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Abstract: Recently, there have been attempts to challenge the status of PIE *-eh₂ as a feminine suffix in Tocharian. It has been claimed that there are virtually no traces of *-eh₂ in Tocharian nominal morphology and that the instances of *-eh₂ that are found do only reflect the continuants of PIE neuter collectives/abstracts. Based on these assumptions, the Tocharian gender system has been interpreted as preserving a more archaic state than the other non-Anatolian languages. I argue that the Tocharian evidence does not permit such far-reaching claims. Based on the Tocharian gender and agreement system, I show that it inherited PIE *-eh₂ as a feminine marker just like the other non-Anatolian languages.

1.1 Tocharian possesses two morphological categories that have recently been invoked to claim that it preserves a more archaic gender system than the inner-Indo-European languages. These are the feminine singular of the continuants of PIE thematic adjectives in nom. sg. f. B-ya A-i, obl. B-ai A-yaṃ and a group of nouns in nom. sg. m./f. B-a A-ø, obl. B-ai, A-āṃ. In different ways both of them have been used to challenge the status of PIE *-eh₂ and *-ih₂ as feminine markers in Tocharian with (partially far-reaching) conjectures about the Indo-European proto-language.

1.1. Turning to the first category, it is notable that in the feminine singular, the continuants of PIE thematic adjectives (TEB class I) differ from their cognates in other Indo-European languages. Greek and Latin, for example, show the regular development of the (late-)PIE feminine adjective suffix *-eh₂:
Depending on the exact treatment of *-eh₂ in final position,⁷ the expected outcome of the (late-)PIE feminine adjective suffix *-eh₂ in Tocharian would have looked as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TB</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>PIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom. sg.</td>
<td>†-o or †-a</td>
<td>†-ø</td>
<td>*-ā or *-a</td>
<td>*-*eh₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl. sg.</td>
<td>†-o</td>
<td>†-ø</td>
<td>*-ā</td>
<td>*-*eh₂-m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no evidence for this kind of feminine inflection in class I adjectives. The attested feminine in this class deviates significantly from the expected continuants of the (late-)PIE feminine adjectival suffix *-eh₂:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TB</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom. sg.</td>
<td>-ya -i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl. sg.</td>
<td>-yāṃ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom./obl. pl.</td>
<td>-yana -yāṃ or -ona -aṃ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reconstruction of this feminine yields PT *-ya.⁸ The suffix *-ya as a feminine is also found mutatis mutandis in the adjective classes that continue PIE athematic stems.⁹ Furthermore, there are two feminine substantives that continue PT *-ya, namely the substantivized feminine nt-stem Blānsta Alānts ‘queen’ < PT *-nt-ya (to the substantivized masculine nt-stem Bwalo, obl. Blānt; Awał, obl. Alānt ‘king’) and Bepetsa ‘fiancée’ < PT *-pæt-ya (cf. Ved. sapātnī- ‘rival; bride’).¹⁰

---

⁵ As it is well known, the Latin nom. sg. f. -a goes back to the PIE voc. f. sg. *-a, in which the laryngeal of *-eh₂ was lost by Kuiper’s Law (cf. Gk. nom. νύμφη vs. voc. νύμφα, OCS nom. žena ‘woman’ vs. voc. ženo).

⁶ Latin acc. sg. f. -am is the product of regular shortening of *-ām.

⁷ See below.

⁸ The oblique stems have been remodeled in both Toch. languages, but nevertheless continue PT *-ya- (see below).

⁹ These include the preterite participle (TEB class IV) in nom. sg. f. B-usa, A-us (cf. Ved. -ūṣi, Gk. -veis), the nt-adjectives (TEB class III) in nom. sg. f. B-ntsa, A-nts (cf. Ved. -tī, Gk. -tē), and the mo-adjectives (TEB class II) in nom. sg. f. B-mīna, A-mim.

