



HAL
open science

The development of the TB adjectives suffixed in -ṣke/-śke 1

Athanaric Huard

► **To cite this version:**

Athanaric Huard. The development of the TB adjectives suffixed in -ṣke/-śke 1. Tocharian in Progress Online Conference, Dec 2019, Leiden, Netherlands. hal-03356380

HAL Id: hal-03356380

<https://hal.science/hal-03356380v1>

Submitted on 28 Sep 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



The development of the TB adjectives suffixed in *-ške/-śke*¹

Athararic Huard (EPHE, PSL / ERC HisTochText²)

Tocharian in Progress Online Conference, Leiden University, December 8–10, 2020 (revised version)

This publication belongs to the research conducted under the HisTochText project. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 788205).

- Scope: adjective formations, study of a small class of adjectives derived with the following suffixes:
 - *-śke*: *amiśke* ‘despondent’, *tallāñciśke** ‘miserable’; *lykaśke* ‘small’, *wlaiśke* ‘tender, soft’;
 - *-ške*: *lalaṃške* ‘soft’; *añmālaške* ‘compassionate, pitying’;
 - *-rške*: *klänkarške** ‘wavering’, *pällarške* ‘praiseworthy’, *pautarške* ‘caressing, pleasant’, *mäntarške* ‘short’, *mällarške* ‘soft’, *takarške* ‘serene, pure; faithful’, *nekarške* ‘pleasant’.

NB: As shown by Winter 1961 and Itkin 2016, the TA adjectives *läläṃške** and *potarške** are borrowings from TB.
- Problems:
 - These adjectives are linked to a nominal diminutive suffix *-śke* (e.g. *Kercapiśke*, *kokalyiśke*), which was explained as a borrowing from an Iranian diminutive. So how could we explain the spread of this suffix to adjectives and the variants *ş ~ ś* ?

¹ I am very grateful to Chams Bernard, Georges-Jean Pinault and Nicholas Sims-Williams for discussing several points addressed in this presentation.

² This publication belongs to the research conducted under the HisTochText project. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 788205).

- The subclass of *-rške* is productive as deverbative adjectives (e.g. *māntarške* ‘short’ (cf. Peyrot 2016:204) ← *māntā-* ‘to stir, to destroy’). What have these adjectives in common with the other adjectives in *-ške/ške* and how the growth of this class can be explained?
- Some of these words translate important Buddhist concepts: *añmālaške* = Skt. *kāruṇika-* ‘compassionate’ and *takarške* = Skt. *prasanna-* ‘pure, clear; faithful’. In which extent is this suffix linked to Buddhist Tocharian terminology and phraseology? Are they different suffixes or should be taken together as variants? In the latter case, how should this alternation *ś ~ ś* be accounted for?

I. The origin of the *-ške/ške* suffix(es)

- It is clear that these suffixes should at least partly connected to the Iranian suffix of Kaniška and the Khotanese diminutive *-ška/škā* as was first proposed by Bailey, then by Klingenschmitt 1975 and lastly Sims-Williams 2002:237-2.
- According to Sims-Williams 2002:237-2, this suffix comes the combination of two diminutive suffixes **-iča-k(k)a-* (> Parthian *-ičak* and Sogdian *-c'kk*). In an unattested Iranian language, this suffix was syncopated and simplified to **čk > *šk*.
- The earliest attestations are the names of Kušan kings: Kaniška (κανησκο), Huviška (οοησκο), Vasiška (βαζησκο); also Kuzgašk (κοζγασκο) and Sadaskano.
- In TB, *-ške* is attested in proper names (*kercapiške*, *lariška*, etc.), in common names for small beings (*kālyške* ‘young brahmin’, *śamaške* ‘boy’), and in adjectives. According to Pinault 2015:176-77, the suffix spread from an hypocoristic attached to proper names, but there is no necessity to assume such a specialized meaning.

NB: as in Khotanese, this suffix is limited to Late Khotanese it could have been borrowed from TB, or from another Iranian language (Pinault 2015:175; Degener 1989:312).

- For the variant *-ške*, considered as an adjectival suffix, two scholars proposed a separate origin:
 - According to Hilmarsson 1996:141, *-ške* is a second member compound reinterpreted as an adjectival suffix: < action noun **-šākæ* ‘stepping, treading’, from the root *sikā-* ‘to step’ (cf. *šiko* ‘step’). The first member is an abstract in *-ār* < **-r*. Thus: *klänkarške* ‘doubtful’ [sic] < **klänkä´r+šākæ* ‘stepping into doubt, turning to doubt’ and *māntarške* ‘evil’ [sic] < **‘stepping into evil, turning to evil’*.
 - According to Pinault 2015:178, one should start from **-šākæ* ‘following, aiming at’ < **sek^wos-* or **sek^w-ó-*. Thus: *lalaṃške* ‘soft’ < **lālan-šākæ* ‘close to caressing’ > ‘soft, tender’ and *tparške* ‘shallow’ (built on *tapre* ‘high’) < **‘almost high’* or ‘aiming at height’.

II. A single diminutive suffix

- However, there are several reasons to assume that both *-ške* and *-ške* are variants of the same diminutive suffix:
 - 1) no clear distribution nominal diminutive *-ške* vs. adjectival *-ške*;
 - 2) both share the same inflection which is highly peculiar in TB;
 - 3) in the two only cases in which we have both the base adjective and the suffixed one, the meaning of the suffix can be explained as a diminutive, not as conveying an approximative or a inchoative meaning.

