

## Etymological Connections of the Tocharian Word for ‘Village’ and the Germanic Word for ‘House’

With Notes on Tocharian B *koṣkiye* ‘hut’, and *koṣko* ‘± reproach’

Douglas Q. Adams  
*University of Idaho*

The Tocharian words for ‘village,’<sup>1</sup> A *ṣukṣ-* (attested only in the locative *ṣukṣam*), B *kwāṣai-* (acc. sg. *kwāṣai*, nom. pl. *k<sub>u</sub>ṣaiñ*, acc. pl. *k<sub>u</sub>ṣaim*), are generally taken as related (cf. van Windekens, 1976, and Adams, 1999<sup>2</sup>). Since Tocharian A *ṣukṣ-* can be from a more underlying *\*ṣukus-* or *\*ṣkus-* by regular phonological processes within Tocharian A, cognacy between A *-kus-* and B *kuṣ-* ~ *kwāṣ-* seems inherently very likely, though the problem of Tocharian A’s initial *ṣ(u)-* would remain (see below).

The final palatalized *-ṣ-* of the root must have originally been followed by a front vowel. In morphological terms we should think of an original *i*-stem, *en*-stem, or *ih<sub>e</sub>en*-stem. It is probably easiest if we assume that the Tocharian A form reflects a simple *i*-stem and the Tocharian B an extended *\*-ih<sub>e</sub>en-*. The relationship would be essentially similar to that obtaining between Tocharian A *prār* ‘finger’ (< *\*p(e)reh<sub>a</sub>ru-*, cf. the TochA plural *prāru* from *\*p(e)reh<sub>a</sub>rweh<sub>a</sub>*) and Tocharian B *prāri* ‘id.’ (< *\*p(e)reh<sub>a</sub>ru-h<sub>e</sub>en-*). Since a Proto-Indo-European nominative singular *\*-s-is* and accusative singular *\*-s-im* would have give Proto-Tocharian *\*-sā* and not *\*-ṣā*, the actual *-ṣ-* of Tocharian A must, under this hypothesis, must have been extended from the nominative plural *\*-s-eyes* and (probably a

---

<sup>1</sup>The meaning is assured by the Tocharian B word’s use as the translation of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit *grāma-*.

<sup>2</sup>The etymology presented here amplifies, corrects, and justifies that given in Adams, 1999. Together van Windekens and Adams review all previous etymological proposals.

heavy contributor in a word with this meaning) the locative singular *\*-s-ei*.<sup>3</sup> In any event, the Proto-Tocharian form would have been *\*kuṣi(yān)-*, with Tocharian A showing the short form and Tocharian B the longer.

Just as in the case of its stem formation, the first part of Proto-Tocharian *\*kuṣi(yān)-* is also etymologically ambiguous. It might reflect PIE *\*Kus-*<sup>4</sup>, where the *\*K* is by manner a voiceless, voiced, or voiced aspirate or by place a palatal, velar, or dorsovelar; or it might reflect *\*k<sup>w</sup>is-* or *\*k<sup>w</sup>is-* (again with the stop with any combination of voicing and aspiration). This multiple ambiguity would seem to give us a host of etymological possibilities. However, in reality, there would be seem to be only two: *\*ghaw-* (or *\*ghowh<sub>1</sub>-*) 'region' and Pokorny's *\*keus-*, taken by him (1959) to be an élargissement of *\*(s)keu-* 'be round,' or by others from *\*(s)keu(h<sub>x</sub>)-s-*, an élargissement of *\*(s)keu(h<sub>x</sub>)-* 'cover' (but see below).

