Alle redaktionelle Korrespondenz, Manuskripte und Bücher sind an einen der Herausgeber (Anschrift wie oben) zu richten. Für unverlangt eingesandte Bücher kann weder eine Besprechung noch Rücksendung garantiert werden.

Eingelangte Manuskripte unterliegen einem Begutachtungsverfahren durch mindestens zwei *peer reviewer*. Über die Annahme entscheidet das Herausgeberkollegium.

Die Aufnahme von Repliken und persönlichen Erklärungen wird prinzipiell abgelehnt; die Autor(inn)en sind ihrerseits zu einer streng sachlichen Formulierung angehalten.

DIE SPRACHE •°• Bd. 56 (2024)

On Toch. B *akwampere* 'sprout [and] stalk'
and the sequence Toch. AB ⟨mp⟩

GIULIO IMBERCIADORI

A b s t r a c t : Based on the assumption that the Tocharian sequence AB ⟨mp⟩ at times spells a spirantized allophone [β] ← /p/ / *V_V*, I analyze the Tocharian B dvandva compound *akwampere* 'sprout [and] stalk' as [akwa-βere] ← /akwắ-pere/. Accordingly, I trace the first compound member B /akwă-/ 'sprout' back to the weak stem of an acrostatic *u*-stem abstract PIE *$h_2ók̂$-u-/*$h_2ék̂$-u- n. 'sharpness', whose reconstruction is supported by independent evidence. Moreover, I argue that the interpretation of the sequence AB ⟨mp⟩ as spelling an allophone [β] ← /p/ / *V_V* allows etymologizing also the Tocharian B lexeme *āmpär** 'member, limb', which has been obscure thus far.

The present article proposes a new synchronic and diachronic analysis of the Tocharian B dvandva compound *akwampere* 'sprout [and] stalk', in particular with regard to its first member. The paper is structured as following: (I) section 1 discusses the attestations and the semantics of B *akwampere*; (II) section 2 critically reviews the previous interpretations of B *akwampere*; (III) section 3 advances a new interpretation, based on the assumption that the attested sequence ⟨mp⟩ actually spells an allophone [β] ← /p/ / *V_V*; (IV) section 4 discusses further examples for the spelling of AB [β] ← /p/ / *V_V* as ⟨mp⟩, argued to be further attested in B *āmpär** 'member, limb'; (V) finally, section 5 summarizes the main results of the paper.

1. Attestations and semantics of B *akwampere*

1.1. Key attestation: PKNS53a6

The key to the interpretation of the Tocharian B form *akwampere* is the Paris *Abhidarma* text PKNS53a6 DA (classic; *Pratītyasamutpāda*), which has

---

been treated in detail by Pinault (1988, esp. 100, 116 f.). There, in the context of a simile, (I) deeds (B *yāmornta*) are compared to field work (*mīṣe-ne lāṃs*), (II) knowledge (B *aiśalle*) is compared to a seed (B *śäktālye*), and (III) name and form (B *ñem-ersna*) are compared to B *akwampere*, as per (1).

(1) PKNS53a6

> [*mī*]*ṣene lāṃs ramt yāmornta • śäktālye ra aiśalle • akwampere ra ñe*(*m-ersna*)
>
> 'like the work in a field [are] the deeds. Like a seed [is] knowledge. Like *akwampere* [are] name ([and] form)' (the translation is mine; reading and restoration follow Pinault 1988, 100, 106).

Since B *śäktālye* 'seed' (compared with B *aiśalle* 'knowledge') refers to an embryonic stage in the development of a plant, it stands to reason that the immediately following form B *akwampere* (compared with B *ñem-ersna* 'name [and] form') refers to a more advanced stage in the development of a plant. According to this line of reasoning, Pinault (1988, 143–146) proposed an appealing interpretation of B *akwampere* as a dvandva compound with the semantics 'sprout [and] stalk' ('pousse [et] tige') – thus also DTB², 4.[1] The latter view is supported by the fact that, within the simile in PKNS53a6, B *akwampere* indeed corresponds to a dvandva compound, namely, B *ñem-ersna* 'name [and] form'.

    An alternative account of B *akwampere* has been put forth by Hilmarsson (1996, 14), who instead reckons with the meaning 'bud-bearing, sprout-bearing'. This hypothesis is less convincing. First, Hilmarsson leaves unspecified which part of a plant B *akwampere* would then refer to. Second, under this analysis B *akwampere* could be no longer interpreted as a dvandva, and the attractive parallelism between the compounds B *ñem-ersna* 'name [and] form' and B *akwampere* 'sprout [and] stalk' (as identified by Pinault) would thereby be lost.

1.2. Further attestations

For B *akwampere* two further attestations from London texts are known, which befit well the semantics 'sprout [and] stalk' assumed in 1.1 above. In IOL Toch 9a6 (classic [Peyrot 2009, IOL Toch 9]), B *akwampere* is again associated with B *śäktālye* 'seed'. In IOL Toch 190a6 (classic [Peyrot 2009, IOL Toch 190]) B *akwampere* is subject of the verbal form B *lnaṣṣäṃ* 'goes

---

[1]   Although he regards it as less likely, Pinault (1988, 145) does not exclude an alternative translation 'sprout [and] shoot' ('pousse [et] surgeon') of B *akwampere*, with both compound members being synonymous rather than complementary.

out' (root B *länt-*),[2] which is semantically suitable for the description of sprouts, stalks or similar – cf., e.g., the semantic relation between Gr. θάλλω 'bloom, grow' and Alb. *del* 'goes out' (LIV², 132; Neri in DPEWA s.v. *del*). The above-mentioned attestations of B *akwampere* are listed in (2).

(2) Further attestations of B *akwampere*:

I. IOL Toch 9a6

    /// *sū śäktālye sūk akwampere* •

    'this seed [and] this very sprout [and] stalk' (after DTB², 4);

II. IOL Toch 190a6 (beginning of line)

    tumeṃ akwampere lnaṣṣäṃ •

    'then sprout [and] stalk go [lit. goes] out'.

1.3. Fragmentary attestations

Finally, B *akwampere* may also be restored in two fragmentary passages from London texts.

For IOL Toch 190b1 (classic [see 1.2 above]), a line-initial restoration (*akwa*)*mpere* was proposed by Broomhead (1962 I, 245)[3] and is accepted by Peyrot (2009, IOL Toch 190), cf. (3).

(3) IOL Toch 190b1 (beginning of the line)

    (*akwa*)*mpere tetemu mā alanmeṃ kekamu* ///

    '... (sprout) [and] stalk born, not come from elsewhere' (?).

As for IOL Toch 165b4 (classic; *Pratītyasamutpāda*), the context runs as follows: (beginning of the line) *lyake painārña akwa* ///. Whereas Broomhead (1962 I, 63) and Peyrot (2009, IOL Toch 165) refrain from any restoration at the end of the line and Broomhead (1962 II, 7) is undecided between the restorations *akwa*(*mpere*) and *akwa*(*tse*), Pinault (1988, 149) tentatively proposes *akwa*(*mpere*). At the same time, both Broomhead (1962 I, 63) and Pinault (1988, 149) complete the line-initial sequence *lyake* as (*ma*)*lyake* 'young, fresh', which would make good sense as an attribute to B *akwa*(*mpere*) 'sprout [and] (stalk)'. Despite this, the hapax B *painārña* remains obscure (cf. DTB², 431, where the present passage is given as "PK-AS-17A-b6").

---

2   For the reading B *lnaṣṣäṃ*, see Peyrot (2009, IOL Toch 190) contra Broomhead (1962 I, 245, II, 7), who reads B *lkaṣṣäṃ* 'sees'.

3   Who nevertheless reads B (*akwa*)*mpare* instead of (*akwa*)*mpere*.

2. Previous interpretations of B *akwampere* 'sprout [and] stalk'

The compound B *akwampere* has usually been segmented as *akwam-pere* (= /akwä́m-pere/). This led to the identification of a first compound member (FCM) B *akwam-* (= /akwä́m-/) – disyllabic and thus regularly accented on its second syllable (Pinault 2008, 562 f.) – followed by a second compound member (SCM) B *-pere*.

2.1. Second compound member B *-pere*

As for the SCM B *-pere*, Hilmarsson (1996, 14) analyzes it as "a verbal abstract to B *pär-* 'to carry', reflecting IE **bhoro-s*". However, Hilmarsson's interpretation relies on his translation of B *akwampere* as 'bud-bearing, sprout-bearing', argued to be unattractive in 1.1 above.

A different approach was taken by Pinault (1988, 147 f.; cf. also DTB², 4 f.), who equates *-pere* in B *akwampere* with Gr. πόρος 'passage' (← root PIE **per-* 'come through' [LIV², 472 f.]) and assumes an original meaning 'lieu où l'on traverse, lieu traversé' denoting a "partie d'un végétal, en tant qu'elle est traversée, croisée par les nœuds, les embranchements, les attaches des feuilles" (p. 148). Additionally, Pinault compares the semantics of Ved. *párur*/ *párvan-* n. 'joint; node (of a plant stem)', which goes back to **pér-u̯r̥*/ **p(e)r-u̯én-* and thus also belongs to the PIE root **per-* (cf. EWAia II, 99 f.).