¹⁰ Pinault (2010: 36) shows that this is the correct interpretation of the word previously understood as ¹⁸petso ‘husband’.
In the light of this evidence, there can be no doubt that PT *-ya continues PIE *-ih₂, i.e., the devī-type athematic feminine suffix (*-ih₂). The devī-type feminine had PIE nom. sg. *-ih₂ > PT *-ya, acc. sg. *-ih₂-m > *-īm > PT *-i. The somewhat surprising fact is that all Tocharian adjectives continuing PIE thematic stems continue this suffix. Since the comparative evidence suggests that the devī-type *ih₂-feminine was primarily associated with athematic stems whereas the *eh₂-feminine was primarily associated with thematic stems, the Tocharian data are in need of an explanation.

1.2. There are two possible ways to account for the fact that Tocharian feminine thematic adjectives show the continuant of PIE *-ih₂: (1) Tocharian preserves a more morphologically archaic state of affairs than the other Indo-European languages. In accordance with the hypothesis that Tocharian was the second language to split off from PIE after Anatolian (Jasanoff 1988, 2003; Ringe 2000; Ringe et al. 2002), it could be argued that PIE *-eh₂ was not yet a feminine marker for adjectives when Tocharian left the Indo-European proto-language; (2) Tocharian does not differ from the inner-Indo-European branches and the continuant of PIE *-ih₂ was somehow analogically extended from athematic to thematic feminine adjectives.

1.2.1. Kim (2009) and Hackstein (2011) develop different approaches claiming that PIE *-eh₂ was not yet a feminine marker for adjectives when Tocharian left the Indo-European proto-language. Both assume a special status for PIE *-ih₂ that eventually lead to its grammaticalization as a feminine marker in Tocharian. According to Kim all Tocharian feminine adjectives continue a non-ablauting PIE *-ih₂ that originally designated appurtenance and could be derived from athematic and thematic stems. According to Hackstein the feminine to thematic adjectives in Tocharian goes back to a “collective-abstract” *-i-h₂, an *h₂-collective that was derived from an *i-stem abstract.

---

11 The obl. sg. f. in the adjectives was remodeled in both languages. In TA, PT nom. *-ya was extended to the oblique and equipped with the ubiquitous oblique marker *-n(ă) giving A-yām. Similarly in TB, PT nom. *-ya was probably extended and later analogically reshaped on the bases of the oblique in -ai found, for example, in nouns of the type yoko, obl. -ai f. ‘thirst, desire’ (TEB class VI), for the origin of which see Pinault (2008: 483). It is also possible that PT *-i (< *-īm < *-ih₂-m) was reattached to PT *-ya after it was leveled from the nominative in TB.

1.2.2. I have dealt with the semantic and morphological difficulties of Kim’s and Hackstein’s proposals concerning PIE *-ih₂ elsewhere in detail (Fellner forthcoming a).¹³ In a nutshell, there are no indications that the continuants of PIE *-ih₂ in Tocharian behaved any different from the devī-type feminine in the other Indo-European languages. The curious fact that thematic adjectives exhibit devī-type feminine inflection in the singular can easily be attributed to an analogical extension from athematic to thematic stems, as I have argued based on a similar development in Proto-Indo-Iranian.¹⁴ This analogy was motivated by the fact that thematic m. *-o-adjuncts were associated with f. *-ih₂-derivatives by speakers’ reinterpretation of a derivational mechanism. The starting point for this were the continuants of the PIE masculine o-stem *deiy-o- ‘heavenly, god’ (Ved. devā-, Lat. deus etc.) and the PIE feminine ih₂-stem *deiy-ih₂ ‘heavenly, goddess’ < ‘(the one) having heaven (at her disposal)’ (Ved. devē-, Gk. δῖα). PIE *deiy-o- and *deiy-ih₂ are originally both independently derived from *diey-/*diy- ‘day-lit sky, heaven’ (Ved. dyaú-, Gk. ἀuros); PIE *deiy-o- is a genitival formation with thematic *-o- and vrddhi, while PIE *deiy-ih₂ is an athematic possessive formation with *-ih₂-d. (Schindler 1970 [1972]: 152):

\[
\begin{align*}
*\text{diey} &\rightarrow *\text{diy} \\
*\text{diy} &\rightarrow *\text{diey-ih}_2
\end{align*}
\]

Speakers reinterpreted the relationship between masculine *deiy-o- ‘heavenly, god’ and feminine *deiy-ih₂ ‘heavenly, goddess’ in such a way as to understand *deiy-ih₂ as the feminine to the vrddhi-formation *deiy-o-; they then abstracted a new derivational rule:¹⁵

\[
\text{vrddhi-formation m.} \quad \text{f.} \\
*\text{deiy-o-} \rightarrow *\text{deiy-ih}_2
\]

---

¹³ I am glad that Kim (this volume) has taken up some of my criticism. However, I remain unconvinced by his revised account of the evolution of *-(e)h₂- and *-ih₂- in Tocharian and Indo-European (see below).


