

dozd-e tō bālin-e tō-rā ārāste and „tes cheveux ravissants ont orné ton chevet“.

37. -suz (rad. I de *suhtan* „brûler“). Ex. *imān-suz* „impie“ (?) (litt. „brûle-foi“) — *buse-ye tab-deh imān-suz* „un baiser brûlant, impie“.

38. -gīr (rad. I de *gereftan* „prendre, saisir“). Ex. *gereh-gīr* „crépu, frisé“ — *šammāme-ye ān gisuvān-e gereh-gīr-e-tō-rā hwa-ham šanid* „je sentirai l'odeur de tes cheveux crépus“.

40. -kaš (rad. I de *kašidan* „trainer, entraîner“). Ex. *ājoš-kaš* „qui embrasse“.

Quelque nombre des adjectifs cités plus haut sont des néologismes éphémères, par ex. *zāhed-farib*, *sehr-foruš*, *zand-bāf*, *imān-suz*, *sim-pālā*, *horafāt-pasand* etc.

Remarque. La formation: substantif + suffixe déverbatif avec préverbe est plus rare. Ex. *hāne-bar-afkan* (rad. I de *bar-afkandan* „démolir, détruire“ — *seyl-e hāne-bar-afkan* „inondation qui démolit des maisons“.

La liste ci-dessus ne contient qu'un nombre restreint d'exemples. On s'est borné d'indiquer le sens dans lequel s'effectue l'enrichissement lexicologique du persan contemporain. Ses possibilités ne se bornent pas à l'adjectif. Le renouvellement du substantif persan n'est pas moins évident. Cet état des choses nécessite une mise au point des dictionnaires du persan moderne. Les difficultés que la lecture des oeuvres telles que par ex. celles de Sādek Hedāyat, Ġamāl-zādeh etc. présente pour les débutants, proviennent justement du fait que les dictionnaires persans qu'on avait employés jusqu'à présent se montrent insuffisants.

En préparant la liste ci-dessus je me suis servi surtout de deux dictionnaires du persan contemporain:

1. *New Persian-English Dictionary* by S. Haim. Ed. Be-roukhim, Tehrān 1934—1936, 2 vol.

2. *Persidsko-russkij slovar* sostavil Prof. B. W. Miller, Moskva, 1950.

BOŽENA CZERNICKA

AN ATTEMPT TO RECONSTRUCT PROTO-TOCHARIAN

Part II: Consonants

§ 27.

IEur.	PToch	product of palatalization	B	product of palatalization	A	product of palatalization
*p	p	p̣	p	py	p	py
*t	t ⇒ ts	ṭ	t ⇒ ts	c	t ⇒ ts	c
*k	k	ḳ	k	ś	k	ś
*q						
*q ^u	k ^u	ḳ	k, k ^u	ś	k, p	ś
*b	b	ḅ	p	py	p	py
*d	d ⇒ ts	ḍ	t ⇒ ts	c	t ⇒ ts	c
*ġ	}	g'	k	ś	k	ś
*g						
*g ^u	g ^u	g'	k, k ^u	ś	k, p	ś
*bh	b	ḅ	p	py	p	py
*dh	d ⇒ ts	ḍ	t ⇒ ts	c	t ⇒ ts	c
*ġh	g	g'	k	ś	k	ś
*gh						
*g ^u h	g ^u	g'	k, k ^u	ś	k, p	ś
*m	m	m'	m	my	m	my
*n	n	n'	n	n'	n	n'
*w						
*s	s	ś	s	š	s	š
*l	l	l'	l	ly	l	ly
*r	r		r		r	
*i	u		y		y	
*u	i	i	w	y	w	

Consonants

§ 28. The proto-Tocharian and then the Tocharian consonant system developed from the Indo-European which is as follows:

	Voiceless	Voiced		Nasals
		non aspirated	aspirated	
Labial	p	b	bh	m
Dental	t	d	dh	n
Palatal	k̂	ġ	ġh	ñ
Velar	q	g	gh	ŋ
Labio-velar	qʷ	gʷ	gʷh	
Fricative	s			
Liquid		l	r	
Semivowels		i	u	

§ 29. The reconstructed consonant system of proto-Tocharian:

	Voiceless	Voiced	Nasals
Labial	p	b	m
Dental	t	d	n
Velar	k	g	
Labio-velar	kʷ	k	
Fricative	s		
Liquid		l r	
Semivowels		i u	
Affricate	ts		

§ 30. The Tocharian consonant system in both dialects is as follows:

	Voiceless	Voiced	Nasals
Labial	p		m
Dental	t		n
Palatal			ñ
Velar	k		ŋ
Fricative	s š ś		
Liquid		l r	
Semivowels		y w	
Affricate	ts	c	

§ 31. Normally IEur. consonants are replaced in Tocharian dialects by *p t k s l r m n*.

