The morphological and constructional evolution of OHG *huuanta* and Dutch *want**

Olav Hackstein

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München

olav.hackstein@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

Abstract

Under a formal and functional reconstruction, the form and semantics of Old High German *huuanta* and Dutch *want* receive an explanation for the first time. Both conjunctions, together with Latin *unde* and Tocharian B *ente*, A *äntā(ne)*, descend from PIE interrogative-relative **k^wo-m-d^heh₁*, **k^wo-m-d^hoh₁*, **k^wo-m-d^hah₂* ‘whence, where’, whose semantics may be compositionally analyzed as ablative-instrumental **k^wo-m* plus locative-directional **-d^ho(h₁)*, **-d^ha(h₂)*. The novel equation of Old High German *huuanta*, Dutch *want* with Latin *unde* and Tocharian B *ente*, A *äntā(ne)* sheds light on a number of phonological and syntactic questions, including the merger of PIE **-nd-* and **-nd^h-* in Latin and Tocharian (§ 2.1) and the non-affrication of **-nd-* in Tocharian (§ 3.1.2). Another consequence is that a case can be made for clause-initial aphaeresis which triggered the loss of the labiovelar onsets in *unde* and *ente/äntā(ne)*, thus pointing to the existence of *wh*-movement and clause-initial *wh*-words in both Latin and Tocharian (§ 3.1.1).

Keywords

ORIGIN-CAUSE METONYMY – SOURCE → REASON (whence? → why?) – INTERROGATIVE-CONJUNCTION SHIFT (why? → for, because) – SOURCE-PLACE/GOAL METONYMY (whence → where(to)) – GOAL BIAS – aphaeresis – *wh*-movement

* Earlier versions of this paper were read on June 7, 2015 in Vienna at the 34th East Coast Indo-European Conference, and on May 19, 2017 at the 10th Jenaer Mai-Kolloquium. Many thanks for the feedback of both audiences, as well as to Ron Kim, Laura Sturm, Ryan Sandell, and

1 The etymology of OHG *huuanta*, present-day Dutch *want*

Etymologizing conjunctions is challenging for at least two reasons. First, conjunctions tend to preserve frozen nominal and especially pronominal morphology. Second, the functional reconstruction of conjunctions and their morphemes cannot be carried out successfully on the basis of the morphophonemic material alone. It is necessary to distinguish between the etymology of a construction marker and the history of a construction. The two need not be identical, and inferring the history and historical function of the construction from the synchronic or historical function of the construction marker is problematic if the construction has undergone functional changes. An example is the English causal conjunction *for*, which etymologically is to be equated with the homophonous purposive or benefactive preposition *for* as in *for this purpose* and *for me*, while the causal speech-act construction marked by *for* (as in *Come ... take your inheritance, the kingdom ...! For I was hungry and you fed me*) derives neither from a purposive nor from a beneficiary construction. The functional breadth of a conjunction thus cannot be explained on the basis of its construction marker alone (cf. Harris and Campbell 1995:284 on the *marker-structure fallacy*). But the etymology of a construction marker certainly provides an indispensable starting point and basis for syntactic reconstruction, which has to be augmented by the formal and functional evolution of the construction. An instructive example is the etymology of the OHG interrogative adverb and conjunction *huuanta* ‘why?; for; because’. *huuanta* did not survive into Modern German except in South Bavarian dialects like Cimbrian in northern Italy, where it remained at least until the 19th century (Old Cimbrian *bant* [Schmeller 1855:109]; *bánda*, *ban* ‘for; because’ [Schweizer 2008:917, 918]), but is still in living use in present-day Dutch *want* ‘for; because’. Both the formal reconstruction of OHG *huuanta* and its constructional history pose problems, but as I hope to show in the following pages, it is possible to make some headway in the search for external etymological matches. Methodologically, the discussion must begin with the formal reconstruction, on which also hinges the identification of Indo-European cognates outside Germanic.

1.1 Phonological and morphological reconstruction

Schmidt (1962:28 ff.) equated OHG *huuanta* ‘why, etc.’, OS *hwanda*, *hwande*, OFri. *hwande*, *hwant* with OCS *kŏdě* ‘whence?’, arriving at a purely phonological

an anonymous reviewer for their help in correcting a preliminary version of this article. All remaining flaws are entirely my own responsibility.

reconstruction of OHG *huuanta* as Proto-Germanic **hwardē*, contracted from PIE **k^wu-n-d^he-ē* or **k^wo-n-d^he-ē*. According to Schmidt, the reconstructed form is to be segmented as interrogative morpheme **k^wo-* followed by a nasal morpheme *-n-* and adverbial morpheme *-d^he*.¹ For the development of word-final PIE **-eh₁* in Germanic, see Boutkan (1995:379). But the functional identification of the latter two morphemes remained elusive at Schmidt's time, and the same holds for the final long **ē* of the form. Regarding the PIE reconstruction of OHG *huuanta* and of the related Modern Dutch conjunction *want*, the etymological dictionaries of German and Dutch adhere to Streitberg's 1920:241 and Schmidt's 1962 etymological identifications. The most recent example is Philippa's (2009) account, which traces PD Dutch and Frisian *want* back to Old Saxon *hwanda*, Middle Dutch *wande*, *wende*, *want*, *went*, Old Frisian *hwande*, *hwende*, OHG *huuanta* and Proto-Germanic **hwardē* from a PIE interrogative **k^wo-m* with assimilation **m > *n* before the dental morpheme **-d^he*.² In sum, the form and function of the two morphemes and the origin of the vowel length in **-d^he* have been left unexplained, and OHG *huuanta* as well as Dutch *want* have remained etymological orphans, lacking exact etymological matches outside Germanic. Proto-Germanic **hwardē*, as posited by Schmidt, is composed of a total of four morphemes, to wit **k^wo-*, **-m*, **-d^he*, and **-(e)h₁*. I will begin with the formal identification of these four morphemes and then turn to a compositional account of the function of Proto-Germanic **hwardē*.

- a. The morphological base is the interrogative stem **k^wo-*.
- b. **k^wo-* is followed by a suffix **-m*; this morphological parse has recently been proposed by Dunkel (2014; see the important summary in Dunkel 2014a:137 f.). Basing himself on Delbrück, Dunkel demonstrates the systematic occurrence of ablative-instrumental **-m*, as preserved in ablative PIE **i-m > Lat. ex-im* 'thence', *intrin-secus* '(from) inside' (Dunkel 1997:66–69); cf. also the minimal pair of locative Old Russian *kŭdě* (= Lat. *ubi*) versus nasalized ablative OCS *kŏdě* 'whence', and Gk. locative **ἐνθι* (= Lat. *inde*, cf. Dunkel 1997:69) versus ablative *ἐνθεν*. The ablative (and instrumental) morpheme PIE **-m*, posited by Delbrück and Dunkel, is

1 PIE unspirated **-de*, as posited by Schrodtt (2004:144), is phonologically incompatible with *-t* in OHG *huuanta*.

2 "Ontwikkeld (met assimilatie van *-m-* aan de dentaal) uit pie. **k^wom-d^he-*, afgeleid van de vragende voornaamwoordstam **k^wo-*." (Philippa 2009 = *EWNI* 4, 594).

confirmed by the Hieroglyphic Luwian ablative-instrumental adverbs *zin*, *apin*, for which see Goedegebuure 2007:322, 332 f.

- c. Ablatival **k^{wo}-m* ‘whence?’ is further followed by a locatival suffix **-d^{he}* (Dunkel 2014a:120 f.). For the locatival value of **-d^{he}*, cf. PIE **k^{wu}-d^{he}* ‘where’ > OCS *kŭde*, Osc. *puf*, Ved. *kúha* (EWAia I 383, Dunkel 2014b: 437); PIE **i-d^{he}* ‘here’ > Umbr. *ife* ‘there’, OCS *ide-že* (rel.) ‘where’, Gk. *πό-θη* ‘where?’, Ved. *ihá* ‘here’ (Dunkel 2014b: 367); PIE **an-d^{he}* ‘below’ > Toch. A *āñc* ‘downwards’ (Dunkel 2014b: 41–44; cf. Klingenschmitt 1987:175 fn.15 ‘A *āñc* < uridg. **h₂en-d^{he}*’), cf. *āñc tā-* ‘to place below’ in e.g. *āñc tāluneyo wāłts akṣarāṣ pikāṣ* ‘by putting (a line) beneath, he is writing a thousand akṣaras’ (Pinault 2013:211).
- d. Finally, locatival *-d^{he}* may be followed by an instrumental case morpheme **(e)h_i* conveying perlocative-directional function, hence PIE **d^{ho}h_i/d^{he}h_i* ‘all over’. Cf. the pairs Gk. *άνά: άνω* ‘up’, reflecting PIE **h₂en-eh_i* (> Goth., OS, OHG *ana* ‘at, in, upon’; cf. Boutkan 1995:377), and *κατά: κάτω* ‘towards below’, *πρός: πρόσσω* ‘forward’ (García-Ramón 1997, Zeilfelder 2001:104 f.). Another possibility is **-d^{ho}* in directional **-o*, on which cf. Dunkel 2014a: 154–161.

