

М. Л. ГАСПАРОВУ-  
СТИХОВЕДУ  
IN MEMORIAM



*Составление и редакция  
М. В. Акимовой и М. Г. Тарлинской*



Издательский Дом ЯСК  
Языки славянской культуры  
Москва 2017

УДК 80/81

ББК 83.3

М 11

Работа над сборником осуществлена в рамках научного проекта, направленного на изучение западноевропейских источников отечественной словесности, поддержанного программой «Научный фонд Национального исследовательского университета “Высшая школа экономики”» в 2017 г.

М 11 М. Л. Гаспарову-стиховеде. In memoriam / Сост. и ред. М. В. Акимовой и М. Г. Тарлинской. — М.: Издательский Дом ЯСК: Языки славянской культуры, 2017. — 288 с. — *(Вклейка в конце книги.)*

ISBN 978-5-94457-286-8

Книга представляет собой сборник статей по истории и теории стиха и поэтического языка, написанных специально к 80-летию М. Л. Гаспарова. Материалом стал не только русский, но и голландский, немецкий, английский стих. Здесь можно найти статьи, развивающие новую теорию русского ямба; размышления о механизме связи между ритмом и рифмой в «Евгении Онегине»; серьезные опыты вслед за Гаспаровым применить статистику для решения вопросов атрибуции (тексты Шекспира), описания поэтического словаря, распознавания цитат.

Авторы статей — ведущие отечественные и зарубежные филологи и лингвисты.

УДК 80/81

ББК 81

ISBN 978-5-94457-286-8

© Авторы, 2017

© Издательский Дом ЯСК, 2017

М. Л. ГАСПАРОВУ-СТИХОВЕДУ.  
IN MEMORIAM

Корректор О. Круподер

Оригинал-макет и художественное оформление  
переплета подготовлены И. Богатыревой

Подписано в печать 17.07.2017. Формат 60×90 1/16.

Бумага офсетная № 1, печать офсетная. Гарнитура Times.

Усл. печ. л. 18. Тираж 600. Заказ №

Издательство «Языки славянской культуры»

№ госрегистрации 1037739118449.

Phone: 8 (495) 624-35-92 E-mail: Lrc.phouse@gmail.com

Site: <http://www.lrc-press.ru>, <http://www.lrc-lib.ru>

ООО «ИТДГК “Гнозис”»

Розничный магазин «Гнозис» (с 10-00 до 19-00)

Турчанинов пер., д. 4, стр. 2. Тел.: (499) 255-77-57

[itdkggnosis@gmail.com](mailto:itdkggnosis@gmail.com)

## СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

Предисловие редактора .....	5
<i>Vyacheslav V. Ivanov. Typology of Hittite, Luwian and Tocharian Archaic Accentuation Forms. ....</i>	7
<i>Е. В. Казарцев. К вопросу о взаимодействии метра и языка в процессе распространения ямбической версификации в Европе .....</i>	20
<i>А. В. Прохоров. Распределение междударных интервалов и проблема альтернирующего ритма .....</i>	34
<i>С. Е. Ляпин. Русский четырехстопный ямб: ритм и речевая норма . . .</i>	58
<i>Б. В. Орехов. Почему ошибался Жуковский: о внутритекстовых причинах метрических сбоев в «Одиссее» .....</i>	73
<i>А. М. Левашов. Трехиктный дольник Иосифа Бродского: к описанию новых ритмических форм .....</i>	90
<i>Barry P. Scherr. Analyzing Stanza Rhythm in Russian Poetry: A Brief History and Future Directions .....</i>	117
<i>Т. В. Никитина, Б. П. Маслов. Рифма и ритм в онегинской строфе (опыт квантитативной исторической поэтики) .....</i>	138
<i>Л. Л. Горелик. Лексико-грамматическая классификация рифм: на примере лирики Валерия Брюсова .....</i>	170
<i>И. А. Пильщиков. Авантекст как объект авторской лексикографии (несколько практических вопросов на примере словаря языка Батюшкова) .....</i>	190
<i>Д. К. Каримова. «Глаз» в зеркале «функционального тезауруса» английской поэзии XVI и XIX веков: семантика устойчивых связей 'eye' с существительными .....</i>	202
<i>М. В. Акимова. Цитата или клише в поэтическом тексте: попытка разграничения .....</i>	221
<i>М. Тарлинская. «Пере-вод»: как драмы Шекспира перекочевали из одной эпохи в другую .....</i>	255
<i>А. К. Жолковский. Поэзия грамматики и непереводаемость (Catullus, 85) .....</i>	280

