



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The Tocharian subjunctive

Peyrot, M.

Citation

Peyrot, M. (2010, September 28). *The Tocharian subjunctive*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15996>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15996>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

3 SYNTAX AND MEANING

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In order to establish the meaning of the subjunctive, its use in both languages will be investigated.

3.1.1 FORMER DESCRIPTIONS

In the grammar of Sieg, Siegling and Schulze (1931), all we learn about the meaning of the subjunctive is that there is a “Konjunktiv, der zugleich das Futurum vertreten muß” (p 324). Couvreur argued against the use of the term “Konjunktiv” because in his eyes it is too limited.

“Conversely, the term «future-subjunctive» is advisable because it denotes the double use of the form correctly. After all, it has a temporal (future) as well as a modal (subjunctive: voluntative, real condition, consequence and goal) meaning and presumably the second use has developed out of the first.” (1947: 73, translation mine)

The first serious account of the syntax of the subjunctive is that by Krause because he gives example sentences in order to prove his analysis (he discusses only Tocharian B).

“Der Konjunktiv steht in Haupt- wie in Nebensätzen mit der Funktion der Vermutung, Erwartung, Annahme, also der Ungewißheit, woraus sich die Funktion des reinen Futurs entwickelt hat, sowie als Jussiv.” (1952: 30)

Krause illustrates the main clause uses expectation and presumption, pure future and jussive separately, but for subclauses the reader has to extract the different uses from a couple of example sentences.

Lane, in his seminal paper about the formation of the subjunctive, takes an agnostic stand in matters of syntax, saying that

“the syntax of the Tocharian subjunctive has not yet been written. But we can say with confidence that one of the functions, perhaps the chief function of the so-called Tocharian subjunctive is to express futurity.” (1959: 158)

In a footnote he adds that “subjunctive” may not be a suitable term, and the relation between subjunctive and present should perhaps be evaluated differently:

“I do not mean to exclude the possibility that some other name may be more appropriate – even that a difference in aspect or ‘Aktionsart’ may better describe the relation between the two formal categories here.” (l.c.)

Unfortunately, he does not refer to Couvreur or Krause, so that we can only guess that he found their accounts unsatisfactory.

The first treatment of the syntax of the subjunctive in Tocharian A and B is that in the *Elementarbuch* (Krause and Thomas 1960: 180-181), which in many respects continues the work of Krause for Tocharian B alone. The principal division of the *Elementarbuch* is between the subjunctive “in rein futurischer Funktion”, which they think is found in both main and subclauses (p 181), and the one “in modaler Funktion” (p 180).

The latter category is subdivided into several smaller categories. In main clauses, they distinguish the uses 1) expectation and presumption, 2) voluntative and jussive, i.e. will and command (addressed to non-second persons), and 3) preventive prohibitive, i.e. (future) negative command. In subclauses, they find the subjunctive in 1) relative clauses, 2) local and temporal subclauses, 3) modal subclauses, i.e. in metaphors (see 3.3.9, p 208), and 4) conditional subclauses.

Although the *Elementarbuch* is an important step forward, it suffers from being too concise. For a number of uses, an example of only one language (A or B) is given, and they make no effort to avoid clear calques on Sanskrit constructions. Worse, they do not describe the categories any further, but just label them and list examples. For instance, no attempt is made at clarifying which relative clauses have a subjunctive and which have e.g. a present or an optative, and the same is true of the other subclause types.

In his *Introduction* and *Chrestomathie*, Pinault’s short characterisation is generally in line with the *Elementarbuch*, yet he adds a precision for subclauses, where the subjunctive has a “valeur éventuelle”, especially in conditional (“hypothétiques”) and temporal subclauses (1989: 124; 2008: 571). He further adds a functionally descriptive note on the expression of future tense:

“Le futur n’a pas de tiroir propre: il est exprimé en partie par le présent (avec valeur illocutoire d’une action future donnée comme certaine), surtout par le subjonctif, et aussi par une périphrase propre aux phrases négatives: gérondif II, exprimant la possibilité, avec présent de la copule (exprimée ou non).” (2008: 569-570; similarly 1989: 124-125)

Apart from these remarks about the meaning of the subjunctive as a whole, there are detail studies that treat the uses of the subjunctive and functionally neighbouring categories in subclauses. Iterative subclauses are treated by Thomas (1970), who shows that they are in the subjunctive when they have present reference and in the optative when they have past reference. Pinault (1997) contains a study of essentially

the conditional conjunctions TA *kuprene* and TB *krui*, both ‘if’,⁹³ but in passing he gives an overview of conditional types that is an excellent introduction to the subject.

Most of the descriptions mentioned above focus on the various uses of the subjunctive, and little effort is made to distinguish between the way the subjunctive is used and the semantic value it contributes. In other words, the focus is primarily on different contexts in which it occurs and much less on its inherent meaning. Nevertheless, Couvreur claims that the modal value has developed out of its future meaning and Lane suggests that futurity may be its chief function; conversely, Krause makes a very clear statement, claiming that all non-future uses can be unified as “uncertainty”, which is also at the base of the future meaning (see above).

Besides, there is one generalising notion about the function of the subjunctive, to my knowledge first voiced by Couvreur, and recurring from time to time, namely that the subjunctive is actually a perfective present formed to the preterite stem, the “normal” present being imperfective or progressive.

“The future-subjunctive [...] is originally a present (primary endings!) of the perfective preterite stem, hence (like in Slavic) the future meaning. Therefore, the future-subjunctive (perfective stem + primary endings) is the reversal of the imperfect in A (imperfective stem + secondary endings).” (Couvreur 1947: 73, translation mine)

Probably Lane’s feeling that the difference between present and subjunctive might rather be one of aspect or Aktionsart (see above) is to be interpreted along the same lines.

The most elaborated version of this idea is that by Winter, whose argument is essentially the same, “The so-called subjunctive is simply the nonpast of the punctual aspect” (1982: 9). Importantly, he further supported the aspect theory with the observation that present-subjunctives have a durative (or imperfective) Aktionsart. In other words, present-subjunctives are actually presents without a subjunctive, and since they are inherently durative (or imperfective), they do not have the punctual (or perfective) subjunctive next to them (most explicitly 1994a: 286-287, cf further Peyrot 2008c: 251).

Winter’s version seems to be accepted by Pinault (2008: 570), who adds yet another argument from the distribution of the different roots in cases of suppletion:

“La distribution des lexèmes dans les verbes supplétifs montre que le prétérit et le subjonctif ont la même valeur aspectuelle, celle de perfectif ou non-duratif, par opposition au présent.” (l.c.)

However valuable the notion of an imperfective present versus a perfective subjunctive and preterite may be, none of its defenders has shown that there is anything like an aspectual difference between present and subjunctive with examples from the

⁹³ Pinault argues for a different older meaning; cf 3.7.5 (p 314).

texts. Instead, all arguments adduced are morphological: they concern the present endings of the subjunctive and the close relationship between preterite and subjunctive stems versus the present stem (Couvreur), semantic properties of verbs with a present-subjunctive (Winter), and the root structure of suppletive verbs (Pinault). In fact, the only syntactic aspectual difference that is commonly acknowledged is the one between the imperfective imperfect and the perfective preterite (Thomas 1957; Pinault 2008: 569; see also 2.2.3, p 32).

As none of the proponents of the “aspect theory” has argued with syntactic arguments, it is far from clear where one should start a syntactic investigation of the problem. In my view, the aspect theory has only a morphological and historical value. Although I feel that the burden of proof rests with the proponents, I offer arguments against it at the end of this chapter (3.8.4, p 325); the whole matter is further left out of the description of the use of the subjunctive.

3.1.2 AIM

As pointed out in the preceding section, there are many unclear points in the description of the use of the subjunctive. Further, no systematic distinction between use and meaning has been made, nor have the different functions in main and subclause been unified. Tocharian A and B have always been treated together, thus obscuring the view on possible differences. Finally, the idea that the subjunctive is a perfective present is based on morphological arguments instead of syntax.

Thus, the aim of this chapter is

- a) to give a detailed description of the various uses of the Tocharian A and B subjunctives;
- b) to extract the meaning of the Tocharian A and B subjunctives from their uses and to give a unified account of their meanings in main and subclauses;
- c) to review any differences in meaning between the Tocharian A and B subjunctives;
- d) to investigate possible syntactic proof for the aspectual value of the Tocharian A and B subjunctives.

3.1.3 METHOD

Describing the use and meaning of a modal verbal form such as a subjunctive is not at all easy. The situation is a good deal worse if the language is dead, as in the case of Tocharian: there is no native speaker to explain meaning nuances and often even a general idea of the sense of a passage would be welcomed by many scholars of Tocharian. Strictly speaking, there is no way to be certain of the meaning of any piece of text: the writer has long passed away and even if we had a parallel text in another language we could not be completely certain about the identity level of the content.

For Tocharian, an additional problem is that there are hardly any texts that continue for more than a leaf: a whole lot have only a few complete sentences

without lacunae preserved (if we leave fragments with only isolated words or parts of words aside for the moment). All this means that for frequent grammatical phenomena it will mostly be possible to find a reliable sample of useful examples, but for less frequent forms or constructions it is not rare to eventually depend on only one or two good instances for an analysis. This in turn implies that the value of the conclusions may vary: if there are many instances, the level of certainty is much higher than if there are only a couple of them, and in the latter case it is sometimes necessary to be creative when it comes to finding arguments for an analysis.

Although one may often find oneself on the verge of despair, the whole undertaking is in fact by no means hopeless. Without doubt the most valuable help for interpreting fragmentary Tocharian texts are parallels in other languages. These come roughly in three variants:

- 1) Sanskrit originals for Tocharian texts translated from Sanskrit, or Sanskrit texts so close to those originals that they can be used as if they were originals;
- 2) Old Uygur translations of the Tocharian text;
- 3) parallel texts in other languages.

All these parallel texts have their peculiarities, also per individual text, but nevertheless it is possible to give short characterisations.

sub 1) Sanskrit originals are known for a limited number of texts in both Tocharian A and B. It is certain that many more texts were translated from Sanskrit, but those originals have not been identified yet, or, as in most cases, they have been lost. The problem with the text offering most bilingual matches, the Udānavarga, is that the language of the Tocharian translation is a demonstrably artificial “translationese” that is of limited value for many types of syntactic matters. If, however, the Tocharian text deviates from the Sanskrit in spite of its being very faithful to it in other respects, we can take this as an important indication for the rules of genuine Tocharian grammar. Finally, there are many parallel Sanskrit texts that are probably not the original the Tocharian was translated from,⁹⁴ and caution is always due when comparing a Tocharian text with a Sanskrit parallel.

sub 2) There is only one Tocharian text with an Old Uygur translation: the Tocharian A *Maitreyasamitinātaka*, translated into Old Uygur as the *Maytrisimit nom bitig*.⁹⁵ Although many portions of the Tocharian A text are fragmentary, and many others are lacking altogether, whereas for the portions preserved we do not always have the Old Uygur text, this parallel text corpus is of inestimable value, radically improving our understanding of Tocharian A. The text genre of the Old Uygur is different, as it is running prose, whereas the Tocharian is conceived as a play with

⁹⁴ An example is the story of the last meal of the Bodhisattva before his enlightenment (B107), which has a close, but not exact match in the Saṅghabhedavastu of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins (Gnoli 1977: 109-110), cf Schmidt (2008) and Pinault (2008, especially 159-162).

⁹⁵ On (possible) other Old Uygur translations from Tocharian, cf Schmidt (2001), Peyrot (forth.e).

narrative intermezzi and many variegating songs,⁹⁶ which means that especially for lyric passages the Old Uygur may deviate considerably. But even if the texts are parallel, the baroque literary style of the Old Uygur, with many repeated synonyms and explanatory additions, may make it hard to compare the texts adequately. The advantage of all this is undeniable, however: the Old Uygur translator generally understood the Tocharian perfectly and has made a serious effort to produce a good translation in “real” Old Uygur. Consequently, the Old Uygur is in principle reliable and calques on the Tocharian constructions are rare (Wilkens 2008: 426 adduces an interesting example).

sub 3) Parallel texts in other languages than Sanskrit and Old Uygur are mostly in Chinese or Pāli, sometimes also in Tibetan. Only very rarely do these parallels give direct evidence for the meaning or function of a Tocharian form, and in most cases they can only clarify the general context. Although even the latter is often of great help, a pitfall is obviously that the parallels are indirect, as no Tocharian text is translated from Pāli, and no Tibetan from Tocharian. Chinese is a slightly different matter since we know that the translators of some Chinese texts spoke Tocharian. Although the translations themselves were probably made from Sanskrit or Prakrits, Chinese translations are sometimes remarkably close to the Tocharian version, which may suggest that both were translated from the same source. Especially Pāli is a clear opposite to this, as these texts are from a completely different Buddhist school and they can only rarely be used fruitfully. However, Pāli has the great advantage over Sanskrit that the texts are well preserved and studied, which makes their evaluation easier.

Once the gist of a passage is known and the philological work is done, the linguistic analysis can be undertaken. The essential problem is that often various different translations give a coherent interpretation and there is no objective way to verify which interpretation is correct. Although the number of translation possibilities is certainly increased because we are working with texts in a dead language, the essence of the problem is probably the difference between use and meaning, or between the effective sense of a form in its context and the inalienable kernel of it.

As an example of the difference between meaning and implicature (by-meaning or inference), Comrie gives the example *it's cold in here* (1985: 23). This sentence is normally used not just to state the temperature, but implies another idea, for instance that it is too cold, which should be changed. According to Comrie, the implicature can be cancelled, whereas the meaning cannot. For instance, *it's cold in here. please don't close the window, I enjoy the cold* is fine, but *it's cold in here. please don't close the window, it's hot in here* is incoherent. Then he continues,

⁹⁶ Winter's idea (1955: 18) that the “poems” we find in this text genre (and in others too, for that matter) are in fact songs seems to be generally accepted now (e.g. Pinault 2008: 400-401). Obviously, as readers of the texts, we cannot experience the songs as such, as there is no music to it: we read them as poems with a rigid metrical pattern.

“Although the principled distinction between meaning and implicature is crucial to a correct semantic analysis of linguistic items, carrying out the distinction in practice is by no means easy, since it often requires the construction of subtle situations to distinguish between the meaning of a form and its implicature.” (1985: 24)

One cannot but fullheartedly agree, all the more since any type of “construction”, even of less subtle situations, is of course impossible for Tocharian.

Nevertheless, the importance of this distinction can hardly be overestimated. For instance, how can we decide between future and voluntative meaning of the subjunctive in sentences like TA *waṣtāṣ lāñcam* ‘I leave (sbj.) the house’? In most contexts, both a future ‘I will leave the house’ and a voluntative ‘I want to leave the house’ seem to be possible interpretations. My approach to this problem is based on the assumption that a basic meaning cannot be self-contradictory, nor can it be contradictory to any inference without explicit marking. For example, if I could find an instance of the subjunctive where it is clear from the context that the “I” person does *not want* to leave the house, but is forced to do so and protests, the same *waṣtāṣ lāñcam* cannot, without explicit marking, at once mean ‘I do not want to leave the house’. If such contradictory instances were indeed found, I would conclude that ‘wanting’ and ‘not wanting’ cannot be part of the meaning of the subjunctive, but must be inferences based on context knowledge (implicatures).

In practice, examples are unfortunately seldom as clear-cut as they are in theory, and even if the general approach seems to be correct, the statistics may give a very ill-balanced picture. For main clauses, I investigate the relation between future uses and other uses bordering future, such as will, wish, expectation, and so on, by evaluating a number of possible modal sources. For instance, if indeed the subjunctive is voluntative in first person clauses (‘I want to leave’), the next question is of course if there is any relation between speaker or subject for other persons, too. Would ‘He leaves (sbj.) the house’ mean ‘I want him to leave the house’ or ‘He wants to leave the house’?

The possible modal sources that I consider are the speaker, the subject and the hearer; the first person is discussed separately because it unites speaker and subject. These are of course by no means all sources that are theoretically possible, but they are the ones that I have distilled from the various descriptions of the use of the subjunctive (see 3.1.1, p 155). Thus, the claim of voluntative use invites the question whether speaker or subject are a modal source, and so does that of jussive use. I have not found the uses promise or permission in those descriptions, but as there are actually quite seducing examples for these subcategories, too, I have included the hearer as yet another possible modal source.

Expectation and presumption, the other uses that have been mentioned in the literature, form no special research focus, as these are much more subtle than voluntative and jussive. I understand expectation as a subjective form of future in the sense that the speaker has *personal* reasons to think that a future event will take place. On the other hand, expectation is neutral as to whether the speaker wants the event to happen or not: we may expect good or bad weather without the one

expectation being more typical than the other. As a (linguistic) future event is always expressed by a speaker, pure non-subjective futures can probably only exist in contrast to subjective ones (a contrast certainly not there in Tocharian), i.e. a kind of special form where the speaker stresses that his reasons to think that the event will take place are *not* personal; on a certain level, however, such a claim must remain in vain, as the hearer is always dependent on the judgment of the speaker.

Presumption⁹⁷ is close to expectation, but here the focus seems to be on the process of inferencing from indications for a future event, and the uncertainty that results from it. In the same way as expectation, presumption is subjective, but in addition it has its element of uncertainty. Obviously, both expectation and presumption are only possible in situations where the speaker does not control the event. Thus, they are theoretically compatible with second and third person subjects, but with first person subjects only when the verb is without control: ‘I will leave the house’ cannot be an expectation or presumption of the speaker. Although it is my conviction that expectation and presumption are no components of the meaning of the subjunctive, they do not, in fact, lack grammatical form: especially Tocharian B has a rich system of particles, but Tocharian A is not devoid either (see 3.4.5, p 222, and 3.7.5, p 287).

The uses in subclauses are less controversial and the problems are of a different kind. The meaning of the subjunctive is often quite well recognisable, but the various uses are sometimes difficult to delimit. This does not necessarily mean that the categories do not really exist in Tocharian, and are only imposed: there are always some clear examples with overt marking at the basis. The fact that there are other examples that could belong to more than one category is actually strong evidence for the function of the subjunctive in those clauses. Apparently it could be used in different ways, and without explicit marking, it could be interpreted according to the respective context.

Perhaps the most salient function of the subjunctive in subclauses is conditionality. For the examples that I have collected, I have found two parameters helpful. The first parameter is the distinction between conditionals based on consequence on the one hand, and on inference on the other. Although “consequence” is not to be understood in a very strict sense as perhaps in physics, these conditionals connect two events of which the occurrence of the second is somehow dependent on the first (in Sweetser’s terminology, the two events are related in the “content domain”, 1990: 113-116). This dependency can be real causality, as in *If it rains, the streets get wet*, but

⁹⁷ I have chosen this term for Krause’s “Annahme”. He mentions both “Annahme” and “Vermutung”, which in my understanding differ principally in how the presentation of the information is meant to be used: *Vermutung* is neutral, but *Annahme* suggests that the information is used for a follow-up. At the same time, *Annahme* is more neutral (empty, so to say) in its degree of certainty, whereas *Vermutung* has an inherent level of a particular half-certainty. I fear that differences of this kind are beyond the limits of philological feasibility in Tocharian.

it may also be much less strict, as in *If you go there, I will go with you*. In conditionals based on inference it is not the occurrence of the second event that follows from the first, but rather its truth (the events are related in the “epistemic domain”, according to Sweetser 1990: 116-117). In this type of conditionals, reversal of causality, for instance, is very common, as in *If the streets are wet, it has rained* (evidently, such a reversal is logically only valid with *if and only if* conditionals).⁹⁸

The distinction between consequential conditionals (based on consequence) and inferential conditionals (based on inference) is important because in English as well as in Tocharian the verb forms of the latter are much more variable than those of the former (Dancygier 1998, e.g. 25-29). In consequential conditionals, it turns out to be useful to distinguish generic, real, potential and unreal conditionals. Generic conditionals, which have no specific time reference, are in Tocharian formed with a subjunctive protasis and present apodosis, e.g. *If you do (sbj.) good deeds, you gather (prs.) merit*. Real conditionals, which are specific and have future reference, are formed with a subjunctive protasis and a subjunctive apodosis, e.g. *If you do (sbj.) good deeds, you will gather (sbj.) merit*. Potential conditionals denote possible but not very probable events, formed with an optative protasis and an optative apodosis, e.g. *If you did (opt.) good deeds, you would gather (opt.) merit*. Unreal conditionals denote purely imaginary events, expressed with a periphrasis of subjunctive gerund and imperfect copula in protasis and apodosis, e.g. *If you had done (sbj. ger. + ipf. cop.) good deeds, you would have gathered (sbj. ger. + ipf. cop.) merit*. Of course there are individual cases where these rules are difficult to apply, but as a general guideline they may be helpful. Compare the following scheme:

	Tocharian		English	
	PROTASIS	APODOSIS	PROTASIS	APODOSIS
generic	subjunctive	present	present	present
real	subjunctive	subjunctive	present	<i>will</i> -future
potential	optative	optative	past	<i>would</i>
unreal	sbj.ger+ipf.cop.	sbj.ger.+ipf.cop.	past perfect	<i>would</i> -perfect

A major pitfall in the study of Tocharian syntax in general is the real possibility that it is coloured by the syntax of other languages.⁹⁹ The first language to think of is obviously Sanskrit, the source language for many texts that were translated, and the model of many others that were recomposed, elaborated or adapted. Indeed, some

⁹⁸ Sweetser distinguishes yet a third type of conditionals in the “speech-act domain” (1990: 118-121). In this type, it is the relevance of the second event that follows from the first, e.g. *If it interests you, Dancygier and Sweetser (2005) treat this type extensively*. I have no reason to assume that this type did not occur in Tocharian, but I have found no instances in the corpus.

⁹⁹ It is characteristic of the philologist Werner Thomas that this problem seems never even to have occurred to him in an impressive number of syntax case studies; any linguist, I believe, would have been worried about this point in his position.

texts where the Sanskrit original is known show an astoundingly high level of syntactic matches, continuing well into the morphological domain. At the same time it is a relieve that those texts are also strange compared to other Tocharian texts, so that we can be certain that many texts are better, less literally translated. Of course, it is nearly impossible to verify to what extent the latter category of texts exhibits influence of Sanskrit constructions.

A much more delicate matter is that of the syntactic similarities between Tocharian A and B. As we know that Tocharian B has influenced Tocharian A in the script and in the lexicon, it is probably influence of Tocharian B on Tocharian A that caused these similarities, if they are caused by mutual influence at all (on this problem, cf in detail Peyrot forth.c).

Unfortunately, there is not much we can do about the problem of possible “calque syntax” when we do not have the exact models, e.g. the Sanskrit original of a Tocharian text. In some cases, infrequent and deviating constructions can indeed be attributed to calquing, but in most instances we will have to describe the language as it is attested in our corpus: after all, we can hardly exclude that Sanskrit patterns had become linguistically real features of the language. I will therefore be very careful with the “calque argument”: as long as it cannot be shown that one construction is due to calquing and another is not, the argument remains ad hoc. And even if a particular construction is a calque, it was apparently acceptable according to Tocharian grammar: if we are not in the centre of Tocharian grammar, we must nevertheless be in the margins, not outside.

3.1.4 PRESENTATION OF EXAMPLES

There is no essential difference between the presentation of the Tocharian A and B passages, and it conforms to general usage:

- a (narrow) transliteration is only given if necessary: in principle, Fremdzeichen are rendered by their regular counterparts, virāma is not indicated etc, and square brackets for uncertain readings are left out;¹⁰⁰
- round brackets indicate restorations in the Tocharian text, as well as in the translation;
- square brackets in the translation are used for non-trivial additions that make the English readable;
- “.” indicates an unreadable part of an akṣara; “-” an unreadable akṣara; “///” the damaged edge of a manuscript.

My deviations from the traditional system concern the presentation of the manuscript lines, the metrical structure, and the addition of interlinear glosses.

¹⁰⁰ I do not use arcs over non-syllabic vowels, as these are sufficiently marked by their subscript, i.e., *kr_ui*, not *kr̄_ui*.

It is often extremely important to know whether it is certain that a clause or a sentence is complete, or whether it might continue left or right of the respective margin. Therefore, I have inserted line breaks in square brackets in subscript in the Tocharian text, e.g. “[a1]”, “[a2]” etc, giving the reader the opportunity to see whether words from a sentence may be missing or not. If I know or suspect that a clause is not complete, I indicate this with three dots “...” in the translation.

A very large portion of the corpus is metrical and this is vital for the identification of syntagms and the recognition of the size of lacunae. Moreover, the language of metrical passages is often slightly different, most of all – obviously – in word order. Therefore I have indicated the metrical structure of a passage as much as possible, as well as the fact that it is metrical when I could not identify the metre. The system used is the same as that of Sieg, i.e. when he noted “4 x 14 Silben im Rhythmus 7/7”, I give the metre as “4 x 7 | 7”, with further subdivision, e.g. “(4+3 | 4+3)”. In the Tocharian text itself, I indicate the caesurae with the symbol “|”, but only between the larger units, e.g. between two units of 7 syllables, while the smaller subdivision into 4 and 3 is left unmarked. The end of pādas (strophe lines) is noted with the strophe number and a letter indicating the pāda in square brackets *after* the pāda (e.g., “[1a]”, “[1b]”, etc), since the last pāda is usually followed by the strophe number (of the strophe just *preceding*) in the Tocharian text itself (it is taken as self-evident that e.g. 1 in the Tocharian text is pāda 1d).¹⁰¹

For convenience, I have chosen to give interlinear glosses for all Tocharian and Old Uygur examples in this chapter, even if this is relatively space-consuming. By contrast, examples in other chapters are not glossed because the argumentation will be possible to follow without. To save some space nevertheless, not *all* grammatical information is given in the glosses. For instance, I do not indicate voice for verbs, or gender for adjectives and pronouns; however, I hope to give all information needed for an understanding of the use and meaning of the relevant verbal forms.

The presentation of the Old Uygur parallels to the Tocharian A Maitreya-samitināṭaka is sometimes problematic, too. One difficulty is that they are scattered over a large number of publications so that the transcription used is not uniform; worse still, Tekin’s edition (1980) contains only transliterations. I have chosen to uniformise following the system used by Röhrborn (1977etc), which has gained general acceptance in the last decades.¹⁰² The grammatical terminology follows Erdal (2004), and for Old Uygur grammar in general, the reader is referred to that book.

Another difficulty concerns the transliteration and transcription conventions for Old Uygur, which confusingly deviate from, and interfere with those for Tocharian. The main difference is the usage of brackets: square brackets are used for restorations in text and translation, and round brackets are used to add defective vowels, i.e. vowels that are assumed to have been there but are not written in the

¹⁰¹ On Tocharian metrics in general, see especially Pinault (2008: 397-409).

¹⁰² In checking and uniformising the Old Uygur, I have made extensive use of VATEC.

manuscript, mostly *a* and *ä*. As a compromise between the Tocharian and turkologist systems, I have left the defective vowels in brackets, but put them in subscript. Thus, turkologist *t(ä)ñri t(ä)ñrisi burhan* ‘Buddha, god of gods’ has become *t_(ä)ñri t_(ä)ñrisi burhan*.¹⁰³ In a word [*bur*]han the first syllable is completely restored (for Tocharian A, the same would be noted e.g. (*ptā*)ñkāt).

3.1.5 STRUCTURE

The general lay-out of the chapter is as follows. I describe the use of the subjunctive in main clauses first, then that in subclauses, and then there is a section on other uses, which includes periphrastic constructions, the present-subjunctive and particles etc. Tocharian A and B are treated separately, so that the main clauses are discussed in 3.2 (p 166) for Tocharian A and in 3.5 (p 231) for B, the subclauses in 3.3 (p 191) for A and in 3.6 (p 250) for B, and the other uses in 3.4 (p 216) for A and in 3.7 (p 276) for B. The last section of the chapter, 3.8 (p 321), contains conclusions about the use of the subjunctive, a comparison between Tocharian A and B, and a discussion of its meaning.

3.2 THE TOCHARIAN A SUBJUNCTIVE IN MAIN CLAUSES

In main clauses, the subjunctive principally denotes future events. In some cases, other readings seem possible too, such as intention, wish or promise, but in others such interpretations can be excluded with certainty because the event has negative consequences for the subject, the speaker or the hearer. In the following sections, I will first present a literal translation from Sanskrit (3.2.1, p 166), and then I will explore the relation between the event on the one hand and the subject (3.2.2, p 167), the speaker (3.2.4, p 171), and the hearer (3.2.5, p 174) on the other, in order to show that the subjunctive does not entail any necessary relation with any of these (the first person is discussed in 3.2.3, p 168). I will continue with samples of “neutral” predictions (3.2.6, p 175). The section on main clauses is concluded by an overview of moods in (rhetorical) questions (3.2.7, p 177), and by sections on neighbouring verbal categories, i.e. the present (3.2.8, p 180), the optative (3.2.9, p 185), and the imperative (3.2.10, p 189).

3.2.1 BILINGUALS

The number of literal or almost literal translations from Sanskrit must be considerable, but of course they can be of use only if the Sanskrit original is known. Only in a modest number of cases do we have good matches, and the yield for a first

¹⁰³ I.e., the manuscript has *tnkry tnkrysy pwrq'n* v.s., without <'> in the sequence <tnk>, but that spelling is thought to stand for *tāñri tāñrisi burhan*.

outlook on the use of the Tocharian A subjunctive in main clauses is not impressive. However, the following example is very clear, and intriguing at the same time. The Sanskrit future *haniṣye* ‘I will beat’ is rendered by a Tocharian A subjunctive, as we expect, but the preceding *gamiṣyāmi* ‘I will go’ by a present. In other words, the Sanskrit would have to be translated as a neutral ‘I will go and beat’ (as below), but the Tocharian with ‘I am going to Benares and I will beat the drum [there]’. In a literal translation such a deviation is significant, of course, and the issue will return in 3.2.9 (p 185). The speaker, i.e. the Buddha, can probably use the present for ‘go’ because he is about to go, but he will arrive in Benares only after his journey, so that his action there is necessarily in the subjunctive.

A218a3-4¹⁰⁴

(*bārānas*)*y(a)c* *yām* † *koṣtam* *oṅkraci* † *kumpāc* – [a4] /// †
Benares:ALL go:1SG.PRS beat:1SG.SBJ immortal drum

sāspārtwṣūnt : 14¹⁰⁵

turn:PRT.PTC

‘I am going to Benares and I will beat the drum of immortality; (I will turn the wheel of the law) that has (not) been turned (in the world before).’

Uv21.6

bārānasīm *gamiṣyāmi* [a] *haniṣye* *’mṛtadundubhim* [b]
Benares go:1SG.FUT beat:1SG.FUT drum.of.immortality

dharmacakram *pravartayiṣye* [c] *lokeṣv* *aprativartitam* [d]
wheel.of.the law turn:1SG.FUT world:LOC.PL not.turned.before

‘I will go to Benares and beat the drum of immortality; I will turn the wheel of the law that has not been turned in the world before.’¹⁰⁶

3.2.2 SUBJECT

Although they are not frequent, examples of subjunctive events with positive effects for the subject (other than the first person) can be found next to others that will turn out negatively. This shows that the subjunctive does not entail a wish or an intention of the subject: the attitude of the subject is of no importance for the use of the subjunctive.

In the following example the subjunctive is used in a clause where the king gives his permission to leave the house (and become a monk), at last. In this context, a rendering by English *will* yields an unnatural translation.

¹⁰⁴ Verse: metre 4 x 5 † 5 † 8 † 7 (5 † 5 † 4+4 † 4+3).

¹⁰⁵ Restoration after Sieg and Siegling (1933: 171); for the context, cf Beal (1883: 170).

¹⁰⁶ Bernhard (1965: 280). Cf Hahn (2007: 73).

A74b6

/// *tärkor* *tāṣ* *māskite* *läñcäṣ* *waṣtäṣ*
 permission be:3SG.SBJ prince:GEN leave:3SG.SBJ house:ABL
 ‘... the prince will have permission: he may leave the house.’¹⁰⁷

In the example below, however, a permission reading can easily be excluded, since the event is clearly not to the advantage of the subject:

A77b6

camäṣ *wä(tkoṣ* *tāpärk)* *cem* *ānäs* *nāmṣus*
 DEM:PL separate:PRT.PTC now DEM:PL miserable be:PRT.PTC
wekanträ *tāśsi* *kälkeñc* :
 break.down:3PL.SBJ where.PCL go:3PL.SBJ
 ‘Having been separated, they have now become miserable and will fall apart.
 Where will they go?’¹⁰⁸

3.2.3 FIRST PERSON

First person subjunctives, in which of course subject and speaker coincide, are well presented in the corpus. As it turns out, most examples concern events that are in some way profitable for the first person and the subjunctive forms can in many cases receive an intentional reading. Accordingly, we usually find a voluntative form in the Old Uyghur parallels to the Maitreyasamitināṭaka. However, there are also some examples where Maitreya predicts something about himself in a “neutral” way; in those cases, we find Old Uyghur futures. In conclusion, we can say that the intentional reading so often found is only based on inference: the fact that a neutral prediction exists next to it makes it unlikely that “intention” is an inherent feature of the subjunctive.

In most cases, a Tocharian A subjunctive corresponds to an Old Uyghur volitional in the Maitreyasamitināṭaka.

MY1.8b4

/// *ṣñikek* *nu* *waltsurā* *weñam* *päklyoṣ*
 however but in.short tell.1SG.SBJ listen.IPV.SG
 ‘However, I will tell in short. Listen!’¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ Cf Sieg (1952: 23).

¹⁰⁸ Cf Sieg (1952: 16).

¹⁰⁹ Cf Ji (1998: 57).

MayH1.14b2o = MayT13b1o-1

[nä] y_(e)mä t_(a)vrak yıgvırak ayu beräyin
 what and quick concise say:CVB BEN:VOL.1SG
 'I just want to tell something in short.'¹¹⁰

In the following example, the additions in the Old Uyğur make it especially clear that the first person has the wish to carry out the event. In other words, the intentional reading is obvious, even though the volitional suffix in the Old Uyğur is lacking because the sentence is presented as unfinished and ongoing:

MY2.2a8¹¹¹

/// (käşşina)c † waştäş läñcam : 1
 teacher:ALL house:ABL leave:3SG.SBJ
 'I will leave the house towards (the Buddha), the teacher.'¹¹²

MayH2.2b2-5

amti t_(ä)ñri [b₃] bahşı boşuyu y_(a)rlıkazun kim t_(ä)ñri t_(ä)ñrisi [b₄]
 now god teacher let:CVB RESP:3SG.VOL that god.of.gods
 burhanka yakın barıp ävig barkıg [b₅] kodup
 Buddha:DAT close go:CVB house home give.up:CVB
 toyın bolup
 monk be:CVB
 'Jetzt möge der göttliche Lehrer zu erlauben geruhen, daß ich nahe zum
 Göttergott Buddha gehe und, Haus und Habe aufgebend, Mönch werde und
 ...!'¹¹³

In the passage below, princess Bhadrā announces her selection of a husband; although this follows an agreement with her father, it is clearly her own wish to do so:

A66b1

(tä)my(o) ñuk p(e)nu svayamparam tsälporäş şñi mänwä
 therefore I:F too svayaṃvara:LOC be.freed:ABS REFL will:PERL
 pats yāmmār
 husband do:1SG.SBJ
 'Therefore I too will choose¹¹⁴ a husband for myself in the svayaṃvara, free and
 according to my own will!'¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 102-103), Tekin (1980: 51), Yüsüp, Xoĵa and Qämbiri (1988: C, 137) and Wilkens (2008: 428).

¹¹¹ Verse: metre 4 x 7 † 7 † 4 (4+3 † 4+3 † 4).

¹¹² Cf Ji (1998: 75).

¹¹³ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 120-121).

The following example is more complex because the first person expresses a wish involving his own death, a thing not usually desired. However, within a Buddhist context, the speaker, Bādhari, will be relieved from his sorrows when he dies. Moreover, the wish element could also apply to the rest of his life, as the “clinging-free mind” is clearly desirable (in any case, the Old Uyghur has a volitional as if the speaker wanted it).

MY1.4a8

tāpärk näş tşäşş aci sne tränklune päłtsäkyo şom wıalune
 now I DEM:ABL EMPH without clinging mind:INS only death
pälko tām
 look:PRT.PTC be:1SG.SBJ

‘Now I will, from this point on, with a clinging-free mind look forward only to (my) death.’¹¹⁶

MayT12a23-25

amtı bu ...rU bu tünte [a24] ... ilıgsız tutugsuz
 now DEM DEM night:LOC ... without.clinging without.clinging
köñülin [a25] ...Um küñümin küdäyin
 mind:INS day:POSS.1SG await:VOL.1SG

‘Now I will ... tonight ... with a clinging-free mind await my ... [last] day.’¹¹⁷

A prediction by Maitreya about his own future is apparently more neutral, and in the Old Uyghur it is rendered not by a voluntative, but by a future form. Otherwise, first person futures are rare in the Old Uyghur Maitrisimit. See also A257a2 (3.2.6, p 175).

A257a3

wlesm(ām puttişparşş)ām sne (lyutār) w(ā)km(tsām) wl(es)
 work:PRS.PTC Buddha.rank:ADJ unsurpassable excellent work
k(a)lkam nervān(ām)
 go:1SG.SBJ nirvāna:LOC

‘Carrying out the unsurpassable and excellent task of the Buddha rank I will go to the nirvāna.’¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Literally: ‘make’.

¹¹⁵ Cf Sieg (1952: 9).

¹¹⁶ Cf Ji (1998: 37). Possibly, the combination *pälko nas-* means something different from ‘look’, i.e. ‘wait for’ or ‘look forward’: a literal ‘will have seen’ gives a strange sense here and is contradicted by the Old Uyghur translation with *küd-* ‘wait’.

¹¹⁷ Cf Tekin (1980: 49).

¹¹⁸ Cf Pinault (1991: 148).

MayH11.11a11-13

burhanlar işin tüzü tükäti işläp kalısz
 Buddha:PL work completely completely work:CVB complete

nirvanlag uluška b_(a)rgay m_(ä)n
 nirvāṇa:ADJ part:DAT go:FUT 1SG

‘I will completely carry out the task of the Buddhas and go to the domain of the complete nirvāṇa.’¹¹⁹

3.2.4 SPEAKER

In most cases, the stand of the speaker towards the event is not very clear: often it can be understood as a promise, without it being clear whether the speaker himself has a positive or a negative attitude towards the event. Only in a limited number of cases do we find clear wishes. As above, I argue that the wish element is inferential and not an inherent component of the subjunctive: there are other examples where a wish is impossible and so it is cancelled out as a feature of the meaning of the subjunctive.

The first example is of an isolated type, but its interpretation is very clear already on the basis of the Tocharian A alone, and it is further strengthened by a close Old Uygur parallel with a 3sg. volitional in *-zUn*:

A342¹²⁰a5-b1¹²¹

oñi cmołši rākṣat(s sām)† kalkaṣ lo ymār caṣ
 human birth:ADJ rakṣasa DEM go:3SG.SBJ PCL quickly DEM

ypeyāṣ : 1
 country:ABL

‘This rākṣasa of human birth must quickly go away from this country.’¹²²

PeOüib.b5-7[56-58]

inčip körksüz körklüg yäk mähizlig ayag kılınčl₍₁₎g
 so ugly appearance yakṣa appearance:ADJ bad deed:ADJ

bram_(a)n ketip barzun biziñ uluṣ balıkta
 brahmin leave:CVB go:3SG.VOL we:GEN country town:LOC

turmazun
 stay:3SG.VOL

‘Then the brahmin with the ugly appearance, with the looks of a yakṣa and of bad deeds must go away, and not stay in our country and our towns!’¹²³

¹¹⁹ Cf Geng, Klimkeit and Laut (1988: 332, 352).

¹²⁰ To be turned over.

¹²¹ Verse: metre 4 x 7 † 7 (4+3 † 4+3).

¹²² Cf Sieg (1952: 36); Schmidt (2001: 305).

For the following short expression we a precise parallel in A214a3 = MY2.1a7, and probably it was a fixed formula. It introduces an announcement of the speaker, and a rendering by English *will* is strange.

A9a5

tāṣ nātkis kāsror tāṣ
 DEM lord:GEN knowing be:3SG.SBJ
 'The lord should know this.'¹²⁴

In the following example, some women have requested permission to listen to the preaching of the Buddha, and it is granted to them. Therefore, the first clause below is not a real wish (it is strange to wish something that is granted already), but still the event is desirable for the women.

MY3.3a8

naṣ nu mā nākāntār tāmyo picākk ats was
 blame but not reproach:3SG.SBJ therefore go:IPV.PL EMPH we
mārkampal klyo_[b1](ssī)
 law hear:INF
 'He will not put blame on us, let us therefore go to listen to the law!'¹²⁵

MayH3.3b8-11

antag ogurī tāññi bolgay.. biziñä y_(e)mā nom nomlayu
 so opportunity possibility be:FUT we:DAT and law preach:CVB
y_(a)rlkagay.. anñ kōni baralñ nom ešidālim
 RESP:3SG.SBJ therefore truly go:1PL.VOL law hear:1PL.VOL
 'This will be an opportunity; he will deign to preach us the law! Let us therefore truly go and listen to the law!'¹²⁶

The next example is more complicated because the first person expresses a peculiar wish, namely to be killed. In the context of the story, however, this is understandable, as the mother (the speaker) does not want to live to see her own son killed by the same *caṇḍālas* (low caste executioners). A further difficulty is that *kāwe(ñc)* (or just *kāwe*, as both forms are possible) is probably to be understood as the content of the wish: possibly its usage here is rather to be compared with the final subclauses

¹²³ Cf Hamilton (1986: 5, 10).

¹²⁴ Cf Sieg (1944: 12); Pinault (2008: 261).

¹²⁵ Cf Ji (1998: 157), who translates slightly different "May he not put blame on us!"

¹²⁶ So rather than with Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 181; cf further 180, 182-183) desiderative "Möge dies eine Gelegenheit (Hend.) (für uns) sein, möge er auch uns die Lehre zu predigen geruhen!" (their reference to von Gabain 1974: 134, §270 is misleading because her desiderative is not a bare volitional form, but a combination of volitional forms with a past or future copula, *ārti* or *ārgāy*).

under 3.3.10 (p 209). Anyhow, that *kāwe(ñc)* in some way expresses her wish is of course clear from the preceding *ākāl* ‘wish’.

A56b1¹²⁷

k_upre(n)e šakk ats raryu ci | pkanā ñy ākāl
 when really EMPH give.up:PRT.PTC you come.about:IPV.SG my wish
caṇḍālāñ | ñuk¹²⁸ neš kāwe(ñc : 1)
 caṇḍāla:PL I:F before kill:3PL.SBJ

‘If he is really given up by you, fulfil my wish [that] the caṇḍālas will first kill me.’¹²⁹

In the next two examples, a wish of the part of the speaker is excluded. In the first, the speaker is the mother of Mūgapakkha who is about to be killed by the caṇḍālas on the order of her husband: she mourns her son’s fate. In the second, the word for ‘danger’ is partly restored, but the context is clear enough: the speakers certainly mention something that is bad for them.

A56b3¹³⁰

(oñi c)m(o)l m≠ āryu praṣtaṃ | kāreyo kākoṣtu nkatār [1a]
 human birth not long time:LOC sword:INS kill:PRT.PTC perish:3SG.SBJ
 ‘... human birth ... before long he will perish, killed by the sword.’¹³¹

A395b1-2

klänkoš kausašim wärtam ane tsalpar • tmäš
 argue:PRT.PTC Kausala:ADJ forest:LOC into be.freed¹³²:3PL.PRT then
āsuk ysi kuc yärmaṃ mā campār pälskānt kupre
 further go:INF any measure:LOC not can:3PL.PRT think:3PL.PRT whether
śrāvasti riyam anne ymäs šakk atsek – – – – – (ñā)_[b2]tse
 Śrāvasti town:LOC into go:1PL.PRS really EMPH danger
klāš-äm tämyo cam kausašim wärt āssuk mā
 bring:3SG.SBJ-PL.SUFF therefore DEM Kausala:ADJ forest further not
katkar
 cross:3PL.PRT

¹²⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 | 4 (4+3 | 4+3 | 4).