2.2. First compound member B *akwam-* (?)

As for the assumed FCM B *akwam-* (= /akwä́m-/), it is usually argued to be cognate with the adjective B *akwatse* 'sharp' (on which see 3.2 below) and thus to be a derivative of the root PIE **h₂ek̂-* 'be(come) sharp' (NIL, 287–300). Specifically, the following etymological interpretations of B *akwam-* have been proposed.

2.2.1. Interpretation as an old *men*-stem

The most widespread view[4] traces B *akwam-* back to a Pre-Proto-Tocharian *men*-stem **h₂ek̂-u-mn̥* and assumes the following inner-Tocharian development: Pre-PToch. **h₂ek̂-u-mn̥* > **ak̂u-u-mn̥* > PToch. **aku̯ämän* > B **ä́kwäm* or **akwä́m* ~ FCM *akwä́m-*. Pre-PToch. **h₂ek̂-u-mn̥* would be most closely comparable to Lat. *acūmen* n. 'sharp point' (Ennius), which belongs to the small group of Latin neuters in *-ū-men* (cf. Leumann 1977, 370).

---

[4]   Cf. Pinault 1988, 146 f.; NIL, 289, 299, n. 68; DTB², 4.

Morphologically, the pre-form *$*h_2e\hat{k}$-u-mṇ* might be analyzed as an abstract in *-mṇ* derived from an adjectival base *$*h_2e\hat{k}$-u-* 'sharp' (on which see 3.2 below). Although the suffix PIE *-mṇ* is most frequently used to build primary deverbal abstracts, few examples of deadjectival abstracts in *-mṇ* might indeed be attested – cf. CLuw. *ḫuitu-mar/ḫuitu-m(a)n-* n. 'life' (with secondary heteroclitic inflection) ← adjective *ḫuitu-* 'alive'; Ved. *várṣ-man-* n. 'height' ← adjective *várṣ-* 'high' (~ *várṣ-īyas-* 'higher' and *várṣ-iṣṭha-* 'highest'), etc.[5]

Nevertheless, the above scenario is exposed to the following objections.

First, the long *-ū-* of Lat. *acūmen* 'sharp point' is not compatible with the short *-u-* of the assumed pre-form Pre-PToch. *$*h_2e\hat{k}$-u-mṇ*. Latin *-ū-* may suggest that *acūmen* actually is an inner-Latin derivative of the verb *acu-ō* 'sharpen', since neuter substantives in Lat. *-V̄men* can be derived in a mildly productive fashion from secondary verbs – cf., e.g., Lat. *statu-ō* 'set, erect' → *statūmen* 'support, stay; rib (of a ship)' (Caesar) and see further Pinault 1988, 147; Leumann 1977, 370. Therefore, from a morphological point of view, Pre-PToch. *$*h_2e\hat{k}$-u-mṇ* remains without certain outer-Tocharian comparanda.

Second, there is independent evidence suggesting that (I) the suffix PIE *-mṇ* developed into *-m* rather than *-mä^n* in Proto-Tocharian and that (II) a final segment *-m* in the context / *ä*[- stress]_# became *-y* in the prehistory of Tocharian B.[6] This is shown by the items in (4).[7] That here the suffix PToch. *-m* goes back to the suffix PIE *-mṇ* is guaranteed by the plural forms, which – when attested – exhibit an ending B *-nma* < (metathesis) PToch. *-mna* < PIE *-mn-h₂*.

(4) Evidence for the development PIE *-mṇ* > PToch. *-m* > Pre-Toch. B *-y* / *ä*[- stress]_#:

    I. subjunctive-I-stem PToch. *nak-ä-* 'reprove' (> B /nak-ä-/ 'id.' [Malzahn 2010, 677]) → substantive PToch. *nakä-m* > B *nakä-m* > *nakä-y* > (monophthongization) /náki/ → [nāki] (: A *nākä-m*) 'reproach';

II. subjunctive-I-stem PToch. *plak-ä- 'agree' (> B /plak-ä-/ 'id.' [Malzahn 2010, 740]) → substantive PToch. *plakä-m > B *plakä-m > *plakä-y > (monophthongization) /plа́ki/* → [plāki]* 'agreement';

III. subjunctive-I-stem PToch. *mæns-ä- 'be sorrowful' (cf. B 1.sg.opt.MP meṃṣ-ī-mar [Malzahn 2010, 748 f.]) → substantive PToch. *mænsä-m > B *mensä-m > *mensä-y > (monophthongization) /mе́nsi/ → [mentsi] 'sorrow';

IV. subjunctive-I-stem PToch. *wak-ä- 'split apart' (cf. A subjunctive-VII-stem wāk-ñ- 'id.' [Malzahn 2005, 397; 2010, 864]) → substantive PToch. *wakä-m > B *wakä-m > *wakä-y > /wа́ki/ → [wāki] ~ pl. /wakа́-nma/ → [waka-nma] (: A sg. wākä-m) 'difference'.

In contrast, reconstructing trisyllabic pre-forms in *-mä^n for Proto-Tocharian would make it impossible to explain the attested Tocharian B forms: cf., e.g., PToch. *wakä-mä^n (instead of *wakä-m), which would yield either B */wakа́mä/ → *[wakam] (like B obl.sg. /säswénä/ → [säsweṃ] 'lord') or B */wakа́yä/ → *[wakiy] > *[waki] (like B nom.pl. /lʲäsа́yä/ → *[lʲsiy] > [lʲsi] = ⟨lyśi⟩ 'thieves'), but not B /wа́ki/ → [wāki]. Accordingly, one would expect a pre-form *h₂ek̑-u-mn̥ to undergo the following inner-Tocharian development: Pre-PToch. *h₂ek̑-u-mn̥ > *ak^u-u-mn̥ > PToch. *ak^{u}äm > B *akwäm > *akwäy > (monophthongization) */а́kwi/ → *[ākwi], not B *а́kwäm or *akwа́m as per above. Moreover, the examples in (4) show that Adams' claim (DTB², 4) that "[h]ere [i.e., in the FCM B akwam-] PIE *-men remains as -m rather than become -i (e.g., wāki) because it is preceded by a vowel", cannot be upheld.

2.2.2. Interpretation as an old heterocliticon

Alternatively, Hilmarsson (1996, 14 f.) proposed the following account of the supposed FCM B akwám-: PIE acrostatic (AS) *h₂ḗk̑-ur̥/*h₂ék̑-un- >> Pre-PToch. *h₂ék̑-un̥ > PToch. *akwän > B *а́kwän → FCM *akwán-p° > (labial assimilation) akwám-p°. However, this hypothesis runs into two major difficulties.

First, it is unlikely that a preform Pre-PToch. *h₂ék̑-un̥ would have led to a simplex Pre-Toch. B *akwän or B *ākwän (→ compound B akwam-pere), since absolute final nasals arisen from old syllabic resonants got lost quite early in the prehistory of Tocharian. This is confirmed by the FCM B śka- (= /sä̀kä-/) rather than B *śkán- in the compound B śka-maiyya 'having ten powers', where B śka- goes back to PIE *dék̑m̥ 'ten' (> simplex B śak 'id.') – cf. Pinault 2008, 563.

Second, the existence of an AS heterocliticon PIE *h₂ḗk̑-ur̥/*h₂ék̑-un-, which has been posited by Eichner (1973, 71) on the basis of Hitt. ḫekur- 'rock (summit)', is extremely uncertain, since Hitt. ḫekur- not only exhibits

genus commune, but also inflects as an *r*-stem and not as a heterocliticon synchronically (cf. acc.pl. *ḥekur-uš*).[8]

3. An alternative interpretation of B *akwampere* 'sprout [and] stalk'

3.1. Second compound member B *-pere*

Pinault's (1988, 147 f.) connection of the SCM B *-pere* with the PIE root **per-* 'come through' is attractive. As an alternative to the derivation of B *-pere* from a *tómos*-noun Pre-PToch. **pór-o-* 'act of coming through' (> Gr. πόρος 'passage, ford' [see 2.1 above]), one may start from a substantivized *tomós*-adjective **por-ó-* 'coming through, sprouting' > PToch. **pærǣ* > B **pere* 'sprout'. Thus, B **pere* would have originally indicated the sprout or the sprouting branch of a plant, although it later shifted to denote the whole (plant) stem.[9] Notably, a semantic variation of the kind 'sprout, shoot' ~ 'branch' ~ 'stalk, stem' is supported by several parallels, as per (5).

