Ability and possibility in Tocharian A:
The semantics of the verbs *yāt-* and *cämp-*
and their derivatives

© 2020   **Maksim V. Vyzhlakov**

Palacký University Olomouc, Olomouc, Czech Republic; m.v.vyzhlakov@gmail.com

Abstract: There are two verbs in Tocharian A that denote potential modality: *yāt-* and *cämp-*. Their forms, as well as the derived abstract nouns *yātlune* and *cämplune*, are usually translated almost identically. A thorough analysis shows that *yāt-* emphasizes the aspect of probability, external to the agent, whereas *cämp-* focuses on the inner ability or potency of the agent. *Yāt-* demonstrates a rather impersonal and inactive behavior even at the level of grammar, which can be seen in the distribution of forms and some specific syntactic constructions. This distinction is found in the derivatives as well. For instance, *yātlune*, unlike *cämplune*, is regularly described as not inherent to the owner, so it can be gained or achieved. While it is difficult to find differences in the core semantics of these words (i.e., 'ability' or 'power'), *yātlune* has, in addition, specific meanings, such as 'possessions, property' and probably 'perfection'. The article also includes two supplemental parts. The first has to do with the adjective *cämpamo*, borrowed from Tocharian B, and its controversial Tocharian A counterpart *cämpam*. The second part deals with the lexicalized past participle *yāytu* and its probable synonym *sākär*. As the research will show, both mean 'obedient, docile'.

Keywords: modality, possibility, Tocharian

Способность и возможность в тохарском А:
семантика глаголов *yāt-* и *cämp-*
и их дериватов

Максим Владимирович Выжлаков

Университет Палацкого в Оломоуце, Оломоуц, Чехия; m.v.vyzhlakov@gmail.com

Аннотация: В тохарском А языке существует два глагола, обозначающих потенциальную модальность: *yāt-* и *cämp-*. Обычно их формы, так же как и формы производных абстрактных существительных *yātlune* и *cämplune*, переводятся практически одинаково. Тщательный анализ, однако, показывает, что *yāt-* подчеркивает вероятностный аспект, внешний по отношению к деятелю, тогда как *cämp-* концентрируется на внутренней способности, потенции деятеля. *Yāt-* демонстрирует достаточно безличное и инактивное поведение даже на грамматическом уровне, что можно увидеть на примере распределения некоторых форм, а также в отдельных синтаксических

конструкциях. Указанное различие проявляется и в случае производных существительных. В частности, *yātlune*, в отличие от *cämplune*, последовательно характеризируется как нечто, что не является внутренне присущим носителю — *yātlune* можно получить или достичь. Хотя найти различия в базовой семантике этих слов (например, 'способность' или 'могущество') достаточно сложно, у *yātlune* есть и специфические значения, такие как 'имущество' и, возможно, 'совершенство'. Статья содержит две дополнительных части. Одна из них касается прилагательного *cämpato*, пришедшего в тохарский A из тохарского B, а также аналогичного незаимствованного слова *cämpat*, связанного с рядом противоречий. Другая же часть затрагивает лексикализованное причастие прошедшего времени *yāytu* и его вероятный синоним *sākär*. Как показывает наше исследование, оба слова означают 'послушный, покорный'.

Ключевые слова: возможность, модальность, тохарские языки

1. *Cämp-* and *yāt-* (Grundverb)

The Tocharian languages comprise an extinct branch of the Indo-European language family, spoken during the first millennium AD in the Tarim Basin (modern Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, China) and discovered only in the early twentieth century. Many unsolved problems and tentative solutions remain in Tocharian, especially its lexicology. For instance, both languages under this branch, called Tocharian A and Tocharian B, contain the important verbs *yāt-* and *cämp-*, which are usually translated similarly as 'can' or 'be able' but can have quite distinctive meanings. In this paper I analyze Tocharian A exclusively, though the conclusions here may also be applicable to Tocharian B.[1]

It should also be mentioned that Tocharian verbs can have two (or even three) conjugational paradigms: the 'basic' Grundverb and one or two Kausativa. These terms are merely traditional. In fact, the valency and semantic relationships between these are highly controversial and quite frequently cannot be described purely in terms of causativity. For this reason, an interpretation of the third paradigm as the Antigrundverb [Malzahn 2010: 64 ff.] has gained some traction, although it is not a universally recognized concept. This term is used in this paper in order to distinguish between different stems, because *yāt-* attests this third paradigm. However, I will focus on *yāt-* (Antigrundverb) only briefly, as its traditional rendering seems to be unambiguous. (No Antigrundverb counterpart for *cämp-* is attested.)

As for the Grundverb paradigms of *cämp-* and *yāt-*, common translation variants are found in the literature. For instance, *cämp-* 'be able' [Carling et al. 2009: 195; Malzahn 2010: 635] and 'können, vermögen' [Thomas, Krause 1964: 101]. As for *yāt-*, 'fähig sein, imstande sein' [Thomas, Krause 1964: 128] and 'be (cap)able' [Malzahn 2010: 787]. However, none of these variants shows much of a semantic difference. (Both verbs are translated alike in two other works: as 'posse' [Poucha 1955: 102, 239] and 'мочь' [Burlak, Itkin 2013: 406, 470].) Using the support of considerable evidence, this study attempts to show that this difference does exist, although it may not always be demonstrated in every translation.

---

[1] In Tocharian B, *yāt-* is defined as "'be capable of' [often with infinitive complement]; 'succeed' (Grundverb), 'have power over, control; tame'; (mediopassive) 'be enabled'" (Kausativum); *cämp-*, as "'be able to' [always followed by an infinitive]" [Adams 2013: 527, 272 (respectively)].

In my view, the distinction between *yāt-* and *cämp-* could be formulated as follows:

1) *yāt-* encodes **deontic modality**, emphasizing the **possibility or probability** for the agent to do or achieve something, based on **external** conditions.
2) *cämp-* rather expresses **dynamic modality**, emphasizing the **potency or ability** of the agent to do or achieve something, based on its **inner** capability.

There are several reasons for making such a proposal for *yāt-*. First, its personal forms demonstrate a rather 'unbalanced' distribution of tenses. There are no examples of either the preterit or imperfect forms, only two sentences with the present, and one with the optative. Meanwhile, there are at least eight examples of the subjunctive forms (which usually express the future in the main clause but have various meanings in the subordinate clause[2]). Taking into account the limited number of entries containing *yāt-* (where the Grundverb paradigm is represented by around 27 tokens), the relatively high frequency of subjunctives shows a dominant pattern.

As for the other forms of *yāt-*, the gerundive I, the absolutes I and II and the *nt*-participle are absent and there is only one example of the *m*-participle *yatmāṃ*:

(A 459 b3) /// *yatmāṃ tāṣ säm cāturdi[ś]·* /// '… ⟨he⟩ will be able. He … the four regions …'.[3]

The participle seems to be part of a future construction with the 3 Sg. Sbjv. form of 'be', but it cannot be unambiguously translated. It does not show any peculiarities either, in contrast with the past participle *yāytu*, which should be investigated separately.