1.1.1 Metonymic source-goal shifts

Turning to a compositional account of OHG *huuanta*, the question arises how to derive the functional breadth of OHG *huuanta* ‘for, because’ from the four aforementioned morphemes **k^{wo}-m-d^{he}-h_i* or **k^{wo}-m-d^h(e)-oh_i*. Can the ablatival meaning of **k^{wo}-m-d^{he}h_i* or **k^{wo}-m-d^{ho}h_i* be reconciled with the locatival-directional suffix **d^{ho}h_i/d^{he}h_i*, and does the combination of two morphemes of opposite meaning (ablatival versus locatival-directional) make sense? In fact, modern and ancient languages offer parallels for just this kind of complex source-goal expression. While it may be taken for granted that every complete motion-to contains both a starting and an end point, it may be communicationally less important to focus equally on both ends of the event of motion and more salient and hence natural to focus either on the motion’s source or on its target. Crosslinguistically, languages show either complex source-goal expressions with source prominence, cf. e.g.

German:

demonstrative *von da-her* ‘from there hither’;

interrogative *von wo-her?* ‘whence here?’

or exhibit, more frequently complex source-goal expressions with goal prominence. Examples are:

- a. German:
 - i. **demonstrative** ablative *von dort her-bei* ‘from there **thither**’;
 - ii. **interrogative** *von dort wohin?*
- b. Old Latin:
 - i. **demonstrative** *inde usque ad*³ ‘thence **until**’; to be analyzed as ablative *inde* ‘thence’ + *ut-* ‘outside’ + directional *-s* plus *que* ‘and’ + *ad* ‘towards’;
 - ii. **interrogative** *quo usque ad?* ‘whence up to **where**?’
- c. Oscan:
 - i. **demonstrative** *dat* ‘until’, e.g., *dat senateis tanginud* literally ‘from and according to the senate’s decree’ [Tabula Bantina 6 f.], *dat catrid loufir en eituas* ‘concerning a legal or financial case’ [Tabula Bantina 8 f.].⁴
 - ii. **interrogative** unattested.
- d. Proto-Indo-European:
 - i. **demonstrative** **h₁eĝ^h-s* > **h₁eĝ^h-s* ‘out and somewhere’ (ablative-directional Lat. *ex*, Gk. *ἐξ*); to be analyzed as: ablative **h₁eĝ^h* ‘towards the rim, towards outside, outside’ (cf. Dunkel 2014b: 214 ff.) plus directional **-s* >; for directional *-s*, an entry for which is wanting in Dunkel 2014, cf. directional Old Icelandic *-r* in *nið-r* ‘down(ward)’, *aust-r* ‘ain the east, eastward’.
 - ii. **interrogative** **out of there where*.

In addition to complex source-goal expressions like the foregoing, it is also possible for simple morphemes to acquire source-goal meaning with prominence placed on either the source or the goal. Since projective motion always combines motion away from a starting point and motion towards somewhere, the two aspects are two sides of the same coin, i.e., ablative and directional motion entail each other. Hence shifts may occur metonymically and the focus may shift a) either from ablative to locative and directional by SOURCE-PLACE/GOAL METONYMY, or less frequently b) from directional to ablative by GOAL-SOURCE METONYMY.

3 Cf. *inde=usque=ad diurnam stellam crastinam potabimus* ‘Then we shall drink till tomorrow’s morning star’ (Pl. *Men.* 175; trsl. de Melo). Old Lat. *inde usque ad* yields a purely directional expression in French *jusqu’à* ‘until’, see Opfermann (2016:229 ff.).

4 Oscan *dat* was previously explained as an ad-hoc ablative of the pronominal stem **do-/dā-*, cf. Untermann 2000:156 (‘Wahrscheinlich < **dād*, urspr. Abl. Sg. eines Pron.-Stammes **do-/dā-*’); to be analyzed as ablative *d(e)* + directional *ad* (as attested in Osc. *ad-pūd* ‘as long as’).

Examples of an ablative-to-directional shift include the following.

- a. Ablative case forms frequently adopt locative and directional readings; for examples, see Hackstein 2007:138–140.
- b. Ablative-directional PIE **de* ‘away from an object and towards the subject’ in the OLat. phrase *susque deque ferre* ‘to bear something up/forward and down/backward/away’,⁵ in which *de* denotes a downward/backward motion, i.e. back from an object towards the subject; cf. ModGerm. *auf und ab gehen* ‘to go up (= towards) and down (= backwards)’. By functional narrowing, we obtain either the ablative, source-prominent **de* continued in Lat. *dē* ‘away from’, or directional goal-prominent **-de* as in Latin compounds with preverb *dē-* and motion verb, encoding a goal-oriented movement, cf. *deferre ad*, *deuenire in*, *deuenire ad*, cf. e.g. *in Pylum deueniens* (Liv. Andr. fr. 9); *in insidias deuenere* (Pl. As. 104); *ad praetorem ... deuenit* (Pl. Aul. 316); cf. Homeric δέ ‘towards’, e.g., Οὐλυμπόν-δε ‘towards Olympus’, Attic οἴκα-δε with petrified neuter plural οἴκα; YAv. *vaēsman=da* ‘to the house’ (Pokorny 1959: 181 s.v. **de-*, *do-*).⁶
- c. PIE **-tos*: ablative → locative and directional, cf. Hackstein 2007:141: PIE **h₂en-tos* ‘from inside’ > Lat. ablative *intus* ‘from inside’ (Pl. Bacch. 95) → locative ‘inside’ (Pl. Mil. 483) → renewed ablative *de intus* ‘from inside’ > French locative prep. *dans* ‘within, inside’ (cf. adv. *dedans* ‘within, inside’).
- d. Latin ablative *unde* ‘whence’ > local ‘where’ (cf. Romanian *unde*, Portuguese *onde*) → renewed ablative *de unde* ‘whence’ > Spanish locative *donde* ‘where’.

Examples of directional to ablative by GOAL-SOURCE METONYMY are comparatively less frequent, cf. e.g.

- 5 ‘*Susque deque fero*’ (aut ‘*susque deque sum*’) aut ‘*susque deque habeo*’—*his enim omnibus modis dicitur—verbum est ex hominum doctorum sermonibus*. ‘I’m taking/carrying it up and down, to and fro = it’s equal to me ...’ (Gellius NA 16, 9, 1/27).
- 6 Differently Wackernagel (1926:209) in favor of a purely directional function: idg. **dó* directional ‘in der Richtung’, with accusative argument → directional meaning ‘hin ... zu’, with ablative argument → ablative meaning ‘von ... her’. For another account, cf. Dunkel (2014b:156): the ablative meaning of **de* arose by “Gliederungsverschiebung” [syntagmatic reanalysis] (as if Gk. δόμονδε τροίηνθεν ≈ Lat. *domum de Troia* ‘homewards, from Troia’).

- a. Local-directional OHG *hera*, MHG *hēr*, *hēre*, ModGerm. *her* ultimately from **ke-r*, **ki-r* + instr. **-eh_l* (EWAhd IV 962 f.), whose local-directional function is etymologically primary; but when suffixed by PIE **ut-s* [*< *ud-s*] or **dō*, the particle chain allows a focus shift to either ablative or directional meaning; the source is stressed in (**ke-r-eh_l ut-s >*) OHG *hera ūz* > ModGerm. *heraus*, but the goal in (**ke-r-eh_l dō >*) OHG *hera zuo* > ModGerm. *herzu*.
- b. Directional PIE **sue* ‘towards oneself (, and away from an object)’ → ablative ‘away (from)’ and Lat. privative *so-* as in *so-cors* ‘heart-less’ and in Toch. A *ṣu* ‘towards oneself; away (from)’; see Hackstein 2004c.

1.1.2 Paths of functional ramification in source-goal expressions

To conclude, ablative and directional meaning are not contradictory, but mutually inclusive and hence compatible. This and the mechanisms of shifting between ablative and directional-locative open a door towards explaining the functional ramifications of OHG *huuanta*, Dutch *want* as well as Latin *unde* and Tocharian B *ente*, A *äntā(ne)*. The starting point is

A: ABLATIVE-DIRECTIONAL INTERROGATIVE-RELATIVE PIE **k^{wo}-m-d^{heh}_l*, **k^{wo}-m-d^{ho}_l* ‘whence (, whereto)’, preserved in OCS *kǫdǫ*, Latin *unde* ‘whence’.