¹²⁸ So to be corrected for *nuk* in the manuscript; the mistake may have to do with the ligature with *ñ*: <ñnu> instead of <ññu>.

¹²⁹ Cf Sieg (1952: 19).

¹³⁰ Verse: metre probably 4 x 7 | 8 (apparently 3+4 | 3+5) or 8 | 7.

¹³¹ Cf Sieg (1952: 19).

¹³² Here obviously in a slightly different meaning ‘get through, enter’.

‘... (so) arguing they entered the Kausala forest. Then they could by no means go any further and thought, «Will we enter the town Śrāvasti? Certainly ... (this road) will bring danger on us!». Therefore they did not cross the Kausala forest any further.’¹³³

3.2.5 HEARER

If the hearer has a special interest in the event expressed by the subjunctive, it is often a positive one: the speaker makes a promise to the hearer or gives permission for something.

A typical fixed expression is *tānne tāṣ* ‘so it will be’. Of course it is literally a promise, but without doubt its meaning was bleached out and ‘yes madam; yes sir’ or the like would perhaps be a more appropriate rendering in English. In the example below, it seems to correspond to Skt. *tathā*, literally ‘so’, but used in the sense of ‘yes; alright’.

A59b6

/// (*brā*)*mnāśī śwātsi pāk pyām || tānne tāṣ wewñurāṣ*
 brahmin:GEN.PL food piece do:IPV.SG so be:3SG.SBJ say:ABS

tmāṣ unmādaya(ntī) ...

then Unmādayantī

‘«Give¹³⁴ the brahmaṇas a piece of the food!» Having said, «so it will be!», Unmādayantī ...’¹³⁵

A typical promise is the following, which is preceded by a request in the imperative. This example is interesting because otherwise the verb ‘give’ is especially frequent as a present used for a future action near at hand.

A341a3¹³⁶

paṣ-ñi klyomiṃ śwātsik caṃ : 89
 give:IPV.SG-1SG.SUFF noble food something

kuḷyi weñā-ṃ em-ci ///
 woman say:3SG.PRT-3SG.SUFF give:1SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF

‘«Give me, o noble one, something to eat!» The woman said: «I will give you [something], ...»’¹³⁷

¹³³ Restoration and translation after Thomas (1957: 127).

¹³⁴ Literally: ‘make’.

¹³⁵ Cf Skt. (Hanisch 2005: 1, 116, lines 5-7): ... *unmādayantīm uvāca | bhadre svayam brāhmaṇān pariveṣayeti | sā tatheti pratiśrutya ... pariveṣayitum upacakrame ||* ‘... and asked Unmādayantī to attend to his guests. She said she would and promptly set about serving them refreshments.’ (Khoroché 1989: 89).

¹³⁶ Verse: metre a: 5 | 5 | 5 | 5, b: 8 | 7 | 7 (4+4 | 4+3 | 4+3), c: 5 | 5, d: 8 | 7 (4+4 | 4+3).

The next example is not a promise because the speaker cannot determine or control the event, or at least so it seems. Nevertheless, the event is clearly to the advantage of the hearer and the speaker is reassuring him.

A79a3

/// *onkäl māñ nātse mā kleñc(i)*
 elephant:PL danger not bring:3PL.SBJ:2SG.SUFF
 ‘The elephants will bring you no distress.’¹³⁸

With the word for ‘permission’ preceding, the next example can confidently be classified as a permission, after the son has insistently requested his father the king for permission to leave the house and become a monk.

A81a3

tärkor tās-śi māškit plāc w(aštās) ///
 permission be:3SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF prince leave:IPV.SG house:ABL
 ‘You will have permission, prince. Leave the house!’

3.2.6 NEUTRAL PREDICTION

A substantial number of future subjunctives can be classified as predictive: in the large corpus of the Maitreyasamitināṭaka, we naturally find several passages relating the advent of the future Buddha Maitreya and connected events. As Maitreya himself also appears in the nāṭaka, he is sometimes addressed about his future actions and even tells about them himself. Consequently, the third person is best represented among predictives, but the second and first person are attested, too. All three regularly correspond to *gAy*-futures in the Old Uyghur, which is especially striking for the first person: in the first person, the Tocharian A subjunctive is normally not predictive, and it corresponds much more frequently to an Old Uyghur volitional.

Below, I give a third person predictive subjunctive, followed by two second person predictives, and then one first person.

A288a6¹³⁹

šome metrāky(āp) † klyoseñc mārkaṃpal † tsälpeñc
 some Maitreya:GEN hear:3PL.SBJ law be.freed:3PL.SBJ

¹³⁷ Cf Chinese (Chavannes 1910-34: II, 249): “«Noble femme, faites-moi l’aumône d’un peu de nourriture.» «Je vous en donnerai, dit la femme; mais gardez-vous d’en faire part à ces deux démons affamés.»”

¹³⁸ Cf Sieg (1952: 13), whose deontic “sollen dir nicht Not bringen” can be discarded.

¹³⁹ Verse: metre usually 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4? | 4+3), but the unit of 8 is one syllable short in this pāda.

klopä(ntwäš) yomneñc † puttis̄parnac vyākārit : [1c]

sorrow:ABL reach:3PL.SBJ Buddha.rank:ALL prophecy

‘Some will hear Maitreya’s law, be redeemed from sorrow [and] reach the prophecy of the Buddha rank.’

MayH1.6a28-30

... tıñlayu kanınčsız nomlug y(a)r[lıgka tigin]gäylär .. amarı

hear:CVB not.tiring law:ADJ doctrine:DAT obtain:FUT.PL some

tüz-kärinčsız burhan]¹⁴⁰ kutıña alkış bulgay[lar]

incomparable Buddha rank:POSS.DAT praise reach:FUT.PL

‘They ... will obtain the word of doctrine, never tiring to listen to. Some will reach the praise of the incomparable Buddha rank.’¹⁴¹

A25a6

(ā)rkišo(šš)i(s) s(e)m (wa)ste pākār tāt

world:GEN protection refuge manifest be:2SG.SBJ

‘You will appear as help and stay of the world.’¹⁴²

A258a7

tāt šakkats tu tanā (sārki)

be:2SG.SBJ certainly you here after

‘You will certainly appear (in the world) hereafter.’¹⁴³

MayT185a1-3

kälmiš ayagka tiginlig köni [a2] tüz tuyuğlı burhan

come:PTC reverence:DAT worthy true complete enlightened Buddha

yer-suvda [a3] b(ā)lgürgäy s(ā)n

world:LOC appear:FUT 2SG

‘... als [so-]gekommener, verehrungswürdiger, vollkommen wahrhaftig erleuchteter Buddha wirst du in der Welt erscheinen.’¹⁴⁴

A257a2

///t tām puk(i)s dakšinak

be:1SG.SBJ all:GEN worthy.of.gift

‘... I will be (a monk), worthy of gifts for all.’¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁰ Geng and Klimkeit read [*burhan*]; Yüsüp, Xoǰa and Qämbiri (1988: c, 126): *b[urhan]*.

¹⁴¹ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 76-77).

¹⁴² Sieg (1944: 29).

¹⁴³ Geng, Laut and Pinault (2004: 73-74).

¹⁴⁴ Cf Tekin (1980: 217).

¹⁴⁵ Pinault (1991: 147).

MayH11.11a6-8

*bol[gay]*¹⁴⁶ *m(ā)n kop kamaḡ tnl[ag]larn(i)ŋ tüz.gärinčsiz dentari*
 be:FUT I all all being:PL.GEN incomparable monk:POSS
 'I will be the incomparable monk of all beings.'¹⁴⁷

In the following example, it is less certain that we have to do with a prediction, but it remains a good possibility. Alternatively, but less likely, I think, *pāda* 1d could have to be taken together with 1c, as a postponed final clause.

A21b2-3¹⁴⁸

pkāmār māntak šälyp sāt wär † pälkār käßiṣiṃ šñy
 bring:IPV.SG self oil warm water see:IPV.SG teacher REFL
ašänyo : [1c]
 eye:DU.INS
šl/ oko ašäm tāke(ñci † *šl/ o)ko tāš-ši*
 with fruit eye:DU be:3PL.SBJ-2SG.SUFF with fruit be:3SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF
oñi cmol : 1
 human birth
 'Bring oil and warm water yourself, and look at the teacher with your eyes. Your eyes will be succesful and your human birth will be succesful.'¹⁴⁹

3.2.7 QUESTIONS

Rhetorical questions deserve a special treatment because they show a bewildering range of moods: subjunctive, preterite participle with subjunctive copula, present, and optative. Although it is difficult to classify all examples with confidence, and certainly impossible to grasp all nuances, it seems feasible indeed to discover some patterns.

A nice pair of subjunctive and present sentences with 'say' is the following. In the first example with a subjunctive clause, the words have not been said yet and the subjunctive can be understood as a future. In the second example with a present clause, the speaker comments on what he has just said and denies being a liar, i.e. the present can be taken to refer to a steady trait of his character, and to be tenseless in a way. Otherwise, we could take the present as referring to a situation that still holds at the moment of speaking, i.e. although in a strict sense the words have already been spoken, they are still actual.

¹⁴⁶ In view of several exactly parallel *gAy*-futures preceding and following, the restitution *bol[gay]* in the Old Uyghur passage is certain.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Geng, Klimkeit and Laut (1988: 332, 352).

¹⁴⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 7 † 7 (4+3 † 4+3).

¹⁴⁹ Sieg (1944: 25).

MY2.2a5

klyom upādhyā kuc śkaṃ māḥ weṇam
 noble teacher what and much say:1SG.SBJ
 ‘Oh noble teacher, why would I say much?’¹⁵⁰

MY1.6b5

k_uyal śkaṃ smale trāṅkāṃ
 why and lie say:1SG.PRS
 ‘And why should I be telling a lie?’¹⁵¹

MayH1.12b13 = MayT11a11-12

kačan nāṅ āzök sözlāmāči m_(ā)n
 when INDF lie say:NEG.FUT.PTC 1SG
 ‘I will never tell a lie.’¹⁵²

The difference between the following two examples is difficult to establish: in both cases, the speaker does not know what to do. Probably, *yal tākiş* ‘should be done’ with a gerund plus an optative copula has a stronger reference to what *ought* to be done, rather than for instance what the speaker wants or deems best to do: both the optative and the present gerund imply this nuance. *kuc ypam* with a simple present is surprising, but it just cannot mean ‘what am I doing?’.

A10a4

māt yal tākiş
 how do:PRS.GER be:3SG.OPT
 ‘How should one act?’¹⁵³

A343a1

kuc ypam
 what do:1SG.PRS
 ‘What should I do?’

The following two examples have different verbs, but since they concern the same situation, the parallelism is nevertheless instructive. In the first example with a subjunctive clause the speaker has received a kind of ultimatum and the event (of not having the requested money) lies in the future. In the second example with an optative clause the speaker is demanded to hand over the money immediately (cf

¹⁵⁰ Cf Ji (1998: 75). The Old Uyghur parallel is not completely literal: MayH2.2a23 *tözün bahşı öküş sav k_(ā)rgäk ärmäz* ‘Edler Lehrer! Viele Worte sind nicht nötig.’ (Geng and Klimkeit 1988: 120-121).

¹⁵¹ Cf Ji (1998: 45).

¹⁵² Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 282-283), Tekin (1980: 48); cf also von Gabain (1974: 116).

¹⁵³ Cf Sieg (1944: 13).

tāpärk ‘now’), which is impossible because he does not have it. In other words, the subjunctive clause is about an unrealistic event but probably expresses only future tense, whereas the optative clause is about an impossible event, and this is indeed expressed by that optative form. The Old Uyghur confirms this as it has a neutral *gAy*-future as a translation for the subjunctive, but a periphrasis with *uk-* ‘can’ (*ukay* is {*uk-gAy*}) for the optative.

A215a6 = MY1.6b5

sām okāk tinār mā škam naš-ñi kuc škam pāñ
 one including gold.piece not and be:3SG.PRS-1SG.SUFF how and five
kānt tāke-ñi
 hundred be:3PL.SBJ-1SG.SUFF

‘I do not have a single gold piece – how am I going to have five hundred?’¹⁵⁴

MayH1.12b14-15 = MayT11a12-14

bir bakar tāñinčä ädim tavarım
 one copper.coin like possession:POSS.1SG possession:POSS.1SG
yok beš yüz bakar takı kanta bulgay
 there.is.not five hundred copper.coin and where find:FUT

‘I do not have as much property as one copper coin – where will one find five hundred copper coins?’¹⁵⁵

MY1.6b2 = A215a3¹⁵⁶

pāñ kšāñ mā neñc tāpärk kucäš | pāñ kānt tñ
 five copper.coin not be:3PL.PRS now how five hundred you.GEN
āyim tināräs : 1
 give:1SG.OPT gold.piece:PL

‘[I] do not [even] have five copper coins – how could I now give you five hundred gold pieces?’¹⁵⁷

MayT117+10b16-18

m(ä)n beš bakar tāñinčä tavarım yok kanta takı
 I five copper.coin like my.possession there.is.not how and
beš yüz yaratmak berü ukay m(ä)n
 five hundred gold.piece give:CVB can:FUT 1SG

‘I do not [even] possess five copper coins – how will I be able to give you five hundred gold pieces?’¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁴ Ji (1998: 45).

¹⁵⁵ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 282-283, “Wo sollte man denn 5[00] Kupfer[münzen] finden?”); Tekin (1980: 48).

¹⁵⁶ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

¹⁵⁷ Cf Ji (1998: 45).

¹⁵⁸ Cf Tekin (1988: 47).

3.2.8 COMPARED TO THE PRESENT

Although the subjunctive principally denotes future tense in main clauses, and future tense is expressed by the subjunctive, the present may also be used for events that take place after the moment of speaking. The traditional view is: “das toch. Präsens bezeichnet eine als sicher vorgestellte zukünftige Handlung” (Krause and Thomas 1960: 177; cf also Pinault 2008: 569). Even if this is not untrue, it lacks precision because it invites the question what “presented as certain” means, especially in contrast to other future types. In view of the large number of predictive subjunctive futures, which are definitely meant to depict future events as certain, the truth must be a bit more complicated.

In search for a demarcation between future present and future subjunctive I have noticed that the present may be used:

- in (rhetorical) questions concerning future events;
- to denote events that take place at the moment of speaking and continue in the future (clauses that fulfil this condition are typically negated);
- in clauses where the difference between moment of speaking and event is so small that a present can be used without causing any ambiguity: especially frequent are verbs of motion (‘go’, ‘go out’, ‘come’), verbs of speaking (‘say’ etc), and ‘give’;
- with the verb ‘become’, which has no subjunctive and carries an element of future in its lexical meaning.

Although this list is not exhaustive, it gives a good impression. I will illustrate these uses below. Whether the Old Uygur, which usually has an aorist when the Tocharian A has a future present in the Maitreyasamitināṭaka, is of great help, is difficult to decide, but the correspondences are not always neat, which suggests that the Old Uygur translation is, in this respect too, not slavish.

In the example below, we find a beautiful contrast between present and subjunctive, definitely denoting the same event. In between, the speaker, the Buddha, thinks of two persons just deceased, and five still alive, and he decides to teach the law to the latter.¹⁵⁹ Possibly, the question renders the event vague and indefinite so that the present can be used, but when the matter is decided, the event has become concrete and a subjunctive is required.

¹⁵⁹ Compare the Chinese translation of Aśvaghōṣa’s *Buddhacarita* in the English translation of Beal (1883: 167-168): “then he deeply pondered, who first should hear the law; he thought at once of *Ārāda Kâlāma* and *Udraka Rāmaputra*, As being fit to accept the righteous law; but now they both were dead. Then next he thought of the five men, that they were fit to hear the first sermon. [...] so went he on towards Benares”.

A217a5-6¹⁶⁰

pālskāt pūk knānmām | ke maltw āksisam | lyāklām
 think:3SG.PRT all knowing who:GEN first teach:1SG.PRS fine
kuṣpā_[a6](rām krant mā)rkampal | [9a]
 deep good law

‘The omniscient thought, «Whom do I first teach the fine, deep [and] good law?»’¹⁶¹

A217a7¹⁶⁰

cesmy ākṣiññam krant | märkampal metäs | ūrbilwāyāṣ
 they:GEN teach:1SG.SBJ good law set.out:3SG.PRT Urubilvā
bārānasyac | [9d]
 Benares

‘«To them I will teach the good law!», [and] he set out from Urubilvā towards Benares.’¹⁶¹

Although the question in the example below is embedded, it is probably the reason why a present can be used for an event that with utmost certainty lies in the future, and not even necessarily a close one.¹⁶²

MY3.1a7

tāmyo tāpärk skamat prakāštär kupre aśsi ptāñkät kāṣṣi
 therefore now always ask:3SG.PRS whether PCL Buddha teacher
lo kumnä_[a8](ṣ)
 PCL come:3SG.PRS

‘Therefore she now keeps asking whether the Buddha, the teacher is about to arrive.’¹⁶³

MayH3.1a24-25

ann basa basa mini [t_(ā)ṣri] t_(ā)ṣrisi burhanag ayıtgali idur
 therefore again again me god.of.gods Buddha ask:GER send:AOR
 ‘Deshalb schickt sie mich wiederholt, um nach dem [Götter]gott Buddha zu fragen.’¹⁶⁴

An event that starts or has started at the moment of speaking and continues in the future is illustrated below. In this case, the verb is negated; for the same pattern with-

¹⁶⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3); the last seven syllables of the pāda are not cited.

¹⁶¹ For translation and restoration, cf Sieg and Siegling (1933: 168-169).

¹⁶² Cf the different construction a bit further on, where both languages have a participial construction: MayH3.5a4 *kālgüsin* ~ MY3.4b5 *śmäl naṣ*.

¹⁶³ Cf Ji (1998: 145).

¹⁶⁴ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 172-173).

out negation, one could imagine a change of state that takes place at the moment of speaking.

MY2.7a8¹⁶⁵

kāṃtsāsāmrā maṅk | mā śkaṃ ḡpamās omāskeṃ [3a]

confess:1PL.PRS fault not and do:1PL.PRS evil

‘We confess our sin[s]; we will do no more evil.’¹⁶⁶

MayH2.8a16-18

amti bilinür biz kántü yazokumuznı büküntä maru ayag

now confess:AOR we self sin:POSS.1PL today:LOC further bad

kılmčtn tıdılur biz

deed:ABL be.held:AOR we

‘Now we confess our own sins. As from today we will be held from bad deeds.’¹⁶⁷

The following unique example must have a present because death is as close as it can come without the dying one no longer being able to speak; the inference that this is not the *exact* moment of dying is completely unavoidable.

MY1.10a8¹⁶⁸

(wä)lläsmār : 1

die:1SG.PRS

‘I am dying.’¹⁶⁹

MayH1.16b4-7

kim kop munta kutgardači [b5] kutlug tınlıg körmädin alku

that all misery:LOC redeem:PRS.PTC blessed being see:NEG.CVB all

adata arılaguči [b6] adınčıg t(ā)ḡrı t(ā)ḡrısı burhanag körmädin

danger:LOC intercede:AG.N special god.of.gods Buddha see:NEG.CVB

ölür [b7] m(ā)n

die:AOR 1SG

‘Ohne das glückliche Wesen, das (die Lebenden) aus aller Not befreit erblickt zu haben, ohne den wunderbaren Göttergott Buddha, der aus allem Unglück befreit, erblickt zu haben, sterbe ich.’¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁵ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

¹⁶⁶ Cf Ji (1998: 103).

¹⁶⁷ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 140-141) and especially Wilkens (2008: 426).

¹⁶⁸ Verse: metre of unequal pādas, a, b: 8 | 7 | 6, c: 9 | 9, d: 7 | 6 (a, b: 5+3 | 4+3 | 6, c: 9 | 9, d: 4+3 | 6).

¹⁶⁹ Cf Ji (1998: 65).

¹⁷⁰ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 110-111) and the corrections by Wilkens (2008: 428; cf Yüsüp, Xoja and Qämbiri 1988: c, 154).

Below, an example of a verb of motion is given. Of course, ‘leaving the house’ is lexicalised as ‘becoming monk’, but the movement may still have been tangible (however, the second verb, *artmār*, is of course no verb of motion).¹⁷¹ The Old Uyghur is only helpful for the general content, but at least it has an aorist among parallel aorists (parallel examples are found in MY2.12b2, MY2.12b5).¹⁷²

MY2.14b1¹⁷³

waštäs lantunā | cwā sārky āṣānik | waštäs läntsam
 house:ABL left:ALL you:ALL after venerable house:ABL leave:1SG.PRS
nāṣ | artmār tñy ārtunt wkām [1a]
 I attach:1SG.PRS your attached way

‘Following you, who has left the house, oh venerable one, I am leaving the house; I am embracing the way that you have embraced.’¹⁷⁴

MayT18a6-7

toyin bolup v_(a)žanpat [a7] kīlu tāginūr m_(ā)n
 monk be:CVB ordination do:CVB HUMIL:AOR 1SG

‘Ich werde Mönch werden und ehrerbietigst die Weihe dazu vollziehen.’¹⁷⁵

An example with the verb ‘say’ is the following, where the event is very close, but not identical to the moment of speaking.¹⁷⁶

MY3.4a7

tränkām-ci
 say:1SG.PRS-2SG.SUFF
 ‘I am telling you this, « ...’¹⁷⁷

Perhaps we have to understand the next example in the same way; i.e. the act of the invitation is presented as taking more time, and the fact that it is not exactly at the time of speaking can lead to no misunderstandings.

¹⁷¹ In the next line we find a fragmentary parallel: MY2.14b2 /// *·is yām semāśwam* ‘I am going to the protector of ...’ (Ji 1998: 135).

¹⁷² The parallel passage MayH2.16a26-b3 (Geng and Klimkeit 1988: 285-286) ≈ Turpan18a1-7 is not exact; parallel aorists are found in MayH2.16a27, a28, a29, a30, b3.

¹⁷³ Verse: metre of unequal pādas, a: 5 | 5 | 5 | 5, b: 8 | 7 | 7, c: 5 | 5, d: 8 | 7 (b: 4+4 | 4+3 | 4+3, d: 4+4 | 4+3).

¹⁷⁴ Cf Ji (1998: 135).

¹⁷⁵ Cf Tekin (1980: 58).

¹⁷⁶ This particular phrase lacks in MayH3.4b10.

¹⁷⁷ Ji (1998: 161).

MY3.11b1¹⁷⁸

konaṃ *wu* *näṣ* *piṣṣaṅkāṣ*! *ṣāmnās* *kenmār*
 day:LOC two I community:ABL monk:PL call:1SG.PRS
piṃ(*twātac* :) [1c]
 alms:ALL

'Today I am inviting two monks from the community (to give them) alms ...'¹⁷⁹

MayT118b4-9

ann *amtı* *kamaḡ* *bursaṅ* *kuvragdın* *iki* *toyın* *ötünü*
 therefore now whole community community:ABL two monk request:CVB
täginür *m(ā)n*
 HUMIL:AOR 1SG

'Therefore I am now respectfully inviting two monks from the whole community.'¹⁸⁰

In the next example future reference is ascertained by the content, but nevertheless a present is used. In this case, it is probably the verb *mäsk-* 'become', which has no subjunctive, that can do with a present because the future meaning is already part of its lexical semantics. Alternatively, it might be the question that makes a subjunctive superfluous (see above). In any case, the Old Uyğur deviates in having a future instead of an aorist.

MY3.5a6

/// *kupre* *aśsi* *sām* *prašt* *mäskaträ* • *äntāne* *ñuk* *caṣ* *wsālři* *ñemi*
 when Q DEM time be:3SG.PRS then I DEM garment:ADJ jewel
putti(*śparāṃři*)
 Buddha.rank:ADJ

'When is the time going to be, when I ... with the rank of Buddha ... this jewel of a garment ...'¹⁸¹

MayH3.5b10-13

ol *antag* *öd* *kolu* *kačan* *bolgay* [b11] *ärki* .. *kim* *m(ā)n* *bu* *ton*
 DEM such time time when be:FUT Q that I DEM garment
ärdinimin *burhan* [b12] *č(a)kr(a)v(a)rt* *elig* *hannıḡ* *kädmišin*
 jewel Buddha cakravartin king king:GEN put.on:PTC

¹⁷⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

¹⁷⁹ Ji (1998: 193).

¹⁸⁰ Cf Tekin (1980: 74-75) and Erdal (2004: 529). The sentence continues: *kim küntämäk mäniḡ ävımtä ašanunlar .. mān y(e)mä küčüm yetmişčä tapınıp azunluḡ azuk* 'damit sie täglich in meinem Hause speisen, und ich will (sie), soweit meine Kraft reicht, verehren und [mit] irdischem Mundvorrat [versorgen] ...' (cf Clauson 1972: 264).

¹⁸¹ Ji (1998: 165).

köräyin [b₁₃] *ärđi*
see:1SG.VOL be:PRT

‘Wann wird wohl jene Zeit sein, da ich sehen werde, daß der Buddha, der *cakra-vartin*-König, dieses Juwel von Gewand anzieht?’¹⁸²

3.2.9 COMPARED TO THE OPTATIVE

In main clauses, the Tocharian A optative is always modal: it has a deontic value, expressing either the speaker’s wish that the subject carries out an event, or the speaker’s opinion that the subject should carry it out for some external reason. It seems that the regular negation is, in both uses, the prohibitive negation *mar* rather than the “normal” negation *mā*. In Old Uygur, we may find volitional forms, but more often than not periphrases are used, which give more insight in the different nuances of the Tocharian A optative forms.

The examples below are clear wishes. The first is rendered with a volitional form in the Old Uygur, albeit with an infinitive with a volitional copula. In the second example, it is used with the respective auxiliary *yarlıka-*, ca. ‘deign to’, which probably does not follow from the wish function, but neatly goes together with it, since wishes are often addressed to or expressed about people higher in rank (as in this case).

MY2.7b₁¹⁸³

/// (*klyo*)*m* † *şakkats śmimträ cwaśśäl şyak* : [3c]
noble certainly come:1PL.OPT you:COM together
kärsimäs saṃsār † *tsälpimäs puk klopäntwäş* : 3
know:1PL.OPT saṃsāra be.freed:1PL.OPT all sorrow:ABL.PL

‘... oh noble one, may we definitely come together with you, may we understand the saṃsāra and be freed from all woes!’¹⁸⁴

MayH2.8a₂₁₋₂₃

ažun ažunta sizni birlä tusuşup sansardın ozmakım(_i)*z*
existence existence:LOC you together meet:CVB saṃsāra:ABL flee:INF.1PL
bolzun
be:3SG.VOL

‘Mögen wir in allen Existenzformen mit Euch zusammentreffen und aus dem Saṃsāra entfliehen!’¹⁸⁵

¹⁸² Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 188-190).

¹⁸³ Verse: metre 4 x 5 † 7 (5 † 4+3).

¹⁸⁴ Ji (1998: 103).

¹⁸⁵ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 140-141).

MY3.6b2

(tä)myo eṃtsitār caş ñom kälywäts kārūnik kәşşi
 therefore seize:3SG.OPT DEM named famed compassionate teacher
 wasaṃ tuñkiñlu(neyo)
 we:LOC love:INS

‘May he therefore take it, the renowned compassionate teacher, (out of) love for us.’¹⁸⁶

MayH3.6b16-17

anı amtı y_(a)rlıkančučı biligin biziñä amranma_[b17]kın tutup
 DEM now compassionate wisdom us:DAT love:INST take:CVB
 kädä y_(a)rlıkazun
 put.on:CVB RESP:3SG.VOL

‘Jetzt möge er geruhen, mit Barmherzigkeit und mit Liebe zu uns (ihn) zu nehmen und anzuziehen!’¹⁸⁷

In the following wish we find two optative forms, one negated with *mar*, the other positive. The Old Uygur translation has a second person volitional that also serves as imperative, but need not imply a significant difference in the strength of the wish.

MY2.15a2¹⁸⁸

mar was märsit tskitār-äm ! puk klopäntwäş : 2
 not.PROH we forget.OPT.2SG pull.out:OPT.2SG-PL.SUFF all woe:PL.ABL
 ‘May you not forget us, may you deliver us from all woes!’¹⁸⁹

MayH2.17a7-8 = MayT18b20-21

ol ödün bizni y_(e)mä unıtmaṅ
 DEM time us and forget:NEG.VOL.2SG
 ‘At that time do not forget us!’¹⁹⁰

Strictly speaking, the following expression is a wish, too, but of course in practice it is rather obligative because of the negative content of the wish; we can probably equate the opt. *täkiş* with the volitional *bolzun*.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁶ Cf Ji (1998: 169); his permissive interpretation “Therefore he may take it” is wrong.

¹⁸⁷ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 192-194).

¹⁸⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 | 4 (4+3 | 4+3 | 4).

¹⁸⁹ Ji (1998: 139).

¹⁹⁰ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 164-165), Tekin (1980: 59).

¹⁹¹ The fixed formula *hişt täkiş* also occurs A254b3, MY1.4b8, MY.N3a8 = A295a4-5, which are not cited in this study.

MY3.3b4

hišt tākiṣ ṣtākkrukkeśī ku(sne) ///
 shame be:3SG.OPT denouncer:GEN.PL who
 ‘Shame be on the denouncers,¹⁹² who ...’¹⁹³

MayH3.3b28-30

yeritmiṣ bolzun ol bagragu ṣaki_[b29]lar sözlämiṣ
 reproach:PTC be:3SG.VOL DEM alms.begging¹⁹⁴ Śākya:PL say:PTC
savlar .. kim biziñä inčä tep_[b30] tedilär
 words that us:DAT so say:CVB say:3PL.PRT
 ‘Getadelt werden mögen jene (noch) der Leidenschaft (verhafteten) Śākya-(Jüng-
 linge) wegen ihrer Worte, die sie zu uns sagten.’¹⁹⁵

Typical obligative optatives are found in the prescriptive verses that conclude the Prātimokṣasūtra of the Sarvāstivādins. The first example is positive, the second, a citation from the Udānavarga, is negative; both render a Sanskrit optative.¹⁹⁶

A353b5

/// yā(ṣ śuk kākmurā)ṣ : tāmnek ṣukṣaṣ riṣak¹⁹⁷ kālkiṣ : 4
 ...:ABL juice take:ABS just.so village:ABL wise go:3SG.OPT
 ‘... taking the juice [away], just so the wise should go [away] from the village.’

Skt.

yathāpi bhramaraḥ puṣpād varṇagandhāv aheṭhayan
 like≠EMPH bee flower:ABL appearance.and.fragrance not.harming
paraiti rasam ādāya tathā grāmāṃ muniś caret 4
 fly.away:3SG.PRS juice taking.away so village wise go:3SG.OPT
 ‘Like the bee flies away from the flower, taking the juice without damaging the
 appearance and the fragrance (of the flower), [so] the wise one should go out of
 the village.’¹⁹⁸

A354a5

kapśiñño śkaṃ omāskeṃ mar yāmiṣ
 body:INS and evil not do:3SG.OPT

¹⁹² TA *ṣtākkrukkeśī* is a hapax legomenon: its translation is based on this Old Uyghur parallel.

¹⁹³ Cf Ji (1998: 157).

¹⁹⁴ According to Tekin (1980: 186).

¹⁹⁵ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 182-183).

¹⁹⁶ The Sanskrit text of Uv7.12 is corrupt, the opt. *kuryāt* being the result of a wrong sanskritisation of an original participle **kuvve* (Bernhard 1965: 160), but this has no bearing on the correspondence between the Tocharian A and the Sanskrit.

¹⁹⁷ So to be corrected for *rik* in the manuscript.

¹⁹⁸ Cf Schmidt (1989: 75, 78).

Uv7.12b

kāyena caivākuśalaṃ na kuryāt
 body:INS and/evil not do:3SG.OPT
 ‘With the body one should do no evil either.’¹⁹⁹

In the following two examples, we see that the obligative optatives of Tocharian A are rendered by periphrastic constructions in the Old Uyghur version: in the first, it is the an irreal or past optative *kılayın ärdi*, in the second it is an irreal apodosis with the respective auxiliary *yarlıka-* ‘deign to’.

MY3.4a3

/// (märka)mpalšim pruccamñeyis korpā · akäm̄tsuneši pruccamñe
 law:ADJ advantage:GEN in.return property:ADJ advantage
yāmi(mār)
 do:1SG.OPT
 ‘... in return for the advantages of the law, I should offer²⁰⁰ advantages in property.’²⁰¹

MayH3.4a24-26

amtı [a25] bu m(ā)n y(e)mā nā ärsär äd tavar üzä
 now DEM I and what be:COND possession possession by
sävinč [a26] utlı törüsinčä tapag udug kılayın ärdi
 thanks thanks law:EQU reverence reverence do:1SG.VOL be:PRT
 ‘Sollte ich jetzt nicht mit Hab und Gut Verehrung (Hend.) darbringen gemäß dem Gesetz der Dankbarkeit (Hend.)?’²⁰²

MY3.7a2²⁰³

wärpitār-ñi wsitār-ñi | mācarši tuñk
 receive:2SG.OPT-1SG.SUFF put.on:2SG.OPT:1SG.SUFF mother:ADJ love
pälko(räş :) [1c]
 see:ABS

‘You should accept (it) from me, you should put (it) on because of me, having recognised the love of a mother.’²⁰⁴

¹⁹⁹ Uv7.12 *vācānurakṣi manasā susamvṛtaḥ* [a] *kāyena caivākuśalaṃ na kuryāt* [b] *etāṃ śubhāṃ karmaphathāṃ viśodhayann* [c] *ārādhayen mārgam ṛṣipraveditam* [d] (Bernhard 1965: 160) ‘Guarding one’s words, keeping the mind well controlled, one should do no evil with the body either. These splendid paths of deed are to be purified in order to reach the path preached by the wise.’ (cf Chakravarti 1930: 82; Hahn 2007: 37).

²⁰⁰ Literally: ‘make’.

²⁰¹ Cf Ji (1998: 161), whose “I want to offer” is not completely adequate.

²⁰² Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 184-185).

²⁰³ Verse: metre probably 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

²⁰⁴ Ji (1998: 173).

MayH3.7a7-10

amtı [a8] *birök analarka sävinč utlu* [a9] *tägürmāk törü bar*
 now if mother:DAT.PL thanks thanks do:INF law there.is

ärsär alıp [a10] *kädä y(a)rlıkagay ärdi*
 be:COND take:CVB put.on:CVB RESP:FUT be:PRT

‘Wenn es ein Gesetz gibt, daß man den Müttern Dank (Hend.) abstaten müsse, dann würde es sich geziemen, (den Stoff) zu nehmen und anzuziehen.’²⁰⁵

For the use of the optative as a dubitative in questions, as below, cf further 3.2.8 (p 180).

MY.N3b1 = A295a5-6

k_uyal mā nās śol raryuräş ksaluneyam kälkim
 why not I life abandon:ABS extinction:LOC go:1SG.OPT
 ‘Why shouldn’t I, having abandoned life, go into nirvāṇa?’

3.2.10 COMPARED TO THE IMPERATIVE

The imperative is the pre-eminent deontic mood: it is principally used for commands. In positive commands, it does not interfere with the subjunctive, but the imperative cannot be negated, and the present and the subjunctive are used for negated commands instead. The former is used for events that have already started, i.e. “inhibitive”, and the latter for events that are still to take place, i.e. “preventive”. In Tocharian A, these uses are easily recognised because the inhibitive and preventive are construed with the special prohibitive negation *mar*.

Another common ground between subjunctive and imperative is the hortative use of the imperative. In its morphology, the imperative has only second person forms (singular, dual and plural; active and middle), but the dual and plural forms can be used to include the speaker.

The preventive is regularly formed with a second person subjunctive form and the negation *mar*, as in the example directly below.

A256a4²⁰⁶

āpas pācräśši † *śāsmunt slyi cam mar katkat* : [1b]
 ancestor:PL father:GEN.PL established rule DEM PROH cross:2SG.SBJ
 ‘Don’t break the rule established by ancestors and fathers!’²⁰⁷

²⁰⁵ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 194-195).

²⁰⁶ Verse: metre 4 x 5 † 7 (5 † 4+3).

²⁰⁷ Cf Geng, Laut and Pinault (2004: 55) and Thomas (1958a: 304-306).

MY2.7b2

(kā)su sewāñ maśkaṃ yas umpar yac
 good son:PL PROH~~and~~²⁰⁸ you:PL evil do:2PL.PRS
 ‘Good, my sons! Do no more evil deeds!’²⁰⁹

MayH2.8a26-27

ädgü ädü oġlanım ayıġ yavlak kılmañ_[a27]lar
 good good son:POSS.1SG evil evil do:NEG.IPV.PL
 ‘Gut, gut, meine Kinder, Schlechtes (Hend.) tut nicht (mehr)!’²¹⁰

MY1.10a8

bādhari mar klopasu našt
 Bādhari PROH sorrowful be:2SG.PRS
 ‘Bādhari, do not be sorrowful!’²¹¹

MayH1.16b8-9

ämġäklig_[b9] busuślug bolmañ
 sorrowful sorrowful be:NEG.VOL.2SG
 ‘Do not be sorrowful!’²¹²

There are two isolated examples of *mar* followed by a third person subjunctive. Since we have no parallels for this construction, we cannot be totally certain about its meaning, but it is very probable that *mar* is responsible for the negative deontic content, whereas the subjunctive adds future reference.

A79a1

mar c(eṣ tālon)tāp cami ñātse kleñc
 PROH DEM:PL miserable:GEN DEM:GEN distress bring:3PL.SBJ
 ‘They must not bring distress onto the miserable one!’²¹³

A230a5²¹⁴

krañcān märkampal špärkāšlune mar ñi tṣaṃ (nā)ntsū
 good law destruction PROH I:GEN DEM:LOC be:PRT.PTC
 tāṣ : [56b]
 be:3SG.SBJ

‘In this, may there not be destruction of the good law by me.’²¹⁵

²⁰⁸ *mar śkaṃ* is regularly fused to *maśkaṃ*.

²⁰⁹ Cf Ji (1998: 103).

²¹⁰ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 140-141).

²¹¹ Ji (1998: 65).

²¹² Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 110-111).

²¹³ Cf Sieg (1952: 13).

²¹⁴ Verse: metre usually a, c: 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3), b, d: 7 | 8 (3+4 | 5+3), but this pāda deviates in its subdivision.

The example below illustrates the hortative use of the imperative. The difference between this hortative and a first person plural subjunctive is probably that the hortative is a suggestion to do something together, whereas the 1pl. subjunctive is used when the action is already agreed. In other words, with a hortative, the speaker wants to involve the hearer in the event and the latter still has the option to refuse, whereas the 1pl. subjunctive is addressed to yet a third party (and the speaker assumes that the other part of the ‘we’ agrees and will not refuse to take part).

MY3.11a6 = A446b6

šu piṣ ṛṣiwataṃ saṅkrāmaṃc piṇes
 here come:IPV.2SG Ṛṣivadana monastery:ALL go:IPV.2DU
 ‘Come here! Let us both go to the Ṛṣivadana monastery!’²¹⁶

MayH3.11a6-7

antag ärsär yu- ... [a7] aršvida[n s]äṅrämkä²¹⁷ barahm
 thus be:COND Ṛṣivadana monastery:DAT go:VOL.1PL
 ‘If it is thus, ... let us go to the Ṛṣivadana monastery!’²¹⁸

3.3 THE TOCHARIAN A SUBJUNCTIVE IN SUBCLAUSES

In subclauses, the Tocharian A subjunctive expresses uncertainty, including conditionality. First, conditionals are discussed, with subjunctive (3.3.1, p 191), present (3.3.2, 195), and imperative apodoses (3.3.3, p 198) respectively. Several other subcategories follow: eventual clauses (3.3.4, p 201), iterative (3.3.5, p 202), indefinite (3.3.6, p 203), *kosne*-clauses (3.3.7, p 204), concessives (3.3.8, p 206), comparison clauses (3.3.9, p 208), and final clauses (3.3.10, p 209). In conclusion, the subclause subjunctive is compared with the present (3.3.11, p 211), nominal clauses (3.3.12, p 213), and the optative (3.3.13, p 213).

3.3.1 CONDITIONALS WITH SUBJUNCTIVE APODOSIS

Subjunctive conditionals with a subjunctive apodosis are well attested. In principle, the condition is specific and its fulfilment realistic; since it refers to an as yet unrealised event, it has future reference. The relation between the condition and the consequence may, but not need to be logical, i.e. sometimes the consequence logically follows from the condition, and sometimes it does not. First and second persons are especially frequent since they typically occur in specific conditionals, but third persons are well attested, too.

²¹⁵ Sieg (1937: 134).

²¹⁶ Cf Ji (1998: 193).

²¹⁷ Or *aršvidan*; Yūsüp, Xoja and Qāmbiri (1988: C, 188) read *arsivdan sanramkä*.

²¹⁸ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 210-211).

In Old Uygur, Tocharian A subjunctive conditionals are usually rendered with a *sAr*-conditional, but the evidence for the consequence is meagre. For third person consequences, we have *gAy*-futures, just as in main clauses. In view of the correspondences found for main clauses, we would expect different patterns for at least the first person (3.2.3, p 168), and maybe also for the second, but good examples are lacking.

In the first example, the relation is certainly one of logic (*kärsäl täs* probably has no special periphrasis value; it is just the subjunctive – in future function – of *kärsäl*). In the second, the relation is also based on logic, but that logic seems to depend more on the judgment of the speaker: at least for the speaker, the consequence follows logically from the condition.

A15a2-3

äntā(ne wa)s ālu ype kälkāmäs tmann ats
 when we other:GEN.PL country go:1PL.SBJ then EMPH
šakkats wasām weñlune kärsäl täs
 certainly we:GEN saying know:SBJ.GER be:3SG.SBJ
 ‘When we go into another country,²¹⁹ then it will be possible to check our statement[s].’²²⁰

MY1.9a4

(ku)pr(e)ne nu waštäs läncäš ktsets puttišparām
 when but home.ABL leave.3SG.SBJ perfect Buddha.rank
kälpāträ
 obtain.3SG.SBJ
 ‘If, however, he leaves the house, he will attain the perfect Buddha rank.’²²¹

MayH1.15a24-26

kačan birök [a25] ävig barkıg kodup dentar işin işläsär [a26]
 when however house home abandon:CVB monk act:POSS work:COND
tüz-kärinčsiz yeg burhan kutın bulgay
 incomparable excellent Buddha worth:POSS find:FUT
 ‘If, however, he gives up the house and carries out the duties of a monk, he will attain the incomparable Buddha rank.’²²²

²¹⁹ Literally: ‘into the country of others’.

²²⁰ Cf Sieg (1944: 18). Literally: ‘our saying can be recognised’. The rationale of this sentence is that the princes have such good renown in their own country that they will not be able to prove the value of their skills objectively if they do not go abroad.

²²¹ Ji (1998: 61) slightly different.

²²² Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 104-105).

In the below example, the consequence does not follow logically from the condition: it reflects an expectation of the speaker.