It is immediately obvious that the three IEur. series **p *b *bh* became one series without differentiating tenses, mediae and aspirates. It is the result of the consonant shift, which in Tocharian as in Hittite comprised only the first phase of the hard mutation.

The proto-Indo-European aspiration had already disappeared in Tocharian dialects before the hard mutation (Zabrocki, *Usilnienie i lenicja*, 208; Milewski, Zabrocki, *Usilnienie i lenicja*, 327) and the consonant system had been based on the opposition of the two series — voiceless and voiced). The disappearance of aspiration must have taken place before PToch. divided into dialects, therefore I accept this state for proto-Tocharian.

It was only in the later period that the hard mutation caused the opposition of voice to disappear, and replaced it by the opposition of strength: voiceless *p t k* gave strong *p t k* and the voiced *b d g* became weak *p t k*. As we see the tenses did not undergo any visible changes, all the more so as the opposition had not been sufficiently noted graphically in Tocharian dialects, which used the Indian alphabet, based on the opposition of voice. To explain this it is necessary to note that the changes in tenses under the action of the hard mutation could either

go towards aspirating them or towards increasing the strength of their plosion. Taking into account the possibility of designating aspirates in Tocharian dialects (Indian alphabet) we should accept the second eventuality; that is, that a strong reaction of the organs of speech occurred which led to strengthening the plosion of the tenuis. „The reaction was so strong that it did not allow for aspiration“.

§ 32. Yet the difference between the IEur series $*\tilde{k} *q *q^*$ did not disappear completely. The series $*\tilde{k}$ and $*q$ are identical in fact whereas the series $*q^*$ leaves visible traces, which sometimes appear in uncertain conditions in the A dialect as *p*.

It was different with the B dialect. The labialisation occurred here when the vowel following a labio-velar was reduced. Besides, the labio-velar had the peculiar property of labializing the preceding sounds. SSS. 346. Ped. Toch. § 111.

§ 33. The remaining consonants of the dialects are newly-arisen by palatalization as secondary forms: *c ś š ly ŋ* or by sibilantization: *ts*.

All Tocharian AB consonants were more or less under the influence of palatalization. There are difficulties with the problem of the palatalization of *r* (Ped. Toch. § 112.4) and of the labials, because it is known that labials (and also *r*) are not inclined to be softened, and besides *y* can be also a palatalized form of *w*. Lane, Lg. 21. 20.

§ 34. It is an important problem whether the palatalization took place already in proto-Tocharian or only in the later Tocharian languages. It is possible to give examples where it is evident that the soft consonants underwent this softening in prehistoric times.

1. $*bheu-$, B *pyautk-*, A *pyotk-*, AB *pyutk-*, „to come to a result“ IEW. 150.

If $*eu$ Toch. diphthong B *au* monophthongized to A *o* palatalizes the preceding consonant, one may conclude that

it must have been represented in PToch. as $*eu$, and similarly the softening must also have taken place in PToch.

2. IEur $*\tilde{e}$ gives Toch. AB $\tilde{a}$ with pre-palatalization.

The Imperfect in the A dialect is formed from the present stem, adding $-\tilde{a}-$, and the final consonant undergoes palatalization. We may conclude that $-\tilde{a}-$ was an older $-\tilde{e}-$ and therefore the softening must have already taken place in proto-Tocharian.

Present		Imperfect
<i>klisnā-š</i>	„sleeps“	<i>klisñā</i>
<i>nuseñc</i>	„howls“	<i>nušar</i>

So on the basis of these examples I accepted that palatalization already operated in the proto-Tocharian community.

