Zurück zur Wurzel

Struktur, Funktion und Semantik der Wurzel im Indogermanischen

Akten der 15. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft
vom 13. bis 16. September 2016 in Wien

Herausgegeben von
Melanie Malzahn, Hannes A. Fellner und Theresa-Susanna Illés

Table of Contents

Suffixes from roots: the case of PIE *-*bʰo*- and related issues

Georges-Jean Pinault

I. The two sources of the nominal suffix *-*bʰo*- from compounds

1. The pan-IE suffix *-*bʰo*- is found mostly in adjectives referring to colours or visual appearance, as well as in substantives naming animals, or adjectives connected with the same sphere[1]: a) Ved. *vr̥ṣabhá*- 'bull', *r̥ṣabhá*- 'bull, male', *rā́sabha*- 'donkey', *gardabhá*- 'ass', Gk. ἔλαφος 'deer', Lat. *columbus*/°*a* 'dove, pigeon'; AV *sthū́labha*- 'bulky', Gk. στέριφος 'sterile'; b) Lat. *albus* 'white', Gk. ἀλφός 'dull-white leprosy', Hitt. *alpa*- 'cloud'[2], Gk. ἄργυφος 'silver-white'[3], Lith. *raĩbas* 'speckled', OIr. *noib* 'divine', OP *naiba*- 'beautiful' (< *noi̯-*bʰo*-), Lat. *galbus* 'greenish' (probably from Gaulish < *ǵʰl̥h₃-*bʰo*-, cf. χλωρός), Arm. *alb*, *o*-stem, 'dung, excrement' < 'dirty', cf. Hitt. *šalpa*-, *šalpi*- c. 'dung' < *sal-*bʰo*-, *sal-*bʰi*-, besides *sal-u̯o*- in OIr. *sal* 'dirth, filth', OHG *salo* 'dark, dirty'[4]. This lexical distribution can be accounted for by the two possible origins of the suffix. The most obvious one is *-*bʰo*- < *-*bʰh₂-o*-, vs. the root noun *bʰéh₂*- (Ved. *bʰā́*- fem. 'shining, light'), from the root *bʰeh₂*- 'to shine, be bright' (LIV: 68–69). This root noun is found as second compound member, e.g. Ved. *vi-bʰā́*- adj. 'shining widely'. It is then arguable that the suffix *-*bʰo*- was issued from a thematicized second compound member. Such thematic second compound members coexist often with root nouns and are prone to being reshaped as suffixes: *-*h₃ku̯-o*- vs. *-*h₃eku̯*-, *-*sth₂-o*- vs. *-*steh₂*-, *-*dʰh₁-o*- vs. *-*dʰeh₁*-, *-*ph₂-o*- vs. *-*peh₂*-, *-*h₃n-o*- vs. *-*h₃en*- (Hoffmann suffix, provided it was issued from a root noun as second member)[5], etc. Some are known only by the thematic form: *-*h₁u̯-o*- 'looking' into some direction, from the root *h₁au̯*- 'to see' (*h₁eu̯*- as per LIV: 243, cf. Hitt. *uḫḫi*, *autti*, *uḫanzi*, Ved. *uvé*), see OCS *protivǫ* 'against' < *proti-h₁u̯-o*-, OCS *pravъ* 'right', OHG *fruo*, Gk. πρωΐ 'early [in the day]' < *pro-h₁u̯-o*- 'situated before'.[6] Several of these formations

---

1 BRUGMANN 1906: 386–390; DEBRUNNER 1954: 746–748; NUSSBAUM 1999: 393.

2 The connection with the adjective 'white' has been put in doubt by PUHVEL (1984: 38) and KLOEKHORST (2008: 169). It can be maintained if one assumes that the same item, to wit *alb*ʰ*o*- < *al-*bʰh₂-ó*- (because there is no root *(h₁)*albʰ*-, nor *(h₁)*al*-, 'to shine') has evolved into *alpa*- 'cloud' in Anatolian (< *"shining out of a different light', by contrast with color of the surrounding sky), since Hitt. *alpa*- is mostly associated with rain and thunder, but into 'white' in Core IE, from *al-*bʰh₂-ó*- 'shining differently, exclusively', by contrast with all other colors. This confirms at best the analysis of *-*bʰó*- as *-*bʰh₂-ó*-, associated with the particle *ál* 'elsewhere', hence 'distant, different', see *ali*-, *ali̯o*- 'other', and the adverbs meaning 'differently, otherwise' (DUNKEL 2014, II: 18–35).

3 *Pace* LE FEUVRE 2004.

4 SCHINDLER 1978.

5 PINAULT 2000. The number of the laryngeal of the suffix is immaterial for the present issue.

6 LE FEUVRE 2010.

became at early date the basis of productive further derivation, see for instance the directional adjectives in *-h_3k^u-o-, which spread in Indo-Iranian as the restructured suffix *-Hka-, e.g. *úpāka-* 'near, close', *abhī́ka-* nt. 'proximity', *asmā́ka-* 'belonging to us'.[7] The Vedic masculine substantives in -*dhí-* (e.g. *nidhí-* 'hoard, treasury')[8] presuppose the substantivization[9] in *-$d^h(h_1)$-í- of compound adjective in *-$d^h(h_1)$-ó- (see especially °*nidhá-* in RV *su-nidhá-*, °*dhá-* in *madhu-dhá-* 'providing sweetness'[10] vs. the athematic version of the second compound member in *ratna-dhā́-* 'procuring wealth').