The indications are that PIE interrogative-relative **k^{wo}-m-d^{heh}_l*, **k^{wo}-m-d^{ho}_l* diversified its functions along the following four paths:

A → Ba

MECHANISM: ORIGIN-CAUSE METONYMY (causa efficiens).

CATEGORIES: SOURCE → REASON (whence? → why?).

EXAMPLES: OHG *huuanta* ‘why?’, Latin *unde* ‘whence, why?’

Ba → Bb

MECHANISM: INTERROGATIVE-CONJUNCTION SHIFT.

CATEGORIES: REASON interrogative *why?* → CAUSAL speech-act linker and CAUSAL conjunction ‘for; because’.

EXAMPLES: OHG *huuanta*, Dutch *want* ‘for; because’ presuppose a shift from a reason interrogative to a causal conjunction, as argued below in section 1.2. This shift recurs crosslinguistically. Handbook examples include Latin *quippe*, *quare*, *cur*, all of which attest their original use as causal interrogatives alongside the innovative use as coordinating and subordinating causal conjunctions, cf. Hackstein 2004b:263 f., 266 f. Destressed Latin *quare* ‘why?’ is the source of French *car* ‘for; because’. In Germanic, Bavarian dialect

isolates in Northern Italy, for instance, attest the grammaticalisation of an interrogative linking phrase *unt barume*, *un borúm* ‘and why?’ (Schweizer 2008:918) as a causal conjunction, whence also the polysemy of modern Cimbrian *ombrom(me)*, *ambrumme* as ‘(and) why?’ and ‘for; because’, cf. e.g.:

Cimbrian, Roana-Mezzaselva

ambrumme légant =za net án de
 why put:PRS.3PL =they:NOM NEG on the:ACC.PL
modánden in khüün òch?
 pant:ACC.PL in cow:PL too
 ‘Why don’t they also dress cows in pants?’ (Robàan-Mittebald = Roana-Mezzaselva; Zotti Nöbler 1986:97)

Cimbrian, Luserna

Nètt offetiian di vestadarn pan bintar,
 NEG open:INF the:ACC.PL window:ACC.PL in.ART.DAT winter:DAT
 ‘Don’t open the windows during winter,’

ombrómm =z *gevriart* =az
 why =it:NOM.SG freeze:PRS.3SG =the:NOM.SG.N
bazzar.
 water:NOM.SG.N
 ‘for the water is freezing.’ (Geyer et al. 2014:54)

A → Ca

MECHANISM: SOURCE-PLACE/GOAL METONYMY.

CATEGORIES: SOURCE → PLACE/GOAL (*whence* → *where*), PLACE/GOAL correlative *where—there*.

EXAMPLES: (COR)RELATIVE Latin *unde* ‘where’; INTERROGATIVE, (COR)-RELATIVE Tocharian B *ente*, A *äntā(ne)* ‘where’; for further examples, see Hackstein 2007:138–142.

Ca → Cb

MECHANISM: RELATIVE-CONJUNCTION SHIFT.

CATEGORIES: PLACE → TEMPORAL-CONDITIONAL (*where* → *when, if*).

EXAMPLES: OHG *huuanta* ‘when, if?’, Tocharian B *ente*, A *äntā(ne)* ‘when, if’.

1.2 *The functional range of OHG huuanta and ModDutch want*

The functional domains of OHG *huuanta* include its deployment as: a) a causal interrogative, b) a (speech-act) causal conjunction (cf. Handschuh 1964:164, Schrodtt 2004:163 f.), and c) a temporal-conditional conjunction. In its inherited and oldest use, OHG *huuanta* occurs as a causal interrogative. OHG *uuanta: quare* ‘why?’ is attested in glosses (II,70,64; III,12,63; V,519,5), see Starck and Wells 1983:695, and in Kasseler Gespräche, see Seebold 2008: 898 (s.v. *wanta*). Further examples include:

huuanta du errahhos reht miniu?
 why you:NOM proclaim:PRS.2SG statute:ACC.PL my:ACC.PL
 (translating Lat. *quare tu enarras iustitias meas?*, Psalm 49,16 f.)
 ‘Why do you declare my statutes?’ (Regula Benedicti 2, 6)

huuanta sprihhis?
 why speak:PRS.2SG
 (translating Lat. *quare ... loqueris?*)
 ‘Why are you speaking?’ (Monsee fragment 8, 16).

Negated OHG (*huanta ni*), *wanta ne*, *wanne* ‘why not?’, e.g. in early MHG

wante ne was si ime gevallen an den
 why NEG be:PRT.3SG she:NOM he:DAT fallen at the:ACC
fuoz?
 foot.ACC
 ‘Why had Eve not fallen at his feet?’ (Genesis 539)

wan=ne sagest tû mir, frouwe ...? unt sage
 why=NEG say:PRS.2SG you.SG I:DAT lady:VOC ...? and say:IMP.2SG
mir dâ mite ...!
 I:DAT there by ...
 ‘Why don’t you tell me, lady ...? And tell me thereby ...!’ (Genesis 324 f.)

A → Ba: SOURCE → REASON (whence? → why?).

In order to reconcile the functional difference between OHG *huuanta* ‘why?’ and the etymologically related interrogatives OCS *kŏdě*, Latin *unde* ‘whence?’, the hypothesis that the ablative-local function is primary and REASON represents a secondary, derived concept turns out to be much likelier than the converse assumption of *why* → *whence*. Viewing REASON as the primary concept is a priori unlikely, since Indo-European lacks an inherited, cross-linguistically

TABLE 1 SOURCE → REASON

Source language	Target language	
PIE <i>*k^wu-tos</i>	Sanskrit	<i>kutaḥ</i> ‘whence, why’
PIE <i>*k^wi/k^we-ti</i>	Hittite	<i>kuez</i> ‘whence, how, why’
	Tocharian A	<i>kucäṣ</i> ‘whence, why’
PIE <i>*k^wo-m-d^(h)e</i>	Latin	<i>unde</i> ‘whence, why’

For Tocharian A, cf. *kucäṣ päñ kánt tñ=äyim tināräs?* ‘How could/why should I give you five hundred gold pieces?’ (AYQ16 [1.6] b 2). For Hittite *kuez* ‘whence’ > ‘how’, cf. Hackstein (2007:146); for Latin *unde*, see below § 2.2.

equatable uniform expression for causal interrogatives. Instead, it exhibits a great variety of linguistically unrelated expressions for REASON interrogatives.

The observed lexical instability of REASON interrogatives is the result of their cognitive complexity. The more abstract a functional concept is, the less homogeneous appears its linguistic expression across related languages. This supposition is borne out both by the interrogatives of PIE and by the Indo-European lexicon. Just as the Indo-European languages diverge tremendously in the expression of REASON interrogatives, so too on the lexical level the Indo-European languages offer a variety of etymologically heterogeneous expressions to denote the concepts of REASON; cf. Buck 1949: 1242 f. (REASON, CAUSE). Whereas interrogatives are more lexically stable in the functional domains of PERSON, THING and PLACE, they tend to be considerably less stable in the functional domain of REASON. Consequently, the linguistic means of expressing interrogative adverbials for REASON exhibit a greater measure of lexical variability (synchronically) and lexical renewal (diachronically).

Among the lexical sources of REASON interrogatives, the path of SOURCE → REASON turns out to be quite common, cf. Table 1.

Therefore, OHG *huannta* ‘why’ can straightforwardly be derived from PIE **k^wo-m-d^heh₁*, **k^wo-m-d^hoh₁* ‘whence’.

Ba → Bb: REASON interrogative *why?* → CAUSAL speech-act linker and CAUSAL conjunction ‘for; because’.

Already from the beginning of the OHG transmission, the inherited use of OHG *huannta* as ‘why?’ appears as recessive, and is outnumbered by its innovative use as a coordinating causal conjunction, or more precisely as a speech-act linking conjunction. The indications are that OHG *huannta* ‘why?’ and *wanne* ‘why not?’ were on the wane as interrogatives already in the (pre-)OHG period, as

they were gradually superseded by analytic expressions like *fone wiu, bi wiu* ‘why?’. Eventually, MHG *want* was replaced by *war umbe*, the source of Modern Germ. *warum*. But OHG *huuanta* and *wanne* survived in functional specialization, being relegated to noninterrogative conjunctive uses. OHG *huuanta* ‘for; because’ derives from the well-known shift from *why* to *because*; for the interrogative-to-conjunction shift, see the examples and references in §1.1.2 sub Ba → Bb above.