§ 35. The influence of the vowel on the preceding consonant was the factor operating in all the instances of palatalization. First and foremost *e ē i j* were the palatalizing vowels. But not in all cases; e. g. without the influence of softening were *e* derived from *o* instrumental suffix A $-yo$ (Ped. Toch. 267 b.7), and also the vowel similar to *e* derived from *ŋ* (except *s* which before final *m* becomes *š* e. g. B *ke-kenoš*: Ped. Toch. § 16).

§ 36. The changes of the combinations $sk \Rightarrow šš$, $st \Rightarrow śc$, $ts \Rightarrow ś$ and $śc \Rightarrow śś$ e. g. $st \Rightarrow śc \Rightarrow śś$ (*st* normally appears in B as *st*, A *št*) should be added to the changes brought about under the influence of palatalization, shown in the table of consonants and discussed in the second part:

B *krostaññe*, *krošsaññe*, A *krošsune* „cold“.

B *pāscane*, A *pššāñ* „breasts“.

B *aiskau* „I give“, 3rd sg. *aiššāñ* Ped. Toch. § 112.4.

§ 37. In general it is easy to show the etymology of the products of palatalization; as it can be deduced from the frequent alternation of the consonant with the sound palatalized within a root, which is derived from it.

e. g. 1. that $c \leq t$ is apparent from

A *cmol*, B *cmel* „birth“ besides A *təm*,
B *təm*, *tem* „to be born“. Lane, Lg. 21. 21.

2. that $s \leq k$:

B *aistrə* „vijānāte“ besides *aikemar* „janāmi“. Lane,
Lg. 21. 21.

A *kəm-*, *kum-*, B *kəm-*, *kam-* besides the subjunctive
root.

A *śm-*, B *śem-*. Lane, Lg. 21. 22.

3. that $śc \leq st$;

A *śmoñne*, B *śmoñña*, *śmoñña* „place“ besides.

A *stəm-*, B *stam-*, „to stand“ IEur **st(h)ā*, Lane,
Lg. 21. 23.

4. that $s \leq ts$:

A *tsip-*, B *tsip-*, *tsep-* „to dance“ besides imperfect
act. 3 pl. A *šaper*. Lane, Lg. 21. 22.

§ 38. Some of these sounds can be however of another origin. First of all *ts* can be derived from $t + s$ e. g. *lentsen* „to come out“ SSS 360. Then *s* can become *ts* as happened in imperf. middle *p* — *tstsar* where $t + s + s \Rightarrow tsts$ (Ped. Toch. § 98). Also after nasals, *s* and *l*, *s* gave *ts*, e. g. the postposition *sa* after *N* and *l* gave *tsa*. Ped. Toch. § 42.

§ 39. As to the origin of *ts* as the product of palatalization Pedersen changes his opinion in his later work *Zur Tocharischen Sprachgeschichte* 1944 § 10—44. He states that this phenomenon should not be treated as palatalization but as sibilantisation, i. e. as the conversion of *t* into a „chuintante“ whereas *c* arose through the palatalization of *t*, and he considers this sibilantisation to be an older change. Already Wolfgang Krause, GGA 32—37 had noted this, calling these processes „the late proto-Tocharian affricatisation“ and the „Tocharian palatalization“ but he did not give the conditions of this affricatization saying only that it was independent of the following vowel. His few examples offered to prove this and showing the change

$t \Rightarrow ts$ before *a*, *ā* are not suitable because in *klautso* „ear“ both *-tjā* (Sanskrit *hatya* „dying“) and *tā* can appear. But it is clear that *t* remains before *a*, *ā* from such examples:

B *tāka*, A *tāk²* „he became“, **stā-*;

A *tāp²* „he ate“, Lat. *daps*; Ped. Toch. spr. § 13.

As we see from this the change $t \Rightarrow ts$ depends on the following vowel and Pedersen quotes all these which take part in the process of sibilantisation: *i*, *j*, *ē*, *el*, *er*, *e* + *N*, *ek*. Apparently these are the same vowels which have also palatalizing properties, but we should notice that there is no independent *e*, and that the conditions of sibilantization differ from the conditions of palatalization. Following Pedersen I treated *ts* in my work as the sibilantization of the dental, taking only another term to denote this phenomenon: affricatization, considering it more proper as *ts* is undoubtedly an affricate.

§ 40. We should now consider the case of the final consonant. In the majority of cases the final consonant is dropped.