¹⁵ Cf. the reinterpretation of the relationship of Ved. m. pīvān-, Gk. m. πίων adj. ‘fat’ (< PIE *pihx-yo-) to Ved. f. pīvār-, Gk. f. πίερα adj. ‘fat’ (< PIE *pihx-ye∥-ih₂), both originally independently derived from the stem that underlies Gk. πῖαρ subst. ‘fat’ (< *pihx-yr, *pihx-ye∥-).
The new derivational mechanism first affected \textit{vṛddhi}-formations and then began to spread to other thematic stems from there. The extension of the pattern to thematic adjectives in Pre-Proto-Tocharian finally eliminated almost all traces of old \textit{*-eh₂} feminine adjectives, thus giving rise to the attested situation.\textsuperscript{16}

2.1. The second category used to claim a special archaic status for the continuants of PIE \textit{*-eh₂} and \textit{*-ih₂} in Tocharian comprises a number of different agent formations that all seem to be related from both semantic and morphological points of view. These include the formations in \textit{B₄tsa} \textit{A₄ts} (\textit{Baknātsa} \textit{Aāknats} subst. ‘fool’, adj. ‘ignorant’) and \textit{B₄ntsa} (e.g. \textit{Bwapāntsas} ‘weaver’ (\textit{Bwāp- ‘weave’}), the formations in \textit{B₄nta} \textit{A₄nt} (e.g. \textit{Bkausenta} \textit{Akoṣant} ‘killer, killing’ (\textit{Bkau- Ako- ‘kill’)), the \textit{nt}-participles in \textit{B₄eṅca} \textit{A₄nt} (e.g. \textit{Bnākṣeṅca} \textit{Aṇākṣant} ‘destroying’ (\textit{Bānāk- ‘destroy’)), the formations in \textit{B₄(a)uca} (e.g. \textit{Bkārstauca} ‘cutting’ (\textit{Bkār- ‘cut’)), and the verbal governing compounds in \textit{B₄a} \textit{A₄ø} (cf. \textit{Byoolo-rita} ‘seeking evil’ (\textit{Brit- ‘seek, long for’}). \textit{Aṣotre-lyāk} ‘seeing signs’ (\textit{Aḷāk- ‘see’}). All of these inflect in the same way, with the singular expressing both masculine and feminine gender:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{TB} & \text{m.} & \text{f.} & \text{TA} \\
\text{nom. sg.} & -a & -ø & \\
\text{obl. sg.} & -āi & -āṃ & \\
\text{nom. pl.} & -aṅ & -ana & -āṅ & n/a \\
\text{obl. pl.} & n/a & n/a & \\
\end{array}
\]

2.2. Hackstein (2011: 155–66) claims that the formations in \textit{B₄nta} \textit{A₄nt}, the \textit{nt}-participles in \textit{B₄eṅca} \textit{A₄nt} and the formations in \textit{B₄(a)uca} go back to “collective-abstract” PIE \textit{*-eh₂} and that the formations in \textit{B₄tsa} \textit{A₄ts} and \textit{B₄ntsa} go back to—in his terminology—“collective-abstract” PIE \textit{*-ih₂}.

\textsuperscript{16} To be sure, the continuants of \textit{*deiu-o} and \textit{*deiu-ih₂} are, unfortunately, not attested in Tocharian. But since they were pivotal for the reinterpretation process in Proto-Indo-Iranian and belong to the core vocabulary of PIE, it is fair to assume that they once existed in the prehistory of Tocharian. That these lexical items were eventually lost in Tocharian is due to the cultural and religious context of Central Asia in which the speakers of (Pre-)Proto-Tocharian were situated (cf. Pinault 1998).
2.2.1. For a criticism of Hackstein’s view concerning PIE *-ih₂ in Tocharian which in my view is not compatible with the comparative evidence see again Fellner (forthcoming a).

