Tocharian *klyomo*

Timothy Barnes, Harvard University
WECIEC XVIII 11.4.2006

1. The Problem.

Tocharian B *klyomo* (: A *klyom*) 'noble' is clearly a derivative – one way or another – of PIE *ḱleu̯-. It shows in particular the well-known specialized semantics of the latter, 'fame, repute', Gk. κλέος, Skt. śrávas-, etc. The exact prehistory of the form has never been properly described.[*]

Adams' etymological note s.v. adduces several parallel-looking formations (Skt. śromata- n. 'fame' < ḱleu̯mṇto- ; OHG *hliumunt* (> ModG *Leumund*) 'reputation, character')[1], but skirts the issue of how he supposes the root vocalism B o = A o (PToch. *o̜) to have resulted. Further, it is highly doubtful whether the preform is to be set up with –*mont-* at all; A obl. *klyomänt-* shows the usual extension of –*nt-* participle forms found in related categories (e.g. the past participle).

Other attempts to get at the phonology are those of Hilmarsson[2], Winter[3] and Ringe[4]:

> Hilmarsson: lowering of u > o in this environment ("o-Umlaut")

> Winter: *klä́wmn- simplified to *klyomn-* in feminine, then generalized throughout paradigm.

> Ringe: *kläwem- contracted to *klyom-*

Hilmarsson's phonological rule is suspect and frankly ad hoc. Winter's explanation not credible; why remodel the masc. after the feminine? Ringe's, one must admit, is the only workable *phonology* (see below fn. 6 for contractions over –w-).

Common, however, to all these accounts is an inadequate examination of the derivational morphology; only Ringe makes explicit his view (-*mon-* stem to reflex of noun *ḱléu̯os)[5]. In fact, any explanation of the form must not only be phonologically justifiable but ought also to respect the derivational properties of the Tocharian class of adjectives in –*mo*. To anticipate: there is no certain example in all of Tocharian of a denominal -*mo* stem. For this reason an explanation of the form that takes it as denominal (to the Toch. reflex of *ḱléu̯os) should be suspect. By

---

[*] Abbreviations of frequently cited works: Adams = D.Q. Adams, *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam 1999; Hilmarsson *Materials* = J. Hilmarsson, *Materials for a Tocharian historical and etymological dictionary*. Reykjavík 1996; K-T = W. Krause, W. Thomas, *Tocharisches Elementarbuch I-II*. Heidelberg 1960; Ringe *Sound Changes* = D. Ringe, *On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian, Volume I*. New Haven 1996; VW = A.J. Van Windekens, *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes, I, II/1, II/2*. Louvain 1976-82.

[1] Of course, these forms are properly –*to-* adjectives to base *ḱléu̯-mṇ (av. *sraoman-*)

[2] *Materials* s.v. *klyomo*.

[3] *TIES* 8, 1999, 247-74 esp. 265ff.

[4] *Sound changes* 4, 9, 50, 64.

[5] Explanations starting from a *ḱlEumŏn- would be completely straightforward were it not for the phonological problem; the Indic and Germanic -*to-* adjectives next to Av. *sraoman-* in effect guarantee a grundspr. action noun *ḱléu̯-mṇ, as if Gk. "κλεῦμα, κλεύματος". *ḱlEumŏn- would be a regular internal derivative displaying exocentric semantics with respect to its base (etwa *ḱléu̯mṇ '(result of) hearing' > 'renown' → ḱléu̯mŏn- 'possessing renown, famous' : Gk. γνῶμα → γνώμων. Cf. Haudry *BSL* 66, 1971, 109ff., Melchert, *Sprache* 29, 1-26 (esp. 22, where Toch. forms incorrectly analyzed as denominative).

contrast, a close examination of the derivational properties of adjectives in *–mo* shows that they are overwhelmingly deverbative; if we can analyse *klyomo* along these same lines, we should.

2. Adjectives in *–mo*.

2.1. Repertory.

(a) Adjectival:

>*klyomo* [*klyom*] 'noble'; *alāṣmo* 'sick'; *aiśamo* 'wise'; *orkamo* 'dark, gloomy'; *cämpamo* 'able'; *päknāmo* 'intending'; *ynamo* 'going'; *lyukemo* 'shining'; *waskāmo* 'in motion, moveable'; *salamo* 'leaping' or 'flying'; *sälpamo* 'gluhend'; *klyemo* 'standing, situated'; *pälkamo* 'bright, visible', *weñmo* 'speaking'.