MY1.6b4 = A215a5

kuprene mā et-ñi wtāk šakkats dhanike
 if not give:2SG.SBJ-1SG.SUFF again certainly rich.man
*protkaṃ prutkāš-ñi*²²³
 prison:LOC shut.up:3SG.SBJ-1SG.SUFF

‘If you do not give me (the money), the rich man will surely have me shut up in prison again!’²²⁴

MayH1.12b8-10 = MayT11a4-7

birökin bermäz ök ärsär siz²²⁵ mini ikilä tünäriḡ
 if give:AOR.NEG EMPH be:COND you:PL me again dark
kınl(ı)kta bäklägäylär tünin künin tokıḡaylar
 prison:LOC lock.up:FUT.PL by.night by.day beat:FUT.PL

‘Wenn Ihr [nicht gebt], dann werden sie mich wiederum im [finsteren Gefängnis] einschließen. Nachts [und tags werden sie (mich) schlagen].’²²⁶

In the following example, the condition is obviously set by the speaker; it is followed by an alternative condition and a long threat in MY1.6b7-8 (‘If you don’t give it, then ...’).

A215a7 = MY1.6b6

kuprene et-ñi kāsu šāwam ākäläntu knāsam-ci
 if give:2SG.SBJ-1SG.SUFF good great wish:PL fulfil:1SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF
 ‘If you give me (the money), then it is good and I will fulfil your great wishes!’²²⁷

MayT11a16 = MayH1.12b17-19

birökin altun yaratmak bersär s(ä)n k[üsü]šünjin kanta[či
 if gold coin give:COND 2SG wish:POSS.2SG fulfil:PRS.PTC
*m(ä)n?*²²⁸
 1SG

‘If you give the gold pieces, I will fulfil your wish[es].’²²⁹

²²³ With Sieg and Siegling (1921: 104) to be read so rather than <1> (pace Ji 1998: 44); the preceding text seems to be in prose, not verse.

²²⁴ Cf Ji (1998: 45).

²²⁵ MayH reads (a wrong) *siziḡ*.

²²⁶ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 282-283); Tekin (1980: 48).

²²⁷ Cf Schmidt (1999: 283; see also Ji 1998: 45).

²²⁸ The restoration of the damaged Old Uyghur text to *küsüşünjin* is plausible, but that of a future *kantači* is less certain.

²²⁹ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 282-283), Tekin (1980: 48).

The passage cited below is interesting because it contains one clear first person conditional where the apodosis cannot be understood as a consequence in the strict sense, but it is rather the intention of the speaker. Then this intentional apodosis is continued by the company of the speaker (his brothers), so that the difference between subjunctive apodoses and main clause future subjunctives is blurred.

A11b4-5

kuprene waluntāp ṣṇi āyāntu (pkā)nt pkānt penu kākloñcās
 if deceased:GEN REFL bone:PL apart apart also fall:PRT.PTC
kālpāmār cesām nāṣ wtā kaśal tswāsam
 obtain:1SG.SBJ DEM:PL I again together fit:1SG.SBJ
 ‘If I find the bones of a deceased, even [if] they have fallen apart, I will put them together again.’²³⁰

A11b5-6

nāṣ nu ce(smā)k āyāntu p_ukāk puskāsyo kaśal
 I but DEM:PL bone:PL completely sinew:INS.PL together
malkam-ām
 join:1SG.SBJ-PL.SUFF
 ‘But I will join the bones completely with the sinews.’²³¹

A11b6-A12a1

nāṣ nu cesmāk āyāntu śwāl ysār yats krām yokyo mām̄tne
 I but DEM:PL bone:PL flesh blood skin outer skin hair:INS like
neṣ tām̄nek salu pyutkāsmār-ām̄
 before just.so whole realise:1SG.SBJ-3SG.SUFF
 ‘But I will restore the bones with flesh, blood, skin, and outer skin,²³² exactly like before.’²³³

A12a1-2

nāṣ śkaṃ wtāk sāmānām̄ y(āmmā)r-ām̄
 I and again living do:1SG.SBJ-3SG.SUFF
 ‘And I will make him living again.’²³⁴

Although they are rare, reversed conditionals are found, too. In this particular example *pāṣtā(r)* is a present-subjunctive, but its function is ascertained if indeed it is protatic; the apodotic *wikāṣ* is certainly a subjunctive.

²³⁰ Cf Sieg (1944: 14). Preceding: A11b4 *śas trānkāṣ ṇi amokyo tāṣ cām̄plune* ‘One [the first] says, «Through my art this is my ability:»’.

²³¹ Cf Sieg (1944: 15). Preceding: A11b5 *wāt trānkāṣ* ‘The second says:’.

²³² For this translation, see Carling (2009: 171).

²³³ Cf Sieg (1944: 15). Preceding: A11b6 *trit trānkāṣ* ‘The third says:’.

²³⁴ Cf Sieg (1944: 15). Preceding: A12a1 *stārt trānkāṣ* ‘The fourth says:’.

A229a7²³⁵

šurmant mā wīkāṣ | omäskenäṣ mā pāštä(r) [46a]
 cause:PL not drive.off:3SG.SBJ evil:ABL not protect:3SG.PRS/SBJ
 'He will not drive off the causes if he does not protect himself against evil.'²³⁶

3.3.2 CONDITIONALS WITH PRESENT APODOSIS

Subjunctive conditionals followed by present clauses are of a number of different types, which seem to have in common that the apodotic present clause does not have future reference (for Tocharian standards). Types we find are:

- general conditionals that do not refer to a specific future event, but to a “tenseless”, principal truth;
- conditionals with specific referents, but an iterative aspect, which makes the event itself non-specific;
- conditionals based on inference, i.e. deduced conclusions and philosophical reasoning;
- conditionals with an apodosis that meets one of the conditions for a present with future reference, i.e. a negligibly close future or one of the verbs ‘go’, ‘become’, ‘give’, etc (see 3.2.8, p 180).

Not for all these types do we have good Old Uyghur parallels from the Maitreya-samitināṭaka, but the ones we have seem to follow the Tocharian A system: the subjunctive protasis is rendered by a *sAr*-conditional clause, and the present apodosis by an aorist clause.

In the following example, the general character of the conditional is ascertained, but unfortunately the apodotic verb is *y-* ‘go’, which by itself could perhaps be a reason for the present. However, it is used in a fixed expression and it does not denote motion here.

A14a2-6

(ku_[a3]pre) škam ne wrasom wlal lakeyaṃ kliso puk
 if and REL being die:SBJ.GER bed:LOC lie:PRT.PTC all
wraskentuyo worpu : sne ime sne kā(pñe_[a4]s
 illness:INS.PL surrounded without consciousness without love
ālakām) ārkīsoṣ(y)ac ymām tāṣ tām praṣtam mā cami
 other world:ALL go:PRS.PTC be:3SG.SBJ DEM moment not DEM:GEN
škam tsraṣsune wramam yāṣ mā amo(k_[a5] mā knānmune m)ā
 and energy case:LOC go:3SG.PRS not art not wisdom not
kāwältune mā pācar mā mācar mā ṣar mā pracar mā sām
 beauty not father not mother not sister not brother not wife

²³⁵ Verse: metre a, c: 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3), b, d: 7 | 8 (3+4 | 5+3).

²³⁶ Cf Schmidt (1974: 306).

mā sewāñ mā wašt mā nišpa(l _[a6] *cami wramañ yä)š*
 not children not house not possessions DEM:GEN case:LOC go:3SG.PRS
sas pñik škañ tām praštañ cami wramañ yäš
 one merit and DEM moment DEM:GEN case:LOC go:3SG.PRS

‘And when a being lies dying in bed, surrounded by all illnesses, and is going to (another) world without consciousness and without love, at that moment [its] energy is not of any use,²³⁷ nor are [its] art, [its] wisdom, [its] beauty, [its] father, [its] mother, [its] sister, [its] brother, [its] wife, [its] sons, [its] house, or [its] possession[s] of any use²³⁷ – only and alone [its] merit is of use²³⁷ at that moment.’²³⁸

An example with an Old Uygur parallel is the following, but here again the apodotic verb is *y-* ‘go’; moreover, the Old Uygur is far from literal.

MY2.11b4²³⁹

/// (wras)om † tri ñemintwam † wsokoneyäš : [1a]
 being three jewel:LOC.PL joy:ABL
letatär yäš † muskālune † kotluneyam : [1b]
 fall:3SG.SBJ go:3SG.PRS vanishing destruction:LOC

‘If a being falls from the joy in the three jewels, he goes to vanishing and destruction.’²⁴⁰

MayH2.13a6-11

kim kayu tñlag _[a7] *öñrä üç ärdnikä süzüliip* _[a8] *ken yana*
 who which being before three jewel:DAT purify:CVB later again
anča munča tıltagin _[a9] *aklap süzük köñli işilsär* _[a10]
 a.bit such cause:INST hate:CVB pure heart decrease:COND
korasar bu ärür .. töpüdin taymak _[a11] *tüşmāk*
 decrease:COND DEM be:AOR skull:ABL slip:INF fall:INF

‘Wenn ein Wesen früher die drei Juwelen verehrt hat²⁴¹ und danach wiederum aus irgendeiner Ursache (sie) verachtet und sein Herz (an Glauben) abnimmt (Hend.), so ist dies das ‘Herabgleiten vom Scheitel’.’²⁴²

A sharp line between iterative clauses and iterative conditionals is not always easy to draw: in Tocharian, a conditional conjunction need not be there and then it becomes

²³⁷ Literally: ‘goes in the case’ or ‘comes in the case’ etc.

²³⁸ Cf Sieg (1944: 17).

²³⁹ Verse: metre apparently 4 x 4 † 4 † 4, but päda 1d does not fit.

²⁴⁰ Ji (1998: 121).

²⁴¹ Literally “is purified” according to Clauson (1972: 863); by Geng and Klimkeit (1988) often rendered as “ehrfürchtig”. Erdal translates *süzül-* as ‘have faith’ (1991: 244).

²⁴² Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 160-161).

a matter of interpretation what the function of the subjunctive subclause is. In the first example, the indefinite or iterative value follows from *pkänt pkänt* ‘one by one’; in the second, it is only the present of the apodosis that leads to the iterative interpretation. In both cases, the apodosis evidently has no future reference.

A7b5-6²⁴³

*ka(pśim)*_[b6] *ñāṣās pākāntu* | *pkänt pkänt potkamā*²⁴⁴ *tṣam*
 body:ADJ part:PL apart apart divide:1SG.SBJ/NOT DEM:LOC
naṣ | *āñcām ñomā* : [1c]
 be:3SG.PRS self name:PERL

‘If I examine²⁴⁵ the body parts one by one, there is nothing called “the self”.’²⁴⁶

A6a1²⁴⁷

rasaṣ poke paṃ ypamām | *sumnātr oki cwankeyam* : [1b]
 stretch:3SG.SBJ arm PAM²⁴⁸ do:PRS.PTC pull:3SG.PRS like lap:LOC

‘[But] anytime she stretches her arm when she serves me, she pulls [me] onto her lap, as it were.’²⁴⁹

The clearest example of a conditional based on inference that I have found is the one directly below, where the truth of the condition automatically leads to the conclusion in the consequence, which in itself has no strict relation to tense, and certainly not to the future.

MY1.5a8

(ma)dhyadeṣaṣi tāt sne parnākk ats naṣt
 Madhyadeśa be:2SG.SBJ without glory EMPH be:2SG.PRS
 ‘If you are from Madhyadeśa, you will indeed be without glory.’²⁵⁰

Closer to a general conditional is the following, from a philosophical explanation of several types of eras or world periods.²⁵¹

²⁴³ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 | 4 (4+3 | 4+3 | 4).

²⁴⁴ For *potkam mā*.

²⁴⁵ Literally: ‘divide’.

²⁴⁶ Cf Sieg (1944: 11); Pinault (2008: 260).

²⁴⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

²⁴⁸ On this particle, see footnote 349.

²⁴⁹ Cf Sieg (1944: 9); Pinault (2008: 258).

²⁵⁰ Ji (1998: 41).

²⁵¹ The restoration of a present for *māsk-* is certain because this verb has no subjunctive.

A18a3-4

oktuk antarakalpañ kätkeñc sas mahākalp mā(skatä)r
 eighty antarakalpa:PL cross:3PL.SBJ one mahākalpa be:3SG.PRS
 ‘If eighty antarakalpas pass, it is one mahākalpa.’²⁵²

The next two examples are definitely specific and one could therefore expect a subjunctive apodosis, but as the verbs *y-* ‘go’ and *āy-* ‘give’ are among those that are more often found as future presents, this may be the reason why they are in the present. In the second example, the finite verb forms of the Old Uygur are unfortunately restored, so that instead of a volitional, we could perhaps also restore an aorist *berü täginür m(ä)n*.

MY3.11b4

šmeñc ats dakšinakī tmäk korpac yš-äm
 come:3PL.SBJ EMPH receiver.of.alms:PL then towards go:3SG.PRS-PL.SUFF
 ‘When the receivers of alms arrive, he goes to meet them.’²⁵³

MY3.10b2 = A446a5

/// täşş āšānik pissānkac el esam
 be:3SG.SBJ venerable community:ALL gift give:1SG.PRS
 ‘(If this) is (so), I will give a gift, o venerable one, to the community.’²⁵⁴

MayH3.10a22-23

antag [a23] [ärsär m(ä)n] kuvrag ärdnikä buşi berü [a24]
 so be:COND 1SG community jewel:DAT alms give:CVB
 [tägäyin]
 RESP:1SG.VOL

‘[Wenn] es so [ist, will ich] dem Juwel der Mönchsgemeinde eine Gabe geben.’²⁵⁵

3.3.3 CONDITIONALS WITH IMPERATIVE APODOSIS

An imperative clause may be preceded by a conditional clause. As it happens, the pattern of a preceding subjunctive conditional clause followed by an imperative clause is well attested, and in quite some cases there are good Old Uygur parallels to the examples from the Maitreyasamitināṭaka. Grammatically, there seems to be little difference between conditionals that would in English be rendered by *if*-clauses, i.e. probable but uncertain circumstances, and *when*-clauses, i.e. future events that are so likely to take place that it is merely a matter of time.

²⁵² Cf Sieg (1944: 22).

²⁵³ Cf Ji (1998: 193).

²⁵⁴ Cf Ji (1998: 189).

²⁵⁵ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 206-207).

I would expect that imperative clauses can also be preceded by optative conditionals, but I have found no examples; in principle, there is nothing wrong with ‘if by chance you should be in the neighbourhood, please do drop in’ or the like, which I would expect to have the structure *optative – imperative* in Tocharian A. Counterfactual conditionals with following imperative are not attested either, but that is certainly to be explained with the incompatibility of the imperative with past tense.²⁵⁶

In the first two examples below, it is still uncertain whether the condition will be fulfilled. In the second, we have a nice Old Uyğur parallel with the OUY. cond. *y_(a)rlıkasar*, corresponding to the TA conditional sbj. *wätkäşş-*, and OUY. 2pl.vol. *ukuñlar* in the apodosis, which corresponds to the TA ipv. *pkärsäs*.

A71b2²⁵⁷

k_uprene rake mäkk ats weñäş | pätskâc-äm sol käreyo
 if word not:EMPH PCL say:3SG.SBJ pull.out:IPV.PL life sword:INS
 ‘If he does not say a word at all, take the life out of him with the sword!’²⁵⁸

MY2.5a7-8 = A213b3-4

kuprene säm yasäm caş penu pärklune sne • (tä)ñklune
 if DEM your:PL DEM also questioning without hesitation
atänkät wätkäşş-äm cam yas wäşpâ wä(tkälts
 unchecked distinguish:3SG.SBJ-3SG.SUFF DEM you indeed certainly
tämne) w(ä)knâ kakmunt puk knänmänänt ptänkät pkärsäs²⁵⁹
 DEM:REL way come:PRT.PTC all knowing Buddha know:IPV.PL
 ‘If he also understands your questioning immediately and without hesitation, then you are indeed to recognise him surely as the (Tat)hägata and the all-knowing Buddha.’²⁶⁰

MayH2.6a8-12

bu muntag törlüg ayıt_[a9]miş sezikläriñizni adartlayu_[a10]
 DEM thus ADJ ask:PTC your.questions distinguish:CVB
y_(a)rlıkasar .. ötrü sizlär inčä ukuñlar_[a11] seziksiz
 RESP:COND then you:PL so understand:VOL.2PL doubtless

²⁵⁶ In fact, Dutch has a counterfactual imperative, e.g.

had dat gedaan!
 had that done

ca. ‘you should have done that’ (see Haeseryn e.a. 1997: 66-67).

²⁵⁷ Verse: metre a: 20, b: 22, c: 10, d: 15 (a: 5 | 5 | 5 | 5, b: 8 | 7 | 7, c: 5 | 5, d: 4+4 | 4+3).

²⁵⁸ Cf Sieg (1952: 18).

²⁵⁹ Here A213 seems to deviate. The photo of the damaged manuscript is not very clear, but instead of Sieg and Siegling’s <[t]äm> (1921: 103) where we actually expect to find *pkärsäs*, we can probably also read <[s]äm> (<š> with a virāma seems to be no option).

²⁶⁰ Cf Ji (1998: 91).

tükäl *bilgä* *t(ä)ŋri* *t(ä)ŋrisi* *burhan* [a12] *ärmiš*
 completely wise god.of.gods Buddha be:PTC

‘Wenn er dieses derartig von euch Gefragte zu unterscheiden geruht, dann möget ihr es so verstehen: Ohne Zweifel ist es der völlig weise Göttergott Buddha.’²⁶¹

In the two examples below, it seems that the protases are best rendered as *when*-clauses: in the first, it is the OÜy. conjunction *kačan* ‘when’ that indicates this, in the second it is the meaning, combined with the Tocharian A conjunction *äntäne* ‘when’. Although the TA protasis is incomplete in the first example, we have a perfect correspondence between the TA sbj. *yomnāc* ‘you reach’ and the OÜy. cond. *tägsär sizlär* ‘if you reach’, and in the apodosis between the TA ipv. *plos* ‘send!’ and the OÜy. *ıdıñlar* ‘send!’. In the second, the TA sbj. *šmāc* ‘you come’ corresponds to the OÜy. cond. *tägsär sizlär* ‘if you reach’ in the protasis, and the TA ipv. *päskāyäs* ‘make effort!’ to the OÜy. 2pl.vol. *kataglanıñlar* ‘make effort!’ in the apodosis.

MY2.5b6²⁶²

/// *yomnāc* *oñkraci* : *šakkats* *škañ* *ñi* *tmāš* *pāk*
 obtain:2PL.SBJ immortal surely too I:GEN DEM:ABL part
plos *ymā(r* *škārā)*
 send:IPV.2PL quickly back

‘When you reach immortal (bliss), surely send also part of it quickly (back) to me!’²⁶³

MayH2.6a28-b1

kačan [a29] *sizlär* *māñülüg* *māñikā* *tägsär* *sizlär* [a30] *maña*
 when you:PL eternal joy:DAT reach:COND you:PL I:DAT
γ(e)mā *ädgülig* *ülüš* *yanturu* *ıdıñ*[b1]*lar*
 too good part back send:VOL.2PL

‘When you reach eternal joy, send also a good part²⁶⁴ back to me again!’²⁶⁵

MY2.4b3 = A216²⁶⁶b4-5 = A212b5

(*änt*)*äne* *tsopatsām* *krop* *wartsyañ* *lmont* *ptāñkät* *käššinac*
 when large crowd community:LOC sit:PRS.PTC Buddha teacher:ALL
kātse *šmāc* *tmäk* *yas* *camı* *kapšīññam* *taryāk* (*wepı*)
 close come:2PL.SBJ then you:PL DEM:GEN body:LOC thirty.two

²⁶¹ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 132-133).

²⁶² Possibly metrical, but the passage is too fragmentary to establish the metre.

²⁶³ Cf Ji (1998: 93).

²⁶⁴ Wilkens translates this as a more specific “Heilsanteil” (2008: 420).

²⁶⁵ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 134-135, slightly different).

²⁶⁶ To be turned over.

lakṣaṇās lkā)tsi päskāyäs

mark:PL see:INF make.effort:IPV.PL

‘When you come close to the Buddha, the teacher, sitting surrounded by a large crowd, then you must try to see the thirty-(two marks) on his body.’²⁶⁷

MayH2.5a1-5

tört törlüg terin [a2] kuvrag ara olorur ärkän t(ä)ḡri
four ADJ crowd community between sit:AOR while god

burhan[a3]ka yakın tägsär ..²⁶⁸ sizlär anta sizlär aḡ [a4] ilki
Buddha:DAT close reach:COND you:PL then you:PL EMPH first

iki kırk irü b(ä)lgü kutın buyanın [a5] adirtlagalı²⁶⁹
thirty.two omen mark worth:POSS merit:POSS distinguish:CVB

ukgali kataglanñlar

understand:CVB make.effort:2PL.VOL

‘When you come close to the Buddha while he is sitting amidst the fourfold community, then you must first try to recognise the thirty-two marks of worth and merit.’²⁷⁰

3.3.4 EVENTUAL

Eventual clauses add uncertain information to a main clause: the information may or may not be correct, or the situation may or may not be the case. This uncertainty is expressed by the subjunctive. In the example directly below, for instance, there seems to be no other way to interpret the use of the subjunctive form *tāṣ* ‘is’: it is certainly not temporal or conditional, for instance, and the preceding *mämtne* ‘how’ indicates that the content is uncertain. In a literal translation, this type of clauses should be rendered with English *may*, but it seems that in the Tocharian the subjunctive form does not have a comparably strong emphasis.

A432a2

śomiṃ pärkmār-ci mämtne wram tāṣ tāmne
girl ask:1SG.PRS/SBJ-2SG.SUFF how thing be:3SG.SBJ so

²⁶⁷ Cf Ji (1998: 83).

²⁶⁸ The interpunction is wrong.

²⁶⁹ Yüsüp, Xoǰa and Qämbiri (1988: C, 148) read *adartlagalı*.

²⁷⁰ The translation follows that of Yüsüp, Xoǰa and Qämbiri (1988: C, 35). Cf also Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 126-127), who have the wrong subject for the *ärkän*-clause: ‘Wenn ihr inmitten der viergliedrigen Gemeinde (*caṭuṣpariṣad*) sitzt und dem göttlichen Buddha nahekommt, dann möget ihr euch bemühen, zuerst die 32 guten Zeichen (*lakṣana*) der Würde [des Buddha] zu unterscheiden und zu verstehen’.

peṃ mar nṣac smale ·
 say:IPV.SG not:PROH I:ALL lie:GER

‘Girl, I ask you, how the matter is, so say it! [You are] not to lie to me!’²⁷¹

The following example is rather fragmentary, but because of the good match with the Old Uygur version it is nevertheless possible to give a reliable interpretation. Here the eventual subjunctive seems to emphasise that it is as yet unknown which field it is that has the required qualities to grow cotton for a garment for the Buddha.

MY3.4a5

/// k(a)knu miṣi tāṣ cam tu kāsu āneñci pleṣār
 provided field be:3SG.SBJ DEM you good careful work:IPV.SG

‘(Which) field is provided with ..., that you must till well and carefully!’²⁷²

MayH3.4a31-b3

kayu kábāzkā ya[ra]ṣi sākiz törlüg [b₁] adrokin tükällig yer
 which cotton:DAT quality eight ADJ special completely land
ärsär anı sizlär suvap [b₂] sıp sapanlap anok uruñlar
 be:COND DEM you:PL water:CVB plough:CVB work:CVB ready make:IPV.PL

kim m(ā)n t(ā)ṅri [b₃] t(ā)ṅriṣi burhan üčün kábāz tariyur m(ā)n
 that I god.of.gods Buddha because.of cotton plant:AOR 1SG

‘Dasjenige Land, das für Baumwolle geeignet ist und insgesamt achterlei Qualitäten aufweist, das bewässert, pflügt, beackert und bereitet, damit ich für den Göttergott Buddha Baumwolle pflanze!’²⁷³

3.3.5 ITERATIVE

Present iterative and indefinite clauses require a subjunctive finite verb; if they are past, an optative is used instead (see 3.3.13, p 213). The difference between iterative and indefinite clauses is sometimes small. In principle, an iterative clause denotes a repeated action, whereas an indefinite clause presents an action as not entirely clear, but in any case irrelevant for the main clause. However, the two become close to each other if the indefinite clause stresses the irrelevance of the number of instances of an event, or its degree. As typical iterative clauses I take those where the main clause takes up the number of instances, as in the two sentences below. The first is damaged, but its type is ascertained by the reduplicated *tmanäk tmanäk* ‘in each of them’ on the one hand and by the Old Uygur parallel on the other. A more literal translation for the second would be ‘as often as ..., exactly so often ...’.

²⁷¹ Cf Schmidt (1974: 377).

²⁷² Probably so rather than Ji’s: “(when) this field has become ..., then you work it well and carefully.” (1998: 161).

²⁷³ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 184-185).

MY2.7a1

/// (y)pe)yaṃ śmāš tmanäk tmanäk wältsantuyo

land:LOC come:3SG.SBJ in.each.of.them thousand:INS.PL

‘... in every land (of Madhyadeśa) he comes to, in each of them (the beings honour him) by thousands.’²⁷⁴

MayH2.7b15-20

anta ötrü burhanlig č_(a)kr_(a)v_(a)rt elig han_[b16]nuṃ uluḡ oḡl töziün

then then Buddha:ADJ cakravartin king king:GEN great son noble

maytri bodis_(a)vt_[b17] d_(a)kšanap_(a)t eltin matyadeš uluška_[b18]

Maitreya Bodhisattva Dakṣiṇāpatha land:ABL Madhyadeśa domain:DAT

täginčä kayu kayu uluška tägsär sans_{(i)z}_[b19] öküš tnlḡlar

reach:EQU whichever land:DAT reach:COND countless many being:PL

ulug agar ayagin utru_[b20] ünärlär ärdi

great honour honour towards come.out:AOR.PL be:PRT

‘Als der bedeutendste Sohn des Buddha-cakravartin-Königs, der edle Bodhisattva Maitreya, vom Dakṣiṇāpatha-Reich zum Land Madhyadeśa kam, da erwiesen ihm in jedem Land, das er erreichte, zahllose, viele Wesen tiefe Verehrung (Hend.) und hießen ihn willkommen.’²⁷⁵

A2b4-5

kospreṃ kospreṃ škaṃ ne amokäts amo(kṣim) wram pyutkāštär :

anytime and REL artist art:ADJ thing create:3SG.SBJ

täprenäk täprenäk päñ pärkowäntu mäskamtr-äm

just.so.often five advantages be:3PL.PRS-3SG.SUFF

‘Anytime an artist creates a work of art he has five advantages [from it].’²⁷⁶

3.3.6 INDEFINITE

For the similarities between iterative and indefinite clauses, see above. Below, I give three examples that are difficult to analyse as iterative clauses. Importantly, they all have a present main clause. For the second and the third example this is certain because it contains an overt present form; in the first it is plausible, but not certain because *praskmār* is a present-subjunctive.

A10b5-6

kusne rāmes praskmāṃ tāc (näš mā)

who Rāma:GEN fear:PRS.PTC be:2PL.SBJ I not

²⁷⁴ Cf Ji (1998: 103).

²⁷⁵ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 138-139).

²⁷⁶ Cf Sieg (1944: 5).

praskmār-ām

fear:1SG.PRS/SBJ-3SG.SUFF

‘Whoever of you is fearing²⁷⁷ Rāma, I don’t fear him.’²⁷⁸

A4a4-5

āntām tkaṇā ne sām tsmār kārknāṣ tmāṣṣ aci
 where earth:PERL REL DEM root bind:3SG.SBJ there:ABL onwards

kro(ś [a₅] tka)naṃ lok or oktsiṣṣ-ām

krośa earth:LOC far wood grow:3SG.PRS-3SG.SUFF

‘Where on earth it strikes²⁷⁹ root, from there its wood grows on on earth for *krośas*.^{280,281}

A218b₃²⁸²

mā ṇi wāsklune mā rake pātsāk paramāṇū kṣaṃ yārmaṃ
 not I:GEN movement not word thought atom moment measure:LOC

naṣ kusne ālu s_ukac mā tāṣ : 17

be:3SG.PRS which other:GEN.PL happiness:ALL not be:3SG.SBJ

‘There is no movement, no word or thought of mine, [not] even within the measure of the smallest moment, which would not be for the happiness of others.’²⁸³

3.3.7 KOSNE ‘AS’

Adverbial clauses with the conjunction *kosne* ‘as’ are attested in two types: nominal, and with subjunctive finite verbs. It seems that the subjunctive depends on *kosne*, making the clause indefinite, i.e. no matter how long the event in the subclauses goes on, or no matter how much of it is done, the main clause still holds. However, it is also possible that the subjunctive is caused by the future reference of these sentences instead, as I have found no subjunctive *kosne*-clause with a present main clause.

²⁷⁷ The construction *praskmām tāc*, with a prs.ptc. and a copula, is unusual; perhaps it is a calque on a Sanskrit construction.

²⁷⁸ Rather than Sieg’s conditional “Wenn ihr den Rāma fürchten solltet, (ich) fürchte ihn (nicht).” (1944: 14).

²⁷⁹ Literally: ‘binds’.

²⁸⁰ A large distance measure, “Indian league” (Monier-Williams 1899: 322, col.2).

²⁸¹ Cf Sieg (1944: 7).

²⁸² Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

²⁸³ Cf Sieg and Siegling (1933: 173; see also Hackstein 1995: 198). The Chinese translation of Aśvaghōṣa’s *Buddhacarita* offers only an imprecise match; perhaps we should compare Beal (1883: 170): “I have no name – nor do I seek profit or pleasure, But simply to declare the truth; to save men (living things) from pain, and to fulfil my ancient oath, to rescue all not yet delivered.”

In view of the different nuances of *kosne*, it is probably best to say that it actually means no more than ‘as’ in the non-causal sense. In English, we often need to translate ‘as much as’, ‘as far as’, ‘as long as’, and so on, but these precisions form no part of the meaning of the Tocharian word.

A71a5

/// *tp(u)kässī yātaṣ kosne śolṣim praskiyam mā śmāṣ*
 hide:INF be.able:3SG.SBJ as life:ADJ fear:LOC not come:3SG.SBJ
 ‘Will he be able to hide himself as long as he does not come into danger of life?’²⁸⁴

A218a5²⁸⁵

‖ *weñam tāpärk ślokaśī wram | kosne ime*
 say:1SG.SBJ now strophe:GEN.PL thing as memory
kalkaṣ-ñi : [14b]
 go:3SG.SBJ-1SG.SUFF
 ‘I will now state the sense²⁸⁶ of the strophes as far as my memory goes.’²⁸⁷

Nominal *kosne*-clauses are much better attested, even next to subjunctive main clauses.

MY1.2a4²⁸⁸

/// (*ñäkcyā*)s *napeñšās | yomnāṣ sukuntu kosne kri* : [2b]
 divine human reach:3SG.SBJ²⁸⁹ happiness:PL as desire
 ‘He will acquire (divine) and human happiness as much as he wants.’²⁹⁰

²⁸⁴ Cf Sieg (1952: 18).

²⁸⁵ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3). The preceding /// *tī* might be for *utpatti* ‘origin’.

²⁸⁶ *wram*, normally ‘matter, thing’, is here as a calque used in another meaning of Skt. *artha*, o.a. ‘thing; sense’.

²⁸⁷ Cf Sieg and Siegling (1933: 172).

²⁸⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

²⁸⁹ This form could theoretically also be a present, i.e. prs. {*yomnāṣ-ṣ*} instead of sbj. {*yomnā-ṣ*}, but as it should be one of the two, the *stem* is not present-subjunctive.

²⁹⁰ Ji (1998: 29).

A62b1-2²⁹¹

tṣaṃ spārtweñc | kälkeñc ñāktas napemsaṃ : [5a]
 DEM:LOC turn:3PL.SBJ go:3PL.SBJ god:PL man:LOC.PL

sne kaś saku – – – /// [5b]
 without number pleasure[s]

(*kosne*) *piktrā mārkaṃpal | kritāṃ yaś sām*
 who write:3SG.PRS law gratitude do:3SG.PRS DEM

ptāñāktes : [5c]

Buddha:GEN

kosne postkaṃ akṣari | tprenāk wyārās sas yāmtrā : 5
 as book:LOC akṣara:PL so.many monastery:PL one do:3SG.SBJ

‘Here they [= the possessions of the law] will turn round and go among men and gods; countless pleasures ...; he who writes down the law, shows his gratitude to the Buddha;²⁹² as many akṣaras as there are in a book, so many monasteries will the first²⁹³ make.’

The pattern with a negated present main clause and a very short *kosne*-clause is well attested, too. Here, *kosne* is very close to being a preposition.

A71a4

mā tṣaṃ tāpreṃ kāpñe ālak wraṃ naś kosne ṣñi śol
 not DEM:LOC so dear other thing be:3SG.PRS as REFL life

‘There is no other thing as dear as one’s own life.’²⁹⁴

The fact that no present *kosne*-clauses are attested in my view leaves room for the possibility that the conjunction requires a subjunctive. The nominal examples would then form a special category, or *kosne* has to be viewed as a preposition there.

3.3.8 CONCESSIVE

In concessive clauses the information is presented as irrelevant to the statement of the main clause. A typical concessive clause gives factual information that is irrelevant, but clauses that give *possible* irrelevant information may be closely related

²⁹¹ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3). The first four syllables of 5a belong syntactically to the preceding (with a considerable lacuna; for the restoration cf Thomas 1957: 153): A62a6-b1 *māmtne pācar niṣpalntu | wla(luneyaṃ sewāśī [4c] lipāś tāmnek sām kāṣṣi | mārkaṃpa)lṣās niṣpalntu* : 4 *lyepās wasāṃ* ‘Like a father who leaves his possessions to his sons when dying, thus the teacher has left to us the possessions of the law.’

²⁹² Cf Carling (2009: 172).

²⁹³ Literally: ‘the one’.

²⁹⁴ Cf Sieg (1952: 18).

to conditional clauses. The factual concessive would be ‘even though A, B’, the possible concessive ‘even if A, B’; the difference with ‘if A, B’ is only the word “even”, which roughly corresponds to *penu* ‘also’ in Tocharian A.

In the first example, the concessive clause is factual, i.e. speaker and hearer take its truth for granted. The second example concerns a general principle that could be applied to many specific cases, and, consequently, its concessive clause is possible. (A third good example is A5a2-4, given further below in 3.3.9, p 208.)

A65a1²⁹⁵

pñintwiss oko nišpalntu | tākeñc penu nutont šol | mā
 merit:GEN.PL fruit possession:PL be:3PL.SBJ also perish:PRT.PTC life not
škaṃ štämseñc [1b]
 and establish:3PL.PRS

‘Even though possessions are the fruit of merits, they do not [re-]establish life when it has perished.’²⁹⁶

MY2.6b1-2²⁹⁷

aryu penu wärpātrā | [b2] /// [1a]
 long also receive:3SG.SBJ
 /// (ce)smaššäl aryu pe | plāntaš ākaṃ śralune | tmäkk
 they:COM long also be.pleased:3SG.SBJ end:LOC separation then
ats kumnäš : [1b]
 EMPH come:3SG.PRS

‘Even if for a long time (one) enjoys ... even if for a long time he is pleased with them, in the end separation will come for sure.’²⁹⁸

MayH2.7a11-17

näč [a12] ürkič bu tmlag oglm beš törlüg [a13] säviglig mäñji
 what long DEM being child five ADJ lovely joy
täginsärlär .. šor suv [a14] ičmiš osuglug todmaz
 reach:COND.PL salt water drink:PTC like satisfy:NEG.AOR
kanmazlar .. näčä ür [a15]kič amraklagu kuvrag birlä
 satisfy:NEG.AOR.PL what long dear community together
mähiläsär [a16] ögrünčüläsär (.) keniñä amraktin adralmak [a17] ačtğ
 enjoy:COND enjoy:COND later dear:ABL separate:INF pain
ämgäk k(ä)lmäki bar
 pain come:INF there.is

²⁹⁵ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 | 4 (4+3 | 4+3 | 4).

²⁹⁶ Cf Sieg (1952: 25).

²⁹⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 | 4 (4+3 | 4+3 | 4).

²⁹⁸ Ji (1998: 97).

‘Wie lange auch die Kinder der Lebewesen diese fünf Arten von lieblichen Freuden (*pañca kāmaguṇāḥ*) genießen (wrtl.: erreichen), indem sie wie Salzwasser trinkende (Wesen sind), die nicht gestillt und befriedigt werden, wie lange sie sich (auch) freuen (Hend.) mit (ihrer) geliebten Gemeinschaft, so kommt doch letztlich das schmerzliche Leid der Trennung von den Geliebten.’²⁹⁹

3.3.9 COMPARISON

There are three instances of subclauses in a metaphorical comparison where a subjunctive is used. In the English translation, it is necessary to express the fact that the comparison clause is not actual with a *were*-conditional. Normally, such unreal clauses are formed with the optative in Tocharian, so that it is surprising to find a subjunctive instead. However, the interpretation is beyond doubt and so we are forced to add this category to the use of the Tocharian A subjunctive. It is striking to note that in the first case, the main clause is even past, whereas the subjunctive is normally not used in past contexts (the same is true of A312a1, not cited here, but see 3.3.13, p 213). In the second example, the main clause is a general present. Apparently, the tense of the main clause did not affect the finite verb of the comparison clause – a clear relative tense feature (see footnote 11). The structure of the second example is a bit more complicated, the first two subjunctives *tāṣ* being part of concessive subclauses; the finite verb of the main clause is *pālkāṣ*.

A12b2-3

tāmne sām tām praṣṭam pālkāl tāk māmtne ṣpānyo
 so DEM DEM moment see:SBJ.GER be:3SG.PRT like sleep:INS
kliso sne wāsklune kesār śīśāk tāṣ
 lie:PRT.PTC without motion Kesara lion be:3SG.SBJ
 ‘At that moment it looked like it were a motionless Kesara lion, lying asleep.’³⁰⁰

A5a2-4

tāṣ penu (wra)_[a3] som arāmpātyo kaknu lkātsi kāswe knānmune
 be:3SG.SBJ also being figure:INS provided see:INF lovely wisdom
ats mā tāṣ-ām tāpreṃ ats pālkāṣ mām(tne) _[a4] tsekeṣi
 just not be:3SG.SBJ-3SG.SUFF then just look:3SG.PRS like fashioned
pekeṣi pat arāmpāt tāṣ
 painted or figure be:3SG.SBJ
 ‘Even if a being is provided with a [beautiful] figure [and] lovely to look at, [but] it has no wisdom, then it looks exactly like it were a fashioned or painted figure.’³⁰¹

²⁹⁹ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 136-137).

³⁰⁰ Cf Sieg (1944: 15).

3.3.10 FINAL

The usual way to express purpose and goal is with an infinitive clause, mostly preceding the main clause: the infinitive has a strong final value. Besides, finite final clauses are also found, which rather follow the main clause. In all certain cases this main clause is an imperative clause, and the final clause is a subjunctive clause.

In quite a number of cases the word *māntne* (or *māmtne*) introduces the final clause, and in these sentences it is attractive to view it as a conjunction ‘so that’, ‘in order to’. However, because the word has other functions, too, mostly translating as ‘how’ or ‘like’,³⁰² we have to bear in mind that splitting its function is perhaps only imposing distinctions on the Tocharian that are not actually there. Having said that, the word *māntne* is very helpful for the interpretation of these sentences, as it shows that smaller clauses have to be taken together as longer sentences.

Alternatively, it seems that *māntne* may also be absent, but in those cases it is often difficult to exclude that the clauses are merely juxtaposed.

In the first two examples, the final clause is introduced by *māntne*, which is in the second rendered by the Old Uygur conjunction *kim* ‘that’; the construction with *gAll*-forms and *bol-* ‘be’ expresses ability,³⁰³ whereas the volitional ending *-alim* can be compared with the Tocharian subjunctive.

A340b7

oṣem pkāmār śikṣāpat māntne tmākyok mā nkatār
 by.night bring:IPV.SG moral so.that DEM:PERL/EMPH not perish:2SG.SBJ
 ‘Keep the moral by night, so that you will not perish by that same thing!’

MY3.2b1

pyām ske māntne kälpāmtār krant märkampal klyosnässi
 do:IPV.SG effort so.that obtain:1PL.SBJ good law hear:INF
ptāñkā(t) kāṣṣi lkātsi
 Buddha teacher see:INF

‘Make an effort so that we get to hear the good law, (and see) the Buddha, the teacher.’³⁰⁴

MayH3.2b7-10

amtı siz inčā [b8] kataḡlanıñ³⁰⁵ kim biz y(e)mā siz [b9]iñ
 now you so make.effort:IPV that we and your

³⁰¹ Cf Sieg (1944: 8).

³⁰² These two meanings are closely connected, cf Gm. *wie*, It. *como*, both ‘how; like’.

³⁰³ The construction is well attested (Erdal 2004: 259); therefore, there is no need to read *bul-* ‘find’ instead, which could theoretically render *kälpā-* ‘obtain’.

³⁰⁴ Cf Ji (1998: 151).

³⁰⁵ So to be corrected for *kataglanına* in the manuscript.

kutuñuzta nom ešidgäli t_(ä)ñ_[b10]ri t_(ä)ñrisi burhanag kör[gäli]
 glory:2PL.LOC law hear:CVB god.of.gods Buddha see:CVB
bolalım
 be:VOL.1PL

'Jetzt bemüht Euch dahingehend, daß auch wir durch Eure Majestät das Gesetz hören und den Göttergott Buddha sehen!'³⁰⁶

In the example below, still translated as juxtaposed sentences, there is a strong causal connection between the imperative and subjunctive clauses, which makes a final reading of the latter attractive. The Old Uygur translator has definitely understood it that way, as he has added *kim* 'that', making the larger structure explicit.

MY1.6a6³⁰⁷

(paş-ñi päñ kã)nt tinãrãs | lyutñam pare
 give:IPV.2SG-1SG.SUFF five hundred gold.piece:PL drive.away:1SG.SBJ debt
tãm skassu : 1
 be:1SG.SBJ happy

'(Give me five hundred) gold pieces. I will get out of [my] debts and be happy.'³⁰⁸

MayH1.12a19 = MayT117+10b1-2

beş yüz yaratmak b_(e)rgil.. kim birimimin ötãp
 five hundred gold.piece give:2SG.VOL that debt:POSS.1SG pay.debts:CVB
ençin äräyin
 peace:INS be:1SG.VOL

'Give five hundred gold pieces, so that I can pay my debts and be in peace.'³⁰⁹

In the below appeal by a king (or a herald) to suitors for his daughter, a final reading is certainly possible, but since again overt marking is lacking, we cannot be totally certain (Sieg has translated them as independent clauses).³¹⁰

A66b5

ärwar yãmurãş cam koñ tãm tkanã pukmãs
 ready do:ABS DEM day DEM place:ALL come:IPV.PL
knatr-ãm rito ãkãl plãntac kãleñcim
 come.about:3SG.SBJ-PL.SUFF cherished wish enjoy:2PL.SBJ woman:ADJ

³⁰⁶ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 176-177).

³⁰⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

³⁰⁸ Cf Ji (1998: 45).

³⁰⁹ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 280-281), Tekin (1980: 47). In the Turpan version, the beginning is slightly different: *beş yüz yaratmak kim birimim ...*

³¹⁰ 1952 (p 9): "... rüstet euch [und] kommt an dem Tag zu dem Platz. Es wird euch in Erfüllung gehen der gehegte Wunsch. Ihr werdet euch an der Frauenperle erfreuen."

ñemiyo

pearl:INS

‘Make yourself ready and come to the place that day, so that your cherished wish will be fulfilled [and] you will enjoy yourself with the pearl of women.’

In the example below, it seems possible to take *waštāš lāñcāš* as a final clause, but other options are certainly available, too. It could be a permissive main clause ‘he may leave the house’, or perhaps the content of *tārkor* ‘permission that he leaves the house’, i.e. ‘permission to leave the house’.

A74a4-5

kuprene māskit waštāš lāntāssi mā kālpāl tāš ... ///
if prince house:ABL leave:INF not obtain:SBJ.GER be:3SG.SBJ

(tā)rkor pyāmā-ṃ waštāš lāñcāš
permission do:IPV.SG house:ABL leave:3SG.SBJ

‘If the prince cannot get to leave the house, ... Give him permission that he may leave the house!’