1) **No clear distribution** between adjectival *-ške* and nominal *-ške*:

Table 1³

Nouns suffixed in <i>-ške</i>	Adjectives suffixed in <i>-ške</i>
<i>larašk(e)</i> (vs. <i>lariška</i>), <i>cayaška*</i> , <i>turkaška</i> , <i>yurpāška*</i> <i>yäkwaške*</i> ‘small horse’, <i>šamāške*</i> ‘small boy’ (vs. <i>šamaške</i>)	<i>wlaiške</i> ‘tender, soft’ (vs. <i>lalamške</i> ‘soft’), <i>lykaške</i> ‘small’, <i>amiške</i> ‘despondent’, <i>tallāñciške*</i> ‘miserable’

2) **Both suffixes share the same inflection**

- Both suffixes share in the masculine the same inflection that is unique within the nominal morphology. It combines an *-e* < **-o* from the thematic inflection with the plural of the nasal inflection Obl.pl. *-aṃ* < **āns* < **ōns* (type *oṅkolmo*, *oṅkolmañ*):

Table 2⁴

	Masculine <i>-ške</i> declension			Masculine <i>-ške</i> declension		
	Sg.	Dual	Pl.	Sg.	Dual	Pl.
Nom.	<i>ami-šk-e</i>	[<i>šamä-šk-ane</i>]	<i>lyka-šk-aṃ</i>	<i>mällar-šk-e</i>	(<i>la</i>) <i>läṃ-šk-i</i>	<i>takar-šk-aṃ</i> [<i>šamä-šk-añ</i>]
Obl.	<i>lyka-šk-eṃ</i>	[<i>saiwi-šk-ane</i>]	<i>tallāñci-šk-aṃ</i>	<i>mällar-šk-eṃ</i>	(<i>l</i>) <i>alam-šk-i</i> <i>lalam-šk-ane</i>	<i>lalam-šk-aṃ</i>

- Here we have two problems to address, the dual and the ending of the N.pl:

3 References: *laraške* (SI P 139.d b1(I); *lariška* THT 465 a2; *cayaška** PK AS 14.2 b6; *turkaška* THT 1397.n b2; on *yurpaška** see Ching and Ogihara 2013:106-107; *yäkwaške** ‘small horse’ (THT 352 a2), *šamāškañ* ‘small’ THT 514 b1 (vs. normal form *šamaške*).

4 References, for the first line: THT 127 a6 (class.); THT 1248 a4 (arch.); THT 92 b4 (class.); PK AS 7J b1 (class.); PK NS 83 b3 (arch.); PK NS 107 b3 (class.) and THT 514 b1 (arch.); for the second line: PK AS 5B a1 (class.); PK NS 83 b3 (arch.); THT 273 a5 (arch.); IOL Toch 68 a5 (class.); IOL Toch 764 b2 (class.) and THT 386 a5 (class.); PK AS 13 F a3 (class.).

- Problem of the depalatalization of final *-ñ*, treated in full length by Michaël Peyrot 2008:78-84. All attested adjectival N.pl.m. are in *-am* but there is no attestation in archaic texts. Looking at the nouns, there is one case of N.pl. *-ñ* in an archaic text, which suggests we have to deal with a phonetic rule.
- No clear distribution of the dual endings *-i* and *-a-ne* (interpreted, respectively as the masculine dual ending (< **-o_ih₁*), and the feminine one (< *(i)yāyā* < **(i)h₂-ih₁*) by Hilmarrson 1989:19-29). Probably both are analogical formations after the singular or the plural:
 - arch.: *(la)lämški* (on *saiwiškane*, obl. du. m.), PK NS 83 b3;
 - class.: *(l)alamški* (on *(p)ai(n)eś*), IOL Toch 764 b2; *lalamški* (on *paine*, obl. du.), PK AS 13A a5; *lalamški* (on *šarne*), THT 23 a7; *lalamškane* (on *praroñ*, alt.) THT 74 a6, *lalamškane* (on *painesa*, alt.), THT 386 a5
 - Nouns in archaic texts: Obl.du.m. *saiwiškane*, PK NS 83 b3; *šamäškane*, THT 1248 a4; *šeyyiškane* THT 3597 b4.

3) The meaning of both suffix can be accounted for as a diminutive.

- Most adjectives with these suffixes are lexicalized. In only two cases, both the base word and the suffixed adjective are attested: *tallāñciške** on *tallā_u* ‘miserable’ and *tparške* on *tapre* ‘high’.
- *tparške* means ‘shallow’ (said of water) in all of its three occurrences, and it correspond to Skt. *uttāna-*. See e.g. in the adaptation of the *Varṇārḥavarṇastotra*:

(Ex. 1) *snai ptsa kätkre ra tparškemem tparške (mäsketär)*

“Even the bottomless deep (becomes for you) the shallowest of the shallow”

sugambhīram api jñeyam uttānottānam eva te

“selbst das tiefgründigste Erkennbare liegt völlig offen für dich da”

(SI P 2 b4; tr. Pinault 2016:16; VAV III 17 ; tr. Hartmann 1987:149)

- Previous semantic explanation: < ‘little deep’ (Adams 2013:297), but this would be anachronistic; < *‘almost high, aiming at height’ (Pinault 2015:178), which is close to approximative value that diminutive suffixes could adopt (Jurafsky 1996:547).
- The concept of “highness” could be conceived as 1) referring to a position; 2) to a scale of the vertical dimension. In this context, one should rather start from the second alternative. Thus it we should likely start from a literal diminutive value.
- The reference of scale for adjectives or phrases describing the level of water is the body water itself. Thus, adjective referring to small dimensions can refer to low waters:
 - Greek βράχεια ‘shallow water’, substantivized neuter of βραχύς ‘short’;
 - Latin *tenuis aqua* ‘shallow water’, lit. ‘thin water’.
- To conclude, an adjective *‘little high [water]’ would naturally mean ‘shallow [water]’.

- *tallāñciške** is used two times in the same text. Here is the whole passage after the metrical reconstruction and the translation (with some modifications) of Peyrot 2013:368:

(Ex. 2) *snai keś wā wes | cī saim yāmoṣ / tallāñciškaṃ* [28a]

*pātār mātār | rīntsānte pest | ciṣc sīkāṃā*⁵ [28b]

(mästa) [b1] *no tve | rīne räme(r) | n(e)rvvāṅṣai pest* [28c]

orästa wes | kleśānmāṣṣeṃ | sānānts śwātsi 28

(wināške_u -) [b2] *cā | erepāte | tsātsaikarne* [29a]

nno =ntwe / te mänt pärmānk | mäsketār nī [29b]

wes wā {n}nai (tne | yolai)ñ mākā | yekte-perni [29c]

yust-me wā {n}nai | tallāñciškaṃ | mā west-meśca 29

“Albeit in countless numbers we have made you our refuge, we abandoned our poor⁶ father and mother [and] we stepped towards you, you quickly went away to the *nirvāṇa* city [and] you left us as food to the *kleśa* enemies 28. I (honor) you in [your] beauty and shape [= in your statue (?)]. «He [= Maitreya] will arise then», thus is my hope. For we are very evil here and of little worth; you turn towards us miserable ones, [but] you don’t speak to us.” (THT 273a5-b5; tr. after Peyrot 2013:368)