(b) Substantives:

>*śaumo* [*śom*] 'living being, man'; *waṣamo* 'friend'.

2.2. Inflection.

Departing from PIE *-mon / -mn-*, B shows the more original paradigm (K-T$238):

masc. nom.	*klyomo* < *-mōn*
obl.	*klyomoṃ* < *-mon-m̥*
pl. nom.	*klyomoñ* < *-mon-es*
obl.	*klyomoṃ* : regular pattern pl. *ñ* : obl. *–ṃ* (< *-ns*)

fem. nom.	*klyomña* < *-mn-i̯ə₂*

obl. °-*mñai*, pl. °-*mñana* again analogical / productive pattern

A by contrast has introduced *–nt-* forms in the masc. (obl. *klyomänt*) clearly based on the participle. This is a trivial development in A, common to all deverbative adjectives.

2.3. Derivation (1).

These adjectives, wherever one can tell, fit into clear patterns of deverbal derivation (based mainly on the subjunctive stem, where the latter is less characterized than the present; occasionally also to the present stem, again, where that has a 'primary' look to it):

>*alāṣmo* /ālāṣmo/ ← *alāṣṣäm* Cl. IX pres./subj. 'gets sick'

>*aiśamo* /aiśämo/ ← *aiś-ä-* Cl. II (thematic) pres./subj. 'knows' (*aiśtär*, ger. II *aiśalle*)

>*cämpamo* /cämpämo/ ← *cämp-ä-* Cl. I/II pres./subj. 'is able'

>*päknāmo* /päknämo/ ← *päk-nā-* Cl. VI subj. (pres. *päk-nāsk-*) intends

>*ynamo* /y(ä)nämo/ ← pres./subj. stem *yä-n-ä-* (irregular) to *i-* 'go'

>*lyukemo* /lyukémo/ ← *lyuketär* Cl. III present (no subj. attested) 'shines'

waskāmo /wāskā́mo/ ← *wāsk-ā-* Cl. V subj. 'moves (intr.)' (in ger.II *wāskalle*)

sälpamo /sälpä́mo/ ← *sälp-ä-* Cl. I/II present (subj. Cl. V *salp-ā-)*

pälkamo /pälkā́mo/ ← *pälk-ä-* Cl. I pres. (no subj. attested)

weñmo /weñ(ä)mo/ ← subjunctive stem *we-ñ-* (: pres. *we-sk-*)

A further link in the chain: This productive derivational chain has a further link; a *–mo* adjective generally pairs with a *–mñe* adjective abstract (< *-mn-iiom*):

aiśamo 'wise' → *aiśamñe* 'wisdom'

cämpamo 'able' → *cämpamñe* 'ability'

This fact militates against the interpretation of *wināmaññe* (supposed to mean 'taking pleasure (in)') as derived from a **wināmo* in turn based on *wīna* 'pleasure'(VW II/1, 44ff., picked up by Melchert, art.cit.). The form should have been !*winamñe*. In fact, the word means 'garden' and is probably a compound *wina-māññe* 'pleasure-place', see Adams s.v., with parallels for second member *–māññe*.

2.4. *salamo*.

The case of *salamo* 'leaping' is not so straightforward. Hilmarsson has dealt with this verb in great detail. His examination of the B forms lead him to set up an individual verb system of the following familiar shape:

Pres. VI *säl-nā- > sällā-* : Subj. V *sálā-/sälā-* : Pret I *salā́-*

salamo will then be underlying /sälā́mo/, derived from the subjunctive stem, with the accent copied from base to derivative. However, as noted already K-T, next to the expected fem.pl. *salamñana* (certain restoration in H 149. 330 a3 *salamña///*), one encounters a *ṣlyamñana*. For the latter Hilmarsson has suggested a reduplicated present (of Cl. II) parallel to Vedic *sísarti* and exactly equivalent to Gk. *ἰάλλω*, viz. a **si-sḷ-ie/o-* giving PToch. **ṣäṣäl'yä-* and with reduction of *Fremdvokal* in unstressed initial open syllable *ṣṣäl'yä-*, which is supposed to have supplied both pres. and subj. stem.