1. Nasal after *i*, *u*, *e*, and *m* is dropped:

Nom. A *se* „son“ (u-stem) = Acc. (The accusative in Tocharian is formed by the addition of *-n*).

Nom. A *pats²* „husband, spouse“ (Gr. *πόσις*, Sanskrit *pāti*) = Acc. In the B dialect there are no materials. Ped. Toch. § 17.

B *šukt²*, A *špāt²* „7“, B *šak²*, A *šēk* „10“, **dekm-*, cf. Gr. *ἑπτά*, *δέκα*, Lat. *septem*, *decem*. Ped. Toch. § 16.

2. The final *s* is also dropped:

**gombho-s* „tooth“, A *kam²*, B *keme* „tooth“ Gr. *γόμφος* IEW 369.

**bhāghu-s* „elbow, forearm“, AB *poke* „hand“ Gr. *πῆχος* Sanskrit *bahu*, W. 130.

But:

1. The nasal is retained at the end of a word (Wortauslaut) after an open vowel e. g. in acc. of *o*-stems:

**equos*, B *yakwe²*, „horse“. Ped. Toch. § 15.

2. Followed by another consonant at the end of a word the nasal is retained after all vowels. Also the Toch. AB $-n \leftarrow$ IEur $*-ns$, $*-nt$ are retained.

Acc. pl. *onolmeⁿ*, *lantaⁿ*. Ped. Toch. § 38. 12.

B *weskeⁿ* „they speak“. Ped. § 68.

3. The final *r* is also retained as we see first of all in the names of relationships:

$*dhug(h)ater$ - B *tkācer*, A *ckācer* „daughter“, Sanskrit *duhitār* IEW 277.

$*bhrāter$, A *pracar*, B *procer* „brother“, Sanskrit *bhrātār*-, Gr. *φρήτη*; Lat. *frater*. IEW 164.

§ 41. IEur. *p* proto-Tocharian *p*, *p̄*, gave in both Tocharian dialects *p* subject to palatalization in *py*. $*pēd$, B *pai*, A *pe* „foot“, Sanskrit *pad*- „foot“, Gr. *ποδός*, Goth. *fōtus*, Lat. *pēs*, *pēdis*; W. 23 A *pyāpi*, pl. *pyāplān*, B *pyāpyo* „flower“ Lat. *pāpa*, *pāpis*, *pāpulis*, Lith. *pāpas*, *pupuolo* „bud“. Lane, Lg. 21. 24.

$*penk^e$, B *piś* „5“: Sanskrit *pañca*; Lat. *quīnque*; *e* palatalized *p*, and in turn under the influence of *p̄* *e* became *i*. Lane, Lg. 21. 24.

§ 42.

IEur. $*t$, proto-Tocharian *t t'* appears as Tocharian AB *t*: $*ter$ - „to rub“ B *tetriwu* „crushed“ Gr. *τερω* „to rub“, Lat. *tero*- *-ere*; W 729.

$*ātos$, *atta* „father, mother“ A *ātāl* „man“ Sanskrit *attā* „mother, elder sister“ Gr. *ἄττα* „daddy“ Lat. *atta* m „Father“ IEW. 71.

Before *e i j* the Tocharian AB *t* is palatalized into *c*:

$*bhrāter$, A *pracar*, dual. *pratri*, B *procer*, Gr. *φρήτη* IEW. 164.

$*dhug(h)ater$, B *tkācer*, A *ckācar* „daughter“ Sanskrit *duhitār*-, Arm. *dustṛ*, Gr. *θυγάτηρ*; IEW. 277.

According to Pedersen (*Zur Toch. Sprachgeschichte* § 10—44) *t* before *e i j en el er e + N ek* undergoes affricatization

into *ts*. $*-tei$, $-tei$, AB $-tsi$ the ending of the infinitive for both dialects.

§ 43. IEur. $*k̄$, proto-Tocharian *k*, *k̄*, in both Tocharian dialects became *k* which under the influence of palatalization gave *ś*.

$*laks$ - „salmon“ Toch. *laks* „fish“; OHG. *lahs* OIcel *lax* „salmon“; W 381.

$*dek̄$ -, „to take, to lift“, A *tək* „to divide“, Sanskrit *daśā* f. „fate, situation“; Lat. *decus*, *-oris* „decoration“. IEW. 190.

