

Tocharian Lexemes for ‘belly’, ‘beaming’ and ‘burly’¹

Olav Hackstein, LMU München
olav.hackstein@lmu.de
43rd East Coast Indo-European Conference (ECIEC 43)
July 2, 2024
University of Georgia, Athens

1 Toch. A *kāts-pracar* ‘biological/uterine brother’

Chao-jung Ching has recently edited a Tocharian A inscription on a wooden tablet kept in the Indian Office Library at the British Museum in London (Ching 2019). The inscription most likely belongs to a donor’s family portrait, identifying and naming the individual deceased family members (Ching 2019: 15–6). The inscription contains inter alia the following two sentences.

(1) IOL Khot Wood 65

sās kātk[o] kāts-pra[c]ar Sökkocospā ||

‘This [is my/his/her?] deceased uterine brother *Sökkocospā*.’

sās kātkos kāš-šar Kāttuṃ

‘This [is my/his/her?] deceased uterine sister *Kāttuṃ*.’ (Ching 2019: 10)

The inscription features the two compound kinship terms *kāts-pra[c]ar* ‘uterine/biological brother’ and *kāš-šar* ‘uterine/biological sister’ (*DTA* 118). The literal meaning is ‘womb brother/sister’ or ‘uterine brother/sister’. Both compounds contain *kāts-* or its assimilated form *kāš-* as first member. The noun *kāts* means ‘womb, belly’. Its etymology was straightforwardly explained by Pinault 1991:186 and 2008: 260n.5, who derived it from PIE **kat̥j-o-* ‘being situated down, below’, cf. G. *Unterleib*. Furthermore, Pinault demonstrated that the noun had undergone semantic specialization (2008: “désigne le bas-ventre aussi bien que le ventre, et spécialement l’utérus chez la femme”), referring to the phrase

(2) Toch. A *kāts kām/pār-* ‘carry below/ in the womb’, G. (*unten*)/im *Mutterleib tragen*: 76 YQ 1.44 a4 *siddhārteṃ kāts kāmant* ‘they [the women] carried Siddharta in their womb/uterus’ (Pinault 1991:170–1); cf. Gk. *καταφέρω* ‘carry below/bring down’.

The full etymological development can be explained as follows:

¹ Work in progress. Many thanks to the participants of the *Münchener Indogermanistisches Forschungskolloquium*, to which this paper was presented on 6 June 2024, for their feedback, in particular to Athanaric Huard, Giulio Imberciadori, Alexander Nikolaev, Ryan Sandell, and Sergio Neri.

☞ **Handout including bibliography available at**

<https://www.indogermanistik.uni-muenchen.de/personen/professoren/hackstein/publikationen/>

(3) Local particle PIE **kat* ‘below, down’, with possible verbal conversion ‘to down, subdue’.

→ **kát-u-s* ‘downing, fight’ > OHG name *Hadu(-brand)* ‘battle (-sword)’, ON *Hǫðr* name of the god of war, OIr. *cath* (u/m.) ‘battle’; CLuw. *kattu-* ‘fight, enmity’; cf. HLuw. *kati-* ‘damage’ (cf. Melchert 2012: 209 n. 6).

→ **kát-e/or-e-h₂-*, **kót-e/or-e-h₂-* ‘fighting’ > MHG *hader* > NHG *Hader* ‘quarrel’, CS Russ. *kotora* f. ‘fight’ (Imberciadori 2024 [in prep.]: 681).

→ allative **kat-a(h₂)* > Gk. *κατά* ‘down’, *κατα-τίθημι* ‘put down, deposit’, Hitt. *katta dāi/tijanzi* ‘put down, deposit’ (Puhvel 1997: 127), and possibly Tocharian A *kat yā(m)-* literally ‘to throw/make down, sub-due, destroy’ (cf. DTA 91), if not from **kát-o-*, **kót-o-*.

→ locative **kat-i* ‘down, below’ > Hittite *katti* ‘*underneath, (along) with’; cf. Lat. *sub* ‘among’, G. *mitunter, darunter* ‘together with, including’.

→ delocalival “Positionsadjektiv” **katj-o-* ‘being situated down, below’.

→ collective **katj-eh₂* ‘the below (mass)’ > Tocharian A *kāts*, B *kātso* ‘abdomen, belly’.

→ locative **katj-eh₂-i* ‘in the below’ > Tocharian A *kātse* ‘near, close to the below, in front of’ (cf. DTA 118, s.v.).

Note that PIE **kat* ‘below, down’ is formally (with plain velar onset) and semantically (local particle and verbal root ‘to down’) distinct from **kāt-* ‘tear/chop apart, *zerreißen, zerschlagen*’, as tentatively posited by LIV²-Add: 47 with regard to Chwar. *p-st-* ‘zerreißen’, Ved. *śātaya* ‘zerhaue, zerteile!’; cf. Pinault 2008: 366, 38 on Ved. *śātru-* ‘enemy’; García Ramón 2020 on Gk. *κότος* ‘grudge, rancour’; Imberciadori 2024 (in prep.): 679 suggests adding Tocharian B *storwe* ‘greedy’). Melchert, *ibidem* argues that the Anatolian cognates of *κότος* are Hitt. *kadduwā(i)-* ‘to become aggrieved’ and CLuw. *kattawatnalli* ‘spiteful’ must be separated from *kattu-* ‘fight, enmity’ and HLuw. *kati-* ‘damage’ on semantic grounds: “while one often fights one’s enemies, enmity or hatred is a mental state of existence, while fighting is a concrete action”.