PIE *\*ghaw-* is to be seen in Avestan *gava-* 'district,' Zoroastrian Pahlavi *gō-pat* '± district lord,' Khotanese *āvū* (< *\*ā-gū* < Proto-Iranian *\*ā-gawa-*) 'village,' Ossetic (Digoron) *ṣāu* 'village,' Armenian (< Iranian) *gavar* 'province,' Gothic *gawi* 'region,' Old High German *gewi* (gen. *gouwes*), New High German *gau* 'region,' Old English *-gē* 'district' (Proto-Germanic *\*gawi*, gen. *\*gawjis*). The Iranian words reflect a PIE *\*ghaw(h<sub>x</sub>)-* or *\*ghowh<sub>x</sub>-* (not *\*ghowo-* as that would have given Proto-Iranian *\*gāva-*) and the Germanic a PIE *\*gha/ow(i)yo-* (or possibly *\*gha/owh<sub>1</sub>yo-* if the *-h<sub>1</sub>-* was lost early in the consonant cluster). Semantically the Tocharian words would fit right in, but they are phonologically impossible reflexes of PIE *\*gha/ou(h<sub>x</sub>)-s-* or *\*ghuh<sub>1</sub>s-*, and, in any case, the *s*-extension one

<sup>3</sup>Starting from PIE *\*-s-en-* would certainly give the Tocharian A forms perfectly straightforwardly, but we would have to assume the Tocharian B *kuṣai-* represents an earlier *\*kuṣi-* (which is probable under any hypothesis) where the *-i-* is generalized from the nominative plural *\*-ṣiñā*. This *\*-ṣiñā* is from *\*-ṣāñā*, where the more original *\*-ā-* lay between two palatalized consonants and thus subject to raising and fronting itself. Ultimately, of course the form would reflect a PIE *\*-s-enes*. Arguing against this particular derivation is that the nominative plural would seem to be a very slim basis for the analogical spread of *-i-*. A third possibility is that Tocharian A reflects a PIE *\*-s-ih<sub>a</sub>* and B a PIE *\*-s-ih<sub>a</sub>-h<sub>e</sub>en-*. While the phonological development would be absolutely regular in both languages, there is no independent evidence for the survival of PIE *ih<sub>a</sub>-*stems in Tocharian. Thus I will continue to assume we have *\*-s-i-* and *\*-s-i-h<sub>e</sub>en-* but these other possibilities (particularly *\*-s-ih<sub>a</sub>[-h<sub>e</sub>en]-*) must be kept in mind.

<sup>4</sup>Or *\*kh<sub>x</sub>us-*, see below.

would have to assume for Tocharian is seen nowhere else.<sup>5</sup>

Thus we are left with Pokorny's *\*keus-*. This root is richly attested in Indo-Iranian. In Indic we have *koṣa-* 'container,' *koṣṭha-* (m.) 'stomach, abdomen,' *koṣṭha-* (nt.) 'granary, storeroom' with the expected *-s-*, and *kusūla-* 'granary' (whose *-s-* is confirmed by Pashai *kusālī* 'grain-bin,' Shumashti *kūselī* 'id.),' *kūsindha-* 'trunk (of the body),' *kusumbha-* 'water pot' (whose form has been influenced by the synonymous *kumbha-*), and Prakrit *kotthala-* (and not *\*koṭṭhala-*) 'granary; bag, container' with irregular (dialectal?) *-s-* (for this whole group, see Burrow, 1976:37). In Iranian we have Khotanese *kuvāysa-* 'side' (< *\*kušāza-* or *\*kaušāza-*) and Christian Sogdian *qwš(y)* 'side' (= *kōš*, *kušē*, *kušī?* [Gharib, 1995]), Khotanese *kuša-* 'awn; seed vessel' (< *\*kus-ya-*), and Zoroastrian Pahlavi *kušt* 'side, belly.' In addition Iranian has *\*kaužda-* in Avestan *ašta-kaužda-* '± having eight tiers' (of a crown) and Khotanese *kūšda-* 'mansion, palace' and the homophonous *kūšda-* 'hole.' Finally, New Persian *kōšk* (~ *kūšk* ~ *kušk*) 'palace, villa; castle, citadel' and Zoroastrian Pahlavi *kōšk* 'castle' reflect an extended *\*kaužda-ka-* (for the Iranian in general, see Bailey, 1979:63).