(5) Semantic variation 'sprout, shoot' ~ 'branch' ~ 'stalk, stem':

I. Gr. μόσχος m. 'shoot of a plant' (*Ilias* 11.105) ~ 'leaf-stalk' (Dioscorides) (LSJ s.v.; GEW II, 259; EDG, 970 f.);

II. Gr. ὅρμενος (~ ὄρμενος) m. 'sprout' ~ 'stalk, esp. of cabbage and asparagus' (Diphilus of Siphnus apud Athenaeus; Posidippus) (LSJ s.v.; GEW II, 419; EDG, 1104);

III. Gr. ῥάδαμνος m. 'branch, twig' ~ 'sprout' (*Septuaginta*, *Suda*) beside Hesychius' gloss ῥάδαμον· καυλόν, βλαστόν 'stem; shoot' (GEW II, 637 f.; EDG, 1270 f.; HAL ρ 17);

IV. OE *wīse* f. 'sprout' ~ 'stem' (Bosworth & Toller 1954, 1241);

V. NHG *Reis* n. 'twig' ~ 'sprout' (DUDEN s.v.).

---

[8] On Hitt. *ḥekur-*, see Melchert 1984, 142, n. 113; 1994, 144; Puhvel 1991, 289 (Sumerian loanword); NIL, 292 f., n. 15; EDHIL, 339 (with translation as 'rock-sanctuary'); cf. also Tischler 1983, 235–237 and Neri 2022, 732, n. 2. Rieken (1999, 289) tentatively reconstructs "**h₂ḗḱ-ur-o-*", with syncope of the thematic vowel after a preceding *CR*-cluster. However, on phonotactic grounds one would rather expect a preform **h₂ḗḱ-ur-o-*, which would have not undergone syncope and would therefore be incompatible with the *r*-stem inflection of Hitt. *ḥekur-*.

[9] But recall that a synchronic semantics 'sprout, shoot' of the SCM B *-pere* cannot be categorically excluded – see n. 1 above with refs.

Nevertheless, Hilmarsson's (1996, 14) etymological connection of the SCM B -*pere* with the root PIE *$b^h er$- 'bear, bring' (see 2.1 above) remains possible. In particular, one might assume that B -*pere* meant 'stalk' from the beginning and that it goes back to Pre-PToch. *$b^h or$-o- 'bearer (of the plant/of the sprouts)' ← (substantivization) PIE *(-)$b^h or$-$ó$- 'bearing' (on which see NIL, 18) – thus Guido Borghi, p.c.

3.2. First compound member B *akwa*-

As for the first member, I propose to segment B *akwampere* 'sprout [and] stalk' not as *akwam-pere* (see 2 above), but rather as *akwa-mpere* = [akwa-βere] ← /akwắ-pere/, thus identifying a FCM B *akwa*- = /akwắ-/. This segmentation relies on the assumption that the sequence AB ⟨mp⟩ could denote – as Pinault (2009, 237–240) has first recognized – "a voiced bilabial, actually the allophone of /p/ in medial position" (p. 237), indicated above as [β] (cf. also Pinault 2008, 418 f., 471). This important issue will be further discussed in the following section, see 4 below.

If this hypothesis is correct, the FCM B *akwá*- (rather than B *akwám*-) presupposes an unattested simplex B *$ākw$ (= */ákwä/) 'sprout, shoot', which would go back to Pre-Toch. B *akwä < PToch. *$ak^u ä$. In turn, PToch. *$ak^u ä$ would regularly continue Pre-PToch. *$h_2 eKu$-, which may be identified with the (generalized) weak stem of an AS *u*-stem abstract PIE *$h_2 óḱ$-u-/ *$h_2 éḱ$-u-n. 'sharpness'.

From a semantic point of view, one should assume a development 'sharpness' ⇒ (concretization) 'sharp, pointed thing' ⇒ 'sprout, shoot', which in view of the widespread association between the meanings 'point, tip' and 'sprout, shoot' would be unproblematic – cf. the examples in (6).

(6) Semantic association between 'point, tip' and 'sprout, shoot':

    I.   PIE root *$d^h eiHg^u$- 'stick into, prick' (LIV[2], 142)[10] → Lith. *dýg-ti* 'to prick' ~ 'to sprout, shoot', *díeg-as* m. (3) 'sprout', *daig-ùs* (4) 'thorny, prickly' → *daig-ìnti* 'let sprout', etc. (ALEW, 190, 231, 236);

    II.   OE *brord* m. 'point' ~ 'spire of grass, sprout' (Bosworth & Toller 1954, 107; EWAhd II, 294);

    III.   ON *vísir* m. 'point' ~ 'sprout' (de Vries 1977, 668; Magnússon 1989, 1145 s.v. [3]*vísir*).

---

[10]   For a different reconstruction of this root – namely, PIE *$d^h eh_2 ig^u$- – see now Nikolaev 2022.

Morphologically, the reconstruction of an AS *u*-stem abstract PIE **h₂óḱ-u-/*
*h₂éḱ-u- n. 'sharpness' is independently supported. Moreover, a derivative of
the latter lexeme is attested even within Tocharian itself, as per (7).[11]

(7) Derivatives of PIE **h₂óḱ-u-/*h₂éḱ-u-* n. 'sharpness' > B **ākw* ~ FCM B *akwa-*
    'sprout':

   → proterokinetic adjective **h₂éḱ-u-/*h₂ḱ-éu̯-* 'sharp':
      > PBalt. **aš-u-* > Latv. *ass*, *aśs* 'sharp';
      → (substantivization) Pre-PIt. **ak-u-/*ak-eu̯-* f. 'sharpness' > PIt. **ak-u-/*ak-ou̯-*
      > (concretization) Lat. *acus*, *-ūs* f. 'needle' (Plautus);

   → adjective **h₂eḱ-u-to-* 'sharp' (I) >> (suffix substitution)[12] Pre-PToch. **ak-u-ti̯o-* >
   *akᵘ-u-ti̯o- > PToch. **akᵘätˢœ* > B *akwatse* (= /akwä́tse/) 'sharp', (II) → (substantiv-
   ization) Pre-PBSl. **aḱ-u-ta-* m. 'sharp, pointed object' > Lith. *ašutaĩ* pl.m. (3) 'hairs
   of a horse', CS *osŭtŭ* m. 'thistle', (III) > Pre-PAlb. **aćuta-* > PAlb. **atˢətᵼh* > i *athët*
   'sharp, sour';

   → deinstrumental adjective **h₂eḱ-u-h₁-to-* 'provided with sharpness, sharp' > Lat.
   acūtus 'sharp' (Plautus);[13]

   → adjective **h₂eḱ-u-lo-* 'sharp' (I) → Pre-PGerm. **ak-u̯-eló-* 'id.' >> PGerm. **agᵘ-*
   ala- > ON (*soð-)all* m. 'meat awl', OE *awul* m. 'awl', (II) > Very Old Lat. **ak-u-lo-*
   → Lat. *acul-eus* m. 'sting' (Cicero), etc.[14]

As for the formal relationship between the FCM B *akwa-* (= /akwǽ-/) and the
simplex B **ākw* (= */ǽkwä/) 'sprout', the former regularly exhibits absence
of surface apocope in word-internal environment – cf., as a parallel, B *ost*

---

[11] On the forms in (7) see, among others, Bosworth & Toller 1954, 63; EDLIL, 23;
EDSIL, 380; NIL, 287–300; DTB², 5; EDPG, 44; ALEW, 59 f.; Neri in DPEWA s.v.
i athët. The appurtenance of Hitt. *aku-* 'sea-shell' is uncertain on formal grounds (on
the latter form see Woodhouse 2012, 227 f.).

[12] On the Pre-Proto-Tocharian suffix substitution **-(C)o-* >> **-(C)i̯o-*, see, among
others, Hilmarsson 1987a, 42 and Pinault 2021, 124, 130.

[13] Since the adjective Lat. *acūtus* 'sharp' (Plautus) is attested earlier than the verb *acuō*
'sharpen' (Terentius [cf. EDLIL, 23]), I follow Weiss (2020, 470) in regarding *acuō*
as backformed to *acūtus*, which thus represents a denominative adjective in origin.
Alternatively, one might analyze *acu-ō* 'sharpen' as a denominative verb and trace it
back to a pre-form Pre-PIt. **ak-u-i̯e/o-* < **h₂eḱ-u-i̯e/o-* 'make sharp' ← adjective
*h₂éḱ-u-/*h₂ḱ-éu̯- 'sharp' – cf. Leumann 1977, 543; Meiser 1998, 194.

[14] On these Germanic forms, see esp. Neri 2016, 37. As for Very Old Lat. **ak-u-lo-* (→
Lat. *acul-eus*), one should note, to be sure, that its internal vowel **-u-* is etymologi-
cally ambiguous, since before a following *[ɫ]* (so called *pinguis l*) every vowel
would have merged with Very Old Lat. **-u-*.

'house' (= /ósta/, old *u*-stem) ~ FCM *osta-* (= /ostǻ-/) in *osta-ṣmeñca* 'house-holder'.

Compared to the earlier hypotheses, the proposed interpretation of B *akwampere* as [akwa-βere] ← /akwǻ-pere/ presents the following advantages: (I) within Tocharian, the FCM B *akwa-* (= /akwǻ-/) 'sprout' is no longer morphologically isolated, but can be closely connected with the adjective B *akwa-tse* (= /akwǻ-tse/) 'sharp'; (II) in a broader Indo-European perspective, both B *akwa-* 'sprout' (< *$h_2 \acute{e}\hat{k}$-u-*) and B *akwa-tse* 'sharp' (<< *$h_2 e\hat{k}$-u-to-*) can be ultimately traced back to the same source, namely, the AS *u*-stem abstract PIE *$h_2 \acute{o}\hat{k}$-u-/*$h_2 \acute{e}\hat{k}$-u-* n. 'sharpness', whose reconstruction is independently supported.