(4) Delocalival derivatives of local particles are often used to denote body parts; cf.

PIE **ud-ter-o-* > **u^htero-* ‘being located outside’ (> Gk. *ὑστερος* ‘latter, later’, Tocharian B *wāstarye* ‘entrails, liver’), “but earlier probably also “higher, sticking out” as in *ὑστέρᾱ* ‘womb’ (Hilmarsson 1993, Adams 2013: 651); cf. also Hesychius υ 857 **ὑστρος γαστήρ*.

PIE **en-ter-o-* > Gk. *ἔντερον, ἔντερα* ‘entrails’.

PIE **neh₁-ur* ‘lower part’, *νεαίρη δ’ ἐν γαστρὶ* ‘in the lower part of the belly’ (Il. 5.539, 616), and as transferred epithet *ἡ νεαίρα* ‘abdomen’ (Hilmarsson 1986: 5).

The Tocharian A evidence for kinship terms exhibiting the PIE term for ‘belly, womb, uterus’ as first compound member and ‘brother/sister’ as second turns out to provide the key to the actual etymology of Ancient Greek *κασίγνητος, κασιγνήτη*. The historical-phonological interpretation of the former Greek terms has remained ambiguous so far with regard to their first compound member *κασι-*:

(5) a. PIE **k_ṛnta*, **k_ṛnti* (Sturtevant 1927), **k_ṛnti* “erwägenswert” Willi 2003: 244, Egetmeyer 2010; on Hitt. *katti* (along) with’ from **k_ṛnti* see Willi 2003: 243n.47, Kimball 1999: 252; Dunkel 2014: 426 posits “urgr. **k_ṛnti-gnētos* ‘zusammen geboren’”.

b. PIE locative **kati* ‘below, underneath’. Cowgill 1985, 2006: 542 (“neither Gk. κατά, καί etc. nor Hitt. *katta*, *katti-* comes from a form with syllabic nasal in its first syllable”);

Unrelated Greek καί if from PIE **kas-* (Lokativ Wurzelnomen **kas-i* ,in fortlaufender Anreihung, in kontinuierlicher Folge‘ [Klingenschmitt 1975: 75]; möglicherweise Verbindung mit präpositionalem **kḡ-* [Willi 2003:243]).

The Tocharian evidence excludes an internal nasal and an internal **-s-*, and thus tips the scales in favor of b) PIE **kati* with internal *a*-vowel and coronal plosive /t/.

The Tocharian evidence has thus repercussions on the explanation of κασίγνητος.

Crucially, the equation of the first compound member in Toch. *A kāts-pra[c]ar* and *kāš-šar* with that of Greek κασί-γνητος and κασι-γνήτη implies two things:

- first that Greek κασί- originally presupposed a meaning ‘womb’ and is therefore not related to Greek καί.
- second, that Toch. *A kāts-pra[c]ar* and *kāš-šar* and Greek κασί-γνητος and κασι-γνήτη as kinship terms to designate biological brothers and sisters may form a Tocharian-Greek isogloss of some age. Ching (2019: 11) points out the semantic parallelism in the kinship terms for biological brother that exists between East Tocharian and Chinese *baoxiong* (Standard Chin. *bāoxiōng*) 胞兄, lit. “womb-elder-brother”, *baodi* (Standard Chin. *bāodi*) 胞弟, lit. “womb-younger-brother”. An areal convergence would be possible, but on the other hand the designation ‘womb brother’ is so natural as to recur also independently. It is however the non-trivial etymological overlap between East Tocharian *kāts-* and Greek κασι- that speaks in favor of a Tocharian-Greek connection.

Generally it makes sense for Indo-European languages to employ specialized terms for the designation of biological brothers and sisters, since the generic term for ‘brother’, PIE **b^hréh₂tēr*, had a broader meaning, denoting not exclusively natural brothers but **any male relatives of the same generation**. The broader meaning of brother, therefore, necessitated the need for a specialized kinship term to designate natural brother and sister, as seen e.g. in English *brother* and *biological brother* or in German *Bruder* and *leiblicher Bruder*.

NIL 39: “Nach EIEC war das Bedeutungsspektrum wohl ursprünglich weiter (etwa ‘father’s brother’s son, cousin’), da im Anat., Alb., und Gr. das Etymon anderweitig ersetzt wurde und in verschiedenen Einzelsprachen (Air., Lat.) Bedeutungen wie ‘Angehöriger des eigenen Clans etc.’ gegeben sind.”

Frisk, *GEW* 1040: Im Rahmen der Großfamilie wurde wahrscheinlich das Wort für ‚Bruder‘ auch für Halbbruder und mit weiterer Beziehung auf andere männliche Verwandte derselben Generation wie die Vettern gebraucht (Risch 1944: 118).

Therefore in order to encode the concept of biological brother, Latin could expand *frater* with the adjective *germanus*:

(6) Latin *frater germanus*, Pl. Men. 1102–3 *spes mihi est uos inuenturum fratres germanos duos| geminos, una matre natos et patre uno uno die*. ‘I have the hope of finding that you are **two twin brothers**, born from one mother and one father on one day.’

Cic. Ver. 2.128 [49] *Dixit Cn. Fannius, eques Romanus, frater germanus Q. Titini, iudicis tui, tibi pecuniam se dedisse.* ‘Cn. Fannius, a Roman knight, **the biological brother** of your judge Q. Titinius testified that he gave you money.’