Another notable feature of *yāt-* is the relatively frequent use of the gerundive II (at least nine entries), which usually expresses possibility [Krause, Thomas 1960: 186–187]. With negation, the gerundive can mean almost prohibition (A 2 a1–2, A 6 a3–4, A 7 a1–2), like 'must not'. It is worth mentioning that A 6 a3–4 uses the copular verb, which is in the third person. Meanwhile, there are no examples of expression of the first or second person using either the finite forms or the non-finite forms with the copular verb. Along with the frequency of the gerundive, this suggests a strong tendency towards a generalized inactivity, both semantic and grammatical.

In addition, the following observation about predicative constructions containing *yāt-* shows a rather interesting yet controversial picture. Unfortunately, most of the examples are damaged to some degree, so there are few sentences that give full information. First, the scheme of **grammatical subject in the nominative (patient) + gerundive + infinitive with passive meaning** is present:

(A 2 a1–2) *: mā =pärmāt tsru yärm yātal ya(tsi) a2 tsraṣṣune : 1* 'Not in the least must energy be decried. 1.' [CEToM]

(A 6 a3–4) *: mā (nu yā)a4talyi ṣeṣ lokit lo«ki»tāp-äk yärk yatsi wätkässi* 'Aber ein Gast würde nicht geheißen werden können einem Gaste aufzuwarten.' [Sieg 1944: 9]

(A 7 a1–2) *tämyo sās ñi ṣñaṣṣeyāp ṣñi lyutār pāk śkaṃ (lkā)a2tsi krämtso nasluneyā mā yātalyi tuṅ= śärsässi* 'Therefore, (because) she (is) of my own relative and mainly because

---

[2] Cf. [Peyrot 2013: 616]: "In subclauses, the subjunctive takes on a variety of functions, which may be summarised as 'uncertainty'. It is used in the protasis of conditions, where it may be the only explicit marking of the conditional; it is further found in eventual, iterative, indefinite, comparative, concessive, and final clauses. Compared to present subclauses, subjunctive subclauses denote events that are not well known or do not need to be known precisely, or of which it is uncertain whether they actually take place, or events that are irrelevant to the truth of the main clause."

[3] Hereinafter, translations are mine unless another source is stated. The * symbol after a word denotes a reconstructed form of an attested lexeme. The • and : symbols in the Tocharian citations denote specific punctuation marks used in Tocharian manuscripts, while the = symbol denotes sandhi and the subscript marks show the beginning of a new line. The /// , – , and · symbols denote different amounts of the lost text. The symbols in my translations are: (…) — reconstructed text, that is not preserved in the manuscript; ⟨…⟩ — additional text, needed for understanding the phrase; […] — other additional notes; (?) — questionable translation.

of being beautiful to look at, (she) must not be made aware of the love' (my transl., based on [CEToM]).

Another gerundive construction is **no grammatical subject + agent in the genitive or perlative + gerundive + infinitive with active meaning**:

(A 66 a5) *(ā)kāl ritorā tatmus nasam ṣakk atsek nāñi brahmadatte wäl pats mäskal mā nu ñkā yātal mäccākye (///)* 'I was born because I cherished a wish. King Brahmadatta, by any means, must become my husband, for it is impossible for me (to kill the elephant) by myself' (transl. by S. V. Malyshev, p. c., with my minor changes).

(A 69ext[4] b5) *(yātal te nṣā mätta)kyāp puk saṃ[sā](r-ṣi)näs wrasaśśi klopaṃ [p]āṣlune yatsi kupre pat nu mā yātal •* '(Is it possible for me to protect by myself) the living beings of Saṃsāra in \<their\> suffering? What if it is impossible?' (reconstructed and transl. by I. B. Itkin and S. V. Malyshev, p. c., with my minor changes).

As for the personal forms, we can find the construction of **grammatical subject in the nominative (patient) + agent in the genitive or perlative + personal form + infinitive with passive meaning**:

(A 14 a1–2) : *(2 || śla)k śkaṃ pñintwāśśi säs p̬ukäṣ lyutār kāswone näm kuc ne täm mā ₐ₂ poryo tskäṃsaṃtär mā wäryo sikaṃtä(r) mā lāñcsā pärtsi yāteñc mā penu lyäksā kärnātsi yāteñc* '(2. And furthermore): Of virtue/merit this is the one quality superior to all for us: that it is not burned with fire, not flooded away by water, [that it] cannot be taken away by kings [and that] further they cannot be stolen by thieves.'[5] [CEToM]

(A 125ext[6] a3) … *pāpṣu[ne] (waṣtäṣ laltuntāp pāssi ya)tatär mā waṣt lmontāp* … 'Observation \<of rules\> (by the one who left home) can be (observed), \<but\> not by a householder' [Itkin 2020: 226] (reconstructed and transl. by S. V. Malyshev; conjecture *(ya)tatär* according to [Siegling PK: 66]).

There are three possible exceptions within this system. The first contains the gerundive and the infinitive with active meaning, but the gerundive seems to play an attributive role:

(A 23 b1–3) *pälkāt − ₆₂ − − − − k·tukr(i) wl(e)ṣluneyā tsres päsres āsres tukrinuñcäs krośśes mā yātlyes ptāñä₆₃(kte ka)pśñac tsinātsi* 'he saw (his hands) …, [which were,] due to working the clay, rough, hard, dry, covered in clay, cold and not fit to touch the Buddha's body.' [CEToM]

As for the unusual variant of rendering here, if we compare this usage with the proposed semantics of *yāt-*, the sentence rather assumes that the hands could not touch the Buddha's body because they were dirty, rough, etc. (external conditions again).

There is also a strange passage that seems to lack the infinitive:

(A 17 b2–3) *pñintu(yo) ₆₃ ptāñkät yärkā ypamāṃ yatatär :* 'through virtue one becomes the venerated Buddha.' [CEToM]

---

[4] A 69ext = THT 1382.1 + A 69 + THT 1382.c + THT 1868.

[5] The translation is not fully correct, because *pñintwāśśi* and all the verbs in the subordinate clause are in the plural. However, it is difficult to render this passage precisely, because it indeed shows some inconsistency between the singular and the plural. Also, *tskäṃsaṃtär* and *sikaṃtä(r)* are in the present, while *yāteñc* is in the subjunctive. [Peyrot 2013: 793] suggests that *yāt-* is sometimes used in the subjunctive in such contexts where it should be in the present. On the one hand, it can be another sign of the 'unbalanced' tense system. On the other, there can be an additional meaning, such as indefiniteness (see [Ibid.: 258–259]): '… taken away by whatever kings …', '… stolen by whatever thieves …'. Such an emphasis on indefiniteness can hardly be applied to the uncountable "fire" and "water".