4. On Tocharian AB ⟨mp⟩ = [β] ← /p/ / V_V

That the phoneme AB /p/ developed an allophone [β] (a voiced bilabial fricative) in intervocalic position – as well as after the sonorants *r*, *l(y)*, *y* in Tocharian B – follows from the occasional spelling of AB /p/ as ⟨w⟩, where the latter grapheme undoubtedly indicates a fricative sound (Pinault 2008, 418 f.). Although this phenomenon, in Tocharian B, is most frequently attested in late/colloquial texts (Schmidt 1986, 640 f.; Peyrot 2008, 88–90), it sporadically occurs already in archaic texts, where we find the spelling ⟨v⟩ (Malzahn 2007, 270).

However, there is evidence suggesting that ⟨w⟩ and ⟨v⟩ were not the only options available to Tocharian scribes in order to spell the spirantized allophone [β]. In the following, I discuss some examples which point to the alternative rendering of allophonic AB [β] ← /p/ / V_V through the sequence ⟨mp⟩. I begin with those cases which have already been treated in the literature (sections 4.1 and 4.2) and I then propose one possible new example (section 4.3).

4.1. A *märkampal* 'law' and A *arämpāt* 'shape, beauty'

4.1.1. A *märkampal* 'law'

A *märkampal* 'law' (DTTA, 343 f.) is a lexicalized compound, whose second member *-pal* clearly corresponds to the simplex A *pal* 'law' (: B *pele* 'id.'; cf. also B *pela-ikne* 'id.').

Its first member might be argued to be A *märkam-*, which would then go back to a pre-form ending in Pre-PToch. *°-o-mṇ. Although such a morphological structure is not impossible (see 2.2 above with refs.), it is neverthe-

less striking that secondary neuter *men*-stems are quite rare in the Indo-European languages.

Therefore, it is more promising to interpret A *märkampal* as the graphic rendering of a form A [märka-βal] ← /märka-pal/, with an allophonic spirantization of the bilabial stop A /p/ in intervocalic position (thus Pinault 2009, 237, followed by Barnes 2022/2023, 53). Accordingly, the first member A /märka-/ will continue a pre-form Pre-PToch. **mŕ̥ǵ-o-* or **mérǵ-o-*. The latter likely represent substantivized adjectival derivatives of the PIE root **merǵ-* 'divide' (→ Heth. *mārk-*/*mark-* 'id.', Lat. *margō*, -*inis* f./m. 'edge, boundary', OHG *marka* f. 'boundary, land', etc.),[15] which underwent a semantic development 'dividing' ⇒ 'the dividing one, border' ⇒ 'norm, rule, law' (cf. Pinault 1991, 248; 2009, 237 with n. 58). Remarkably, the pre-forms Pre-PToch. **mŕ̥ǵ-o-* or **mérǵ-o-* are not set up ad hoc for Tocharian, as they find a formal and semantic match in Anatolian: cf. the plurale tantum Lyc. nom./acc. *mara* 'law', which Barnes (2022/2023, 53) convincingly traced back to a pre-form **m(e/o)rǵ-e-h₂*.

Summing up, A /märka-pal/ (→ [märka-βal] = ⟨märkampal⟩) 'law' originally meant 'norm [and] law' (or similar) and was a dvandva compound with synonymous members.[16]

---

[15] Cf. IEW, 738; EDHIL, 558 f.; EWAhd V, 172–175.

[16] To be sure, Pinault (2020, 471–474) has recently proposed an alternative explanation of the FCM *märka-* in A *märkampal* 'law', regarding it as a loan from Middle Indic: "[t]he point of departure of the loan would have been Middle Indic *magga-* ['way'] for Skt. *mārga-*, cf. Pāli *magga-*, Aśoka Pkt. *maga-*, Pkt. *magga-*. This form was borrowed into Toch. A as *makka and wrongly re-Sanskritized as *marka, of course after the Skt. form *mārga-*. Then, *marka yielded *märka through an inner-Toch. A development, that is raising of the middle vowel /a/ in the first closed syllable, compare Toch. A *wärkänt* "wheel" < *warkänt, which is the expected match of Toch. B *yerkwantai*, oblique singular of *yerkwanto**" (Pinault 2020, 472 f.). The medial segment -*m*- would have been analogically transferred to A *märka-pal from A *ampal (the supposed equivalent of B *empele* 'terrible') and A *arämpāt* 'shape, beauty' (Pinault 2020, 473 f.). Although this is an intriguing proposal, the following points should be addressed here. (I) As for the postulated development Pre-Toch. A *marka > *märka, it is worth recalling that the weakening Pre-Toch. A *a > *ä* / _*RC* is an "optional" sound change according to Himarsson (1987b, 67), for which several counterexamples are met: cf. A *wark* 'hunt' (: B *werke** 'id.' [DTTA, 424]), A *warp** 'garden' (~ B *werp-iye** 'id.' [DTTA, 424]), etc. (II) As for the assumed transfer of -*m*- into the reconstructed form A *märka-pal: (a) the next section will show that also in the case of A *arämpāt* medial -*m*- is likely to be purely graphic, see 4.1.2 below; (b) the actual existence of an unattested form A *ampal remains uncertain: due to the

4.1.2. A *arämpāt* 'shape, beauty'

Like A *märkampal*, also A *arämpāt* 'shape, beauty' (DTTA, 15) is a lexical-ized compound. It is attested in two variants, viz., A *arämpāt* (standard form) and A *arämpāt* (3×: A22b2, A134a4, PKNS3a3).

On the basis of the independently attested substantive A *aräṃ* 'appear-ance',[17] one might first consider A *aräṃ-pāt* as the primary form and A *aräm-pāt* as a secondary variant arisen through a labial assimilation °ṃ-p° > °m-p°. However, such a scenario has two drawbacks. (I) The putatively orig-inal form A *araṃ-pāt* cannot be equated with Tocharian B *ere-pate* 'shape', which does not show any traces of an internal dental nasal. Separating A *araṃ*/*m-pāt* from B *ere-pate* is not an appealing solution, since both forms are semantically and structurally so close that they must go back to a com-mon Proto-Tocharian ancestor rather than represent independent formations created separately within the Tocharian languages. (II) The assumed assimi-lation °ṃ-p° > °m-p° at a morpheme boundary is not supported by any paral-lel in Tocharian A.[18] Against this assumption speaks the adverb A *keṃ-par* ~ *ken-par* 'erroneously, wrongly' (← indeclinable adjective/adverb A *keṃ* 'id.'), which never shows an assimilated variant A **kem-par* (Itkin 2002, 12; DTTA, 148).

Therefore, the following account is preferable (cf. Pinault 2009, 236). The standard variant A *aräm-pāt* is primary: it represents the graphic render-ing of an underlying form A /arä-pāt/, which was realized on the surface as [aräβāt], i.e., with an allophonic spirantization of the intervocalic bilabial stop A /p/. Thus, A /arä-pāt/ can be directly compared with B *ere-pate* 'shape', and both forms go back to PToch. **æræ-patæ* 'form [and] appear-ance',[19] a dvandva compound with synonymous members. The rarer variant

---

fact that "[b]efore a consonant the nasal [of the negative prefix] is lost in East Tocha-rian without regard to preceding or following sounds" (Hilmarsson 1991b, 193), the expected equivalent of B *em-pele* ought to have been A **a-pal* rather than A **am-pal* (see further Barnes 2022/2023, 53, n. 41).

[17]   On which see, among others, Pinault 2009, 236; Del Tomba 2023, 213 f.; DTTA, 15.

[18]   Cf. the explicit claim by Pinault (2009, 236, n. 53): "there is no rule of assimilation that could explain A *aräm-* as from **arän-* before bilabial stop".

[19]   PToch. **æræ-* < **h₃ér-o/es-* ← PIE root **h₃er-* 'rise' (Pinault 2009, 236, n. 52; Del Tomba 2023, 213); PToch. **-patæ* < **bʰh₂-to-* or **bʰoh₂-to-* ← PIE root **bʰeh₂-* 'shi-ne' (DTB², 99 with refs.) – differently Pinault 2020, 474 (< **bʰuh₂-to-* 'becoming'). Most recently, Barnes (2022/2023) proposed to equate PToch. **æræ-patæ* with the Hieroglyphic Luwian binomial *ara pata*.

A *aräṃ-pāt* (= /arän-pāt/) arose by analogy to the substantive A *aräṃ* 'appearance'.

Nevertheless, the scenario above is not completely without difficulties. In particular, the following formal point should be addressed: why did PToch. *æræ-patæ* (> B *ere-pate*) develop to A /arä-pāt/ (→ [arä-βāt] = ⟨arämpāt⟩) rather than to A */ar-pāt/*, with the expected syncope of the weakened vowel A -*ä*- (< *-*a*- < PToch. *-*æ*-) in the context / *aC_$Cā*?[20] A possible answer to this question may be provided by the fact that the secondary variant A *aräṃ-pāt* – due to its closed internal syllable – regularly exhibited a weakened but non-syncopated internal vowel A -*ä*- (< *-*a*- < PToch. *-*æ*-). Therefore, the influence of the form A *aräṃ-pāt* (= /arän-pāt/) may have been responsible for the absence of the syncope in the primary variant A /arä-pāt/.