Recall that Lat. *germānus* means ‘belonging to the same stem/germen’ (Neri 2021).

And in the same vein, Greek likely expanded the inherited term *φράτηρ with ἀδελφεός, as hypothesized by Beekes and van Beek *EDG* 2010: 20, whence arose as transferred epithets ἀδελφεός, ἀδελφός. The naming motive refers to the origin from the same womb; cf. Hesychius α 1061 ἀδελφοί · οἱ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς δελφύος γεγονότες. δελφὺς γὰρ ἡ μήτρα λέγεται, and recurs in Skt. *sagarbhya-* ‘(brother) from the same womb’ (**sm-*).

Furthermore, diachronically such bipartite noun phrases for natural brother and sister tended to give rise to new generic terms for brother and sister through the clipping of the generic head noun for brother/sister and the innovative use of the adjective as a transferred epithet. This explains Greek ἀδελφός, ἀδελφή and Spanish *hermano*, *hermana*, and perhaps Hittite *negna-* ‘brother’ from **ne-ġnh₁-o-* ‘born inside’; cf. Kloekhorst *EDIHL* 601 and Steer 2012: 292–3 ‘engeboren’, with substitution of **ne-* for **η-* or vr̥ddhi formation ‘belonging to/of the *gēns*’; cf. PIE **ṛbhro-* > OE *umbor* ‘child’ (Schaffner 2006).

Gk. αὐτο- makes sense if -κασί- originally meant ‘womb’:

(7) *Iliad* 3, 236-8 δῖω δ’ οὐ δύναμαι ἰδέειν κοσμήτορε λαῶν | Κάστορα θ’ ἰππόδαμον καὶ πύξ ἀγαθὸν Πολυδεύκεα | **αὐτοκασιγνήτω**, τῷ μοι μία γείνατο μήτηρ. ‘Castor and Polydeukes, the two (biological brothers) **born from the same womb**’.

Odyssey 10, 135-7 ... ἔνθα δ’ ἔναιε | Κίρκη ἐνπλόκαμος, δεινὴ θεὸς αὐδήεσσα, | **αὐτοκασιγνήτη** ὀλοόφρονος Αἰήταο ‘(the biological sister) **born from the same womb**’.

In sum, Toch. A *kāts-(pra[c]ar)* and *kās-(sar)* and Greek κασί-(γνητος) and κασι-(γνήτη) adds another example to the list of Greek-Tocharian isoglosses, for which cf. Adams 1988:7n.12, considering the possibility of “Tocharian-Greek contact in the Balkans”, and Nikolaev 2022: 24–5n. 16).

2 Toch. B *pāwe*

In a recent article, Michaël Peyrot 2022: 171–4 has managed to narrow down the actual meaning of the Tocharian B lexeme *pāwe*, which Emil Sieg 1955: 74 had tentatively assumed to be a substantive of the meaning ‘[medical] powder’.

In contrast, Peyrot 2022: 173 has recently shown that *pāwe* is more likely an adjective meaning ‘clear, bright’. A reevaluation of the textual attestations suggests approximating the meaning of *pāwe* as ‘bright, fresh, vital’. Further support comes from a new etymology of *pāwe*. But let us begin by reviewing its textual attestations.

In at least two passages *pāwe* occurs in coordination with *ārkwī* ‘white’.

- (8) W8a3 [p]āwe ā(r)[kw](i)
‘bright/fresh/vital [and] (shining) white’
- (9) W30a5 särwāna ♦ päścane kātso ♦ po kektseñ^ā [ʌ] ♦ ārkwi pāwe yamaṣṣām
‘the face, the breasts, the belly, the whole body it makes white and bright/fresh/vital’

Both passages confirm *pāwe* to be an adjective because of the syntactic coordination restriction stipulating elements of the same syntactic category to coordinate, cf., e.g., E. *sober and sound* which is well-formed while **sobriety and sound* is not. Therefore, since Toch. B *ārkwi* ‘white’ is an adjective, *pāwe* too is likely to be an adjective.

The following passage that has recently been emended and restored by Peyrot features *pāwe* as a predicative adjective.

- (10) Or.6402A/1.1(W13)a6 särwāna pawona mäskenträ
‘The face becomes bright/fresh/vital’ (emended by Peyrot 2022: 171-2)

But there is one passage which deviates in showing the collocation *kartse pāwesa*, literally ‘good’ and with *pāwe*:

- (11) Or. 6402A/1.5 (W17) b2 nastukārm eśanene kartse pāwesa ṣpā nestsi
Peyrot translates (p. 172): ‘a nasal medicament in the eyes in order to be good and *pāwe*’ (?) and remarks (p. 173): “The occurrence of the perlativ *pāwesa* ... is not in favor of being an adjective, but the construction in Or. 6402A/1.5 (W17) b2 is difficult, and not easier if *pāwesa* is taken to be a noun.” This assessment is correct, and it turns out to be possible to bypass the difficulty if we reckon with substantivization *pāwe* ‘bright/fresh/vital’ → ‘brightness/ freshness/vitality’ and parse *pāwesa* as a predicative instrumental ‘provided with brightness/ freshness/vitality’, resulting in the new translation [‘a nasal medicament in the eyes is good and provided with freshness/vitality’]. For the substantivization of adjectives in Tocharian, see Imberciadori 2023: *passim* and *CEToM*, e.g., s.v. *kartse*, ‘(adj.) good’; ‘(n.) good, welfare’, loc. *kartse-ne* ‘in well-being’, *kartse-śc* ‘to well-being’.