In Germanic we have from an apparent PIE *\*kóuso-* (m.) (= Sanskrit *koṣa-*) the Old Norse *hauss* 'skull.' Presupposing an apparent PIE *\*kúseh<sub>a</sub>-* (f.), we have Old English *hosu* (f.) 'stocking, legging; pod, husk,'<sup>6</sup> Old Norse *hosa* 'stocking, legging,' Old High German *hosa* 'gaiter,' New High German *Hose* 'trousers,' and Dutch *hoos* 'legging, gaiter.' And finally, and most importantly from the semantic point of view, as if from PIE *\*kūso-* (nt.), some would add Gothic, Old Norse, Old English, and Old High German *hūs* 'house.'

Whether the Germanic words for 'house' are included in this set varies from linguist to linguist. Though etymological

<sup>5</sup>A barely possible exception to the last statement is Epic Sanskrit *ghoṣa-* (m.) 'station of herdsmen' (in the plural: 'herdsmen') and in Prakrit we have *ghosa-* (m.) 'cowherd's station.' In contemporary Indic there is Hindi *ghos* 'caste of herdsmen' (*ghosī* [m.] 'herdsman) and Shina *go* (pl. *gozi*) 'house.' Mayrhofer (1956:364) takes the Epic, Middle, and Modern Indic words to reflect a semantic development of older Indic *ghoṣa-* '(indistinct) noise, tumult.' A relationship with Gothic *gawi* was suggested by Meillet apud Lévi in Hoernle, 1916:379.

<sup>6</sup>And with secondary *n*-stem extensions, both *hosa* (m.) and *hose* (f.) 'hose.' Their collective descendant is of course Modern English *hose* (in all its senses).

discussions are usually not explicit about this point, it would appear the difference lies in whether one takes \*-ū- in this formation as a possible member of the PIE \*-eu- ~ -ou- ~ -u- ablaut series in Germanic. There is no question that it does in the Class II strong verbs, e.g., Old English *dūfan* 'dive,' *scūfan* beside *scēofan* 'shove,' etc. Many, perhaps most, would limit \*-ū- to these formations, taking the \*-ū- to be lengthened from an original \*-u- of an "aorist-present" or created by analogy to Class I presents in \*-ī- from PIE \*-ei-. However, forms with Proto-Germanic \*-ū- are quite easy to find outside the Class II presents. There is Proto-Germanic *\*hlūd* 'loud' (OE/ON *hlūd*, OHG *hlūt*) from a putative PIE *\*klūtós*, MHG *vlūs* ~ *vlüşch* 'sheepskin, fleece,' Norwegian *flūra* 'shaggy hair' as if from PIE *\*plūso-* ~ *\*plūsko-* and *\*plūsā-* respectively beside the *\*pléuso-* that gave Old English *flēos* 'fleece,' Old English *rūst* 'rust' beside Old High German *rost* 'rust' from *\*rūdhsto-* and *\*rudhsto-*, derivatives of *\*reudh-* 'red,' Old High German *stūhha* 'broadly open sleeve of a woman's dress' but Old English *stocu* 'long sleeve,' Old Norse *stūfr* 'stump' beside Old English *stofn* 'stump,' Gothic *hauhs* 'high' but *hūhjan* 'gather, heap up,' Old English *drēosan* 'fall, perish; become weak' but Old English *drūsian* 'droop, become sluggish' or Old High German *trūrēn* 'be downcast, despondent; mourn'; one could adduce many more possibilities. Whether the *ū*-grade is a purely Germanic development based on the *ī* ~ *i* which had come into being with the change of *\*ei* to *ī* or whether it was a part of the more general extension of lengthened grades (i.e., *e* > *ē*, *o* > *ō*, thus *i* > *ī* and *u* > *ū*) seen in more developed form in the neighboring Baltic and Slavic I'm not prepared to say (though I favor the latter possibility). What does seem obvious is that Proto-Germanic had an *ū*-grade as a member of the *eu* ~ *ou* ~ *u* series.