- Here a speaking “we”, representing the devotee, complain about the disappearance of Śākyamuni, and find a consolation in the future advent of Maitreya. In the second stanza, this “we” is probably dramatically staged as standing before a statue of the Buddha (*erepāte tsātsaikar**, cf. e.g. Pāli *loharūpa*- ‘statue of bronze’) which is turned towards the devotee but cannot speak.
- Thus the text insists on the despondency of the devotee grieved by the absence of Śākyamuni. The suffix of *tallāñciške* has clearly a nuance of affection and pity since it commutes with *lāre* in similar phrases: *śaul nī lāre päst rinaṣṭe* ‘I have to abandon my dear life’ (THT 25 a8, see also THT 220 a4); or with a diminutive: *mākte ai(sk)au (uttareṃ nā)kte-yokām säsuwer(śk)eṃ amāskai rilye* ‘How [should] I give (Uttara), my divine little son, who is difficult to abandon’ (THT 85 a6 and PK NS 355 a4).
- This is a frequent value endorsed by diminutive suffixes as in e.g. Latin *misellus* ‘poor, wretched’, French *pauvret*, or Classical Persian *miskīnak* ‘poor, wretched’ on *miskīn* ‘poor wretched’ (Chams Bernard, personal communication).

5 Meter (4x12, 4/4/4). Peyrot reads *ciṣc-īkā*, but some traces of *akṣara* can be seen. In ligature with *ṣc*, a vertical stroke that can belong to a <ma>, a <sa>, or a <pa> can be seen. At the edge of the manuscript, one can see the left side of an rectangular *akṣara* that could only be <pa> or <ma>. Given that we expect a 1st pers. pl., the latter is more likely. As for the verb, the verb *sikā*- ‘to step’ would fit both the meter and the context (constructed with the allative in THT 3 b6). Hence my reading: *ciṣc [s]īk(·)ā[ma]*.

6 One can hesitate on the status of *tallāñciškaṃ* en a5, namely if it depends of *pātār mātār* (Adams 2013:299) or of the subject *wes* (Peyrot 2013:398). The meter would favor the first hypothesis, but one has to assume depalatization of the final nasal in an archaic text, which is still possible. The second option would better fit the ending. Besides in these contexts, the epithet is rather on the beings that are abandoned: *śaul nī lāre päst rinaṣṭe* ‘I have to abandon my dear life’ (THT 25 a8, see also THT 220 a4), *(la)lämṣki saiwiṣkane rintsātai snai eñkāl nāktā* ‘you left these two sweet boys, [showing] no attachment, o lord’ (PK NS 83 b3).

III. Further arguments for a borrowing

- Since these two forms seem to be variants of the same suffix, how can we explain this variation? Both cluster are attested elsewhere, even if the *šk* cluster is rarer and likely come from secondary syncope and borrowings: *škas*, *aškār*; *eṃške*, *peške*, *koško*.

1) An explication of variants *-ške/śke*

- Klingenschmitt's explanation (1994:371, fn. 106): the original variant *-śk-* was dissimilated in contact of *r* (e.g. *tparške* < **tparśke*). This dissimilation was blocked when a palatal sibilant was in the word as in *śanmirśke*, *śerśka*. But there are numerous counter-examples: *lalaṃške*, *m(ñ)cuške*, *paitārśke*, etc.
- Sims-Williams posits two stages of development for the suffix **-č(a)k-* > *-čk-* > **-šk-*. As in TB *ck* > *šk*, cf. *ywārc* 'in the middle' + *kā* > *ywārcka* and *ywārśka* (Peyrot 2008:77, fn. 88), borrowings at two stages can be assumed:
 - Iranian **-č(a)k* → TB **-ck-* > *-śk-*
 - Iranian (Bactrian) **-šk* → TB *-šk-* (cf. Skt. *kaniška-*, TB *kanaške*, Khotanese *kaṇaiška-*).
- Evidence for this hypothesis in an archaic text:

(Ex. 3) */// (śai)ṣṣe ' tāñwas lareṃ soyñcka(ṃ) ramt 6*
"you [pl.] loved the world like dear sons. 6."⁷ (THT 226 a1)

2) Hypothesis for the origin of the inflection

- The paradigm is unique in Tocharian nominal morphology and is difficult to explain within the history of Tocharian:

	Sg.	Pl.
N.	<i>-šk-e</i>	<i>-šk-añ /-šk-aṃ</i>
Obl.	<i>-šk-eṃ</i>	<i>-šk-aṃ</i>

- Hilmarsson (1989:85) proposed the following explanation: 1) there is an affinity of the collective with the diminutive, 2) one should start from the ending of a collective singular **-ā*

⁷ End of a meter of 4x25 (5 / 5 / 8 / 7). Thomas following Sieg and Siegling 1953:135 emends *tāñk-ṣ* to *tāñk-ṭ* and interprets it as the 2sg. pers. subjunctive of the verbe *tāñkwā(ññ)*:- "Die Welt wirst du lieben wie ein liebes Söhnlein" (Thomas 1968:205). But as several verbs with a present XII are paired with a prt I (cf. *kāskam*, *kāskānte*; *kawāññentār*; *kawāte-ne*; *klāntsan-ne*, *klyantsa*; *māntam*, *mantāre*), there is no need to do so and this form can be interpreted as the expected 2pl. prt. of this verb. Besides the correction required for *śoñcka* to *śoṃśkem* can be avoided by interpreting the words as a plural with an *anusvāra* concealed by the mud.

< **h*₂; 3) this ending was then reinterpreted as a neuter plural and a new singular was built using the vowel *-e*.