2. In the present context, I will not dwell longer about the origin and function of the thematic second member in *-CC-ó- based on root nouns. The thematic vowel can be interpreted as a compositional suffix[11], without bearing per se a strictly "possessive" meaning. Since the original semantics of these second member elements was soon in the way of fading, I would provisionally surmise that the thematicization was extended after thematic suffixes and particles which had various values, several of them being local or spatial in the broad sense, such as *-b^ho- (besides adverbial ending *-b^hi), *-d^he (adverbial ending, parallel to -d^hi), *-mno-, *-tro-, *-$m̥k^u$o-, *-$u̯$o-, etc.[12] The origins of most of these thematic morphemes cannot be longer recovered. In the case of the directional suffix *-mno-, it is most likely based on the thematicization of the suffix *-men-, as extended to bases expressing local situation.[13] It is then likely that the thematic structure of *-h_3k^u-o-, since *-$h_3(e)k^u$- itself had already shifted to the status of quasi suffix, is due to the influence of *-mno- and *-$m̥k^u$o-, which had precisely the same function, as derived from local adverbs.

3. For the suffix *-b^hó- as based on the thematicization of a root noun, an alternative origin ought to be stated, as from the second compound member *-b^huh_2-ó-, competing with *-$b^húh_2$-, the root noun of the root *$b^hu̯eh_2$- 'to become' (LIV: 98–101). This requires only the application of two successive sound laws: 1) through the νεογνός-rule, *-b^huh_2-ó- > *-$b^hu̯$ó-, 2) then, *-$b^hu̯$ó- > *-b^hó- through the rule *$b^hu̯$V > *b^hV. The latter is seen in several derivatives from the root *$b^hu̯eh_2$-, see for instance Gk. φωλεός 'hole, lair', Alb. *botë* 'earth, world'. This is further supported by Gk. φώς, stem φωτ-, 'man', the meaning of which is better understood as stemming from *$b^hóh_2$-t- < *$b^hu̯óh_2$-t- 'human' < 'living being', concretization of an abstract, the acrostatic -t-derivative from *$b^hu̯eh_2$- 'to grow' [on earth] rather than from *b^heh_2- 'to shine'.[14] It is also presupposed by some restructurings proper to this root, which led to the elimination of the expected full grade (so-called stem II) *$b^hu̯eh_2$- (which ought to yield *b^heh_2-

---

[7] DUNKEL 2014, I: 202; SCARLATA 1999: 33.

[8] Complete list in SCARLATA 1999: 267.

[9] GRESTENBERGER 2014: 92.

[10] SCARLATA 1999: 256.

[11] See KLINGENSCHMITT (2004: 249-250) about *-h_3k^u-o-.

[12] See DUNKEL 2014, *ss.uu.*

[13] MELCHERT 1983: 17–18.

[14] *Pace* PETERS 1993: 101–106; see also VIJŪNAS 2009: 72–76.

by sound law) in several categories.[15] The second alternative *-b^hó- < *-b^h(uh₂)-ó- is fitting for animal names. The original meaning of those was: 'having the origin, the race of X', 'issued from X', becoming a derivative referring to the young of animals, and further substantivized, type Gk. ἔλαφος < *(h₁)eln̥-b^h(uh₂)-o-. The merger with the suffix *-b^hó- < *-b^h(h₂)-ó- was secondary, both for semantic and formal reasons. This type evolved as to mean: 'having the look of X', 'looking like X'. The polygenesis of the secondary suffix *-b^ho- should be admitted, so that many derivatives could not be longer attributed to either of the two possible origins. A link between the two major categories (colour adjectives and animal names) lies in the fact that some animals could also be described by reference to colours of their coat or other external features. The spread of this morpheme as suffix was correlated with the fading of the original meaning to 'being like X', see above (cf. 1) the case of *-h_3k^u-ó-, expressing orientation, and then likeness, and even appurtenance.