Whether this analysis is correct or not (one suspects it isn't the last word), it at least suggests the possibility that verbal morphology not attested in the finite forms on the books may be lurking in *–mo* derivatives created at a time before the form in question fell out of use.

3. Derivation (2). Not clearly deverbal.

3.1. Repertory.

Five items (3 adjectival, 2 substantival) appear on the face of things to resist a deverbative analysis:

orkamo (adj.) 'dark, gloomy'; *waṣamo* (subst.) 'friend'; *śaumo* (subst.) 'living being, man'; *klyemo* (adj.) 'standing'; and *klyomo* (our *explanandum*).

3.2. *orkamo* [*orkäm*]

No verb AB !ork-.

Connection with B *erkent-* : A *arkant-* 'dark' seems inevitable, but both the phonology of and the morphology are difficult. For *erkent* : *arkant-* a relation with PIE *$h_1rég^uos$-* n. '1.(the) dark; 2. dark (atmospheric) region' (: ἔρεβος, erek, riqis; rájas-) is secure and points to a *$h_1\mathring{r}g^uont$-* not elsewhere attested.

> The adj. pairing with *$h_1rég^uos$-* may have been *h_1reg^u-no-*, to judge by Gk. ἐρεμνός and perhaps Alb. /rẽ:/ f. 'cloud', if concretized from *$(e)remnā$ < *h_1reg^u-neh_2-* 'darkness' (Demiraj, *Albanische Etymologien*).

This would suggest a *Transponat* *$h_1org^u(V_{-front})mŏn$-* (with an *o that failed to unround in the environment of labiovelar or a following –u- resulting from a sequence labiovelar + *Fremdvokal* (compare vocalism of *okät* '8' <= *$oktū$ < *$ok\hat{t}ō$)). But the o-grade itself is unexpected and difficult to account for. Further analysis would be totally speculative. In any case given the uncertainty the word cannot be profitably used as the basis for explaining other –*mo* forms.

3.3. *waṣamo*

Only B; no verb of the right shape or semantics.

Connection with *yṣuwar* 'friendship; friendly' seems likely. One cannot really go any further. Note however that *waṣamo* is not an adjective and that *yṣuwar* has the peculiarity of apparently being both a substantive and an adjective. Suggests that *waṣamo* requires a special treatment, not possible at the current state of knowledge.

3.4. śaumo [śom]

Here we are on firmer ground. The form must go back to a *śāumo*. The question arises whether this can be deverbative to *śāw-/śāy-* in the productive way. In fact, to Pres./Subj. Cl. II *śāu'-ä-* / *śāu-a-* a productively built -*mo* adj. would have the shape *$śāwämo$, a preform which would have contracted[6] to *$śåmo$ which would of course give B *śomo* : A *śom*.

In fact, *śomo* is attested in B, alongside more common *śaumo*. It seems possible to understand B *śomo* as reflecting a remodelling of older *$śāumo$ < *$g^u\iota\mathit{ə}_3u$-mŏn-* after the productive pattern.

---

[6] The rules for contraction over w have been established by Þórhallsdóttir (TIES 2, 1988, 184-210), followed by Ringe *Sound Changes* and others, are as follows (where Λ = the reflex of IE *o, o = PToch. close *ǫ):

*-äwΛ-	>	*-o-	>	AB o
*-åwΛ-	>	*-å-	>	B o : A a
*-āwΛ-	>	*-ā-	>	AB ā (subject to the usual changes)
*-ΛwΛ-	>	*-Λ-	>	B e : A a
*-āwä-	>	*-å-	>	B o : A a
*-owä-	>	*-o-	>	AB o
*-åwä-	>	*-o-	>	AB o

4

śaumo itself, with its plural *śāmna* (old neut.pl.) not †*śaumoñ / śomoñ*, is in derivational terms the real reflex of the older IE pattern by which *-mon* stems are internally derived from *men*-stem neuters.

śaumo thus provides a crucial counterexample to the productive derivational pattern, in three respects: 1. It is substantival; 2. It shows an archaic derivational pattern with root as base + internal derivation; 3. It displays a different inflectional pattern (plural *śāmna*). One should note that in all these respects *klyomo* patterns with the productive adjectival type introduced above, as – again - the o-vocalism excludes a preform *$\hat{k}l(E)u$-mon-* uel sim; further, *klyomo*, unlike *śaumo*, is really an adjective, and patterns with the productive type in its plural in *–oñ*.