OHG

sorgen mac diu sela (...)
 be.worried may:PRS.3SG the:NOM.SG.F soul:NOM.SG.F
 ‘The soul may be worried (...)’

uuanta ipu sia daz Satanazses kisindi
 why/for if she the:ACC.SG.N Satan:GEN.SG company:ACC.SG.N
kiuuinnit
 gain:PRS.3SG
 ‘Why?/For if it attracts the company of Satan’

daz leitit sia sar, dar iru
 that:NOM lead:PRS.3SG she:ACC.SG immediately where she:DAT.SG
leid uuirdit.
 grief:NOM.SG.N become:PRS.3SG
 ‘It will guide here where grief will afflict her right away.’ (Muspilli 6–9)

tuot riuwa!
 do:PRS.IMP.2PL remorse:ACC
 ‘Repent!’

huuanta? nâhit sih himilo rîchi.
 why/for approach:PRS.3SG REFL heaven:GEN kingdom:NOM
 ‘For approaching is heaven’s kingdom.’ (Tatian 13,2)

Old Low Franconian (Old Dutch)

Behaldan mi duo got,
 sheltered:ACC I:ACC do:IMP.2SG god:VOC
 ‘Give me shelter, O Lord!’

uuanda ingiengon uuatir untes te selon
 why/for come.in:PRT.3PL water:NOM.PL till the:ACC soul:ACC
minro.

my:ACC

'For the waters have come up to my neck (soul).' (Wachtendonck Psalm 68,2)

The use of OHG *huuanta* as an interrogative linker and as the marker of a paratatic speech-act construction turns out to be remarkably robust, persisting in MHG and older Bavarian dialects of German until at least the 19th century as well as from Old Low Franconian (Old Dutch) to present-day Dutch, cf. e.g.

Old Low Franconian (Old Dutch)

Gihori mi herro!
 hear:IMP.2SG I:ACC lord:VOC
 'Hear me, O Lord!'

uuanda guot ist ginatha thina.
 why/for good:NOM be:PRS.3SG mercy:NOM your:NOM
 'For your mercy is good.' (Wachtendonck Psalm 68,17)

Modern Dutch

Betaal de rekening nou maar!
 pay:PRS.IMP.2SG the:ACC bill:ACC now only
 'Pay the bill now!'

want de diensster wordt ongeduldig.
 why/for the:NOM waiter:NOM become:PRS.3SG impatient:NOM
 'For the waiter is losing his patience.' (ANS 26-4-1-2, ex. 3a)

A → Ca: SOURCE-PLACE METONYMY (*whence* → *where*); and Ca → Cb: PLACE → TEMPORAL-CONDITIONAL (*where* → *when*, *if*).

Additionally, OHG *huuanta*, MHG *wande*, *wand* are deployed as temporal(-conditional) conjunctions. This temporal-conditional use can be accounted for by SOURCE-PLACE METONYMY (*whence* → *where*) and an ensuing relative-conjunction shift from *where* to *when* and *if*.

OHG

uuanda *andere* *fogela* *rûment*,
 while (< *where) other:NOM.PL bird:NOM.PL migrate:PRS.3PL
 ‘While (< *where) other birds are migrating,’

sparo *ist* *heime*.
 sparrow:nom.sg be:PRS.3SG home:DAT.SG
 ‘the sparrow stays at home.’ (Notker, Ps. 101,8, ed. King/Tax, Bd 10, 370)

uuanta *sar* *so sih* *diu* *sela*
 where/when/if immediately so itself the:NOM.SG.F soul:NOM.SG.F
in den sind arheuit (...) *in*
 into the way raise.up:PRS.3SG
 ‘Where/When/If the soul then raises itself in this direction (...)’

so quimit *ein* *heri*
 so come:PRS.3SG a:NOM.SG.N army:NOM.SG.N
 ‘then (thus) comes an army.’ (Muspilli 2–4)

MHG

want tu *daz hast* *gemachot*,
 since you.SG this have:PRS.2SG done
 ‘Now that/since you have done that,’

nu solt *tu* *sin verfluochot*.
 now shall:PRS.2SG you.NOM.SG be:INF cursed
 ‘you shall now be cursed.’ (Genesis 808)

wand=ez *an in* *was verlân*,
 since=it:NOM to he:ACC.SG be:PRT.3SG transferred
 ‘Now that/since it had been transferred to him,’

sô wart *ez wol verendet*.
 so become:PRT.3SG it:NOM well finished
 ‘so it was well brought to an end.’ (Iwein 7718f.)

In what follows I will show that OHG *huuanta* and ModDutch *want* are not isolated formations, as etymological matches can be identified in the ancient Italic

and the Tocharian branches of Indo-European. The next two sections examine accordingly the formal and constructional history of Latin *unde* ‘whence’ and Tocharian B *ente*, A *äntā(ne)*, which turn out to differ in interesting respects from the Germanic forms.

2 The etymology of Latin *unde*

2.1 *Phonological reconstruction*

It may be hypothesized that Latin *unde* ‘whence’ is a cognate of OHG *huuanta* and derives like the latter from PIE **k^wo-m-d^heh₁*, **k^wo-m-d^hoh₁*, including the generalized sandhi-forms with loss of the final laryngeal in pausa. An additional possibility is **k^wo-m-d^ho* in directional **-o*, for which cf. Dunkel 2014a: 154–161. Based on forms like *alicunde* and *nēcunde*, it can safely be assumed that *unde* had a velar onset originally.

Lat. *ali-cunde* ‘from somewhere’:

tu mihi aliquid aliquo modo alicunde
 you:NOM I:DAT something:ACC some:ABL way:ABL from.somewhere
a aliis blatis.
 about other:ABL.PL waffle:PRS.2SG
 ‘You’re waffling about something somehow from somewhere from some people.’ (Pl. *Ep.* 334; trsl. de Melo)

nē-cunde ‘that from no place, lest from anywhere’:

circumspectans necunde impetus in
 look.around:PTCP.NOM from.nowhere attack:NOM in
frumentatores fieret
 corn.providers:ACC be.produced:PRT.SBJV.3SG
 ‘paying heed that from nowhere an attack could be launched against the providers of corn’ (Liv. 22,23,10)

The further reconstruction of *unde* and its status as an inner-Latin innovation or an inherited form has been a matter of debate. A proponent of the former view was Pokorny (1959:647), who sought to derive *unde* from the proportion: *i-bi* ‘there’: *in-de* ‘thence’ = *u-bi* ‘where’: *x* ‘whence’, *x* = *un-de*. Methodologically, however, the mere formal possibility of deriving a form by proportional analogy does not prove this form to be analogical or secondary. After all, for

many inherited forms it is possible to set up a proportional analogy that generates them. Thus it would be possible to derive the undisputably inherited interrogative **k^wis* from a proportion PIE **sos*: *k^wos* = **is*: *x*, *x* = **k^wis*. Many grammatical forms incidentally form part of proportions and are at the same time inherited, at least within the limits of the Comparative Method. Put differently, formal proportionality does not preclude direct inheritance. There are many indications that tip the scales in favor of considering Lat. *unde* an inherited interrogative. To begin with, interrogative adverbials in general and those of Latin in particular are typically conservative, and interrogatives tend to be even more conservative in the functional domain of PLACE. The PIE locative interrogative **k^wu-* is retained in many branches of Indo-European, cf. Skt. *ku-* (EWAia I 359), OCS *kŭde* ‘where’, Lith. *kur̃* ‘where(to)’, Oscan *puf* ‘where’. And crucially, Lat. *unde* is formally and functionally equatable with OCS *kŭdě*, which warrants a derivation of both from **kwond^hē* < PIE **kwomd^he(h_i)*. (Schmidt [1962:29]: “Man wird ihm [Lat. *unde*] wegen slav. *kŭd-*, das idg. **q^wu-n-d^h-* sein kann, vor-ital. Alter zubilligen dürfen.”)