II. The various sources of Tocharian roots ending in *°P-

4. In the Tocharian lexicon, everyone can note the presence of many roots ending in °p-, which do not have any clear etymology. It is obvious that the theory of enlarged or complex roots cannot hold for all these problematic instances. In the following survey[16], four classes are distinguished. 1) Roots going back to PIE roots ending in *°P-: TB *kāw-*/TA *kāp-* 'to well up, be greedy' (*$k\underline{u}ap$-, IEW: 596), TA/TB *kārp-* 'to descend' (*$k^u erp$-, IEW: 631), TB *kälyp-* 'to steal' (*klep-, LIV: 363), TA/TB *kulyp-* 'to desire' (*$k^u lep$-), TA/TB *krämp-* 'to be hindered, disturbed' (*$g\underline{r}$-m-b^h-, nasal-infixed form[17] based on *gr-eb^h- 'to be crooked', IEW: 387), TB *tälp-* 'to be purged' (*telp-, LIV: 623), TB *yäp-*/*yop-*, TA *yäw-* 'to enter' (*$h_3\underline{i}eb^h$-, without laryngeal in LIV: 309), TA/TB *lip-* 'to remain, be left over' (*le$\underline{i}$p-, LIV: 408), TB/TA *lup-* 'to rub, smear' (*(s)le$\underline{u}b^h$- IEW: 963). 2) Loans: from Indo-Aryan, TA *räp-* 'to play music' (< Skt. *ribh-* 'to shout, sing', PIE *re$\underline{i}b^h$-, IEW: 860); from Iranian, TB *nip-* 'to set aside', TB *āmp-* 'to rot', TB *sānāp-* 'to anoint'. 3) Roots issued from enlarged PIE roots: TA/TB *cämp-* 'to be able to' (*temp- < *ten-p-, LIV: 626), TA/TB *täp-* 'to proclaim' (< *(s)tu-P-, cf. *ste$\underline{u}$-, LIV: 600), TB *yärp-* 'to be concerned, take care' (*$\underline{u}er$-P-, cf. 3. *$\underline{u}er$-, LIV: 685), TA/TB *rāp-* 'to dig, plow' (*drep- < *dr-ep-, enlargement of *der-, LIV: 128), TB/TA *ṣärp-* 'to indicate, explain' (*suer-P- or *ser-P-), TB *särp-* 'to beat (of the heart)' < *sur-P-, cf. *s$\underline{u}er$- 'to sound' (LIV: 613), TA/TB *sälp-* 'to glow' (< *sulp- from PIE *s$\underline{u}el$-p-, cf. *s$\underline{u}el$- LIV: 609), TB *släpp-* 'to fall into, sink in' (maybe *slib- related to *sle$\underline{i}$-b-, IEW: 663), TB *tsāp-* 'to mash, crush' (maybe < *dh₂-p-, cf. *deh₂-p-, LIV: 104), TA *tāp-* 'to eat' (maybe *d^hh_1-p- 'to nourish oneself', from *d^heh_1- 'to milk'). 4) Roots for which there is no convincing etymology till now: TB *aip-*/TA *ep-* 'to cover', TA/TB *ālp-* 'to stroke, brush', TB/TA *kälp-* 'to

---

[15] See JASANOFF 1997: 174, 179–182; RIX 2003: 365.

[16] I shall refrain hereafter from discussions pertaining to the A-character of several roots, which may be secondary, and from the various reshapings which may affect the root vocalism. Further secondary literature can be found in VAN WINDEKENS 1976, ADAMS 1999 and 2013.

[17] Compare Gmc. *krimpan 'to shrink', cf. KROONEN 2013: 305.

find, obtain', TB *kurp-* 'to care', TB *klāp-* 'to touch, investigate', TB *kraup-*/TA *krop-* 'to gather, assemble', TB *trāpp-* 'to stumble, trip', TA *trāp-* 'to falter', TA/TB *wärp-* 'to enjoy, receive', TB *śāmp-* 'to be haughty, conceited', TB *sāmp-*/TA *sum-* 'to take away, deprive of', TA/TB *tsälp-* 'to pass away, be released', TA/TB *tsip-* 'to dance', TA/TB *tsop-* 'to sting, poke'.

5. The secondary *qua* enlarged roots ending in °*p-* in CToch., if they go back to the reinterpretation of suffixes, which were based themselves on second compound members, are actually ambiguous, due to the merger of the different manners of articulation of PIE stops into the voiceless: CToch. *°pæ* < *°p(h₂)-o-* (from the root *peh₂-) or *°bʰo-*, which may have itself two points of departure (see above 3), to wit < *°bʰu̯o-* < *°bʰu(h₂)-o-* or *°bʰ(h₂)-o-* respectively from the roots *bʰuh₂-* 'to become' and *bʰeh₂-* 'to shine'. This opens the way to a wider potentiality for etymologizing such apparently enlarged roots. One can object that the range of possibilities is effectively too large, and it would be commendable to resort on some means of controlling any etymological analysis. Since the CToch. roots in question are well-anchored in the lexicon and are no more analysable in synchrony for the speakers, the chances for finding an underlying phrase are very remote. The semantics do not always allow to prefer one of the possible origins: 1) enlargement in *-P-*, 2) suffixation, 3) univerbation of a phrase, given that the difference between the second and third scenarios could be merely chronological, the suffix being itself derived from a second compound member. As for the latter case, this type of restructuring is always acceptable in principle, and even trivial. A well-known instance is the new Sanskrit root *gop-*/*gup-* 'to guard, defend, protect', which arises already in Vedic, but at a relatively late stage (RV perfect 3rd pl. act. *jugupur*, verbal adj. *gupitá-*, AV+ *guptá-*, etc.).[18] It is issued from the metanalysis of the verb, present *gopayati*, based on the denominative *gopā-yá-ti*/*gopa-yá-ti* 'to guard' < 'to be guardian, act as guardian'.[19] A general caveat pertains to the difficulty, for the enlargements in *-P-* as well as for any other enlargement, of distinguishing between the following processes: a) extension of the original root by an additional consonant, after other roots ending in *°P-*, through semantic association, morphological parallelism, etc., the motivation of which cannot be longer recovered; b) reshaping of previous formations, which were in principle compounds, and more precisely verbal governing compounds. In the latter case, the point of departure is more transparent than the vague notion of univerbation. In theory, a further point of departure would be serial verbs or constructions with noun and light verb[20], with integration of the root of the second verb as suffix, but this process is also most difficult to recover in exact terms. The so-called enlargements are in most cases devoid of any semantic content, so that it remains impossible to qualify them as verbal "suffix".