[6] A 125ext = A 125 + THT 1425.e + A 117.

The whole translation is questionable, and the assumption of meaning 'become' (or even 'can become') for *yatatär*, 3 Sg. Prs. M. of *yāt-*, has no apparent foundation. (If anything, the verb is intransitive.) Either the infinitive meaning 'become' is missing or the participle *ypamāṃ* is employed instead of the infinitive *yatsi* (perhaps by mistake). Also, this translation is built on the assumption that *yärkā ypamāṃ* 'venerating / venerated' is the postpositive attribute of *ptāñkät* 'the Buddha', which is a plausible story, but not a reliable one as Tocharian A has a strong tendency to employ prepositive attributes. If we treat *yärkā ypamāṃ* as the argument of *yatatär*, the syntax of the phrase becomes a little bit less peculiar. In addition, taking into account that the next sentence advises the veneration of the Buddha, the whole passage may have quite the opposite meaning: 'Through virtue the Buddha can [be] venerated.'

Finally, we can find a construction with an intransitive verb:

(YQ III.5 b2) /// (: w)[s](o)konyo ats śl= āñcālyi tṣaṃ ytsi yātaṣ eṅkäl kleś wikäṣṣ oki : '… with joy indeed and hands placed together he will be able to come here, [and] he will drive away as it were the impurity of passion' [Ji et al. 1998: 165].

However, there are peculiarities in this passage and its translation, which can be connected with another interesting detail about the usage of *yāt-*. While *yātaṣ* is the subjunctive form, *wikäṣ* 'drives away, removes' is the present-tense form. Still, [Ji et al. 1998] translate both verbs using the future tense. Such interpretation is possible as the present sometimes can have a future meaning. On the contrary, this passage has been treated as an example of a **present-subjunctive**: "Morphologically, TA *yātaṣ* looks like a subjunctive, but in this example parallel and unambiguously presentic *wikäṣ* suggests that it is used as a present" [Peyrot 2013: 653–654]. Rather unusually, both variants assume the use of two different tenses with the same meaning within the same sentence. There is an equal chance that it is a conditional clause (subjunctive) plus a main clause (present): the conditional conjunction k_u*pre ne* may have been lost because of the destruction of the leaf, yet it can be just omitted, especially in poetical texts (e.g. A 65 a2, A 229 a7, A 230 a2). Note that the YQ III.5 b2 passage is also written in verse. It is likely that only an analysis of the context where the passage is from, as well as making a comparison with the parallel found in Old Uyghur, can give us a solution.

The plots of the Tocharian A (TA) and Old Uyghur (OU) fragments coincide along general lines: a group of women go to the Nyagrodhārāma monastery, the dwelling of the Buddha, and recite different speeches. One of them sees the monastery and speaks in monologue about how the Buddha brought happiness to thousands of women and cured them of their passion. After that, queen Gautamī steps into the monastery. Despite the fact that the OU version is much better preserved, it does not contain the name of the last speaker. In [Geng, Klimkeit 1988: 191], it is restored as Gautamī, but the Tocharian version has the name of a different queen: Gopikā. In addition, the OU monologue has nothing similar to 'with joy indeed and hands placed together he will be able to come here' (the Buddha is already in Nyagrodhārāma and does not go anywhere). Keeping in mind that YQ III.5 b2 contains no explicit pronouns or words that could tell the gender, I suggest that at least one 'she' should replace a 'he' in this sentence. While, according to the OU parallel, it is the Buddha who provides the cure from passions, he is not the subject of the subjunctive part of the sentence.

Summing up, the Tocharian pada probably means 'if <she = Gautamī> can come here [to the monastery] with joy indeed and hands placed together, <he = the Buddha> will drive away <from her> as it were the impurity of passion.' The sentence preserves the active construction, but it stresses rather the external condition than the inner capability.

Whether *yāt-* can form active constructions or not, it obviously has a very strong tendency towards passive and reflexive ones. Strikingly, *cämp-* provides us with plenty of active examples and with a complete absence of passive ones. In other words, the agent of *cämp-* can only be the subject (or at least tends to be so), while *yāt-* gives to its agent the object role, creating an impersonal impression for this lexeme. The subject of both the finite forms of *cämp-* and its gerundive constructions tends to be always in the nominative.

Apart from this, investigating *cämp-* without comparing it to *yāt-* cannot give us so much information. *Cämp-* is visibly more frequent than its counterpart because there are at least 50 registered examples accounting for it. However, *cämp-* shows a much more consistent situation, definitely corresponding to the aforementioned variants of its translation, provides a diverse variety of tense forms, and is attested in all three persons:

1 Sg. Prs.: (A 191 b3) /// *(eṃ)tsässi mā śkaṃ cäm[pa]m* || '… and I cannot take'

2 Sg. Prs.: (A 343 b4) /// *(o)mäskeṃ wraso[m] (mā tu) [cä]mpät* '… as a bad person you [Sg.] are not able <to do something> …' (transl. from [CEToM], with my minor changes).

3 Pl. Prt.: (A 395 b1) • *tmäṣ āsuk ysi kuc yärmaṃ mā campär* 'Then they could not come further away at all' [CEToM]

The gerundive *cämpäl* demonstrates no semantic difference from the finite forms and is quite regularly used with the first and second person forms of the verb *nas-* 'be' (all these examples are in the present). Even in the cases where the copula is omitted, A 342 a5 and b2–3, the first person is explicitly shown by the pronouns.

Little can be added to the traditional variants of rendering. Sometimes the very contexts suggest 'manage' as a translation, emphasizing the personal potency not only to conduct some action, but to overcome something. For example:

(A 7 a2–3) *kus nu cämpiṣ taṃne kräm(tso)$_{a3}$nāṃ taṃne tkanā «†taṃne» «†tkanā» taṃne praṣtā kälporäṣ āñcäm sākässi* 'But who would, having found such a beautiful girl in such a place and at such a time, be able to restrain oneself?' [CEToM]

(A 153 b2) /// *neyā āsāñcac porr oki eṅkäl santānaṃ täklā-ṃ kapśañi sākässi mā śkaṃ campäs ṣūraṃ lcā-ṃ* /// '… because of (touching?) the buttocks (?), like a fire, the passion lit up in his mindstream, and <he> did not manage to restrain the body, the seed came out from him …' (transl. by S. V. Malyshev and me).