B *aiśtrə* „vijānāte“ besides *aikemar* „janāmi“, Goth. *aih*, Sanskrit *iśe* „law“. Lane, Lg. 21. 19.

§ 44. IEur. $*q$, proto-Tocharian *k* *k̄* were continued by Tocharian AB *k*.

$*lena$ „to see“, B *lk*-, *lyk* „to see“; Gr. *λέσσω* „I see“; Sanskrit *lōcanam* „eye“; W. 411.

Palatalized *k* is perhaps to be found in A *śisri* „points (of the ears)“ which may be the reduplicated form of the root occurring in Lat. *crinis*, *crista*; Lane, Lg. 21. 21.

§ 45. IEur. $*q^*$ proto-Tocharian *k*, *k̄* *k̄* in most examples give in Tocharian AB *k* palatalized into *ś*.

$*peq^*$ -, B *pepakšu* „cooked“ Sanskrit *pācati* Gr. *πέφω*, Lat. *coxō*; W. 17.

$*q^*etuor$ „4“, B *štūwār*, A *štūwār* „4“ Sanskrit *catvarah* Lat. *quattuor*; W 512.

Besides appearing normally as AB *k*, IEur. $*q^*$ leaves traces of labialism. The labialisation occurs in both dialects, for which examples can be given:

$*q^*i$ — *s*, $*q^*i$ — *m*, $*q^*i$ — *d*, B *k̄se*, A *kus̄* „who“ Ped. Toch. § 52.

$*q^*ljo$ -, A *q̄lyi* „woman“ (B *klyiye*) Ir. *caile*; SSS 106. Ped. Toch. § 45. 2.

The imperative particle A *p*-, *pə*- before the IEur. labio-velar appears as *pu*-, *p̄*-, the labialization has been passed on here to the preceding consonant. (SSS 346).

A *p^ukal* $\Leftarrow$ *kəllāš* „brings“; Gr. *πελομαι*;

A *p^ukaks* — *ən* from *kāk* „calls“

A *pukmas* „come“, Gr. *βαίνω*;

Labialization occurred in cases when the vowel following the labiovelar (in the case of *p^u* preceding) was reduced. But before a full vowel pure *k* appears.

A *kāk* „calls“ (according to Ped. Toch. 183, A *kāk* belongs to the same family as Sanskrit *gā* — *ti*, **gē* — (*i*), *gō(i)*-, but morphologically it can be compared to Goth. *gainōn*; ON. *kveina*, **g^uei-* „to complain“).

In the A dialect IEur. labiovelars appear also as *p*.

**lei^q-*, A *lipo* „left“, Gr. *λείπω*; Lat. *linguo*, -*ere*; W. 396.

A *wleep* „soft“, Ir. *flíuch* Cymr. *gwlyb*; Ped. Toch. 235.

A *wampe* „decoration“, Cymr. *gwyp*. Toch. 235.

Note: the group *kw* often found in B dialect is not a continuant of IEur. labiovelars. Etymologically it is always the result of two sounds (in A *w* is dropped).

**ek^uos*, B *yakwe*, A *yuk*, Sanskrit *aśva*.

**arg^uio*, A *ārki*, B *ārkiw* „white“, Gr. *ἄργος* Lat. *argentum*. IEW. 65.

§ 46. IEur. **b* proto-Tocharian *b*, *b'* gave Tocharian AB *p* $\Rightarrow$ *py*, but I lack examples to prove this.

§ 47. IEur. **d* proto-Tocharian *d* *d'* gave in A and B dialects *t* as the product of palatalization of *c* and of affricatization of *ts*.

**deup-*, A *təp-*, inf. *tpəssi*, part. pass. *cəpu* „to tell, inform“. IEW. 222.

**ades-*, **ados-*, AB *āti* „mover“ Lat. *ador*, *ōris*; IEW. 3.

**del-*, B *tselt*, *tsält* „to chew“, Sanskrit *dālati*, Gr. *δαίδαλος*, *δαίδλεος* Lat *dolo*, -*are*. IEW. 3.

We often find in Tocharian dialects *ś* developed by palatalization of the dental. Lane explains this as the secondary development through retrogressive assimilation or by development from *ts*. (also Ped. Toch. § 116).