Less often connected to PIE *\*keus-* are possible Baltic cognates. Lithuanian has *káušas* (m.) 'skull; ladle; musselshell; snailshell,' *kiáušas* (m.) ~ *kiáušė* (f.) 'skull,' *kiaūšis* (m.) 'egg,' and Latvian has *kaūss* (m.) 'skull; large container; drinking glass, wooden spoon, shell.' All of these are ambiguous and may come equally from PIE *\*ke/ous-* or *\*ke/ouk̥*.<sup>7</sup> However,

<sup>7</sup>Whether from *\*keus-* or *\*keuk̥-* the Lithuanian *-áu-* (and Latvian *-aū-*) rather than *-aũ-* (and *-au-*) of most of these words would have to reflect some sort of analogical or derivational metatony or lengthened grade. Illich-Svitych (1979:64-65) suggests that Lithuanian *káušas* and Latvian *kaūss* reflect a Proto-

there seems to be no good reason to reject the perfect phonological and semantic equation of Lithuanian *káušas*, Latvian *kaūss* and Old Norse *hauss*, all ‘skull’ so I would include at least *káušas* and *kaūss* in the group reflecting PIE *\*ke/ous-*.<sup>8</sup>

Sometimes put here (e.g., Pokorny 1959:953, s.v. *\*(s)keu-s-*) is Greek *kústis* ‘bladder.’ But since this word also means ‘ulcer (on a horse’s back),’ ‘the wind swelling out of the clouds,’ or (in the plural) ‘bags under the eyes,’ the meaning underlying the Greek words is ‘swell’ and the etymological relationship is rather with Sanskrit *śvāsiti* ‘blows’ (Frisk 1960-1970). A more likely possibility is Armenian *xuc* ‘room’ which, except for the initial *x-*, may reflect a PIE *\*kus-ko- ~ \*kus-ko-* (Lehmann 1986:161-162). For a PIE initial *\*k-* we would expect Armenian *k-*, *h-* or *Ø-* but there may have been some stage of the phonetic development of the medial cluster that promoted an assimilatory or dissimilatory change in manner of the initial consonant. In any case, the meaning is very suggestive.<sup>9</sup>

The Baltic intonation of *\*káušas* and the initial *x-* of the putative Armenian cognates could be reconciled more easily with the other data if we assume a slightly different root shape. Taking the equation of Lithuanian *káušas* and Sanskrit *koṣa-* at face value, we could reconstruct PIE *\*koh<sub>x</sub>uso-*.<sup>10</sup> If so, it is the Lithuanian forms with circumflex accent which show

Baltic neuter *\*kōušom*, pl. *\*kōušā*, which was root-stressed in the singular and ending-stressed in the plural. The original neuter gender would be seen in the Finnish borrowing *kauha* ‘ladle, scoop.’ Dialectal eastern Latvian *kaūss* might reflect either *\*kōušo-* with fixed root stress or *\*kōušo-*, again with fixed root stress. The borrowed Vepsian *kāuvaz* beside *kāuh* suggest a Proto-Baltic masculine *\*koušos/kōušos* beside neuter *\*koušom/kōušom* (cf. Illich-Svitych 1979:160-161, fn. 88). If we start from *\*keus-*, the totality of the Indo-European evidence makes it plausible to assume a inherited Proto-Baltic *\*kōušos* with both the lengthened grade or the metatony (the latter being far the more likely) and the presumptive neuter gender inner-Baltic developments.

<sup>8</sup>Fraenkel (1962: 231-232, 250) opts for *\*keuk-* but without any particular argument.

<sup>9</sup>If *xuc* is not disallowed by its initial, than we should probably also add *xul* ‘hut’ from a putative *\*kuslo-*. Indeed, we could explain the Proto-Armenian *\*kh-* (whence actual Armenian *x-*) as the result of attraction of aspiration from an earlier *\*kuhlo-*. We could also assume that the initial *\*kh-* was then transferred to the semantically related (ancestor of) *xuc*. But see immediately below.