(A 313 a5–6) *cämpäl te nasam ānand śtwarāk päñ pi puklākaṃ salu (puttiśpa)$_{a6}$rṣṣāṃ wles wlessi :* 'Am I able, oh Ānanda, in 45 years' time, to fulfill the entire service of a Buddha?' [CEToM]

Basically, *cämp-* is 'be able / managed / will manage to do something', whereas *yāt-* is 'It is possible to do something'.[7]

Finally, the Old Uyghur parallels should be mentioned. They are surprisingly scarce, as most of the respective OU fragments either are damaged or differ from the TA passages. Perhaps the only interesting example can be found here:

TA (A 296 a6) *(////) (kupre ne … täm) kärsoräṣ rinäṣtār was yātiś-śi [ā](kāl … knässi)* /// '(Si,) après avoir compris (cela), tu nous abandonnes, puisse le vœu (désiré) être en état (d'être réalisé) par toi !' (conjecture and translation according to [Pinault 1993: 139]).

OU (MaitrHami 13, 8 b10–12) *amtï inčä ök ävrilmätin barïr $_{b11}$ ärsär siz … küsämiš küsüšüngüz qanmaqï $_{b12}$ bolzun …* 'Wenn Ihr jetzt genau so, ohne Euch umzuwenden, weggeht, so möge Euer ersehnter Wunsch in Erfüllung gehen!' [Geng et al. 1991: 290].

These passages do not correspond precisely, and while the TA sentence has the optative form of *yāt-* ('may it be possible'), the OU fragment has *bolzun*, the voluntative form of the verb *bol-* 'be' ('may it be'). Furthermore, the TA passage YQ II.13 b7 contains *cämp-*. Its OU parallel, MaitrHami 2, 15 b18–19, probably contains a construction with the verb *bol-*, but it is too damaged to reach any definitive conclusion.

---

[7] Cf. also [Seržant 2014: 201–204], where we can find a similar view on the deontic nature of the Grundverb of *yāt-*. Note, however, that, because Seržant proposes a new interpretation of the Tocharian verbal system, he treats this not as the Grundverb, but as "Inagentiv". The basic paradigm is different and expresses not the deontic, but the dynamic possibility (see also footnote 10).

2. The adjectives *cämpamo* and *cämpam**

Turning to *cämp-*, the related adjectives *cämpam** and *cämpamo* should also be mentioned. *Cämpamo* is borrowed from Tocharian B (TB) [Winter 1961: 272–273], with the same meaning as the verbal forms, and always used as the predicate (with or without a copula). Seven of nine passages containing this word are found in verse (A 56 a1, A 71 b1, A 125+117 b3–4, A 166 a5, A 212 a7, A 275 b7, YQ I.10 a7), but the style of the remaining two (A 368 b2 and b3) cannot be identified with certainty. Tocharian poetry is syllabic and uses different instruments to reduce or increase the number of syllables in accordance with the requirements of the meter:

(A 71 b1) *: lāñciṃ watku yatr appärmāt rake träṅktsi mā tswātär cämpamo pe ñi se säs* : 'Deliberately, however, this my son mocks the royal command [and] does not comply to say a single word, although [he is] able [to speak].' [CEToM]

The required number of syllables in the line is 22, which is divided in three groups: of 8 (*lāñciṃ watku yatr appärmāt*), 7 (*rake träṅktsi mā tswātär*), and 7 (*cämpamo pe ñi se säs*) syllables. The 3 Sg. Prs. form *cämpäṣ* is too short and does not fit here. Therefore, it is quite likely that *cämpamo* is used only as a poetic counterpart of the finite forms of *cämp-* and it was the main reason for its borrowing, as it does not represent any additional meaning or connotation. Strangely, the loanword in TA appears to be even more frequent than its source in TB. (Regarding this, there are only six reliable examples: PK AS 6B a2, PK NS 22 a4, THT 214 a3, THT 295 b6, THT 1109 b1, and THT 1374.g a2).

Moreover, as [Winter 1961: 272] states, TA probably has its own adjective counterpart *cämpam**, which coincides with the 1 Sg. Prs. form of the verb and tends to be extremely rare. This lexeme is found in two questionable passages:

(THT 1592.a, a2) /// *s[si] mā cämpam-ci waṣtā pic* /// '… I cannot <do something> to you. Go home!'

Given the enclitic pronoun *-ci*, we can state with some certainty that the verb is attested here. The second example is the aforementioned A 191 b3[8], but [Malzahn 2010: 635] argues that it also contains the verbal form. The same interpretation is provided in [Carling et al. 2009: 195]. Indeed, this passage is from prose, and for this genre, the presence of the adjective in final position (especially without any copula), instead of a verb, is very unlikely. However, the occurrence of the Nom. Pl. f. form *cämpaminā[ñ]* (A 388 b2), pace [Carling et al. 2009: 195], cannot be a form of *cämpamo*[9], then it clearly indicates the existence of the TA adjective *cämpam** (I. B. Itkin, p. c.). Unfortunately, such scarce evidence does not permit a reliable analysis.

3. The Antigrundverb of *yāt-*, past participle *yāytu* and adjective *sākär*

The Antigrundverb paradigm of *yāt-* encodes two meanings. The direct one is clearly the causative 'enable' (in other words, 'make something possible / probable', which corresponds neatly with the proposed Grundverb sense). On the other hand, its figurative meaning is rather

---

[8] *(/// (eṃ)tsässi mā śkaṃ cäm[pa]m ǁ* '… and I cannot take')

[9] Cf., for instance, the declension of another TB-to-TA borrowing, *pruccamo* 'useful, advantageous; excellent', that attests the Nom./Acc. Pl. f. form, which is *pruccamont* (A 14 b6), not **pruccamināñ / **pruccaminās. On the other hand, as one of the anonymous reviewers noted, TA *cämpam** is not a regular formation, and the 'native' TA word should be *cämpäm. However, TA adjectives sometimes demonstrate such irregularities, cf. *kulypam* 'desiring' instead of the expected *kulypām (I. B. Itkin, p. c.).

unusual: 'to tame' [Malzahn 2010: 787], 'mansuefacere' [Poucha 1955: 239]. All in all, the published translations agree about this meaning, and I cannot find any grounds for questioning them.[10]

Still, there is no consensus about the past participle *yāytu* (and the CEToM seemingly does not have translations at all for this form). There are only five examples (A 147 b3, A 308 b6, A 322 b6, A 464 b3, and THT 2056 a2). Fortunately, one of these passages belongs to a Sanskrit-Tocharian A bilingual text:

(A 464 b3) || *bhadraka • yāytu* ||

Sanskrit *bhadraka* is defined by a variety of words with positive connotations: 'good, brave, fine, handsome, beautiful' [Monier-Williams] (see also [Mayrhofer 1996: 244]). It could be possible to be satisfied with this vague meaning, because it suits to all the fragments unsurprisingly well. However, a more thorough investigation can bring new details to light. See the only passage with sufficient context:

(A 147 b3) … *klaṅkäṣ kākärpu yāytu ākälṣäll oki śla ynāñmune śino ymāṃ riṣa(knac) k(ā)ts(e) yeṣ*