## Предисловие редактора

Михаил Леонович Гаспаров был подобен человеку Возрождения. Античник, исследователь поэтики, переводчик с нескольких языков, автор-экспериментатор. Но все-таки главной его профессией и любовью было стиховедение. Авторы настоящего сборника — стиховеды, соратники и последователи Михаила Леоновича. Разумеется, каждый из нас шел своим путем и занимался своими темами, разрабатывая методологию, подходящую для своего материала и поставленных задач. Но мы все, как и Михаил Леонович, работаем в русле так называемого русского метода, мы все — индуктивисты, «полевые работники», применяющие статистику к анализируемым текстам.

Несколько слов об истории этого сборника. К 80-летию М. Л. Гаспарова была подготовлена книга в трех частях: в первую часть вошли неопубликованные произведения Михаила Леоновича, его переписка и мемуары о нем; во вторую — эссе и статьи, в центре которых — сам ученый; в третью — научные статьи по истории поэзии и по стиховедению. Однако в таком виде сборник получился слишком объемным. Редакторы приняли решение не сокращать его, а издать в виде двух книг. Первая из них содержит всё, кроме статей по стиховедению, и выходит в издательстве «Новое литературное обозрение», а вторая объединяет исключительно стиховедческие и лингвистические работы, которые вы сейчас и держите в руках. Это оказалось к лучшему: настоящий сборник является компактным и цельным по своей тематике и подходу и в этом смысле более всего напоминает *Festschrift*. Хотя сборники к восьмидесятилетию М. Л. Гаспарова выходят в разных издательствах и в разное время, редакторы воспринимают их как два тома единой по замыслу книги.

*Марина Тарлинская*

*Vyacheslav V. Ivanov*  
(Los Angeles / Moscow)

## **Typology of Hittite, Luwian and Tocharian Archaic Accentuation Forms**

In the article the use of the archaic accentual forms in the texts of the languages that had separated from Proto-Indo-European at an early date has been discussed.

### **1. Hittite (North Anatolian) accent**

In Anatolian systems of the cuneiform writing Pleneschreibung is a double spelling of vowels used to render a stressed and/or long syllable or the tone of a stressed syllable, see synchronic description and an internal reconstruction of the earlier state in [Eichner 1993; Kloekhorst 2010] (with the discussion of the use of the accentuated forms in Hittite metrics and the bibliography).

Old and Middle Hittite nominal forms make it possible to reconstruct a mobile paradigm of a heteroclitic noun:

Nom.-Acc. Sg. Neutr. g. *e-eš-ḫar* ‘blood’, Gen. Sg. *iš-ḫa-na-a-aš*, Dat.-Loc. *iš-ḫa-ni-i* corresponds to Vedic Nom.-Acc. Sg. *ásr-k(<asr-j)* ‘blood’, Gen.-Abl. *asnás*, cf. Latvian *asiņš* (generalized stem in *-n-* with a shift to the animate class and a derived type of nouns in *-i-*). A collective heteroclitic noun is close to a similar paradigm:

Nom.-Acc. Sg. *wa-a-tar* ‘water’, Dat.-Loc. Sg. *ú-i-te-e-ni*, Nom.-Acc. Coll. Neutr. g. (= Pl.) *ú-i-ta(/da)-a-ar* ‘quantity of water, portions of water’.

In a comparable Greek form *ὕδωρ* the stress was shifted from the last syllable to the initial one. The accent of the Hittite Dat.-Loc. 1a similar to that of the Vedic Loc. *udáni*.

An ancient noun in *-r*:

Old Hittite Dat.-Loc. *ki-iš-ša-ri-i* ‘in the hand’ corresponds to Greek *χείρι*. See the Internal reconstruction in [Kloekhorst 2010].

An ancient noun in *\*-m/-n*:

Old Hittite Nom.-Acc. Sg. Neutr. g. *te-e-kán* ‘earth’, Gen. *ták-na-a-aš*, loc. *ta-ga-a-an*. Greek Nom.-Acc. Sg. *χθών*, Gen. *χθονός*; Tocharian A *tkam*. The forms correspond to Indo-European amphikinetic and holokinetic types.