<sup>10</sup>Or *\*keh<sub>x</sub>uso-*, so long as *\*h<sub>x</sub>* is not *\*h<sub>1</sub>*.

metatony.<sup>11</sup> Under this scenario the Armenian words would need no special explanation since they would represent zero-grades *\*kh<sub>x</sub>us-* with the expected development of *k* + laryngeal to Armenian *x-*. Germanic *\*hūsa-* might represent either a metathesized *\*kuh<sub>x</sub>s-* or the lengthened grade discussed above.<sup>12</sup>

This *\*keh<sub>x</sub>us-* would be extended from *\*keh<sub>x</sub>u-* seen otherwise extended in *\*kuh<sub>x</sub>p-* (with laryngeal metathesis) 'hole, hollow' (e.g., Old Norse *hūfr* 'ship's hull,' Old English *hȳf* 'hive,' Latin *cūpa* 'cask, butt', Greek (Hesychius) *kūpē* 'cave', Sanskrit *kūpa-* 'hole, hollow, cave') or *\*keh<sub>x</sub>u-l-* (with no laryngeal metathesis in zero-grade forms<sup>13</sup>) 'hollow tube,' hence 'stalk', '[long] bone' (e.g., Middle Irish *cuaille* 'post, stake,' Latin *caulis* 'stalk; cabbage-plant', Greek *kaulós* 'stalk, various tubular structures of animals [e.g., quill of feather, duct of penis]; cole, kail, cauliflower', *kūla* [short vowel] 'parts under the eyes', Lithuanian *kāulas* 'bone,' Old English *hol* 'hollow,' Goth *ushulōn* 'hollow out,' Sanskrit *kūlyam* 'bone,' *kulyā* 'stream, canal,' perhaps Hittite *gullant-* if, as seems likely,<sup>14</sup> it means 'hollow' [*< \*kh<sub>x</sub>ulnó-* or, by more distant metathesis *< \*kulh<sub>x</sub>ó- < \*kh<sub>x</sub>uló-?*]). The Latin and Greek forms make the determination of the laryngeal more precise: it must be *\*-h<sub>a</sub>-*.<sup>15</sup>

*\*Keh<sub>a</sub>u(s)-* suggests a derivative of *\*keh<sub>a</sub>u-* 'cut, strike.'<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup>It seems pretty clear that metatony in Baltic works both ways: originally circumflex forms give rise to acute derivatives and originally acute forms give rise to circumflex derivatives. However, in general, the latter process is more common.

<sup>12</sup>Given Proto-Germanic *\*husōn-* 'hose,' which must reflect a putative *\*kh<sub>x</sub>useh<sub>a</sub>-n-* under this hypothesis, it seems more likely to me that *\*hūsa-* reflects a neo-lengthened grade rather than metathesis, but nothing in particular hangs on this decision.

<sup>13</sup>In this case we might think of an old *l*-stem neuter *\*kēh<sub>x</sub>ul*, gen. *\*kh<sub>x</sub>ulós*.

<sup>14</sup>Puhvel (1997:238-239).

<sup>15</sup>Distinct from *\*keh<sub>a</sub>u-* 'hollow' is the synonymous *\*keuh<sub>x</sub>-* (with derivatives *\*kūh<sub>x</sub>g* [gen. *\*kūh<sub>x</sub>nós*], *\*kōuh<sub>x</sub>ilo-*, *kōuh<sub>x</sub>o-*) seen in Latin *cavus* 'cave', Middle Irish *cūa* 'hollow,' Greek *kúar* 'eye of a needle, opening of the ear,' *kōos* 'cave, den' (mostly in the plural), *koi5los* (dialectally *kōīlos* ~ *koīilos*) 'hollow (of a ship), empty, deep,' (Hesychius) *kōoi* 'chasms of the earth,' Albanian *thellë* 'deep,' Armenian *soyl* 'hole,' Avestan *sūra-* 'hole,' Sanskrit *śūna-* (m.) 'lack,' *śūnya-* 'empty, hollow,' Tocharian B *kor* 'throat.'