---

[18] MW: 358c; EWAia I: 499–500.

[19] See RV *gopá-* besides *gopā́-*, and Epic Skt. *nr̥pa-*, reflecting the doublet *-ph₂-ó-* of the second member *-péh₂-* of verbal governing compounds (cf. 1).

[20] For phrases involving the root *dʰeh₁-* 'to set, put', see KÖLLIGAN 2018.

6. Therefore, one should resort to arguments of different types which concur to the same scenario. This point can be illustrated by the case of the Tocharian verbal root TB/TA *tsälp-* 'to pass away, be released, be redeemed', causative 'to redeem, release, free', nearly equivalent to Skt. *moc-/muc-* 'to loose, release, liberate, set free'.[21] The recorded etymology (ADAMS 1999: 738; 2013: 807), from the root *d^helb^h-* 'to dig, excavate' (IEW: 246, LIV: 143), is far from compelling. I have argued elsewhere[22] that the basis was the denominative of an adjective *$d\llap{.}l h_1 b^h ó$-*, from a verbal governing compound *$d\llap{.}l h_1 - b^h u̯ ó$-* < *$d\llap{.}l h_1 - b^h u h_2 - ó$-* 'becoming distant, remote' > 'moving to a different place or status, entering into a different place', finally 'passing away to the released status'. There is no direct evidence for the theoretical underlying phrase. One may however note that a denominative verb from this basis, meaning basically 'to pass away', in order to enter a somewhat distant place, separated by a limit, either material or symbolic, accounts easily for the prevailing use of the verb, as meaning 'to be released', with a complement in the ablative which refers to the sufferings or to an evil state from which the beings are freed or wish to be freed. This semantic evolution is bound to the construction of the basic verb *tsälp-* as parallel to the construction with the ablative of the Skt. verb *muc-*, present *mucyate* 'to be loosed, set free, released'. The first type of argument lies in the morphological plausibility of a CToch. noun *$tsälpæ$* < *$d\llap{.}l h_1 b^h ó$-* < *$d\llap{.}l h_1 - b^h u̯ ó$-*. This noun was the basis of the present of class III, which is typically intransitive, with middle voice: TB 3rd sg. *tsälpetär*, 3rd pl. *tsälpentär*; the divergent ablaut grade of the corresponding TA *śalpatär*, *śalpantär*, inf. *śalpatsi*, can be explained by the influence of other verbs of movement of the type TB *lyewetär*, from the root *lu-* 'to send', see TA *śamatär* (vis-à-sis TB *tsmetär*) from *tsäm-* 'to grow', TA *mloskatär* (vis-à-vis TB *mlutketär*) from the root *mlutk-* 'to escape'. Following the interpretation of the presents of class III and IV as denominatives, which are mostly intransitive, denoting a state or most commonly the process of entering into a state,[23] the present stem TB *tsälpe°* < CToch. *$tsälpæ$-* can be traced back to a present *$tsälpæyä$-/°*$æyæ$-* (with regular contraction)[24], denominative from a CToch. noun *$tsälpæ$* < *$d\llap{.}l h_1 b^h ó$-*. The second type of argument is based on the existence of a well-known thematic noun parallel to *$d\llap{.}l h_1 b^h ó$-*, to wit *$d\llap{.}l h_1 g^h ó$-* 'long', in time and space, cf. Ved. *dīrghá-*, OAv. *darəγa-*, YAv. *darəga-*, OP *dargam*, OCS *dlъgъ*, SCr. *dȗg*, Lith. *ìlgas*, Goth. *tulgus* (*u*-stem). This item can be further analysed indeed as *$d\llap{.}l h_1 - g^h ó$-*, as revealed by the related forms Gk. δολιχός and Hitt. *daluki-* /dalugi-/, of the same meaning.[25] In its turn, the etymon reflected by the majority of languages is traced back[26] to a governing compound *$d\llap{.}l h_1 - g^h h_1 - ó$-* 'reaching distance, remoteness'. The thematic second member is based on the root *$g^h e h_1$-* 'to attain' (LIV: 196),

[21] MALZAHN 2010: 989–991; PEYROT 2013: 846.

[22] PINAULT 2017 (written in 2015).

[23] MALZAHN 2010: 385–402.

[24] Corresponding to the PIE type of denominative present in *-*o-*$i̯e$/o-*.

[25] I shall leave aside in the present context the discussion of separate issues pertaining to some forms.