To sum up, the linguistic evidence does not contradict taking *pāwe* ‘bright/fresh/vital’ to be an adjective.

Turning now to the diachronic etymological interpretation of *pāwe*, Peyrot proposed taking *pāwe* back to PIE **ph₂uo-* ‘clean’. Formally, this is possible, but the semantics in a medical and not cosmetic context rather point to ‘shining, fresh & healthy, vital’. That is, *pāwe* is used in a medical context, refers to an outward attribute of healthy skin. Basing myself on this contextual approximation of the meaning of *pāwe* as ‘shining, fresh & healthy, vital’ another etymological connection suggests itself, namely connecting *pāwe* to PIE **b^heh₂-* ‘shine’ (Pokorny *IEW* 105, *LIV*² 68–9).

(12) Derivatives of PIE **b^heh₂-* ‘shine’.

2.1 Tocharian B

a. PIE **b^heh₂-* ‘shine’ → *u*-pres. **b^heh₂-u/ǔ-* (Hom. πι-φάυ-σκω, Φα(φ)-έ-θων, pres. *φα(φ)-έ-θω ‘shine’).

→ PIE **b^hóh₂-u-*, **b^héh₂-u-* ‘brilliance’.

→ **b^hh₂-u-ó-* ‘provided with brilliance/strength; shining, strong’.

PIE **b^hh₂-u-o-* > Toch.B *pāwe* as ‘shining, fresh & healthy, vital’, referring to the skin.

Tocharian, Vedic and Greek feature an extended root shape with vocalic or consonantal *-u/ǔ-* which likely comes from a *u*-present. The incorporation of morphemic *-u/ǔ-* into roots is encountered elsewhere; cf., e.g.,

- *u*-pres. **kh₂-u/ǔ-* > **kuh₂-*, **keǔh₂-* ‘hew, chop’, NHG *hauen* (Jasanoff 1978: 81, Hackstein 1995: 42, 55–6, Neri 2017: 232n.116);
- *u*-pres. **mih₁-u/ǔ-* ‘move’ > **mǐuh₁-* (Hackstein 1995: 17, 25, 191–2);
- *u*-pres. **spiH-u-* > **spǐuH-* ‘spit’;
- **leh₂-* ‘cut’ (Toch. AB *lātk-* ‘cut off’), *u*-pres. **lh₂-u-* > **luh₂-*, **leǔh₂-* (Ved. *lunāti* ‘cut (off)’) (cf. Nikolaev 2010:200-1);
- it is possible that *u*-pres. **b^hh₂-u-* ‘shine’ might likewise exhibit laryngeal metathesis yielding **b^huh₂-*, **b^heǔh₂-*, **b^hou(h₂)-no-* > OIr. *búan* ‘good’, **b^hǔh₂-ǐo-m* > OIr. *báe* ‘benefit, utility’; but unfortunately OIr. *búan* ‘good’ and *báe* ‘benefit, utility’ remain formally ambiguous since they may (as per Pokorny 1959: 148) be derived from the distinct root **b^heǔh₂-* ‘grow, become’.

2.2 Vedic

b. PIE **b^héh₂-os* ‘light, glory, might’ > Ved. *bhās-* n. ‘light, beam’ (RV sometimes disyllabic *bhaas-*; Schindler 1972: 34).

c. PIE **b^héh₂-u-on-* ‘shining’ > Ved. *vi-bhāvan-* ‘shining (far)’, e.g., RV 10,6,2 (Agni) *yáh bhānúbhiḥ vibhāvā vibhāti*, literally ‘[Agni], who is shining afar with his beams, beaming afar’.

2.3 Greek

d. IE **b^héh₂-u-* in Gk. πιφάυσκω ‘I make manifest, show’.

e. PIE **b^hh₂-u-os*, **b^hh₂-u-es-os* > Pamphylian φάβος (Eusth.), Aeolic (Hesychius φ 252) φαυοφόροι (· Αιολεῖς, ἰέρεια) ‘light/torch carrying priestesses’, Hom. φάος, gen. φάεος n. ‘light’ > → post-Hom. φῶς, gen. φωτός (Rix 1976: 148 §162).

f. PIE *t*-stem **b^hóh₂-t-s* ‘glamor’ > ‘glamorous being’ > Hom. φώς m. ‘shining, physically strong hero, warrior’ (Peters 1993; acute accentuation speaks against a contraction and, e.g., PIE **b^héh₂-ōs*). Peters 1993: 101–8 is called into question by Beekes, van Beek in *EDG*, but without arguments.

2.4 Westgermanic *beacon* and *beckon*

g. PIE **b^heh₂-u-n-* ‘shining (sign/signal involving fire)’ in West Germanic: OFris. *bāken*, as a loan from Frisian in NHG *Bake* ‘[marker] buoy’, OE *bēacen* ‘Zeichen, Erscheinung, Banner’, E. *beacon*, OHG *bouhhan* (n./a-st.) ‘Zeichen, Wink, Fahne’, Alemannic High German *Bauche(n)*, *Pauche(n)* ‘Boje, Ankerzeichen’ (*EWA* 2. 261–2).