<sup>16</sup>Cf. Old English *h ēawan* 'hew,' Lithuanian *kājuju* 'beat, strike; f *orge*,' OCS *kovō* 'forge,' Tocharian B *kau-* 'kill, strike down, destroy.' Similar semantics are shown by the enlarged *\*keh<sub>a</sub>u-dhe/o-* in Tocharian B *kaut-* 'split off, chop (down)' and Latin *cūdō* 'beat, pound, thresh; forge, strike (of metals).'

The difficulty of positing such a relationship rests with the semantic divergence: ‘hollowing out’ is not a natural derivative of ‘striking.’ It is best to think of homophonous roots, though for those who assume a distinction between  $*h_2$  and  $*h_4$ , it is also possible to assume that the two roots were not homophonous but had different laryngeals.

Thus PIE  $*keh_aus-$  ‘hollow out’ is attested in Tocharian, Indic, Iranian, Baltic, Germanic, and Armenian. Setting aside for the moment those words meaning ‘human dwelling’ *vel sim.* (Tocharian *kus-* ‘village,’ Khotanese *kūṣda-* ‘mansion,’ Pahlevi *kōšk* ‘castle,’ Armenian *xuc* ‘room,’ *xul* ‘hut,’ Germanic  $*hūsa-$  ‘house’), we have a group of words meaning ‘container,’ ‘hollow object’ (e.g., ‘hole,’ ‘skull,’ ‘egg,’ ‘legging’), or ‘hollowed out object’ (‘ladle,’ ‘spoon’). It seems clear that we have a series of derivatives of the verbal root which is preserved as a verb only in Lithuanian *kaiūšti* (1<sup>st</sup> sg. *kaušū*) ‘hollow out.’<sup>17</sup> The ‘dwelling’ words might all reflect secondary derivatives of an original root noun  $*kó/éh_auss$  (gen. *kh\_ausós*). One might then also reconstruct the original meaning to have been ‘dugout’ or partially subterranean dwelling. The Tocharian word for ‘village’ would be a collective derivative of ‘dwelling.’

#### Tocharian A initial $\varsigma-$

I see two possible explanations for the initial of the Tocharian A form. In the first case it might reflect a Proto-Indo-European *s*-mobile and show the same alternation we see in Greek *tégos* ~ *stégos* ‘roof, house.’ If so, the Tocharian A  $\varsigma-$  rather than  $*s-$  would be the result of semi-regular palatalization attraction (as in *ckācar* ‘daughter’ rather than the expected  $*tkācar$ , cf. Tocharian B *tkācer*). A second possible explanation (one that goes back *in nuce* to Hilmarsson 1996:197-198) would see the  $\varsigma-$  as the remnant of a Proto-Indo-European prefix  $*swe-$  ‘own-.’ One might compare the late Sanskrit *sva-deśa-* ‘own place, country, or home’ or, particularly, *sva-grāma-* ‘own village.’

Either explanation is possible; neither is compelling owing to the lack of appropriate parallel formations: there are no extra-Tocharian examples of *s*-mobile in the root  $*kh_aeus-$

<sup>17</sup>So Fraenkel for the Baltic cognates, though as noted above he takes the verb to be from  $*keuk̃-$ .

and there are no other examples within Tocharian of the Proto-Indo-European prefix *\*swe-*. Since the general use of *\*swe-* as prefix seems a particularly Indic innovation (and not a very early one at that), to assume the same innovation in this one Tocharian A case seems bolder than the assumption of a case of the notoriously hit-and-miss *s-*mobile. The Greek *tégos* ~ *stégos*, while linguistically distant, is otherwise nearly a perfect comparandum.<sup>18</sup>