- However: 1) there is no affinity between “collective” and diminutive suffixes. On the contrary, a collective suffix should have rather an augmentative status (Jurasky 1996:545), as in the Romance nouns descendant of Latin *-ālia*, cf. French *mangeaille* ‘big meal’ vs. *manger* ‘normal meal’; 2) Hilmarsson probably thought of the diminutives of Germanic languages which produce neuter nouns, but this is not a cross-linguistic widespread feature. Besides it entails the existence of the neuter singular as a category.
- Alternatively, one could assume that in plural the inflection of nasal stems of *oñkolmo* type was taken over, but no obvious motivation is available. On the other hand, the nasal inflection seems to characteristic of adjectives, as in the types *lāre*, *lareñ* ‘dear’, or *läkle-lyakāñ* ‘who see the suffering’. However:
 - This inflection is also shared by the *-ś/ške* nouns, cf. *śamaškañ*;
 - According to this hypothesis, one would rather expect an inflection like *śrāddhe*, *śraddheñ* ‘faithful’.
- Tentative hypothesis: this peculiar inflection could explained through the borrowing process, since the descendant of the thematic inflection in several Middle Iranian languages opposites a weak vowel in the singular to an /a/ in the plural. This, through reanalysis, could have been rendered in TB as an opposition between *-e* in the singular and *-añ/-aṃ* in the plural, since the *-añ* plural is the only inflection pattern with an /a/ vowel in which we find masculine nouns.⁸

Table 3⁹

	Tocharian B		Khotanese <i>-a</i> stems	
	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.
Nom.	<i>-šk-e</i>	<i>-šk-añ /-šk-aṃ</i>	<i>-ä < -*a</i>	<i>-a < *-ā</i>
Obl./Acc.	<i>-šk-eṃ</i>	<i>-šk-aṃ</i>	<i>-u < *-om</i>	<i>-a < *-ā</i>

- First difficulty: One can retort to this hypothesis that borrowings from Iranian with the *-ike* suffix do not show a similar inflection, but have a *-i* plural¹⁰:
 - TB *kamartike* ‘lord’, N.pl. *kamartiki* (THT 65 a2) ← Bactrian *καμρδο* ‘chief’, according Pinault 2002:262-264, or from another Iranian language (Peyrot 2015);

⁸ Alternatively, N. Sims-Williams suggested to me that one could think of an Iranian language that have generalized the old gen. pl. (forms such as *-ān*) as a general plural, which would directly explain the TB forms.

⁹ The data are taken from Emmerick 1968:251.

¹⁰ I leave the TA aside since these terms were possibly borrowed from TB into TA, or at least influenced by TB, see Winter 1961:276. This would be further supported by the fact that they have a plural in *-āñ* different from the inherited thematic nouns.

- TB *spaktanike* ‘servant’, N.pl. *spaktanīki* (IOL Toch 215 b3) ← Bactrian *σπαχτανιγο, as TB *spaktām* < *σπαχτανο, cf. σπαχτανιου ‘who should obey’ (Tremblay 2005, 436 <ith references);
- TB *aṣanike* ‘worthy’, N.pl. *aṣanīki** (Obl. pl. *aṣanīkem*, THT 375 b1), cf. *aṣām* borrowed from Khotanese *āṣāno* ‘worthy, arhant’ or Bactrian αζανο (Tremblay 2005:436, with references). For the inflection, see Peyrot 2008:110 *contra* TEB.
- However, these loans are from the Tocharian point of view not analyzable. In contrast, *-ś/ške* is a productive TB suffix and has a distinctive shape that could resist analogical pressure.
- Second difficulty: the flexion of the diminutive/caritative of *appaka* ‘dear father!’. Most of the attestation of this suffix are vocatives, but *naumikkane* ‘small jewels’ suggests an inflection close to that of *-ške* (Pinault 2011:180-83). However, they are very rare and the inflection of the suffix is difficult to reconstruct:
 - N.sg. *appakke* (THT 83 a4) Voc. *appakka* on *āppo** ‘father’ (Voc.sg. *āppa*, Obl.sg. *āppai*);
 - Voc.sg. *larekka* on *lāre* ‘dear’;
 - Voc.sg. *ammaki* ‘dear mother’;
 - Dual.Obl. *naumikkane* (THT 33 b1) on *naumiye* ‘jewel’;
 - Obl.sg. *tanākkai* (PK AS 2A a2) on *tāno* ‘grain’ (flexion maybe influenced by *witsako* ‘root’, *tvānkaro* ‘ginger’);
 - Proper names: *palāk(k)e* (SI P 117 a6), *korakke* (SI B Toch 12 a3), Obl.sg. *korakem* (K DA M 507.37 and 36 a14). G.sg. *purmakki* (SI P 139.d b2i). But several names come from Skt. *pālaka*- ‘guardian’, *pūrṇa*- ‘full’, *pūrṇaka*- ‘the blue jay’.
- Thus the only evidence is *naumikkane*, but since this form seems exceptional, it could have been influenced by the inflection of *-ške*.

3) Cases of peculiar inflections in loanwords

- Gen.sg. TB *-ñ* and TA *-y* only attested in borrowed proper names in *-i*, *-u*, and *-a*, although a genitive *-ntse* was possible. The TB *-ñ* ending can be related to the pronominal ending of TB *tañ*, *ṣañ*, eventually to the causal. Pinault 2008:488 compares the Middle Indic Dat.sg. *-āya* (assuming that in TB **y* > *ñ* by hyper-correction). But the TA *-y* could independently be explained as an extension of the *-i*-genitive. Influence of the Middle Indic G.sg. *-ino* could also be considered, according to the following scenario: Middle Indic borrowed as **-inā*, lined up as **-iñā* according to *tañ* and *ṣañ* in order to differentiate it from the accusative:

Table 4 ¹¹			
	Tocharian B	Tocharian A	Middle Indian (Pāli; other forms)

11 References, for TB *araṇemi*: THT 78 a6; 91 b5; 77 a4; for TB *yaśodhara*: THT 109 b3; PK AS 15A b7; PK AS 15C b4; for TA *iṣavaku*: A 153 a3; for TA *bhādrā*: A 58 b2; 188 b4; 58 a5; for Middle Indian: Hinüber 2001:147-150.

	-i nouns	-a nouns	-u nouns	-ā nouns	-i stems	-ā stems
N.sg.	<i>aranemi</i>	<i>yaśodhara</i>	<i>ikṣvāku*</i>	<i>bhādrā</i>	<i>aggi</i> ; Pkt. <i>aggī</i>	<i>mālā</i>
Acc.sg.	<i>aranemiṃ</i>	<i>yaśodharai</i>	<i>ikṣvāku*</i>	<i>bhādrāṃ</i>	<i>aggiṃ</i>	<i>mālaṃ</i>
G.sg. / D.sg.	<i>aranemiñ</i>	<i>yaśodharañ</i>	<i>ikṣvākuy</i>	<i>bhādrāy</i>	<i>aggino, aggisso</i>	<i>mālāya</i> ; Pkt. <i>mālāe</i>

- TAB Gen.sg. -i for proper names borrowed from Sanskrit -a stems. Here also a TB -ntse genitive could have been adopted. The -i genitive is also attested in kinship terms: *pātri*, etc.
 - Since at an earlier stage, nouns were borrowed from Middle Indic with a weak final vowel, borrowed in TB as -ā. The borrowed nouns may have adopted the ending of the kinship terms, because these ones had in the oblique a similar ending (Obl.sg. *pātār* or *pātrā*), and this ending was marked [+human] in comparison to the ending *-nsæ (or rather refers to “institutional persons” according to Pinault, personal communication).
 - Alternatively, if the kinship term were paired with proper nouns as epithet, an analogical transfer could be considered: **kāśyap pātri* → *kāśyapi pātri* ‘for your father Kāśyapa’.