An old noun in *\*-men*:

Old Hittite Nom.-Acc. *la-a-ma-an* ‘name’, the corresponding Vedic form *nāma* has a stress on the first syllable.

Barytonic stem in *-s*:

Old Hittite Nom.-Acc. *ne-e-pí-iš* ‘sky’, Gen. *ne-e-pí-ša-aš*.

Old Indian *nábhas* ‘cloud’, Gen. *nábhasas*.

Greek *νέφος* ‘cloud’, Gen. *νέφους*. Compare Lithuanian dialectal accentual paradigm of the *i-* stem *debesis*, Gen. *debesies* with a barytonic type of intonation [Illich-Svitych 1963: § 22].

Nouns in *-u-*:

Old Hittite Nom.-Acc. *ta-a-ru* ‘tree; piece of wood’ corresponds to Old Indian *dāru* with the stress on the initial syllable, Greek *δόρυ*.

Old Hittite Nom.-Acc. *gi-e-nu* ‘knee’ corresponds to Old Indian *jānu*, Greek *γόνυ*.

Thematic nouns:

Old Hittite Acc. Pl. *pa-a-tu-uš* ‘feet’, Gen. Pl. *pa-ta-a-na* (‘but – a feet’) correspond to Greek *πόδας*, *ποδών*, Old Indian *padām* (with a final stress both in Greek and Old Indian).

Old Hittite Nom.-Acc. neutr. *pí-e-da(ta)-an* ‘place’, loc. *pí-e-di* correspond to Greek Nom.-Acc. *πέδον* ‘ground’.

Old Hittite verbal forms.

Pleneschreibung (double spelling of vowels used to render a stressed and/or long syllable or the tone of a stressed syllable) is found in the root syllables of the verbs of the *-mi-* conjugation (from the stems historically equivalent to durative or non-aoristic roots, 2 class of verbs in Sanskrit):

3 P. Sg. Pres. *ku-e-en-zi* ‘he is killing’ / 3 P. Pl. *ku-na-an-zi*

3 P. Sg. Pres. *e-eš-zi/za* ‘he/she/it is’; 3 P. Sg. Impv. *e-eš-tu* ‘let it be so’/  
3 P. Pl. Pres. *a-ša-an-zi* ‘they are’, 3 P. Pl. Impv. *a-ša-an-tu*. Correspondence to the forms of the Vedic verb *as-* ‘to be’ is striking:

Form	Hittite	Sanskrit	Indo-European
3 P. Sg. Pres. ‘he is killing’	<i>ku-e-en-zi</i>	<i>hánti</i>	* <i>g<sup>hw</sup>én-ti</i>
3 P. Pl. Pres. ‘they are killing’	<i>ku-na-an-zi</i>	<i>ghnánti</i>	* <i>g<sup>hw</sup>n-énti</i>
3 P. Sg. ‘he is’	<i>e-eš-zi</i>	<i>ásti</i>	*(H) <i>és-ti</i>
3 P. Pl. ‘they are’	<i>a-ša-an-zi</i>	<i>sánti</i>	*(H) <i>s-énti</i>
3 P. Sg. ‘let it be’	<i>e-eš-tu</i>	<i>ástu</i>	*(H) <i>és-tu</i>
3 P. Pl. ‘let them be’	<i>a-ša-an-tu</i>	<i>sántu</i>	*(H) <i>s-éntu</i>

Two last forms of the Imperative have correspondences in the other Anatolian languages showing that this scheme of the change of the place of the accent was common to all of them.

3 P. Sg. Pres. *e-ip-mi* ‘I am seizing’, 3 P. Sg. *e-ip-zi* / double spelling of *-a-* in the suffix of the pres. part. Nom. Pl. inanimate g. *ap-pa-a-an-t[e-e]š*.

## 2. Luwian (South Anatolian)

Luwian heteroclitic noun: *a-aš-ḫar-ša* ‘blood’ (see above on the Hittite form).

Luwian verbal forms.