### Tocharian B *koškīye*

Tocharian B has a feminine noun *koškīye* (acc. sg. *koškai*) 'hut.' The meaning is not assured by any translation equivalence but is surely correct.<sup>19</sup> Certainly in all its occurrences it is explicitly made of wood or plausibly is made of wood (i.e., it is flammable) and it would always appear to be small. The meaning makes a difficulty, unremarked upon, for the one etymology offered to date for this word (van Windekens, 1972, followed by Adams, 1999). Van Windekens saw in this word a borrowing from some western Iranian source akin to New Persian *kōšk* 'palace, villa; castle, citadel' reflecting an earlier *\*kauška-* < *\*kaužda-ka-* where *\*kaužda-* is the same as Khotanese *kūšda-* 'mansion.' The putative change of meaning from 'castle' *vel sim.* to 'hut' is not an expected one. Nor is there any good reason to expect a borrowed noun referring to an inanimate object to show up in Tocharian B with feminine gender and the ending *-īye* (*-ai-*). Rather, we would expect a neuter *\*\*košk* or *\*\*koške*. Finally, it is at least a little odd that

<sup>18</sup>Gerd Carling has very recently (2005:58) suggested a very different origin for Tocharian A *šukš-*. She takes it as a borrowing from Chinese *sù* 'lodge, mansion' (Middle Chinese *\*sjuwk*, Old Chinese *\*suk* [Baxter, 1992] or *\*sjak<sup>w</sup>-s* [Itō and Takashima, 1995:401]), a nominalization of *sù* 'spend the night.' Particularly the latter Old Chinese reconstruction would provide the almost perfect phonological antecedent to Tocharian A *šukš-* (the second *s-* of the Tocharian form might be by distant assimilation to the first. However, this particular Old Chinese reconstruction is by no means assured and the meaning of the putative borrowing is rather distant from the putative antecedent. Most importantly, this etymology allows no connection between Tocharian A *šukš-* and Tocharian B *k<sub>u</sub>siye* (the probable form of the unattested nominative singular).

<sup>19</sup>The meaning was established by Sieg in 1943 (cf. van Windekens, 1972:46, fn. 2). There is also a *koško* which appears at 255a4 which, in form at least, looks like it might be an alternative nominative singular to *koškīye*, and was so taken by Krause and Thomas (1960:134) who have been followed by everyone else. But see the excursus.

the borrowing should come from western Iranian rather than eastern. A borrowing from an eastern Iranian reflex of *\*kaušdaka-* would probably have eventuated in a Tocharian B *\*\*koṣtek*.<sup>20</sup>

These three considerations together cast a distinct shadow on van Windekens' suggestion. The possibility that we have an inherited word, a cognate of *k<sub>u</sub>šīye*, must be entertained. Phonologically impeccable would be a late Proto-Indo-European diminutive *\*kūsek/gā-*, most closely related to Germanic *\*hūsa-*.<sup>21</sup> However, since the long *\*-ū-* of this etymon, whatever its source, is apparently limited to Germanic, it is probably better to see the Tocharian *-o-* as somehow a development of PIE short *\*-u-*. In this context one might compare Tocharian B *pošiya\**, Tocharian A *poši* 'wall' from PIE *\*pusiyeh<sub>a</sub>*,<sup>22</sup> though the conditions under which this development occurs are obscure.

### Excursus on *koško*

The context in which *koško* occurs is only partly clear (at least to me). It occurs in pāda 8c of a partially preserved metrical Buddhist work (B 255a3-5). We have:

- 8a *ket ṣāñ skwānma ma takam sū alyekmem yaskāstrā*  
 8b *yaṣu skwānma ket [p]ālsko kārwa[ts] skwānma ma skwānma :*  
 8c *koško rāsām tarśitse tsātko tsātkwaṃ enkāstrā.*  
 8d *rukṣā-pālsko [ṣek] klyeñktrā skwātse laute mā nesām*

8a/b may be translated, "[8a] Whoever does not have his own fortune [plural in Tocharian], he begs from another. [8b] Begging [is] fortune; to whom [is] the thought, 'the fortune of reeds [reeds metonymic for beggars' canes] [is] not a fortune." The meaning of 8c is difficult, but the subject of the verbs (i.e., *rāsām* and *enkāstrā*) should be the (unexpressed) head of the preceding relative clause ('to whom [is] the thought'). But, if so, *koško*, whatever its meaning, cannot be a

<sup>20</sup> Compare TchB *\*ekšinek* 'dove' (only in the derived adjective *ekšinekāññe*) from *\*axšīnaka-* (seen in Iranian only in Khotanese and Ossetic).