	TB	TA	Middle Indian (Pāli; other forms)
Nsg.	<i>maitrāk*</i> or <i>maitreya</i>	<i>kāśyap</i>	<i>putto</i> ; Māgādhi <i>putte</i> ; Gāndhārī -u, -o, -a
Acc.sg.	<i>maitrāk</i> or <i>maitreyeṃ</i>	<i>kāśyap</i> or <i>kāśyapāṃ</i>	<i>puttaṃ</i> ; Gāndhārī -u, -o, -a
G.sg.	<i>maitreyi</i>	<i>kāśyapi</i>	<i>putassa</i> ; Gāndhārī <i>puttaṣa</i>
D.sg. (final meaning)			<i>puttāya</i> ; Aśoka edict (Shāhbāzgarhī) <i>aṭhāye</i>

- Plural in -nta for loanwords ending in -i referring to animate beings although among native vocabulary this class only includes nouns referring to inanimate things:
 - *ṣaḍvarginta* (PK AS 18B b3) of *ṣaḍvargi** borrowing from Skt. *ṣaḍvargīya-* ‘belonging to the group of six [bad monks]’;
 - *kāṣṣinta* (THT 11 b4) of *kāṣṣi* ‘teacher’ perhaps borrowed from Iranian;
 - *maharṣinta* (THT 107 b3) of *maharṣi* borrowing of Skt. *maharṣi-* ‘great sage’;
 - (*cakra*)*vartinta* (THT 2665 b2) of *cakravartti* from Skt. *cakravartin-* ‘universal ruler’.

12 References, for TB *maitreya/maitrāk*: PK AS 13C b6; THT 74 b1 and IOL Toch 271 b3; THT 1573.k a6; for TA *kāśyap*: A 255 a5; 255 a8 and 332 b7; 226 a2; for Middle Indian, Hinüber 2001:139. One could also consider TB *kāśyap(e)*: *kāśyape* (PK AS 15J b7); *kāśyap* (IOL Toch 273 a3) and *kāśyapem* (IOL Toch 263 b4); (*kā*)*śya(pi)* (THT 25 b1).

- This is probably to be explained by the fact that all nouns with a N.sg. *-i* have a plural in the nominal classes II.1, c (*reki, rekauna*); II, 2 (*nāki, nakanma*), and III (*keni, keñinta, or ek(a)ñi, ekñinta*), cf. Hartmann 2013:404-405. This was apparently the only available pattern for a borrowing with an *-i* nominative. The ending *-iñ* is restricted to agent nouns in second member of compounds (type *kärtse-yamiñ*). The plural *poyśinta* is analogical of *käşşinta*.

IV. The development of the suffix in the history of Tocharian B

- We should explain this small class with a suffix was originally a diminutive; but several members of this class are obviously not diminutive in the strict sense and the different ranges of use of this suffix should be clarified.
- Due to lack of time, I will adopt a thematic approach and propose 4 factors that concurred to the development of this class:
 - 1) semantic factor: the extension of this suffix on synonyms (and even in antonyms);
 - 2) stylistic factor: peculiar use of this suffix in the literary language and in *stotras*;
 - 3) morphological factor: the creation of a productive subclass of deverbative adjectives in *-rşke*;
 - 4) terminological factor: this suffix was used to create a specific Buddhist terminology, partly calquing the Indic *-ka* suffix.

1) Semantic factor

- Looking at sources, there are several cases in which adjectives suffixed in *-ś/şke* are enumerated together. Many terms of the corpus mean ‘soft, pleasant, delightful, vel sim.’. This suggests that the suffix spread through synonymy; see: TB *wlaiśke* ‘tender’ vs. TA *wlyep; lykaśke* ‘small, fine’ vs. TA *lykäly*.

(Ex. 4) *şmare mällarşke mäsketär-ne palsko şpä wlaiśke pautarşke* :

‘his mind becomes gentle, fine, soft, tender’ (PK AS 7J b1)

= *snigdhasaṃtatir bhavati* (Lévi 1932:91), see also: *cittaṃ mudukaṃ hoti maddavaṃ siniddhaṃ* ‘his mind is soft, tender and gentle’ (Mil 361).

(Ex. 5) *pañäktaññe pelaikne ate tot empreṃtse swāre nekarşke pällarşke ste*

‘the Law of the Buddha is so true, sweet, delightful, agreeable!’ (THT 101 5)

- Thus the spread of the suffix *-şke/śke* is probably to be attributed to such cases of micro relationship of synonymy (and antonymy), evolving from the original diminutive value to an affective one. One could try to order the corpus in the following manner:

1. plain diminutive: *tparške* ‘shallow’, *lykaške* ‘small’; *mällarške* ‘fine’; *mäntarške* ‘short’ (cf. Peyrot 2016:204).
2. emotional value:
 1. positive, with affection: *lalaṃške* ‘soft, dear’, *wlaiške* ‘smooth, pliable’; *nekarške* ‘pleasant’, *pautarške* ‘caressing, tender’, *pällarške* (hapax) ‘praiseworthy’, *takarške* ‘serene, trustful’, *(mā) klänkarške* (hapax) ‘not wavering’.
 2. pitying value: *tallāñciške* ‘unhappy’, *amiške* ‘sorrowful’, *añmālaške* ‘compassionate, pitying’.