3.3.11 COMPARED TO THE PRESENT

There are no conditionals with a present in the protatic clause. On the basis of general patterns in conditionals (as exemplified by English, see 3.1.3, p 158), and the evidence of Tocharian B (see 3.6.10, p 265), I would expect that inferential conditionals could have taken present protatic clauses, but I have not been able to find examples.

In some cases, a Tocharian A present subclause corresponds to Old Uyghur conditional sentences. However, this is certainly a subtype of a relative clause with *who* etc, where a conditional is needed in Old Uyghur only: in Tocharian, these clauses are simply construed with a present. In the first example, the Tocharian A subclause is reasonably well preserved, including the word for ‘who’. In the second, the word for ‘who’ is unfortunately lost, but it can safely be reconstructed on the basis of the Old Uyghur parallel (MY3.10a6, not cited here, is probably construed in the same way, but no Old Uyghur parallel is preserved).

MY2.3b2³¹¹

‡ *(ke)ne*³¹² *kri n-äm cam lkātsi* : [2c]
who:GEN wish be:3SG.SUFF DEM see:INF

pālcās waštāš ptāñāktac ‡ *kene kri n-äm*
leave:IPV.PL house:ABL Buddha:ALL who:GEN wish be:3SG.SUFF

³¹¹ Verse: metre 4 x 7 ‡ 7 (4+3 ‡ 4+3).

³¹² Because of the parallel construction, probably rather *(ke)ne* than Ji’s *(k_upre)ne* (1998: 78).

śālpatsi : 2

free:INF

‘... whose wish it is to see him. Go away from the house to the Buddha, (you) whose wish it is to become freed!’³¹³

MY3.10a5 = A446a1

/// *ś(o)mm (o)kāk śāmaṃ kenträ • camaṃ kālymeyā*
one including monk call:3SG.PRS DEM:LOC correctly

sparcwatär • puk pissānkāntu
behave:3SG.PRS all community:PL

‘... (who) invites only one monk ..., and treats him correctly, all communities ...’³¹⁴

MayH3.10a5-8

inčip kamag kuvragdın bir yaluṃuz [a6] toyıng ötünüp
then all community:ABL one only monk invite:CVB

ävkä elitip ayap čiltäp agar[a7]lap buši
house:DAT lead:CVB honour:CVB honour:CVB honour:CVB alms

bersär .. alku kuvragka tapınmiš udun[a8]miš bolur
give:COND all community:DAT honour:PTC honour:PTC be:AOR

‘Wenn man von der ganzen Mönchsgemeinde nur einen Mönch ins Haus bittet, ihn verehrt und beehrt (Hend.) und ihm eine Gabe gibt, dann wird die ganze Mönchsgemeinde verehrt (Hend.).’³¹⁵

In A361.2, the editors have transliterated *k_upre ne knānat*, which looks like a conditional present ‘if you know’ (Sieg and Siegling 1921: 202), but in fact we have to read *k_upre te*: it is *not* an example of a conditional present (the Tocharian A clause is difficult to translate because it seems that Skt. *pratijānāsi* ‘you claim’ has been interpreted as *jānāsi* ‘you know’):

A361.2

[SKT:] | *kārśakam pratijānāsi* | [TA:] *pate k_upre te*
ploughman claim:2SG.PRS plough whether Q

knānat |

know:2SG.PRS

‘You claim to be a ploughman? | You know how to be a ploughman, don’t you?’

Compare the Pāli parallel in the Saṃyutta Nikāya, *kassako paṭijānāsi na ca passāmi te kaṣiṃ* (Feer 1884: 172) ‘A ploughman by thine own confession thou? No plough-

³¹³ Cf Ji (1998: 79).

³¹⁴ Cf Ji (1998: 189).

³¹⁵ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 206-207).

ing I can see!” (Rhys Davids 1917: 217) or “Du behauptest ein Säemann zu sein, aber ich sehe deine Aufsaat nicht.” (Geiger 1930: 270). Cf also the Chinese parallel *zi shuō gēng tián zhě* 自說耕田者 ‘You say yourself that you are a ploughman’ adduced by Enomoto (1997: 97).

3.3.12 COMPARED TO NOMINAL CLAUSES

The example below is fragmentary, but nevertheless instructive. The clauses are evidently parallel, but only the first has an eventual subjunctive *tāṣ* ‘who may have the wish’. Apparently, the following clauses could be nominal because the structure was sufficiently clear.

A226b6-7³¹⁶

ke pat nu krī tāṣ | ñareyāntwaṣ /// [2a] [b7] ///
 who:GEN or but wish be:3SG.SBJ hell:ABL.PL

ke pat nu saṃ krī | ñākci suk nāṣ kālpimār : [2c]
 who:GEN or but DEM wish divine happiness I obtain:1SG.OPT

ke pat nu ākāl | ñākci napemṣi ā /// [2d]
 who:GEN or but wish divine human

‘Who may want to (be freed?) from the hells, or who has this wish, «may I obtain divine happiness!», or who has the wish, «... human and divine ...»’

3.3.13 COMPARED TO THE OPTATIVE

Whereas the subjunctive in subclauses denotes events that are as yet uncertain, or not completely known or defined, the optative in the same clauses denotes events that are perhaps theoretically possible, but improbable. Further, the optative replaces the subjunctive in iterative or indefinite subclauses in a past rather than a present or future context.

On the basis of examples in Tocharian B, and the value of the optative in subclauses and main clauses in Tocharian A, one would expect that irreal, but not counterfactual conditionals are formed with an optative plus optative pattern, i.e. an optative subclause and an optative main clause (this is in my view suggested, though not explicitly stated, by Krause and Thomas 1960: 182-183 and Pinault 1997: 475). Strikingly, it is very difficult to find good examples of this type. Irreal protatic clauses are well attested, but I have not found pure irreal apodotic clauses.

In the often cited example below, the optative subclause indeed denotes an event that is not realistic (in the eyes of the speaker), and not impossible either, but the following optative main clause can hardly be taken as the consequence: it is rather a wish.

³¹⁶ Verse: metre a, c: 5 | 7, b, d: 7 | 8 (a, c: 5 | 4+3, b, d: 3+4 | 5+3).

A23a4-6³¹⁷

k_iprene āṣānik † āśāṃ tākīṣ nāṣ-wāknum : [1a]
 if venerable worthy be:3SG.OPT like.me

parnoṃtsā(ṃ ... † tñi kapśa)ñi (ts)i(nāts)i : [1b]
 worthy you:GEN body touch:INF

tārkor kālpimār † ṣñi tsar ptāñkāt yrāṣimār : [1c]
 permission obtain:1SG.OPT REFL hand Buddha wash:1SG.OPT

'If [some]one like me, o arhat, were worthy of touching your dignified body, may I obtain the permission that I may wash the Buddha with my own hand!'³¹⁸

For the other example that is often cited, and where indeed a conditional reading is very likely, see A253a2-3 further below; in that example, the apodosis is nominal and we could be tempted to supply an optative copula, but in view of the scarcity of the type, we should be careful. Below, I interpret the apodosis not as an apodotic clause, but as a normal present clause.

The past iterative use is well illustrated and described by Thomas (1970: 454-458). Of the following two examples, the first, extensively elaborated, contains imperfects in the first main clause, as we would expect for a repeated action. Although the following preterite is less clear, we can probably still suppose that the second example, where the finite verb of the main clause is not preserved, had an imperfect, too.

A312a1-3

tmāṣ ptāñkāt kāṣṣi māṃtne y. — — ṣul tāṣ
 then Buddha teacher like mountain be:3SG.SBJ

tmaśśāl tāskmāṃ taryāk we pi lakṣaṇā(syo) o(ktuk) [a2] cāñcraṃ
 DEM:COM comparable thirty.two marks eighty gentle

yetwesyo (yetu) wāmpu kospreṃne ṣik tāwiṣ
 jewel:PERL.INS decorated decorated how.many step put:3SG.OPT

tāprenāk sās tkam-ñkāt nuṣā kāl(ñā oki) kāckeyo ·
 so.many DEM earth.god roar:3SG.IPF resound:3SG.IPF like joy:INS

tāpreṃ tāprenāk mrācāṣ ṣuñkā³¹⁹ swāñcenāñ ñā(ktas na)_[a3]penās
 so.many so.many skull:ABL mouth beams gods men

kāksont oki (puk) śāk kālymentwaṃ satkar ·
 blinded like all ten direction:LOC.PL spread:3PL.PRT

'Anytime the Buddha, the teacher, (decorated) and adorned with the 32 marks [of the great man] and the 80 gentle jewels, took a step, like he were a ... mountain, just as many times the earth roared and resounded as if out of joy, and

³¹⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 5 † 7 (5 † 4+3).

³¹⁸ Cf Sieg (1944: 27).

³¹⁹ To be corrected to *ṣuñkāṣ* (abl.).

just as many times rays spread from his skull and mouth towards all ten cardinal points, [which] blinded gods and men, as it were.³²⁰

A341b2³²¹

kucne nūk : śwātsi yoktsi tāsya āyim-ām ca(m) ///
 what I:F food dring put:INF give:1SG.OPT-3SG.SUFF DEM
 ‘Anytime I gave her food and drink to stock up, that ...’³²²

Thomas also adduced a good example of an irreal concessive clause (1970: 463). In this type of construction, we do not expect an optative in the main clause either, but rather a present, a subjunctive or, as in this case, a nominal clause. The function of the optative clause is to underline that even in such an unrealistic case, the proposition expressed in the main clause would still hold.

A346a3-4

tmānantuyo koṃ-nāктаñ kāmpo tākiñc tmāṣ lyutār ceṣ
 ten.thousand:INS.PL sun.god:PL circle be:3PL.OPT then more DEM:PL
wañitse
 brilliant³²³
 ‘Even if suns by tens of thousands were forming a circle, those [gods] are more brilliant.’³²⁴

As Thomas remarks (1970: 463-465), the following example, often cited as an irreal conditional with an optative subclause and a nominal main clause *that would have been optative*, too, may have to be interpreted rather as an irreal concessive with a “normal” present clause: ‘no matter how worthy they are, all have to bow’. The latter interpretation may be supported by the aorist in the apodosis of the Old Uyghur parallel.

A253a2-3³²⁵

ārkišoṣṣam puk wrasañ | kuṣprene tākiñc bra(m-ñä)ктаñ : [1c]
 world:LOC all being:PL if be:3PL.OPT Brahmā.god:PL

³²⁰ Cf Sieg (1952: 26-27) and Carling (2009: 185). Thomas (1970: 457) also cites A59a6-b1, where we find a compound tense *kakmus tākiṣ* ‘anytime she had come’ in the subclause.

³²¹ Verse: end of pāda 95a and beginning of pāda 95b of a metre a: 5 | 5 | 5 | 5, b: 8 | 7 | 7 (4+4 | 4+3 | 4+3), c: 5 | 5, d: 8 | 7 (4+4 | 4+3).

³²² Cf Sieg (1952: 40) and the Chinese parallel (Chavannes 1910-34: II, 252): ‘quand je lui donnais des aliments à porter à Mahākātyāyana, tantôt elle les mangeait elle-même, tantôt elle les donnait à d’autres personnes’.

³²³ If for *pañitse* (Thomas 1970: 463).

³²⁴ Cf Carling (2009: 132).

³²⁵ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

puk cemm āṣāṃ mrāc śpāl-yo | nmāssi caṣi śalpenac 1
 all DEM:PL worthy skull head:INS bow:INF DEM:GEN sole:DU.ALL

‘Even if all beings in the world were Brahmā gods, all these are worthy to bow with skull and head at his feet.’

MayT38b4-7

yer-suvdaki tml(i)glar āzrua t(ā)ṅri tæg bilgä biliglig bolsarlar alku
 world:LOC.ADJ being:PL Brahmā god like wise wise be:COND.PL all
olar munuṅ adakınta āṅitgäli yūküngäli tægim ärürlär
 DEM:PL DEM:GEN foot:POSS.LOC bow:CVB bow:CVB worthy be:AOR.PL

‘Even if the beings in the world were as wise as Brahmā, they are all worthy to bow at his feet.’³²⁶

3.4 OTHER USES OF THE TOCHARIAN A SUBJUNCTIVE

In this section, I briefly discuss some other functions of the Tocharian A subjunctive. First, I discuss compound tenses and moods (3.4.1-3.4.4, p 216). Second, I discuss adverbials and particles (3.4.5, p 222). Third, I briefly go into the problem of the usage of the present-subjunctive (3.4.6, p 230).

3.4.1 SUBJUNCTIVE GERUND WITH IMPERFECT COPULA

The construction with a subjunctive gerund and an imperfect copula often denotes counterfactuality, both in subclauses and main clauses. This is easily illustrated with conditionals that suggest an alternative development for the past, which is, of course, contrary to fact. Consequently, the content of counterfactual conditionals must be specific, as they are bound to a real moment in the past to which an unreal alternative is offered.³²⁷

A typical example is the following, where the Buddha has already left the house, so that it is not possible to return to the situation where he had not left it, and still had the possibility to become a worldly king instead of an enlightened one.³²⁸

³²⁶ Cf Tekin (1980: 112) and Müller and Sieg (1916: 405).

³²⁷ I have no reason to assume that present or future counterfactuals were impossible in Tocharian, i.e. of the type *If John had come to the party tomorrow, he would have met you* (Dancygier 1998: 33). Although that type is important to show the character of the construction in English, I would insist that the prototypical counterfactual conditional is past. Not included are fragmentary MY3.7a8 ~ MayH3.7a23-4 and MY3.7b2. Another good example is A347a3-4, cited and translated by Thomas (1970: 468).

³²⁸ Thomas also adduces A21a4 *sām tāpärk waštāṣ lantu* ‘he has now left the house’ to illustrate that this conditional is indeed contrary to fact (1970: 467).

A21a2-4

kuprene waštāš mā läñcäl šeṣ ṣtwar dviṗäntwā
 if house:ABL not leave:SBJ.GER be:3SG.IPF four continent:PL.PERL
kākmārtik ṣpā(t ñemi)ntuyo kaknu cakravartti wäl
 ruler seven jewel:INS.PL provided cakravartin king
nasäl šeṣ nāṣ penu tu penu cami spaktānikāñ
 be:PRS/SBJ.GER be:3SG.IPF I too you too DEM:GEN servant:PL
nas(lye ṣe)mäs
 be:PRS/SBJ.GER be:1PL.IPF

‘If he had not left the house, he would have become a cakravartin king, endowed with the seven jewels, a ruler over the four continents, and I too, and you too, we had become his servants.’³²⁹

A313b4-6

kuprene nāṣ neṣā kārsäl ṣem pracar tanne ṣpālmemñ
 if I before know:SBJ.GER be:1SG.IPF brother so excellent
taṃ puttīṣparāṃ paṃ try asaṃkhesaṃ kusne kṣaṇa(ñ
 DEM Buddha.rank PAM³³⁰ three asaṃkhyeya:LOC.PL which moment
ṣom) [b₅] ṣom kṣaṇā try asaṃkhes kānt kalpas
 one one moment:PERL three asaṃkhyeya:PL hundred kalpa:PL
nāṣ wleṣäl ṣem sälpmām kapṣiñño aviśanākk ats
 I work:PRS/SBJ.GER be:1SG.IPF glow:PRS.PTC body:INS Avīci:LOC EMPH
puttīṣparṣiṃ ākālāṣ cam mā o(нтаṃ lotka)[b₆] ṣem
 Buddha.rank wish:ABL DEM not ever turn.away:SBJ.GER be:1SG.IPF

‘If I had known before, brother, that the Buddha rank is so excellent, and that for each moment, for as many moments as there are in three asaṃkhyeyas, I had had to work three asaṃkhyeyas and hundred kalpas in the Avīci [hell] with glowing body, then I would never have returned from my wish for the Buddha rank.’³³¹

In the example below, a painter considers several options but then decides that the girl that he finds in his room cannot be another guest because she is there to serve him and guests are not to serve other guests; thus, he discards that option as impossible (i.e. counterfactual, since the event is past).³³²

³²⁹ Cf Sieg (1944: 25).

³³⁰ On *paṃ*, see footnote 349.

³³¹ Cf Sieg (1952: 33).

³³² Pace Thomas (1970: 471), this is not a question or something similar (“Fragesätze u. dgl.”).

A6a3-4

mā (*nu yā*)_[a4]*talyi* *şeş* *lokit* *lokitāpāk*³³³ *yärk* *yatsi*
 not but be.able:SBJ.GER be:3SG.IPF guest guest:GEN honour do:INF
wätkässi
 command:INF
 ‘But a guest would not have been charged to pay honour to a[nother] guest.’³³⁴

In the following example, the construction with a subjunctive gerund plus imperfect copula is again found in a subclause, whose counterfactuality is governed by the negation in the main clause.

A62a5³³⁵

(*tämne şni āri*)*ñc ptāñkāt* | *pälskāt* *ke* *neş* *yärk*
 thus REFL heart Buddha think:3SG.PRT who:GEN before reverence
yā(m)im : [3c]
 do:1SG.OPT
mā kälpāt *caṃ yärk* *yāmläṃ* | *kucne yärka* *yāmäl*
 not obtain:3SG.PRT DEM reverence do:SBJ.GER that reverence do:SBJ.GER
şeş : [3d]
 be:3SG.IPF
 ‘Thus the Buddha thought by himself, «to whom shall I first make reverence?»,
 [but] he found no one worthy of reverence he could have made reverence to.’

Finally, a rhetorical question of the Bodhisattva who has suffered not for his own sake, but for the sake of others, also refers to the past and offers an irreal alternative to it (for more questions, see 3.2.7, p 177).

A67a5

mät nu näş şni klopyo *siñäl* *şem*
 how but I REFL sorrow:INS satisfy:SBJ.GER be:1SG.IPF
 ‘How could I have had satisfaction from my own sorrow?’

3.4.2 SUBJUNCTIVE GERUND WITH PRESENT COPULA

A periphrastic construction with a subjunctive and a present copula, principally found in main clauses, denotes future events. All few clear examples are negated. The expected notion of possibility, the basic meaning of the subjunctive gerund, is in most cases not very clear, but the notion of future is easily derived from it. Not with

³³³ So to be corrected for *lotāpāk* in the manuscript.

³³⁴ Sieg (1944: 9); Pinault (2008: 258).

³³⁵ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

Thomas (1952: 38-39) can this construction in any way be shown to be emphatic (see also 3.7.2, p 279). Only two examples are given below; for a few more, see Thomas (1952: 41). In both, the copula is left out, but it is there in A70b4, A144b2, and A313a8.

A70a3

mā ontam ñuk cwā särki ymām kārāsaṃ stare
 not ever I:F you:PERL after go:PRS.PTC wilds:LOC hardship
kaś wālyi
 attention put:SBJ.GER
 ‘Not in any way will I care about the hardship in the wilds if I follow you.’³³⁶

A99b3

/// śolāṣ pkānt kaṣsaṇi oki cwāṣ pkānt mā ṣtmāl
 life:ABL apart body like you:ABL apart not stand:SBJ.GER
 ‘... like the body without life ..., [so] I will not exist without you.’³³⁷

3.4.3 SUBJUNCTIVE GERUND WITH SUBJUNCTIVE COPULA

A rare construction is that of a subjunctive gerund with a subjunctive copula, termed the “periphrastische Konjunktiv” by Thomas (1952: 41). In two examples, the construction is clearly conditional, and the added value of the subjunctive gerund is not easily recognised: the meaning seems close to a simple subjunctive protasis. If any difference in meaning should be noted, the most probable is in my view possibility because that is what the subjunctive gerund expresses with e.g. a present copula. It must be admitted, however, that the possibility meaning is not imposed by the material.

A74a4-5

kuprene māskit waṣtāṣ läntāssi mā kälpäḷ tāṣ ///
 if prince house:ABL leave:INF not obtain:SBJ.GER be:3SG.SBJ
(tä)rkor pyāmā-ṃ waṣtāṣ läñcäs
 permission do:IPV.SG house:ABL leave:3SG.SBJ
 ‘If the prince cannot get to leave the house, ... Give him permission that he may leave the house!’

³³⁶ Cf Sieg (1952: 43). The corresponding passage of the Sanskrit parallel of the Viśvāntara-Jātaka is not precise: *naiva ca khalu me deva vanavāso duḥkha iti pratibhāti* (Hanisch 2005: 1, 82, line 9) ‘Nor does life in the forest seem to me such a hardship, my lord.’ (Khoroché 1989: 63).

³³⁷ Cf Thomas (1952: 41).

A67b1-2

(*k_uprene*) *k(ār)m(e)* *rakeyo* *sarās* *puskās* *āñkarās*
 if true word:INS vein:PL nerve:PL tusk:PL
rsunāmāṃ *ñi :* *ñareṣiṃśī* *klopāṣ* *pkānt* *klopyo*
 pull.out:PRS.PTC I:GEN hell:ADJ.GEN sorrow:ABL apart sorrow:INS
pātsāk (*āriñc* *ñi* *mā* *sasyu* *tāṣ*³³⁸ *canāk*
 mind heart I:GEN not satisfy:PRT.PTC be:3SG.SBJ DEM
kā)*rm(e)tsuneyo* *k_upre* *pat* *ṣakk ats* *kālpāl* *tām*
 truth:INS whether or certainly obtain:SBJ.GER be:1SG.SBJ
puttiśparāṃ : *ṣakk* *āñkari* *puk* *salu* *ṣitsrāk* *pākār*
 Buddha.rank six tusk:PL all completely again? manifest
tāki-ñi *neṣiṃ* *sā(rki)*
 be:3PL.OPT-1SG.SUFF before:ADJ after

‘(If) truly I (have not satisfied) my mind (and heart) with sorrow beyond the sorrow of the hell-beings by pulling out my veins, nerves and tusks, or whether [?] by this truth I can attain the Buddha rank, may all my six tusks completely reappear, like before.’³³⁹

The example below is damaged, but it is clearly of general didactic content, giving an answer to the question what is to be understood by “grain consumed at the root”. This general content makes any sort of future reading very unlikely, and therefore the apodosis is probably a present clause.³⁴⁰ However, there is clearly something going on with the subjunctive gerund plus subjunctive copula construction in the subclause because the fruit can no longer be obtained if the root has already been consumed. The only explanation that I can offer is either that *tāṣ* marks this subclause as an eventual clause, or that it is to be taken together with the comparison clauses discussed in 3.3.9 (p 208), where *tāṣ* clauses are irreal (in terms of their English translation). As there are no independent indications to take *kālpāl tāṣ* together as a kind of counterfactual, I suggest that *kālpāl* adds a possibility meaning. Even though such a reading is not directly imposed by the context, it gives a plausible interpretation indeed.

³³⁸ So Thomas (1964: 28); Sieg restituted *siṃsāwe*.

³³⁹ Cf Müller (1922: 61): S89.1[Mz112]b1-8 *sansardakı nızvanılıg kap-karaṅguda// [yo]lci yerçi bolur ārsār m(ā)n .. ///[aṣi]gımın tartar ārkān keyikçi ārkā bir k(a)ṣan ödtā y(e)mā övkā köñülüm yügārü bolmayuk ārsār bu köni kertü üzä altı azıglarım öñrāki tæg // lüg bolzun* ‘If I have become a guide in the deep darkness of the passions in the samsāra ..., and if there has not, not even for one moment, risen anger in my heart when the hunter pulled out my tusks, may because of this truth my six tusks be ... like before.’

³⁴⁰ Pace Sieg, who switches from a normal real protasis to an irreal one (1952: 26, italics mine): “Denn wenn der Mensch vor der Zeit das Getreide *verzehrt*, [dann] (*würde er*) die Frucht, die er [bestimmt] daraus bekāme, [schon] (vorher verzehrt haben).”

A65b5-6

k_uyalte yusār praṣṭā wrasom wsār tāpaṣ kucne tmāṣ
 because new? time:PERL being grain eat:3SG.SBJ what DEM:ABL
oko kälpāl tāṣ
 fruit obtain:SBJ.GER be:3SG.SBJ

‘Because if a being consumes the grain before the [right] time, the fruit that he might have been able to obtain from it,’³⁴¹

The last example is fragmentary and its precise context remains unclear. The subject is without doubt Rāma, who has laid siege to the town Lañkā, where he wants to get the captured Sitā back from. Sieg (1944: 13) and e.g. Krause and Thomas (1960: 191) have taken the clause with *kälkāl* as a main clause, which makes good sense indeed (Sieg l.c.): “(Rāma) aber wird, wenn er seinen Zweck erreicht hat, freudig von selbst gehen.” However, a conditional reading is certainly possible, too (I have suggested a possible apodosis just to make clear how I would understand *kälpāl tāṣ* as protatic):

A10b1

(*rām*³⁴²) *nu ṣñi wram kälporā kātkmām kälkāl*
 Rāma but REFL thing obtain:ABS be.glad:PRS.PTC go:SBJ.GER
ṣāññā tāṣ
 self:PERL be:3SG.SBJ

‘But if (Rāma) can go [away] of his own accord, glad after reaching his object,³⁴³ (then we will avoid this damage to our own town).’

3.4.4 PRETERITE PARTICIPLE WITH SUBJUNCTIVE COPULA

The preterite participle can be combined with a subjunctive copula, both in main and subclauses. Although examples are few, they comply with our expectations. Whereas the preterite participle expresses a state, in main clauses the subjunctive may express that this state will hold at a future moment, or in subclauses that the state is the condition for another event etc. See also on the usage in Tocharian B (3.7.4, p 283).

In the first example below, the subjunctive copula probably expresses future tense; in the second and the third, it denotes a condition.

³⁴¹ Instead of Sieg’s (l.c.) restoration *cam sā(m neṣā tāppu tākiṣ)* it is probably better to restore a normal conditional, i.e. *cam sā(m neṣā tāppu)* ‘he has eaten [already] before’, i.e. ‘Because if a being consumes the grain before the [right] time, he has eaten the fruit that he might have been able to obtain from it [already] before.’

³⁴² Or *sām* ‘he’.

³⁴³ Literally: ‘thing’.

A226b2³⁴⁴

– *pat nu kātkañ tāke kākropuṣ tām*
 or now householder:PL be:3PL.SBJ gather:PRT.PTC DEM

praṣtaṃ : [87a]
 time

‘but ... the householders will be gathered that time’

MY3.10b3

/// (*pi*)*ssañk kākropu tāṣ tmaṃ tu caṃ kanaḱṣi*
 community gather:PRT.PTC be:3SG.SBJ then you DEM cotton:ADJ

ñemi cārit pyām
 jewel action do:IPV.SG

‘... when the community is assembled, then you handle the matter of the jewel of a cotton cloth!’³⁴⁵

A4b6-A5a2

āntāne nu knānmuneṣiṃ vajramukhenyo ākntsune [A5a1] *krośavati*
 when now foolishness:ADJ Vajramukha wisdom Krośavati

*tātrāskus*³⁴⁶ *tāṣ tām praṣtaṃ puk kāryapāmtwāśśi nkalune*
 bite:PRT.PTC be:3SG.SBJ DEM time all harm:GEN.PL ruin

māskatār puk pārkwāntwāśśi śkaṃ sātkā(*lu*)_[a2]*ne māskatār*
 be:3SG.PRS all advantage:GEN.PL and spread be:3SG.PRS

‘Well, if the foolishness Krośavati is bitten through by the wisdom Vajramukha, at that moment the ruin of all harms is there, and the spread of all advantages.’³⁴⁷

3.4.5 ADVERBIALS AND PARTICLES

Unlike Tocharian B (3.7.5, p 287), Tocharian A has only a limited number of number of modal particles. This is not to say that the language has a shortage of particles, and even less so that they are rare. On the contrary, especially the emphatic clitic *-k* and the emphatic particle *ats* (and *atsaṃ*) are very frequent, also combined, e.g. *nāṣ* ‘I’, *nṣāk* ‘me’, i.e. ‘I, not you’, *nṣākk ats*³⁴⁸ ‘just me; exactly me’; quite some words do not even occur without *-k*, or only rarely (Sieg, Siegling and Schulze 1931: 302-303, 306-

³⁴⁴ Verse: metre normally 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3), but this line deviates.

³⁴⁵ Cf Ji (1998: 189). Thanks to the identification of the parallel fragment A446 (Burlak and Itkin 2004: 30), his translation can be revised slightly: it is now clear that the following *ā(nant)* ‘Ānanda’ starts a new clause. The OUY. parallel in MayH3.10a26-28 is too damaged.

³⁴⁶ So to be corrected for *tātrās* in the manuscript.

³⁴⁷ Cf Sieg (1944: 8).

³⁴⁸ *ats* entails gemination of the preceding consonant, i.e. *nṣāk ats* becomes *nṣākk ats* automatically.

307). However, since these particles have no special connection to the verb or the clause, they are of no relevance for an understanding of the modal system.

Particles that could or do have modal uses are *aśśi* and *kar*;³⁴⁹ not considered are interjections like *ote* ‘o’ and *hišt* ‘hey’ (Sieg, Siegling and Schulze 1931: 319-321).

aśśi ‘perhaps’

According to Sieg, Siegling and Schulze (1931: 302), *aśśi* is “meistens Fragepartikel, den Schlußkonsonanten des vorhergehenden Wortes verdoppelnd, überwiegend direkt hinter Interrogativpronomen und Interrogativadverbium”. It is further attested a couple of times after a verb in questions, and once “mitten in der Erzählung, wo für eine Frage kein Platz ist” (1931: 190). Since the context of the latter example is rather clear, I take that as a starting point: a master mechanic has fooled his guest, a master painter, by giving him a mechanical girl servant. When the painter found out, he was so mad that he in turn fooled the mechanic by painting himself hanged on the wall. The nuance *aśśi* introduces here is thus very probably one of assumption, i.e. the mechanic has not seen himself that the painter touched the girl out of love, but only sees him hanging and *concludes* it.

A9a1³⁵⁰

<i>tuñkyo</i>	<i>∕śśi</i>	<i>tsit</i> ³⁵¹	<i>śominām</i>	<i>wekat</i>	<i>yañtār</i>	
love:INS	AŚŚI	touch:3SG.PRT	girl	break.down:3SG.PRT	mechanism	
<i>cam</i>	<i>kipyo</i> : [1c]					
DEM	shame:INS					
<i>sruksāt</i>	<i>āñcām</i>	<i>sām</i>	<i>pekant</i>	<i>lānkāš</i>	<i>špinac</i>	<i>pālkāc</i>
die:3SG.PRT	self	DEM	painter	hang:3SG.PRS	nail:ALL	see:IPV.PL
<i>kraṃs</i> : 1						
good:PL						

³⁴⁹ *paṃ*, listed among particles in Sieg, Siegling and Schulze (1931: 309), is called an “Adv. od. Part. von unbestimmter, aber jedenfalls wohl intensiver Bedeutung” by Thomas (1964: 113). He thus ignores Sieg’s proposal that it means ‘dear’ (1944: 8). Although I have the feeling that both are wrong, I do not have a ready solution. In any case, *paṃ* does not seem to add anything modal, and the idea of an “intensive” meaning can be discarded. Together with *yatsi* ‘do’, it seems to mean ‘serve’ indeed (Ji 1943: 323; Sieg 1944: 8), which hardly points to intensivity – nor to modality, for that matter – and Thomas’ proposal to render *paṃ* *māsk-* with “im tiefsten Wesen da sein” (1964: 113) follows from the same idée fixe. I suspect that the particle entails a certain type of reciprocity or distributivity: A7b6-A8a1 *māñtne kratswsaṃ ñi tunk tāk* | (*tä*_[A8a1]*m*)*n*(*e*)*k kapśñam mskatār paṃ* ‘As my love was towards rags, just so it is to the [living] body in turn.’

³⁵⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

³⁵¹ So to be corrected for *tsis* in the manuscript.

‘Presumably out of love he touched the girl and the mechanism broke down. Out of shame the painter killed himself: he is hanging from the nail – look, o good ones!’

All other (possible) non-interrogative examples of *aśśi* are too fragmentary to be of any use, except for one from the Maitreyasamitināṭaka, unfortunately without Old Uygur parallel. In the preceding, somebody – probably the sacrificial assistant – concludes that the brahmin Nirdhana is without glory (see MY1.5a8 ‘If you are from Madhyadeśa, you will indeed be without glory’), and then the same speaker continues with an explanatory strophe, introduced with *kuyalte* ‘why that?’. At the end of the strophe, Nirdhana speaks again, so that it is very improbable that Nirdhana is also the speaker of that strophe; more probably, it is the same sacrificial assistant. The fact that the strophe elaborates on an assumption makes it very likely that *aśśi* has approximately the same value as in the above example.

MY1.5a8-b1³⁵²

şakkatsts aśśi tu [b₁] /// [1a]
certainly AŚŚI you

(*mā*³⁵³) *kāswone kaklyuşu † naşt mā tuñk naśśi*
not virtue hear:PRT.PTC be:2SG.PRS not love be:3SG.PRS:2SG.SUFF

metraknaṃ † tāmyo tşaṃ mā kakmu şet : [1b]

Maitreya:LOC therefore here:LOC not come:PRT.PTC be:2SG.IPF

‘Certainly you must ... ; you have (not) heard of [his] virtue, [and] you have no love for Maitreya, so that is not why you have come here.’³⁵⁴

An intricate, but nevertheless helpful example is also the following, where the speaker insults the hearer, blaming him of stupidity, for which he suggests a reason, likewise insulting.

MY1.5a7

hai tālo kucim naşt aśśi talke-māṃñe okāk tränktsi
hey miserable idiot? be:2SG.PRS AŚŚI sacrificial.site until say:INF

mā kāršnāt
not know:2SG.PRS

‘Hey, miserable one! You must really be an idiot, [as] you do not even know [how] to say “sacrificial site”!’³⁵⁵

³⁵² Verse: metre a: 5 | 5 | 5 | 5, b: 8 | 8 | 7 (apparently 5+3 | 5+3 | 4+3), c: 5 | 5, d: 8 | 7.

³⁵³ Plus one more akşara; perhaps *nu* ‘but’ or *pe* ‘and’.

³⁵⁴ Cf Ji (1998: 41).

³⁵⁵ Cf extensively on this passage Pinault (2002a: 322, 324-325 and passim).

When *aśśi* follows an interrogative pronoun or adverb, its function is very difficult to assess, and it must have been bleached out substantially. In some questions without question words, or where at least *aśśi* does not directly follow a question word, it seems that it adds an assumption indeed: it introduces a possible answer to the question, ca. ‘perhaps, by any chance’. Two good examples follow below. In the first, the Bodhisattva elephant wonders why the hunter is crying, and asks him whether it may be because he hurt him with his heavy body.³⁵⁶

A79b2

///·pāšlune ypamāṃ wraṣäl ślā aśśi
 protection do:PRS.PTC harm bring:1SG.PRT AŚŚI
 ‘Have I perhaps brought [you] harm in offering³⁵⁷ [you] protection?’³⁵⁸

Even if its meaning after question words is difficult to assess, it is striking that *aśśi* is frequently found in reported or embedded questions, as the following (attestations are conveniently assembled by Carling 2009: 18).³⁵⁹

MY3.1a7

tāmyo tāpärk skamat prakāštär kupre aśśi ptāñkät kāṣṣi
 therefore now always ask:3SG.PRS whether AŚŚI Buddha teacher
 lo kumnä(š)
 PCL come:3SG.PRS.

‘Therefore she now keeps asking whether the Buddha, the teacher is about to arrive.’³⁶⁰

A311b4

kupre sañce yāmtrā kuyall aśśi täppreṃ märkampalši pñi
 whether doubt do:3SG.SBJ why AŚŚI so law:ADJ merit

³⁵⁶ Compare the parallel from the Chinese version of the Sūtrālaṅkāra in the translation of Huber (1908: 406): “Je t’ai invité à te cacher sous mon ventre, parce que je craignais que les autres éléphants ne te fissent du mal. Est-ce que le poids de mon corps t’écrase?” Without this parallel, the Tocharian A passage can hardly be understood, and I do not agree with Lühr, who claims that the Tocharian question has an “Antworterwartung NEIN” (1997: 113) – it is just one of the possible explanations the Bodhisattva can think of at that moment.

³⁵⁷ Literally: ‘doing’, ‘making’.

³⁵⁸ Sieg (1952: 13).

³⁵⁹ This reminds me of an informal use of Dutch of ‘whether’, which may follow the question word in embedded questions (apparently with emphatic effect), e.g.

Ik weet niet wanneer of hij komt.
 I know not when whether he comes
 ‘I don’t know when he comes.’ (Haeseryn e.a. 1997: 319).

³⁶⁰ Cf Ji (1998: 145). For the Old Uyghur parallel see 3.2.8 (p 180).

tsopatsām weñār

great say:3PL.PRT

‘Whether he will question why they have said [that] the merit of the law is so great?’³⁶¹

I can only guess that in non-embedded questions the particle has a softening function, which I would derive from the fact that it includes possible answers in the question, and so makes it less “wild”. This function is perhaps present in the example below, where clearly the question is not totally open, but the speaker has already several options in mind:³⁶²

A6a2-3

kuss aśśi sās yaṃtrācā(res [a₃]) mā)skatār ṣar ckācar epe
 who AŚŚI DEM mechanic:GEN be:3SG.PRS sister daughter or

sām epe spaktānik epe nṣākk oki lokit kakmus nām
 wife or servant or I:EMPH like guest come:PRT.PTC be:3SG.PRS

‘Who may she be? Is she the sister, the daughter, or the wife, or the servant of the mechanic, or has she come as a guest, just like me?’³⁶³

kar ‘just’

“*kar* hängt sich in den meisten Stellen unselbständig an eine finite Verbalform an, ohne daß irgendwo seine besondere Funktion sich deutlich offenbarte”, according to Sieg, Siegling and Schulze (1931: 307). For two deviating examples where they could not establish its grammatical function either, Sieg later proposed “*schon*” (1944: 10), in a sense ‘only, already’ that invites a comment ‘can you imagine!’ (i.e., ‘can you imagine what would happen in another situation!’).³⁶⁴

A21b3-4

o(t)e täpreṃ añumāski oñi cmol kar taṃne wkānyo
 o so wonderful human birth KAR that way:INS

kāswoneyo kaknu tāṣ
 virtue:INS provided be:3SG.SBJ

‘O so wonderful is the human birth already, if its endowed with such virtue!’³⁶⁵

³⁶¹ Cf Thomas (1957: 239), Schmidt (1974: 343).

³⁶² Evidently, I agree with Lühr (1997: 112-114) that *aśśi* is not a question particle.

³⁶³ Cf Sieg (1944: 9).

³⁶⁴ Cf Krause and Thomas (1960: 172): “*doch, schon*”.

³⁶⁵ Cf Sieg (1944: 25): “*Ach, wunderbar ist schon die Menschengeburt, wenn sie mit solcher Art Vorzug ausgestattet ist.*”.

A7b1-2

(h)ai šokyo nu kakätwu tākā yaṃtrācāreṃ
 o very now deceive:PRT.PTC be:1SG.PRT mechanic
 kāššinā ote täpreṃ enklis tampewätsune o(te tä_[b2]preṃ)
 teacher:PERL o so passion:GEN power o so
 ākntsuneyis empelune kratswsaṃ kar wrasom täpreṃ prākär
 ignorance:GEN horror rag:LOC.PL KAR being so firm
 tuñk yāmrä
 love do:3SG.SBJ

‘O dear! I have been terribly deceived by the master mechanic! O such [is] the power of passion! O such [is] the horror of ignorance! If a being loves even rags so intensely!’³⁶⁶

Although from these two examples one could get the impression that *kar* introduces the following subjunctive clause, it rather bears on the words directly preceding, and in most cases it is indeed found just before the punctuation mark “:” and after a finite verb, which is several times in the subjunctive, but may also be in the present or the preterite.³⁶⁷ The Yānqí fragments of the Maitreyasamitiñāṭaka have yielded four certain and two restored new examples, most of them with good parallel Old Uyghur passages. Strikingly, in two instances, no trace of it is seen in the Old Uyghur version, but in two other instances, Old Uyghur modal markers have been added: *ärmiš* among others ca. ‘apparently’ (Erdal 2004: 273-275) in the first, and *ärki* ca. ‘I wonder’ (Erdal 2004: 350) in the second.

MY2.1a8 = A214a4-5

bā(dhari tränkāš māgatšin)ās ypeyāntwaṃ pāšānak šulaṃ
 Bādhari say:3SG.PRS Magadha:ADJ land:LOC.PL Pāšānaka mountain:LOC
 māskaträ kar
 be:3SG.PRS KAR

‘Bādhari says, «He is on mount Pāšānaka in the lands of Magadha.»’³⁶⁸

MayH2.1b3-4

ötrü badari braman inčä tep tedii (: [b4] magit eltä
 then Bādhari brahmin thus say:CVB say:PRT Magadha land:LOC
 pašan_(a)k tagda y_(a)rlıkar ärmiš
 Pāšānaka mountain:LOC RESP:AOR ÄRMIŠ

³⁶⁶ Sieg (1944: 10, cf also Pinault 2008: 259): “... ach die Macht der Dummheit, wenn ein Mensch schon zu Lappen so heftig Liebe faßt!”

³⁶⁷ Cf A108a5, A157b4, A376b1; before “||” in A157b4; before a clause starting with *māmt* in A149b3, with *kosne* in A159b5, with a punctuation mark and *äntāne* in A269a5.

³⁶⁸ Cf Ji (1998: 69).

‘Then Bādhari the brahmin said, «Apparently he is on mount Pāṣāṇaka in the land of Magadha!»³⁶⁹

MY3.1b7

(*kus*) *ṣurm tāpārk śākkeṣi lāts māccāk kar kappās sāryā*
 what reason now Śākya:ADJ queen herself KAR cotton sow:3SG.PRT
 ‘What is the reason now that the queen of the Śākyas has sowed the cotton just by herself?’³⁷⁰

MayH3.1b23-26 (= MayT121a1-4)

nā sav ārki .. nā ücün öz iligin kābāz-z tarıp
 what thing ĀRKI what for self hand:INS cloth plant:CVB
tod tolı-ı kisi osuglug böz tokudı-ı ārki
 completely completely woman like cotton weave:PRT ĀRKI
 ‘Was ist das wohl für eine Sache? Warum hat sie mit eigener Hand die Baumwolle gepflanzt und wie eine niedrige Frau den [Baumwoll]stoff gewebt?’³⁷¹

However, the evidence of these Old Uyğur passages is not univocal, and worse still, it does not fit the meaning established so far very well. In MY3.1b7, the example directly above, *kar* seems to reinforce *māccāk* ‘she herself’ rather than modify the whole sentence. Therefore, I would side with Ji, who takes ‘only’ as a default translation, which yields a credible interpretation in the following example.

MY1.7a5

(*śuddhavāsiñ nākta*)ñ *bram n̄kāt śasārsār kar*
 Śuddhāvāsa:ADJ god:PL Brahmā god let.know:3PL KAR
 ‘... (the Śuddhāvāsa gods) told only God Brahmā.’³⁷²

³⁶⁹ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 116-117). *ārmiš* is not translated by Geng and Klimkeit, if it is not “sein” in “Im Reich Magadha auf dem Pāṣāṇaka-Berg geruht er zu sein.” (1988: 117; they mark the form as uncertain, “ārmiš”, but Yūsüp, Xoǰa and Qāmbiri 1988: C, 143 read the same); nor is it by Yūsüp, Xoǰa and Qāmbiri (1988: U, 48; C, 32). Erdal (2004: 528-529) makes special mention of the use of *yarlıka-* with a locative complement, which “signifies ‘to come a certain place’” (p 528). However, ‘come’ is far off from the Tocharian text, and it does not fit the Old Uyğur parallel very well either. Therefore I have tentatively translated simply ‘is’ instead.