2.2.2. There are semantic difficulties with Hackstein’s assumption that B-nta A-nt, B-eñca A-nt and B-(a)uca go back to “collective-abstract” PIE *-eh₂ (*nte₂h₂, *nti₂eh₂ and *-tii₂eh₂). There is no evidence that these categories ever were collectives or abstracts in Tocharian. Synchronically, all of these formations are verbal nouns with participial qualities in Tocharian that are intimately linked with the verbal system. In the case of Hackstein’s nt-participle derived “collective-abstracts” it is questionable whether they would systematically and across the board be turned into participles again (especially—as one has to assume—if real participles existed side by side with them).

While the reanalysis of an abstract/collective as concrete/individual noun as envisaged by Hackstein is indeed a well-attested development (cf. NHG Bedienung ‘waiter, waitress’ < ‘service’, *slou̯g(h)-eh₂ ‘service’ in Lith. slaugà ‘id.’, directly corresponding to concretized OCS sluga ‘servant’, or Modern English youth), it is a lexical, not a morphological change, i.e. this kind of change is sporadic and confined to individual lexical items. Lexical change of this kind is not enough to transform a suffix forming abstracts/collectives into a suffix forming individuals/agents. Furthermore, the abstract usually does not lose its original denotation, nor does it change its gender/agreement properties (cf. NHG Bedienung f. 1. ‘service’, 2. ‘waiter’; Ofr. la justice f. 1. ‘justice’ 2. ‘judge’, OCS døve vojevode f. ‘two generals’ m., Serb. moje sluge f. ‘my servants’ m.).

However, the main obstacle for Hackstein’s treatment of B-nta A-nt, B-eñca A-nt and B-(a)uca stemming from formations with PIE *-eh₂ is a phonological one.

3. The status of the PIE sequence *eh₂ has been a matter of not only morphological, but also phonological debate. The communis opinio in Tocharian linguistics assumes a development of PIE *-eh₂- in internal position to PT *-ā- > B-o- A-ā- (e.g. PIE *bhrebh₂-tōr → Pre-PT *bhrebh₂tēr > PT *prāćer > Bprocer Apracar ‘brother’ (Ved. bhrátar- ‘id.’ etc.); cf. the development of PIE *-ā- in PIE *uāst-u- > PT *wāstā > Bost Awaṣt ‘house’ (Ved. vástu- ‘id.’)).

17 I refer to Fellner (forthcoming b) for the details.
There is no consensus on the development of PIE *-eh₂ in final position. Malzahn (2011 following Peters 1988–1990 [1991]) and Hackstein (2011: 151) suggest a lautgesetzlich development of PIE *-eh₂ > PT *-a > Bₐ-∅ in final position. According to Malzahn only internal PIE *-eh₂-C- gave PT *-â- > Bₐ- ∅-a-. Her prime examples are nom. sg. m. Bh*ktwo ‘tongue’ < PIE *dŋʰyeh₂-s and obl. sg. allok < PIE *alî-eh₂-m.

Pinault (2008: 428, 486) assumes a general development of PIE *eh₂ > PT *â- > B₀ ∅a, his examples for the auslaut treatment being nom. sg. m. Bh*ktwo ‘tongue’ < PIE *dŋʰyeh₂ and nom. sg. f. Bh*tano ‘grain’ < PIE *dʰohxneh₂.

3.1. In order to determine the fate of the sequence PIE *eh₂ in Tocharian it is necessary to review the evidence connected with it.

3.1.1. The PIE *eh₂-feminine is directly reflected in the paradigm of the cardinal Bh*se ∅as ‘one’ in the obl. sg. f. Bh*somo ∅som,¹⁸ which go back to PIE *som-eh₂-m (Skt. samā ‘same’, Gk. ὁμή ‘id.’).¹⁹

3.1.2. The PIE *eh₂-feminine is also directly reflected in the paradigm of the pronominal stem Bh*allek ∅alāk ‘other’ in the obl. sg. f. Bh*allok < *alå²⁰ (later extended with the particle *-kâ-) < PIE *alî-eh₂-m.²¹

3.1.3. The feminine of the Tocharian demonstrative pronoun Bh*Aṣā < PT *sa either directly goes back to PIE *seh₂ via a special auslaut-treatment (in monosyllabic words or function words or by generalization of a Kuiper’s

¹⁸ Tocharian Bh*somo is the archaic variant of the innovative obl. sg. f. Bh*sanai, which is based on the nom. sg. f. Bh*sanai (cf. Peyrot 2008: 13f.).