A problem for the future study:

Preterite (Past) 1 P. Sg. *e-el-ḫa-a-ḫa* ‘I washed’ (a Luwian form in an Old Hittite ritual) < \**é[=ē]-* + the root *lH-* + *ā* (an accentuated stem suffix) + *-Ha* (ending of the 1 P. Sg. Past); the word is cognate to Luwian *laḫ-uni* ‘to wash off’, (with a loss of a laryngeal) *luwa-*, reduplicated *liluwa-* ‘pour’, Hittite *laḫ-* ‘pour’, *laḫuwai-*, reduplicated *liluwai-* ‘pour (to many vessels-an intensive form)’, Latin *lavo*, Greek *λῶω*, *ἐλὺθην*, *ἐλὺμενος*; is the Luwian initial stressed *é-* a trace of a syllable of reduplication?

Luwian change of a voiced aspirated stop to a geminate after the stressed initial short \*eDh > aDD (Čop’s law):

Luwian Nom.-Acc. Sg. *ta-ap-pa-aš-ša* ‘heaven’ corresponds to Old Hittite Nom.-Acc. *ne-e-pi-iš* ‘sky’.

In this paradigm there is an oxytonic Luwian form Dat.-Loc. Sg. *tap-pa-ši-i* (compare a similar structure of the Hittite *tag-ni-i* ‘in the earth’); a comparison to Church Slavonic *nebesi* = *HEBECI*, Lithuanian dialectal *debesij* can be suggested that needs a special explanation.

What is the scope of Čop’s law?

Luwian *ma-al-li* ‘honey’ corresponds to Hittite *mi-li-it*, Greek μέλι.

### 3. Hittite and Tocharian development of the Indo-European accent

#### HETEROCLITIC NEUTER NOUNS

In Tocharian B there was an accentual opposition of the Nom.-Acc. Sg. *yasar* ‘blood’ < \**ésHr* (see above on Hittite *e-eš-ḫar* ‘blood’) where the initial vowel had been preserved due to the old stress on it and the Plural (based on the old collective) form *yasār-a* with a stress on the suffix *-ār*, see above on Hittite *ú-i-ta(/da)-a-ar* ‘quantity of water, portions of water’, Greek ὕδωρ. In a new form an innovative Plural ending \**ā* > *a* loses the length in an unstressed position after a stressed suffix: \**esHōr* + \**-ā* > \**yās(H)ōr-ā* > *yasār-a*. In Tocharian A only an ancient collective form Acc.-Nom. Sg. *ysār* ‘blood’ has been preserved (with a new \**-n-* stem ending in Plural *ysār-ām*). Compare Hittite *éšḫar* with a meaning ‘bloody events’ in such Old Hittite texts as the document of the king Telepinu, Palaic *ešḫur*, Luwian *ášḫar* (with an interesting structural parallel: Luwian *ašḫar-ša*, Animated Neutr., Tocharian B Instrum. *yasar-sa*), Ancient Greek *éap*, Old Indian *asṛ-k*, Armenian *ariwn*, Latin *assy/er*.

The same set of forms is present in Tocharian B *puwar* ‘fire’ (a rare Hittite collective form *pa-aḫ-ḫu-wa-ar* = [*paḫḫuwar*], KUB VII 60 II 11; this collective form is different from a non-collective one as attested in Tocharian A *por*, Hittite *paḫḫur*, Luwian *pa-aḫ-ḫu-u-ur* with a final stress), Tocharian B Plural (based on the old collective) *pwār-a*. In Tocharian A the old heteroclitic neuter noun *por* (with a new Plural *por-ām*) has been preserved. It is explained by a regular Tocharian A change \**au* > *o*. Tocharian A *por* < \**paur* is historically identical to Hittite *pa-aḫ-ḫur* (with an initial stress). In Greek *πῦρ*, Old Norse *fýr* (English *fire*), Old Prussian *panno* ‘fire’ only some traces of the old system can be seen. Only Hittite and Tocharian have preserved the old category of heteroclitic Neuter nouns. But in Tocharian the type of the declension of each word has been changed.



Among other words of this type one may mention:

Tocharian A *ytār* < \**i-tōr* ‘way, road’ (originally with a final stress), B *ytārye*, Obl. Sg. *ytār-i* cognate to Hittite *i-tar* ‘going = way (of stars)’, an astronomic term derived from an ancient verb \**i-*), Latin *iter*, Gen. *itineris* (a transformed heteroclitic alternation of stems).

Tocharian B *war* ‘water’, A *wār* (with a change of the old morphonological structure) is cognate to Luwian *ú-wa-ar-ša* ‘by the water’(?) and *wa-a-ar-ša* ‘water’(?), Old Indian *vār* ‘water’.