Notorious formal questions concern the reconstruction of the vocalism and the voiced dental in the PIE form underlying *unde*. Concerning the vocalism, it has often been proposed to reconstruct the onset of *cunde* as **k^wu-m-*: cf. e.g., Meiser (1998:99), deriving *unde* like *ubi* from PIE **k^wu-*; Weiss (2009: 354): “**k^wu-*, a variant of the interrogative-indefinite stem”; and de Vaan (2008:647): “interrogative stem **k^wu-* in *ubī, unde, ut*”. But Oscan *pún, pon*, Umbrian *pune, ponne* ‘when, if’ (Untermann 2000:604f.) and OCS *kŭdě* ‘whence’ point to **k^wom-*, as rightly acknowledged by Stüber (2012:409) and Dunkel (2014b: 154). The dental suffix *-de* in Latin *unde* has usually been identified with the directional suffix **-de/o*, for which compare **-de/o* ‘dazu, andererseits’ (Dunkel 2014a: 224), **-dē, *deh_i* ‘in Richtung, zu—hin’ (Dunkel 2014b: 150f.), Gk. *ὄνδε δόμονδε* ‘to his house’ (Dunkel 2014a: 52). The same holds for Oscan *pún, pon*, Umbrian *pune, ponne* (with *-nd-* > *-nn-*, see Meiser 1986:94; **en-dom* > Umbrian *ennom* ‘then’, Meiser 1986:111).

As for the voiced dental, it has been widely held that that Lat. *-nd-* can only come from PIE **-nd-* (Rix 1995:406f., Meiser 1998:192, Weiss 2009:434), and that likewise Sabellic *-nn-* points unequivocally to PIE **-nd-*. But there is in fact evidence to bolster the phonetic development of PIE **-nd^h-* > Lat. *-nd-*; cf. already Sommer (1948:179) on Lat. *con-dere* ‘compose, lay the foundation, found’, and cf. furthermore the possibility of deriving Lat. *defendere* from impv. **fen-de* < **g^wh₂-d^hi* (Kümmel in LIV 219 n. 4) or *uādere* from impv. *uāde* < **g^weh₂-d^hi* (Garnier 2010).⁷ For Sabellic, Kümmel (2014) has recently shown that

7 On de-imperative derivatives, cf. Garnier 2010 and Dunkel 2014a:54, e.g. **h₁id^hi* → OCS *idp*,

geminate *-nn-* permits a reconstruction as either **-n-* plus nonaspirated **-d-* or **-n-* plus aspirated **-dʰ-*. Consequently, Latin *unde* is compatible not only with a protoform in **-de-*, as was previously believed, but also with a protoform in locative **-dʰe/o-* (cf. Dunkel 2014a 120 f., and cf. **kʷudʰeǵ* > Lat. *ubi* ‘where’).

2.2 The functional range of Latin *unde*

The functional range of Latin *unde* overlaps with that of OHG *huuanta*.

A: SOURCE, PLACE, DIRECTION, *whence, where, whereto?*

Ablative function ‘from which place, whence’, cf. e.g.

unde, non ubi sumuntur pingues turdi.
 whence NEG where take:PRS.3PL.MP fat:NOM.PL thrush:NOM.PL
 ‘the place **from which** fat thrushes are taken, and not the place **where** they are taken.’ (Varro, *de agri cultura* 3,51)

rogat unde sit;
 ask:PRS.3SG whence be:PRS.SBJV.3SG
 ‘She asks me **where** it’s **from**;’

narro omnia haec: indeest cognitio facta,
 tell:PRS.1SG all:ACC this:ACC thence recognition:NOM done:NOM
 ‘I disclose to her everything: **Thence** it has been recognized that’

Philumenam compressam esse ab eo et filium inde hunc natum.
 Philomena:ACC raped:ACC be:INF by he:ABL and son:ACC thence this.one:ACC borne:ACC
 ‘Philomena had been raped by him and that this son has been begotten **by him**.’ (Ter. *Hec.* 831 f.)

A → Ba: SOURCE → REASON (whence? → why?).

causam dicere prius unde₁ petitur,
 reason:ACC state:INF first whence demand:PRS.3SG.MP
 ‘that first [the defendant] **from whom₁** the gold is demanded,’

and Narten-present imperative, as S. Neri reminds me, **h₁ed-dʰi* > **éσθi* → *éσθiω*; cf. Schwyzler (1938:713 fn. 6) with lit.

aurum quare sit suom
 gold:NOM why be:PRS.SBJV.3SG his:NOM
 'states the cause why [the gold] is his own,'

quam illic qui petit, unde₂ is
 than there who:nom demand:PRS.3SG why this:NOM
sit thesaurus sibi
 be:PRS.SBJV.3SG treasure:NOM to.himself:DAT
 'before the plaintiff [states] **why₂** the gold belonged to him'

aut unde₃ in patrium monumentum peruenerit.
 or how/why in fatherly:ACC tomb:ACC get:PERF.SBJV.3SG
 'or **how/why₂** it found its way into his father's tomb.' (Ter. *Eun.* 10–13)

Quaeritis unde putem Maio data
 ask:PRS.2PL whence/why think:PRS.SBJV.1SG May:DAT given:NOM
nomina mensi.
 names:NOM month:DAT
 'You are asking **whence/why** I think these names are given to the month of May.'

non satis est liquido cognita causa mihi.
 NEG enough be:PRS.3SG clearly known:NOM reason:NOM I:DAT
 'The reason is not sufficiently clear to me.' (Ov. *Fast.* 5,1)

Ba → Ca: SOURCE → PLACE (*whence* → *where*), PLACE correlative *where*—*there*, cf.

qui eum necasset unde ipse
 who:NOM he:ACC kill:PLPF.SBJV.3SG where he.himself:NOM
natus esset
 born:NOM be:PRT.SBJV.3SG
 'who had killed him **where** he himself was born' (Cic. *Rosc.* 71,27,15)

eventus belli uelut aequus iudex,
 result:NOM war:GEN like just:NOM judge:NOM
 'The result of the war is like a just judge,'

unde ius stabat, ei victoriam
 whence/where law:NOM stand:PRT:3SG he:DAT victory:ACC
dedit.
 give:PERF.3SG
 ‘on whose side was the law, to him it gave the victory.’ (Liv. 21,10,9)

Cf. Hofmann and Szantyr (1972:209 f.) on Late Lat. *unde* = *ubi*.
 Correlative

unde tu me, inquit, ex iure manum
 whence you:NOM I:ACC say:PRT.3SG from law:ABL hand:ACC
consertum vocasti,
 joining:SUP.ACC call:PERF.2SG
 ‘In the place, he said, **whence** you called me legally into hand-to-hand fighting,’

inde ibi ego te revoco.
 thence here I:NOM you:ACC recall:PRS.1SG
 ‘**thence** I call you back here.’ (Cic. *Mur.* 26)

unde illis terror, inde Romanis animus
 whence those:DAT terror:NOM thence Romans:DAT courage:NOM
creuit.
 grow:PERF.3SG
 ‘**Whence** for those terror arose, **thence** grew the spirits of the Romans.’
 (Liv. 40,32,1)

In short, Lat. *unde* ‘whence’ is formally and functionally reconcilable with OHG *huuanta* and Dutch *want*.

3 The etymology of Tocharian B *ente* ‘where?’, ‘when, if’, A *äntā* ‘where?’, *äntā-ne* ‘where’

The establishment of Latin *unde* as a cognate of OHG *huuanta* and ModDutch *want* does not exhaust the etymological possibilities. This section will make a case for including Toch. B *ente* ‘where?’, ‘when, if’, A *äntā* ‘where?’, *äntāne* ‘where’ in the list of comparanda of OHG *huuanta*.

3.1 *Phonological reconstruction: aphaeresis, dental development and vowel weakening*

Like OHG *huuanta* and Latin *unde*, both Toch. B *ente* and Toch. A *äntā* appear as PLACE interrogatives and locative and temporal-conditional conjunctions, thus meeting the minimal conditions for being functionally equatable. The previous proposal, advanced by Adams (2013), sought to derive B *ente* from PToch. **en-te*, where **en-* and weakened **än-, in-* are from the demonstrative stem **h₁eno-*, **h₁ono-* (Adams 2013:69) and **-te* must be from PIE ablative **tōd*” (Adams 2013: 91). But it is difficult to imagine where the interrogative function of Toch. B *ente* ‘where?’, A *äntā* ‘where?’ could come from if the underlying stem is a demonstrative pronoun. An alternative and simpler proposal is to derive Toch. B *ente* from PIE **k^{wo}-m-d^{ho}(h₁)* or **k^{wo}-m-do(h₁)*, and Toch. A *äntā(ne)* from **k^{wo}-m-d^{ha}(h₂)* or **k^{wo}-m-da(h₂)* (suffixed with allative **-ah₂*). This account presupposes the operation of velar aphaeresis (as in Latin), a phonological development PIE **-nd-* > Toch. *-nt-*, and vowel weakening in the initial syllable in Tocharian A. Let us address each of these issues in turn.