This can be translated as '… coming down from the draught animal, like a *yāytu* disciple, going with respect … <he> came to the sage', where *śino* is a hapax legomenon. As for the remaining passages, the following are more or less informative:

(A 322 b6) /// *śolaṃ yāytuñc(ä)s wrassaśśäl* /// '… in life with *yāytu* creatures …'

(THT 2056 a2) /// *[yā]ytu sā[kär]* /// (reading by I. B. Itkin, p. c.; pace [Carling et al. 2009: 37])

The collocation with *sākär* is interesting because its derivative is used for the translation of the same Sanskrit root in another bilingual fragment:

(A 386 b1) *cittabhadravatā • pälskes sākrone :*

[Thomas, Krause 1964: 153] translates *sākär* as 'glückselig' (and *sākrone* as 'Glückseligkeit'), while [Poucha 1955: 362] offers the variant 'prosper, felix'. Again, there is a positive connotation, but the word does not seem to be well defined. As for textual evidence, a few examples are found, providing some context:

(A 93 a5) *: sākkres parnoñcäśśi kāpñe yāmu saṃkrām nyagrodha* (///) 'Being loved by the *sākär* [Acc. Pl.] ones and the glorious ones, … the Nyagrodhā(rāma) <monastery> …'

(A 239 a3) *mrosk_uluneyo sākrone :* '… by disgust to the world *sākrone* …'

However, the word order suggests another word division and, thus, translation:

(A 239 a3) *mrosk_ulune yo sākrone* '… disgust to the world and *sākrone* …' (I. B. Itkin, p. c.)

(A 266 b8) *yetuñcäs sākres klaṅksā lmo(räṣ)* /// '… sitting on **docile** riding animals' (transl. from CEToM based on [Carling 2000: 237]; emphasis mine).

Carling [Ibid.] provides the OU parallel, where we can find the word *yawas* (cf. *javaš* in [Nadeljaev et al. 1969: 248] 'gentle, meek, tamed, domestic').

---

[10] Yet (continuing somewhat from the preceding footnote), [Seržant 2014: 201–204] splits the Antigrund-verb into two paradigms: the basic one ('control') and the causative ('enable, tame'). The former, however, is attested in only two examples: YQ II.15 b6 and YQ III.12 b3 (coincidently, with the subjunctive and gerundive, derived from the subjunctive stem, respectively). Both passages lack important parts that could allow one to determine the nuances of meaning, while the Old Uyghur parallels are no help in verifying them with certainty. And even if these translations are correct, the opposition between 'control' and 'tame' seems rather forced to me, as we can imagine some core meaning (e.g. 'subdue').

(A 313 a2–3) *(tämne)$_{a3}$k tām praṣṭaṃ cam suryodgam prātī[h]āriyo wrasañ puk wlyepe sākre [l](ot)k(a)r ||* 'just so through the marvel of sunrise all beings had grown gentle and glad then' [CEToM]

(A 369 a3) • *sākär kā(w)äl(lt)e — – — ·ākäts lu* • '*sākär*, beautiful, … [adjective?] animal'

(YQ III.9 a2) /// *[ne]yo sākroneyo kläṣmuneyo kaknu* 'having materialized by …, blissfulness [and] patience' [Ji et al. 1998: 183].

The parallel OU passage, MaitrHami 3, 8 b24, does not contain this part, but, quite notably, tells about the life of a monastic community (see [Geng, Klimkeit 1988: 203]).

[Poucha 1955: 362] adds to this A 129 b2 as well, but it is very damaged and [Siegling PK: 70] offers a different reading excluding *sākär*, so it probably does not belong here. Another example mentioned by Poucha, A 314 b1, also lacks the crucial part needed to define whether there is *sākär* or another word.

Summarizing the translation of *sākär* (A 266 b8) and its probable synonymity with *yāytu*, I would suggest that both *sākär* and *yāytu* mean 'obedient, docile'. In this view, it is worth mentioning that these two lexemes frequently occur in passages about animals or monks, for whom obedience is an expected feature.

It would be tempting to link *yāytu* grammatically with the Antigrundverb paradigm, as both stems are identical, but the past participle of *yāt-* (Antigrundverb) has been attested in (A 425e + A 425f a4) as *(yāyä)tṣuräṣ* [Peyrot 2016: 202]. However, the existence of such a meaning in the paradigms of the verb could somehow affect the semantic shift in the case of the Grundverb past participle.[11]

Reanalyzing the examples following this view, I daresay that it fits much better in most cases:

(A 93 a5) 'Being loved by the obedient ones and the glorious ones, … the Nyagrodhā(rāma) <monastery> …'

(A 147 b3–4) '… coming down from the draught animal, like an obedient disciple, going with respect … <he> came to the sage'

(A 313 a2–3) 'just so through the marvel of sunrise all beings had grown gentle and docile then'

(A 369 a3) 'docile, beautiful, … [adjective?] animal'

(A 386 b1) 'cittabhadravatā — obedience of mind'

(YQ III.9 a2) 'having materialized by …, obedience [and] patience'

The material of TB can hardly help there, as [Adams 2013: 744] notes in the article about TB *sākre**: "The meaning is based on the almost certain correspondence with TchA *sākär*." However, one of the examples there is particularly notable, as Adams himself expresses uncertainty about the syntax of the phrase:

(IOL Toch 51 a4) /// *·[o] wiksen-ne sakreñ arṣā(klaṃ)* ///

---

[11] One of the anonymous reviewers suggested the opposite scenario. Namely, sometimes the peculiarities of the semantics of *yāt-* and its derivatives (see also the analysis of *yātlune* below) can represent not the innovations but the traces of older meaning(s). However, at the first glance, there are no apparent clues. [Adams 2013: 528] links this verb with the PIE root **yet-*, 'strive, fly at, concern oneself zealously'. Adams also mentions a hypothesis by Van Windekens [1976: 645] that the Tocharian root was borrowed from the Sanskrit past participle *yata-* from *yam-* 'hold, sustain, tame, etc.'. While this scheme does not seem plausible, the semantics of the paronymic Sanskrit word could affect the Tocharian translation (see also the next footnote).

Apart from the analyzed adjective which is probably in Nom. Pl. m., there is the verb *wiksen* '<they> avoid' plus 3 Sg. enclitic pronoun *-ne*, and also the noun *arṣā(klaṃ)* 'snakes'. Adams suggests that *sakreñ* can be the grammatical subject of *wiksen*. This interpretation assumes an inverted word order (which can occur in a poetic line, but there is no certainty about the genre in this case). On the other hand, if we treat *sakreñ* as the attribute of *arṣā(klaṃ)*, there is a word collocation 'good snakes' (if one follows the traditional translation of TB *sākre* / TA *sākär*), which is quite unusual, because snakes can hardly be good. However, as I. B. Itkin (p.c.) proposes, *wiksen-ne* marks the end of the previous phrase, whereas the last two words are the subject of the next sentence and should be reconstructed as *sakreñ arṣā(klañ)*. Adding to this the newly proposed meaning for the lexeme, one can get a less unusual, both from the syntactical and semantical point of view, interpretation of the passage, which allows to translate it as following: '… avoid him. The tamed snakes …'.