Phonological development (Cowgill’s law feeds Kluge’s law, which in turn feeds Grimm’s law III, cf. Scheungraber 2014, Neri 2017: 232):

PIE <i>r/n</i> -heteroclite	[<i>*b^héh₂-u-r</i> , → Gk. ἀφαιρός, 2.5 below], weak stem <i>*b^heh₂-u-n-</i> ’.
<i>n</i> -stem	<i>*b^heh₂-u-ón-</i> > <i>*b^hah₂-u-ón-</i> + weak stem <i>*b^heh₂-u-n-</i> ’/ <i>*b^heh₂-u-n-</i> ’.
Cowgill , occlusion	<i>*b^hah₂-u-án-</i> > PGmc. <i>*bag^u-án-</i> + weak stem <i>*baun-</i> ² .
bidirectional leveling	PGmc. strong stem <i>*bag^w-án-</i> + weak stem <i>*baun-</i> ’ → strong stem <i>*baug^w-án-</i> + weak stem <i>*baug^wn-</i> ’
Kluge , assimilation	[PGmc. strong stem <i>*baug^w-án-</i> +] weak stem <i>*baugg-</i> ’
Grimm , devoicing	PGmc. <i>*baukan-</i> , <i>*baukk-</i> .
degemination	PGmc. <i>*baukk-</i> > <i>*bauk-</i> .
thematization	PGmc. <i>*baukan-</i> > <i>*baukna</i> ³ > OHG <i>bouhhan</i> (n./a-st.) ‘Zeichen, Wink, Fahne’, Alemannic High German <i>Bauche(n)</i> , <i>Pauche(n)</i> ‘Boje, Ankerzeichen’.

2.5 Homeric Greek ἀφαιρός

It is possible to posit an *r/n*-heteroclite **b^héh₂-u-r*, **b^hh₂-u-én-* ‘brilliance (and strength)’, whose weak *n*-stem may be derivationally linked with **c.** Ved. *vi-bhāvan-* ‘shining (far)’ (< PIE **b^héh₂-u-on-* ‘shining’) and **g.** West Germanic E. *beacon* (< PIE **b^heh₂-u-n-* ‘shining’), and whose strong *r*-stem may be continued in the Homeric epithet ἀφαιρός which I take to derive from privative **ǵ-b^heh₂-uro-* ‘not provided with brilliance (and strength)’.

Homeric ἀφαιρός has mostly been glossed as ‘weak’: *LfgrE* 1.1699–2000 glosses ἀφαιρός as “schwach (wohl das eigenliche und nicht weiter spezifizierte Adjektiv für **körperliche Schwäche**)” [my emphasis].

The etymological accounts have so far largely remained agnostic. *LfgrE* 1.1699: “E unbekannt”; Frisk GEW 1.194: “unklar. Wahrscheinlich aus ἀφαιρός und einem bedeutungsähnlichen Wort (φαῦλος, φαῦρος) kontaminiert”; Chantraine *DÉLG* 146: Ét. obscure; Beekes, van Beek *EDG* 176: “Etym unknown. These words are often explained as

² Sergio Neri adduces the parallel in **h₃ok^w-ón-/n-*’ > **agan-/aun-/awin-* → **augan-/augin-*, which renders the complicated explanation in *EWA* 6.1254, s.v. *ouga* (contamination of **h₃ek^w-* and **h₃eμ-* ‘see’) obsolete.

³ As in PIE **tek^v-ón-/n-*’ ‘runner’ > PGmc. **peg^w-án-* ‘runner, servant’ → **pegn-a-* > OHG *degan* ‘servant’ (S. Neri, p.c.).

contaminations (see Frisk), but there is no reason to assume such processes; it only testifies to our ignorance.”

But Homeric ἀφαιρός was rightly glossed by Georg Autenrieth, *Wörterbuch zu den homerischen Gedichten*: ἀφαιρός as ‚**unscheinbar**, schwächlich‘ (**φάρος**) [my emphasis] (Autenrieth 1902: 62), cf. in the same vein Risch 1974: 64 considering a connection with πφάυσκω, φάος. Its semantics ‘not having shining, brilliance, strength’ draw on the same metaphoric naming motive that underlies as well the Homeric warrior/hero denomination φός m. ‘shining, physically strong hero, warrior’ (cf. the Homeric hero-epithet φαίδιμος), and the Vedic Agni epithet *vi-bhāvan-* ‘shining (far)’.

- Homeric ἀφαιρός ‘lacking brilliance and strength’ may count as the etymologically related antonym of φαίδιμος ‘luminous, glorious, stout, burly’ which occurs in the prominent verse-end formulas II. 6.144 φαίδιμος υἱός ‘the luminous, stout son’ (4x II, 10x Od.) as an epithet of heroes (Hektor, Aias, Achilles and others), and of body parts in φαίδιμα γυῖα ‘the glorious, stout limbs’ 7x II. (II. 6.27 +), ἀνὰ φαιδίμῳ ὤμῳ ‘on my stout shoulder’ (2x Od.), cf. Stoevesandt (2008: 57, ad II. 6.144).
- The metaphorical shift from luminosity to splendor and to strength/might is encountered in the CLuw. lexeme **piha-* which is attested only in the epithets of the Storm-god (**pihašša/i-* ‘luminous’; subst. ‘lightning, or CLuw. *pihamma/i-*, *pihaimma/i-* ‘imbued with splendor/might’, Starke 1990:104, Melchert 1993: 176) encompasses the meanings ‘luminosity, splendor; might’.