3.1.1 Aphaeresis in clause-initial interrogatives and *wh*-movement in Latin, Armenian and Tocharian

A case can be made for aphaeresis in clause-initial interrogatives and for *wh*-movement in Latin, Armenian and Tocharian. In general, aphaeresis describes the tendency to eliminate segments in unstressed initial syllables, e.g., Engl. *alone* → *lone*. More precisely, however, the evidence demonstrates that aphaeresis tends to target utterance-initial (= sentence-initial) and clause-initial phrasal onsets more often than the onsets of subphrasal onsets that more likely occur utterance- and phrase-internally. This raises the question whether there is a connection between utterance-initial placement and aphaeresis, and what its explanation might be. To begin with, utterance-initial segments and clause-initial onsets are prone to show weak articulation, as was already observed by Jespersen (1917:6), who referred to the process as *prosiopesis* ‘silencing’ and used it to explain the sentence-initial elision of negations. But the deeper mechanism behind utterance initial reduction may be sought in a lag in the articulatory planning and synchronicization of utterance-initial segments.⁸ Evidence can be adduced that points in this direction. There are contrasting treatments with and without aphaeresis, such as the following.

8 In the case of habitualized and frequent phrases chunking-related phonological reduction might also have played a role, e.g., Engl. *excuse me* → *’scuse me*. On phonetic reduction in chunking (and univerbation), see Bybee and Scheibmann 1999, and Hackstein 2014 with examples from older Indo-European languages.

Aphaeresis in demonstrative pronouns:

In North Germanic, the onset of the neuter demonstrative undergoes elision when used as clause-initial complementizer (Olc. *þat* → *at*) while being retained in the (mostly) phrase-initial demonstrative (Olc. *þat*).

Aphaeresis in personal pronouns:

Across Indo-European, there is “a cross-linguistic tendency for personal and demonstrative pronouns to aphaeritize” (see Katz 1998:102), which likewise originates from their tendency to occur utterance-initially.

Aphaeresis in interrogative pronouns:

- a. In Latin, aphaeresis affects **cunde* sentence- and clause-initially, when used as an interrogative and relative, but not phrase-internally *necunde*.
- b. Classical Armenian *inč^c* ‘something’ from **[k^w]im=k^wid* shows the phrase-initial operation of aphaeresis while leaving the onset of the phrase-internal constituent *=k^wid* intact. Another example is the Classical Armenian complementizer *et^{ce}*, unverbated from *e* and *t^{ce}* PIE **[k^w]e(h₁) te(h₁)* ‘how so?’ (cf. Goth. *hve* ‘how?’; and OE. *þe* demonstr. instr. ‘by which’ and relative particle, Homeric Greek τῇ ‘here’).

Alternative explanations for the loss of the interrogatives onsets in Italic and Armenian have been proposed, but all of these suffer from drawbacks. In the case of Italic, scholars have invoked resegmentation (indefinite *ne|cubi* → *nec|ubi* >> interrogative *ubi*), but the spread of the resegmented *ubi* from the negated indefinite to the interrogative would reverse the more natural and expected directionality of analogical extension from basic to derived. In the case of Armenian, it has been proposed to attribute aphaeresis in Arm. interrogatives to a dissimilatory loss **k...k... → Ø...k...*, e.g. **[k^w]im k^wid* > Arm. *inč^c* ‘something’, cf. Skt. *kim-cit* (e.g. de Lambert-erie 2013:43), but in Armenian aphaeresis also occurs outside this context, cf. PIE **k^wo-* > Arm. *o-* (or ‘who’), **k^wu-r* > Arm. *ow-r* ‘where’, PIE **k^wesjō* > *ēr* ‘whose’.

- c. In Tocharian, aphaeresis targets disyllabic interrogatives and relatives that have destressed their first syllable by accent protraction. Aphaeresis indisputably occurs in Toch. B *k_ucé* > *cé* ‘what; that’ and is restricted to disyllabic oxytone interrogatives, e.g. Toch. B *k_usé, k_ucé* → *se, ce*. Another example of aphaeresis is Toch. A *tā* ‘where?’ < PIE **k^wi/k^wu=téh₂*, with **teh₂* being the PIE allative of demonstrative **to-*, see Pinault (2014:

301). It has not yet been recognized that under this reconstruction, Toch. A *tā* ‘where’ forms an equation with HLuw. *kwita* ‘where’ < PIE **k^wid=teh₂*; cf. Hitt. adv. conj. *kuwatta(n)* ‘whence’, *kuwatta kuwatta* ‘wherever’, *kuwattin kuwattin* ‘wherever-to’ (Plöchl 2003:90 f.).

⟨*wa=ti mis VIR-tis REL-ita REL-ita adama(n)za izis(a)tai*⟩
wa=ti mis zitis kwita kwita atman=za izistai
 ‘Wheresoever my husband honours his own name.’ (KARKAMIŠ A1b § 2)

⟨*REL-ta=ha LITUUS+natis 4-zi nipa=wa 5-n(*78)arutin wa=mu*⟩
*kwita=ha manatis 4-zi nipa=wa 5-n(*78)arutin wa=mu*
VIA-wini)
harwini
 ‘Wherever you see these 4 or five (*78)arutin, send them to me!’ (AŠŠUR letters c § 9–10; cf. § 43)

HLuw. *kwita* ‘where’ would thus support the explanation of Toch. A *tā* as an aphaeresized **kutā*.

In Tocharian, aphaeresis shows all the earmarks of a vernacular phonostylistic phenomenon with the possibility of the generalization of phonostylistically reduced variants, as would be the case with Toch. A *tā* under the present explanation.

In sum, considering the possible involvement of phonostylistics and that aphaeresis typically affects conjunctions and interrogatives, the possibility of a unified account for Latin, Armenian and Tocharian emerges. In all three languages, aphaeresis targets weakly stressed utterance-initial segments. Invoking aphaeresis for Latin *unde* and *ubi* is supported by the fact that other languages show aphaeresis in interrogatives on condition that these languages place their interrogatives clause-initially by *wh*-movement. The presence of aphaeresis in Tocharian interrogatives therefore strongly indicates that Tocharian, too, was a *wh*-movement language, thus testifying against *wh*-in-situ. (Note that *wh*-movement in Tocharian as well as in Hittite could be masked by topicalization movement, cf. already Hackstein 2004a:351 n. 7.)

3.1.2 PIE **-nd^h-* and *-nd-* > Tocharian *-nt-*

Turning to the development of the dental, Toch. *-nt-* as in Toch. B *ente* may continue either PIE **-nd^h-* (e.g. Toch. ^{AB}*länt-* < **h₁lu-n-d^h-*) or PIE **-nd-*. In the latter case, affrication of PIE **d* fails to occur when **d* is adjacent to nasals. Examples include:

- PIE **skedh₂-*: **skd-n-h₂-* > ^B *katnaṃ* ‘strews, spreads’ (Ringe 1996: 147):
 Gk. σκίδνῃμι ‘I spread’.
- PIE **spend-* > ^{AB} *spänt-* ‘trust’ (Malzahn 2010: 968): Lat. *spondēre* ‘vow’.
- PIE **splend-* > ^{AB} *plānt-* ‘rejoice’ (Malzahn 2010: 742): Lat. *splendēre* ‘shine’.

Hence Toch. B *ente* may descend from either **k^wo-m-d^ho(h₁)* or **k^wo-m-do(h₁)*, or from **k^wo-m-d^ho* in directional **-o*, for which cf. Dunkel 2014a: 154–161.

3.1.3 Vowel weakening in Tocharian A *äntā(-ne)*

The final phonological question to be treated concerns the weakened vocalic onset of Tocharian A *äntā(-ne)*. While the differing onsets of B *ente* and A *äntā-ne* may appear as incompatible, they turn out to be reconcilable under the assumption of vowel weakening by destressing and proclisis. When unstressed (in absolute final position) and destressed (in proclitics), Toch. B *-e/-a-* also yields *-ä-* (Hackstein 2004b: 289). Examples include unstressed bound morphemes:

PIE **-th₂a* > PToch. 2sg. act. pres./subj./opt. **-tä* (cf. Peters 2004: 438 n. 40);

and initial free and bound morphemes that are destressed in the wake of a proclitic accent shift (see Hackstein 2011 for a documentation of this phenomenon in various Indo-European languages):

- a. PIE demonstrative **so* > TB *se* versus **so ú* > **sæ-ú* > **sä-ú* > TB *su*;
- b. PIE interrogative-relative stem **mo(s)* *k^wis=só-u* > TB *mäksú*, see Pinault (2010: 359, 362), Hackstein (2014a: 283);
- c. PIE adverb, adposition **po-sth₂-ú-* > local particle and preverb ^B*pestä ~ pästä* ‘away’; cf. Peyrot 2008: 164 f.: “I assume that we have a phonetic development here, although a sound law *e* > *ə* is not well established. The change of *e* to *ə* could be an instance of irregular phonological reduction due to the weak accentuation of the particle-like adverb.”;
- d. PIE negation **mē* > PToch. **ma* > TB *mā* versus *ma-ntá* > unstressed *mä-ntá* ‘not at all’ (e.g. B 284b7, 295a7).