All in all, this transition — from the general 'good' to the specific 'obedient' — is not odd. Obedience and timidity were obvious virtues for the Buddhist doctrine, especially in the world of monasteries, teachers and students.

Finally, this obscure passage should be mentioned:

(A 138 b1) /// || *āytātsuney·* ///

Having in mind the existence of the TB privative *ayātaitstse**, which likely means 'untamable, indomitable, unsubdued' [Adams 2013: 22], this word may be an abstract noun derived from the hypothetical TA privative *āytāts** (S. V. Malyshev, p. c.). While there is no sufficient context to specify its semantics, it would be tempting to have it connected with *yāt-*.

4. The verbal abstracts *cämplune* and *yātlune*

Usually, the verbal abstracts are not given much attention. [Thomas, Krause 1964: 101, 128; Malzahn 2010: 635, 787] simply list both words as derivatives without any commentary. For *cämplune*, [Poucha 1955: 103] gives 'facultas'; [Carling et al. 2009: 195], 'ability'. For *yātlune*, [Poucha 1955: 239] equates it with Sanskrit *ṛddhi* 'facultas, sollertia'. A search on the CEToM adds translations that do not widen the meaning considerably: 'capability' or 'capacity'. While in general this can hardly be questioned, a heedful analysis shows a more controversial picture.

The main distinction between these words tends to lie in the concept of inherence. This can be illustrated by the verbs with which these nouns collocate, especially in the patient role. Namely, *cämplune* attests only two such tokens: one can 'understand, seize' it (A 43+52 b6), but it can also be 'seen' (A 397 b1). As for *yātlune*, one can 'seize' (A 54 b6) and 'see' (A 324 a7) it as well, but one can also 'attain', 'reach', or 'gain' it (A 1 a2, A 16 a1–2, A 271 a5, YQ N.4 a7, YQ N.4 a8). Moreover, *yātlune* can 'appear' (A 372 a2), 'increase' (A 254 a6–7), and probably 'disappear' (A 243 b4). With it, a subject can be 'endowed', 'provided', or 'furnished' (A 317 a3, A 345 b1–2, YQ V.1 a2). In other words, *yātlune* is quite regularly described as something that can be given or attained, something that is not inherent to its owner. By contrast, there is no such nuance for *cämplune* and it can be probably characterized as an **inherent ability**. Indeed, the richness of the data should also be noted: *cämplune* is rarer than its counterpart (around 22 as opposed to 38 examples; the situation is the absolute opposite to that of the corresponding verbal forms). However, there is a striking correspondence to the semantics of their respective verbs: the 'external possibility' of *yāt-* and the 'inner capability' of *cämp-*.

Here are some additional details strengthening this interpretation. For instance, *cämplune* has no proven examples of plural forms. It can be treated like something indivisible, quite natural for inner potency. The only possible exception is the form *(c)ä(mpluneytu)* /// (A 292 b3), reconstructed in [Pinault 1999: 221]. However, G.-J. Pinault himself calls this reading "purement conjecturale" based on 'the ten powers' (or 'abilities') of the Buddha in the parallel OU text [Ibid.:

222]. But, as I. B. Itkin (p.c.) notes, in TA, the respective sense is always denoted by *śäk tampeyntu* (cf., for example, A 372 a3), so it is more likely that we should restore *(ś)ä(k tampeyntu)* in this line.

The overwhelming majority of the examples can be divided into two groups. The first describes abilities in a literal sense, and they are always characterized by constructions like '*cämplune* to do something' or some wider context (A 4 b5, A 11 b4, A 29 b2, a number of passages from the A 384–386 manuscript). The second group usually has no such explanations but is used as '*cämplune* of the Buddha' (A 43+52 b6, A 153 b3, A 438 a3) or at least with adjectives like 'great', 'big', or 'mighty' (A 397 b1, A 438 b6, THT 2152 b1). This group deals with the concept of 'power' (perhaps occasionally even in a supernatural sense), but, again, there is no clue that this power was acquired.

In this context, it would be interesting to look at A 4 b5: *tämnek {t}ṣaṃ ākntsuneyis cämpluneyā wrasañ* 'Just so are the beings because of their ignorance' [CEToM], literally '… because of their ability for ignorance', and, if we apply to my reasoning, this ignorance is inherent for the living beings.

As for *yātlune*, it demonstrates more fractured and even obscure semantics, just like its respective verb.[12] Strangely, whereas 'ability' should be deduced from the source verb, there are almost no passages that conclusively show this. To be precise, only one example is found in this regard:

(YQ N.4 a8) /// *[a]käṃtsuneṣiṃ spārtwluneṣiṃ yātlune śkaṃ śtärcäṃ yomu* '… and having gained the fourth ability, connected with transformation of riches'

Based on this translation, we can suggest the same meaning in the preceding line:

(YQ N.4 a7) /// *ñ mäskaṃtär yātluneytu śtwar yomuṣ :* '… <they> become the ones who have gained the four abilities'

Of course, in practice, 'ability' can be used without any specifications, but the distinction from *cämplune* is notable. YQ N.4 a7 also demonstrates other differences: the use of the plural and collocation with numerals. For the latter, see also the following example.

(A 317 a3) *tosäṃ tri yātluneyntuyo pukyo kaknu ṣeṣ* /// '… <he?> was wholly provided with these three abilities …'

As for the plural of this noun, though, it is not always 'abilities', but instead a different, unexpected meaning is possible, as these examples show:

(A 254 a2–4) /// *(tāk) k(e)tuma(ti) [r](i) waṣtu ṣontañ wrasañ wrasaśśi yātluneyntu • [mä](nt ne tṣaṃ riñ waṣtu) ₐ₃ (ṣontañ wrasañ wrasaśśi) yātluneyntu mäskanträ • tämnek ālkontäk āṣānik metrak ptāñkät ris waṣtu ṣontas wrasas wrasaśśi yātluneyntu rä(ddhiyo pā*ₐ₄*kär yāmäs •)* '(This was) the city Ketumatī, houses, streets, beings, and the achievements of the beings. So as (here there are cities, houses, streets, beings, and) the achievements (of the beings), just so the venerable Maitreya, the Buddha-god, (by his supernatural power let appear) other cities, houses, streets, beings, and achievements of the beings.' [CEToM]

(254 b1–2) *ñemiṣināñ riñ ñemiṣin(āñ) ₍b₂₎ (waṣtu ñemiṣiñi ṣontañ) ś[l]a niṣpal yātluneyaśśäl raurāp ñareyaṃ oki slamasyo wäntoṣ p*ᵤ*kāk sälpiñc* 'The jewel-cities, the jewel-(houses,) (the jewel-streets), with [all] possessions and achievements shrouded in flames, burn one and all as in the Raurava-hell.' [CEToM]

Cf. also examples in the singular:

(A 271 a6) /// *(yā)tl(u)neyo mā trikal : 2* '… one must not be misled because of property' (conjecture and transl. according to I. B. Itkin, p. c.)