### IE HETEROCLITIC TERMS FOR SEASONS IN TOCHARIAN

Tocharian B *ysāre* ‘wheat’, Tocharian A *wsār* and the Indo-European collective term for ‘spring/summer’.

According to the system of agricultural terms established by Klaus T. Schmidt Tocharian B *ysāre* has the meaning ‘wheat’; a related Tocharian A noun *wsār* means ‘a heap (of grain)’ (Tocharian B *y-* < \**w* ‘palatalized by a following front vowel that has disappeared). As previously suggested historical explanations are either phonetically difficult or semantically doubtful, one should prefer the connection to the Indo-European term for ‘spring/summer’ proposed by Huld and supported tentatively by Adams and in a much more resolute manner by Schmidt. According to the latter, Tocharian B *ysāre* designated wheat as cereals that were reaped in August and might have been called by a derivative from the Indo-European word for the ‘spring’. Besides a semantically and etymologically comparable derivation from the same root in Latvian *vasariņi* ‘a field with summer grain’ and *vasaras laiks* ‘the time of reaping of summer cereals’ one may also refer to similar Lithuanian names of the summer / spring grain and plants: Lithuanian *vasar-kvietis* ‘spring-sown wheat’, *vasar-ūg-is* ‘spring sprout’ (parallel Western Baltic formations from a different root: Old Prussian compounds *dag-o-gaydis* ‘spring-sown wheat’ and *dag-o-aug-is* ‘spring sprout’). Typologically identical Slavic forms have been derived from another word for ‘spring’ like Russian *яp-овoй* [yar-ovoy], *яp-овoе* [yar-ovoe] ‘spring-sown (seeds, grain)’, Old Russian *ЯРb* [yar] ‘the grain that has been sown in the spring of the year’ (Old Russian *ЯР-А* [yar-a] ‘spring’, Czech *jaro* cognate to the English *year*, German *Jahr*, Gothic *jer* ‘year’, Latin *hōrnus* < \**ho-yōr-i-nus*, Ancient Greek *ώρα* ‘time, season, year’, Cuneiform Luwian *āra-i-*, Hieroglyphic Luwian *a-ra* /*i* ‘time’ with Nostratic parallels related to Hungarian name of ‘spring’), Polish *jarz-yna* ‘bread sown in the spring’.

Tocharian A *wsār* ‘heap (of grain)’ and Tocharian B *ysāre* ‘wheat’ belong to the type of the ancient heteroclitic nouns from which in Tocharian only the stem of the Nominative-Accusative case in *-r* has been preserved. These Tocharian words correspond to Ancient Greek *ἔαρ* ‘spring’, Avestan *vahr-i*, Armenian *gar-un* ‘spring’ (with an unexplained root vocalism: a reduced grade *\*e/o*, schwa indogermanicum secundum?), Lithuanian *vasarà* ‘summer’, Latin *uēr* ‘spring’, Old Icelandic *vár*. A connection of Old Irish *errach* ‘spring’ to this stem although accepted by Pedersen (with a supposition of a loss of *\*-w-* and a normal development *\*-sr- > -rr-*) remains controversial.

In Tocharian there are no traces of a stem of oblique cases in *-n-* of the type of Old Indian *vas-an-t-a-*, Hittite *ḫammešḫant* < *\*ḫant-wesḫ-ant-* ‘spring = before-the-summer, prima-vera’, Slavic *\*ves-n-a* ‘spring’.

Tocharian A *wsār* ‘heap (of grain)’ is structurally identical to A *ysār* ‘blood’, B *yasar*.

Tocharian B *puwar* ‘fire’, Tocharian A *ytār* ‘road, way’. From the latter stem Tocharian B *ytār-ye* is built in a way that reminds of the relation between Tocharian A *wsār* ‘heap (of grain)’ and Tocharian B *ysāre* ‘wheat’.