3.2 *The functional range of Toch. B ente, A äntâne*

Tocharian B *ente*

A: SOURCE, PLACE, DIRECTION, *whence, where, whereto?*

A → Ca: SOURCE → PLACE (*whence* → *where*), PLACE correlative *where—there*.
Toch. B *ente* functions as a locative interrogative-relative (cf. Peyrot 2013:377 f., Adams 2015:32 f.) and translates Skt. *kuttra* ‘where?’ (S1 P/65b1, a2, Pinault 2002:314). Textual attestations include

pokse=ñ pala, ente nai ñake mǎñcuške ...
tell:IMPV.2SG=me guardian:VOC where really now prince:NOM ...
‘Tell me guardian, where now is the prince ...?’ (B520 b8).

ente tetriku, se śaiṣṣe
where deceived:NOM, this:NOM world:NOM
translating Skt. *yatra mūḍham idaṃ jagat*
‘where there is foolishness, this is the world.’ (B148 a4).

Correlative:

ente se krentaunattse araṇemi ñemtsa walo
where/when this:NOM virtuous:NOM Araṇemi name:PERL king:NOM
ṣai,
be:IMPF.2SG
‘Where/when this virtuous one was a king, Araṇemi by name,’

ot rano sū ololyesa ākteke wāntare
there/then himself he:NOM by.far:PERL wonderful:ACC thing:ACC
yamaṣa.
do:PRT.3SG
‘there/then he himself accomplished an extraordinarily wonderful deed.’
(B77 a2 f.)

māka omp snūnma,
many:NOM there danger:NOM.PL
‘There are many dangers,’

ent(e) āknātsaṇ yamaskenträ
 where ignorant:NOM.PL act:PRS.3PL
 ‘where ignorant people are acting.’ (B44 a6)

A → Cb: PLACE → TEMPORAL-CONDITIONAL (*where* → *when, if*).

Temporal: Toch. B *inte* translates Skt. *yadā* ‘when’ (B541 b2). For further attestations, see Adams (2015:32). Toch. B *ente ente* is indefinite temporal.

ente ente wirotānta weṇau.
 where/when where/when virodha:ACC.PL mention:SBJV.1SG
 ‘(Wherever >) whenever I will mention/enumerate the virodhas/contradictions.’ (IOL 305 a3)

Temporal/conditional:

ente se krentaunattse sunetre walo
 when/if this:NOM virtuous:NOM Sunetra:NOM king:NOM
pañākte śaiṣṣene tsāṅkaṃ,
 buddha:NOM world:LOC rise:SBJV.3SG
 ‘When/if this virtuous king Sunetra will rise as Buddha in the world,’

ot cwi spaktaniki alālācci tākam.
 then he:GEN servant:NOM.PL indefatigable:NOM.PL become:SBJV.1PL
 ‘then we will be his indefatigable servants.’ (B77 a1f., Peyrot 2013:294)

Tocharian A

A → Ca: SOURCE → PLACE (*whence* → *where*), PLACE correlative *where—there*.
 Interrogative, local:

āntā aśśi tāpärk säm āṣānik mäskatär?
 where then this.time this:NOM venerable:NOM reside:PRS.3SG
 ‘Where then does at this moment this venerable one reside?’ (YQ II.1 a7f.)

A → Cb: PLACE → TEMPORAL (*where* → *when*).

āntāne mahāprabhāse ṇomā wäl ṣeṣ
 when Mahāprabhāsa name:PERL king:NOM be:IMPF.3SG
 ‘When he was the king named Mahāprabhāsa’ (B18 b4f.)

TABLE 2 *Summary of possible reconstructions of OHG huuanta, Dutch want, Lat. unde, Toch. B. ente, Toch. A äntā(ne)*

Indo-European ablative-directional interrogative		
OHG <i>huuanta</i> , Dutch <i>want</i>	$*k^{w_o-m} + \text{instr. } *d^heh_1$	
Lat. <i>unde</i>	$*k^{w_o-m} + \text{instr. } *d^ho(h_1)/d^he(h_1)/$ directional $*d^ho$	$*k^{w_o-m} + \text{instr. } *do(h_1)/de(h_1)/$ directional $*do$
Toch. B <i>ente</i>	$*k^{w_o-m} + \text{instr. } *d^ho(h_1)/$ directional $*d^ho$	$*k^{w_o-m} + \text{instr. } do(h_1)/$ directional $*do$
Toch. A <i>äntā(ne)</i>	$*k^{w_o-m} + \text{allative } *d^ha(h_2)$	$*k^{w_o-m} + \text{allative } da(h_2)$

äntāne säs klyom metrak oktapuklyi
 when the:NOM noble:NOM Maitreya eight.year.old:NOM
kakām
 become:PRT.3SG
 ‘When the noble Metrak became an eight-year old,’

tām praṣṭanāk ... brāmnāsāṣ lyutār tāk.
 that:ACC time:ACC ... brāhmaṇa:ABL.PL more become:PRT.3SG
 ‘just at that time ... he surpassed the Brahmins.’ (YQ [I.2] 1.29 b3 f., ed. Ji et al. 1998:28 f.)

(For further attestations, see Sieg, Siegling and Schulze 1931:182 (*tā*), 182 f. (*äntāne*), and *DThTA* 60.)

4 Synthesis

The reconstruction of OHG *huuanta* as an inherited interrogative conforms to a morphological and semantic template that recurs in Latin and Tocharian. The morphological template consists in an ablative-directional expression, i.e. an ablative interrogative $*k^{w_o-m}$ plus suffixed locative-directional morpheme, which for all three branches can be posited as $*-d^he/o-$, Latin and Tocharian additionally allowing for $*-de/o-$, cf. the overview in Table 2.

The three interrogatives and conjunctions, OHG *huuanta*, Latin *unde* and Toch. B *ente*, A *äntā(ne)*, exhibit the same array of functions. Their (original) core function is ablative-directional. The semantic development involves a possible shift from ablative to causal meaning, as in the case of OHG *huuanta*

(*whence* > *why*) and Lat. *unde*, or from ablative-directional to locative-directional meaning (*whence* > *where*), as in the case of Lat. *unde* and Toch. B *ente*, A *äntāne*. The shift from *whence* to *where* accords with the typologically observed preferential focus on GOAL in motion events. The data presented in this paper thus confirm that in a projective SOURCE-GOAL motion, GOAL is the unmarked, cognitively more salient concept, cf. Fillmore 1997, Stefanowitsch and Rohde 2004, Zwarts 2010.

Abbreviations

- ANS *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Versie 1.2. ANS 26-4-1-1f. accessed 11 June 2012 at <http://www.let.ru.nl/ans/e-ans/26/04/01/01/body.html> and <http://www.let.ru.nl/ans/e-ans/26/04/01/02/body.html>
- DThTA Gerd Carling in collaboration with Georges-Jean Pinault and Werner Winter. *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Vol. 1:A–J. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- EWAhD *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. Herausgegeben von Albert L. Lloyd und Rosemarie Lühr. Band IV *gâba—hylare*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- EWAia Manfred, Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. 3 Bände. Heidelberg 1992 ff.: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- EWNl 4 *Etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands*. s–z. Onder hoofdredactie van dr. Marlies Philippa, dr. Frans Debrabandere, prof. dr. Arend Quak, dr. Tanneke Schoonheim en dr. Nicoline van der Sijs. Amsterdam 2009: Amsterdam University Press.
- LIV *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden 2001: Reichert Verlag.

References

- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam / New York: Rodopi, 2nd Revised and greatly enlarged edn.
- Adams, Douglas Q. 2015. *Tocharian B: A Grammar of Syntax and Word-Formation*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Boutkan, Dirk. 1995. *The Germanic Auslautgesetze*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.