---

[12] As S. V. Malyshev (p.c.) suggests, the range of meanings of TA *yātlune* mostly corresponds to that of Sanskrit *ṛddhi* 'increase, growth, prosperity, success, good fortune, wealth, abundance, accomplishment, perfection, supernatural power' [Monier-Williams]. This hypothesis requires further verification.

(A 304 b2) /// *[r] pracar : akäṃtsune yātlune kātkuneṣiṃ kärparäṃ* '… (fathe)r, brother, property, power, and the dignity of a householder' [CEToM]

(YQ N.1 b7) /// *(käṣ)[ṣ]i träṅkäṣ weñā näṣ cesmi waṣtwāṣiṃ yātlune śwātsi pe[n](u)* /// '… the teacher speaks: "I said: their household property (?), food indeed"'

The translation of A 254 a2–4 and b1–2 is based on [Geng et al. 2004: 54–55], where the variant 'die Leistungen' is given. It is hard to say what the reasons are for such a translation. Unfortunately, there is no parallel in the OU texts for it [Ibid.: 51]. Such a collocation is quite homogenous: streets, houses, property — in other words, physical objects that lay in the semantic field of wealth and possessions. A similar, but not-so-verbose collocation can be seen in the last two fragments too. In one of them, A 304 b2, *yātlune* seems to be translated by the OU hendiadys *ärk türk* 'Macht und Kraft' [Geng et al. 1991: 292] in MaitrHami 13, 9 b24–25. But these fragments, though very similar, do not correspond with one another perfectly, and the OU passage mentions nothing pertaining to property or household: 'Ich habe mein Haus, meinen Sohn, meine Frau, meine Mutter, meinen Vater, meine Verwandten, Macht und Kraft, Glanz und Gloria, Freuden und Heroismus vollständig aufgegeben' [Ibid.: 291–292]. Therefore, *yātlune* cannot be argued conclusively to be 'power' here. With all of this in mind, for *yātlune* in general and for these passages in particular, I would like to proffer a novel gloss: 'possessions, property'.

Still, the overwhelming majority of the other fragments containing the singular form and with a sufficient context can be rendered by 'power' or 'might' (including other passages with 'achievement(s)'). It is here that we find the obvious contamination of *yātlune* with *cämplune*, but *yātlune*, as mentioned earlier, stresses 'power that is not inherent to the owner and can be gained' (from this point of view, the transition to 'possessions, property' is quite natural as it is obviously a 'gainable' thing). The understanding of *yāt-* as 'something is possible (for me)' also provides an explanation of *yātlune* in the sense, on the one hand, of 'ability as a new possibility' and, on the other hand, of 'power as an increase in possibilities'. For this, see also the Russian idiom *čelovek s bol'šimi vozmožnostjami*, literally 'person with great possibilities' = 'powerful, rich person'. If so, then, for example, the passage below can be understood as '… great [inner] power and [achieved] might …':

(A 438 b6) /// *tsopatsäṃ cämplune yā(t)l(u)* /// (conjecture according to [Siegling PK: 438])

Of course, we cannot state for sure that the distinction between *cämplune* and *yātlune* was 'alive'. It could be just two different (and almost opposite) ways to develop the same (or at least similar) meaning. However, the verb collocation and the presence / absence of ability specifications are divided in a rather patent fashion. Still, sometimes these words overlap with each other, because there are two fragments where *yātlune* is linked with the Buddha, whose power can hardly be anything other than inherent:

(A 32 a5–6) /// *(yā)$_{a6}$tluneyo ptāñkät käṣṣ(i) op[y]ā(c)* /// '… through his capacity the Buddhalord, the teacher remembered (his previous births)' [CEToM].

(A 357 3) /// *(pru)[c]camñeṣi wākmats ptāñkäkteṃ yātlune n-äṃ* '… he has … excellent, outstanding, inherent to the Buddha power'.

In A 357 3, however, it is unclear whether the main subject of these epithets is the Buddha himself.

Finally, there is a rare but remarkable variant as 'perfection(s)':

(A 3 b6 — 4 a1) *: yomnāṣ lame ñä(ktaśśi)$_{a1}$ yātluneyo sne nākäm :* '…it attains the dwelling of the gods through its flawless perfection' [CEToM]. Note, however, that [Lane 1947: 39] has 'prospering' and [Pinault 2008: 241] even interprets the literal 'capacité' as 'vertu'.

(A 14 b4) /// *(ts)m(ā)r nā(ṃ)tsunt puk yātluneṃ[tw]āśśi «†śśi» nāṃtsunt puk krañcäs wrasaśśi kāpñe yāmunt kra* /// '(the requirement?) for all perfections, [and since they] are loved by all good beings' [CEToM]

(A 15 b2) || *rupavāṃ śpālmeṃ śpālunt kānikāñcās kₐlewās a«rä»mpātṣiṃ yātluneyo* /// 'Rūpavān, by giving pleasure to the most beautiful girls and women with the capability of his body…' [CEToM], while [Carling et al. 2009: 15] has here 'by the perfection of the beauty'.

(A 16 a1–2) *«:» mā ca(m kä)ₐ₂lpānt yātlune kuc ne kälpāt pñi s{n}e ske : tämyo kropnₐlaṃ skam pñintu ke ne kulypal yātlune :* '…they do not reach the perfection that virtue achieved without effort. Therefore, he who longs for perfection shall always gather merit' [CEToM].

    I hold no objections to such a variant except for a general point, that we should strive for as few translations as possible, especially if there is no consensus in at least some cases. It is also strange that this variant is applied only to a specific manuscript. Moreover, A 14 b4 just lacks the essential context to make a conclusion, giving us room to render *yātlune* as 'powers' (remember also the Buddha's ten powers mentioned in the section on *cämplune*). On the other hand, the very transition from 'power' to 'perfection', especially in the case of 'Buddha-connected power', is quite plausible. In addition, 'perfection' seems well suited for the other three passages (A 15 b2 in particular).