³⁷⁰ Cf Ji (1998: 147).

³⁷¹ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 174-175), Tekin (1980: 65).

³⁷² Ji (1998: 51). In the Old Uyğur parallel, the verb is restored, but the next clause is completely parallel: MayH1.13a21-22 *śudavas t_(ā)ñri yerintā[ki]* [a22] *t_(ā)ñrilār āz[rua]* *t_(ā)ñrikä u[kitmiš]* ‘Die Götter im Götterhimmel Śuddhāvāsa [teilten es] dem Gott Brah[mā] mit.’ (Geng and Klimkeit 1988: 96-97; Yūsüp, Xoǰa and Qāmbiri 1988: C, 134 read *ukitmiš*).

Although the example below is fragmentary, it can receive a meaningful interpretation with the help of the Old Uygur; we can interpret ‘if as one [human] being he has *already* so many virtues’, etc.

MY1.9b6

ote täpreṃ weyeṃ sas wrasom kar tanne [b7] (*wkänyo*)
 o so wonderful DEM being KAR such way:INS
 ‘Oh how wonderful! this one being ... thus only’³⁷³

MayH1.16a1-4

bir [a2] *kiši yalḥok bolup bu munča törlüg ülgüsüz* [a3] *sansız*
 one person human be:CVB DEM such ADJ measureless countless
ädgü ärdämkä tükäl(ḷ)ig *ärsär.. muntada* [a4] *y(e)mä taṃ*
 good virtue:DAT completely be:COND here and wonder?
nägü bolgay
 how be:FUT

‘Wenn er ein Mensch geworden ist und derartig unermeßliche, zahllose gute Tugenden völlig besitzt, wie wird (einer) ihm auch gleichartig sein?’³⁷⁴

Finally, although the content remains unclear, *kar* is likely to reinforce the preceding *som* ‘one’ in the following example:

A108a5

/// [štā]ñcam pat *wunäṣ som wil lawat-äṃ* *kar* :
 ? or two:ABL one WIL send:3SG.SBJ-3SG.SUFF KAR
 ‘... or if from the second he sends her *just* one *wil*.’³⁷⁵

As for MY2.1a8 ‘just’ is not satisfactory, I assume that *kar* is to be interpreted in the light of Bādhari’s amazement about the appearance of the Buddha (*ärmiš* can have a sense of amazement, too). Perhaps the particle originally meant ‘only, just, already’, but it was often used in “admirative” contexts to express surprise and amazement, and this admirativity became a slightly independent part of its meaning.³⁷⁶ I would propose the following pathway:

³⁷³ Ji (1998: 61).

³⁷⁴ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 108-109).

³⁷⁵ Without doubt it is Nanda, who, having left his wife Sundari, is to give her some sign or message.

³⁷⁶ Needless to say, my little investigation fully confirms Hilmansson’s etymological connection with Tocharian B *ka* ‘just’ (1996: 82-83); yet I see no evidence for a meaning like German “doch”, nor for one like English ‘indeed’. Neither have I found confirmed Carling’s ‘yet, really, for sure’ (2009: 102; although her characterisation “downgrading particle” is

JUST, ONLY → ALREADY, SOONER THAN EXPECTED → CONTRARY TO EXPECTATION, SURPRISE

3.4.6 THE PRESENT-SUBJUNCTIVE

The present-subjunctive is only a minor category in Tocharian A, certainly in comparison to Tocharian B. Therefore, the number of verbs that qualify for a syntactic investigation of the present-subjunctive is rather small, and, evidently, the number of useful text passages is even smaller. As far as can be judged from this limited corpus, there is no special usage of the present-subjunctive: it can be used in exactly the same way as presents and subjunctives, and the precise function has to be inferred from the context. Whereas examples of present-subjunctives used like presents can actually be found, certain instances of subjunctive usage are lacking almost completely. Below, I cite two passages: the first is a main clause where it seems that a subjunctive is required because of the future reference, and the second is a subclause where the indefinite meaning would probably need a subjunctive.

MY3.2b3

tāprem³⁷⁷ koṃsā parmā k_alewāñ klyoseñc
 thus day:PL.PERL surely woman:PL.NOM hear:3PL.SBJ
 ‘Thus women may surely hear (it) as from today.’³⁷⁸

MayH3.2b14-15

büküntä maru kunčular nom t[1]ηlaz[un]
 day:LOC further princess:PL law hear:VOL.3SG
 ‘May the women hear the law as from today!’³⁷⁹

A274b7³⁸⁰

/// r källymentwāṣ wināse † śla āñcālyi : [1c]
 direction:ABL.PL revere:3PL.PRS/SBJ with añjali

actually correct for a number of examples) nor Winter’s “erst; zuerst” (1991b: 317). Further, it is certainly too rash and vague to call the particle “emphatic”.

³⁷⁷ The preceding */// (märka)mpal päklyoṣäs* ‘Listen to the law!’ is missing in the OÜy. version.

³⁷⁸ Cf Ji (1998: 151).

³⁷⁹ Cf Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 176-177). The Old Uyghur translation is somewhat short, and it is not totally clear whether this is a grant (which it should be according to the development of the drama), or rather a command or a wish (which it seems in the German translation of Geng and Klimkeit “Von heute an mögen auch die Frauen das Gesetz hören!”) or even a kind of prediction (‘they will here the law’). Logically, the TA should be translated either as ‘may the women listen to the law’ (a wish) or as ‘the women may listen to the law’ (a grant), with a preference for the second. It cannot be excluded that the OÜy. translator misunderstood this function of the TA subjunctive.

³⁸⁰ Verse, metre probably 4 x 7 † 7 † 4 (4+3 † 4+3 † 4).

yas penu caṣ ykoṃ o(ṣeñi)! [1d]
 you too DEM by.day by.night

‘(No matter how many gods) ... from (all) directions revere (Brahmāvati) with *añjali*-hands, you too by day [and] (by night) ... him ...’

MayH11.3b24-29

näčä y(e)mä ulug küčlüg t(ä)ñrilär törtđin yñak
 how.many and great strong god:PL four:ABL direction
ayayu agarlayu yūkünsärlär .. sizlär y(e)mä barıp k(ä)ntü
 honour:CVB honour:CVB bow:COND.PL you:PL and go:CVB own
k(ä)ntü kuvrañızlar birlä tünlä kü[ntüz] tört
 own community:2PL.PL together by.night by.day four
yñaktın küyü küzädü [barı]ñlar
 direction:ABL protect:CVB protect:CVB go:IPV.PL

‘Wie viele große starke Götter der vier Richtungen sich auch vor (Brahmāvati) verehrend (Hend.) verneigen mögen, geht auch ihr und schützt sie [Tag] und Nacht mit euren je eigenen Scharen von allen vier Richtungen!’³⁸¹

3.5 THE TOCHARIAN B SUBJUNCTIVE IN MAIN CLAUSES

In main clauses, the Tocharian B subjunctive principally denotes future tense. It has many semantic nuances and often a rendering by an English *will* future is not satisfactory, but these nuances probably follow from inferences. I first adduce bilinguals in order to show that these suggest nothing but future for the Tocharian B subjunctive (3.5.1, p 231). Then I present some examples in which the subjunctive clearly functions as a mirror to the past in stylistics, and so clearly was used to express the notion of future tense (3.5.2, p 233). I then continue to focus on evidence from the relation between the event and the subject (3.5.3, p 236), the speaker (3.5.5, p 238), and the hearer (3.5.6, p 239; first persons are discussed in 3.5.4, p 236). This evidence shows that the subjunctive is free of modal value. Good examples of neutral, predictive subjunctive futures are given in 3.5.7 (p 242), whereas the use of the subjunctive and other moods in (rhetorical) questions is discussed in 3.5.8 (p 243), and its use in 1pl. address in 3.5.9 (p 245). The relation between the subjunctive and other verbal categories is investigated in 3.5.10 (present, p 245), 3.5.11 (optative, p 247), and 3.5.12 (imperative, p 249).

3.5.1 BILINGUALS

A rich collection of Sanskrit - Tocharian B bilinguals is offered by the Udānavarga. As noted in 3.1.3 (p 158), these bilingual correspondences are to be treated with much care. First of all, the Sanskrit is versified and formulaic, it contains many metaphors

³⁸¹ Geng, Klimkeit and Laut (1988: 323, 342).

and style figures, and it is written in the artificial classical language that replaced earlier Prākṛit versions. Second, the Tocharian B translation is not a real translation, but a very precise word-for-word translation, full of calques; in fact, it comes very close to interlinear glossing as it is usual in modern linguistics.

In view of all this, we have to be very cautious with evidence from these Udānavarga bilinguals. However, as a first hint, they give clear results. The majority of the Tocharian B subjunctives translates a Sanskrit future, chiefly in main clauses, but sometimes in subclauses, too. Only in a very limited number of cases does a Tocharian B subjunctive render another Sanskrit category; this other category is exclusively the present, and never in main clauses. I have found no examples of Sanskrit futures *not* rendered by a Tocharian B subjunctive.³⁸²

IT862b1, U2b4

/// *plāsk(au) tumem ñi mā tākat*
think:1SG.SBJ therefore me not be:2SG.SBJ

Uv2.1c-d

na tvāṃ saṃkalpayiṣyāmi | tato me na bhaviṣyasi
not you imagine:1SG.FUT therefore I:DAT not be:2SG.FUT
'I will not imagine you, so you will not arise from my [imagination].'³⁸³

THT1333a1

*(kār)s(au)ca takat*³⁸⁴
knowing be:2SG.SBJ

Uv33.6od

hy akṛtajño bhaviṣyasi
PCL knowing.the.uncreated be:2SG.FUT
'you will be knowing the uncreated [nirvāṇa]'³⁸⁵

Other persons than the 1sg. and the 2sg. are attested as well, but only with present-subjunctive forms in the Tocharian B translation, so that they are useless as proof here.

³⁸² There are Sanskrit futures translated by present-subjunctives, but as I argue, that is just a morphological, not a syntactic category. Consequently, we can just take them as subjunctives when they render Sanskrit futures.

³⁸³ Uv2.1a-b *kāma jānāmi te mūlaṃ* [a] *saṃkalpāt kāma jāyase* [b] 'O desire, I know your root: you, desire, are born from the imagination.' (Bernhard 1965: 112; Chakravarti 1930: 19).

³⁸⁴ Sic, for regular classical *tākat*.

³⁸⁵ Uv33.60a-c *chindhi srotāḥ parākramya* [a] *kāmāṃ praṇuda brāhmaṇa* [b] *saṃskārāṇāṃ kṣayaṃ jñātvā* [c] 'Cut off the stream with energy, drive off the desires, o brahmin. Knowing the end [destruction] of the cycles [of birth], ...' (Bernhard 1965: 494; Hahn 2007: 154).

In other bilingual texts, we find the same correspondence; because of the fragmentary contexts, it is difficult to decide how automatic the rendering of the Skt. future by the TB subjunctive is:

B189b4

[SKT:] /// (*vista*)*reṇa vakṣyāma* • [TB:] *taisaktuka postam*³⁸⁶ • *tane*
 in.detail say:1PL.FUT likewise afterwards here
*ortsesa*³⁸⁷ *weñem*
 in.detail say:1PL.SBJ
 ‘... we will say in detail • likewise we will afterwards say here in detail’

B542a1

[SKT:] (*utsā*)*dayiṣyāmi* • [TB:] *neku-me* •
 destroy:1SG.FUT destroy:1SG.SBJ-PL.SUFF
 ‘I will destroy • I will destroy them •’³⁸⁸

The fragmentary passage below can receive a reliable interpretation thanks to its identification by Waldschmidt as the translation of *vṛjikaṇṇiyāni kariṣyanti* ‘[as long as] they will carry out the duties of the Vṛjī’s’ MPS1.22 (1951: 110; 1955: 16).

B542a5

///*lñe yamantār* •
 do:3PL.SBJ
 ‘they will do ...’

Although the future has some modal value in classical Sanskrit, i.e. it may express a wish, possibility or intention (Renou 1996: 461), it is the principal form to denote future events.³⁸⁹ At least the passages cited above clearly suggest that the Tocharian B subjunctive denotes future tense.

3.5.2 NOTION OF FUTURE

The notion of future is often conveyed with the adverb *postam* ‘afterwards; in the future’; sometimes it is also expressed in contrast to a past action. In the latter case,

³⁸⁶ For *postam*.

³⁸⁷ For classical *aurtsesa*.

³⁸⁸ Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra 1.3 or 1.6, see Waldschmidt (1955: 16; cf also Schmidt 1985: 430-431), who gives the context as: “König Ājātaśatru von Magadha ist seinen nördlichen Nachbarn, den Vṛjī, verfeindet und verkündet: „Ich will sie vernichten, ich will sie ins Verderben bringen, ich will sie in Unglück und Elend stürzen“”.

³⁸⁹ I have found no correspondences with the Skt. periphrastic future (Renou 1996: 491-493), although this formation is (rarely) attested in Buddhist Sanskrit, too (Edgerton 1953: I, 152).

the past is sometimes marked with the adverb *nauṣ* ‘before; in the past’. As a stylistic device, past, present and future may be mentioned all three to cover “all times” and underline the definiteness of a statement.

In the first example, the present is lacking, and the context is fragmentary, but the formula is known from Sanskrit. The Tocharian B preterite *weña* corresponds to the Sanskrit past participle *uktam*; the Tocharian B subjunctive *wem* renders the Sanskrit future *vakṣyate*.

B173b6

(*bhavāñkā*)*nta nauṣ päst weña · somona ñke postäm*
bhavāngas before PCL say:3SG.PRT single:PL then afterwards
wem ·
 say:3SG.SBJ

‘... he has stated the *bhavāngas* [elements of existence] before; he will state the single things afterwards.’³⁹⁰

In the following example, all three tenses are expressed: past, present and future.

B597b1³⁹¹

w(e)ñäre ! weskem wat te postä(m) w(e)ñem : [69a]
 say:3PL.PRT say:3PL.PRS or DEM afterwards say:3PL.SBJ
 ‘... they said before, or they say [now, or] will say after this.’³⁹²

In the below fragment from the casuistics of lying, we find a beautiful example of crossed tenses, i.e. before uttering the words that may or may not have to be classified as a lie, this utterance was in the future, at the time of uttering it was the present and afterwards it had become the past.

NS58a4 = B336a7

/// *s(e)*³⁹³ *pälskanaṃ waike weñau · weskemane aišträ*
 which think:3SG.PRS lie say:1sg.sbj say:PRS.PTC know:3SG.PRS-SBJ
waike weskau · postäm aišträ waike weñāwa
 lie say:1SG.PRS afterwards know:3SG.PRS-SBJ lie say:1SG.PRT

³⁹⁰ Cf a Sanskrit parallel in the *Abhidharmakośa* of Vasubandhu: “Les autres membres de l’existence ne sont pas expliqués ici. Les autres ont été expliqués ou seront expliqués plus loin.”, where the relevant formula is *uktam ca vakṣyate cānyat* (de La Vallée Poussin 1980: III, 116).

³⁹¹ Verse: metre 4 x 7 ! 8 (4+3 ! 3+5).

³⁹² The adverb *ñake* ‘now’ is certainly not used, but since 4 akṣaras are missing at the beginning of the *pāda*, *w(e)ñäre* was probably accompanied by *nauṣ* ‘before’.

³⁹³ Relative.

‘which (monk) thinks, «I will tell a lie», [and] telling it he knows, «I am telling a lie», [and] afterwards he knows, «I have told a lie», ...’

B336b1 (first part) and NS58a5 (second part)

wai(k)e (*w*)*e*(*ñ*)*au* *weskemane aišträ* *waike* /// /// (*po*)*stäm*
lie say:1SG.SBJ say:PRS.PTC know:3SG.PRS-SBJ lie afterwards

mā aišträ *mā te waike šai* 60³⁹⁴
not know:3SG.PRS-SBJ not DEM lie be:3SG.IPF

‘... «I will tell a lie», [and while] speaking he knows, «(I am telling) a lie», [but] afterwards he does not know it [anymore], then it was no lie.’

NS58a5 = B336b2

*nauš mā pälskanam waike w(e)ṃtsi · tetekāk špä (we)ššä(ṃ)*³⁹⁵
before not think:3SG.PRS lie say:INF suddenly and say:3SG.PRS

weskemane [NS58a6]

say:PRS.PTC

‘[If] beforehand he does not intend to tell a lie, [and] suddenly he tells [one while] speaking, ...’

NS58a6 = B336b3

/// *weskema(n)e* (*ai*)*šträ* *waike*³⁹⁶ *weskau* *wešnak*
say:PRS.PTC know:3SG.PRS-SBJ lie say:1SG.PRS say:3SG.PRS≠EMPH

cau wāntare · mā no sū wāntare waike mäsketrä 60³⁹⁴
DEM thing not but DEM thing lie be:3SG.PRS

‘... [if] speaking he knows, «I am telling a lie», [and] indeed he says that thing, then that thing is not a lie.’

For edition, commentary and analysis, cf Pinault (1994: 136-184, especially p 166). Apparently, the main verbs are all in the present: with the situation “before” we find the prs. *pälskanam*, with the situation “now” we find the prs.-sbj. *aišträ* and for “afterwards” again *aišträ*; on the basis of the unchanged tense of *pälskanam*, I assume that *postäm*, too, goes together with a present. As a parallel, Pinault adduces the Pāli *pubbeṃ assa hoti musā bhaṇissan ti bhaṇantassa hoti musā bhaṇāmīti bhaṇitassa hoti musā mayā bhaṇitan ti* ‘Before he has lied he knows, «I am going to lie»; while lying he knows, «I am lying»; having lied he knows, «I lied.» (Pinault 1994: 166, citing Horner 1940: 167 and Oldenberg 1882: 2, lines 29-31).

Although the grammar of Sanskrit or Indian models certainly played an important role, these examples show very clearly that if the notion of future had to be expressed, it was expressed with the subjunctive in Tocharian B. Whether the reverse relation holds as well, is discussed below; at this point, it is still possible that the future notion is inferred from a more basic meaning of the subjunctive.

³⁹⁴ <60> is here used as a punctuation mark.

³⁹⁵ B336b2: *wešäm* ·.

³⁹⁶ B336b3: *waike te*.

3.5.3 SUBJECT

Unambiguous examples where the future event is advantageous or disadvantageous for the subject (other than 1st person subjects) are rare. I have found only one good example where the event is clearly to the advantage of the 2nd person subject.

B286a3³⁹⁷

tune nke twe | wīna källāt | m̄ āklyilñene 19
 therein then you pleasure obtain:3SG.SBJ not in.study
 'For therein you will find pleasure, not in study.'³⁹⁸

3.5.4 FIRST PERSON

First person subjects are discussed separately because speaker and subject coincide. For first person subjects, conflicting examples as to the desirability of the event are easily found. With events that work out positively for the subject and the speaker, a translation with 'want' or 'wish' is often possible, and in some cases it yields a much more natural translation than a neutral *will* future.

In the example directly below, the first subjunctive *tākam* 'we will be' refers to an action the speaker, the god Guṇasāmpada, wishes to see fulfilled. As I argue in 3.7.5 (p 288), the particle *nai* probably signals that Guṇasāmpada seeks the agreement of the addressee.

B77.1-2

c(ām)p(a)mñeccu tus(ā)ks(a) nai ñak(e) ārw(e)r tākam ente se
 mighty:VOC therefore PCL now ready be:1PL.SBJ when DEM
kr(e)ntaunatts(e) sunetre wal(o) p(a)ñ(ā)kt(e) śaiṣṣen(e) tsānka(m) ot
 virtuous Sunetra king Buddha world:LOC rise:3SG.SBJ then
cwi sp(aktaniki alā)_[2]läcci tākam mapi kca sū cāmpān-m(e)
 DEM:GEN servant:PL indefatigable be:1PL.SBJ PCL any DEM can:3SG.PRS/SBJ
laklene waste nestsi
 sorrow:LOC refuge be:INF
 'O mighty one! That is exactly why from now on we will be ready, won't we?
 When this virtuous king Sunetra rises as a Buddha in the world, then we will be
 his indefatigable servants. He can somehow be a refuge in our distress, can't
 he?'³⁹⁹

³⁹⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 4 | 4 | 4.

³⁹⁸ Adams (1999: 38).

³⁹⁹ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 99). Schmidt's translation (2001: 303) is not very different, but to my mind "sollten" suggests an obligative flavour that it is too strong: "Hochmögender! Eben des-

The following example from the ordination ritual, the Karmavācanā, is as clear as can be, but there are two drawbacks. First, this text is mixed with many Sanskrit formulae and the Tocharian is demonstrably very close to the Sanskrit, also where the Sanskrit version of a particular passage is not found in the text itself. Thus, the use of the subjunctive *yāmu* may be due to calquing or to the fixed formulaic style of the whole ritual. Second, the translation given below consists of very short sentences, but in terms of content they are connected. Thus, we cannot completely exclude that *yāmu* is in fact part of a final clause: ‘please be my upādhyāya, so that I will be ordained with you as my upādhyāya’.

THT1109b5-1110a1

aiśai te pyāmtsar śaulasu ñ(i)ś (te-ñemtsa) ci śaulasontä
 attention DEM do:IPV.SG reverend I DEM-name:PERL you reverend
upādhyāyem yaskaske(mar t)w(e śaulasu ñi upādhyāye ptā)k(a)
 upādhyāya request:1SG.PRS you reverend me upādhyāya be:IPV.SG
ci śaulasotsa upādhyāyetsa ñiś wasanpāt yāmu
 you reverend:PERL upādhyāya:PERL I ordination do:1SG.SBJ
 ‘Pay attention, reverend! I (of this name) ask you [to be] my upādhyāya. [Please] be, reverend, my upādhyāya! With you, reverend, as upādhyāya I will be ordained.’⁴⁰⁰

In contrast, the following examples clearly describe events that work out in a negative way for subject and speaker. In these passages, a translation with ‘want’ or ‘wish’ is certainly not possible. However, it is rather unfortunate that all three examples are damaged to the left, so that in theory they could be apodoses to a conditional with a preceding subjunctive protasis. This possibility is real especially in the second and the third example, but in the first *ñake*, whose restoration is probable, can be taken as an indication that it is an independent sentence indeed.⁴⁰¹

halb sollten wir doch jetzt bereit sein: Wenn sich dieser tugendhafte König Sunetra als Buddha in der Welt erhebt, dann sollten wir seine unermüdlichen Diener sein. Er kann uns doch irgendwie im Leid Schutz sein.”

⁴⁰⁰ For the restorations and the translation cf Schmidt (1986: 50, 83). The Chinese parallel is very close: “Ich N.N. bitte dich Ehrwürdiger, mein *Heshang* [upādhyāya] zu werden. Du Ehrwürdiger mögest bitte mein *Heshang* sein. Mit dir als Heshang werde ich die Ordination erlangen.” (Chung 2004: 84).

⁴⁰¹ This was suggested to me by Prof G.-J. Pinault in February 2009.

IT69b3, B94a4

(*ñā*)ke *ñke* *ñās śle* *witsakai pāst nkema(r)*
 now for I with root PCL perish:1SG.SBJ
 ‘For now I will perish with the root.’⁴⁰²

B367a6

(*trāṅko*)*ssoñc tākam*
 guilty be:1PL.SBJ
 ‘We will be guilty.’⁴⁰³

IT105a2

/// (*wai*)*pte lareṃ śaulā ce nkemā wetane 10*
 apart dear life DEM perish:1PL.SBJ battle:LOC
 ‘We will each lose this dear life in battle.’⁴⁰⁴

3.5.5 SPEAKER

It is not evident that the speaker can be eliminated as a possible modal source. Examples with an event obviously to the advantage of the speaker, which could be seen as expressing a will or a wish, can be found, but for disadvantageous events I have found no examples.

The example below can hardly be seen as a prediction about the future, as it is clearly meant to coordinate a discourse situation, and apparently between unequal partners: the addressee is higher in rank. This type of acute wish, a wish that will very probably be fulfilled in a couple of seconds after it has been uttered, is not expressed by the optative: the optative denotes wishes whose realisation is more difficult and more distant.

B81a2

spantai kāṣṣi weṃ
 trustfully teacher say:3SG.SBJ
 ‘May the teacher speak trustfully.’⁴⁰⁵

The following example is likewise from a discourse situation, but not from a natural one: it is from the ordination ritual, known to have artificial formulae. Possibly, we can compare the Skt. formula *śrṇotu bhādanta saṃghaḥ* ‘Es höre, ihr Ehrwürdigen,

⁴⁰² Schmidt (2001: 326).

⁴⁰³ The restoration is based on B367b3 (*tā*)*kam trāṅkossoñc*.

⁴⁰⁴ Cf Hackstein (1995: 85). The by-meaning ‘lose’ of *nək-* posited by Hackstein seems to occur only when the object is related to the subject: it is a special reading of ‘destroy’. In any case, it seems reasonable that *śaulā ce* is the life of the subject (i.e. ‘we will each lose *our* life’).

⁴⁰⁵ Adams (1999: 715).

die Gemeinde!” (Härtel 1956: 83, §35; 85, §36). Alternatively, the largely restored formula *samanvāharatāyusmantah* “Bedenkt, Ehrwürdige” (Härtel 1956: 109, §69) could be considered, but the context is slightly different.

THT1113a4

ce aiśai te yāmtrā (aśanīke sārīk)
 DEM attention DEM do:3SG.SBJ worthy saṃgha
 ‘May the worthy saṃgha pay attention!’⁴⁰⁶

The example below can in fact be translated as a future, but the event is clearly desirable for the speaker: the fact that his father will do that thing for him, follows from the former’s benevolence, and underlines it at the same time.

AS17Db4-6⁴⁰⁷

pācer walo saññauke | aiśamñesa kekenu (:) [5a]
 father king wise? wisdom:PERL provided
śaitsy epastye ś(ai)ṣṣempa | yāknes(a) ṣpā snai wace : [5b]
 live:INF skilful world:COM way:PERL and without second
aśanīkeṃś ne – ks. | mā cwya amarṣṣe tseṅketār . [5c]
 venerable not DEM:GEN discontent rise:3SG.PRS
ñi yāmṣālye wāntare | pācer walo tu yāmām 5
 me do:PRS.GER thing father king DEM do:3SG.SBJ
 ‘Father king, wise (?) and provided with wisdom, [is] fit to live with the world in a way without equal; for the venerable ... his [i.e., the king’s] discontent does not arise. The thing I have to do will do father king.’

Strictly speaking, negated commands also belong here: it is the speaker who wants that the addressee does not carry out the event. Examples can be found in 3.5.12 (p 249).

3.5.6 HEARER

Although again examples of events that turn out positively for the hearer are much more easy to find than negative ones, the hearer certainly cannot be a parameter for modality: we find both promises with good effects for the hearer and threats with bad effects for the hearer.

The typical ‘yes sir’ expression in the example below is well attested in Tocharian A, but for Tocharian B it is only found in AS12. Because this limited distribution of the type is alarming, it may be a calque on Sanskrit *tathā* ‘so’, i.e. “yes”.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁶ For the restorations and the translation cf Schmidt (1986: 54, 89).

⁴⁰⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

AS12Ba1

o(roc)cu w(a)lo mā(m)t tāk(am)
 great king so be:3SG.SBJ
 ‘Great king, so it will be!’

Although in the example below the speakers want to give the bowl away, receiving it is certainly to the benefit of the hearer (according to the rules of alms-giving, the speakers, the two sisters, may not take the gift back).⁴⁰⁹

B107b9

aṣāñika rerinu star-me : oñkorño eṣe nomyeṣṣe
 venerable give.up:PRT.PTC COP-PL.SUFF porridge together jewel:ADJ
bhājaṃmpa tañ ka ṣ ekalymi tākam
 bowl your EMPH and control be:3SG.SBJ
 ‘Venerable one, it is left by us. The porridge, together with the jewel bowl, will be in precisely your possession!’

In the passage below, the Buddha asks a ferryman to bring him to the other bank of the Ganges on his way to Benares where he will deliver his first sermon. In return, the Buddha promises to redeem the ferryman.

B296b3-5⁴¹⁰

gāñkne olyitau | nes tve epastyā⁴¹¹ · [1a]
 Ganges:LOC boatman be:2SG.PRS you skilful
lyamne saṃsāraṣṣe | ti_[b4]kṣne ñiś nesau : [1b]
 lake:LOC saṃsāra:ADJ zealous I be:1SG.PRS
gāñkne olyisa | tseñe kātkaṣṣar⁴¹² · [1c]
 Ganges:LOC boat:PERL stream cross:IPV.SG
lya_[b5]mmem santsārṣṣe | ñiś ci salkamar : [1d]
 lake:ABL saṃsāra:ADJ I you pull.out:1SG.SBJ
 ‘You are skilful as a boatman on the Ganges; I am zealous on the saṃsāra lake. Cross the stream with [your] boat on the Ganges [and] I will pull you out of the saṃsāra lake.’⁴¹³

⁴⁰⁸ See also AS12Da5 and AS12Db4.

⁴⁰⁹ The parallel in Gnoli (1977: 110, l. 14) is not exact: *bhagavann eṣāpi parityaktā* ‘Venerable one, precisely this [bowl] is left [by us to you]’.

⁴¹⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5.

⁴¹¹ For *epastye*; cf also *ita* b2 for *ite*.

⁴¹² We would rather expect late *katkaṣṣar* /*kātkaṣṣar*/, for classical *pkatkaṣṣar*. Although it is morphologically the causative of *kātka-* ‘cross’, ‘cross’ seems to be the only possible translation here, too.

The following example is delicate because apparently it is ironic, if the interpretation of *kraṣiyate* is correct (as it seems to be⁴¹⁴). Rather than being commanded, the benefactor would in fact like to order himself, whereas the nun should remain silent. Like in English, the Tocharian imperative is normally not accompanied by a subject pronoun, which strengthens this interpretation. Because of the supposed ironic value, *ām lamam* is grammatically probably to be interpreted as a promise to the hearer, i.e. to the benefit of the hearer; the overall negative pragmatics must be inferred.⁴¹⁵

IT248b4-5

tusa tanāpate kraṣiyate · twe pitka wes ām lamam ·
 therefore benefactor be.upset:3SG.PRT you order:IPV.SG we calm sit:1PL.SBJ
 ‘Because of that the benefactor was upset, [and said],⁴¹⁶ «You order! We will remain quiet.»’

Examples with negative consequences for the hearer are also found; the first cited here is a real threat because the speaker, the brahmin Rudramukha, who plans to avenge himself on king Araṇemi, wants the event to be carried out, whereas in the second example it is rather a kind of warning of the speaker, the vidūṣaka, to the hearer.

B81a6-b1

cwī lkāllona lākenta nīs (utta)_[b1]ri mñcuṣkentse lkātsi
 DEM:GEN see:PRS.GER sorrow:PL I Utara:GEN prince:GEN see:INF
āyu :
 give:1SG.SBJ

‘The sorrows he should undergo I will let undergo Utara the prince [instead].’⁴¹⁷

B78b4-5

brāhmaṇiṣka mākcepi nīke kektseñe krarma_[b5](rtsa)⁴¹⁸
 little.brahmin:VOC self:GEN for body heavy
klautkañ-cä
 turn:3SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF

‘Little brahmin, after all your body will become heavy for yourself!’⁴¹⁹

⁴¹³ Schmidt (1974: 487).

⁴¹⁴ Cf the rendering of the Chinese version of this pratideśāniya 2 by Rosen (1959: 216), “Die Haushalter schelten die Nonnen”.

⁴¹⁵ An isolated *ām lamam* could probably also be taken as an exhortation, ‘please be silent’ (see 3.5.9, p 245), but the preceding *twe pitka* rules out this possibility.

⁴¹⁶ In IT137b3 we find the addition *ot weñā-neś* ‘and then said to her’.

⁴¹⁷ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 100) and Schmidt (2001: 310).

⁴¹⁸ For *kramartsa*.

3.5.7 NEUTRAL PREDICTIVE

Although pure futures are rare cross-linguistically and there often is at least a slight modal value, there are quite a number of examples of predictions in Tocharian B, always expressed with (a series of) subjunctive clauses.

In the first example, the god Pürvottara makes a prophecy about the cakravartin king Supriya; the clauses are evidently parallel.

AS17Ab4⁴²⁰

tā twe rīne śmemane | pikwalasa wī tmane : [2a]
 DEM you town:LOC sit:PRS.PTC years two ten.thousand
śak-(y)āmorṣṣai ytārine | stamāst wnołmem ce preke : [2b]
 ten.deeds:ADJ path:LOC put:2SG.PRS/SBJ beings DEM time
ñ(ā)kcyē(ṃ) śāmñem śaiṣṣeṃtso | rewāt yenme emparkre (:) [2c]
 divine human worlds:GEN.PL open:2SG.SBJ door wide
nrai lwāsa śle prete(nne | nekä)t lakle eṃṣketstse : 2
 hell animal:PL with preta:LOC.PL destroy:2SG.SBJ sorrow completely
 ‘Staying twenty thousand years in this town, you will at that time put the beings on the path of the ten deeds; you will open wide the door to the worlds of gods and humans; you will completely destroy sorrow among the hell-[beings], the animals and the pretas.’⁴²¹

The following example, even if it is fragmentary, is certainly from the prophecy of Asita the wise who foretells Buddha’s future just after his birth (on this scene, cf e.g. Foucaux 1884: 91-102).

AS12Ca5⁴²²

kārsau te mānt empreṃtsā | källaṃ klāwi śaiṣṣene 1
 know:PRT.PTC thus truth:PERL obtain:3SG.SBJ fame world:LOC
 ‘Thus having understood it for truth he will obtain fame in the world.’⁴²³

The classic examples of predictions or prophecies in Buddhist literature are the advent of the future Buddha Maitreya and descriptions of the ideal future city Ketumatī. Below, a small extract of a poem about Maitreya is given, with the characteristic series of subjunctive clauses.

⁴¹⁹ Cf Schmidt (2001: 308): “Brahmanlein! Dein Körper wird dir selbst doch schwer werden.”

⁴²⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

⁴²¹ For text, translation and commentary, see Pinault (1984c).

⁴²² Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

⁴²³ For the translation, cf Couvreur (1953b: 280).

THT1859b3⁴²⁴

(*prati*)//*harinta* † *kaśyape aiṃ śamnants (D)katsi* †
 miracle:PL Kāśyapa give:3SG.SBJ people:GEN.PL see:INF
klutkaṣṣāmn-me akteke [63a]
 make:3SG.PRS/SBJ-3PL.SUFF amazed

‘Kāśyapa will give the people ... miracles to see, and make them amazed.’

The last example is different in that the Buddha prophesies his own future, but nevertheless the interpretation is quite certain: his knows his destiny and future well (a comparable example is AS12Hb3-4, see 3.7.4, p 283).

B107b10

se ñi posa postanu prāthagjaññene pinwāt warpalñe
 DEM me all:PERL last state.of.unenlightened alms receiving
tākam
 be:3SG.SBJ

‘This will be my last receiving of alms of all in the state of the unenlightened.’

3.5.8 QUESTIONS

The reasons for the interchange of present, subjunctive and optative in rhetorical questions are difficult to understand in full detail. With our knowledge about the use of these categories elsewhere, we can tentatively suggest that the subjunctive is used for questions asked to oneself in aporia that are not rhetorical in the strict sense, but refer to future situations with an uncertain development and outcome.

AS12La3

k_uce saim yāmmār ·
 what protection do:1SG.SBJ
 ‘What protection should I offer?’ or ‘What should I protect?’

B93a4 (= NS36+20a2)

mākte ñake tākam mā ñi pele ste waike weṃtsi
 how now be:3SG.SBJ not I:GEN way be:3SG.PRS lie say:INF
 ‘How shall it be now? It is not my way to tell lies!’⁴²⁵

⁴²⁴ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

⁴²⁵ Cf Couvreur (1964: 246; see also Schmidt 2001: 325).

AS12Eb3

kce śāp yāmu se nāke yumāne tākau nau ///
 what and do:1SG.SBJ DEM now ripen:PRS.PTC be:1SG.SBJ
 ‘And what shall I do? It is maturing now. I will ...’

B81a4⁴²⁶

su ke nēn walo | yāmṣate nīśś erkatte | mākṭe ś tem
 DEM name king do:3SG.SBJ I badly how and DEM
kelu : [1d]
 bear:1SG.SBJ

‘This king by that name⁴²⁷ has treated me badly: how will I bear that?’⁴²⁸

The present, on the other hand, seems to be used for situations that call for immediate action. In the example below, it is striking that the main verb is again ‘give’, which is also more often in the present in main clauses with future reference and apodotes to specific conditionals (the restoration *ai(sk)au* is certain; the subjunctive would be *āyu*, the optative *āyim*).

B85a6 = NS355a4

mākṭe ai(sk)au (uttareṃ nā)kte-yokām sās(uw)e(rśk)e(m)
 how give:1SG.PRS Uttara of.divine.appearance dear.son
amāskai rilye ·
 difficult give.up:SBJ.GER

‘How can I give [away] Uttara, my dear son of divine appearance that is difficult to let go?’⁴²⁹

The optative, in turn, is used for “real” rhetorical questions that expect no answer (quite like the others above), but are only used for a stylistic effect (unlike the other examples above): not only does the speaker not expect an answer, he also assumes that the hearer knows exactly that.

B224a1⁴³⁰

ket no cāmpāmñe | seṃ takoy alyekepi [3c]
 who:GEN but ability DEM be:3SG.OPT other:GEN.SG
 ‘Who else then could have that ability?’

⁴²⁶ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 | 5 (5 | 4+3 | 5) or 6 | 6 | 5.

⁴²⁷ The word *ke* is analysed as an intensifier by Adams (1999: 188), whereas Schmidt (see footnote 428) follows Sieg and Siegling’s correction into *te* (1953: 19).

⁴²⁸ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 100, see also Schmidt 2001: 310 “Der so benannte König hat mich verächtlich behandelt: wie aber soll ich das ertragen?”).

⁴²⁹ Cf Couvreur (1964: 240; see also Schmidt 2001: 314).

⁴³⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

3.5.9 1PL ADDRESS

It seems that in a very small number of cases a 1pl. subjunctive is used for direct address. If correctly identified, this marginal use could be compared with the “doctors’ *we*” found in English as well as in other European languages, e.g. *How are we today?* in the meaning ‘How are *you* today?’. In the example directly below, I suspect that *yenme ruwäm* ‘we will open the gate’ is an order because the reply *mäm̄t tākam̄* ‘so it will be’ presupposes one. King Vaiśravaṇa, who speaks in the preceding line, may be the speaker of this order, too; it would be addressed to the yakṣas Pramardana and Gardabhaga. For other possible examples of 1pl. address, see B331a4 *kwri mā cimpem* ‘if we cannot’ and B331b3-4 *ārwe(r ya)maṣṣam̄tte mā wat* ‘have we made ourselves ready, or not?’. An alternative interpretation of the example below could be that *yenme ruwäm* is a suggestion of one of the persons who partakes in the opening of the gate.

AS12Ga2

/// y(e)nme ruwäm · pramardane weṣṣäm mā(ṃ)t tākam̄ ·
 gate open:1PL.SBJ Pramardana say:3SG.PRS so be:3SG.SBJ
 ‘«... we will open the gate.» Pramardana says: «So it will be!»’⁴³¹

3.5.10 COMPARED TO THE PRESENT

The present can be contrasted in two ways with the subjunctive, as 1) the present may refer to close or certain futures, and 2) the present may sometimes have modal values. In contrast, the subjunctive is never used to refer to the present in main clauses. For Tocharian B in particular, the comparison between the present and the subjunctive is complicated because of the relatively high number of examples with present-subjunctives: some of them are pre-eminent high frequency verbs, such as ‘go’ (which is one of the verbs that is often in the present in future contexts in Tocharian A, see 3.2.8, p 180).

There is one verb, ‘become’, that has no subjunctive, but its present is sometimes used as such, which without doubt follows from the future sense that is already part of its meaning. Probably, the use of the present instead of the subjunctive depicts the future event as more certain.

B496a1-2⁴³²

(mā) ñ(i ci)sa noṣ | sómo ñ(e)m [a2] (wno)lme | (D)āre
 not me you:PERL before human name being dear

⁴³¹ Cf Couvreur (1953b: 282).

⁴³² Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

tāka mā ra postam | cisa lāre mäsketär-ñ : [2c]
 be:3SG.PRT not and afterwards you:PERL dear be:3SG.PRS-1SG.SUFF
 ‘No human being⁴³³ has [ever] before been dearer to me than you, and none will be dearer to me than you afterwards.’

Another verb that is frequently in the present is ‘give’. I suppose that this use is due to discourse situations in which the event of giving is so near at hand that a present cannot cause any ambiguity. There are also some present apodoses in conditionals where the same principle seems to be at work. For the example below, contrast the construction following in B81a6-b1 (3.5.6, p 239).

B81a6

sū no walo pañāktāññe (perne)šše akālksa po (aiššeñca
 DEM but king Buddha:ADJ worth:ADJ wish:PERL all give:AG.N
nemce)k cau uttareñ mñ(cu)škeñ yesāmññ aiššäm
 certainly DEM Uttara prince you:GEN.PL give:3SG.PRS
 ‘Now this king is giving away all out of his wish for the Buddha rank and certainly he will give Uttara the prince to you.’⁴³⁴

The most important modal use of the present is in negated commands. In Tocharian, the imperative cannot be negated. Instead, the present or the subjunctive is used; the former is used to make the hearer stop carrying out an event (inhibitive), the latter to prevent the hearer from carrying out a future event (preventive). Thomas (1958a) gives examples of both inhibitives (p 301-303) and preventives (p 306-307; unfortunately he cites mainly present-subjunctives here). See the inhibitive example below:

B85a2 (also NS355a1)

šarya ammakki poññ āppai mā ñiś cempañts rakšatsents
 dear mum tell:IPV.SG dad not I DEM:GEN.PL rākšasa:GEN.PL
aiššäm
 give:3SG.PRS
 ‘Dear mummy, tell dad that he mustn’t give me to those rākšasas!’⁴³⁵

⁴³³ Literally: ‘being called “man”’ or ‘being with the name “man”’.

⁴³⁴ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 100).

⁴³⁵ Cf Couvreur (1964: 240); Schmidt (2001: 314).

B123b1⁴³⁶

pkel *twe erkätñe* † *mā rinasta(r)* ///
 bear:IPV.SG you displeasure not give.up:2SG.PRS
 ‘Endure the displeasure, do not give up!’

B88b4

mā trañko yamas-ne
 not guilt do:2SG.PRS-3SG.SUFF
 ‘Do not blame him!’⁴³⁷

Although in the example below future reference seems to be ascertained by *tu postām* ‘after that’, *kāskan-me* ‘disperses them’ is probably a present. This present could be caused by *nemcek* ‘certainly’, which indicates that it is certain;⁴³⁸ alternatively, one could take it as a general description without explicit reference to a specific future event, which would also allow for the use of the present.

B555.2

/// (*ne*)*mc(e)k* *tu* *postām* *ceṃ* *srukalyñe* *kāskan-me* :
 certainly DEM after DEM death scatter:3SG.PRS-PL.SUFF
 ‘Certainly death will disperse them after that.’

3.5.11 COMPARED TO THE OPTATIVE

The widest use of the optative in both main and subclauses is found in the Udānavarga bilinguals; however, since they are copied from optatives in the Sanskrit original, this wide use does not reflect genuine Tocharian grammar, but rather the modal system of Buddhist Sanskrit.

The principal uses in independent main clauses in Tocharian B are optative, obligative, and dubitative. The usage in dependent main clauses in conditionals is briefly described in 3.6.11 (p 266).