²⁰ While it is true that Bh*allok could in principle go back to PIE *alîeh₂-m, the accusative of a devi-type *ih₂-stem that was remodeled on the weak stem, as Kim (this volume fn. 18, 2009: 78f.) points out, there is no comparative evidence that PIE *alîo- (or other basic pronouns) ever had a devi-feminine. Under the analysis put forth by Kim (2009) there is no basis for this kind of weak stem anyhow since according to him the devi-type developed only after Tocharian branched off. An interpretation of Bh*allok as continuing a devi-type feminine is also a problem for Kim (this volume fn. 18.) since he assumes that non-derived primary adjectives had PIE *-eh₂.

²¹ Less compelling are the adverbs Bh*wato ‘again’ and Bh*wasto ∅wāṣt ‘doubly, in two ways’. The former could in principle go back to the continuant of the inst. sg. f. Bh*eh₂-(e)h₁ or the acc. sg. f. Bh*eh₂-m of the ordinal number Bh*wate ∅wāt ‘second’ (cf. Ved. dvitā ‘again, doubly’). The latter could likewise continue the inst. sg. f. Bh*eh₂-(e)h₁ or the acc. sg. f. Bh*eh₂-m of an adjective whose cognate is attested in Skt. dvistha- ‘in two places; ambiguous’. However, the problem with these adverbs is that it is impossible to prove a definitive preform for their origin.
Law context) or it is the replacement of a PT *sā with *-a taken from the feminine adjective inflection (see 1.1.).

3.1.4. Tocharian Bñuwa (Añwa) the feminine of Bñuwe Añu ‘new’ (< PIE *neu-o-), either directly goes back to PT *ñäwa (< PIE *neu-eh₂), or has been remodeled to *ñäwa (from PT *ñäwā < PIE *neu-eh₂) based on the generalized feminine adjective inflection.

3.1.5. Tocharian Btano f. ‘grain’ either directly corresponds to Ved. f. pl. dhanā- ‘grain’ (Lith. dúona ‘bread’) and goes back to pl. *-eh₂-es, which was reinterpreted as singular, or it goes back directly to the sg. *-eh₂.

3.1.6. Tocharian Bkantwo m., Ḍkantu m./f. ‘tongue’ (Ved. jihvā-, OLat. dingua etc.) either directly corresponds to what is found in the compound Yav. hitō.hīzuuā Y 65, 9 ‘having a bound tongue’ and goes back to sg. *-eh₂-s, or directly goes back to sg. *-eh₂.

3.2. It is important to note that the morphological evidence in 3.1.1.–3.1.4. strongly suggests that Tocharian inherited PIE *-eh₂ as a feminine marker in pronouns and thematic adjectives regardless of its actual phonology.

Phonologically, only one thing is certain, namely, that PIE *-eh₂-m, *-eh₂-es, and *-eh₂-s in accordance with the communis opinio gave PT *-ā. But, since it could be argued that final PIE *-eh₂ gave PT *-a > B.a A-ø in the examples 3.1.3. and 3.1.4., the matter cannot be decided alone by lexical items that allow different (valid) interpretations. There is, however, a strong grammatical argument in favor of Pinault’s account that has never been fully brought to bear in this context. This is the Tocharian agreement system, specifically, gender concord.

4. Gender concord, as opposed to the derivation of oppositional gender (NHG “Femininmotion”), falls into the domain of agreement. Agreement as a syntactic phenomenon is responsible for gender concord between adjectives, pronouns, etc., and the substantives they accompany. It is necessary to differentiate between between so-called “controller (lexical)
gender” and “target (grammatical) gender” (Corbett 1991: 150ff.). “Controller gender” is the lexically inherent noun class of a word. “Target gender” is the agreement triggered by the controller gender on syntactic elements that are in concord with the controller gender.