In short: PIE **b^hh₂-u-r-ó-* ‘provided with brightness/freshness/strength’ > φαιρός (morphological type ἐχυρός, ὀχυρός ‘strong, secure’, for which, cf. Nussbaum 1998), and negated PIE **ǵ-b^hh₂-u-r-o-* ‘not provided with brightness/freshness/strength’ > ἀφαιρός.

h. → *r/n*-heteroclit **b^héh₂-u-r̥*, **b^hh₂-u-én-* ‘brilliance (and strength)’

→ *ro*-derivative **b^heh₂-ur-ó-* ‘provided with brilliance (and strength)’ (on the possibility of *r/n*-heteroclit as derivational basis for **-ur-o*-adjectives, see Nussbaum 1998: 535–6: **séǵh-u-r̥/-u-én-* (σθένος ‘steadfastness’) → **séǵh-u-r-os* > ἐχυρός, ὀχυρός ‘steadfast’).

→ privative **ǵ-b^heh₂-uro-* ‘not provided with brilliance (and strength)’ > ἀφαιρός (oxytone accentuation analogical with **b^heh₂-u-ró-*).

Cf. PIE **ǵ-meh₂-u-r-o-* ‘not at the (right) time; untimely’ > Gk. ἀμαυρός ‘having died untimely; dark’ (cf. Nikolaev 2014 who took **mo/eh₂-* ‘magnitude, might’ as base de foundations and advocated a slightly differing semantic pathway ‘not big, large, strong; frail, weak’ → ‘hardly seen, dim, obscure, dark’,), and with original barytone accentuation Gk. ἄωρος ‘untimely; having died untimely or unmarried’ < **ǵ-ǵoh₁-r-o-* (Clayton 2022).

Let’s survey the attestations for some philological details. Homeric ἀφαιρός occurs 4x in the Iliad and 1x in the Odyssey.

(13) Homeric ἀφαιρός: range of meanings

a. litotes ‘not entirely inconspicuous, not entirely unspectacular’

Motive: “the shining warrior or hero who is not the most inconspicuous, who shines out with brilliance and strength”:

Hom. Il. 15.9–11

Ἔκτορα δ’ ἐν πεδίῳ ἴδε κείμενον, ἀμφὶ δ’ ἑταῖροι
εἶαθ’, ὃ δ’ ἀργαλέῳ ἔχετ’ ἄσθματι κῆρ ἀπινύσσων
αἴμ’ ἐμέων, ἐπεὶ οὐ μιν ἀφαιρότατος βάλ’ Ἀχαιῶν.

‘He beheld Hektor lying in the plain, his companions were sitting around him, he was taken by a painful panting, having lost consciousness, vomiting blood, since not the most inconspicuous/not the least capable (G. *nicht der unscheinbarste*) of the Achaeans had hit him.’

of a weapon or missile, that is not entirely unspectacular:

Hom. Il. 12.458

στῆ δὲ μάλ’ ἐγγυὺς ἰών, καὶ ἐρυσάμενος βάλε μέσσας
εὖ διαβάς, ἵνα μὴ οἱ ἀφαιρότερον βέλος εἶη,

‘[Hektor picked up a stone.] He made a step coming very close, and leaning forward he threw at the middle [of the doors] well penetrating them, so that his cast may **not be entirely unspectacular** (G. *nicht völlig unscheinbar*) for him.’

b. ‘not shining out with strength, weak’

Hom. Il. 7.455–7

455 ὦ πόποι ἐννοσίγαι’ εὐρυσθενές, οἷον ἔειπες.
ἄλλός κέν τις τοῦτο θεῶν δείσειε νόημα,
ὃς σέο πολλὸν ἀφαιρότερος χειρᾶς τε μένος τε

‘[Zeus speaking to Poseidon] Oh my, earthshaker of the wide strength, what have you said! Some other one of the gods would likely fear such a thought, one god, who is **much more inconspicuous**/(G. *viel unscheinbarer*) regarding his hands and his anger than you.’

Hom. Il. 7.234–5 ‘weak’ (of a child)

Ἄϊαν διογενὲς Τελαμώνιε κοίρανε λαῶν
μὴ τί μευ ἤϊτε παιδὸς ἀφαιροῦ πειρήτιζε

[Hektor warns Aias] ‘Aias, seed of Zeus, son of Telamon, o lord of the people, do not be testing me like an **inconspicuous/weak** child.’

Hom. Od. 20.109–11

αἰ μὲν ἄρ’ ἄλλαι εὐδον, ἐπεὶ κατὰ πυρὸν ἄλεσσαν,
110ῆ δὲ μί’ οὐπω παύει’, ἀφαιροτάτη δ’ ἐτέτυκτο:
ἦ ῥα μύλην στήσασα ἔπος φάτο, σῆμα ἄνακτι:

‘The other [women] were all asleep since they had ground up the wheat, but one of them had not yet ceased, and she was **the least glamorous one with the least strength.**’

Hes. Op. 586

μαχλόταται δὲ γυναῖκες, ἀφαιρότατοι δὲ τοὶ ἄνδρες
εἰσὶν, ἐπεὶ κεφαλὴν καὶ γούνατα Σείριος ἄζει.

‘And women are in heat, and men are **the least shining out (with strength)** for Sirius parches their head and knees.’

The Hesiodic passage is remarkable in contrasting as antonyms the archaic lexemes *μαχλόταται* and *ἀφαιρότατοι*. Gk. *μαχ-* in *μαχλόταται* is archaic in exhibiting its older meaning ‘rush’ as preserved in Toch. *mākā-* ‘run’, see Malzahn & Peters 2010: 266–7, cf. G. *läufig* ‘in heat’, literally ‘running’.

Pi. P. 4.272

ῥάδιον μὲν γὰρ πόλιν σεῖσαι καὶ ἀφαιροτέροις

‘For it is quite easy even **for the most inconspicuous (weaklings)** to shake a city.’