    As for the Old Uyghur parallels, there are at least two counterparts of *cämplune*: *küč* 'strength, power' (TA YQ III.8 b7 — OU MaitrHami 3, 8 b9) and the hendiadys *küč küsün* (TA YQ I.8 b3 — OU MaitrHami 1, 14 b17) with the same meaning [Nadeljaev et al. 1969: 322–323] (notably enough, [Geng, Klimkeit 1988: 103] translate it as 'Kraft und Vermögen'). For *yātlune*, besides the aforementioned A 304 b2 [13], there is no apparent correspondence.

5. Conclusion

    The main difference between *yāt-* and *cämp-* and their derived verbal abstracts lies in the distinction between the external and internal conditions. Whereas *cämp-* emphasizes potency ('to be able', 'to manage'), *yāt-* emphasizes probability ('may', 'to be possible for someone'). Some word forms of *yāt-* have a tendency to lexicalization. Its gerundive *yātal* in negation can even depict prohibition ('impossible' or 'must not'). Besides, its past participle *yāytu* seems to mean 'obedient, docile'. The other TA word, *sākär*, used for the translation of the same Sanskrit root, *bhadra-*, probably has a similar meaning. The Antigrundverb paradigm of *yāt-* has two meanings: the literally causative one ('enable, make possible') and the idiomatized one ('to tame').

    Highly synonymous, *cämplune* and *yātlune* share both literal ('ability') and figurative ('power, might') meanings. The nuance is that *yātlune* considerably stresses non-inherence: it is regularly described as something that can be gained. By contrast, *cämplune* has no such nuance and is likely to focus on the inherent, indivisible potency of 'being able'. Apart from this, *yātlune* has some specific meanings, such as 'possessions, property' and maybe 'perfection'.

ABBREVIATIONS

Acc. — accusative	Nom. — nominative
f. — feminine	OU — Old Uyghur
M. — middle	Pl. — plural

---

[13] /// *[r] pracar : akäṃtsune yātlune kātkuneṣiṃ kärparäṃ* '… (fathe)r, brother, property, power, and the dignity of a householder' [CEToM]

Prs. — present   Sg. — singular
Prt. — preterit   TA — Tocharian A
Sbjv. — subjunctive   TB — Tocharian B

REFERENCES

Adams 2013 — Adams D. Q. *A dictionary of Tocharian B*. Revised and greatly enlarged. 2nd edn. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013.

Burlak, Itkin 2013 — Бурлак С. А., Иткин И. Б. Тохарские языки. *Языки мира: Реликтовые индоевропейские языки Передней и Центральной Азии*. Коряков Ю. Б., Кибрик А. А. (ред.). М.: Academia, 2013, 386–485. [Burlak S. A., Itkin I. B. Tocharian languages. *Yazyki mira: Reliktovye indoevropeiskie yazyki Perednei i Tsentral'noi Azii*. Koryakov Yu. B., Kibrik A. A. (eds.). Moscow: Academia, 2013, 386–485.]

Carling 2000 — Carling G. *Die Funktion der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000.

Carling et al. 2009 — Carling G., Pinault G.-J., Winter W. *Dictionary and thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Vol. 1: *A–J*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009.

CEToM — CEToM (A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts). URL: https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/. Date of access: 14 May 2019.

Geng, Klimkeit 1988 — Geng Sh., Klimkeit H.-J. *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit*. Teil I: *Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988.

Geng et al. 1991 — Geng Sh., Klimkeit H.-J., Laut J. P. „Die Weltflucht des Bodhisattva". Das 13. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der Maitrisimit. *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 1991, 18: 264–296.

Geng et al. 2004 — Geng Sh., Laut J. P., Pinault G.-J. Neue Ergebnisse der Maitrisimit-Forschung (II): Struktur und Inhalt des 26. Kapitels. *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages*, 2004, 19: 29–94.

Itkin 2020 — Иткин И. Б. Будда увещевает Нанду (тохарский текст A 125 + THT 1425 fgm. e + A 117). *Труды Института востоковедения РАН*, 2020, 27: 220–228. [Itkin I. B. Buddha admonishes Nanda (Tocharian text A 125 + THT 1425 fgm. e + A 117). *Trudy Instituta vostokovedeniya RAN*, 2020, 27: 220–228.]

Ji et al. 1998 — Ji X., Winter W., Pinault G.-J. *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China*. Transliterated, translated and annotated by Ji Xianlin in collaboration with Werner Winter, Georges-Jean Pinault. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998.

Krause, Thomas 1960 — Krause W., Thomas W. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch, Band I. Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1960.

Lane 1947 — Lane G. Sh. The Tocharian Puṇyavantajātaka: Text and translation. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 1947, 67: 33–53.

Malzahn 2010 — Malzahn M. *The Tocharian verbal system*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Mayrhofer 1996 — Mayrhofer M. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Bd. II. Heidelberg: Winter, 1996.

Monier-Williams — *Monier-Williams Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. URL: https://www.sanskrit-lexicon.uni-koeln.de/mwquery/. Date of access: 14 May 2019.

Nadeljaev et al. 1969 — Наделяев В. М., Насилов Д. М., Тенишев Э. Р., Щербак А. М. (ред.). *Древнетюркский словарь*. Л.: Наука, 1969. [Nadeljaev V. M., Nasilov D. M., Tenishev E. R., Shcherbak A. M. (eds.). *Drevnetyurkskii slovar'* [Old Turkic dictionary]. Leningrad: Nauka, 1969.]

Peyrot 2013 — Peyrot M. *The Tocharian subjunctive. A study in syntax and verbal stem formation*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Peyrot 2016 — Peyrot M. Further Sanskrit–Tocharian bilingual Udānavarga fragments. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, 2016, 17: 153–211.

Pinault 1993 — Pinault G.-J. Tokharien A *mälkärteṃ* et autres mots. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, 1993, 6: 133–188.

Pinault 1999 — Pinault G.-J. Restitution du Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka en tokharien A: Bilan provisoire et recherches complémentaires sur l'acte XXVI. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, 1999, 8: 189–240.

Pinault 2008 — Pinault G.-J. *Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et Grammaire*. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.

Poucha 1955 — Poucha P. *Thesaurus linguae tocharicae dialecti A*. Praha: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství, 1955.

Seržant 2014 — Seržant I. A. *Das Kausativ im Tocharischen*. (LINCOM Studies in Indo-European Linguistics, 44.) München: LINCOM, 2014.

Sieg 1944 — Sieg E. *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen I*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1944.

Siegling PK — *Tocharische Sprachreste*. Bd. I.: *Die Texte.* Sieg E., Siegling W. (eds.). Berlin; Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1921. A copy annotated by W. Siegling.

Thomas, Krause 1964 — Thomas W., Krause W. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch.* Bd. I.: *Texte und Glossar*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1964.

Van Windekens 1976 — Van Windekens A. J. *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes.* Vol. I: *La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain: Centre Internationale de Dialectologie Générale, 1976.

Winter 1961 — Winter W. Lexical interchange between 'Tocharian' A and B. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 1961, 81: 271–280.