The key to the correct explanation of *klyomo* is provided by my analysis of *klyemo*.

4. *klyemo* and *klyomo*.

4.1. *klyemo*.

The gloss 'standing, situated' [K-T s.v. 'stehend (?)', Adams 'standing, being in'] seems secure; the word is attested in the obl.pl. in ST-a3/4: *klyemoṃ warne lwasāts misampa mit panit wirot* 'honey (and) molasses (are) a contradiction (*wirot* < Skt. *virodha*) with the flesh of animals situated/living in water'. Note that the the the adj. denotes a permanent state.

The word must be a derivative of *käly-/stäm-* 'stand', but the precise mechanism remains to be determined. It cannot be from the subjunctive stem, for *käly-* is suppleted here by *stäm-*, subj. V *stäm-ā-* → !*stãmamo / stamãmo*. Nor can it be from the present stem, which is of class II, *käly-ä-* to which a ! *klyámo* would be expected.

In principle the e-vocalism may go back to (a) IE *$\bar{e}$ or (b) IE *o. Assuming the former one might imagine an *$-eh_1$- stative; but an important peculiarity of Tocharian consists in the absolute dearth of convincing examples of *$-eh_1$- statives[7]. If, however, we set up –o-, it becomes attractive to consider the form as a reflex of an unattested Cl. III pres. *$klyetar$ < *$\hat{k}li\underaccent{\dot}{i}o\text{-}tor$.

In fact, *klyemo* is not isolated in pointing to such a Cl. III present; the ger. *klyelle* (not !*klyalle*) must be so analysed (K-T 'mit Übergang in Kl. III' have it backwards). Indeed, a Cl. III present to a root of this shape would overlap with Class II in both the 3rd plural (*kälyentär* < *$\hat{k}li\underaccent{\dot}{i}ontor$ **or** *$\hat{k}le\underaccent{\dot}{i}ontor$*), as well as in a handful of non-finite forms actually attested: participles *klyeñca* and *klyemane*. It is inherently more likely that the Cl. III forms are the more original, preserved as they are in non-finite forms less likely to be remade after the (new) present stem.

Our result: The presence of Cl. III forms reflects the original Stammbildung.

Implications/advantages.

Tocharian:

> 1. The stative/intransitive semantics of *klyemo* itself are motivated.

---

[7] Of course, this is to some extent still controversial. Cowgill's idea that III/IV class presents go back to –*$-h_1\underaccent{\dot}{i}e/o$- has had an unfortunate *Nachleben* (and may be seen parading through the pages of LIV under the ominous sobriquet "Essiv").

2. Assuming such a form would do some of the semantic work in getting a meaning 'stand' out of IE *$\hat{k}lei̯$- 'lean'. In other words the quondam existence of a stative-intransitive here may have helped along the lexicalization of a peculiar stative-intransitive reading throughout.

Indo-European:

3. In IE terms a *$\hat{k}li i̯or$ would support an analysis of Lat. *cliens* as the reflex of a *kli-$\bar{e}$-, rather than an old aorist participle (hard to parallel in Lat., and semantically all wrong).
4. A result of analyzing Cl. II *käly*- as secondary is that it leaves the often compared IIr. thematic (Skt. Cl. I) presents Ved. *śrayate*, av. *sraiiata* isolated.

4.2. The analysis of *klyemo* just given suggests the same possibilty for *klyomo*.

4.2.1. For *klyomo*, again, there is no attested verb which can have served as derivational base. The reflex of *$\hat{k}leu̯$- in Toch. is famously the s-form found elsehere in the family (B *klyauṣ*-, A *klyoṣ*-).

4.2.2. The phonology suggests the product of contraction over –*w*-. The derivational facts suggest that we should look in the verbal system, not the nominal, for a derivational base.

4.2.3. What if here too we had a Cl. III present? To a hypothetical *$kl'uwétar$ (: *lyukétar*, both with analogical palatalization) a regularly formed –*mo* adjective → *$kl'uwémo$. Since unstressed –*u*- in this position is phonotactically equivalent to –*ä*-, the form would amount to a *$kl'äwemo$, which will contract to precisely *klyomo*. Parallels are *yāmoṣ* < *-*äwΛs'*- and more closely *yolo* < *$yäwΛl$-V- < *$edu̯ol$-V- (: Hitt. *idālu* etc.).