Due to language change, the number of controller and target genders can start to deviate over time. Romanian, as well as Tocharian itself, is a prominent case of this kind of development. These languages synchronically have three controller genders, i.e. lexically inherent genders, and two target genders, i.e. syntactically dependent genders in concord, cf. Romanian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sg.</th>
<th>m.</th>
<th>f.</th>
<th>n.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rm.</td>
<td>fiu</td>
<td>bun</td>
<td>casă</td>
<td>fir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>filius</td>
<td>bonus</td>
<td>casa</td>
<td>bona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm.</td>
<td>fii</td>
<td>buni</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>filii</td>
<td>boni</td>
<td>caseae</td>
<td>fila</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The continuants of the Latin masculine singular and neuter o-stems (plus some neuter consonant stems) fell together in Romanian. The continuants of the Latin feminine a-stems with nom. sg. -a : pl. -ae in Romanian are sg. -ă : pl. -e. The continuant of the Latin neuter pl. -a first developed into the Pre-Romanian pl. *-ă.26 Learners interpreted *-ă as feminine.27 Subsequently, feminine *-ă that functioned as plural for the now masculine continuants of Latin singular neuter o-stems28 was replaced

---

26 A relic of this stage is Rm. n. sg. ou ‘egg’ : f. pl. ouă < Lat. ouum, oua, cf. It. sg. m. l’uovo ‘egg’ : pl. f. le uova. Italian preserves a few more cases of so-called ambigeneric nouns. Some of these also have a regular plural, e.g., sg. m. corno ‘horn’ : pl. f. corna : pl. m. corni. The a-plural can display a mass reading in a subset of these, e.g., sg. m. cervello ‘brain’ : pl. f. cervella ‘brains’ (mass) : pl. m. cervelli ‘brain’ (organs). For the interpretation of the plurals of Italian ambigeneric nouns as lexical plurals see Acquaviva (2008).

27 The reinterpretation of the continuants of the Latin neuter plurals in -a as feminine singulars also happened in the Italo-Western Romance languages, e.g., Lat. pl. n. gaudia > Fr. sg. f. la joie ‘joy’, Cat. and Occ. sg. f. la joia or VL pl. n. ligna ‘wood’ > Cat. sg. f. la llenya, Sp. sg. f. la leña. It is conceivable that through their mass readings a significant portion of the Italo-Western Romance continuants of Latin neuter plurals in -a averted their classification as plurals. The continuants of the Latin neuter singular o-stems fell together with masculine singular o-stems in the Italo-Western Romance languages and were equipped with masculine plurals, e.g., Lat. sg. n. iugum ‘yoke’ > Fr. sg. m. joug : pl. m. jous, Sp. sg. m. yugo : pl. m. yugos.

28 Other continuants of Latin neuter stems continued their original plurals with a change of gender, e.g., Rm. sg. m. corp < Lat. sg. n. corpus : Rm pl. f. corpuri ‘body’
by the feminine plural -e. The resulting pattern is that the agreement class that is called the neuter triggers masculine concord in the singular and feminine concord in the plural. The neuter as a noun class is thus only defined by its agreement properties. The Romanian nominal system does not have traces of an overtly expressed morphologically three-way gender distinction.

The prehistories of Romanian and Tocharian reveal similarities in the development of the gender system. As is well known, Tocharian has three agreement classes: masculine, feminine and the so-called genus alternans or simply neuter. Tocharian substantives and adjectives show a two-way morphologically expressed gender contrast, namely, masculine and feminine. Neuter substantives trigger masculine concord in the singular and feminine concord in the plural, e.g.:

TB sg. m. f. n. 
eṅkwe astare śana astarya cake astare
TB pl. eṅkwi astari śnona astarona ckenta astarona man pure woman pure river pure

Two phonological mergers were decisive for the emergence of this agreement system. (1) The continuants of inherited nom./acc. sg. m. and sg. n. *o- and *s-stems fell together phonologically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom. sg.</td>
<td>m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-o-s</td>
<td>*-o-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. sg.</td>
<td>*-o-m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

← *corpurā < pl. n. Lat. corpora, or renewed them analogically to other neuters, e.g., Rm. sg. n. animal < Lat. sg. n. animal : Rm. pl. f. animale ~ animalari ← Lat. pl. n. animalia.