<sup>21</sup> And morphologically identical, though historically completely independent of, Scots *hoosie* 'small house' or Dutch *huisken* 'small house,' the source of Modern English *husk*.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. the putative *\*kh<sub>a</sub>usikeh<sub>a</sub>* both with *\*CusiCeh<sub>a</sub>*; for *\*pusiyeh<sub>a</sub>* see Adams, 1999:404.

nominative and thus we have to ask if it belongs with *koṣkiye* at all. 8c might, very tentatively, be translated as, "he [= the one who had the thought] spreads/covers the *koṣko*; he grasps the error of deception [lege: *tarši[n]tse*] erroneously." A meaning 'hut' for *koṣko* does not impose itself here; something like 'falsehood', 'misapprehension,' 'reproach' would fit more naturally. 8d may be translated, "The rough-in-spirit is always in doubt [lege: *klyenkrā*]; there is no opportunity for good fortune [lege: *skwä[n]tse*]."<sup>23</sup>

Given the possible meanings, a connection of *koṣko* with Tocharian A *kāṣ-* 'chide, reproach' seems almost inevitable, though the exact phonological history (whence the Tocharian B *-o-?*) remains obscure.

## References

- Adams, Douglas Q.  
1999 *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam and Atlanta, Rodopi.
- Bailey, Harold  
1979 *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Baxter, William H.  
1992 *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Burrow, Thomas  
1976 Sanskrit words having dental *-s-* after *i*, *u*, and *r*. *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics Offered to Leonard R. Palmer*, pp. 33-41. Edd. Anna Mopurgo Davies and Wolfgang Meid. Innsbruck, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Carling, Gerd  
2005 Appendix to Mair: Proto-Tocharian, Common Tocharian, and Tocharian – on the value of linguistic connections in a reconstructed language. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 5-6, 2004*. Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, Angela della Volpe, Miriam Robbins Dexter, edd. (Journal of the Indo-European Monograph Series, No. 50.) Washington, D. C., Institute for the Study of Man.

<sup>23</sup>The same text is also to be found, in a very fragmented condition, in B 254. In B 254 *skwäntse* is the form written. While in most cases, so far as one can tell given the fragmentary nature of 254, the text of 255 and 254 are identical except for minor spelling variations, it is clear the 8c is completely different. In 254 it begins *trä"p"pä///*, and ends */// tkänme*. No help is to be found there in elucidating *koṣko*.

- Fraenkel, Ernst  
1962-65 *Litauisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, Winter, and Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Frisk, Hjalmar  
1960-70 *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
- Gharib, B.  
1995 *Sogdian Dictionary*. Tehran, Farhang Publications.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur  
1996 *Materials for a Tocharian Historical and Etymological Dictionary*. (Tocharian and Indo-European Studies Supplementary Series, 5.) Reykjavik.
- Hoernle, A. F. R.  
1916 *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan, Vol. 1*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Illich-Svitych, Vladislav M.  
1979 *Nominal Accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. Trans. Richard L. Leed and Ronald F. Feldstein. Cambridge, MIT Press.
- Itō, Michiharu, and Ken-ichi Takashima  
1996 *Studies in Early Chinese Civilization: Religion, Society, Language, and Palaeography*. Vol. 1, Text. Osaka, Kansai Gaidai University Publication.
- Krause, Wolfgang, and Werner Thomas  
1960 *Tocharisches Elementarbuch, Band I: Grammatik*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Lehmann, Winfred  
1986 *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred  
1956-76 *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Pokorny, Julius  
1959 *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern, Francke.
- Puhvel, Jaan.  
1984- *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- van Windekens, A. J.  
1976 *Le Tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes, Vol. I: La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain, Centre Internationale de Dialectologie Générale.