2.6 Summary and resulting derivational scheme

Like Toch.B *pāwe* the Homeric adjective *ἀφαιρός* refers mostly to a human /physical quality like vitality’ (*Lfgre* 1.1699). Hom. *ἀφαιρός* is a privative adjective ascribing the property of not shining physically and of lacking physical strength.

PIE **b^heh₂-* ‘shine’, also ‘stand out by one’s brilliance, be physically strong’.

→ PIE *t*-stem **b^hóh₂-t-s* ‘glamor’ > ‘glamorous being’ > Hom. *φώς* m. ‘shining, physically strong hero, warrior’.

→ *u*-pres. **b^heh₂-u/u-* (Hom. *πι-φάυ-σκω*, *Φα(φ)-έ-θων*, pres. **φα(φ)-έ-θω* ‘shine’).

→ **b^hóh₂-u-*, **b^héh₂-u-* ‘brilliance’.

→ **b^hh₂-u-ó-*, ‘provided with brilliance/strength; shining, strong’ (Toch.B *pāwe* as ‘shining, fresh & healthy, vital’, referring to the skin).

→ r/n-heteroclit **b^héh₂-u-r-*, **b^hh₂-u-én-* ‘brilliance (and strength)’.

→ **b^heh₂-u-n-* > **b^hah₂-u-n-* > → PGmc. **ba(u)gg^(w)* > PGmc. **baŷkk-* > **baŷk-* (E. *beacon*, *to beckon*, Alemannic High German *Bauchen*, *Pauchen*).

→ poss. *o*-derivative **b^heh₂-ur-ó-* ‘having brilliance and strength’, cf. on **-u-r-o-* Nussbaum 1998.

→ privative **ǵ-b^heh₂-ur-o-* ‘lacking brilliance and strength’ (Hom. *ἀφαιρός* ‘physically weak’).

Abbreviations

CEToM = *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*, <https://cetom.univie.ac.at/>

DPEWA = *Digitales Philologisches Wörterbuch des Altalbanischen, Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of Old Albanian* (15th-18th c. CE) [Fjalori digjital filologjik-etimologjik i shqipes më të vjetër në shek. XV-XVIII], under the supervision of Bardhyl Demiraj (DE 2080/1-1) and Olav Hackstein (HA 3372/10-1) as principal investigators, and the collaboration of Giulio Imberciadori, Sergio Neri and Anila Omari. Online <https://www.dpwa.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/>

DÉLG = Chantraine, Pierre. 1977. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.

DTA = Carling, Gerd, Georges-Jean Pinault. 2023. *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

EDG = Robert S. P. Beekes. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. With the assistance of Lucien van Beek. 2 Volumes. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

eDiAna = *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*, under the supervision of Elisabeth Rieken, Jared Miller and Olav Hackstein as principal investigators. URL <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/>

EWA 6 = Lühr, Rosemarie et al. 2017. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. Band VI: *mâda – pûzza*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

EWAia I = Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen I*. Band. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

GEW = Frisk, Hjalmar. 1960-1973. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bd. I-III. Heidelberg: Winter.

LfgrE = Voigt, Eva Maria, Michael Meier-Brügger. 1955-2010. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Band 1: A(lpha). Band 2: B(eta) - L(ambda) (= Lieferung 10-14). Band 3: M(y) - P(i) (= Lieferung 15-20). Band 4: P(i) - O(mega) (= Lieferung 21-25). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

LIV²-Add = Kümmel, Martin. 2024. *Addenda und corrigenda zu LIV²*. <https://www.gw.uni-jena.de/phifakmedia/42185/kuemmel-liv2-add.pdf> (last revised 09 May 2024; accessed 11 June 2024).

NIL = Wodtko, Dagmar, Britta Irslinger, Carolin Schneider. 2008. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

W = Weber-Macartney, see in Filiozat, Jean. 1948. *Fragments de textes koutchéens de médecine et de magie*, Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, pp. 64–88.

References

Adams, Douglas Q. 1988. *Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology*. New Haven, Connecticut.

Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Revised and greatly enlarged. 2 vols. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