29 Italian ambigeneric nouns were not renewed with the regular feminine plural -e < Lat. -ae, cf. le uova fresche ‘the fresh eggs’.

30 An overt morphologically expressed three-way gender contrast is only found within the demonstrative pronouns. As in Vedic and Greek, the Tocharian demonstrative pronouns basically continue PIE m. *so, f. *seh₂, n. *tod (for form and function of the demonstrative pronouns in Tocharian see Pinault 2009). An interesting feature of the demonstrative pronouns is the fact that only the masculine and feminine can be used attributively, while the neuter can only be used anaphorically (cf. Stumpf 1971: 5f., 47–54).

Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom. pl.</td>
<td>acc. pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-eh₂-es</td>
<td>*-eh₂ &gt; *-ä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-eh₂-ns</td>
<td>*-eh₂ &gt; *-ä</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom. pl.</td>
<td>acc. pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*h₁rudʰ-r-eh₂-e/ns</td>
<td>*rāträ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*som-eh₂-e/ns</td>
<td>*sēmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*h₁rudʰ-r-eh₂</td>
<td>*rāträ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*som-eh₂</td>
<td>*sēmā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has to be emphasized that without these mergers the masculine and neuter would not have begun to share the same agreement properties in...
the singular and the feminine and the neuter would not have begun to share the same agreement properties in the plural.\textsuperscript{32}

\begin{tabular}{llll}

 Late PIE & & & \\

 sg. & *ŋkʷo-m sēm-o-m & *ɡʷé-n-h₂ sīm-iₐ₂ & *h₂ék-os som-oₐ₂ \\

 pl. & *ŋkʷai som-oₐ₂ & *ɡʷn-eh₂-es som-eh₂-es & *h₂ék-ós som-eh₂ \\

 PT & & & \\

 sg. & *enkʷae s̥emae & *šānā sānā & *akəe s̥emæ \\

 pl. & *enkʷe̥y semḁy & *šānā seme̥ & *akente semḁ \\

 TB & & & \\

 sg. & enkwæ s̥emæ & šānā sānā & akæ s̥emæ \\

 pl. & enkwæy semḁy & šnōna somona & akente somona \\

 TA & & & \\

 sg. & oṅk som & sāṃ sām & āk som \\

 pl. & oṅki some & snu somam & ākant somam \\

 man first & woman first & end first &

\end{tabular}

This means that one part of the specific Tocharian agreement system crucially depends on nom. pl. f. *-eh₂-es and acc. pl. f. *-eh₂-ns (with the undisputed internal treatment of *-eh₂-) giving PT *-ā, which fell together with the nom./acc. n. pl. *-eh₂ giving PT *-ā in auslaut.

If nom. pl. f. *-eh₂-es and acc. pl. f. *-eh₂-ns had given PT *-ā and nom./acc. pl. n. and nom. sg. f. and nom./acc. pl. n. *-eh₂ had given PT *-a there would be no reason why neuters should show feminine agreement in the plural.\textsuperscript{33} A Romanian scenario by which nom./acc. pl. n. in PT *-a (< *-eh₂), functioning as plural for nom./acc. m./n. sg. in PT *-æ (< *-os, *-om), was interpreted as feminine and subsequently re-characterized with feminine plural morphology (PT *-ā (< *-eh₂-es, *-eh₂-ns), later plus *-na) can be excluded for Tocharian. In that case, it would be expected that the plurals of nouns ending PT *-a (< *-h₂) would also have been effected by this development, which they are not (cf., e.g., ḅāy ‘bone’, pl. ḅāsta < PIE *h₂ó/ést-h₂, cf. Ved. āsthi; ḅost ‘house’, pl. ḅostwa < PIE

---

\textsuperscript{32} In the following table the dotted line indicates the masculine and neuter forms that fell together, the bold line indicates the feminine and neuter forms that fell together.