[26] See BALLES 2009: 23–24; *pace* RAU (2009: 132 n. 20), who takes it as a primary formation, with a so-called Caland suffix *-*$g^h o$-*.

and the first member is related to the root *$delh_1$- (= 5. *del-* in IEW: 196) 'to set at some distance', cf. OCS *pro-dьliti* 'to prolong', Ru. *dal'* 'distant', *dliná* 'length', etc. One may then conceive a parallel governing compound *$dl h_1$-$b^h uh_2$-ó-, as glossed above. From the structural point of view, the first member would be the weak stem allomorph of a root noun. The analysis of these items as compounds make sense by itself, without the support of some phrase which would be by chance recorded in one single language.

III. Analysis of further Tocharian roots ending in °*p-*

7. The evidence should be widened to nouns which contain at first sight a bilabial stop in the final part of the stem. A case in point is TB *kwīpe*, TA *kip* 'shame, modesty', an item which is deemed as etymologically obscure.[27] In any case, this word does not seem compatible with any type of noun ending in TB °*e*, be it thematic (< CToch. *-*æ* < *-*o-s*, masculine, *-*o-m*, neuter)[28] or athematic (< CToch. *-*æ* < *-*os*, neuter, e.g. TB *cake* 'river', pl. *ckenta*, < CToch. *$cäkæ$ < *$ték^u$-os 'running'). The CToch. point of departure ought to be set up as *kwäyipæ, which underwent regular contraction. It cannot be *kwäyäpæ as per HILMARSSON (1996: 210) because this ought to yield *kwæpæ through contraction. This word has enjoyed a – fortunately – short-term reputation in non-Tocharologist circles because of the alleged connection with Gmc. *wīƀan nt. 'woman, wife', and due to the overall interest for lexemes pertaining to sex in some way or the other. This odd connection has been refuted by HILMARSSON (1996: 208–221) both from the formal and semantic point of view. TB *kwīpe*, TA *kip* do not show any prevalent relationship with sexuality. Ironically, the compound TB *kwipe-ike*, lit. 'shame-place' refers to the penis, and not to the vagina. The etymology of the Gmc. noun is itself deemed as obscure[29] and its structure is not illuminated by the comparison with TB *kwīpe*, TA *kip*. As a matter of fact, the philological data about these words may provide some hints.[30] TB *kwīpe* and TA *kip* have both a moral sense, corresponding to Skt. *hrī-* fem. 'shame, modesty, shyness'. Both have synonyms: TB *yase* and TA *śāñi*, which express the same concept, mostly in binomial phrases: TB *yase kwīpe*, TA *kip śāñi*. TA *śāñi* occurs also alone as translation of Skt. *hrī-* in A 386 b4; the derived adjectives meaning 'shameful', TA *kipsu* (cf. TB *kwipassu*) and *śāñinu*, occur together in the nom. pl. masc. in a binomial phrase, *kipsuṣ śāñinuṣ*, in A 229 b3. TB *kwipassorñe*, abstract based on the adjective *kwipassu*, has been used (B 23 a2) for translating Skt. *hrī-* in the Udānavarga (X.1). In TB the denominative verb *kwipeññ-* 'to be ashamed' occurs side by side with the phrase *onmiṃ yām-* 'to make remorse' and the verb, probably denominative as well, *ykāṃṣäññ-* 'to feel disgust'.[31] These binomial phrases (TB *yase kwīpe*, TA *kip śāñi*) correspond to a well-known item of

---

[27] ADAMS 1999: 238; 2013: 257. Abortive proposal by VAN WINDEKENS (1976: 216) with further literature.

[28] Survey by MALZAHN 2013, discussing the various ablaut grades.

[29] See KROONEN 2013: 504; KLUGE-SEEBOLD 1999: 879–880 with thorough discussion and literature.

[30] The material can be easily retrieved through the CEToM database.

[31] The latter verb is certainly a denominative as well, cf. MALZAHN 2010: 812; ADAMS 2013: 558.

Buddhist phraseology, which is made of two terms: Pāli *hiri-ottappa-* 'shame [and] fear of sin' (PED: 732a), Sankritized as *hrīr-apatrāpya-* (BHSD: 623a). The latter term, *apatrāpya-* nt. 'modesty, bashfulness, shame' (BSHD: 43b)[32] is almost always associated with *hrī-* 'shame', which is of course matched by the Pāli form *hiri-/hirī-*. See further (CPD, *ss.uu.*) the nouns *ottappa-* nt. 'shunning, shrinking from, fear of doing wrong', *ottāpa-* masc. 'id.', the verb *ottapati* (Skt. *apa-trap-*), more frequently *ottappati* (influenced by the noun) 'to feel ashamed, to be conscious or afraid of evil', adjective *ottappin-*, *ottāpin-* 'afraid of wrong, conscientious, scrupulous' (PED: 166; DP I: 568).