- Autenrieth, Georg. 1902. *Wörterbuch zu den homerischen Gedichten*. Neunte verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von Dr. Adolf Kaegi. Leipzig, Berlin: B.G. Teubner.
- Ching, Chao-jung. 2019. An Agnean inscription found by Aurel Stein at the Shorchuk Ming-öi (Yanqi, China) kept at the British library. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 19: 1–26.
- Clayton, John. 2022. A Männerbund for All Seasons: L *Māvort-*, Ved. *śárdho mārutam*, U *Serfus Martius*, Gr. ἄμαυρός, and H *mēhur*. Paper presented at the 33rd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, CA 12–13 November 2022.
- Clayton, John. 2023. *The Development of the Indo-European *-w̥r-/-wen Heteroclitics in Sanskrit and Beyond*. PhD dissertation University of California at Los Angeles.
- Cowgill, Warren. 2006. The personal endings of thematic verbs in Indo-European. In *The Collected Writings of Warren Cowgill, edited with an introduction by Jared S. Klein*. Ann Arbor, New York; Beech Stave Press. 535–567. [Long version of “Cowgill, Warren 1985. The personal endings of thematic verbs in Indo-European. In *Grammatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, 20.-25. Februar 1983*, edited by Bernfried Schlerath. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 109–118.”]
- Dunkel, George E. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. Bd. 2 Lexikon. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Egetmeyer, Markus. 2010. *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre. Tome I. Grammaire. Tome II. Répertoire des inscriptions en syllabaire chyro-grec*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Filiozat, Jean. 1948: *Fragments de textes koutchéens de médecine et de magie. Texte, parallèles sanskrits et tibétains, traduction et glossaire*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- García Ramón, José Luis. 2020. Grec κότος « rancune », hittite *kattaqātar* « tort, grief », « cause (ou objet) de vengeance, motif de querelle » : phraséologie, comparaison. In Ὀνομάτων ἵστορ, *Mélanges offerts à Charles de Lamberterie*. Louvain, Peeters, 261–282.
- Hackstein, Olav. 1995. *Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensbildungen des Tocharischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur. 1986. A Tocharian – Greek isogloss: toch. B *ñor* ‘below’ ~ Gk. *νεῖαιρα* ‘lower’. *Glotta* 96: 1–9.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur. 1993. The fate of TTR/RTT in Indo-European. In *Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Meiser. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. 209–222.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur. 1996. *Materials for a Historical and Etymological Dictionary*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- Kimball, Sara E. 1999. *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1975. Altindisch *śaśvat-*. MSS 33: 67–78.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 1978. Observations on the Germanic Verschärfung. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 37: 77–90.
- Malzahn, Melanie, Martin Peters. 2010. How (not) to compare Tocharian and Ancient Greek verbal stems. In *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, edited by Ronald Kim, Norbert Oettinger, Elisabeth Rieken, Michael Weiss. Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave Press. 265–268.
- Melchert, Craig. 1993. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill.
- Melchert, Craig. 2012. Luvo-Lycian Dorsal Stops Revisited. In *The Sound of Indo-European 2 (Papers on Indo-European phonetics, phonemics and morphophonemics)*, edited by Roman Sukač & Ondřej Šefčík (eds.). München: Lincom. 206–218.
- Neri, Sergio. 2017. *Wetter. Etymologie und Lautgesetz*. Perugia: Università degli Studi di Perugia.
- Neri, Sergio. 2019. Riflessi delle laringali indoeuropee in germanico. In: *XVIII Seminario avanzato in Filologia germanica. Dall'indoeuropeo al germanico: problemi di linguistica storica*. A cura di Roberto Rosselli Del Turco. Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso. 41–66.
- Neri, Sergio. 2021. Zur Wortbildung von lat. *germānus* ‚leiblich; echt‘. In *Studies in General and Historical Linguistics*, offered to Jón Axel Haradarsen on the occasion of his 65th birthday. Edited by Matteo Tarsi. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. 365–385.
- Nikolaev, Alexander. 2010. Time to Gather Stones Together: Greek *λάαζ* and Its Indo-European Background. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, edited by Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine. Bremen: Hempen. 189–206.
- Nikolaev, Alexander. 2014. Greek *ἀμωρός* and Indo-European **meh₂-* ‘great, large’. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference: October 26th and 27th, 2013*, edited by Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine, 121–136. Bremen: Hempen.
- Nikolaev, Alexander. 2022. Greek *μάρπτω* and Tocharian A *märk-*. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* 32: 23–28.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 1998. Severe problems. In *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Lisi Oliver. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. 521-538.
- Peters, Martin. 1993. Beiträge zur griechischen Etymologie. In *Miscellanea linguistica graeco-latina*, edited by Lambert Isebaert, 85–113. Namur: Société des études classiques.
- Peyrot, Michael. 2022. Notes on Tocharian A *o(k)* ‘snake’, A *oram* and B *sorromp* ‘down’, B *oşno*, B *nanāmo* ‘recognising’, B *pāwe*, and B *†səwm* ‘trickle’. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 21: 163–177.

- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2008. About the slaying of Soma: uncovering the Rigvedic witness. In: L. Kulikov & M. Rusanov (eds.), *Indologica. T.Ya. Elizarenkova Memorial Volume*. Book 1, Moscow, Russian State University for the Humanities (Orientalia et Classica. Papers of the Institute of Oriental and Classical Studies, 20). 353–388.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1991. Un témoignage tokharien sur les premières nonnes bouddhistes. *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 9: 161–194.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. München, Bern: Francke.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1997. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 4: Words beginning with K*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ringe, Don. 2017. *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Risch, Ernst. 1974. *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Rix, Helmut. 1992. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schaffner, Stefan. 2006. Altenglisch *umbor* 'Kind'. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics* 3: 147–185.
- Scheungraber, Corinna. 2014. *Die Nasalpräsentien im Germanischen: Innovation und Erbe*. Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1972. *Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen*. Inauguraldissertation Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg.
- Sieg, Emil. 1954. Die medizinischen und tantrischen Texte der Pariser Sammlung in Tocharisch B. Bemerkungen zu Prof. J. Filliozats Textausgabe und Übersetzung. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 72: 63–83.
- Starke, Frank. 1990. *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Steer, Thomas. 2012. Nochmals zu rigvedisch *návedas*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 66/2: 277–306.
- Stoevesandt, Magdalene. 2008. *Homers Ilias, Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar/ BK)*, herausgegeben von Anton Bierl und Joachim Latacz. Band IV. 6. Gesang, Faszikel 2. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1927. Hittite *katta(n)* and Related Words. *American Journal of Philology* 48: 247–257.
- Willi, Andreas. 2003 [2005]. *καί* – mykenisch oder nachmykenisch? *Glotta* 79: 224–248.