2) Stylistic factor: a literary device

- The “affective” value cannot be explained by the semantics conveyed by the adjectives (see *klänkarške*). The spread of the suffix is also to be explained by the use of them in *stotra*, as epithet of the Law or the body the Buddha. Thus this affective value is a transfer from a being to the qualities of that being (for “implication” in the development of the affective value of diminutive, see references in Jurafsky 1996:552-553). As for Tocharian *-s/ške*:

(Ex. 6) */// naktsi ceṃ wināskau käṣṣinta 10 – –*
/// myāskante : ente sälpāre kauñi k·r·
/// (ṣar)mts=(a)ñmālaškeṃ mällarškeṃ krento lalaṃškeṃ
 “... I revere these Teachers [who resolved] to destroy [ignorance]. 10.
 ... they exchanged. When the suns glowed ...
 ...because of (that) ... the pitying, soft, good, tender one ...” (THT 1345.b a1-a3)

(Ex. 7) */// ṣeṣṣirku : 4 takarškana ās(tr)ona lalaṃškana au(rtsana) ///*
/// ·s(a)na eśn= āṃtpi toṃ wināskau : 5 wätkāłtsana snai wa(ce) ///
/// – mā rano klänkarškana : śpalmaññesa kekenwa mā cek wa(rñai) ///
 “... having surpassed ... 4. Serene, pure, soft, wide ...[...]
 ... I revere [your] both eyes 5. Powerful, without equal ...
 ... and unwavering, provided with excellency, not in any way ...”
 (IOL Toch 166 a3; b2-b3)

- TB *klänkarške* here refers to the fixed eyes of Buddha (a characteristic of gods in the Indian world) that are described in the list of the secondary marks of his body, and was probably coined to express that quality: *aparimita-balatvād apagatōnmeṣa-nimeṣāḥ* ‘[their eyes] do not

have opening or closing because of their unlimited strength¹³ (*Abhidharmadīpa*, Jains 1959:192).

- It is based on the verb *klānk-* ‘to retort, to contradict’ (*klānkālyñe = pratyānīka-* ‘hostile, opposed, injuring’, PK AS 6D b3). To the same root also belong *klenke* ‘vehicle’ and *klānkā-* ‘to drive’. It was linked to Old English *ge-hlencan* ‘to braid’, Middle High German *lenken* ‘to bend’, Old Norse *hlekk* ‘chain, fetter’ < IE **klenk-* ‘to turn, to twist’ by Adams 2013:240. Thus our adjective is perfectly understandable according earlier (concrete) meaning *‘to bend [the eyes]’, i.e. ‘to turn the eyes’. It was probably created “on the spot” by the author of the *stotra* in order to convey the idea of “fixed [tender] eyes” (Latin *vagulos oculos*).
- NB: Degener 1989:312 notes that most of nouns and adjectives suffixed in *-ska* in Khotanese are recorded in poetry, not with a proper meaning of diminutive, but “in stilistischer Verfeinerung”.

3) Morphological factor

- We have reconstituted the context and the motivation behind the growth of the suffix *-ške/-ške*, but this does not explain all instances, and in particular the agglutination in the *-r-* in the *-rške* variant. As pointed out by Hilmarsson and Pinault, these are in most part deverbative adjectives. Both explain the *-r-* as coming from an abstract suffix **-ār* < **-r* (alternatively **-ri*). Before this diachronical explanation, I will present some evidence to show that the *-rške* adjectives are synchronically linked to deverbal *-re* adjectives.
- A system of *-re* quality adjectives based on “stative” verbs with *ā*-character can be observed in Tocharian, which is still, but marginally, productive (cf. TA *praskär* ‘fearful’):

Table 6: **-ræ*-adjectives compared to verbs¹⁴

TB	TA	Meaning	Verb	Paradigm	Etymology
<i>tapre</i>	<i>tpär</i>	‘high’	TA <i>tāpā-</i> ‘be high, tall’ ¹⁵	TA prs. III <i>tpatär</i> , prt. I <i>tpo</i>	* <i>d^heub^h</i> - ‘deep’ (IEW:267-268)

13 That the *stotra* draws from a similar list of *vyañjana* is further shown by the correspondance between the description of the eyes above and other sub-marks: *viśālāyata-sniḡdha-madhura-prasanna-sama-netrāḥ* ‘their eyes are wide, broad, gentle, sweet, pure, regular’.

14 Verbal paradigms after Malzahn 2010.

15 The root *tāpā-* that was subject of discussion. TG already proposed ‘be high’ for this root because it is paired with the adverb *orto* ‘upward’. Now the meaning can be secured by two parallels: *tpo kāswe sārḡ pe* ‘tall and straight his instep’ (YQ II.4 b6) as a translation of the lakṣaṇa *ucchaṅkapāda* is based on a gloss such as: *uccaiḥ sujātagulphatvād ucchaṅkucaraṅāḥ* ‘their feet are *ucchaṅka* because their ankles are well formed and high’ (Abhidh-dīp 187). In the *Garbhāvākṛānti-sūtra* (A 148), where *orto tpont* ‘raised upwards’ / *āñc nmont* ‘bent downward’ correspond to Tibetan *mtho ba* ‘high’ / *dma’ ba* ‘low’: (*kus ne tpont kulypa*)l(m) *tom tpont māskantrām • kus ne āñc (nmont kulypalaṃ tom āñc) nmont māska(ntrām •)* ‘[The members (*lyiyā āpsā*)] that should be raised upwards become raised upwards. Those that should be bent downward become bent downward’ (A 148 a4-a5), cf.

<i>asāre</i>	<i>āsar</i>	‘dry’	AB <i>ās(ā)</i> - ‘to be dry’	TB prs. IV <i>osotār</i> ; TA <i>osatār</i>	* <i>h₂eh₁s-h₂</i> - ‘heat, hearth’ ¹⁶
	<i>praskār</i>	‘fearful’	AB <i>pārsk(ā)</i> - ‘to fear’	TA prs. III <i>praskatār</i> ; sub. V <i>prāskāl</i>	* <i>preK-sk^e/o</i> - (Adams 2013:445)
<i>cāñcare</i>	<i>ciñcār</i>	‘pleasant’	TB <i>cāñk</i> - ‘to please’	TB prs. II <i>cāñcan-me</i> ; sub II <i>cāñcyem</i>	* <i>teng/ǵ</i> ‘to seem, appear’ (LIV ² :629)
<i>pārkare</i>	<i>pārkār</i>	‘long’	AB <i>pārkā</i> - ‘to arise’	TB sub. V <i>pārkaṃ-me</i>	* <i>b^herg^h</i> - ‘to rise’ (LIV ² :78)

- The verbs from which the *-rške* adjectives are derived from verbs that belong exactly to the same pattern. They are clearly linked to the subjunctive of these verbs with an apparent deletion of the *-ā* vowel:

Adjective	Meanin	Verb	Paradigm	Etymology
<i>tparške</i>	‘shallow’	TA <i>tāpā</i> - ‘be high, tall’	TA prs. III <i>tpatār</i> ; prt. I <i>tpo</i> ; caus. in TB prs. IX <i>tpāstār</i> ‘to proclaim’ < *‘to raise the voice’	* <i>d^heub^h</i> - ‘deep’ (IEW:267-268)
<i>takarške</i>	‘serene; faithful’	<i>tākā</i> - ‘to be’	sub V <i>tākaṃ</i> ; prt. I <i>tāka</i>	* <i>(s)th₂-k</i> - ‘to step, to install’ (LIV ² :590)
<i>māntarške</i>	‘short’	<i>māntā</i> - ‘to hurt, to stir’	sub. V <i>māntatār</i> *	* <i>ment₂</i> - ‘to stir’ (LIV ² :438)
<i>māllarške</i>	‘fine’	<i>māl(ā)</i> - ‘to crush’	prs. X <i>māllāstār</i> ; sub VI <i>māllālñe</i>	* <i>mel₂</i> - ‘to grind’ (LIV ² :432)
<i>pautarške</i>	‘caressing, tender’	<i>pautā</i> - ‘to caress, to praise’	prs. IV <i>pautotār</i> ; sub V <i>pautoy</i>	* <i>b^heud^h</i> - ‘to be awake’ (LIV ² :82)
<i>klānkarške</i> *	‘wavering’	<i>klānk</i> - ‘doubt; contest, refute’	prs. I <i>klyeñktār</i> ; sub I <i>klānkālyñe</i> ; (TA pt I in	* <i>kleng</i> - ‘to turn, to twist’ (Adams 2013:240)

« (If) people (think that) low is handsome, it will be low. (If) people (think that) high is handsome, it will be high » (Kritzer 2014:68).

16 Starting from a collectivum **h₂eh₁s-h₂*- would explain both the prs IV paradigm and the apparent preservation of the *ā* vowel in the adjective. The reconstruction of this stem is secure, cf. Hit. *hāssa-/hassā*- ‘hearth’, Lat. *āra* ‘altar’ (LIV²:258). Alternatively one could start from a verbal stem **h₂h₁s-(e)h₁*- as per LIV² (loc. cit.).

		(<i>klāñkā</i> - ‘to drive’)	<i>klāñko</i>	
--	--	-------------------------------	---------------	--

- For the present explanation, the pivot form is *tparške* since it can be linked both to a *-re* adjective (TB *tapre* TA *tpär*) and a verb (TA *tpatär*). Thus one could explain the birth of the *-rške* type according to the following analogy:
 - verb with stative meaning in *ā* → property adjective in *-re* with deletion of *ā*-vowel (type **tpetär* → *tapre*)
 - property adjective in *-re* → property adjective (with diminutive/affective value) in *-rške* with deletion of the *e*-vowel (*tapre* → *tparške*)
 - verb with stative meaning in *-ā*- → property adjective (with diminutive/affective value) in *-rške* (type **tpetär* → *tparške*)
- Thus, the *-rške* type could be said to be the continuation, in very specific context, of the Caland system into Tocharian. However the exact history of this system remains to be clarified. For now, I will raise two questions: 1) how to explain the *ā* deletion rule ? 2) the *e* deletion rule ?
- For 2), Pinault (forthcoming) linked *nekarške* ‘delightful, pleasant’ to PIE **neg^w-ró-* ‘naked’ (Gk. *νεβρός* and Arm. *merk* ‘naked’), assuming that the semantic kernel was ‘deprived of harshness, sharpness, bitterness’, hence ‘bare’ since in one occurrence it translates Skt. *madhura-* and is opposed *rāskare* ‘sharp’ = Skt. *kaṭuka-* (IOL Toch 716 and 765; Peyrot 2008a:86-87).
- According to this explanation, *nekarške* is not actually derived from an adjective ***ñakre* or ***nekre*, but rather from **nekär* < **nog^w-ri*, the abstract corresponding to **neg^w-ró-* according to the **h₂ek^h-ró-* ‘sharp, pointy’ → **h₂ok^h-ri-* scheme (Gk. *ἄκρος* ‘highest’, Gk. *ὄκρις* ‘point, prominence’, etc.).
- This entails the coexistence in an older system of **är* < **ri* action nouns (with resultative meaning), for which there is some evidences, with the same synchronic rule of *ā*-deletion: TB *tsänkär*, TA *tsänkär* ‘summit’ on *tsänkā-* ‘to arise’, or AB *lyipär* ‘rest’ on *lipā-* ‘to remain’.
- As for the synchronic *ā* deletion rule, this can probably be explained by the fact that the derivation pattern of a property adjective from a verb was established before the addition of the *-ā* to the root, as in *tapre* ~ *täpā-*, where the verb may be secondary since the root **d^heyb^h-* gives mostly nominal derivatives in other IE languages (IEW:267-268).

4) Terminological factor

- As I said in introduction, some of these nouns are important Buddhist concept, and the adjectival suffix *-ške* / *-ške* was used to build “native” Tocharian words as counterparts of a specific religious terminology. Here we are not dealing with the technical vocabulary of

Buddhism but rather with words that are sentimentally loaded. For this process, I will take two examples:

- *mällarške* ‘fine, soft’ is a perfect calque of *mṛduka-*, the doublet of *mṛdu-* ‘soft’: 1) *mṛd-* = *mällā-* ‘to crush’; 2) *-r(e)-* = *-u-* as quality adjectives, both ultimately connected to the Caland system; 3) *-ške* = *ka*. Hence: *mälla-r-ške* = *mṛd-u-ka-*.
- *añmālaške* ‘compassionate, pitying’ which translates *kāruṇika-* or *anukampaka-* both epithets of the Buddha.
- Here, one should start from *añmālaṣṣälñe* which is oldest term for *karuṇā* or *anukampa* ‘compassion’ (it does not mean ‘compassionate’ as sometimes assumed), since it is only attested in archaic texts (THT 282, 1192, 1320) e.g.: *añmālaṣle ertsı yesäñ aikne ste* ‘This your duty to have [lit. to evoke] compassion’
- To render *kāruṇika-* or *anukampaka-*, the Tocharians calqued this formation, using the counterpart of Skt. *kāruṇā* or *anukampa*, *añmālaṣṣälñe* and the suffix *-ške*, which was appropriate given the affective context. Hence **añmālaṣ(ṣä)lñäške* > *añmālaške* through haplology (as already argued by Hilmarsson 1996:30, but without the assumption of a calque).