4.2. B *omp* 'there' and B *samp* 'that'

4.2.1. B *omp* 'there'

The adverb B *omp* (~ archaic *ompä*)[21] 'there' is traced back by Pinault (2009, 235 f., 238 f.) to a pre-form Pre-PToch. *o-bʰu* and compared with Pre-PAnat. *o-bʰó- > Hitt. *apā-* 'that one, he (who is next to you)'.[22] This implies the assumption of the following inner-Tocharian development: Pre-PToch. *o-bʰu > PToch. *æpu > (*u*-umlaut) *ǫpu > *ǫpä > B /opä/ → [oβä] = ⟨omp(ä)⟩.

However, it seems more likely that *omp* is not the original Tocharian B form. Rather, it represents a variant of an underlying adverb B (*)ompe 'there', which underwent first weakening (cf. archaic B *ompä*) and then apocope of its final vowel -*e*. The adverb B (*)ompe 'there' could be directly attested in B123a5 MQ (archaic)[23] and is in any case presupposed by the extended adverb B *ompe-k* 'id.' – see the discussion by Adams (DTB², 125 f.), Peyrot (2008, 167 f.; 2021, 168), and Del Tomba (2023, 256). Contrary to

---

[20] On vowel weakening in Tocharian A, see TEB I, 46 and Hackstein 2017, 1308 f.

[21] Spelling attested in B388a2 MQ, B407a6 MQ, and possibly IOL Toch 163b4 – all archaic.

[22] On which see EDHIL, 191 f.; LIPP, 188; Neri 2016, 39, n. 57. On the alternation *-*o*/*u* in PIE local adverbs/particles (cf. *o-bʰu ~ *o-bʰó- in the main text above), see Pinault 2009, 235, 239.

[23] Attested is B *ompe–––*. However, a restoration *ompe(k)* (see immediately below in the main text) or a word separation *omp e–––* can be hardly excluded (Peyrot 2008, 168).

this view is Pinault (2009, 235), who traces B *ompek* 'there' back to a pre-form *omp-te-k. Nonetheless, no parallels for a simplification B **-mptV-* > *-mpV-* are known, all the more so since the latter is contradicted by the adverb B *ompte* 'there' (PKAS7Ba3 DA class.),[24] which consists of the apocopated variant B *omp* 'id.' plus the neutral demonstrative B *te* 'this'. Moreover, the hypothesis of a weakening process B *ompe* > *ompä* > *omp* 'there' is typologically plausible, cf. MHG *dār* 'there' > NHG *da* 'id.' (EWDS, 177) – note that B *omp* could be further reduced to *om* (see below).

If the preceding assumptions are correct, the basic form B (*)*ompe* 'there' cannot go back to a pre-form Pre-PToch. *o-bʰu, since B *-e* would remain unexplained. Accordingly, the initial *o-* in B (*)*ompe* is not due to *u*-umlaut but rather to the assimilation to the following labial segments *-mp-*, as in the case of *o-* in B *om-palsko* 'meditation' (cf. Hilmarsson 1991b, 133; 1986, 58; DTB², 125). This in turn suggests that the sequence ⟨mp⟩ in B (*)*ompe* is not merely graphic but must have had a real phonetic value.[25] The latter hypothesis is further substantiated by the attested distribution of B *omp* and its reduced variant B *om*, which seems to be phonetically motivated. In particular, B *om* mostly[26] appears before the particle B *no*, thus pointing to a development B *p* > ∅ / *m_n* within the prosodic word (Peyrot 2008, 68).[27]

We should conclude that B *omp* 'there' cannot be used as evidence for the spelling of B [β] ← /p/ / *V_V* as ⟨mp⟩.

4.2.2. B *samp* 'that'

Another case in point is the sequence *-mp* in the distal-deictic pronoun B *samp* 'that', for which the following singular forms are attested: masculine nom. *sampä* ~ *samp* ~ *sam* / obl. *compä* ~ *comp*; feminine nom. *somp* ~ *som* / obl. *tomp*; neuter nom./obl. *tamp* ~ *tam*.[28] An older form of the oblique singular feminine B *tomp* might have been lexicalized in the adverb B *tompo-k*

---

[24] Not discussed in DTB², 125 f., but see Peyrot 2008, 167, n. 283.

[25] On the etymology of B (*)*ompe* 'there', see further Hilmarsson 1986, 58, 69 f. (< "**n̥-bʰo*") and DTB², 126 (< "**h₁om(u)* 'that'"); cf. also LIPP, 30.

[26] Precisely, 26× out of 34 occurrences (= 76,4 %) according to a count based on CEToM ("Search" function) and Peyrot 2009.

[27] Like B (*)*ompe* → *ompe-k* and B *omp* → *omp-te* (see above), also B *om* could function as base for the derivation of extended variants: cf. B *om-te* 'there', B *om-te-k* 'id.', and B *om-teṃ* 'id.' (Pinault 2009, 135; DTB², 124 f.).

[28] For an overview of the attestations, see CEToM (s.v., respectively) and Del Tomba 2023, 259 f. The disyllabic spellings are rare and occur only in classical manuscripts: cf. B33b3 Ś and PKAS19.20.Xb5 for B *sampä*, B31b2 Ś for B *compä*.

'(right) now', if the latter arose through ellipsis of a nominal phrase B obl.sg. *tompo-k preściyai* 'that time' – cf. TEB II, 200; Pinault 2009, 239; DTB², 329.[29] The origin of B *samp* 'that' is debated.

According to Adams (DTB², 740), the distal-deictic semantics of B *samp* is conveyed by the segment *-m-*, which he tentatively compares with *-m-* in the accusative stem Ved. *amū́-* 'that'. As for B *-p*, it would be "the devoiced, denasalized off-glide of an *-m* ending a stressed monosyllable [which] [...] became incorporated in the stem". All the same, no parallels for the latter phonetic process are adduced. Moreover, the comparison with the accusative stem Ved. *amū́-* 'that' is unconvincing, since the internal *-m-* of the latter most likely continues a lexicalized accusative singular ending, i.e., PIAr. acc. sg.m. *a-m* 'him' + *u (distal-deictic particle) → Ved. *amū́-* 'that' (EWAia I, 98; LIPP, 191 with n. 49).

Pinault (2009, 238 f.) interprets the paradigm of B *samp* as the result of a Proto-Tocharian crossing between (I) an anaphoric pronoun with masculine singular nom. *sä-/obl. *ťæ-*, feminine singular nom. *så-/obl. *tå-*, neuter singular nom./obl. *tä-* '(s)he, it, the'[30] and (II) a distal-deictic pronoun with nominative singular masculine *æ-pu*, feminine *æ-på*, neuter *æ-pu* 'that (one)' < *o-bʰu-s, *o-bʰe-h₂, *o-bʰu (see 4.2.1 above). If one accepts the reconstruction of a particle PIE *bʰo with the meaning 'out(side); away, off' (thus LIPP, 116), this hypothesis would be semantically attractive, since the derivation from a pronominal stem *o-bʰu/o-* (← *bʰo) would explain straightforwardly the distal-deictic nature of B *samp* 'that'. Formally, the inner-Tocharian development in (8) should be assumed.

(8) Tentative derivation of B *samp* 'that':

   I. Masculine singular: PToch. nom. *sä-pu/obl. *ťæ-pu > *sä-pä/(u-umlaut) *ťọ-pä > B /sä́pä///cópä/ → [saβä]/[coβä] = ⟨samp(ä)⟩/⟨comp(ä)⟩;

---

[29]   Though one should note that the assumed semantic development 'that time' ⇒ '(right) now' is surprising. One would rather expect the latter meaning to have arisen from an original phrase 'this time' (or similar), with a proximal-deictic pronoun.

[30]   Presupposed by the following Tocharian pronouns in the anaphoric meaning 'he, it, the': (I) masculine singular nom. B (*sä-u >) *su*, A *sä-m*/obl. B *ce-ᵤ*, A *ca-m*; (II) neuter singular nom./obl. B (*tä-u >) *tu*, A *tä-m*. Instead, the feminine singular PToch. nom. *så-* (/obl. *tå-*) is not continued by the anaphoric nominative singular feminine B *sā-ᵤ*, A *sā-m* 'she' (in place of expected B *so-ᵤ*, A *sa-m*). B *sā-ᵤ*, A *sā-m* rather rely on an alternative feminine singular PToch. nom. *sa-* (/obl. *ta-*), which goes back to a Kuiper's variant Pre-PToch. *sa (~ *sa-h₂) with laryngeal loss in pausa. See Pinault 2009, 240 f.