Jaán Puhvel has supposed that the original stem *\*wesḫar* has been preserved in a Hittite compound *šuppi-wašḫar* (Sumerian logogram SAR) ‘pure leek’ for which he has reconstructed an initial meaning ‘pure spring-vegetable’; a translation ‘holy spring-vegetable’ > ‘holy onion’ is also possible, in a ritual text the skins of an onion are used metaphorically in connection to the magic of analogy:

KUB XXIX 7 rev. 28—31:

*ka-aš-wa ma-aḫ-ḫa-an šu-up-pí- wa-aš-ḫar<sup>SAR</sup> ḫu-ur-pa-aš-ta-az an-da ḫu-u-la-li -an-za nu a-ra-aš a-ra-an ar[-ḫa Ú-U]L tar-na-i i-da-la-u-wa-an-zi-ya NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM-ya ḫu-ur-ta-iš pa-ap-ra-an-na-a[n-z]a-ša [x] É.DINGIR-LIM šu-up-pí[-wa-aš-ḫa-na-a]š i-wa-ar an-da ḫu-u-la-li-ya-an ḫar-du ki-nu-na ka-a-ša ku-u-un šu-u[p-pí- w]a-aš-ḫar<sup>SAR</sup> ar-ḫa ši-ip-pa-nu-un*

(= Just as this onion is enclosed in leaves/skins and one does not let go of the other, (in the same way) in the manner of the on[ion] let the evil and the oath, the curse and the defiled keep the ... (of?) the temple enclosed!’ See now, I have peeled (?) this onion).

A corresponding heteroclititic stem in *-n-* is attested in oblique cases of this noun and in an Old Hittite compound *šuppi- wašḫa-n-alli-* ‘a bunch of onions’. This hypothesis seems to get support from the study of the two compounds in which *wašḫar* that is attested also separately in not clear contexts may designate a plant. In this case it is possible that the IE spring word had also a botanical agricultural meaning that has been partly preserved in Hittite, cf. above on **hammešhant** < \***hant-wesh-ant-** ‘spring = before-the-summer’.

The stem *wašḫar* found in Hittite corresponds formally to Old Indian *vasar-* ‘early morning, dawn’ found (as its Hittite equivalent) in compounds and long ago connected to the Indo-European term for ‘spring’ (a related stem is supposed to be continued in Nuristani terms for ‘day’, Ashkun *wās*). Through Hittite *wašḫar* structurally identical to the Sanskrit term this hypothetic link seems to be proven at least from a formal point of view.

Two types of the stems in *-r* have been reconstructed in the light of the recent studies that on the base of Hittite and Tocharian have revived Johannes Schmidt’s idea on the Indo-European collective nouns as a special grammatical category. It is supposed that the grammatical opposition of non-collective and collective nouns is formally expressed by a morphemic difference between the two stems with different ablaut grades and a corresponding accent of either the root or the suffix \**e/or* added to it (cf. states I and II according to [Benveniste 1935]).

The IE form can be reconstructed as: I \**wésH-ṛ/-n-* ‘a spring / (early) summer’ (a proterokinetic non-collective neuter noun with a full grade of the root vowel and a zero grade of the suffix): II \**usH-ē/ōr /-n-* ‘mass of things pertaining to the spring/ summer’ (a hystero kinetic collective neuter noun with a zero grade of the root vocalism and a lengthened grade of the vowel of the suffix).

#### TOCHARIAN WORD FOR ‘WINTER’

Although in the reconstructed Indo-European proto-language the names of the seasons belonged to a heteroclititic type with the interchange of the stems in *-r-* and *-n-* [Benveniste 1935: 19], in separate dialects usually only one of them has been generalized. In Tocharian the word for ‘winter’ has been discovered recently: it also has the stem in *-r-* as most of Indo-European heteroclititic nouns represented in Tocharian: Tocharian B *šimpriye* ‘winter’, *šimprāye* ‘pertaining to winter’, Tocharian A *šärme* ‘winter’ <

\**śām(ä)rāi-* comparable to the stem of Ancient Greek χειμέριος, χειμέριός ‘wintry’, Armenian *jmeṛn* ‘winter’, Latin *hibernus*.

The IE form can be reconstructed as IE I \**g'héi-m-* ~ \**g'héi-mr/-n-*: II \**g'hi-mé/ór/-n-*.