8. One may consider which are the semantic components expressed specifically by TB *kwīpe*, TA *kip*, as complementary to the components expressed by TB *yase* and TA *śāñi*. These nouns, both masculine, are not motivated in synchrony, except for TB *yase*. Actually, the latter can be etymologically interpreted as meaning basically 'torment, trouble' < **yäsæ*, related to the verbs TB *yäs-* 'to excite', TA *yäs-* 'to boil', TB *yās-* 'to be excited', which have a good etymology, from the PIE root **i̯es-* 'to boil' (LIV: 312).[33] Therefore, CToch. **yäsæ* can be traced back to an agent noun **i̯es-ó-* 'tormenting', lit. 'boiling'.[34] Consequently, a physical origin is likely for the TA match *śāñi*, by way of physical metaphor.[35] This noun can be based on an adjective or a secondary derivative < CToch. **śāñ-iyæ*. The starting point would be an abstract meaning 'trouble, confusion' or the like, with the addition of a suffix which triggered palatalization. The stem **śāñ-* can be traced back through regular laryngeal evolution to **k̂ih₂-(e)n-*, ultimately from **k̂ih₂-mén-*, from the root **k̂ei̯h₂-* 'to be moved' (LIV: 346). Therefore, it is possible that the proper feeling of guilt lies in the source of TB *kwīpe*, TA *kip*. Since Skt. *hrī-* 'shame, modesty' does not have any internal connection, except with the verb *hrī-/hray-* 'to feel shame, be bashful or modest' (MW: 1307b), nor any clear etymology for that matter[36], the hypothesis of a Tocharian calque can be excluded. I propose to explain CToch. **kwäyipæ* < **kwäñi-pæ*, as a former governing compound **'having regard, watching for penalty, atonement'. The second member reflects the well-known element **-ph₂-ó-* from the root **peh₂-* (LIV: 460) 'to observe, guard, watch over', in moral sense. This dimension is well recorded in Toch. by the uses of the related root TB *pāsk-*/TA *pās-* 'to guard, protect, observe', see in particular the abstracts (based on the respective preterit participles) TB *papāṣṣorñe*, TA *pāpṣune* 'observance', translating the Buddhist term Skt. *śīla-* (Pāli *sīla-*) 'good practice, morality, correct behaviour, moral precept' (PED: 712b). As for the first member, CToch.

---

[32] Compare Buddhist Skt. *(Sarvāstivādin) avatrāpya-* 'Schamempfinden, (empfindliches) Gewissen, Skrupelhaftigkeit' and *hrīr-avatrāpya-* 'Schamgefühl und Skrupel', SWTF I: 160a, IV: 478b.

[33] Malzahn 2010: 789–790, 802–804. Same etymology of TB *yase* by Van Windekens 1976: 588 and Adams 2013: 525, 541.

[34] Of the type described by Malzahn (2013: 169–172), e.g. TB *yape*, gen. sg. *ypentse*, 'spider' < CToch. **yäpæ* < **u̯ebʰ-ó-* 'weaver'.

[35] The connection with Ved. *jyā́-* 'power', Gk. βία 'force', as per Van Windekens (1976: 474) is not compelling.

[36] EWAia II: 823.

*kwäñi- can be traced back to *$k^u i$-néi̯-, an abstract based on an adjective *$k^u i$-nó- 'punished', see the action nouns *k^uói̯-no-, *k^uoi̯-néh2 'expiation, punishment' (> Gk. ποινή, Av. kaēnā-, Lith. káina, OCS cěná), from the root *k^uei̯- 'to pay, atone, compensate' (LIV: 379). This preceding discussion may illustrate once again the fact that the consideration for the Buddhist phraseology does not exclude at the end the perspective of a sensible explanation in IE terms. In the present case, one can strikingly recover a notion and a specific root (*k^uei̯-) which had an important place in the PIE legal vocabulary.[37]

9. I shall now treat some other cases in brief. Even if the notion of a suffix *-p- or *-b^h- is better left aside, one may hesitate between the possible sources for a second compound member: either *-b^ho- or *-p(h2)o-. For instance, the root TB/TA wärp^ä- 'to feel, enjoy; suffer, receive, consent'[38] can be loosely connected with the PIE root *u̯reh1- 'to find' (LIV: 698). This would entail first the hypothesis of a complex enlarged root *u̯erh1-p- or *u̯erh1-b^h-, whose zero grade *u̯r̥h1-P- would yield straight CToch. *wärp-. The structure of the verbal paradigm does not support the idea of a denominative verb. Nonetheless, it would be possible in principle to extract a new root from a noun, such as *wärpæ, re-analysed as *wärp-æ. But this item remains ambiguous, because it could be traced back to *u̯r̥h1-p(h2)o- 'watching over finding' or *u̯r̥h1-b^ho- 'being at finding', featuring the root noun as first member. The same ambiguity holds for the verb TB/TA kälp- (or kälp^ä-) 'to obtain'. An intermediary noun *kälpæ could be traced back to *gl̥H-b^ho- 'being at conquering' or *gl̥H-p(h2)o- 'watching over conquering, gaining', the first member being a root noun from the root *gelH- or *galH- 'to become master of, conquer' (LIV: 185–186, IEW: 351), cf. Lith. galiù, inf. galéti, Arm. aor. kalaw 'to obtain', abstract OIr. gal, fem. 'fighting valour', MW gallu 'to be capable', etc.