4.2.4. The individual verbal system of *$\hat{k}leu̯$- all but predicts a Tocharian Cl. III/IV present. (This observation is strictly empirical and holds no matter what one's view of the exact origins of Cl. III/IV). Beside the common active pattern root aorist (Ved. *aśrot*) : nasal present (Ved. *śṛṇoti*), *$\hat{k}leu̯$- had an Indo-Iranian 'passive aorist' (Ved. *śrāvi*, OAv. *srāuuī*) and (probably) a stative-intransitive (OAv. *sruiie* 3sg.[8]), remade in the productive way[9] to Lat. *clueo*, SPic. **kduíú** (It. *klu-ē̆*-, deverbative –*eh₁*- stative); and cf. Latv. *sluv* (< * *sluvī*), *sluvet*. It is precisely to roots of this pattern that Toch. regularly shows a Cl. III/IV present (and a Cl. V subjunctive). Note for example Ved. *aroci* next to Toch. *lyuketär* (Lat. *lūceo* problematic on account of full-grade, which points to Proto-Ital.*$lou̯k$-$\bar{e}$- (causative-iterative); but could also be analogical), Ved. *aviśran* : Toch. *wikatär*. In Jasanovian terms we are dealing with reflexes of the same 'h₂e'-conjugation pattern:

aor. *$\hat{k}lóu̯$-e (Ved. *śrāvi*, OAv. *srāuuī*) : stat.intrans. pres. *$\hat{k}lu u̯ór$ (*sruiie*[?] < *$\hat{c}ru u̯ai$)
⇨ -*eh₁*-*i̯e/o*- in Italic

---

[8] So Hoffmann-Forssman; otherwise analysed as 1st sg. to derived passive *sruiia*- < *$\hat{c}ru$-$i̯á$- (: Ved. *śrūyáte*). The context (Y. 33, 7) admits of both analyses.

[9] I assume that the deverbative statives of Italic are made up of a nucleus of old stative-intransitives in *–*or* remade to the productive (denominal/deadjectival) -ē̆- type, e.g. *clueo* (below in text), *habeo* (: Go. *habaiþ*) etc. This remodeling may have hinged on *uideo* (: Ved. *vidé* [but note semantic difference] next to Greek pluperfect and subj./opt. forms in –*η*- [Also Welsh *gwydy-[at]* impf. 3sg. may contain a *$u\bar{e}d$-$\bar{\i}$- with –*ī*- < –*ē* < –*eh₁*]).

We may with some confidence add to the second column Toch. *klyäwetär (> klyotär*) in *klyomo < *kl'äwemo.*

And for another time: does the existence of such a present cast any light on A *klawas* : Gk. κλέομαι etc. (cf. Widmer MSS 1998, 171-84)?

5. *$\hat{k}lei$- and *$\hat{k}leu$-.

One may also note as a matter of curiosity the almost exact parallelism between the roots *$\hat{k}leu$- and *$\hat{k}lei$-.

> 1. Both have an active subsystem with root aorist patterning to nasal present.
>
> Ved. aor. *aśrot* : pres. *śṛṇoti*
> Ved. aor. *aśret* : YAv. pres. *–sirinaoiti*, Gk. κλῑ́νω etc.
>
> 2. Both have –s- forms (given as separate 's-erweitert' roots in LIV).
>
> Ved. √*sliṣ*
> Ved. *śrosan*, Toch. √ B *klyaus-* :A *klyos-*
>
> 3. *$\hat{k}leu$- has a 'stative-intransitive system' and we might assume one for *$\hat{k}lei$- on the basis of Toch. *klyemo* and Lat. *cliens*, as analyzed above.

Less interestingly:

> 4. Perfects to both roots in Greek and Indo-Iranian.
>
> 5. Both have causative-iteratives.
>
> 6. Only IIR. *$\acute{c}raiatai$ is unparalleled in *$\hat{k}leu$-. Perhaps reanalyzed root-aorist subjunctive?

Summary.

The analysis of *klyomo* given here has the following advantages:

a The semantics are good.

b The PToch. ǫ vocalism is explained without recourse to ad hoc sound changes or unlikely analogies.

c The account is founded on a well-attested derivational process.

d It assumes as derivational base a form all but predicted on any account of the Toch. Cl. III/IV present and its Indo-European stative-intransitive background.

Timothy Barnes
tbarnes@fas.harvard.edu