- Bybee, Joan und Joanne Scheibman. 1999. The effect of usage on constituency: The reduction of *don't* in English. *Linguistics* 37. 575–596.
- de Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dunkel, George E. 1997. B. Delbrück and the instrumental-ablative in *-m. In Emilio Crespo and José Luis García-Ramón (eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la syntaxis indoeuropea hoy. Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid 1994*, 63–83. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Dunkel, George E. 2014a. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. Band 1: *Einleitung, Terminologie, Lautgesetze, Adverbialendungen, Nominal-suffixe, Anhänge und Indices*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Dunkel, George E. 2014b. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. Band 2: *Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Fillmore, J. Charles. 1997. *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- García-Ramón, José Luis. 1997. Adverbios de dirección e instrumental indoeuropeo. In Emilio Crespo and José Luis García-Ramón (eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la syntaxis indoeuropea hoy. Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid 1994*, 113–141. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Garnier, Romain. 2010. Lat. *baetere* “aller”, *uāde* “va!” et la racine **g^weh₂*- en italique. *Latomus* 69.937–951.
- Geyer et al 2014 = Geyer, Ingeborg and Marco Angster, Marcella Benedetti (eds.) 2014. *Il tesoro linguistico delle isole germaniche in Italia. Wortschatz aus den deutschen Sprachinseln in Italien*. Luserna: Comitato unitario delle isole linguistiche storiche germaniche in Italia.
- Goedegebuure, Petra. 2007. The Hieroglyphic Luwian demonstrative ablative-instrumentals *zin* and *apin*. In: Alfonso Archi and Rita Francia (eds.), *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, Roma, 5–9 settembre 2005* (Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici 49), Roma. 319–334.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2004a. Von der Diskurssyntax zur Satzsyntax: Hethitisch *kī kuit*. In: Detlev Grodek and Sylvester Rößle (eds.), *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer*, 345–359. Dresden: Technische Universität.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2004b. From discourse to syntax: The case of compound interrogatives in Indo-European and beyond. In Karlene Jones-Bley (eds.), *Proceedings of the 15th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference* 256–298. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2004c. Reflexivpronomina, Präverbien und Lokalpartikel in indogermanischen Sprachen. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 10.69–95.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2007. Ablative formations. In: Alan J. Nussbaum (ed.), *Verba Docenti. Studies in Historical and Indo-European Linguistics Presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by Students, Colleagues, and Friends*, 131–153. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.

- Hackstein, Olav. 2011. Proklise und Subordination im Indogermanischen. In Thomas Krisch and Thomas Lindner (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der 13. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft in Salzburg, 192–202*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2014. Univerbierung und irreguläre Reduktion in temporalen Adverbien. Uridg. *ges-tern* von Bopp bis heute. In: *Munus amicitiae: Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum*. Edited by Craig Melchert, Elisabeth Rieken and Thomas Steer, 32–45. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press. [Available at <https://lmu-munich.academia.edu/OlavHackstein>].
- Handschuh, Doris. 1964. *Konjunktionen in Notkers Boethius-Übersetzung*. Zürich: Juris Verlag.
- Harris, Alice C. and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hofmann, Johann Baptist and Anton Szantyr. 1972. *Lateinische Grammatik*. Zweiter Band: *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1917. Negation in English and other languages. *Historisk-filologiske meddelelser* 1:5. Copenhagen: Høst.
- Ji, Xianlin, Werner Winter, Georges-Jean Pinault 1998. *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Katz, Joshua Timothy. 1998. *Topics in Indo-European Personal Pronouns*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1987. Erbe und Neuerung beim germanischen Demonstrativpronomen. In Rolf Bergmann, Heinrich Tiefenbach, and Lothar Voetz (eds.), *Althochdeutsch*. Band 1: *Grammatik*, 169–189. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Kümmel, Martin. 2014. Etymologie und Phonologie: Umbrisch *amboltu*. *Die Sprache* 50/1 (2012/2013 [2014]): 31–43.
- de Lamberterie, Charles. 2013. Grec, phrygien, arménien: des anciens aux modernes. *Journal des Savants—Janvier-Juin 2013*. 3–69.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden: Brill.
- Meiser, Gerhard. 1986. *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Meiser, Gerhard. 1998. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Opfermann, Andreas. 2016. *Univerbierung. Der passive Wortbildungsmechanismus*. Hamburg: Baar Verlag.
- Peters, Martin. 2004. Mögliche Reflexe einer Interaktion hoher und niederer Phonostile im Tocharischen. In Adam Hyllested et al. (eds.), *Per Aspera ad Asteriscos*, 420–446. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2008. *Variation and Change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- Peyrot, Michaël. 2013. *The Tocharian Subjunctive*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Philippa, Marlies. et al. 2009. *Etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands*. s–z. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. See URL: <http://www.etymologie.nl/> and abbreviations above under EWNl 4.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2002. Tokh. B *kucaññe*, A *kucim* et skr. *tokharika*. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 45.311–345.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2010. Le pronom d'ipséité en tokharien. In: Injoo Choi-Jonin, Marc Duval, Olivier Soutet (eds.), *Typologie et comparatisme. Hommages offerts à Alain Lemaréchal*. Leuven: Peeters. 351–365.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2013. Contribution de *Maitrisimit* à l'interprétation de textes parallèles en tokharien. In Yukiyo Kasai, Abdurishid Yakup, Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst (eds.), *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit. Symposium anlässlich des 100. Jahrestages der Entzifferung des Tocharischen (Berlin, 3. und 4. April 2008)*, 183–234. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2014. Distribution and origins of the PIE suffixes **-ih₂-*. In Norbert Oettinger and Thomas Steer (eds.), *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen. Morphologie, Adjektiv vs. Substantiv, Kollektivum. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft von 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen*, 273–306. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2015. Buddhist stylistics in Central Asia. In: *Linguarum Varietas: An International Journal* 4.89–107.
- Plöchl, Reinhold. 2003. *Einführung in das Hieroglyphenluwische*. Dresden: Technische Universität Dresden.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern, München: Francke Verlag.
- Ringe, Don. 1996. *On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian*. Volume 1: *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Tocharian*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Rix, Helmut. 1995. Einige lateinische Präsensbildungen zu Set-Wurzeln. In W. Smoczyński (ed.), *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume. Part One*, 399–408. Kraków: Universitas.
- Schmeller, J. Andreas. 1855. *Cimbrisches Wörterbuch*. Wien: Kaiserl. Königl. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei.
- Schmidt, Gernot. 1962. *Studien zum germanischen Adverb*. Inaugural-Dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin.
- Schweizer, Bruno. 2008. *Zimbrische Gesamtgrammatik. Vergleichende Darstellung der zimbrischen Dialekte*. Herausgegeben von James R. Dow. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Schwyzler, Eduard 1938. *Griechische Grammatik. Erster Band: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. 5., unveränderter Nachdruck 1977. München: C.H. Beck.
- Schrodt, Richard. 2004. *Althochdeutsche Grammatik II. Syntax*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

- Seebold, Elmar. 2008. *Chronologisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Wortschatzes*. Zweiter Band. *Der Wortschatz des 9. Jahrhunderts*. Bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold unter Mitarbeit von Brigitte Bulitta, Elke Krotz und Elisabeth Leiss. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sieg, Emil, Wilhem Siegling, and Wolfgang Schulze. 1931. *Tocharische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1948. *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Starck, Taylor; and J.C. Wells. 1983. *Althochdeutsches Glossenwörterbuch (mit Stellenachweis zu sämtlichen gedruckten althochdeutschen und verwandten Glossen)*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Neunte Lieferung.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol and Ada Rohde. 2004. The goal bias in the encoding of motion events. In G. Radden & K.-U. Panther (eds.), *Studies in Linguistic Motivation*, 249–268. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stüber, Karin. 2012. Zur Frage des Italo-Keltischen: Erkenntnisse aus der Erforschung der Partikeln. In: Velizar Sadovski and David Stifter (eds.), *Iranistische und Indogermanistische Beiträge in memoriam Jochem Schindler (1944–1994)*, *PAGES*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Streitberg, Wilhelm. 1920. *Gotisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Untermann, Jürgen. 2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1926 [1967]. *Vorlesungen zur Syntax*. Zweite Reihe. Basel: Birkhäuser, Zweite Auflage.
- Weiss, Michael. 2009. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.
- Zeilfelder, Susanne. 2001. *Archaismus und Ausgliederung. Studien zur sprachlichen Stellung des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Zotti[-Nöbler] 1986 = Ein "zimbrisches" Sprachdenkmal vom Südrand der Alpen. Die Erinnerungen der Constantina Zotti (1904–1980) aus Toballe in den Sieben Gemeinden. *Zimbrischer Text mit neuhochdeutscher Übersetzung*. Bozen: Landesverband für Heimatpflege in Südtirol. [Toballe = Robàan-Mittebald = Roana-Mezzaselva.]
- Zwarts, Joost. 2010. A hierarchy of locations: Evidence from the encoding of direction in adpositions and cases. *Linguistics* 48:5.983–1009.