\textsuperscript{33} Under the assumption that PIE feminine *-ih₂ was dominant in Tocharian (Kim this volume) and that *-a- of PT nom. sg. f. *-ya was decisive in the collapse with the continuant of PIE nom./acc. pl. n. PT *-a, the expected nom./obl. pl. f./n. forms would be ḅśana A-ṃ. In that case, nom./obl. pl. f./n. ḅ-ona A-ṃ cannot be explained.

To be sure, nom./obl. pl. f./n. B-ona A-aman³⁵ < PT *-ā were only later re-characterized with *-na (< *-nh₂, cf. Ved. -nī).³⁶ It is impossible that this re-characterization took place early enough to have fed the sound law of *-eh₂ → PT -ā- in internal position. There is no motivation for why both nom./acc. pl. f. and nom./acc. n. pl. would have been equipped with neuter *-nh₂ in Pre-Proto-Tocharian.³⁷

These observations have a number of implications: (1) The sequence PIE *eh₂ gave PT *-ā in all environments, (2) Tocharian inherited a full-fledged three-way gender contrast,³⁸ (3) Tocharian inherited the regular thematic adjective declension that is not different from the one of the inner-Indo-European branches,³⁹ and (4) the formations in B-nta A-nt, B-eñca A-nt and B-(a)uca cannot go back to PIE *-nteh₂, *-ntijeh₂ and *-tijeh₂.⁴⁰

5. In conclusion, Tocharian is a “normal” Indo-European language concerning its gender system. In this respect it shows no deviation from the inner-Indo-European branches. Tocharian inherited PIE feminine *-eh₂ in thematic stems and, devi-type feminine *-ih₂ in athematic stems. PIE *eh₂ developed into PT *-ā everywhere.⁴¹ This is proved by the merger of PIE neuter plural and feminine (plural) *-eh₂(-m/ns) to PT *-ā, which was a decisive factor in the development of the specific agreement system in Tocharian. The scarcity of PIE feminine *-eh₂ in the singular of thematic

---

³⁴ Pace Ringe (1996: 95, 97).
³⁵ The other adjectival nom./obl. pl. f./n. B-yana A-yā < PT -.ya is the analogical replacement of the old plural in B-ona A-am based on extension of the singular B-.yā. A-.yā < PT *.ya (which itself was a replacement of old PT *-ā, see above). This replacement process had not yet affected all feminine/neuter adjectival plurals within the period over which Tocharian is attested. The fact that there are doublets of the feminine/neuter plural of the gerundive B-llona- ~ B-lyana in our attestation—the latter being the innovative form appearing in younger texts (Peyrot 2008: 117f.)—confirms the leveling scenario.
³⁶ Cf. the re-characterization of the plurals with B-nta A-nt < PT *-nta < *-nth₂ (Melchert 2000).
³⁷ The reason for this re-characterization may be precisely the fact that nom./obl. plural f./n. PT *-ā and nom./obl. singular f. PT *-ā looked the same for a time.
³⁹ Pace Hackstein (2011) and Kim (this volume).
⁴₀ Pace Hackstein (2011: 155–66) and Kim (this volume). The details of the nouns exhibiting “a-inflection” will be discussed in Fellner (forthcoming b), where I show that their inflectional pattern can effortlessly be connected with the PIE individualizing n-stem inflection of the Catō-type.
⁴¹ The only exception might be BA-sā < PT *sa (see above).
stems can easily be explained by an analogical extension of *-ih₂ₙ from athematic to thematic stems in the prehistory of Tocharian that has a parallel in Indo-Iranian. The account presented here requires less explanatory effort than the ones assuming that Tocharian did not inherit PIE *-eh₂ (and *-ih₂ₙ) as a feminine suffix in the classical distribution. It has the advantage that it deals with the Tocharian data at face value without having to assume intermediate stages between the Indo-European proto-language and Tocharian that are either in conflict with the Tocharian or with the comparative evidence.
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Corrigenda

p. 8

Gr.

Nom. Sg. f.   -ā
Akk. Sg. f.    -āv

p. 12

(cf. NHG Bedienung f. 1. ‘service’, 2. ‘waiter’; Ofr. la justice f. 1. ‘justice’ 2. ‘judge’, OCS dsvě vojevody f. ‘two generals’ m., Serb. moje sluge f. ‘my servants’ m.).

p. 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>enkwe šeme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>enkwí šemi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>