In optative use, the speaker wishes that the subject carries out an event, either to the benefit of the speaker or to the benefit of the subject; the fulfilment of the wish may, but need not be in the hands of the subject. In this usage, the optative is clearly

⁴³⁶ The beginning of pāda 39b of a versified text with the metre a-c: 5 † 7 (5 † 4+3), d: 7 † 8 or 8 † 7.

⁴³⁷ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 102; see also Schmidt 2001: 318); alternatively, one could consider a translation ‘don’t consider it his sin!’.

⁴³⁸ A complicating factor is that the manuscript is archaic, so that the *a*-vowels are not completely reliable. Consequently, *kāskan-me* could theoretically stand for a pl.sbj. *kaskan-me* {kāska-n-me}. However, since this yields the strange interpretation ‘they will disperse their death[s] after that’, *kāskan-me* must be a regular sg.prs. {kaskāññā-n-me}.

distinct from the subjunctive, since the subjunctive does not express wishes (for wish-like subjunctives, confined to specific discourse situations, see 3.5.5, p 238).

B107b7-8⁴³⁹

ce pintwāttsa | kārtsomñenta | po yātoye-ś : [1c]
 DEM alms:PERL virtue:PL all realise:3PL.OPT-2SG.SUFF
wesi [b8] rano | ritau akālk | kññiyoytār · 1
 we:GEN also bind:PRT.PTC wish fulfil:3SG.OPT
 ‘May through these alms all benefits become possible [be realised] for you, and may our cherished wish be fulfilled!’

In obligative use, the speaker claims that the subject should carry out an event according to general rules or principles. The event need not be beneficial to the subject nor to the speaker; the success of the event is generally in the hands of the subject. Although this use is not rare in the corpus, most examples look like they result from calquing on Sanskrit originals (for instance B30b4 *wināṣi* ‘one should honour’, which translates Skt. *namasyeta* ‘id’ Uv12.16d). Even of the example below one could claim that is not probative because on the one hand the Karmavibhaṅga has evident traits of a translation from Sanskrit, and on the other, a nominal subclause precedes, so that the optative clause is not independent.

AS7Jb6⁴⁴⁰

ñākcyē nervāṃṣe | śpā sak warpatsy āñme ket | sū
 divine nirvāṇa:ADJ and happiness receive:INF wish who:GEN DEM
św(ā)tsi āyi 5
 food give:3SG.OPT
 ‘Who has the wish to receive happiness of gods and the nirvāṇa, he should donate food.’

In dubitative use, the optative expresses a high degree of uncertainty on the part of the speaker about the realisation of a future event, or about the truth of a present situation. Especially in questions, including rhetorical ones, dubitative optatives may be difficult to keep apart from presents and subjunctives, as these occur in comparable types of questions (see 3.5.8, p 243).

B99a4

ñakteṃts saswa k,se pi ksa ayi-ne pelaikne
 god:GEN.PL lord:VOC who PCL INDF give:3SG.OPT-3SG.SUFF law

⁴³⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 4 | 4 | 4.

⁴⁴⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 | 5 (5 | 4+3 | 5) or 6 | 6 | 5.

klyauṣṣi

hear:INF

‘O lord of the gods, will anybody give him to hear the law?’⁴⁴¹

3.5.12 COMPARED TO THE IMPERATIVE

The imperative is the pre-eminent deontic mood, and since the subjunctive is not deontic, the overlap between the two is negligible. There are two ways in which the subjunctive and the imperative touch: in the prohibitive and with certain particles (see especially 3.7.3, p 282).

As explained above, the imperative cannot be negated and its negative (prohibitive) counterparts are the present for ongoing actions (inhibitive) and the subjunctive for future actions (preventive). Thus, as a negation of the imperative, the subjunctive has a clear modal value.

B128b5⁴⁴²

‖ *waṣāmñeṣṣe* *pālskosa* *cī* ‖ *weskau* *mapi* *mārsat*
friendly mind:PERL you say:1SG.PRS not⁴⁴³ forget:2SG.SBJ

te · [10b]

DEM

‘I say to you with a friendly mind: do not forget this.’

B77.4

ṣpakk anaiṣai epiyac kalatsi porcaññar cwi araṇemiñ
more careful memory bring:INF deign:IPV.SG DEM:GEN Araṇemi:GEN

lānte krent yamalñe ·

king:GEN good activity

‘Please remember the good activity of king Araṇemi more carefully!’⁴⁴⁴

B588b6

mā twe prāskat

not you be.afraid:2SG.PRS/SBJ

‘Don’t you be afraid!’

⁴⁴¹ Thomas (1954: 730).

⁴⁴² Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

⁴⁴³ On the particle *mapi*, see in detail 3.7.5 (p 300).

⁴⁴⁴ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 99; see also Schmidt 2001: 303).

THT1103b2

mäfte kca twe ce te-yäknece ike mā kätkat
 how INDF you DEM such place not cross:2SG.SBJ
 ‘You mustn’t cross this point on any account!’⁴⁴⁵

In the Udānavarga bilinguals, and in the corresponding passage of the Udānālañkāra, too, there is one instance of a Skt. 3sg.ipv., which is rendered by an optative in Tocharian B. (Both in the Udānavarga and the Udānālañkāra, the 3sg. *astu* is rendered with the 2sg.opt. *tākoyt* because of the different construction of *dhik* and *hišt*. In the Udānālañkāra, *mā klyomo* was added for metrical reasons.)

IT233+368a3 (= Uv1.29a)

[SKT:] *dhik tvām (a)stu jare grāmye* · [TB:]
 shame you be:3SG.IPV old.age:LOC vulgar:LOC
*hištwe*⁴⁴⁶ *tākoytä ktsai(tsāññe) ///*
 shame/you be:2SG.OPT old.age
 ‘Shame be upon you, vulgar old age!’⁴⁴⁷

B5b8⁴⁴⁸

hišt t(w)e tākoyt (kts)aitsāññe ! kārpye-yäkne mā
 shame you be:2SG.OPT old.age of.a.mean.kind not
klyomo : [75a]
 noble

‘Shame be upon you, old age! You are of a mean kind [and] not noble’

3.6 THE TOCHARIAN B SUBJUNCTIVE IN SUBCLAUSES

In subclauses, the Tocharian B subjunctive expresses uncertainty, which includes conditionality. First, conditionals are discussed, with subjunctive (3.6.1, p 251), pres-

⁴⁴⁵ Cf Schmidt (1986: 69-72): “Auf keinen Fall sollst du dir ein solches Vergehen zuschulden kommen lassen.” This is taken from the formula to precept №5 in the *karmavācanā*; damaged or lost versions are for №1 in THT1102b2, №2 in THT1102b4-1103a1, №3 in THT1103a2-3, №4 in THT1103a4-b1, №6 in THT1103b4, №7 in THT1104a2, №8 in THT1104a4, №9 in THT1104b1, №10 in THT1104b3 (in the latter four we find *mäfte kca mäntrakā-yäknece* instead of *mäfte kca twe ce te-yäknece*). The formula has a precise match in Skt. *kaccid evamrūpaṃ sthānaṃ nādhyāpatsyase* “Auf keinen Fall sollst du ein solches Vergehen auf dich laden.” (Härtel 1956: 54-55, §6.7-§6.12). The Chinese parallel of Chung (2004: 46-47, §v.3b-§v.3f; 48-49, §v.6.2) is less precise.

⁴⁴⁶ For *hišt twe*.

⁴⁴⁷ 1.29b-d *virūpakaraṇi hy asi* [b] *tathā manoramaṃ bimbaṃ* [c] *jarayā hy abhimarditam* [d] ‘you are a maker of ugliness because a face gratifying to the mind is destroyed by old age.’ (Bernhard 1965: 106; Chakravarti 1930: 9).

⁴⁴⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

ent (3.6.2, p 253), and imperative apodoses (3.6.3, p 259) respectively; deviating types are discussed in 3.6.4 (p 260). Several other subcategories follow: eventual clauses (3.6.5, p 261), iterative (3.6.6, p 261), indefinite (3.6.7, p 262), concessive (3.6.8, p 263), and final clauses (3.6.9, p 264). Then, the subclause subjunctive is compared with present (3.6.10, p 265), nominal (3.6.11, p 266), and optative clauses (3.6.12, p 268). Because of the wide variety of conditional types in *prātimokṣa* texts, these are treated separately in 3.6.13 (p 272).

3.6.1 CONDITIONALS WITH SUBJUNCTIVE APODOSIS

Subjunctive conditionals with a subjunctive apodosis denote two future events that may possibly take place. The relation between these two events is not fixed: I have found some typical examples where the apodosis is the logical consequence of the protasis, but the protasis may also be a condition for another event that does not logically follow from the fulfilment of the condition.

The first example is a clear conditional, since it has the conjunction *kr_ui*; however, the relation between protasis and apodosis is only logical if the speaker is not promising instead of prophesying. In fact, since the Buddha is the speaker, we have to take into account the possibility that the speaker promises the apodosis. If not, the Buddha may just give guidelines, so to say, and the apodosis is indeed to be seen as a logical consequence of the protasis.

B128b4⁴⁴⁹

kr_ui twe wroccu wlo | yāmt ñi rekisa | käll(ā)t
 if you great king do:2SG.SBJ I:GEN word:PERL obtain:2SG.SBJ
yñ(ak)t(eṃ) śale yśāmna | käre-perne lantuñne [10a]
 among.gods with among.men glory royal

‘If you, o great king, act according to my word, you will attain great glory and kingship among both gods and men.’

The example below certainly contains a logical relation between three events, but since the conditional conjunction is omitted or lost, it is theoretically possible that it is a series of independent main clauses. Nevertheless, taking the whole utterance as one sentence gives a coherent interpretation.

B375a5

/// (śre)ṣṭhinmeṃ peri yāmmar śwer orocceṃ mahāśrā(maṇeṃś)
 distinguished:ABL debt do:1SG.SBJ four great mahāśramaṇa:ALL.PL
kalymisa spārttau ce tallārñemeṃ mlutkamar
 direction:PERL turn:1SG.SBJ DEM misery:ABL get.out:1SG.SBJ

⁴⁴⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

‘If I borrow money⁴⁵⁰ from the distinguished [Priyadeva, my neighbour] and behave correctly towards the four great *mahāśramaṇas*, I will get out of this misery.’

The following set of clauses is definitely logically related, but since it is fragmentary, we cannot be totally certain about its interpretation.

AS₁₂Eb₂

/// *k āklyi mā yāmtār nānokā nke mā kca kārāsā(t)*
 exercise not do:2SG.SBJ still then not INDF know:2SG.SBJ
 ‘... if you don’t learn [it], then you still don’t know anything ...’

Since the following passage is taken from the ordination ritual, the relation between the protases and apodoses is not entirely logical: it is based on the rules of this ritual.

THT_{1113a2-3}

krūi ysomo s(ān)k (warpatrā ām lmorsa) ka wasanpāt
 if whole saṃgha receive:3SG.SBJ silent sit:ABS just ordination
yātaṃñ-c · *ṣe ṣamāne postaññe tenkāñ-c*
 realise:3SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF one monk even stop:3SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF
wasanpāt mā yāt(aṃñ-c ·)
 ordination not be.able:3SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF

‘If the whole saṃgha agrees, [even if] only through remaining silent, you will be ordained. If only one monk stops you, you cannot be ordained.’⁴⁵¹

If the last example still contained a sense of logic, the following is clearly a condition set by the speaker (with a slightly deviant Paris parallel, AS₁₈Ab₃, see Pinault 1984b):

B₃₃₇b₁

kampāl mā pāt kalatar temeñce pāstä
 mantle not away bring:2SG.SBJ because.of.that away
lyutem-cä ·
 drive:1PL.SBJ-2SG.SUFF

‘If you don’t give away the mantle, then we will drive you away because of that.’

⁴⁵⁰ I have tentatively translated *peri yam-* with ‘borrow money’, although literally it means ‘make debt’; alternatively, it would be ‘make debts with sb.’ or the like.

⁴⁵¹ For the restorations and the translation cf Schmidt (1986: 54, 88); his restoration of the moods is without doubt correct. Parallel formulae are cited by Härtel (1956: 86, §37.5) and Chung (2004: 88, §13.2).

AS18Ab3

kampāl mā päst kalatar matsisa kauc lañkäm-c
 mantle not away bring:2SG.SBJ hair:PERL up hang:1PL.SBJ-2SG.SUFF
 'If you don't give away the mantle, we will hang you up by your hair.'

Likewise, in the example below Indra, who puts the pious king Subhāṣitagaveṣin to the test, who says he is prepared to die for one Buddha strophe.⁴⁵²

B100a4

/// mrauskäṣṣeñcai empelyai pwārṣṣai koṣkain(e yaptsi
 making.feel.weary horrible fire:ADJ hut:LOC enter:INF
*campalle*⁴⁵³) *tākat ta*⁴⁵⁴ *ñiś tañ*⁴⁵⁵ *pañaktāññe ślauk*⁴⁵⁶
 can:PRS/SBJ.GER be:2SG.SBJ then I you:GEN Buddha:ADJ strophe
*aksau*⁴⁵⁷
 tell:1SG.SBJ
 'If you are able to enter this horrible fire hut that makes feel weary, then I will
 recite your Buddha strophe.'⁴⁵⁸

3.6.2 CONDITIONALS WITH PRESENT APODOSIS

Subjunctive conditionals with a present apodosis typically do not denote concrete possible future events, but rather general principles. If a concrete event is expressed, the apodosis does not contain the logical consequence of the protatic event.

Many good examples of general principles expressed by this type of conditional can be found in the Karmavibhaṅga, which deals with the consequence of deeds in another rebirth. In this type, it is more about several different scenarios of general causal or temporal relations than about a particular future event conditioned by another.

⁴⁵² Two more comparable examples of the same text are B99a5 and B100a1-2 (3.7.3, p 282).

⁴⁵³ Inf. + *campalle* is restored after B100a1.

⁴⁵⁴ Sieg and Siegling (1953: 36) correct to *tane* 'here', but see 3.7.5 (p 287).

⁴⁵⁵ *tañ* lacks in Sieg and Siegling's edition (1953: 36), but can be read very clearly in the manuscript.

⁴⁵⁶ For *ślok*.

⁴⁵⁷ The following akṣara *ka* may the beginning of a new clause, or otherwise it may be the emphatic particle *ka* 'just'.

⁴⁵⁸ Thomas (1952: 42). 'your strophe' is to be understood roughly as 'the strophe that you requested to hear' or 'the strophe that you talked about'.

AS7Eb2⁴⁵⁹

cai *kr_ui* *nta* *yśāmnā* | *cmentrā* *onolmi* | *snaice*
 DEM:PL if ever among.humans be.born:3PL.SBJ being:PL poor
ostne *tānmaskentrā* | *ekñiññesa* *menkice* : [8b]
 house:LOC be.born:3PL.PRS possession:PERL lacking

‘If these beings are ever reborn among humans, they are born in a poor house that lacks possessions.’

AS7Jb2⁴⁶⁰

tākaṃ *yokaitse* | *kr_ui* *pākri* *māsketar-ne* | *yoktsi* *enepre* 2
 be:3SG.SBJ thirsty if manifest be:3SG.PRS drink before
 ‘If he is thirsty, drink appears in front of him.’

In the following example, the conditional is a complement to *māksu no yāmor* ‘what is the deed’, but otherwise it is regular: *cmetrā* (for *cmentrā*) introduces the condition and *śāyem* (prs.-sbj.), *tsālpentre* (for *tsālpentrā*) and *klinaṣṣān-me* give the consequence.

AS7Ca1-2⁴⁶¹

māksu *n(o)* *yāmor* | *mākcewsa* *tne* *onolmi* : [10a]
 which but action which:PERL here being:PL
nrai_yne *cmetrā*⁴⁶² | *ywārtsa* *omte* *ś(au)l* *ś(ā)y(e)ṃ* : [10b]
 hell:LOC be.born:3PL.SBJ half there life live:3PL.PRS/SBJ
*tsālpentre*⁴⁶³ *nauṣāk* | *lāklentameṃ* *nre*_[a2] *yṣana* : [10c]
 be.freed:3PL.PRS before sorrow:ABL.PL hell:ADJ
mā *solme* *lākle* | *klinaṣṣān-me* *warpatsi* 10
 not complete sorrow have.to:3SG.PRS.-PL.SUFF receive:INF

‘But what is the deed through which the beings here, if they are reborn in hell, then live only half of their lives there, are freed earlier from the sorrows of hell, and do not have to endure all the sorrow.’

There is one such example from the Udānālānkāra, where the Sanskrit Udānavarga original has no modal marking, but apparently it was deemed necessary in the Tocharian, in spite of the artificial character of that text (for “modal calques” on Sanskrit, see 3.1.3, p 158, and e.g. 3.6.9, p 264). The two Sanskrit presents *bhavati* ‘is’

⁴⁵⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

⁴⁶⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 | 5 (5 | 3+4 | 5).

⁴⁶¹ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

⁴⁶² Certainly for *cmentrā*. The preceding unit is one syllable short; perhaps one should read *nrai_yntane* instead.

⁴⁶³ Certainly for *tsālpentrā*.

are rendered by Tocharian subjunctives *tākaṃ* (conditional in the first instance, concessive in the second correspondence).

B_{31a7}⁴⁶⁴

kwri tane | śwātsintse śle yoktsintse | klpauca tākaṃ
if here food:GEN with drink:GEN obtain:AG.N be:3SG.SBJ

wnolme : [40a]

being

yolo-wāntre ra kwri tākaṃ | sū cets mskētār
of.bad.nature also if be:3SG.SBJ DEM DEM:GEN.PL be:3SG.PRS

*yarkesa*⁴⁶⁵ | [40b]

reverence:PERL

‘If a being is obtaining food and drink here, even if he is of bad nature, it is [worthy of] reverence for them’

U_{v13.14}

sa cet tv ihānnapānasya [a] lābhī bhavati
DEM if PCL here≠food.and.drink:GEN obtain:AG.N be:3SG.PRS

pudgalah [b]

person

pāpadharmāpi ced bhavati [c] sa teṣāṃ bhavati
of.evil.character≠even if be:3SG.PRS DEM DEM:GEN.PL be:3SG.PRS

pūjitaḥ [d]

honoured

‘If someone is obtaining food and drink here, even if he is of evil character, he is honoured by them.’⁴⁶⁶

The conditional type with a present apodosis is very often used in all kinds of metaphors where two principles are compared, so that both can have the same structure:

B_{407a1-3}⁴⁶⁷

tättātār tana | (tan)āmotāṣṣai koyne | t(ane)⁴⁶⁸ onolme [23a]
put:3SG.SBJ seed tanamoda:ADJ mouth:LOC here being

ma te tsatsa_[a2]ltarmeṃ | naukāṃn-ne so(lme) su | śūke
not DEM chew:ABS swallow:3SG.SBJ-3SG.SUFF completely DEM taste

⁴⁶⁴ Verse: metre a-b: 8 | 7 | 6, c: 18, d: 7 | 6 (a-b: 5+3 | 4+3 | 6, c: 4+5 | 4+5, d: 4+3 | 6); line 40a is cited from the 6th syllable and line 40b contains 6 more syllables.

⁴⁶⁵ So to be read for *yarkasa* in the manuscript.

⁴⁶⁶ Bernhard (1965: 205); cf Chakravarti (1930: 106).

⁴⁶⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 | 5 (5 | 3+4 | 5) or 6 | 6 | 5.

⁴⁶⁸ The manuscript reads *n* instead of *t* (Sieg and Siegling 1953: 272; restorations after them).

mā /yštār-ne [23b]
 not know:3SG.PRS/SBJ-3SG.SUFF
mā(nt)r(ā)kk(a) āklu | *pelaiykne* [a3] *ompalskoññe* | *krui no mā*
 just.so learn:PRT.PTC law meditation if but not
lama(m) [23c]
 sit:3SG.SBJ
aklilyñe su cpi | *māsketrā tanāmot ramt* | *solme*
 teaching DEM DEM:GEN be:3SG.PRS tanamoda like completely
nukowa 23
 swallow:PRT.PTC

‘If a being here puts a *tanamoda*-seed into its mouth and swallows it as a whole without having chewed, then it does not notice the taste. And likewise, if someone who has learned the law does not sit down in meditation, the teaching is for him like a *tanamoda*-seed swallowed as a whole.’

There are also some examples which clearly cannot be explained as conditionals based on general principles. In most of these cases, there is no logical relation between protasis and apodosis, and probably we have to take the present in the apodosis as the present that may be used for close and certain futures in main clauses. In all clear instances, the main clause contains a present form of the verb *ay-‘give’* (cf apart from the example below also B107b1-2: 3.7.3, p 282).

Cp32.8-9

*ce*⁴⁶⁹ *sem* *kamāte* *pās* [9] *aiyñ* *ce*⁴⁶⁹ *peri*
 what DEM bring:3SG.PRT away give:3SG.SBJ/1SG.SUFF what debt
nesem *tu* *pās* *aiskem-ne*
 be:1PL.PRS DEM away give:1PL.PRS-3SG.SUFF
 ‘If he gives back to me⁴⁷⁰ what he has carried off, we [will] give back to him what we owe.’⁴⁷¹

The following example contains a present form in the apodosis, but it is a specific condition with a logical relation indeed. Here, the explanation may be that the

⁴⁶⁹ Relative.

⁴⁷⁰ Since the *ñ* of *aiyñ* is a first person singular whereas *aiskem* is a first person plural, it could be that we have to read *aim* without suffixed pronoun, but with *saṃdhi* before the following *c*, i.e. ‘if he gives back what he has carried off’.

⁴⁷¹ For text, translation and commentary, cf Pinault (1984a). He had translated the four clauses as two sentences, i.e. with *aiyñ* as part of a main clause: “Ce qu’il a pris, il doit me [le] rendre; ce dont nous sommes redevables, nous le lui rendons.” (1984a: 31-32). However, an interpretation as a conditional yields a coherent, and probably better, translation.

apodosis contains a subjunctive gerund *knelle*, which might provide for the future reference.

B100a5-6

*käṣṣi snai nerke yänmaskau*⁴⁷² *pwārṣai koṣkaine* - - - -
 teacher without hesitation enter:1SG.PRS fire:ADJ hut:LOC
 (*puwa*)*rne nauṣ yopu mā ṣpä akālk knelle*
 fire:LOC before enter:1SG.SBJ not and wish fulfil:SBJ.GER
*star-ñ pañaktä*_[a6](*ññe śloksa*) *lareṃ pelaikne*
 be:3SG.PRS-1SG.SUFF Buddha:ADJ strophe:PERL dear law
*klyautsi*⁴⁷³ *pelaikne klyauṣti nauṣ pete-ñ tak(arṣkem*
 hear:INF law hear:INF before give:IPV.SG-1SG.SUFF faithful
palskosa)
 mind:PERL

‘Teacher, without hesitation I enter into the fire hut ... (but) if I enter into the fire first, my wish to hear the dear law with a Buddha-strophe cannot be fulfilled. First give me the law to hear with faithful mind!’⁴⁷⁴

One example from a philosophical text from the abhidharma could be a conditional on the basis of inference, but it cannot be excluded that it just discusses different states of mind; in the latter case, it is not different from the examples based on general principles given above.⁴⁷⁵

B197a3-4

*inte toyne*⁴⁷⁶ *warpalñenta mā tākaṃ palskone ne*_[a4]*mcek*
 if DEM:PL experience:PL not be:3PL.SBJ mind:LOC certainly
upekṣ mäsketär
 indifference be:3SG.PRS

‘If these experiences are not there in the mind, there is certainly indifference.’

Although the default order of the clauses in a conditional is certainly the conditional subjunctive subclause first and then the present main clause, there are some examples where the order is reversed. In the example below, the reversed order is certain because of the conjunction *krui*, but the line is problematic because *wänträ*

⁴⁷² The present may depict the event as very close and certain.

⁴⁷³ For *klyauṣti*.

⁴⁷⁴ Thomas (1952: 29).

⁴⁷⁵ The passage in Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa* (de La Vallée Poussin 1980: I, 153) given by Sieg and Siegling (1953: 114) is not precise enough to settle the matter.

⁴⁷⁶ Sieg and Siegling (l.c., see footnote 475) suggest to correct into *toy no* ‘these however’.

seems to be a subjunctive morphologically, whereas we would syntactically expect a present.

B255a6⁴⁷⁷

keṃ ma tāllaṃ yoloytä | ṣek wänträ no
 earth not support:3SG.PRS evil.one always cover:3SG.SBJ? but
wotkäṃ kr_(u)i [10a]
 decide:3SG.SBJ if

‘The earth does not support the evil one, but it always covers him if it decides so.’

AS7Bb2⁴⁷⁸

cmela tu wästrä | yāmträ krenta yāmornta : [4c]
 birth:PL DEM make.ripe:3SG.PRS do:3SG.SBJ good deed:PL
cew yāmorsa sū | mā nemcek ṣpä tänmasträ 4
 DEM deed:PL DEM not certainly and be.born:3SG.PRS

‘It makes ripe for rebirths if one does good deeds; through this deed he is not certainly reborn.’

B291a4

• m(a)nta āke weskau-ne kr_{ui} (nraimeṃ) entwe
 never end say:1SG.PRS-3SG.SUFF if hell:ABL then
tsälpāträ •
 be.redeemed:3SG.SBJ

‘I will⁴⁷⁹ never tell his end if he is redeemed from hell then.’⁴⁸⁰

Very similar to the conditional pattern with a present apodosis is a pattern with a nominal apodosis:

B280.1⁴⁸¹

(nervām)ṣṣe yānmān īke | (o)nuwaññe : [21c]
 nirvāṇa:ADJ reach:3SG.SBJ place immortal
tumem mānte läklentse | mā ṣäp preke 21
 then so sorrow:GEN not and time

‘If he reaches the immortal *nirvāṇa* place, then from that moment the time of sorrow [lasts] no longer.’

⁴⁷⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

⁴⁷⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

⁴⁷⁹ A present in the Tocharian original.

⁴⁸⁰ Cf Schmidt (1983: 278).

⁴⁸¹ Verse: metre a, c, d: 7 | 4, b: 6 | 8 (a, c, d: 4+3 | 4 or 3+4 | 4; b: 6 | 4+4).

The living rules of the *prātimokṣasūtra* come in a variety of different structures (see 3.6.11, p 266), but many of them follow the conditional pattern with a subjunctive protasis and a present apodosis, or a nominal apodosis, as below.

IT247a6-b1

omte se yarmä pärkarñesa wi rsoñcä · pañäktentse
 there DEM measure length:PERL two span:DU Buddha:GEN
rasosa · pkantesa śle ywārcä · ñrets raso · tumem
 span:PERL crosswise with half fringe:GEN.PL span DEM:ABL
omṣap yāmrä · ipäṣṣeñca ||
 more do:3SG.SBJ pātayantikā

‘There is that measure: in length two spans according to the Buddha span, crosswise one and a half,⁴⁸² [and] one span for the fringes. If he makes [it] more than that, [it is] a pātayantikā offence.’

3.6.3 CONDITIONAL WITH IMPERATIVE APODOSIS

The relatively independent character of the conditional subjunctive subclause is shown by the fact that it can also be followed by an imperative clause. Of course, these concern specific conditionals, not general principles.

In the example below, the conditionals are used to reason about possibilities. We find two times a subjunctive protasis followed by an imperative apodosis, of which the last is followed by a final clause in the present.

B107b3-4

maharṣinta posa kreś tākacer mant purwat
 great.sage:PL all:PERL good be:2PL.SBJ so receive:2PL.IPV
oñkarñai · mā tākacer wesi pokses posa śpālmem
 porridge not be:2PL.SBJ we:GEN tell:IPV.PL all:PERL excellent
rṣāke intsu ste cwi ka ṣ mant [b4] klāskem
 sage which be:3SG.PRS DEM:GEN EMPH and so bring:1PL.PRS
 ‘O great sages, if you are better than all, then receive this porridge! If you are not, tell us who is the sage that is better than all, so that to him indeed we bring it.’⁴⁸³

The following is said by king Araṇemi to the animals in the forest. It is reported by the two tree gods that are watching the whole scene of Uttara’s “kidnapping”. This conditional really concerns a possible future event.

⁴⁸² *śle-ywārcä* ‘with half’ is a calque on Skt. *sārdham* ‘one and a half’, literally ‘with half’.

⁴⁸³ In the Gilgit parallel, it is the Śuddhāvāsa gods who ask, *kiṃ asmākam anuprayacchatha āhosvid yo ’smadviṣiṣṭatamaḥ* ‘Do you offer it to us, or to him who is better than us?’ (Gnoli 1977: 100, l. 4-5).

B88b2-3⁴⁸⁴

‡ *ñśamem* *wātkoṣ* ‡ *kr_{ui}* *lkācer* *ñī* *so(ṃ)śke* : [2c]
 I:ABL separate:PRT.PTC if see:2PL.SBJ I:GEN little.son
ptsārwaṣṣat-ne *ñi* *yke_[b3]ne* ‡ *ytārin* *empelyai* 2
 console:IPV.PL-3SG.SUFF I:GEN place:LOC road:LOC terrible
 ‘If you see my little son, who is separated from me, console him on [his] awful road instead of me!’⁴⁸⁵

3.6.4 OTHER CONDITIONALS

One example from an oneiromancy clearly is not concerned with a possible future event, but rather gives a possible interpretation of a certain dream type. The fact that this conditional subjunctive is part of reasoning may explain the optative apodosis that is otherwise unexpected. (The second part, with the possibilitive optative clause, returns in every line of this leaf, but the condition with a subjunctive is found only here.)

B511a3

‖ *inte nauṣamem* *niśācare* *tākaṃ* *wate* *dhvaje* *larenāmpa*
 when before jackal be:3SG.SBJ second crow dear:COM.PL
śinmalñeṣṣe *palskalñe* *ṣarpi*
 coming:ADJ thought point.to:3SG.OPT
 ‘If a jackal is first and a crow second, this may point to thinking of coming together with the dear ones.’

The following example does not contain a subjunctive conditional, but it is best compared with the preceding. In this case, the conditional is in the optative and the apodosis is in the present, a combination that is not attested otherwise. The unusual combination of moods is certainly to be explained with the relation between conditional and consequence that is based on reason.

B197a2

tākauy *sak* *(w)ai* *lakle* *warpalñenta* *svabhāptsa*
 be:3SG.OPT happiness and sorrow experience:PL nature:PERL
upekṣ *warpalñe* *mākte* *aiśalle* *ste*
 indifference experience how know:GER be:3SG.PRS
 ‘If by nature there were experiences of happiness and sorrow, how is the experience of indifference to be understood?’⁴⁸⁶

⁴⁸⁴ Verse: the metre has unequal pādas, allegedly a-b: 8 † 7 † 6, c: 9 † 9, d: 7 † 6. However, in this poem, many pādas are one syllable too long.

⁴⁸⁵ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 102; see also Schmidt 2001: 317-318).

3.6.5 EVENTUAL

A large number of subjunctive subclauses are not straightforward conditional clauses: they introduce extra information that is not verified or certain, but may possibly be the case. These clauses, here termed “eventual”, are typically adnominal (the formula of the second example is analysed in detail by Pinault 1987: 80⁴⁸⁷).

B107a6

pilycalñene lalālu laukito ršāke tākaṃ ršākeṃne
penance make.effort:PRT.PTC foreign sage be:3SG.SBJ sage:LOC.PL

špālmeṃ cwi wes tā ōnkorñai pintwāt aiskem ·
excellent DEM:GEN we DEM porridge alms give:1PL.PRS

‘A foreign sage who is trained in penance and best among the sages – to him we [will] give the porridge as alms.’

LP11a1

se⁴⁸⁸ tesa šap tākaṃ tu mā tārkanat
what DEM:PERL more be:3SG.SBJ DEM not let.go:2SG.PRS

‘What is more than this, don’t let it [pass].’

3.6.6 ITERATIVE

In iterative clauses, at least the event of the subclause may take place several times, and often that of the main clause as well. Without specific tense reference, or with present reference, the main clause is in the present, while the subclause is in the subjunctive. With past tense reference, the subclause has an optative and the main clause an imperfect. The present iterative is close to the indefinite subclause type if the number of repetitions in the subclauses is irrelevant.

B241b1-2⁴⁸⁹

kos kos plaskau arāñc tāñ † snai [b2] – t⁴⁹⁰ yāmoṣ
as.often.as think:1SG.SBJ heart your without do:PRT.PTC

⁴⁸⁶ Thomas (1967: 266): “Mag es von Natur die Empfindungen [von] Glück [Lust] und Leid geben, wie soll man das Indifferentempfinden verstehen?”

⁴⁸⁷ “Formule d’autorisation de passage”, type 3. Cf also Couvreur (1953a: 91). After Pinault, the formula can be restored in LP21.4 (*se tentsa šap tāk)am · t(u) parra mā tār(k)a(nat)*; LP28.1-2 (*se tesa) šap tākaṃ · tu mā tārkanat*; LP52.1 · *se t(e)sa ša(p tākaṃ · tu mā tārkanat)*; LP101.1 *s(e tesa šap tākaṃ · tu mā tārkanat)*; and LP102.1 (*se tesa šap tā)kaṃ · tu mā tārka(nat)*).

⁴⁸⁸ Relative.

⁴⁸⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 7 † 7 (4+3 † 4+3).

⁴⁹⁰ Hardly (*ke)t*, a variant of *keta* ‘harm’, if that word exists; in my view, certainly not (*ya)rm* (pace Pinault 2008: 330) because the *t* is very clear.

‘Whoever may be praised by you as refuge, to which doctrine you bind yourself, to that we bind ourselves too.’

B591a2-3⁴⁹⁵

<i>śuddhavāsnttāne</i>	<i>kosä</i>	<i>kca</i>	<i>sāmkaṃ</i> ⁴⁹⁶	<i>paramārth</i>
Śuddhavāsa	how.many	INDF	rise:3PL.SBJ?	highest.truth
<i>sak</i>	<i>päs</i>	<i>kālpāṣṣām</i>	<i>nervvāñä(ṣṣe em)</i> _[a3] <i>ṣkacce</i> ⁴⁹⁷ : 39	
happiness	away	obtain:3SG.PRS	nirvāṇa:ADJ	eternal

‘No matter how many Śuddhavāsa gods rise here, [each] obtains happiness of the highest truth of the eternal nirvāṇa.’

3.6.8 CONCESSIVE

Concessive subjunctive clauses seem to be just another subtype of the eventual usage discussed in 3.6.5 (p 261): the information of the subclause is presented as irrelevant for the main clause.

A good example of a concessive subjunctive is offered by the Udānavarga translations, since the Sanskrit original has a present, which apparently the translators did not want to keep in the Tocharian. This correspondence is attested both for the very literal Udānavarga bilinguals (IT579) and for the Udānālankāra, where the language is artificial, but nevertheless closer to normal Tocharian (B31).

B31a4 = IT579b3

<i>totkāts</i>	<i>aiku</i>		<i>kwri</i>	<i>tākaṃ</i>
little	know:PRT.PTC	if	be:3SG.SBJ	

‘if he is [someone who] knows little’

UV13.12a

<i>alpajñato</i>		<i>’pi</i>	<i>ced</i>	<i>bhavati</i>
of.little.knowledge	even	if	be:3SG.PRS	

‘even if he is someone of little knowledge’⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹⁵ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

⁴⁹⁶ Sieg and Siegling correct to *tsāmkaṃ* (1953: 376). Although the leaf is clearly late, a sound change of initial *ts* to *s* can be dismissed with certainty, as this initial is very well attested in all late manuscripts. If the correction is alright, the problem is why the verb form *tsāmkaṃ* is singular whereas *śuddhavāsnttāne* seems to stand for *śuddhavāsānta tne*, i.e. a plural (metrically shortened *śuddhavāsnta tne*). Perhaps both problems can be solved together, if we assume that a syllable <tsam> in the original was damaged or wrong, so that the <t> could be taken to be a length stroke, i.e. <ā>.

⁴⁹⁷ For *nervvāñäṣṣe emṣkecce*.

⁴⁹⁸ UV13.12b-d *śīleṣu susamāhitaḥ* [b] *vidvāṃsas taṃ praśaṃsanti* [c] *śuddhājīvam atandritam* [d] ‘[if] he practices the morale, the sages honour him because his life is pure and free from lassitude.’ (Bernhard 1965: 204; Chakravarti 1930: 160).

3.6.9 FINAL

There are some cases of subjunctive clauses that denote events that are definitely to the benefit of the speaker, but can hardly be considered certain enough to classify them as futures, so that one could be tempted to characterise them as wishes. In my interpretation, however, these can be explained as postponed subjunctive subclauses with final value. *mäkte* ‘how; so’ may be used as a final conjunction, but it may also be lacking. These final clauses are always postponed; much more frequent are infinite final clauses that precede the main clause, the normal type being an infinitive clause (see Thomas 1954).

IT5b1⁴⁹⁹

karuṇaṣṣe *tr(o)ṅk* *prutk(a)r* † *tune* *taukau-c*
 compassion:ADJ hollow fill.up:IPV.SG therein hide:1SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF

saim *pācer* † *lāma-ñ* *prosko* 13
 protection father sit:3SG.SBJ-1SG.SUFF fear

‘Fill up the hollow of compassion! Therein I will hide, in your protection, father, so that my fear will rest!’⁵⁰⁰

Cp32.11-12

ñake *aśari* *teri* *plāskamṅ-me* *mäkte* *saṅkrām* *wtetse*
 now acārya rule think:3SG.SBJ-3PL.SUFF how monastery secondly
keta *mā* – ·k· *saṅkantse* [12] *ayāto* *nesaññe* *mā* *karsnatār*
 estate? not community:GEN proper state not cut:3SG.PRS

‘May the acārya now think about a way [approach] for us,⁵⁰¹ so that the monastery will not (lose estate?)⁵⁰² for a second time, and the proper situation of the community will not be terminated.’⁵⁰³

In 3.7.5 (p 294), I argue that the particle *mai* is exclusively used in questions to express doubt, so that one could translate the example below as a question. If that analysis of *mai* is not accepted, the subjunctive clause of pāda d below could be analysed as a final clause. In any case, *knetār-me* is not a *wish*-subjunctive.

⁴⁹⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 7 † 7 † 4 (4+3 † 4+3 † 4).

⁵⁰⁰ Cf Pinault (2008: 322-323, 328).

⁵⁰¹ This is without doubt a polite third person address.

⁵⁰² Perhaps we can complete (*tār*)*k(am)*, but the meaning of *keta* remains problematic, too. Alternatively, *keta* could be related to Tocharian A *kat* ‘harm’.

⁵⁰³ For text, translation and commentary, cf Pinault (1984a), who translates: “À présent, l’Ācārya voudra bien considérer pour nous la façon [d’agir] en sorte que le monastère ne [...] pas à nouveau de (préjudice) [et] que la situation convenable de la communauté ne soit pas brisée.” (1984a: 32).

B107b1⁵⁰⁴

purwar *ce* *pinwāt* † *mā* *nai* *ñakta* *prañkäs-me* : [c]
 receive:IPV.SG DEM alms not PCL god reject:2SG.PRS/SBJ-PL.SUFF
mai *no* *knetär-me* † *ritau* *akālk* *laukaññe* : [d]
 MAI but fulfil:3SG.SBJ-PL.SUFF bind:PRT.PTC wish long
 ‘Accept these alms and do not reject us, god, so that the wish [we] long cherished
 will be fulfilled!’

3.6.10 COMPARED TO THE PRESENT

There are hardly any examples of present conditionals. Most instances I have found are from Udānavarga and Udānālañkāra texts, where they can easily be explained as slavish copies of the original, since Sanskrit has no modal form in those cases, i.e. they would be instances of “modal calques”.

The example below is from Mātṛceṭa’s Śatapañcāśatka 83, where the Sanskrit is immediately preceding. There are two possibilities: the protasis is a temporal and not a hypothetical clause, which caused the present, or, perhaps more likely, the Tocharian B present is a slavish copy of the Sanskrit present.

B251a2

[SKT:] (*matam*) *yadi* *vigarha(ṃ)ti* (•) [TB:] *pelaikne*) *kwri*
 doctrine if contemn:3PL.PRS law if
nākse(nt)rā
 blame:3PL.PRS
 ‘If [fools] contemn your teaching • If they blaim the law.’⁵⁰⁵

The following example from the Abhiniṣkramaṇanāṭaka can probably not be explained in the same way (although this text has some constructions that seem to occur only there, possibly copied from a Sanskrit original, see *mānt tākaṃ* ‘so it will be’ in 3.5.5, p 238). In this case, the present may be due to the type of the conditional, since the relation is clearly one of inference, i.e. the speaker *knows* that there is no self (cf also 3.6.4, p 260).

AS12lb5

krui *añme* *mā* *nesām* *kete* *ñake* *tsālpālñe* *pālscanātrā* •
 if self not be:3SG.PRS who:GEN now deliverance think:3SG.PRS
śāmmaṣṣālñe *wa* (•)
 fetter PCL

⁵⁰⁴ Verse: metre 4 x 5 † 7 (5 † 4+3).

⁵⁰⁵ See Shackleton Bailey (1951: 168).

'If there is no "self", by whom now is deliverance imagined?⁵⁰⁶ Nevertheless [there is] a fetter.'⁵⁰⁷

3.6.11 COMPARED TO NOMINAL CLAUSES

Nominal clauses are normal in Tocharian B, and they occur quite frequently. However, mostly only the present copula can be left out, whereas past or modal forms are kept; or, in other words, nominal clauses can only be used if a parallel, isofunctional verbal clause has a present. This means that if a subjunctive protasis is combined with a nominal apodosis, they are most likely to be of the subjunctive plus present type, cf for instance:

B255b3⁵⁰⁸

yamor kešä taššeñca | se kr_ui sraukaṃ śamane 12

action number put:AG.N DEM if die:3SG.SBJ alive

'He who is alive takes the deed into account [only] when he dies.'

In the Karmavibhaṅga, we find some pairs of parallel nominal and subjunctive clauses. In the first pair, the sentences are very parallel indeed, and the difference apparently has only a metrical cause. This freedom of construction may be explained with the fact the subjunctive subclause of AS7Ea2 (the first example) is reduced to only an apposition in AS7Eb3 (the second example).

AS7Ea2 = B521b6⁵⁰⁹

nauṣäk skwassoñc⁵¹⁰ tākaṃ | skwasso(ñc p)ostäm⁵¹¹ mäskenträ : [5a]

before happy be:3PL.SBJ happy afterwards be:3PL.PRS

'(But what is the deed through which beings), if they are happy first, become happy afterwards [too]?'

AS7Eb3⁵¹²

se se yāmor ste | k_ucesa tne wnołmi | nauṣ
DEM DEM deed be:3SG.PRS what:PERL here being:PL before

läklessoñc postäm rano | läklessoñc šek mäś(kenträ 8) :
sorrowful afterwards also sorrowful always be:3PL.PRS

⁵⁰⁶ Or: 'whose deliverance is thought of?'

⁵⁰⁷ Cf Couvreur (1953b: 281).

⁵⁰⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

⁵⁰⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

⁵¹⁰ B521b6 ///soñc.

⁵¹¹ B521b6 *skwassoñc postä*.

⁵¹² Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

‘That is the deed through which beings here, sorrowful before, become always sorrowful afterwards too.’

The second pair, on the other hand, may really be due to a difference in meaning, since the first example with the subjunctive clause (AS7Gb2) is clearly concessive, whereas the second example (AS7Gb6) is not.

AS7Gb2⁵¹³

(*kuse no*) *su yāmor* | *iñcewsa wnołmi* | *cmentär rano*
 what but DEM deed which:PERL being:PL be.born:3PL.SBJ also
ette ymainne | *kreñc no lkātsi māskenträ* : [21a]⁵¹⁴
 low state:LOC.PL good but see:INF be:3PL.PRS

‘But what is the deed through which beings, even if they are born in lower states, become good to look at, ...’