**dek^u* $\Rightarrow$ **tek* $\Rightarrow$ **kek* $\Rightarrow$ **šek* $\Rightarrow$ A *śək*, B *śak* „ten“; Lane, Lg. 21. 22.

The category of verb stems which have parallel forms in *ts* and *ś* is the most important proof of the development **t* $\Rightarrow$ *ts* $\Rightarrow$ *s*.

**der-*, A *tsər-*, B *tsər-*, *tsar-*, „to divide“ besides caus. pret. act. 2 sg. A *śasrāst*, subst. der. *śral* „separation“. Lane, Lg. 21. 22.

§ 48. IEur. consonants **ǵ* **g* **g^u*, proto-Tocharian *g* *g^u* *ǵ* give in Tocharian AB *k* which under the influence of palatalization passes into *ś*.

IEur. **ǵ*:

**aǵ-*, B *ak-*, AB *āk-* „to lead“, A pres. med. 3 sg. *aśtrə*, part. pres. *aśānt* besides pres. act. 3 pl. *ākeñc^ē*; Gr. *ἄγω*, Sanskrit *ajāmi*; Lat. *agō*; Arm. *acem*. IEW. 4; Lane, Lg. 21. 21.

**ǵenu-* *ǵneu-*, A *kanwem*, B *kanīne* dual. „knee“ Lat. *genū*, -*ūs*, Sanskrit *jānu* n Arm. *cunr*, Goth. *kniū*; IEW. 381.

**genu-*, A *śanwe* — m. dual. f. „jaw“; Sanskrit *hanu*, Gr. *γένυς*, -*υος*; IEW. 381.

§ 49. IEur. **g*:

**dēg-*, B *tek-*, *tak-* „to touch“, Goth *tēkan*: IEW. 183.

**bhag-*, B *pāke*, A *pāk* „part“; A *paśim* „treasure“; Sanskrit *bhājati* = Av. *bag-*. IEW. 107.

§ 50. IEur. **g^u*:

**bheg^u-* A *pkənt* (*pkət*) „far“, Gr. *φόβος* „escape“; IEW. 116.

A *śəm* B *śno* „wife“, Gr. *γυνή*; Lane Lg 21. 22.

I have written about the continuation of IEur. labiality in Tocharian dialects discussing the IEur. **q^u* § 45.

§ 51. IEur. **bh*, proto-Tocharian *b*, *b'*, gave Tocharian AB *p* palatalized into *py*.

**bhelg-*, AB *pəlk-* „to shine“, Sanskrit *bhārgas-*. IEW. 124.

**bhrū-*, A *pərwān-*, B *perwāne* (dual) „brew“, Sanskrit *bhrū*, IEW. 173.

**bheu-*, B *pyautk-*, A *pyotk-*, AB *pyutk-*, „to come to a result, to come to effect“. Ped. Toch. 228. IEW. 150

§ 52. IEur. **dh*, proto-Tocharian *d*, *d'* passed into Tocharian AB *t* palatalized and affricatized into *c* and *ts*,

**dhrgh* — *na*, A *tənā-*, *tərk-*, pret. A *cərk*, B *carka* „to leave“; Arm *darnam*. IEW. 258.

**dhō-*, **dhū-* AB *tsu-*, B *tsaw* „to join“; Lat. *funis* „lina“ IEW. 272 **bhrendh-*, A *pratsak*, B *pratsāk* „breast“. IEW. 168.

§ 53. IEur. **gh* **gh* **g^h* proto-Tocharian *g* *g^h* *ġ* are continued by the Tocharian AB *k* (*k^h*) which passes into *ś* under the influence of palatalization.

IEur. **gh*.

**bhāghu-s*, AB „poke“, Gr. *πῆχυς*. IEW. 108.

**bhēgh-*, *bhōgh-*, B *pakware* „badly“; OIr. *bāg* f. „war“? IEW. 115.

IEur. **g^h*.

**dheg^h-*, B *tsak-*, *tsək* „to shine“ Sanskrit, *dāhati*, Av. *dažaiti*, Lat. *foveo* — *ēre*, AB *cok* „lamp“. IEW. 241.

A *śərme* (if its uncertain meaning may be connected with Sanskrit.) *gharma-* Gr. *θερμός*. Lane, Lg. 1 22.