10. The prospects are somewhat better when the supposed first compound member can be explained as a formally correct nominal derivative, as seen above for the cases of CToch. *kwäyipæ (> TB kwīpe, A kip) and of TB/TA tsälp- (cf. 6), and not simply as a root noun. This can be assumed for three additional verbs. TB/TA tsip- 'to dance'[39] presupposes the CToch. root *tsäip-. Let us suppose an intermediary noun *tsäipæ 'moving with quick turns' < *tsäyi-pæ, which can be analysed with the second member *-b^ho- < *-b^h(uh2)-o- 'becoming' and a first member *tsäñi- < *tsäñäy- < *dinéi̯-, an abstract based on the verbal adjective *di-n(h1)-ó- 'turning quickly', from the root *dei̯h1- 'to fly, hasten, move rapidly' (LIV: 107), cf. Ved. díyati 'to fly', Latv. diêt 'to dance', nasal-infixed present *di-n(h1)-eu̯- reflected by Gk. δῑνέω 'to turn around', noun δῖνος 'whirling', etc. The two next examples have in common a final root sequence °mp-: TB sāmp-/TA sum- 'to take away, deprive of' (< CToch. *swämp-, as per

---

[37] WATKINS 1970: 352 n. 26 and 1995: 475–477.

[38] MALZAHN 2010: 889-891.

[39] MALZAHN 2010: 993-994.

PEYROT 2013: 828)[40] and TB *śāmp-* 'to become/feel inflated, be conceited'.[41] This presupposes the existence of a morpheme boundary °*m-p*- at some stage in prehistory, since the inherited PIE sequence *-*mbʰ*- is normally simplified, cf. TB *keme*, A *kam* 'tooth' < *kæmæ* < *kæmβæ* < *ĝombʰ-o*- (Ved. *jámbha*-, Gk. γόμφος, OCS *zǫbъ*, Lith. *žaṁbas*). If one analyses these verb roots as going back to compounds with *-*bʰ(uh₂)-o*- as second member, the following reconstruction can be proposed. For TB *śām-p*-, the compound *śām-pæ* contained as first member the regular outcome[42] of *stioh₃-mṇ* or *stih₃-mṇ*, the result noun from the root *stieh₃*- 'to be/become stiff, grow dense' (LIV: 603; IEW: 1010), cf. the verb Ved. *styā*- (AV +) 'to stiffen, increase', Gk. σῶμα 'body' < *stiéh₃-mṇ*, etc. For the preceding root, TB *sāmp-*/TA *sum*-, the point of departure would be a noun *swämpæ* 'become rich', which was reanalysed as *swämp-ae*, then leading to a new verbal root (preterit and subjunctive stem[43] TB *sāmpā*- < *swāmp-ā*- < *swæmp-ā*-), transitive 'making [something] one's (own) riches'; the first member *swäm°* could be traced back to *h₁su-mṇ* 'goodness, goods, property', a denominative abstract from the well-known PIE adjective 'good'. Compare the same underlying items in the Ved. compound (RV +) *su-bhū́*- 'having an excellent nature, good, strong'[44], etc. In both cases the existence of the nominal stem used as first member is confirmed by comparanda. One may note in addition that Toch. shows several independent -*m*-stems which hail from the very productive category of PIE neuter *-*men*-stems, cf. TB *ñem*/TA *ñom* 'name', TB *stām*/TA *ṣtām* 'tree', TB *lyam*/TA *lyäm* 'lake', etc.

To conclude, the notion of secondary roots based on suffixed nouns which are themselves issued from verbal governing compounds can have some heuristic value in the admittedly difficult field of Tocharian etymology.

References

AV = Saṁhitās of the Atharvaveda
RV = Saṁhitā of the Ṛgveda.

Adams, Douglas Q. 1999. *A dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
—. 2013. *A dictionary of Tocharian B*. Second edition, revised and greatly enlarged. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Balles, Irene. 2009. *Lang*, *rund* und *krumm*: zu einigen indogermanischen Zusammenbildungen. In Robert Nedoma und David Stifter (eds), **h₂nr-. Festschrift für Heiner Eichner* (= *Die Sprache* 48), 20–26.

[40] MALZAHN 2010: 934–935.
[41] Deemed as non-primary formation by MALZAHN 2010: 916.
[42] Precisely, *stih₃°* as well as *stioh₃°* ought to yield by sound laws CToch. *ścā°* > TB *śā°*.
[43] Cf. TB subj. V inf. *sāmpatsi*, pret. I *sampāte*, part. pret. *sassāmpau*, TA subj. V abstract *sumālune*, secondary pres. VI *sumnātär*. In TB pres. IX *sompastär*, the root vowel *æ* underwent Umlaut in rounded context.
[44] SCARLATA 1999: 369.

BHSD = Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. 2: *Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Brugmann, Karl. 1906. *Vergleichende Laut-, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre nebst Lehre vom Gebrauch der Wortformen der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Bd. 2.1. 2. Bearbeitung. Strassburg: Trübner.