AS7Gb6⁵¹⁵

(*intsu no yā*)*mor* | *mā(kc)ewsa wnołmi* | *ette ymainne*
 which but deed which:PERL being:PL low state:LOC.PL
tetemošä | *yolo-were māskenträ* : [23a]
 be.born:PRT.PTC of.bad.smell be:3PL.PRS

‘But what deed is it through which beings, born in lower states, are of bad smell?’

Although it follows a lacuna, the following seems to be a certain example of a nominal indefinite subclause; unfortunately, it is isolated and it is difficult to offer an explanation.

AS12Ea2

/// *kos tānwä tot tānwäntse šärmtsä mälkwer* ·
 as.much.as love so.much love:GEN cause:PERL milk
 ‘As much as [there is] love, so much [is there] milk because of the love.’

The following example is usually translated as if it had a nominal protasis with a subjunctive apodosis, a combination that is unique and difficult to explain. However, this translation requires the correction of *tānwaññeñcä* (thus the manuscript) into *tānwaññeñcañ*, itself in turn for *tānwaññeñcañ* ‘loving (nom.pl.)’ (Sieg and Siegling

⁵¹³ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

⁵¹⁴ Continued in pāda 21b: *takarkšñ erseñcañ* | *esnaisāñ wīna* | *šm(a)re-yetse šmare-ere* | *š(mare) ///* ‘causing faith, [who become] a pleasure to the eyes, of fine skin, of fine appearance, of fine ...’.

⁵¹⁵ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

1953: 17⁵¹⁶). Since there is no problem whatsoever with an analysis of *tāñwaṃñeñcä* as a 3pl. prs.-sbj. (here in subjunctive function) with a 2sg. pronoun suffix, it is clearly preferable to keep to the original reading of the manuscript, which allows the elimination of this alleged nominal protasis with subjunctive apodosis:

B78a3

kr_{ui} ñke cai tāñwaṃñeñ-cä ot ñke ñis ysape
 if then DEM love:3PL.PRS/SBJ-2SG.SUFF then then I close
ykāk källät
 still obtain:2SG.SBJ

‘Since if they are kind to you, then you will find me close (to you) all the same.’

3.6.12 COMPARED TO THE OPTATIVE

Conditionals with optative protasis and optative apodosis are rather frequent; often, they are used in metaphors. Mostly they denote unlikely – but still possible – future events.

B284b5-6⁵¹⁷

kektseñ mā takom_! onolmentso śaiṣṣene : [8a]
 body not be:3PL.OPT being:GEN.PL world:LOC
mānta wārpontrā_! kektseñṣana_[b6] läklenta : [8b]
 not.at.all receive:3PL.OPT body:ADJ sorrow:PL

pälsko mā tāko_i pälskoṣṣana läklenta : [8c]
 mind not be:3SG.OPT mind:ADJ sorrow:PL

cek wārñai rano_! mānta takom śaiṣṣene 8
 DEM including also not.at.all be:3PL.OPT world:LOC

‘If the beings in the world had no bodies, they would not undergo bodily pains at all. If there were no mind, pains of the mind would not be there at all in the world either.’

B407a5-b2⁵¹⁸

snai preñke takoy sa kenä yke postām po_[a6] wars_∕
 without island be:3SG.OPT DEM earth place after all water:PERL
ite [24b]⁵¹⁹
 full

⁵¹⁶ Followed by Couvreur (1954b: 100) and Schmidt (2001: 308): “Wenn diese aber mitleidig sind, dann wirst du mich doch noch in (ihrer) Nähe finden.”

⁵¹⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

⁵¹⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 | 5 (5 | 3+4 | 5) or 6 | 6 | 5.

⁵¹⁹ This pāda is two syllables short.

ešnesa meñkitse | tākoy kacāp ompä | päkre šāyeñca [a7] [24c]
 eye:PERL.DU lacking be:3SG.OPT turtle there long live:AG.N

pyorye šāp tākoy | cew warne somo lyautai | läñktsa mā
 yoke and be:3SG.OPT DEM water:LOC one hole light not

kly(e)ñca 24 [b1]

stand:AG.N

kānte pikwala | epin̄kte kaccap su no | tālašši ašco [25a]
 hundred year:PL within turtle DEM but lift:3SG.IPF~OPT head

rāmoytärme[b2]r⁵²⁰ *ka | cpi ašce lyautaiyne tāu | sälkoytär*
 bow:3SG.OPT≠quickly just DEM:GEN head hole:LOC DEM pull.out:3SG.OPT

kewcä [25b]

up

‘If this earth were without island and full of water all over, and there were a turtle without eyes that lived there for a long time, and there were also a yoke⁵²¹ in this water with only one hole, light and not steady, and in hundred years this turtle lifted its head and pulled⁵²² it in quickly only once, and then its head would be pulled up in that hole.’

This multiple protasis with simple apodosis illustrates how rare it is that animal beings are reborn as humans.⁵²³

I have found one example with an optative protasis and a nominal apodosis, but since the interpretation is a bit shaky and the structure of the poem is unclear, it must remain uncertain.

B78a1-2⁵²⁴

kr_ui ñke tetekā šänmyeñ yaššucañ lareñ šauly ñi
 if now suddenly come:3PL.OPT beggars dear life I:GEN

yašyeñträ sāw ñi wrotstsa [a2] *katkauña mā cakravärtñe*
 beg:3PL.OPT DEM I:GEN great joy not cakravartin.rank

‘Even if now suddenly beggars came and begged for my dear life, this is [still] a great joy for me, not the cakravartin rank.’⁵²⁵

⁵²⁰ For *rāmoytär rmer*.

⁵²¹ The identification of *pyorye* as ‘yoke’ is based on this passage. In Chinese parallels, the expression is rather ‘floating piece of wood with one hole’ or ‘hole in a floating log’ (Allon 2007, especially 246).

⁵²² Literally: ‘bowed’.

⁵²³ B407b2-3 *tusa amāskai | lwa*[b3]s⁵²⁴*sāmemeñ onolmeñtsa | yšamna cmeti* [25c] ‘So difficult is it for beings to be reborn from the animals among men’ (the last unit of this pāda is one syllable short; perhaps we have to read *išamna* instead).

⁵²⁴ Verse, but metre not totally clear.

B278b1⁵²⁶

k_use *su* *tākoy* *śle-palsko* | *k_use* *mā* *kalloy* *ce*
 who DEM be:3SG.OPT with.mind who not obtain:3SG.OPT DEM
ykene | *ymetse* *śmoṃññai* 16
 place consciousness:GEN basis

‘Who would he be who, endowed with reason,⁵²⁷ would not attain the basis of consciousness in that place.’

In one text praising the merits of confession, we find a mixture of optatives and subjunctives in a pattern that is otherwise rather strict. The strophes first mention a certain number of meritorious deeds, and then they conclude that these are nothing compared to the meritorious deed of confession. Thus, the first clauses are indefinite: they present information that is presented as irrelevant for the truth of the conclusion. Now it seems that (more or less) realistic meritorious deeds are in the subjunctive, but fantastic ones are in the optative.

B290.1-2⁵²⁸

(*aśvame*)*t* *wārñai* | *yāmā*(ṃ) *wrotstsana* *telkanma* • [3a]
 aśvamedha including do:3SG.SBJ great sacrifice:PL
pañcvarṣikānta | *kakonta* *wrocceṃ* *stamāṣṣam*⁵²⁹ [3b]
 pañcavarṣika:PL invitation:PL great establish:3SG.PRS/SBJ
celāmāññana | *ain* *wat* *āyornt* *asta* *yettse* [3c]
 prominent? give:3SG.SBJ or gift:PL bone:PL skin
*(yu)*_[2]*kṣām* *yarpoṣa* *āstreṃ* 3 [e]⁵³⁰
 surpass:3SG.PRS merit:PERL pure

‘One may carry out great sacrifices such as the *aśvamedha*, one may establish *pañcavarṣikas* and great invitations, or one may give prominent (?) gifts [such as] bones, skin, ... (– if one confesses, then this) surpasses [it] through its pure merit.’⁵³¹

⁵²⁵ Couvreur (1954b: 99; see also Schmidt 2001: 307).

⁵²⁶ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 | 4 (4+3 | 4+3 | 4).

⁵²⁷ *śle-palsko* looks like a calque on a Sanskrit word; according to the SWTF (II, 247, col. 2), an adj. *sacittaka-* is indeed attested. ‘endowed with reason’ tentatively follows Monier-Williams (1899: 1130, col. 3 - 1131, col. 1 under *sácitta-*).

⁵²⁸ Verse: 5 pāda metre 4 x 5 | 8 (5 | 5+3 or once 5 | 4+4) + 1 x 8 | 8 | 5 (4+4 | 4+4 | 5).

⁵²⁹ For *stamāṣṣam* / *stāmāṣṣan*/.

⁵³⁰ Of line 3d only the fragmentary beginning *mā* /// is preserved.

⁵³¹ Thomas (1970: 260).

B290.2-3⁵³²

yarke *še* *yāmi* † *kiṭanmasa*⁵³³ *arhantentso* • [4a]
 honour one do:3SG.OPT koṭi:PERL.PL Arhat:GEN.PL
pärkreṃ *prekentsa* † *mant* *ra* *pratyaiikapudñāktets* • [4b]
 long time:PERL.PL so also pratyekabuddha:GEN.PL
eritār· /// [4c]
 evoke:3SG.OPT
 [3] *yāmtār* *deśit* † *su* *ce_u* *yukṣām* *yarpos* ≠ *aurce* †
 do:3SG.SBJ confession DEM DEM surpass:3SG.PRS merit:PERL broad
 meñe *ściriṃ* *ra* 4[e]
 moon star:PL like

‘One might honour *koṭis* (tens of millions) of Arhats, and likewise during a long time pratyekabuddhas, one might evoke ... – if one confesses, this surpasses it through extensive merit like the moon the stars.’⁵³⁴

B290.3-4⁵³⁵

ptanma *wrotsana* † *še* *śarirtsana* *yamitrā* [5a]
 stūpa:PL great one relic:PL do:3SG.OPT
akessont *āstre* † *kātkoṣ* *wat* *yāmtār* *deśito* • [5d]⁵³⁶
 final pure cross:PRT.PTC or do:3SG.SBJ confession
su *yarpo* *po* *yukṣām* *noṣwent* † *kaumñākte* *ra* /// [5e]
 DEM merit all surpass:3SG.PRS early sun like
 ‘One might bestow relics [unto] great stūpas,⁵³⁷ ... – if one confesses that one has broken the pure prescriptions, this merit surpasses all earlier [merit] like the sun (the clouds (?)) ...’⁵³⁸

First, meritorious deeds such as *āsvamedha* sacrifices, bone relique offers, etc (strophe 3) are represented as realisable with the subjunctive, and then the rhetorical style builds up to continue with fantastic things like countless reverences to Arhats etc in the optative. The conclusion contains a simple general conditional with a subjunctive protasis and a present apodosis. Possibly, the rare 5 line metre reflects this rhetorical structure with a break between four lines about the “irrelevant” merits and the fifth line with the merit of confession that is to be highlighted.

⁵³² Verse: 5 pāda metre 4 x 5 † 8 (5 † 5+3) + 1 x 8 † 8 † 5 (4+4 † 4+4 † 5).

⁵³³ For *koṭanmasa*.

⁵³⁴ Schmidt (1974: 412).

⁵³⁵ Verse: metre 4 x 5 † 8 (5 † 5+3) † 1 x 8 † 8 † 5 (4+4 † 4+4 † 5).

⁵³⁶ Line 4 starts with the fragmentary end of pāda 5c: /// *śikṣapāt* ‘... moral precept ...’.

⁵³⁷ Schmidt (1974: 462): “Möge einer grosse Stūpas mit Reliquien anlegen, ...”.

⁵³⁸ Hackstein (1995: 98).

3.6.13 CONDITIONALS IN PRĀTIMOKṢA TEXTS

The prātimokṣasūtra contains living rules for monks and one could expect that the syntactic structure of these rules is rather standard and repetitive. Indeed, we find repetitive texts with very standardised syntactic patterns, but there are quite a few of such patterns, it seems. Of course, this has to do in part with the varying character of the texts: some contain only rules, some also a commentary, some discuss the casuistics of a rule in detail. However, we also find differences among texts that are of a similar type. Moreover, prātimokṣa conditionals can be very complex and sometimes they seem to reach the upper limit of what is syntactically practicable. Perhaps that is the reason why there are some rare patterns that seem to occur only in this text genre. Therefore, I present some examples of these patterns below.

The basic pattern seems to be following, where a present relative clause is followed by the type of offence:

IT246a2

*se*⁵³⁹ *ṣamāne* *ṣaṅ* *ṣarsa* *keṃ* *rapanaṃ* *rāpatsi* *wat*
 which monk REFL hand:PERL earth dig:3SG.PRS dig:INF or
watkāṣṣāṃ *pāyiti* 73
 command:3SG.PRS/SBJ pātayantikā
 ‘Which monk digs up the earth with his own hand, or commands [somebody else] to dig it up – pātayantikā.’

Usually, the last part is completed as a nominal clause, ‘[this is] a pātayantikā [offence]’, or a verbal one, ‘[commits] a pātayantikā [offence]’, but also in the Tocharian original, the style is somewhat telegraphic. This pattern is a direct copy of Sanskrit, cf *yaḥ punar bhikṣuḥ pṛthivīm khanyāt khānayed vā pātayantikā* 73 (von Simson 2000: 228). Von Simson translates “Wenn ein Mönch die Erde aufgräbt oder aufgraben lässt, so ist es ein Pātayantikā-Vergehen.” (p 298), but a more literal translation could be ‘Which monk digs up the earth or has it dug up – pātayantikā.’; in the Sanskrit sentence, there is no conditional construction. If the Tocharian construction is translated as a conditional, as is sometimes done, this yields the problem that the conditional is not marked, i.e. one would expect a subjunctive conditional under all circumstances.⁵⁴⁰

⁵³⁹ Relative.

⁵⁴⁰ A strange mixture of moods was usually assumed for IT124a4-5 = IT246a1-2 *se ṣamāne meṅki ikāṃ pikwalaṃṅepi onolmentse wasaṃpāt yamaṣṣāṃ pāyiti su mā wasaṃpaṃ tākaṃ · cai ṣamāni po naḥṣalyi* 72 ‘Which monk ordains a person under twenty – pātayantikā. He will not be [sbj.] ordained. The monks are all to be reproached.’ (cf Couvreur 1954a: 47, 49). However, this interpretation was based on a wrong reading of the passage. The correct reading is *su mā wasaṃpaṃnāke* ·, i.e. ‘he [is] not ordained’ (Peyrot 2007a: №124, №246).

To this basic pattern, additional eventual or conditional clauses may be added, which are then in the subjunctive.

IT246a4-b1

*se*⁵⁴¹ *ṣamāne saṅkantse pelaiykneṣṣe wāntare wātkau*
 which monk saṅgha law:ADJ matter decide:PRT.PTC
tākaṃ amplākätte parra tseṅketār pāyti 77
 be:3SG.SBJ without.permission outside rise:3SG.PRS pātayantikā
 ‘Which monk stands up without permission when a law matter of the saṅgha is decided – pātayantikā.’

Regular conditionals are also found, mostly – but not exclusively – in the casuistics of a rule, i.e. in the discussion of special circumstances, exceptions etc. Simple types are the following:

B326a2

aitār naiṣsargi māsketār
 take:3SG.SBJ niḥsargikā be:3SG.PRS
 ‘If he takes it, it is a niḥsargikā pātayantikā offence.’

B333a4-5

su no cwi speltke_[a5]sa srukalyñe yaṃnmaṃ su mā ṣpā
 it but DEM:GEN effort:PERL death obtain:3SG.SBJ DEM not and
ṣamāne māsketār
 monk be:3SG.PRS
 ‘If by his effort it attains death, he is no longer a monk.’

The apodosis of this condition is elaborated with a description of all that the offending monk loses because of this offence (his monkhood, dignity, etc).⁵⁴²

In the following fragmentary example it is clear that the subjunctives are also copies of the Sanskrit; in this text, conditional subjunctives are used to render conditional optatives of the original.

B317a2

/// (tri)t(e)sa alaṣṣālle klautkā⁵⁴³ kā(rtse mā
 third:PERL keep.away:PRS.GER turn.away:3SG.SBJ good not

⁵⁴¹ Relative.

⁵⁴² To me it seems probable that it belongs to pārajika 3 about killing, but in B333a8 there is a formula which seems to belong to pārajika 4 about lying instead, which could point to ap-
 purtenance of the whole leaf to that rule.

⁵⁴³ For *klautkaṃ*.

klaut)*kä*⁵⁴⁴ *pā* 5
 turn.away:3SG.SBJ *pātayantikā*

‘He is to be kept away for a (second and a) third time. If he turns away [from his heretic viewpoint], it is good; if he does not turn away, it is a *pātayantikā* offence.’

Cf the Skt. parallel (*dv*)*ir api trir api samanūṣiṣyamāṇas tad vastu pratiniḥsṛjet ity evaṃ kuśalaṃ no cet pratiniḥsṛjet pātayantikā* 55 ‘If after having been admonished two or three times he gives up the point of view, then it is good; if however he does not give it up, it is *pātayantikā* offence. 55’ (von Simson 2000: 220, 296). In this example, we can clearly see that the Sanskrit conditional optative *pratiniḥsṛjet* is rendered by the conditional subjunctive *klautkā* in Tocharian, and the nominal apodosis is kept as such (which results in good Tocharian grammar).

In one text, however, we find three examples of such a Sanskrit conditional optative that is rendered by a Tocharian optative as well:

IT247b4-5

māksu no ṣamāne · pañāktentse wāstsintse yarmtsā
 which but monk Buddha:GEN garment:GEN measure:PERL

wastsi yamītrā · omṣṣap wat pañāktāñṇe wāstsimeṃ ·
 garment do:3SG.OPT more or Buddha:ADJ garment:ABL

īpāṣṣeñca ·
pātayantikā

‘Which monk would make a garment according to the measure of the garment of the Buddha, or exceeding the Buddha garment – *pātayantikā*.’

Cf from Sanskrit *pātayantikā* 90: *yaḥ punar bhikṣuḥ sugatacīvarapramāṇena cīvaraṃ kārayed uttaraṃ vā sugatacīvarāt pātayantikā* ‘Wenn sich ein Mönch ein Gewand nach dem Sugata-Gewandmaß anfertigen lässt oder eines, das die Sugata-Gewand (größe) Überschreitet, so ist es ein *Pātayantikā*-Vergehen.’ (von Simson 2000: 235, 301). Apart from the causative *kārayed* vs the non-causative *yamītrā* (the unattested causative would have been *yāmāṣṣitrā*), the Tocharian construction is an exact copy of the Sanskrit model. It seems advisable, therefore, to attribute this peculiar usage of the optative in Tocharian to a “wrong” rendering of the Sanskrit optative where actually a subjunctive should have been used, as in the example cited above. (That the Tocharian optative was seen as the equivalent of the Tocharian optative is clear from a.o. the Udānavarga bilinguals.)

There are some examples of present clauses that interrupt a series of conditional subjunctives. In all cases, the conditional structure is very complex and the best solution seems to assume that a very long conditional can be interrupted by presents

⁵⁴⁴ For *klautkam*. Thus to be read pace Sieg and Siegling (1953: 204).

that give further detailed information. In one leaf, B334, this pattern occurs all over, so that the identification of the verb forms is very clear.

B334a3-6

šamānentse yśelmi pälskone tsa_[a4]ñkaṃ kwipe-ike ke_uwco
 monk:GEN lust.feeling:PL mind:LOC rise:3PL.SBJ shame.place high

kalltär-ne tu maśne enkastär
 stand:3SG.PRS-3SG.SUFF DEM fist:LOC take:3SG.PRS

nuskaššāmn-ne_[a5] tune swāralyñe yamastär krāke
 squeeze:3SG.PRS-3SG.SUFF therein pleasure do:3SG.PRS filth

län-ne sañghā-trāñ(k)ä kätä_[a6]ñkaṃ
 go.out:3SG.SBJ-3SG.SUFF saṃghāvaśeṣa.offence cross:3SG.PRS

‘If lust feelings arise in the mind of a monk⁵⁴⁵ – his shame [i.e. penis] stands high, he takes it in his fist, he squeezes it and he enjoys that – and his filth [i.e. sperm] comes out, then he commits a saṃghāvaśeṣa offence.’⁵⁴⁶

Alternatively, one could try to read the whole sequence as two conditionals, but this does not yield a very convincing interpretation: ‘If lust feelings arise in the mind of a monk, then his penis stands high, he takes it in his fist, he squeezes it and he enjoys the pleasure. If filth comes out, then he commits a saṃghāvaśeṣa offence.’

Illustrative of the complicated structure of prātimokṣa commentaries is also the following:

IT127b4-6

• enestai yāmu tākaṃ • tesa warñai ce ra tsa
 secretly do:PRT.PTC be:3SG.SBJ DEM:PERL including DEM also PCL

alyekepi karep yamašāṃ • yāmtsi wat watkāššāṃ
 other harm do:3SG.PRS do:INF or command:3SG.PRS/SBJ

wāstu ite tākaṃ pāra • || wāstu ite mā tākaṃ
 dwelling? full be:3SG.SBJ pārājika dwelling? full not be:3SG.SBJ

stu • || k_ucesa śaumonmeṃ kramarcesa : para || tusa
 sthūla somehow man:ABL heavy:PERL pārājika thus

amānuṣenmeṃ lwāmeṃ stu • || k_ucesa śaumonmeṃ laiwce
 non.human:ABL animal:ABL sthūla somehow man:ABL light

waipeccesa stu • || tusa amānuṣenmeṃ lwāmeṃ du • ||
 possession:PERL sthūla thus non.human:ABL animal:ABL duṣkrta

‘If it is done secretly, [and] he does in some way harm to another in a comparable manner, or causes [somebody else] to do [so], and it is inside a dwelling [?],⁵⁴⁷

⁵⁴⁵ I.e. ‘if a monk gets lust feelings’.

⁵⁴⁶ Cf Schmidt (1997b: 240); he makes no mention of the interchange of present and subjunctive forms.

then it is a pārājika offence. If it is not inside a dwelling, then it is a grave (sthūla) offence. [If it is] somehow from a human with respect to an important [possession], then it is a pārājika offence. [If it is] like that, [but] from a non-human or an animal, then it is a grave (sthūla) offence. [If it is] somehow from a human with respect to an unimportant possession, then it is a grave (sthūla) offence. [If it is] like that, [but] from a non-human or an animal, then it is a duṣkṛta offence.’

The intervening details may be in the present, even in a protasis complex, as long as the key sentences are in the subjunctive. In the repetitive offence classification the subjunctive can be left out, so that the sentences can be nominal.

3.7 OTHER USES OF THE TOCHARIAN B SUBJUNCTIVE

In this section, I briefly discuss some other functions of the Tocharian B subjunctive. First, I discuss compound tenses and moods (3.7.1-3.7.4, p 276). Second, I discuss adverbials and particles (3.7.5, p 287). Third, I argue that the usage of the present-subjunctive is not different from that of the present and the subjunctive: the ambiguity of the forms has no repercussions on their use (3.7.6, p 317).

3.7.1 SUBJUNCTIVE GERUND WITH IMPERFECT COPULA

The subjunctive gerund can be combined with a finite imperfect form of the copula to denote irreal events (Thomas 1952: 43-47, Krause and Thomas 1960: 192, Pinault 1997: 476). When used as a conditional, this construction seems to form counterfactuals, but in non-conditional clauses this is certainly not a necessary component of the meaning. Therefore, counterfactuality cannot be the core meaning of this construction.

In conditionals, the counterfactual meaning follows from the past tense reference: it is about a past event that could have resulted in another past event, but now neither the conditional event nor the consequence event can take place anymore.

B33a7-8⁵⁴⁸

<i>kwri</i>	<i>yarke</i>	<i>peti</i> †	<i>ṣey-me</i>	<i>kurpelle</i> ⁵⁴⁹ †	<i>ost</i>
if	reverence	flattery	be:3SG.IPF-PL.SUFF	be.concerned:SBJ.GER?	house
<i>olyo</i>	<i>ṣaicer</i> †	<i>makci</i>	<i>lamalyi</i> : [4a]		
more	be:2PL.IPF	self	sit:SBJ.GER		

⁵⁴⁷ *wāstu ite* is unclear; I assume that *wāstu* is borrowed from Skt. *vāstu*, but ‘if the dwelling is full’ yields no sensible interpretation, so that I tentatively translate ‘inside’.

⁵⁴⁸ Verse: metre a: 5 † 5 † 5 † 5, b: 8 † 7 † 7, c: 5 † 5, d: 8 † 7 (b: 4+4 † 4+3 † 4+3, d: 4+4 † 4+3).

⁵⁴⁹ This form looks like a prs.ger. next to a sbj.ger. *kurpalle**, but such a subjunctive stem is not attested and apparently *kurpelle* is used as a sbj.ger. here (see also Thomas 1952: 45).

ṣṅār ṣṅār mañyem mañyanamem † nemcek yarke
 REFL:DISTR REFL:DISTR slave female.slave:ABL certainly reverence
källālyi [a8] † waipeccenta kraupalyi : [4b]
 obtain:SBJ.GER possession:PL gather:SBJ.GER

‘If you had been concerned about reverence and flattery, and you had yourselves further stayed in your [own] hous[es], then each would certainly have obtained reverence from his male and female slaves, and gathered possessions.’⁵⁵⁰

The following example certainly contains a complex construction, but its understanding is made difficult by a lacuna in pāda 30c. Because *ot* ‘then’ in pāda 30b is followed by *kr_uī* ‘if’ in pāda 30c, it is very likely that this strophe contains two conditionals. I think the first is logically reversed, i.e. from the logical conditional ‘if there had been great need, another Buddha would have arisen’ follows the inferential conditional ‘if another Buddha had arisen, there would have been great need’.⁵⁵¹ The second conditional probably forms a chiasmus with the first: we know that no other Buddha has arisen, so there cannot have been great need. Moreover, had there been, then the Buddha had stayed longer (instead of going to the nirvāṇa).⁵⁵²

B273b3-5⁵⁵³

kānte pi(k_ula † kr_uī e)_[b4]piṅkte † tsānkälle ṣeṛi [30a]
 hundred year:PL if within arise:SBJ.GER be:3SG.IPF
allek poyṣī † ot rā mākā † sne_ukī ynāñmä [30b]
 other omniscient then also great need desire
k_uce ṣāp no k(r_u)⁵⁵⁴ † /// ⁵⁵⁵ /// †_[b5] pyāppyaisa ṣāp [30c]
 because and but if flower:PERL and

⁵⁵⁰ Sieg and Siegling (1949: II, 55) slightly different.

⁵⁵¹ In terms of logic, this reversal is only possible with “if and only if” conditionals, of course.

⁵⁵² Krause and Thomas offer a completely different interpretation, but this is only possible because they leave out the difficult part in the middle (1960: 192): “wenn innerhalb von hundert Jahren ein anderer Allerkenner aufgestanden wäre, dann eben ... hättest du wohl schnell erlöschen können”. Much better is Thomas’ earlier translation (1952: 45): “(Wenn) innerhalb von 100 Jahren ein anderer Alleswissender aufgestanden wäre, dann auch der großen Not würdig, ... [dann] wärest du wohl nicht [so] rasch erloschen”. My translation is only tentative: the precise meaning of *sne_ukī*, which I rendered as ‘need’ is unknown, and I stretched the meaning of *ynāñmä* from ‘desired, appreciated’ to ‘want’.

⁵⁵³ Verse: metre 4 x 4 † 4 † 4.

⁵⁵⁴ So transliterated by Sieg and Siegling (1953); in fact, a slight rest of the arc of the <_u> can be seen, too.

⁵⁵⁵ The lacuna certainly contains a metaphor, probably something like *udumbarṣṣai pyāppyaisa* ‘with the [rare] udumbara flower’; although, admittedly, this expression is common only in Tocharian A.

māka sne_ukī | *mā pi rā(me)r*⁵⁵⁶ | *kselle* *šaitā 3o*
 great need not PCL quickly extinguish:SBJ.GER be:3SG.IPF
 'If another omniscient [Buddha] had arisen within hundred years, then there [would have been] great need and want because if there [had been] great need comparable to [the rareness of] the (udumbara)-flower, then you would not have been extinguished [so] quickly, would you?'

As Thomas points out (1952: 46), the subjunctive gerund with imperfect copula is used in relative clauses to main clauses with negation, i.e. the item negated in the main clause is further described in the relative clause. Of course, this usage also fits the counterfactual meaning very well. Note, however, that it is only counterfactual within the scope of the main clause, i.e. the truth of the latter must be accepted; the event in the relative clause itself need not be impossible.

B375a3

(*mā*)⁵⁵⁷ *no nta māskitār-ne ekaññe • k_ucesa su*
 not but ever be:3SG.IPF-3SG.SUFF possession which:PERL DEM
āyorś milykaucce yarpo • kraupalle šey
 giving:ALL based.on merit gather:SBJ.GER be:3SG.IPF
 'However, he had no possessions by which he might have accrued merit based on gift.'⁵⁵⁸

In the following example, we see very clearly that the counterfactual reading depends on the main clause: king Arañemi has in fact come in great misery, only it cannot have been brought about by a human being.⁵⁵⁹ If the construction is the same as in the preceding example, what it seems to be, the tense of the subclause is the same whereas that of the main clause is different, which could be taken as an argument that Tocharian has relative, not absolute tense (see footnote 11).

NS36+2ob3, B93b6, IT69a5

*mā sū ksa nesām ce šaiṣṣene*⁵⁶⁰ *k_use nīs maiyyasa*
 not DEM INDF be:3SG.PRS DEM world:LOC who I power:PERL

⁵⁵⁶ So to be corrected for *rār* in the manuscript

⁵⁵⁷ It is unfortunate that the crucial word *mā* 'not' is restored, but the context of this passage is well known and the restoration is without doubt correct.

⁵⁵⁸ Krause and Thomas (1960: 192), Adams (1999: 463).

⁵⁵⁹ NS36+2ob4 (IT69a6) – – – – *tā kentsa k_use nī tañcī cimpamñe* : could present a counter-example, if the first four syllables of the line are to be restored as *mā ksa nesām* (Schmidt 2001: 324) '(there is nobody) on earth who could stop my power'. However, with Couvreur (1964: 247), it could also be a question: 'will there be somebody on earth who could stop my power?'

⁵⁶⁰ *ce šaiṣṣene* lacks in NS36+2o.

cämpalle *šai* *ce*⁵⁶¹ *erkatñene* *kalatsi*
 can:GER be:3SG.IPF DEM misery bring:INF

‘There is no one in this world who could have brought me in this misfortune by his power.’⁵⁶²

However, in the example below, the same construction cannot be counterfactual, since the porridge has not yet been eaten by somebody else: it is still there and it is not impossible to eat it (the same speaker even asks to eat it in the following, as if he thinks he can really get it).⁵⁶³ Since this example – the only one in an independent main clause – is not counterfactual, counterfactuality cannot belong to the basic meaning of the construction.

B107a3

akālk *tsānkā-ne* *mākte* *pi* *kca* *tā* *oñkorñai* *ñis*
 wish arise:3SG.PRT-3SG.SUFF how PCL INDF DEM porridge I
šwātsi *källālle* *šeym*
 eat:INF obtain:SBJ.GER be:1SG.IPF

‘Then there arose to him the wish: «How could I in any way get to eat this porridge?»’⁵⁶⁴

Although it is tiny basis indeed, I have to assume on the basis of the last example that the probability expressed by this construction is very low, but it does not have counterfactuality as its core meaning.

3.7.2 SUBJUNCTIVE GERUND WITH PRESENT COPULA

The combination of a subjunctive gerund with a present copula, or the subjunctive gerund as predicate without copula, as in nominal clauses, always has future reference. Accordingly, it is called “das periphrastische Futur” by Thomas (1952: 38-39). He remarks (1952: 39) that this construction seems to occur only in main clauses,

⁵⁶¹ B93 has *cem*.

⁵⁶² Couvreur (1964: 246; Schmidt 2001: 325). Pinault (2009: 227) offers a different interpretation, taking the preceding *akañc šconiye* as syntactically connected: “Finally, there is not any enmity that could lead me in such a state of anger.” I do not think that *akañc šconiye* is to be taken with this sentence: the construction is difficult to understand and *šconiye* ‘hatred, enmity’ is probably feminine, which excludes it being taken up with masculine *su* (it follows a lacuna and could belong to a preceding sentence). However, if Pinault’s translation of *erkatñe* with ‘anger’ is correct, this changes the interpretation of the whole construction because it is likely indeed that king Arañemi feels no anger, whereas he has in fact experienced great misfortune (still, one may compare e.g. B89a3 in 3.7.5, p 288, where ‘anger’ is not very plausible).

⁵⁶³ This was suggested to me by Prof G.-J. Pinault in February 2009.

⁵⁶⁴ Cf Gnoli (1977: 109, l. 25-26) *yannv aham etat prārthayeyam* ‘that now would I desire.’

whereas Kraus and Thomas (1960: 191) claim that it is almost exclusively found with negation.

Despite some exceptions, both observations have certainly uncovered two important tendencies. However, Thomas' suggestion (1952: 39) that the "periphrastic future", unlike the regular future expressed by the simple finite subjunctive, is used to emphasise or highlight a future event is unverifiable. If the simple subjunctive and the subjunctive gerund with present copula are different, this difference is probably rather that the latter stresses the possibility, or in negated clauses, the impossibility of the event. Of course, this is in line with the possibility meaning Thomas established for the subjunctive gerund in other syntactic contexts.

B85b6

wesāñ ñake şarnene kekamu nest mā ş pātrā
our now hand:LOC.DU come:PRT.PTC be:2SG.PRS not and father

(lkā)lle nest

see:GER be:2SG.PRS

'You have come into our hands and you can/ will not see your father [any-more].'⁵⁶⁵

B107b5-6

comtsa şpālmeṃ dakṣi_[b6]ñākeṃ mā kālālyana nescer
DEM:PERL excellent worthy.of.gifts not obtain:SBJ.GER be:2PL.PRS

cwim nai tāṃ oñkorñai kalas

DEM:GEN PCL DEM porridge bring:IPV.PL

'You can/ will not find anyone better and worthier of gifts than him there; bring him the porridge!'⁵⁶⁶

THT1554b3

mā ş lalaşcer mā yes cimpalyi neşcer
not and make.effort:2PL.PRS not you:PL can:GER be:2PL

'And you do not make effort, [and] you will not be able.'

However, with first persons, there are quite a number of examples where it seems that the event is intended by the speaker (so mostly negated, i.e. *not* intended):

⁵⁶⁵ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 102, see also Schmidt 2001: 315); cf the parallel B86a4 /// (*wesāñ ñake mañiye nes mā ş pātār lkālle nes* 'you are now our servant and you can/ will not see your father [anymore]').

⁵⁶⁶ The crucial expression lacks in Gnoli's parallel (1977: 110, l. 7-8) *eşo 'smadvişīṣṭatamaḥ ; asmāy anuprayacchatam* 'He is better than us; offer it to him!'

B23b5-6⁵⁶⁷

ñās mā yesaññe | *wase yokalle rekaunaṣṣe* : [23d]
 I not you:PL.ADJ poison drink:GER word:PL.ADJ
mā tañ kc̣ ayor aille nesau | *m̄ ālyeke*_[b6] *pi ten*
 not you:GEN INDF gift give:SBJ.GER be:1SG.PRS not other:GEN DEM
nai pkār̄sa | *päst paṣ ñy ostameṃ* 23
 PCL know:IPV.SG away go:IPV.SG I:GEN house:ABL

‘I won’t drink the poison of your words; neither you nor anyone else will I give a gift. Know this! Go away from my house!’

B10ob2

*mā ñīs pratinmeṃ klyautkalyñe*⁵⁶⁸ *nesau*
 not I resolution turn.away:SBJ.GER? be:1SG.PRS
 ‘I can/ will not be put off my resolution.’

AS12Hb4-5⁵⁶⁹

*rāmer wākoīprer̄ntse*⁵⁷⁰ | *ante kānte pākentāsā* [1c]
 soon burst:3SG.OPT≠sky:GEN surface hundred part:PERL.PL
*(mā*⁵⁷¹*)* _[b5] *nāno ñās ostāṣṣai* | *wṣeññaine*
 not again I house:ADJ dwelling:LOC
*nesewṣille*⁵⁷² *ntā 1* ||
 be:1SG.PRS≠dwell:SBJ.GER ever

‘Sooner may the surface of the sky burst into a hundred pieces! I will never live in a housy place again!’⁵⁷³

B107b10

mā tot ñīs pintwāt warpalle nesau kossa
 not so.long I alms receive:SBJ.GER be:1SG.PRS as.long.as

⁵⁶⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 8 (5 | 5+3) + 8 | 8 | 5 (4+4 | 4+4 | 5).

⁵⁶⁸ For *klyautkalle*.

⁵⁶⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 8; apparently predominantly 4+3 | 3+5, but 4+3 | 4+4 in pāda 1c.

⁵⁷⁰ For *wākoī prer̄ntse*.

⁵⁷¹ Thomas’ *mā* (1952: 40) is to be preferred to Pinault’s *kr̄i* (2000: 151) since all other instances of this construction are found in main clauses. As far as the context is concerned, one could be tempted to interpret ‘Sooner may the surface of the sky burst into a hundred pieces *than that* I will ever live in a housy place again!’. However, I know of no parallel for such a construction (none is mentioned by Thomas 1958b); consequently, it is unclear whether that interpretation would require e.g. a conjunction *k̄ice* instead of the negation *mā*.

⁵⁷² For *nesew wṣille*.

⁵⁷³ For the translation, cf Couvreur (1953b: 282).

wāsaṃ kleśanma mā wikāskau
 false.conception kleśa:PL not drive.off:1SG.PRS.~SBJ
 'I will not receive alms as long as I do not drive off false conception and kleśas.'⁵⁷⁴

The following example is the reaction of Ulkamukha on his father's sending him and his three brothers away (Rockhill 1884: 11). The problem with this example is that it is damaged to the right, so that we cannot be certain whether all is to be taken together with heavy inversion indeed (instead of *wes ṣaṅ śaul mā āppantse rilyi*). Cf with different syntactic units "Das eigene Leben werden wir aufgeben, nicht (den Befehl (?)) des Vaters ..." (Thomas 1952: 40).

B589b4

rilyi wes ṣaṅ śaul mā āppantse [b₅]
 abandon:SBJ.GER we REFL life not dear.father:GEN
 'We, his own life, cannot be abandoned by [our] dear father!'

3.7.3 SUBJUNCTIVE GERUND WITH SUBJUNCTIVE COPULA

Thomas (1952: 41) claims that the combination of subjunctive gerund with subjunctive copula is parallel to the subjunctive gerund with present copula: while the latter is an "emphatic future", the former is an emphatic variant of the subjunctive in "konjunktivischem Sinn". In the *Elementarbuch*, the description is quite different, as they claim that the construction usually serves to denote possibility in conditional clauses (Krause and Thomas 1960: 191). Of course, the second characterisation has the advantage that it fits well with the meaning of the subjunctive gerund elsewhere, and that it is much clearer than the first, but the problem is that there is only one good example:

B107b1-2

cisa [b₂] *kremnt kālālyana tākam cwi aiskem ci eṃṣke*
 you:PERL good obtain:SBJ.GER be:1PL.SBJ DEM:GEN give:1PL.PRS you while
tārkanam
 let.go:1PL.PRS
 'If we can find somebody better than you, we will give it to him while we leave you [alone].'⁵⁷⁵

⁵⁷⁴ Cf Thomas: "Solange werde ich [überhaupt] nicht mehr Almosen genießen, bis ich nicht *vāsanā* [und] *kleśas* vernichte" (1952: 39).

⁵⁷⁵ This construction lacks in Gnoli (1977: 110, l. 2) *yas tavāntikāt prativiṣiṣṭatamaḥ* '[We offer it to him] who is better than you'.

The other two Tocharian B examples Thomas cites contain the verb *cəmp-* ‘can’, so that it is difficult to show a possibility meaning of the construction:⁵⁷⁶

B100a1-2

kr_{ui} no tu ri(ṃ)tsi campalle tākat ta_[a2] ///⁵⁷⁷ (klyau)ṣtsi
 if but DEM give.up:INF can:PRS/SBJ.GER be:2SG.SBJ hear:INF

ayu-c

give:1SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF

‘If you are able to give this up, ... I will give you (the law) to hear.’

3.7.4 PRETERITE PARTICIPLE WITH SUBJUNCTIVE COPULA

The preterite participle can be combined with the copula, in both main and subclauses. Thomas studied combinations of the preterite participle with present, imperfect and preterite copulas, but, probably because they are really no past tenses, he left out subjunctive and optative copulas. According to the *Elementarbuch*, the latter two are completely parallel to the other combinations: “Die Kopula tritt in den Konjunktiv oder Optativ, wo auch bei synthetischen Verbalformen diese Modi erforderlich sind” (Krause and Thomas 1960: 191). To check this, we need to know how the preterite participle is used with present and past copulas.

Whereas the preterite denotes an event in the past that may still hold in the present, the preterite participle with present copula really focuses on the present result of a past event. The preterite participle with imperfect copula is mostly used in subclauses to express a situation prior to the event in the main clause. The preterite copula is only rarely found combined with the preterite participle; according to Thomas (1957: 287), it expresses a “Konstatierung”, an observation.⁵⁷⁸

If we transpose this to the subjunctive, we would expect that the preterite participle with a subjunctive copula denotes future situations, or future results of (future?) events in main clauses, and uncertain or (partly) unknown situations in subclauses.

As it turns out, all clear examples of this construction are found in subclauses, and of different types: conditional, concessive, eventual. The conditionals all have a present in the apodosis and they are non-predictive, i.e. they do not denote possible

⁵⁷⁶ For some examples from Tocharian A that are a bit clearer, but which I do not want to use here, cf 3.4.3 (p 219).

⁵⁷⁷ After Thomas (1983: 252), the object is perhaps to be restored as *pañāktāññe* (in this manuscript apparently *pañāktāññe*, cf a4) *ślok* ‘Buddha-strophe’, i.e. ‘to give a Buddha-strophe to hear’.

⁵⁷⁸ The key passage may be B22a5-6 *tañ (mai)yyane ñiś sanam au(n)u takāwa* ‘In your power I have hit the enemy’. Since it is strange to observe one’s own action, this could be taken to mean that the observation concerns *tañ maiyyane* ‘in your power’, i.e. ‘It is apparently in your power that I have hit the enemy’.

future events, but they always give information about the present as possible or uncertain.

B492a1-4

šilarakite āryawarmem tsamo yšuwarsa prekšām sessatatte rine
 Šilarakṣita Āryavarman very friendly ask:3SG.PRS Śeṣadatta town:LOC
me_[a2]škeṣeṣem cānem aiṣlyi tākaṃ parso ette paiyaka
 joint:ADJ coin:PL give:PRS.GER be:3SG.SBJ letter down write:IPV.SG
ška plāwa sessatatem yaka_[a3] lyaṣ tākaṃ mā
 hither send:IPV.SG Śeṣadatta still send:PRT.PTC be:3SG.SBJ not
plankšām meski šito⁵⁷⁹ ṅi stare parso lywāwa-ś
 sell:3SG.PRS joint:PL price I:GEN be:3PL.PRS letter send:1SG.PRT-2SG.SUFF
plās aškā_[a4]r mā lywāsta
 speech back not send:2SG.PRT

‘Šilarakṣita asks Āryavarman very friendly: Śeṣadatta has to give the coin strings⁵⁸⁰ in town. If [you have] the letter, sign it and send it [to me]! If Śeṣadatta has sent them nevertheless, he should not sell them: the strings are my price. I have sent you a letter, [but] you haven’t sent an answer.’⁵⁸¹

The following example is from the Karmavibhaṅga, where this construction is frequently found.