IEur. **ġh*:

**bhṇgh-*, B *pkante*, *pkatte* „size“ Sanskrit *bahú* — „many“, Gr. *παχύς*. IEW. 128.

A *śew-* „to yawn“, OHG. *anagīwēn*, Lat. *hiāre*, CS. *zeja*, Sanskrit *vi-jihite*. Lane, Lg. 21. 21.

§ 54. IEur. *m*, proto-Tocharian *m* *m̐* gave in Tocharian dialects *m* $\Rightarrow$ *my*.

**meg(h)-* „big“, B *maki-* „much“ Sanskrit *mahānt-*, Av. *mazant*, Gr. *μεγας*, *μεγαλη*, *μεγα* „big“, Lat. *magnus*; W. 257.

The decision whether *m* was inclined to be palatalized is very difficult because only a few isolated examples of this can be found in dialect B.

B *kəlymiye*, *kəlyme*, „direction“ besides A *kəlyme*; In B *mit mīsa*, *m* before *ē* was palatalized and in turn it caused the passing of *e* $\Rightarrow$ *i*.

**médhu* n. B *mit* „mead, honey“, Sanskrit *madhu* „mead, honey“ Gr. *μεθυ* „wine“. W. 261.

m is dropped before sibilants (cf. also B *piś* 5) § 41.

**mēmso-* n B *mīsa* „meat“, Sanskrit *māmsā-* Gr. *μῆρυξ* „skin“; Goth. *mimz* „meat“; W. 262.

§ 55. IEur. *n* *v* proto-Toch. *n* *n̐* appear as Tocharian AB *n* $\Rightarrow$ *n̐*.

**andh-*, A *ānt*, B *ānte* „plain, flat“ Gr. *ἀνθος* n. „flower“; Arm. *and* „field“. IEW. 41.

**mēn-*, A *nañ*, B *meñe* „month“, Gr. *μήν* Lat. *mēnsis*, Goth. *mēna*, *mēnops*. Lane Lg. 14. 30.

**neyn*, AB *ñu* „9“, Sanskrit *nāva*, Arm *inn* Hom Gr. *εἴνα-εἰς* Lat. *novem*. IEW. 319.

**ant-* AB *añ* „life, spirit“; Gr. *ἄνεμος* „wind“ Lat. *animus*, „spirit“. IEW. 39.

**nomn*, A *ñem*, B *ñom*, Sanskrit *nāma*, Gr. *ὄνομα* Lat. *nomen*, Goth. *namo*. IEW. 321.

In B dialect (as other nasals § 54) is dropped before sibilants.

**pevqe*, B *piś* „5“, A *pəñ* ($\Leftarrow$ *pañś*); Gr. *πεντε*; Sanskrit *pañca*, Lat. *quinque*. W. 25.

According to Lane all these *n̐* underwent palatalization only after the simplification of the final consonant group. Lane, Lg. 21. 24.

§ 56. IEur. **s*, proto-Tocharian *s*, *ś* is normally continued in Tocharian AB as *s* $\Leftarrow$ *ś*. Only in dialect A *s* in the combination *st* appears always as *š*, e. g. A *štam* B *stam* „tree“.

**suu* — *ēs*, B *suwo* „swine, pig“, Av. *hū-*; Gr. *ῥς*, *ῥος*, Alb. *i*, Lat. *sūs*, *sūis* „swine“ **eġhs* „out, of“, A postposition *-š* „on account of“ $\Leftarrow$ **kš*; Gr. *εξ* „out of“, Lat. *ex*, Cymr. *ch-*, Gael. *ex*. IEW. 293.

A *šək*, B *škas*, „6“, Lat. *sex*, Goth. *sains*, Sanskrit. *śāt*; Gael. *chwach*. Meillet, *Les noms de nombre* 7.

§ 57. IEur **l*, proto-Tocharian *l* ʹ gave *l*. The palatalization of *l* into *ly* is not yet well investigated.

**leuq-*, B *lk*, *lyk-* „to see“, Gr. *λενός* „white“ „shining“, Lat. *lūx*, -*cis* „light“ W. 411.

**al-*, A *alym* „life, spirit“ Gr. *ἄλμα* n. „grove, copse“. IEW 27.

A *lyək* pl. *lyši*, B *lyak* pl. *lyši* „thief“ Czech *lakati* „ambush“; OHG. *luog* „site“ Lane, Lg. 21, 24.