II. Feminine singular: PToch. nom. *så-på/obl. *tå̆-på > B *so-po/*to-po >> (in analogy to the masculine and neuter forms) /soṕä///tóṕä/ → [soβä]/[toβä] = ⟨somp⟩/⟨tomp⟩;

III. Neuter singular: PToch. nom./obl. *tä-pu > *tä-pä > B /tắṕä/ → [taβä] = ⟨tamp⟩.

Although this scenario is appealing, the following two objections may be raised. (I) If one posits underlying forms such as B /sắṕä/, /cóṕä/, etc., one ought to keep B *samp* 'that' etymologically distinct from B (*)*ompe* 'there', since the sequence ⟨mp⟩ of the latter is real (as per 4.2.1 above). The common distal-deictic semantics of B *samp* and B (*)*ompe*, however, rather suggests that these lexemes are best analyzed as etymologically related to each other (cf. also Del Tomba 2023, 253 with n. 6). (II) If B *samp* 'that' is underlyingly /sắṕä/, the *p*-less variants B *sam*, *som*, *tam*, etc. become hard to explain. Pinault (2009, 238) surmises that in those cases [-β] (= ⟨-mp⟩) would have been nasalized to [-m] (= ⟨-m⟩) before words beginning with *n*-. Nevertheless, since the alleged presence of a spirantized – and thus intervocalic – segment [β] implies that the forms at hand would have been disyllabic (i.e., [saβä], [soβä], [taβä], etc.), one would never expect [β] to be in direct contact with the initial consonant of the following word. In addition, unlike the case of B *omp* ~ *om* 'there' discussed in 4.2.1 above, the *p*-less variants of B *samp* 'that' are not particularly frequent before words beginning with *n*-.[31]

Peyrot (2021, 165) views B *samp* as the etymological equivalent of the Tocharian A anaphoric pronoun *säm*, which he traces back to Pre-Toch. A *sämp. This would lead to the reconstruction of a Proto-Tocharian pre-form with a real sequence *°*mp*° – cf. also Del Tomba (2023), who reconstructs Pre-Toch. B "*sə-mpə" (p. 253) and assumes an "enclitic particle -*m*(*p*)" (p. 270). However, for the sequence PToch./Pre-Toch. AB *°*mp*° no etymological explanation is offered. As for the equation B *samp* : A *säm*, it is functionally questionable, since the former pronoun has a distal-deictic meaning 'that (one)', while the latter pronoun an anaphoric one 'he, the' (cf. TEB I, 164 f., DTTA, 519, and see n. 30 above on A *säm*).

---

[31] A count of the relevant attestations based on CEToM (s.v., respectively) gave the following results for the occurrence of *p*-less case forms of B *samp* before words beginning with *n*-: (I) gen.sg.m. B *cwim*, 4× out of 8 occurrences; (II) nom.sg.f. B *som*, 1× out of 5 occurrences; (III) nom.sg.m. B *sam*, 3× out of 24 occurrences; (IV) nom./obl.sg.n. B *tam*, 0× out of 15 occurrences. Peyrot's (2008, 68) claim that B "*sam* and its inflected forms are especially frequent before the [...] particle" B *no* is difficult to reconcile with these data.

Summing up, the origin of the distal-deictic pronoun B *samp* 'that' remains uncertain. In spite of that, the assumption of an underlying form B /sā́pä/ → [saβä] = ⟨samp(ä)⟩ does not seem to be compatible with the available evidence. In the light of the adverb B (*)/ompe/ 'there', a form B /sā́mpä/ → [sampä] ~ [samp] = ⟨samp(ä)⟩ is preferable, even if its PIE background remains obscure. Moreover, the assumption of a real sequence [°mp] may help explain the *p*-less variants B *sam*, *som*, *tam*, etc., since a preconsonantal simplification *p* > Ø / *m_C* within the prosodic word would be a reasonable solution (although I could not identify any more specific environment for it).[32] Be that as it may, the main take-away from the discussion above is that B *samp* 'that' hardly represents an example for the spelling ⟨mp⟩ of a spirantized allophone B [β] ← /p/ / *V_V*.

4.3. B *āmpär** 'member, limb'

The oblique plural B *amparwa* f. 'limbs' is attested twice (b1, b2) in the classical manuscript PKNS32 DA (*Ambara-Jātaka*, see Pinault 2012). Based on the paradigmatic type B singular nom./obl. *kwarsär* ~ plural nom./obl. *kwärsar-wa* 'league, mile' – which usually occurs in neuter nouns (genus alternans)[33] –, one would expect the nominative/oblique plural B *ampar-wa* to be paired with a nominative/oblique singular B *āmpär*. According to Thomas (1985, 122; cf. also DTB², 48), the latter form is attested in an unpublished Berlin fragment. More cautious is Del Tomba (2021, 62 with n. 19; 2023, 69, n. 4), who gives the Tocharian B singular as *āmpär**. CEToM (s.v. *āmpär*) offers no attestations for the singular. As Ilya Itkin (p.c.) kindly points out to me, the Berlin fragment referred to by Thomas is probably THT1264a3, which reads /// – *āmprä wsā=c* '... he gave you an *āmprä*'. If this fragment belongs to the *Ambara-Jātaka* (on which see Pinault 2012), a translation of B *āmprä wsā=c* as '... he [i.e., the king Ambara] gave you a limb' would make good sense (Ilya Itkin, p.c.) – cf. also PKNS32b1, where the plural B *amp(ar)w=* 'limbs' occurs as direct object of the verbal abstract B (*ā*)*y*(*or*) 'giving, gift'. This suggests that B *āmprä* (= *āmpär**)[34] in THT1264a3 actually means 'limb' and does not represent the simplex of the homophonous Tocharian B word for 'mango', which is attested only as FCM B /ampä́r-/

---

32 Cf. also Peyrot 2008, 68 on the conjunction B *ṣp*(*ä*) 'and': "in *ṣp* the *p* was [...] lost [...] in large clusters in the position before other consonants".

33 Cf. TEB I, 118–120 and Pinault 2008, 491–493.

34 With graphic variation °*Cär#* (primary) ~ °*Crä#* (secondary), which is well attested in both Tocharian languages – cf. TEB I, 255 and Pinault 2010, 287.

(DTB², 48 – loanword from Skt. *āmra-* 'id.'). Therefore, I give here the nominative/oblique singular of 'limb' as B *āmpär**, for attested *āmprä*.

B nom./obl.sg. *āmpär** 'limb' lacks a convincing etymology. (I) Adams (DTB², 48) refers with skepticism the following attempts by Isebaert (1977, 383 f. and 1980, 235, respectively): either from PIE "*$h_a$er-m$\mathring{r}$*" (← root *Har-* 'fit'), which "was made into an *u*-stem in pre-Tocharian [...] giving *$*\bar{a}rm\ddot{a}ru$*, whence *$*\bar{a}m\ddot{a}ru$* with dissimilatory loss > *$*\bar{a}mru$* > *$*\bar{a}mpru$* > *āmpär*"; or connection with Lat. *aptus* "through the assumption of a nasalized variant *$*eh_x$-m-p-*". (II) Hilmarsson (1996, 23 f.) relates B *āmpär** to the family of Ved. *āma-* 'raw', Arm. *howm* 'id.', Gr. ὠμός 'id.', etc. and reconstructs a pre-form PIE "*$*H2em$-u$\mathring{r}$* (or *$*H2\bar{o}m$-u$\mathring{r}$* ?) 'raw flesh, piece of flesh (*vel sim.*)' ~ 'flesh of the limbs'" > (metathesis) *$*h_2em$-ru* > PToch. *$*amr\ddot{a}$* > B (*p*-epenthesis) *$*am$-p-$r\ddot{a}$* > *āmpär**.[35] Semantically, he compares Lat. *membrum* n. 'limb'. However, apart from the fact that the reconstruction of the PIE root in question as *$*h_2em$-* (rather than *$*Hem$-* or *$*HeH$-*) remains uncertain (see EWAia I, 170; NIL, 202–204 with refs.), Hilmarsson's proposal is semantically weak. In particular, the parallelism with Lat. *member* n. 'limb' is only apparent, since the latter does not go back to a substantive in the meaning 'flesh' (cf. Pre-PToch. "*$*H2em$-u$\mathring{r}$* (or *$*H2\bar{o}m$-u$\mathring{r}$* ?)" above), but rather to an adjective in the meaning 'fleshy (body part)' (⇒ 'limb'), namely, PIE *mems-ro-́* (Nussbaum 2018, 291, 295). Hence, the development '(raw) flesh' ⇒ 'limb, member' assumed for B *āmpar** is not supported by any parallels.

Semantically more compelling would be a connection of B nom./obl.sg. *āmpär** 'limb' with the PIE root *$*h_2ep$-* 'fit' (→ Hitt. *ḫap-zi* 'joins, attaches', Lat. *ap-tus* 'fitted, tied', etc.),[36] since a development '(the) fitting/joined (one)' ⇒ 'limb, member' is well attested – cf., e.g., Lat. *artus, -ūs* m. 'limb, member', Gr. ἄρθρον n. 'id.', etc. ← PIE root *Har-* 'fit' (EDLIL, 56; EDG, 130). Moreover, the root PIE *$*h_2ep$-* 'fit' exhibits further derivatives with the semantics 'limb, member', viz., Hitt. *ḫapp-eššar/ḫapp-ešn-* n., CLuw. *ḫapp-iš-* n., etc. (EDHIL, 293 f.). Under the assumption that ⟨mp⟩ in B *āmpär** actually spells a spirantized allophone [β] ← /p/ / *V_V*, I propose the derivation in (9). Its starting point is a *ro-́*-adjective PIE *$*h_2p$-ro-́* 'fitting' or 'joined',

---

[35] For the derivation of B *āmpär** from a Pre-Proto-Tocharian heteroclitcon with final metathesis *°-u$\mathring{r}$ > *°-ru*, see also Del Tomba 2023, 217 f., who nevertheless leaves the root connection open.