CEToM = *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*. URL: http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/

CPD = *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*. 1924–2008. Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. http://cpd.uni-koeln.de (Retrieved June 25, 2021)

Debrunner, Albert. 1954. *Altindische Grammatik*. II.2: *Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

DP I = Cone, Margaret. 2001. *A Dictionary of Pāli*. Part I (*a–kh*). Oxford: Pāli Text Society.

EWAia = Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986–2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Grestenberger, Laura. 2014. Zur Funktion des Nominalsuffixes *-i-* im Vedischen. In Norbert Oettinger und Thomas Steer (eds), *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen. Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 88–102.

Hilmarsson, Jörundur. 1996. *Materials for a Tocharian historical and etymological dictionary*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.

IEW = Pokorny, Julius. 1959-1969. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.

Jasanoff, Jay. 1997. Where does Skt. *bhávati* come from? In Dorothy Disterheft, Martin E. Huld and John A. C. Greppin (eds), *Studies in honor of Jaan Puhvel*. Part One: *Ancient languages and philology*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 173–186.

Klingenschmitt, Gert. 2004. Zur Etymologie der klassischen Sprachen. In Peter Anreiter, Marialuise Haslinger und Heinz Dieter Pohl (eds), *Artes et Scientiae. Festschrift für Ralf-Peter Ritter*. Wien: Praesens, 239–252.

Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.

Kluge, Friedrich und Elmar Seebold. 1999. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 23., erweiterte Auflage. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kölligan, Daniel. 2018. Funktionsverbgefüge und Sekundärwurzeln. In Elisabeth Rieken (ed.), *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen. Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 23. September 2015 in Marburg*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 219–237.

Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill.

Le Feuvre, Claire. 2004. Note sur l'adjectif épique ἄργυφος, ἀργύφεος. *Revue de Philologie* 78.2: 257–263.

—. 2010. Suffixation et composition: composés et dérivés de la racine **Heu̯*- "voir" dans les langues indo-européennes. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 105.1: 125–144.

LIV = Rix, Helmut et al. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. 2., verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Malzahn, Melanie. 2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2013. Cutting around "*temós*": Evidence from Tocharian. In Adam I. Cooper, Jeremy Rau and Michael Weiss (eds), *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European linguistics in honor of Alan J. Nussbaum*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave, 165–174.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1983. A 'New' PIE *men Suffix. *Die Sprache* 29: 1–26.

MW = Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English dictionary: Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Nussbaum, Alan J. 1999. *Jocidus: An account of the Latin adjectives in *-idus*. In Heiner Eichner and Hans Christian Luschützky (eds), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Praha: Enigma, 377–419.

PED = Rhys Davids, Thomas W. and William Stede. 1921–1925. *The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary*. London: Luzac.

Peters, Martin. 1993. Beiträge zur griechischen Etymologie. In Lambert Isebaert (ed.), *Miscellanea linguistica Graeco-Latina*. Namur: Société des Études Classiques, 85–113.

Peyrot, Michaël. 2013. *The Tocharian Subjunctive.* Leiden: Brill.

Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2000. Védique *dámūnas-*, lat. *dominus* et l'origine du suffixe de Hoffmann. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 95.1: 61–118.

—. 2017. Tocharian *tsälp-* in Indo-European perspective. In Bjarne S.S. Hansen et al. (eds), *Usque ad Radices. Indo-European studies in honour of Birgit Anette Olsen*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 643–658.

Puhvel, Jaan. 1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vol. 1. Words beginning with A.- Vol. 2. Words beginning with E and I*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Rau, Jeremy. 2009. *Indo-European nominal morphology: The decads and the Caland system*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Rix, Helmut. 2003. The Latin imperfect in *-bā-*, the Proto-Indo-European root **bʰueh₂-* and full-grade I forms from seṭ-roots with full grade II. In Brigitte L. M. Bauer and Georges-Jean Pinault (eds), *Language in Time and Space. A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the Occasion of his 80ᵗʰ Birthday*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 363–384.

Scarlata, Salvatore. 1999. *Die Wurzelkomposita im R̥gveda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Schindler, Jochem. 1978. Hittite *šalpa-*. *Die Sprache* 24: 45.

Schmidt, Klaus T. und Klaus Strunk. 1989. Toch. B *kwĭpe* "Scham, Schande", A *kip* "Scham" and germ. **wiba-* "Weib". In Karin Heller et al. (eds), *Indogermanica Europaea. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 60. Geburtstag am 12.11.1989*. Graz: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 251–284.

SWTF = Waldschmitt, Ernst et al. 1973–2018. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Van Windekens, Albert Joris. 1976. *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*. Vol. I: *La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale.

Vijūnas, Aurelijus. 2009. *The Indo-European primary* t-*stems*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Watkins, Calvert. 1970. Studies in Indo-European legal language, institutions, and mythology. In George Cardona, Henry M. Hoenigswald and Alfred Senn (eds), *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 321–354.

—. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European poetics*. Oxford: University Press.

Georges-Jean Pinault
École pratique des hautes études, PSL
georges.pinault@wanadoo.fr