Pedersen, *Toch*, 235 supposes that *l* in A dialect had also the *u* sound e. g.

B *kselne*, A *ksalune* „to cross“. Ped. *Toch*, 100.

B *šale*, *šle* „mountain“, A *šula* ← **selo*,

**selos*, Gr. *ἔλος*, Sanskrit *saras*. Ped. *Toch*. 221.

§ 58. IEur. *r* this is the proto-Tocharian *r*, ʹ which passed in Tocharian dialects into *r*.

As to the old palatalization of *r* before *e i j* there is no evidence for it. Yet Pedersen, *Toch*. § 112. 4 states that certain changes could have occurred taking into account the fact that in many languages there was a tendency to lose the softening where there was *r* (Schultze, *Kl. Schr.* 240). He also gives some examples in which the influence of palatalization on *r* can be seen: The group *try* passed into *cr* in A *cravkəs*, *cravkar*, the imperf. of „to answer“. Ped. *Toch*. 74.

bharek A *prākər*, B *prākre* „strong“, Lat. *farcio* — *-ire* „to fatten“; IEW. 111.

**arə-* *trom*, AB are „plough“, Arm. *araur*, Gr. *ἀρόω* „they plough“, Lat. *arō*, -*āre* „to plough“ Goth. *arjan*. IEW. 63.

**uriā*, A *ri*, B *ri* „town“, Lat. *varus*. IEW. 267.

§ 59. IEur. semivowels **i* **u*, proto-Tocharian *i* *u* were replaced by the Tocharian AB *y* *w*.

IEur. **u*:

**uel-* „to close“ „to cover“ B *warto*, *warto* „garden, copse“ 283.

**uer-* „to moisten“, A *wər*, B *war* „water“ Sanskrit *varī* f. Av. *vairi* — m „sea“ W. 268. IEW. 80.

**arǵuio*, A *ārki*, B *ārkwī* „white“. IEW. 65.

duō* „2“ A m. *wu* f. *we* B m. f. *wi*; Sanskrit *dvāu* *dvā* = *dva* m; Lat *duo* (duō*) Goth. *twai* OHG. *zwene*. IEW. 229.

**dhyēr-* **dhyōr-* „door“, B *twere* „door“, Sanskrit Nom. pl. *dvarah* „door“ CS. *dveri*. IEW. 279.

IEur. **i*:

**aiu* „life“ „might“ A *āym* „spirit, life“ (*m* taken from *aīm* „life“), Sanskrit *yuh* „the strength of life“; Av. *ayu*, HomGr. *aiei* „always“. IEW. 17.

**ia-*, A *yā* „went“ B *yatsi* „to go“ broadened with -*p-* *yopsa* „entered“; Sanskrit *yāti* „he goes“ Av. *yaiti*; CS *jade*, *jachati*. IEW. 296.

y often appears in B dialect instead of *w* (Schultze, *Kl. Schr.* 245) proved that it is the result of palatalization of *w*, considering such examples from B as *yaika*, A *wawik* „he destroyed“ B *yātka*, A *wotək* „he ordered“ as parallel to B *spyārta*, A *sapartu*; B *pyatka*, A *papyutək*. These are forms of the preterite formed from the reduplicated aorist (the reduplication was preserved only in the A dialect: B *yātka* ← **ya(y)atka*. Schultze, *Kl. Schr.* 239—248), for which palatalization is characteristic.

**uē-* „to blow“, A *want*, B *yente* „wind“ Sanskrit *vāti*, Av. *vaiti* „it blows“ Lat. *ventus* IEW. 82.

B *yaši*, A *wše* „night“;

y is dropped before *i*;

A *wiki*, B *ikəm* „20“; Meillet, *Les noms de nombre*, 10.

Similarly *w* is dropped after *s*;

A *špəm*, B *špəne* „sleep“; OE. *swefn*, Sanskrit *svapnas*

A *šar*, B *šer* „sister“, Goth. *swistar*, Sanskrit *svasar*;

Lane tries to explain this also with the change *šw* ⇒ *šy*. All the more so as there is an example in which the non-palatalized *w* has been retained.

**seu* „to fall“, A *swase*, B *swese* „rain“ Gr. *ῥεῖ* „it rains“; Alb. *ši* „rain“. W. 468.