[36] On these forms, see LIV², 237, n. 3, 269 with n. 1; EDHIL, 293 f.; Weiss 1993, 16, n. 3; more cautious on Lat. *aptus* is EDLIL, 47.

which belongs to the well-known adjectival type with structure R(Ø)-*ró-* (Vine 2002, 329). In the prehistory of Tocharian, PIE *h_2p-*ró-* 'fitting' or 'joined' underwent *u*-substantivization,[37] with regular introduction of an accented full-grade into the root morpheme.

(9) Derivation of B *āmpär** 'limb':

Adjective PIE *h_2p-*ró-* 'fitting' or 'joined';

→ (*u*-substantivization) Pre-PToch. sg. *$h_2ép$-*ru-* ~ pl. * $h_2ép$-*ru-h_2* n. 'the fitting/ joined one'[38] > *apru ~ *ap̥rwa > PToch. *aprä ~ *apärwa > B *ap̥ ~ *apärwa > sg. nom./obl. /apär/* ~ pl. nom./obl. /apärwa/ → [āβär]* ~ [aβarwa] = ⟨āmpär⟩* ~ ⟨amparwa⟩ 'limb'.

4.4. Local summary

The main take-away from the above discussion is that the forms A *märkampal* 'law', A *arämpāt* 'shape, beauty', and B *āmpär** 'member, limb' offer independent evidence for the spelling of allophonic [β] ← /p/ / *V_V* as ⟨mp⟩ in both Tocharian languages. Of particular interest are the (lexicalized) compounds A *märkampal* 'law' and A *arämpāt* 'shape, beauty', in which – as in B *akwampere* 'sprout [and] stalk' – the allophonic spirantization of intervocalic /p/ occurs at a compositional morpheme boundary.

Finally, I follow Pinault (2009, 238) in regarding the scribal convention according to which the sequence ⟨mp⟩ could serve to spell the allophone AB [β] as ultimately based on the Gāndhārī scribal tradition. In particular, since in Gāndhārī texts ⟨m⟩ was frequently employed to note a fricative phoneme /v/, it seems plausible that the Tocharian scribes at times added a grapheme ⟨m⟩ before an intervocalic ⟨p⟩ in order to indicate its spirantized realization (likely [β]).

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I argued that the dvandva compound B *akwampere* 'sprout [and] stalk' represents the graphic rendering of a real form B [akwa-βere] ← /akwä́-pere/. The interpretation of B *akwampere* as /akwä́-pere/ makes a new diachronic analysis of the FCM B /akwä́-/ 'sprout' possible. The latter can now be seen as the regular continuant of the AS *u*-stem abstract PIE *h_2*ók̑-u/*

---

[37] Cf. Nussbaum 1998, 527 f.; Vine 2002, 331; Neri 2003, 346; Höfler 2017, 150–157.

[38] Equally possible is that the *u*-substantivization process led to a nominal derivative with abstract meaning '(act of) fitting, joining', which subsequently underwent semantic concretization to 'limb' – thus Sergio Neri, p.c.

$h_2\acute{e}\hat{k}$-u- n. 'sharpness', whose reconstruction is supported by independent evidence – cf. the derivatives B *akwatse* 'sharp', Lat. *acus*, -*ūs* f. 'needle', etc.

This new analysis of B *akwampere* relies on the assumption that the sequence AB ⟨mp⟩ could at times spell an intervocalic allophone AB [β] ← /p/ (likely a voiced bilabial fricative). The latter phenomenon has already been noticed in the literature, especially in the case of A *märkampal* 'law' and A *arämpāt* 'shape, beauty'. In the present paper, I presented a further example of it, namely, B *āmpär** 'member, limb' = [āβär]* ← /ápär/* < Pre-PToch. *$h_2\acute{e}p$-ru-* n. 'the fitting/joined one'.

References

AiGr II.2 = Jacob Wackernagel & Albert Debrunner, Altindische Grammatik, II.2: Die Nominalsuffixe (Göttingen 1954).

ALEW = Wolfgang Hock, in collaboration with Elvira-Julia Bukevičiūtė & Christiane Schiller, Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (2021). URL: https://alew.hu-berlin.de/ (state: 31.10.2023).

Barnes 2022/2023 = Timothy G. Barnes, Indo-European and Anatolian legal language (I). Hittite *āra*, *natta āra*, a Hieroglyphic Luwian crux, and a Tocharian parallel. In: Die Sprache 55 (2022/2023 [2023]), 27–60.

Bosworth & Toller 1954 = Joseph Bosworth & Northcote T. Toller, An Anglo-Saxon dictionary (Oxford 1898, repr. 1954).

Broomhead 1962 = J. W. Broomhead, A textual edition of the British Hoernle, Stein, and Weber Kuchean manuscripts. With transliteration, translation, grammatical commentary and vocabulary, I–II (Diss., Univ. Cambridge 1962).

CEToM = A comprehensive edition of Tocharian manuscripts, ed. Melanie Malzahn et al. (2011–). URL: https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/ (state: 31.10.2023).

Del Tomba 2021 = Alessandro Del Tomba, Metathesis of PIE *-*u̯r̥* in Tocharian. In: Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 74,1 (2021), 51–85.

Del Tomba 2023 = —, The Tocharian gender system: A diachronic study in nominal morphology (= Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 25; Leiden – Boston 2023).

de Vries 1977 = Jan de Vries, Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Leiden ²1977).

DPEWA = Bardhyl Demiraj, Olav Hackstein, Plator Gashi, Giulio Imberci-adori, Sergio Neri & Anila Omari, Digitales philologisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altalbanischen (15.–18. Jh.) (2021–).
URL: https://www.dpwa.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary/?lemmaid=9538 (state: 31.10.2023).

DTB² = Douglas Q. Adams, A dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and great-ly enlarged (= Leiden Studies in Indo-European 10; Amsterdam – New York ²2013).

DTTA = Gerd Carling & Georges-Jean Pinault, Dictionary and thesaurus of Tocharian A (Wiesbaden 2023).

DUDEN = Duden online, ed. Dudenredaktion.
URL: https://www.duden.de/ (state: 31.10.2023).

EDG = Robert S. P. Beekes, in collaboration with Lucien van Beek, Etymo-logical dictionary of Greek, I–II (= Leiden IEED Series 10,1; Leiden – Boston 2010).

EDHIL = Alwin Kloekhorst, Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon (= Leiden IEED Series 5; Leiden – Boston 2008).

EDLIL = Michiel de Vaan, Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages (= Leiden IEED Series 7; Leiden – Boston 2008).

EDPG = Guus Kroonen, Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic (= Leiden IEED Series 11; Leiden – Boston 2013).

EDSIL = Rick Derksen, Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexi-con (= Leiden IEED Series 4; Leiden – Boston 2008).

Eichner 1973 = Heiner Eichner, Die Etymologie von heth. *mehur*. In: Mün-chener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 31 (1973), 53–107.

EWAhd = Albert L. Lloyd, Otto Springer, Karen K. Purdy & Rosemarie Lühr, Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen, I– (Göttingen – Zürich 1988–).

EWAia = Manfred Mayrhofer, Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindo-arischen, I–III (Heidelberg 1992–2001).

EWDS = Friedrich Kluge & Elmar Seebold, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (Berlin – Boston ²⁵2011).

GEW = Hjalmar Frisk, Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, I–III (Hei-delberg 1960–1972).

Hackstein 2017 = Olav Hackstein, The phonology of Tocharian. In: Hand-book of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics. An interna-

tional Handbook, ed. Jared S. Klein et al. (Berlin – New York 2017), II 1304–1334.

HAL = Kurt Latte, Peter Allan Hansen & Ian C. Cunningham, Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon, I–IV (= SGLG 11; Berlin 2005–2020).

Hilmarsson 1986 = Jörundur Hilmarsson, Studies in Tocharian phonology, morphology and etymology with special emphasis on the *o*-vocalism (Diss., Univ. Leiden 1986).

Hilmarsson 1987a = —, The element *-ai*(-) in the Tocharian nominal flexion. In: Die Sprache 33 (1987), 34–55.

Hilmarsson 1987b = —, Reflexes of I.-E. *$suH_2n̥to$-/-$ōn$ "sunny" in Germanic and Tocharian. In: Die Sprache 33 (1987), 56–78.

Hilmarsson 1991a = —, Tocharian etymological notes 1–13. In: Tocharian and Indo-European Studies 5 (1991), 137–183.

Hilmarsson 1991b = —, The nasal prefixes in Tocharian. A study in word formation (= TIES supplementary series 3; Reykjavík 1991).

Hilmarsson 1996 = —, Materials for a Tocharian historical and etymological dictionary (= TIES supplementary series 5; Reykjavík 1996).

Höfler 2017 = Stefan Höfler, Der Stier, der Stärke hat. Possessive Adjektive und ihre Substantivierung im Indogermanischen (Diss., Univ. Wien 2017).