V. Appendix: list of the adjectives in *-ške/ške*

- *amiške* ‘despondent’ = Skt. *durmanas-*. Adams 2013:21, following Van Windekens, links it to Ved. *ámivā-* ‘sickness, suffering’, *ámīti* ‘urge, press’, Old Norse *ama* ‘to vex, molest’ (**h₂emh₃-* ‘anfassen, anpacken’, according to LIV²:265-266). If Greek *ἀνία* ‘grief’ belongs here is disputed.
- *klänkarške** ‘wavering’ on *klänk-* ‘to retort, to contradict’ (*klänkälyñe* = *pratyanīka-* ‘hostile, opposed, injuring’, PK AS 6D b3), based on an earlier (concrete) meaning **‘to bend [the eyes]’, i. e. ‘to turn the eyes’*. To the same root belongs *klenke* ‘vehicle’ and *klänkā-* ‘to drive’. Linked to Old English *ge-hlencan* ‘to braid’, Middle High German *lenken* ‘to bend’, Old Norse *hlekk* ‘chain, fetter’ < IE **kleng-* by Adams 2013:240.
- *pällarške* ‘praiseworthy’ from *pälā-* ‘to praise’.
- *pautarške* ‘caressing, pleasant’ from *pautā-* ‘to honor, to please’ (cf. TA *tuñk poto*). Borrowed in TA as *potärške**.
- *mäntarške* ‘short’ (cf. Peyrot 2016, 204) from *mäntā-* ‘to hurt, stir’, cf. Hitt. *tēpu* ‘little, few’, Skt. *dabhrā-* ‘little, small, deficient’ from **d^héb^h-* ‘to hurt, to deceive’ (> Lith. *dóbtı* ‘strike’, ‘beat’, Skt. *dabhnóti* ‘to damage’, Hitt. *tepnuzı* ‘to diminish, to despise’, etc. cf. LIV²:132).
- *mällarške* ‘soft’ from *mälā-* ‘to crush’, calque of Skt. *mṛduka-*.
- *takarške* ‘serene, pure; faithful’ trsl. *prasanna-* from *tākā-* ‘to be’; probably through the following evolution ‘settled, being’ → ‘still, calm’ → ‘clear, serene’, then ‘faithful’ as *Lehnübersetzung* of *prasanna-*.

- *nekarsške* ‘pleasant’, trsl. *madhura*- < **nog^w-ri-*, abstract of **neg^w-ró-* ‘naked’, cf. Gk. *νεβρός* and Arm. *merk* ‘naked’ according to Pinault forthcoming.
- *lalaṃške* ‘soft’ (arch. *lālāṃške*) ← Middle Indic **lalānaka-* (syncopated form) < **lalanaka-* ‘caressing, fondling’ (> Hindī *lalnā* ‘boy’, cf. Turner 1966:636) with suffix substitution. Borrowed in TA as *lālāṃške**.
- *lykaške* (TA *lykäly*) ‘small’, linked to Gr. *ὀλίγος* ‘small’, Albanian *lig* ‘bad, evil; thin’, Lithuanian *ligà* ‘illness’, etc. by Adams 2013:617.
- *wlaiške* (TA *wlyep*) ‘tender, soft’, cf. *wäl-* ‘to bend’ (Adams 2013:673, with reference to Van Windekens).

VI. References

- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. *A dictionary of Tocharian B: revised and greatly enlarged*. 2nd edition. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Degener, A. 1989. *Khotanische Suffixe*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Emmerick, R. E. 1968. *Saka Grammatical Studies*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 1987. *Das Varṇārhavarṇastotra des Mātṛceṭa*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Hartmann, Markus. 2013. *Das Genussystem des Tocharischen*. Hamburg: Baar.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur. 1989. *The Dual Forms of Nouns and Pronouns in Tocharian*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- . 1996. *Materials for a Tocharian Historical and Etymological Dictionary*. Edited by Alexander Lubotsky and Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- Hinüber, Oskar von. 2001. *Das Ältere Mittelindisch um Überblick*. 2., erweiterte Auflage. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Itkin, Ilya B. 2016. “The Tender Ghost: Tocharian B *lalaṃške* ‘Tender’: Tocharian A ?” *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 17: 65–75.
- Jurafsky, Daniel. 1996. “Universal Tendencies in the Semantics of the Diminutive.” *Language*, 533–578.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1975. “Tocharisch und Urindogermanisch.” In *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973*, edited by Helmut Rix, 148–63. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- . 1994. “Das Tocharische in indogermanistischer Sicht.” In *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, edited by Bernfried Schlerath, 310–411. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1932. *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La grande classification des actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga)*. Paris: Leroux.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden: Brill.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2008. *Variation and Change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- . 2008a. “More Sanskrit – Tocharian B Bilingual Udānavarga Fragments.” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 113: 83–125.
- . 2013. *The Tocharian subjunctive: a study in syntax and verbal stem formation*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2015. “TOCHARIAN LANGUAGE” *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, 2015, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/tocharian-language> (accessed on 27 July 2015).
- . 2016. “Further Sanskrit–Tocharian Bilingual Udānavarga Fragments.” *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 17: 153–211.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2008. *Chrestomathie Tokharienne. Textes et Grammaire*. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2015. “The Formation of Buddhist Languages.” In *Tocharian Texts in Context. International Conference on Tocharian Manuscripts and Silk Road Culture (2013)*, edited by Melanie Malzahn, Michaël Peyrot, Hannes Fellner, and Theresa-Susanna Illés, 159–185. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- . forthcoming. “Indo-European ‘Naked’ and the Caland System.” Published in a forthcoming Festschrift, in press..
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. 2002. “Ancient Afghanistan and Its Invaders: Linguistic Evidence from the Bactrian Documents and Inscriptions.” In *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples*, edited by Nicholas Sims-Williams, 225–242. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, Werner. 1968. “Zur Verwendung von toch. A *oki*/B *ramt* und A *māmtne*/B *mäfte* in Vergleichen.” *Orbis* 17, 198–231.
- Tremblay, Xavier. 2005. “Irano-Tocharica et Tocharo-Iranica.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 68: 421–49.
- Turner, R. L. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Winter, Werner. 1961. “Lexical Interchange between ‘Tocharian’ A and B.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 81: 271–80.