#### THE NAME OF THE EARTH

(for the original accent and the Hittite form see above)

Tocharian B *ken-tsa* — ‘on the earth’, literally ‘all the earth along’, Perl. Sg. of the noun *kem* ‘earth’, Toch. A *tkam*, A Pl. Nom. *tkan-i*, A Pl. Obl. *tkan-äs*; Toch. B Locative [Loc.] Sg. *ken- ne*, Adjective [Adj.] *ken-ašše* (Toch. A *tkam-ši*). In Tocharian B the Perlative case (expressing spatial expanding, enlargement) acquires a meaning close to that of the Locative of the noun entering an asyndetic combination with this Perlative form. In Toch. B name of the earth *kem/ken* the initial ‘decessive’ complex of consonants still preserved in Toch. A *tkam* and Hittite *tekan/dgan* ‘earth’ < I-E \**dhég'hom* has been simplified. The initial complex \**tk* > *k* in Toc. B as the original I-E \**dhg'h* changed either to \**g'h* (in Balto-Slavic) or to \**dh* (in Celtic). In Greek *χθων* the two-consonant group has been preserved, but the order of elements has been changed due to a metathesis \**dhg'h* > \**g'hdh* > *χθ*. Preservation of the original decessive complex is a common archaic feature of Hittite and Tocharian; the same sequence of elements and the same stem in final *-n-* as in Hit., Toch. (the same final consonant also in Celtic and Western Balt. - O Prussian; in most other languages \**-m-*) has been reflected in the Western Semitic name of a chtonic god *Dagan*: a borrowing is possible, but it seems difficult to establish a direction: from (dialectal) I-E to (Western ) Semitic (there is an article by Singer suggesting this direction) or vice versa.

*-n-* stem Neuter:

Tocharian B *ñem* (Pl. *ñemna* with the ending historically identical to Russian *ime-na*, имена), Tocharian A *ñom* (acrostatic type, [Adams 1999: 117], see on Hittite Nom.-Acc. *la-a-ma-an* ‘name’ above).

#### THEMATIC NOUNS

Animate > M Gender

\**ék'wo-* ‘horse’ (IE barytonic type reconstructed on the base of the Old Indian Vedic *aśva-s* ‘horse, stallion’, Germanic \**éhwaz* > Old Norse *jór*,

Old English *eah*, cf. [Illich-Svitych 1963: § 4: 23]; the South Anatolian barytonic type of a *satəm* variant of the word is reflected also in the Cuneiform Luwian spelling *a-aš-šu-* and in the absence of a syncope in Lycian (Late Luwian) *esbe* < \**eswe* < *ek'wo-* [Melchert 1994: 326]).

	Proto-IE	Proto-Tocharian	Tocharian B	Tocharian A
Nom.Sg.	*ék'wo-s	*yākwe		
Acc.Sg.	*ék'wo-N (= *m/-n)	*yākwe(ñ)	yakwe	yuk
Nom. Pl.	*ék'w-oy	*yākwäy	yakwi	yuk-añ
Acc.Pl.	*ék'wo-n-s	*yākwens	yakwem (= n)	yuk-as

On the base of Tocharian B (Kuchean) *yakwe*, A *yuk* 'horse' it is possible to reconstruct PreProto-Tocharian \*yékwos < \*ék'wos with a secondary development of the initial \*y- similar to a beginning of the word in Eastern Iranian Ossetic (but absent in Scythian), Mundzhan, Yidga, Vakhana and North Western Iranian Ormuri (where in other cases it alternates with *h-* and *w-*, and thus may be compared to the same initial prothetic *h-* in the name of horse in North Western Iranian Kurd, Beludzhi and Dardic Kala-sha and to *w-* in Nuristani Kati). One may think that the appearance of the new phoneme \*y- (/w-/h-) in the initial was an areal process common to Tocharian and some Iranian dialects of the same Central (Eur)Asiatic linguistic zone; if there was an initial laryngeal it had been lost before that process started. The non-stressed final syllable lost the last consonant of the ending and was reduced in Tocharian B and dropped in A. The old palatal stop + \*w developed into the group \*kw (coinciding with old labiovelars) that was preserved in B but developed into -uk in Tocharian A after the loss of the final vowel: \*yek'wos > \*yāk'we (with a characteristic palatal quality of the whole word typical of Tocharian) > \*yākw > *yuk*. The possibility to express the old combination *k + w* both by *kw* (in Tocharian B) and by *uk* (Tocharian A *yuk* sometimes written in Brahmi with a subscript *u*: *y<sub>u</sub>k*) may hint at a tendency towards its monophonematic interpretation. The combination of the palatal stop + *w* constitutes the main problem in the phonological history of the word. Theoretically in the oldest period of the history of the *centum* dialects three different types of segments may be opposed to one another:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &*k' + *w \\
 &*k + *w \\
 &*k^w
 \end{aligned}$$