IEW = Julius Pokorny, Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, I–III (Bern – München 1959).

Imberciadori 2023 = Giulio Imberciadori, On Tocharian B *śrāy* pl. '(adult) men' (handout, 34th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, 28.10.2023).
URL: https://www.academia.edu/108743199/On_Tocharian_B_s_r%C4%81y_pl_adult_men_ (state: 31.10.2023).

Isebaert 1977 = Lambert Isebaert, Notes de lexicologie tokharienne II. In: Orbis 26,1 (1977), 381–386.

Isebaert 1980 = —, De Indo-Iraanse bestanddelen in de Tocharische woordenschat. Vraagstukken van fonische productinterferentie, met bijzondere aandacht voor de Indo-Iraanse diafonen *a*, *ā* (Diss., Univ. Leuven 1980).

Itkin 2002 = Ilya B. Itkin, The linguistic features of Tocharian A manuscript *Maitreyāvadanavyākaraṇa*. In: Manuscripta Orientalia 8,3 (2002), 11–16.

Jasanoff 2018 = Jay H. Jasanoff, The phonology of Tocharian B *okso* 'ox'. In: *Farnah*. Festschr. Alexander Lubotsky, ed. Lucien van Beek et al. (Ann Arbor – New York 2018), 72–78.

Jasanoff 2021 = —, Pre-Toch. *$h_1ludʰ$-*néu-ti* 'goes out'. In: *lyuke wmer ra*. Festschr. Georges-Jean Pinault, ed. Hannes A. Fellner et al. (Ann Arbor – New York 2021), 243–251.

Leumann 1977 = Manu Leumann, Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre (= Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 1; München 1977).

LIPP = George E. Dunkel, Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme, II: Lexikon (= Indogermanische Bibliothek 2; Heidelberg 2014).

LIV² = Helmut Rix, in collaboration with Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp & Brigitte Schirmer, Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen (Wiesbaden ²2001).

LSJ = The Online Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon. In: Thesaurus linguae graecae. A digital library of Greek literature, ed. Maria Pantelia. URL: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsj/#eid=1 (state: 31.10.2023).

Magnússon 1989 = Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon, Íslensk orðsifjabók (Reykjavík 1989).

Malzahn 2005 = Melanie Malzahn, Westtocharische Substantive auf *-au* und einige Fortsetzer von idg. *men*-Stämmen im Tocharischen. In: *Indogermanica*. Festschr. Gert Klingenschmitt, ed. Günther Schweiger (= Studien zur Iranistik und Indogermanistik 3; Taimering 2005), 389–407.

Malzahn 2007 = —, The most archaic manuscripts of Tocharian B and the varieties of the Tocharian B language. In: Instrumenta tocharica, ed. Melanie Malzahn (= Indogermanische Bibliothek 3; Heidelberg 2007), 255–297.

Malzahn 2010 = —, The Tocharian verbal system (= Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 3; Leiden – Boston 2010).

Meiser 1998 = Gerhard Meiser, Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache (Darmstadt ²1998).

Melchert 1983 = H. Craig Melchert, A 'new' PIE *men suffix. In: Die Sprache 29 (1983), 1–26.

Melchert 1984 = —, Studies in Hittite historical phonology (= ZVS supplementary series 32; Göttingen 1984).

Melchert 1994 = —, Anatolian historical phonology (= Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3; Amsterdam 1994).

Neri 2003 = Sergio Neri, I sostantivi in *-u* del gotico: morfologia e preistoria (= IBS 108; Innsbruck 2003).

Neri 2016 = —, Rev. Guus Kroonen, Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic (Leiden – Boston 2013). In: Kratylos 61 (2016), 1–51.

Neri 2017 = —, Wetter. Etymologie und Lautgesetz (Perugia 2017). URL: http://www.ctl.unipg.it/issues/CTL_14.pdf (state: 31.10.2023).

Neri 2022 = —, Alb. *gur* ‚Stein' und uridg. *$g^w reh_2$*- ‚schwer, massiv sein'. In: EQO ⫶ DUENOSIO. Festschr. Luciano Agostiniani, ed. Alberto Calderini & Riccardo Massarelli (= Linguistica ed Epigrafia dell'Italia Antica 1; Perugia 2022), 731–750.

Nikolaev 2022 = Alexander S. Nikolaev, ΤΙΘΑΙΒΩΣΣΟΥΣΙ ΜΕΛΙΣΣΑΙ (HOMER, *ODYSSEY* 13.106). In: The Classical Quarterly 72,1 (2022), 39–52.

NIL = Dagmar S. Wodtko, Britta S. Irslinger & Carolin Schneider, Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon (Heidelberg 2008).

Nussbaum 1998 = Alan J. Nussbaum, Severe problems. In: *Mír Curad*. Festschr. Calvert Watkins, ed. Jay H. Jasanoff et al. (Innsbruck 1998), 521–538.

Nussbaum 2018 = —, Limning some limbs: a note on Greek μηρός 'thigh' and its relatives. In: *Vina Diem Celebrent.* Festschr. Brent Vine, ed. Dieter Gunkel et al. (Ann Arbor – New York 2018), 288–298.

Peyrot 2008 = Michaël Peyrot, Variation and change in Tocharian B (= Leiden Studies in Indo-European 15; Amsterdam – New York 2008).

Peyrot 2009 = —, An edition of the Tocharian fragments IOL Toch 1 – IOL Toch 822 in the India Office Library, London (unpublished ²2009).

Peyrot 2021 = —, Notes on Tocharian A *o(k)* 'snake', A *oram* and B *sorromp* 'down', B *oṣno*, B *nanāmo* 'recognising', B *pāwe*, and B †*səwm*- 'trickle'. In: Tocharian and Indo-European Studies 21 (2021), 163–177.

Pinault 1988 = Georges-Jean Pinault, Le pratītyasamutpāda en koutchéen. In: Tocharian and Indo-European Studies 2 (1988), 96–165.

Pinault 1991 = —, Les manuscrits tokhariens et la littérature bouddhique en Asie Centrale. In: Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres 135,1 (1991), 227–251.

Pinault 2008 = —, Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et grammaire (= SLP supplementary series 95; Leuven – Paris 2008).

Pinault 2009 = —, On the formation of the Tocharian demonstratives. In: Pragmatische Kategorien: Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg, ed. Elisabeth Rieken & Paul Widmer (Wiesbaden 2009), 221–245.

Pinault 2010 = —, On the *r*-endings of the Tocharian middle. In: *Ex Anatolia Lux*. Festschr. Craig H. Melchert, ed. Ronald I. Kim et al. (Ann Arbor 2010), 285–295.

Pinault 2012 = —, La parfaite générosité du roi Ambara (PK NS 32). In: Tocharian and Indo-European Studies 13 (2012), 221–243.

Pinault 2020 = —, The Dharma of the Tocharians. In: Archaeologies of the written. Festschr. Cristina Scherrer-Schaub, ed. Vincent Tournier et al. (Napoli 2020), 461–492.

Pinault 2021 = —, Regard comparatif sur la dérivation nominale en tokharien. In: Dérivation nominale et innovations dans les langues indo-européennes anciennes. Actes du colloque international de l'Université de Rouen (ÉRIAC), 11–12 octobre 2018, ed. Alain Blanc & Isabelle Boehm (= Collection Littérature et Linguistique 3; Lyon 2021), 113–132.

Puhvel 1991 = Jaan Puhvel, Hittite etymological dictionary, III: Words beginning with *H* (= Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 5; Berlin 1991).

Rieken 1999 = Elisabeth Rieken, Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen (= Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 44; Wiesbaden 1999).

Schmidt 1986 = Klaus Totila Schmidt, Bemerkungen zur westtocharischen Umgangssprache. In: *O-o-pe-ro-si*. Festschr. Ernst Risch, ed. Annemarie Etter (Berlin – New York 1986), 635–649.

TEB = Wolfgang Krause & Werner Thomas, Tocharisches Elementarbuch, I–II (Heidelberg 1960–1964).

Thomas 1985 = Werner Thomas, Die Erforschung des Tocharischen (1960–1984) (= Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe 5; Stuttgart 1985).

Tischler 1983 = Johann Tischler, Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar, I: *A–K* (= IBS 20; Innsbruck 1983).

Vine 2002 = Brent Vine, On full-grade *-ro*-formations in Greek and Indo-European. In: Indo-European perspectives, ed. Mark R. V. Southern (Washington, DC 2002), 329–350.

Weiss 1993 = Michael L. Weiss, Studies in Italic nominal morphology (Diss., Univ. Cornell 1993).

Weiss 2020 = —, Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin (Ann Arbor – New York ²2020).

Winter 1987 = Werner Winter, Toch. B *ñakte*, A *ñkät* 'god': two nouns, their derivatives, their etymology. In: Journal of Indo-European Studies 15,3–4 (1987), 297–325.

Woodhouse 2012 = Robert Woodhouse, Hittite etymologies and notes. In: Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis 129 (2012), 225–244.

Lehrstuhl für Historische und Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft • Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München • Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1, Postfach 130 • 80539 München, Deutschland
E-mail: Giulio.Imberciadori@lrz.uni-muenchen.de