AS7Ba3-4⁵⁸²

ṣuk pel(ai)knenta | ompte cmellāṅṅe spārttaskem : [77b]
 seven law:PL there birth turn:3PL.SBJ

⁵⁷⁹ Probably to be corrected to *pito*.

⁵⁸⁰ The correct interpretation of *meski* (and the adj. *meskeṣeṣem*) is certainly that given by (Pinault 2008: 377-378), after a lecture by Ching Chao-jung: calque on Chin. *guàn qián* 貫錢 ‘string of 1,000 coins’. I would rather expect *caneṣeṣem meskem* ‘strings of coins’, but probably we have to interpret ‘coins in strings’.

⁵⁸¹ Pinault (2008: 380) translates this passage as: “Šilarakṣita demande très aimablement à Āryavarman: Śeṣadatta, en ville, devra donner les pièces des ligatures. Il a signé une lettre. Sollicite Śeṣadatta, qu’elles (scil. les pièces) doivent encore être envoyées. Ce n’est pas lui qui vend. Les ligatures sont le prix qui me revient. Je t’ai envoyé une lettre; tu n’as pas envoyé de réponse en retour.” Although he has improved the interpretation in several crucial points (certainly compared to Peyrot 2008a: 151), his translation still copes with some difficulties: *aiṣlyi tākaṃ* can hardly be “devra donner”; to translate *ška plāwa* as “sollicite” is rather far away from the well-established basic meaning of the verb *lāwa-* ‘send’; I have found no parallels for a rendering of *lypaṣ tākaṃ* as “doivent être envoyées”; finally, it is strange not to have any mark of contrast (i.e. for instance a pronoun) in *mā plankšām* if it should mean “ce n’est pas lui qui vend [but me instead]”.

⁵⁸² Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 8 (5 | 5+3).

ompalskoññenta | *nesäm* *şukt* *şpālmeṃ* *wrotsana* : [77c]
 meditation:PL be:3SG.PRS seven excellent great
tū *yairu* *tākam* | *sū* *ceṃ* *ñakteṃne* *tänmasträ* 77
 DEM practise:PRT.PTC be:3GS.SBJ DEM DEM god:LOC.PL be.born:3SG.PRS
 ‘If seven laws lead [determine?] the birth there – these are the seven great and excellent meditations – if he has practised that, he will be born among these gods (scil. without form).’

The following is a (rare) example of concessive usage:

AS7Cb2-3⁵⁸³

empelona ra | *yāmwa* *tākam* *yāmornta* : [17a]
 horrible also do:PRT.PTC be:3PL.SBJ deed:PL
āñm *n(ā)kālñesa* | *nuttsāna* *pest* *klautkontrā* : [17b]
 self reproach:PERL nugatory?⁵⁸⁴ away turn:3PL.PRS
pākri *yāmorsa* | *wlāwalñesa* *tumeṃ* *şpä* : [17c]
 manifest do:ABS control:PERL because.of.that and
eṃşketse witskai | *rassalñe* *tuntse* *weskau* 17
 within root tearing.out DEM:GEN say:1SG.PRS
 ‘Even if horrible deeds are done, by self reproach they become nugatory (?), [and] by making [them] public and by [self] control; and because of this I tell [about] tearing it out, the root inclusive.’⁵⁸⁵

The example below is not easily analysed as a conditional, so that we probably have to categorise *yāmu tākam* as eventual; *cmetār*, on the other hand, seems to give an extra condition.

AS7Cb3⁵⁸⁶

se(ṃ) *t(ē)-yāknesa* | *yāmor* *yāmu* *ket* *tākam* : [18a]
 DEM such deed do:PRT.PTC who:GEN be:3SG.SBJ
cmetār *ra* *nraiyne* | *rāmer* *no* *pestä* *tsälpeträ* : [18b]
 be.born:3SG.SBJ also hell:LOC quickly but away be.freed:3SG.PRS
 ‘By whom such a deed may be done, even if he is reborn in hell he is redeemed soon.’⁵⁸⁷

⁵⁸³ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

⁵⁸⁴ Adams (1999: 341).

⁵⁸⁵ For text and translation, cf Pinault (2007: 210-211).

⁵⁸⁶ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

⁵⁸⁷ For text and translation, cf Pinault (2007: 210-211).

The only example where the construction seems to occur in a main clause is the following.

AS12Hb3-4⁵⁸⁸

klainamp / *eṣe wīnasā* | *lāmālñe ñi ak(essu)* [b4] *se* [1a]
 woman:COM.PL together pleasure:PERL staying I:GEN final DEM

sāk ñi wṣeñña ostāṣṣa | *postāña tākaṃ auṣusā* [1b]
 DEM/EMPH I:GEN place house:ADJ later be:3SG.SBJ live:PRT.PTC

‘Staying in pleasure together with women, that has come to an end for me: this is the last housy place that I will have lived in!’⁵⁸⁹

It is very difficult to take this clause as a conditional: either it would have to construed with the following (cf 3.7.2, p 279) ‘if this is the last housy place that I have lived in, than the surface of the sky may quickly burst into a hundred pieces’, or with the preceding ‘Staying in pleasure together with women has come to an end for me if this is the last housy place that I have lived in.’ The first is certainly wrong because the Buddha wants to leave the palace and its harem himself, and the second is true, but does not seem coherent in the context: as the Buddha is leaving the palace, it seems to make no sense to talk about it in conditionals.

Unlike the construction with a preterite participle and a subjunctive copula, the construction with an optative copula does not seem to be a real Tocharian category. The only example Krause and Thomas give (1960: 191) is from the same text where a “calque usage” of the optative has been observed (cf 3.6.13, p 272):

IT248b5-6

ṣamāni no masār ostuwaiwentane kakākaṣ tākoṃ
 monk:PL but on.the.way? dwelling:LOC.PL call:PRT.PTC be:3PL.OPT

śwātsiśco · omte krui aśiya ṣār(ps)emaneñña stmausa
 eat:INF.ALL there if nun point.out:PRS.PTC stand:PRT.PTC

tākoy · tane klu pete · tane smañne pete · tane
 be:3SG.OPT here rice give:IPV.SG here soup give:IPV.SG here

(ṣpa)k pete · sāv a(śiya) ṣamānent(s) māntrākka tākoy e –
 more give:IPV.SG DEM nun monk:GEN.PL thus be:3SG.OPT

‘If monks were invited into dwellings to eat on the way [?], and a nun were standing there giving instructions, «Give rice here!», «Give soup here!», «Give more here!», [then] this nun should be [addressed] by the monks like this ...’

Compare the Sanskrit version of pratideśaniya 2: *bhikṣavaḥ punaḥ sambahulāḥ kuleṣūpanimantritā bhumjiraṃs tatra ced bhikṣuṇī vyapadiśamānā sthitā syād*

⁵⁸⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 8 (4+3 | 3+5; sometimes also 4+3 | 4+4).

⁵⁸⁹ For the translation, cf Couvreur (1953b: 282).

ihaudanaṃ dehi iha sūpaṃ dehi iha bhūyo dehīti sā bhikṣuṇī bhikṣubhir evaṃ syād “Angenommen, eine Anzahl Mönche, die bei den vornehmen Familien eingeladen sind, sind beim Essen. Wenn dann eine Nonne dasteht und Anweisungen gibt: “Gib hier Reisbrei, gib hier Soße, gib hier mehr!”, dann sollen die Mönche zu dieser Nonne sagen ...” (von Simson 2000: 236-237, 302). The Tocharian is very literally translated from the Sanskrit, the correspondences being *upanimantritā* (ptc.) ~ *kakākaṣ tākoṃ* (ptc. + opt.), *sthitā syād* (ptc. + opt.) ~ *stmausa tākoy* (ptc. + opt.), *evaṃ syād* (‘so’ + opt.) ~ *māntrākka tākoy* (‘so’ + opt.). Since the verb constructions are clearly calqued, we can dismiss this example of a preterite participle with optative copula; in the first correspondence, the Tocharian optative *tākoṃ* was probably added against the Sanskrit to make the syntax clearer, but following the pattern of the other optatives.⁵⁹⁰

3.7.5 WITH ADVERBIALS AND PARTICLES

Tocharian B disposes of a large set of adverbs and particles that are at home in direct speech and structure the discourse. As this study is primarily concerned with the subjunctive, I cannot address the problem of these particles in full here,⁵⁹¹ but some remarks are necessary as they are sometimes used together with the subjunctive to give deontic readings that are otherwise rare or absent. The particles discussed are *nai* ‘isn’t it?’ (p 288), *mai* ‘perhaps’ (p 294), *pi* ‘please’ (p 297), *mapi* ‘isn’t it?’ (p 300), *wa* ‘still’ (p 303), *rai* ‘o!’ (p 306), and *arai* ‘hey!’ (p 307).

The Tocharian B particles may be used combined, as for instance in Dutch, which makes it even more difficult to assess the meaning.⁵⁹² Here I will only cite some of the strings that I have found without attempting to render the nuances they must express: *ente nai ṅake* THT1552a.b7, THT1552a.b8, *ate nai kca ṅke* IT464b2, */// w nai kca ṅke* B238a3, *kuse nai ṅk(e) p(i)* B93b1.

Further, some conjunctions and adverbials relevant to the study of conditionals are discussed: *ṅke* ‘now’ (p 308), *ot* ‘then’ (p 310), *ente* ‘where’ (p 312), and *krui* ‘if’ (p 314).

Although it is usually corrected to *tane* ‘here’, a word *ta* probably exists, as argued by Ching and Ogihara (forth.; this was pointed out to me by Prof G.-J.

⁵⁹⁰ Although it is not especially our concern here, the strange feminine present participle *ṣār(ps)emaneṅṅā* is clearly calqued on Skt. *vyapadīsamānā*, which further proves the artificial character of the translation.

⁵⁹¹ In my view, it deserves a thorough investigation like for instance a PhD thesis.

⁵⁹² For Dutch, one example has become classical (Haeseryn e.a. 1997: 457):

<i>Geef</i>	<i>die</i>	<i>boeken</i>	<i>dan</i>	<i>nou</i>	<i>toch</i>	<i>maar</i>	<i>eens</i>	<i>even</i>	<i>hier.</i>
give:IPV	DEM	book:PL	PCL	PCL	PCL	PCL	PCL	PCL	here
‘Just hand over those books, will you?’									

Although this sentence is more or less grammatical, it is nearly impossible to indicate the semantic nuances of all of the particles in this combination.

Pinault). In B100a4, it seems to introduce the apodosis of a conditional, but the other attestations (a.o. THT1115b3) suggest a more neutral ‘this; here; now’: apart from THT4001a5, Ching and Ogihara further adduce NS152b3, THT1112b2 and THT1374z.b3. As the number of attestations is limited and there does not seem to be a special link to conditionals or modality, I will not discuss *ta* any further.

nai ‘isn’t it?’

In the majority of its attestations, the particle *nai* combines with an imperative. It clearly strengthens the imperative without making it less polite. It certainly does not make the imperative more polite either: we find clear and impolite commands, next to friendly suggestions. It is often found at the beginning of a quote, or at the beginning of the part where the command or suggestion is found. It thus introduces and underlines an imperative. It is mostly found before the imperative verb form, and always in the same syntactic unit; it is not found, for instance, modifying a vocative.

If it is not used with an imperative, *nai* seems to express an element of doubt or an assumption. In all examples, the speaker seeks to coordinate what he says with the hearer: the questions are not completely open, but invite a reaction of the hearer, and in non-interrogative statements the speaker shares his uncertainty with the hearer.

The following examples with imperatives are clearly friendly suggestions, since they contain positive vocatives:

AS171a3⁵⁹³

yetwe po cmeltse | palkas-ne nai tñwamñai :
 ornament all birth:GEN see:IPV.PL-3SG.SUFF NAI love:VOC
 ‘Look at the ornament of all rebirth, o love!’

B88a4-5

lari(ya pā)lka nai mā-ṣekaṃñe [a5] wāntarwats sparkālye
 dear see:IPV.SG NAI impermanence thing:GEN.PL disappearance
ā(ke)
 end
 ‘O dear!, look at the impermanence of the things [and their] ultimate disappearance⁵⁹⁴!’⁵⁹⁵

In two answers to Nandā and Nandabalā’s question to whom they should give the porridge, *nai* seems to go together with good counsel.⁵⁹⁶

⁵⁹³ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

⁵⁹⁴ Literally: ‘disappearing end’.

⁵⁹⁵ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 102; see also Schmidt 2001: 317).

B107a10

cwim nai kalas
 DEM:GEN NAI bring:IPV.PL
 ‘Bring it to him over there!’

B107b6

cwim nai tāṃ oñkorñai kalas
 DEM:GEN NAI DEM porridge bring:IPV.PL
 ‘Bring that porridge to him over there!’

The following two examples are from the same leaf and probably concern requests (although a command is also possible): king Prasenajit asks for a demonstration of two types of miracles during a competition in magic between the Buddha and the heretics (*tīrthyas*).

IT178b3

/// (tī)rthemś weṣṣām • se pañāktentse raddhi • ñake nai
 tīrthya:ALL.PL say:3SG.PRS DEM Buddha:GEN ṛddhi now NAI
 yes (p)ā(k)r(i) pyāmtsāt
 you:PL manifest do:IPV.PL
 ‘(King Prasenajit) says to the *tīrthyas*: «This is a *ṛddhi* (miracle) of the Buddha. Now you show [one]!»⁵⁹⁷

IT178b5

/// w(a)lo weṣṣām • se pañāktentse pratihari • pyāmtso nai
 king say:3SG.PRS DEM Buddha:GEN prātihārya do:IPV.PL NAI
 yes •
 you:PL

⁵⁹⁶ Pinault (2008: 157, §19 and 158, §28 translates systematically “donc”, but Schmidt (2008: 332, 333) translates the first with “doch” and the second with “nur” without explaining the difference. The relevant detail lacks, as so often, in the Gilgit parallel, where we find just *anuprayacchatam* ‘offer!’ (Gnoli 1977: 109, line 36; 110, line 8).

⁵⁹⁷ A nice match is offered by the Prātihāryasūtra of the Divyāvādāna, *vidarśitam bhagavatottare manuṣyadharme riddhiprātihāryaṃ yūyam api vidarśayata*, which occurs four times with only very slight differences, cf Burnouf (1844: 177-178), “Voilà Bhagavat qui vient d’opérer un miracle supérieur à ce que l’homme peut faire; opérez-en donc un aussi à votre tour.” (p 177; cf also Rotman 2008: 272-273, “You should display one as well.”). The difference between *vidarśayata* (Cowell and Neil 1886: 157) in the first two attestations and *nidarśayata* (p 157-158) in the second two is not reflected in these two Tocharian B sentences. On the other hand, there is no basis in the Sanskrit for the Tocharian difference between the *ṛddhi* and the *prātihārya* miracle.

‘King (Prasenajit) says: «This is a *prātihārya* (miracle) of the Buddha. Now you make [one]!»’

The following example certainly is a command, as the word *yaitkor* ‘command’ itself is used:

B81a5

brāhmane weṣṣām (tusā)ksa nai yes nī yaitkorsa
 brahmin say:3SG.PRS therefore NAI you:PL I:GEN command:PERL
pcīso
 go:IPV.PL

‘The brahmin says: «Therefore get going according to my command!»⁵⁹⁸

The following example is clearly not polite, nor can *nai* have a softening value:

B23b5-6⁵⁹⁹

mā tañ kc̣ āyor aille nesau | ṃ ālyeke_[b6]pi ten nai
 not you:GEN INDF gift give:SBJ.GER be:1SG.PRS not other:GEN DEM NAI
pkārsa | pāst paṣ ñy ostameṃ 23
 know:IPV.SG away go:IPV.SG I:GEN house:ABL

‘Neither you nor anyone else will I give a gift. Know this! Go away from my house!’

More examples with the imperative can be found in for instance: AS13Ia8, B83a2, B363b3, B368a2, B364b5, IT19b2, IT24a4, IT62b3, IT68b2.

There are two cases with a negated present next to an imperative; since the imperative cannot be negated, this is clearly a prohibitive.

B107b1⁶⁰⁰

purwar ce pinwāt | mā nai ñakta prāñkās-me : [c]
 receive:IPV.SG DEM alms not NAI god:VOC reject:2SG.PRS/SBJ-PL.SUFF
 ‘Accept these alms [and] do not reject us, god!’⁶⁰¹

B78a2

mā ṣ nai ñake āyorsa plāc aksast
 not and NAI now giving:PERL speech tell:2SG.PRS
 ‘And now don’t utter a word about giving!’⁶⁰²

⁵⁹⁸ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 100, see also Schmidt 2001: 310).

⁵⁹⁹ Verse: 5 pāda metre 4 x 5 | 8 (5 | 5+3) + 1 x 8 | 8 | 5 (4+4 | 4+4 | 5).

⁶⁰⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

⁶⁰¹ This time Schmidt chooses “doch nur” (2008: 332), cf footnote 596.

The remaining examples worthy of interpretation are much less homogeneous: we find it combined with various tenses and moods. What they seem to have nevertheless in common is an element of doubt that can be paraphrased in different ways: ‘I presume’, ‘isn’t it’, or ‘I think so, do you agree?’. This also accounts for its (relatively) frequent occurrence in questions. However, the element of doubt does not seem to be very strong, compared with for instance *pi* and *mapi*, discussed below.

B46b2⁶⁰³

sklok ket ra nai mā tsānkau ste | kuse tne
 doubt who:GEN also NAI not arise:PRT.PTC be:3SG.PRS who here
cmītrā mā srūko(y 36)
 be.born:3SG.OPT not die:3SG.OPT

‘Presumably nobody has got doubts whether who is born here would die.’⁶⁰⁴

Because of the interrogative pronoun *kuse*, the following two examples are certainly questions (we can probably add the more fragmentary AS17Fa2 and B90a5):

B89b5

kuse nai tamp aṅmālaške palwaṃ sāsweṃtse araṇemiñ
 who NAI there pitiful complain:3SG.PRS/SBJ lord:GEN Araṇemi:GEN
lānte špä ṅem śausāṃ
 king:GEN and name call:3SG.PRS

‘Who might be wailing so pitifully, calling the name of the lord, king Araṇemi?’⁶⁰⁵

B93b1

kuse nai ṅk(e) ś(ai)⁶⁰⁶ su | aknā(tsa śaumo :) [1c]
 who NAI then be:3SG.IPF DEM foolish man

‘Who was this foolish person?’⁶⁰⁷

In one passage from the Udānālankāra, Sieg and Siegling (1949: II, 49) corrected *wat nai* of the transliteration (1949: I, 50) into *wa nnai*, but it seems that a translation

⁶⁰² Schmidt (2001: 308).

⁶⁰³ Verse: metre a: 5 | 5 | 5 | 5, b: 8 | 7 | 7 (4+4 | 4+3 | 4+3), c: 5 | 5, d: 8 | 7 (4+4 | 4+3) or 7 | 8 (4+3 | 3+5).

⁶⁰⁴ Literally: ‘Not to anybody has arisen the doubt *nai* [that] who might be born here would not die.’

⁶⁰⁵ Cf Schmidt (2001: 319).

⁶⁰⁶ So read by Couvreur (1964: 242) after the Paris parallel NS36+20 (*kuse nai ṅke śai* ///; the editors give *p(i)* (Sieg and Siegling 1953: 31). Unfortunately, the manuscript is missing and the reading cannot be verified.

⁶⁰⁷ Verse: metre a: 5 | 5 | 5 | 5, b: 8 | 7 | 7 (4+4 | 4+3 | 4+3), c: 5 | 5, d: 8 | 7 (4+4 | 4+3).

with *wat nai* is possible at least: the monks are in doubt about the sorrows in the world and fear that there is no way to make them disappear.

B30a1-2⁶⁰⁸

mā wat nai [a₂] *sā_u tne nesām* | *ytārye ksa lakle*
 not or NAI DEM here be:3SG.PRS way INDF sorrow
nautṣṣeñca : 22
 make.disappear:AG.N
 ‘Or isn’t there any way here that makes sorrow disappear?’⁶⁰⁹

In one example we find the beginning of a clause with *nai* preceded by the words *mā aikemar* ‘I don’t know’, which seem to point to uncertainty, too:

B52ob7

tane imāne weṣṣām (•) *mā aikemar ente nai ñake* ///
 here IMĀNE say:3SG.PRS not know:1SG.PRS/SBJ where NAI now
 ‘Here the *imāne* says: «I don’t know where (the prince is) now ...»’⁶¹⁰

In the following example we do not have a clear question, but the speaker, Sumanā, makes an assumption about the state of mind of the hearer, Priyaratī, which cannot, of course, be done with certainty.

AS17Ia5⁶¹¹

palsko pluṣaṅ-c nai | *katkauñaisa śuketstse* : [1a]
 mind float:3SG.PRS-2SG.SUFF NAI joy:PERL taste:ADJ
 ‘Your mind, full of savour, must float out of joy!’

Without much context is the following example, but it is very likely that somebody thinking the wrong way is portrayed, and that it represents the content of his thought (i.e., with a wrong assumption).

⁶⁰⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 8 (4+3 | 3+5) or 8 | 7.

⁶⁰⁹ Sieg and Siegling (l.c.): “Es gibt ja hier noch keinen Weg, der das Leid schwinden macht.”

⁶¹⁰ The same string of words is found in the next line: B52ob8 *tumem purohite p(r)e(kṣa)n-ne ·o·e – pala ente nai ñake māñc(uṣke) ///* ‘then the purohita asks him: «... where [is] the prince now?»’. Unfortunately, Sieg and Siegling’s restoration (p)o(kṣ)e(ñ) for ·o·e – (1953: 323) is impossible; in any case, we would be left with an enigmatic *pala*.

⁶¹¹ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

B278b1-2⁶¹²

(*kete palsko*⁶¹³ *ne*)_[b2]*mcek nai* † *tremaṣṣana arṣāklaṃts* † *k_uletär*
 who:GEN thought certainly NAI anger:ADJ snake:GEN.PL fail:3SG.PRS
maiyyo [17a]
 power
 '(Who has the thought), «certainly the power of the snakes of anger fails».'

The example below is completely preserved and its content is very clear, but the function of *nai* in pāda 4b is not easy to establish; it cannot have more than a slight “reminding” effect to the hearer as it is lacking in the parallel clauses before and after.

B284a4-6⁶¹⁴

laremmem tsrelle † *anaiwaccempa śmälyñe* : [4a]
 dear:ABL.PL separate:PRS.GER unpleasant:COM reunion
ritoṣ wändrentse † *mā källa*_[a5]*lle postän nai* : [4b]
 bind:PRT.PTC thing:GEN not obtain:SBJ.GER afterwards NAI
*yainmwa wāntarwāntsä*⁶¹⁵ † *nemcek postäm nkelle*
 achieve:PRT.PTC thing:GEN.PL certainly afterwards perish:SBJ.GER
ste : [4c]
 be:3SG.PRS
tom läklenta tne † *cmelants ṣärmtsa mäskenträ* _[a6] 4
 DEM:PL sorrow:PL here birth:GEN.PL cause:PERL be:3PL.PRS
 'Having to be separated from the dear; reunion with the unpleasant; eventually not being able to obtain a thing [long] cherished; [the fact that] things achieved are certainly to perish afterwards – these sorrows come about here because of the rebirths.'

In one example we find it combined with the optative. The whole sentence clearly is a wish, but this value is of course expressed by the optative itself: we can safely assume that *nai* adds an element of doubt.

B89a3⁶¹⁶

lareñ – *i onolmi* † *lkoycer nai ñi tallärñe* † *erka(tñe)*
 dear ... being:PL see:2PL.IPF~OPT NAI I:GEN misery misfortune

⁶¹² Verse: metre 4 x 7 † 7 † 4 (4+3 † 4+3 † 4).

⁶¹³ Other restorations are also possible.

⁶¹⁴ Verse: metre 4 x 5 † 7 (5 † 4+3).

⁶¹⁵ According to the metre to be read *wāntarwānts*.

⁶¹⁶ Verse: metre 4 x 7 † 7 † 4 (4+3 † 4+3 † 4).

ṣpā :) [3a]
and

‘Dear (forest?) beings!, may you see my misery and misfortune!’⁶¹⁷

In view of the values found above, I interpret the following example with a subjunctive also with an element of doubt, i.e. the speaker wishes to coordinate and agree with the hearer.

B77.1

c(ām)p(a)mñeccu tus(ā)ks(a) nai ñak(e) ārw(e)r tākam
mighty:VOC therefore NAI now ready be:1PL.SBJ

‘O mighty one! That is exactly why from now on we will be ready, won’t we?’⁶¹⁸

The frequent occurrence of *nai* in the poem about the land of the *āryamarga* in B553-B556 is without parallels whatsoever. As a special problem of that text, it is not discussed here.

B365b1⁶¹⁹

(pkā)_[b1]rsaso (m)ānt nai | ptānmameṃ yārpo | ṣāñ kektseñmeṃ ce
know:IPV.PL so NAI stūpa:ABL.PL merit REFL body:ABL DEM
yārpoṣa | pārllle ste (onolmentsā) [92a]
merit:PERL carry:PRS.GER be:3SG.PRS being:GEN.PL

‘Know [this]: «Thus the people have to get the merit from the stūpas through the merit from their own body!»’

mai ‘perhaps’

The particle *mai* occurs much less frequently than *nai* and it is not attested together with the imperative, but it seems to combine rather with the subjunctive. However, it is also found with the preterite and the optative (each once). Because of the limited number of examples, it is difficult to establish the meaning of *mai*, but it seems to be used predominantly in questions; the attestations that are no obvious questions are nevertheless possible to interpret that way – a possible paraphrasis is ‘by chance’ (cf Adams 1999: 470-471, ‘perchance’).⁶²⁰

Although some examples suggest that *mai* adds to the optative value of wishes, there are very clear counterexamples where the element of wish is certainly absent.

⁶¹⁷ Cf Schmidt (2001: 318). See also footnote 562.

⁶¹⁸ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 99; see also Schmidt 2001: 303: “Hochmögender! Eben deshalb sollten wir doch jetzt bereit sein.”).

⁶¹⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (apparently here 5 | 5 | 4+4 | 3+4).

⁶²⁰ Two attestations in the Aranemijātaka are not of any use for our purpose: B91a2, B92a3; one may compare Schmidt’s translations (2001: 321, 322).

AS17Ja2-3

kā twe klyomai allek-pälsko taisa mäsketar mai ksa⁶²¹ tane
 why you noble other.mind so be:3SG.PRS MAI INDF here
pälskontse mā ayāto tāka-c⁶²² [a3] t(e) ñī pokse
 thought:GEN not suitable be:3SG.PRT-2SG.SUFF DEM I:GEN tell:IPV.SG
 ‘Why, o noble one, are you so distracted? Have you had anything that is not
 suitable to your mind? Tell it to me!’

B5a4⁶²³

mai ñī tākaṃ lailāñe | wrocc⁶²⁴ asānmem lamntuññe : [67c]
 MAI I:GEN be:3SG.SBJ falling great throne:ABL royal
epe wat no šaulantse | ñyātse ñī ste nesalle : 67
 or or but life:GEN danger I:GEN be:3SG.PRS be:PRS/SBJ.GER
 ‘Will I fall down from my great royal seat? Or will there be danger of my life?’⁶²⁴

B28a1⁶²⁵

spelke mai tarkacer | kulātsi cek wārñai ra ñīs | epyac
 zeal MAI let.go:2PL.SBJ fail:INF DEM until and I memory
pkalat · [71b]
 bring:IPV.SG
 ‘Will you let [your] zeal fail? Remember me, this including!’

The following example is usually not interpreted as a question (cf e.g. Schmidt 1974: 304, 501⁶²⁶), but such an interpretation is possible at least.

B255b7⁶²⁷

ce pi šaiṣṣe ālyinträ | ñyātse kwipe rmantär mai [15c]⁶²⁸
 DEM PI world keep.away:3PL.SBJ danger shame bow:3PL.PRS MAI
 ‘Will they ward off this world and not bow for distress and shame?’

⁶²¹ *mai ksa* is also attested in the fragmentary line IT259b3.

⁶²² For *takā-c*.

⁶²³ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

⁶²⁴ Preceding: B5a2-4 *walo (rano) [a3] ce_u preke | šaultsa tāka sklokatstse 66 jetavaṃne pudñäkteš | masa yarke ynāñmñesa : [67a] kokalentse kautalñe | preksa poyšim (ot) [a4] walo : [67b]* ‘At that time the king was in doubt about his life. He went into Jetavana towards the Buddha. With honour and reverence the king then asked the omniscient about the breaking of the car.’

⁶²⁵ Verse: metre 4 x 6 | 6 | 5.

⁶²⁶ “Diese fünf [Mächte] sollen [zwar] die Welt fernhalten, sollen sich aber der Not [und] Scham beugen.”

⁶²⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

⁶²⁸ Pāda 15d starts with a fragmentary *piš an·* –, probably ‘The five *skandhas* ...’.

Although the following strophe misses only the first four syllables of its first pāda 39a, it is difficult to interpret because it contains two hapax legomena: *raka-* and *tappa-*. The first may mean something like ‘spread’ (Krause 1952: 277), even though its stem form is morphologically incompatible with *rək-* ‘cover’.⁶²⁹ *tappa-* is usually given as ‘consume’ (Krause 1952: 246 “verzehren”), but this is clearly based on Tocharian A *tāpā-* ‘eat’ and does not fit the context here (see also 4.7.1, p 454).

B271a1-b1⁶³⁰

(ke)_[a1]ktseñi | rākoyentār-ñ painene | po
body:PL spread?:3PL.OPT-1SG.SUFF foot:LOC.DU all

pūdñākteṃts (:) [39a]

Buddha:GEN.PL

arañcāṣṣi uppālta |_[a2] pākri tākoñ yke-postām | po
heart:ADJ lotus:PL manifest be:3PL.OPT-1SG.SUFF bit.by.bit all

saṃṣārne : [39b]

saṃsāra:LOC

tūsa tāppom sai_[a3]m-wāsti | mai no
therefore appear?3PL.OPT help.and.stay:PL MAI but

nautañ empelñe | arañcāntse : [39c]

disappear:3SG.SBJ-1SG.SUFF horror heart:GEN

se kārtseṣṣe saṃva_[b1]r ñ(i) | po saṃsārṣṣeṃ wnołmemmpa | mā
DEM good:ADJ vow I:GEN all saṃsāra:ADJ being:COM.PL not

karstoytār 39

cut.off:3SG.OPT

‘... may ... the bodies ... spread [?] for me at the feet of all Buddhas;⁶³¹ may the lotuses of the heart bit by bit become manifest to me in the whole saṃsāra; may therefore the help and stays appear, so that the horror of my heart disappears; may this vow of the good not be cut off for me and all saṃsāra beings!’⁶³²

IT5a5-6⁶³³

tā ka ṣpā śāmñai kektseñtsa | nraiṣṣi sl(e)mi pannom ñiś |
DEM just and human body:PERL hell:ADJ flame:PL stretch:3PL.OPT I

⁶²⁹ The meaning of *rarākau* B565a5, which is certainly from the same verb *raka-*, is unknown, so that *raka-* need not have anything to do with ‘cover’.

⁶³⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 | 4 (4+3 | 4+3 | 4).

⁶³¹ Cf Schmidt (1974: 276): “Die ... Körper aller Buddhas möchten sich zu meinen Füßen hinbreiten.”

⁶³² Cf Schmidt (1974: 208): “Diese Heilszucht möge mir samt allen Saṃsāra-Wesen nicht abgeschnitten werden.”

⁶³³ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 | 4 (4+3 | 4+3 | 4); the first unit of pāda 12c is one syllable long and we should probably read *ṣp* for *ṣpā*.

eṃṣky āwišne : [12c]
 within Avīci:LOC
empelona klešanma [a6] † *mai no pals(k)o soyi pästä* †
 horrible passion:PL MAI but mind satiate:3SG.OPT away
sañāt tākoy 12
 under.control? be:3SG.OPT

‘Would the flames of hell drag me with this human body until the Avici hell? But may my mind be satiated with terrible passions;⁶³⁴ may it be completely under control!’⁶³⁵

B107b1⁶³⁶

purwar ce pinwāt † *mā nai ñakta prānkäs-me* : [c]
 receive:IPV.SG DEM alms not NAI god reject:2SG.PRS/SBJ-PL.SUFF
mai no knetär-me † *ritau akālk laukaññe* : [d]
 MAI but fulfil:3SG.SBJ-PL.SUFF bind:PRT.PTC wish long
 ‘Accept these alms and do not reject us, god – will the wish [we] long cherished be fulfilled?’⁶³⁷

Although there is some overlap with the particle *nai* discussed above, the differences are obvious: *mai* is not focusing in any way on the hearer, but expresses the uncertainty of the speaker about a future event, or, less frequently, a current situation. *mai* has no directive value, i.e. it is not used to influence the actions of the hearer in any direct way.

pi ‘please’

The particle *pi* is used in orders, wishes, and questions. It seems that in all cases, it has a softening function. The orders are mostly addressed to friendly hearers or to hearers the speaker cannot actually command, so that it could be translated with ‘please’ (see also Winter 2001: 136, who claims that it is used as a “politeness particle”). At the same time, it does not seem to weaken the command, it only turns it into a request. Likewise, in wishes with the main verb in the optative, *pi* seems to add to the strength of the wish while the tone remains polite; here, too, the person in

⁶³⁴ I understand: ‘may it have had enough of them; may there be no more’.

⁶³⁵ Cf Pinault (2008: 328). The beginning of the strophe is IT5a4-5 *onmiṣṣana pwārasa* † *tsäksemane marmmanma* † *tronktse stām ra* : [12a] *sälpiñ cittsa wo*[a5]*lokmar* † *nuskaskemar marmmanma* † *inkaum kätswer* : [12b] ‘[While my] vessels are burnt by the fires of remorse, I dwell like an empty tree with glowing spirit, [and] I press my vessels day and night.’

⁶³⁶ Verse: metre 4 x 5 † 7 (5 † 4+3).

⁶³⁷ If the analysis as a question is not accepted, another option is to take the second clause as a final clause, see 3.6.9, p 264).

charge cannot be commanded by the speaker. Finally, its value in questions is the most difficult to assess, but it seems to be used to make the address less direct.

Not counting loosely connected vocatives and interjections, *pi* normally takes the second place of the clause, e.g. *au!* .. *watkaṣṣi pi, waṣama!* .. *epiyac pi, ñaktemts saswa!* .. *kuse pi*. The same rule is valid for strings of grammatical elements, like *kuse pi ksa, makte pi kca*.

In the examples with imperative, the friendly and polite vocative addresses are striking (cf also fragmentary AS13Ga5):

B53a2

saswa pstināṣṣar pi mcuṣkant̃ ā ///
 lord make.silent:IPV.SG PI prince:PL
 'Lord, make the princes keep silent!'

IT40b1-2

/// (kl)y(o)mai p(ā)lka pi wesāñ larepi sā_[b2](suwerskentse)
 noble:VOC see:IPV.SG PI we:GEN dear:GEN little.son:GEN
 '... noble one!, look at the ... of our dear little son!'

B77.2

waṣama epiyac pi tu pkalar
 friend:VOC memory PI DEM bring:IPV.SG
 'Friend, remember it!'⁶³⁸

The clearest example with a wish optative is the first, where Buddha's disciple Kāḷodāyin speaks; in the other two, it is likely that the wishes are directed towards the Buddha, too (cf fragmentary AS12Db5).

IT247a5-6

tumem weña au · watkaṣṣi pi pañakte niṣīdam [a6]
 then say:3SG.PRT o order:3SG.OPT PI Buddha sitting.mat
ñremem kālymi raso tsamtsi ·
 fringe:ABL direction span grow:INF
 'Then he said, «O!, may the Buddha order to make the sitting-mat one span larger from the fringe!»'

⁶³⁸ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 99).

B134b3⁶³⁹

wertsyaine wrottsai | weñi pī sū tontsa pā(st) [15a]
 assembly:LOC large say:3SG.OPT PI DEM DEM:PERL.PL away
 ‘May he in a large assembly speak about those things!’

B341a7

/// (we)ñā kártse pī ñāktā akṣīt ñī ce_u yākn_u a ///
 say:3SG.PRT good PI god:VOC tell:2SG.OPT I:GEN DEM way
 ‘... (s)he ... said, «Good god!, may you teach me ... in that way ...»’

The example below is special because it is preceded by *te akālk ñāṣṣalle* ‘this wish is to be wished’ in a2:

NS48+258a3-4

po o(n)olmi pi tuk-yä(k)n(e)_[a4]sa po yolaiñentants ākesa
 all being:PL PI in.this.manner all evil:GEN.PL end:PERL
śānmiyeṃ
 come:3PL.OPT
 ‘May in this manner all beings come to the end of all evil.’⁶⁴⁰

Two short questions with subjunctive and present verbs seem to be softened by the particle:

B79.6

yesāñ pi ekalyimi tākaṃ seṃ ///
 you:GEN.PL PI control be:3SG.SBJ DEM
 ‘Is he *perhaps* under your [pl.] control?’

B91b4

w(e)sk(e)ṃ kuse pi se eñwe ste
 say:3PL.PRS who PI DEM man be:3SG.PRS
 ‘They say, «Who may this man be?»’

There are two examples with dubitative and irreal constructions combined with questions. In the first, one could imagine that the god Vibhūṣaṇaprabha, watching the scene of king Subhāṣitagaveṣin who is prepared to give his life in order to hear the law, hopes that the wish of the king can be fulfilled. In the second, it is clear that the speaker wishes to eat the porridge himself.

⁶³⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

⁶⁴⁰ Cf Pinault (1994: 185, 189).

B99a4

vibhuṣaṇaprabhe weṣṣāṃ ṅakteṃts saswa kuse pi ksa
 Vibhūṣaṇaprabha say:3SG.PRS god:GEN.PL lord:VOC who *PI* INDF
ayi-ne pelaikne klyauṣṭsi
 give:3SG.OPT-3SG.SUFF law hear:INF

‘Vibhūṣaṇaprabha says, «Lord of the gods!, would anyone give him the law to hear?»’

B107a3

akālk tsānkā-ne mākte pi kca tā onkorñai ñis
 wish rise:3SG.PRT-3SG.SUFF how *PI* INDF DEM porridge I
śwātsi kāllalle ṣeym
 eat:INF obtain:SBJ.GER be:1SG.IPF

‘Then there arose to him the wish: «How could I in any way get to eat this porridge?»’

mapi ‘isn’t it?’

The form of the particle *mapi* is not self-evident: in its classical form, it could be either /mapəy/ or /mápəy/. While an arch. *māpi* could in fact be read *mā pi*, i.e. the negation *mā* plus the particle *pi*, the phonemic form /mápəy/ is proved by arch. *māpi* in AS12Fb4, B295b6 (consequently, arch. *māpi* B273b5 is to be read *mā pi* instead).

In most of the examples, *mapi* is found at the beginning of a clause, which fits well with its being accented:⁶⁴¹ its scope seems to be the whole following clause. It has a very strong tendency to combine with second person predicates (including imperatives and hortatives)⁶⁴² and the speaker evidently wants to coordinate his suggestion or suggestive question with the hearer.⁶⁴³

A difficult matter with *mapi* is that it mostly seems to be positive – it can even combine with a negation – but sometimes also negative. This strongly reminds of

⁶⁴¹ AS12Fb4 *klyomai klautkā ṅāke māpi* ‘O noble one, he has now returned, hasn’t he?’ is worth citing only because *māpi* is found at the end of the clause; otherwise the context is too fragmentary (pace Thomas 1979: 45, *klautkā* is not an ipv. because there is no initial *p-*).

⁶⁴² If Sieg and Siegling’s restoration of B127b1 (1953: 61) is correct, it would be an example without a clear second person, but the passage is rather damaged: *su m(a)p(i) källoy s(e pā)lsko* ‘he would not attain this thought, would he?’ (in this archaic manuscript, both <ä> and <a> are used for /ś/, so that *m(a)p(i)* is in fact a possible restoration; *m(ä)p(i)* is unlikely because the *m* is not a Fremdzeichen <ṃ>).

⁶⁴³ There is one canonical example with an imperative, but the word *mapi* is restored there: B85b3-4 *saswa appakk(a ma)pi psāmpar ñis ceṃ rakṣatsenmeṃ loke* (cf NS355b4 /// *cenä(n) rākṣat(s)e(nmeṃ) ///*) ‘Dear father, please take me away from these rākṣasas!’ (Couvreur 1964: 240). Since the element of appeal is very strongly present here, and not in the other examples of *mapi*, it is perhaps better to read simple *pi*, which in turn fits very well. The missing akṣara might have to be restored as *twe* ‘you’.

suggestion strategies in questions like English *It is expensive, isn't it?* or French *C'est cher, n'est-ce pas?*, but it remains enigmatic why the value of this suggestion seems to be labile, i.e. why it wouldn't be marked for being positive or negative.

I will first adduce examples that illustrate the coordinative and suggestive usage of the particle, before I embark on a discussion about its seemingly incidentally inherent negative value.

The two questions given below can only be answered by the hearer, but the speaker clearly has a strong expectation as to what the answer will be like.

NS36+20a1⁶⁴⁴

(ta)ne candramukhe walo weṣṣām auspa poks(e)ñ mapi twe
 here Candramukha king say:3SG.PRS truly tell:IPV.SG MAPI you
 nest
 be:2SG.PRS

'Here king Candramukha says, «Truly, say it! It is you, isn't it?»'⁶⁴⁵

NS35b2

mapi ñke ñaṣtar twe pūdñāktamñe (perne) ///
 MAPI then desire:2SG.PRS you Buddha:ADJ worth

'For you desire the Buddha rank, don't you?'⁶⁴⁶

In the below example, we can interpret *mapi* as introducing a suggestive question as above, but it has a strong rhetorical value and is used as a kind of argument:

B77.1-2

mapi kca sū cāmpan-m(e) laklene waste
 MAPI any DEM can:3SG.PRS/SBJ sorrow:LOC refuge
 'He can somehow be a refuge in our distress, can't he?'⁶⁴⁷

The uses illustrated above fit very well with the evidence from a fragmentary bilingual, where it corresponds to Skt. *nanu*, "emphatische Partikel zur Einleitung einer Frage, die eine zustimmende Antwort erwartet" (SWTF: III, 6, col. 2).

B196b6

[SKT:] /// nanu drṣṭam [TB:] m(a)pi ka lelyako(ṣ)
 isn't it see:PRT.PTC MAPI EMPH see:PRT.PTC

⁶⁴⁴ B93a3 deviates slightly: *nano candramukhe walo weṣṣām auspa poñ mapi twe ///*.

⁶⁴⁵ Cf Couvreur (1964: 246).

⁶⁴⁶ Cf Couvreur (1964: 239).

⁶⁴⁷ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 99; see also Schmidt 2001: 303: "Er kann uns doch irgendwie im Leid Schutz sein.").

That the expected answer is positive seems further confirmed by the example below, where *mapi* is combined with the negation *mā*, which suggests, of course, that negation is not part of the meaning of *mapi* itself (see also Lühr 1997: 102).⁶⁴⁸

B100a1

/// (*yākṣe*) *weṣṣām* *mapi mā ca(mpāt)* *c(e)u pito*
 yakṣa say:3SG.PRS MAPI not can:2SG.PRS/SBJ DEM price
rīntī kuce nīs nāskau-cmem :
 give.up:INF what I request:1SG.PRS-2SG.SUFF:ABL

'The yakṣa says, «you cannot give the price I request from you, can you?»'⁶⁴⁹

In the following two examples, we find unambiguous modal forms, instead of the presents *nest* and *nāstar* and the present-subjunctive *campāt* in the examples cited above. It is very difficult to give these instances an interpretation along the lines of the meaning establish so far. Rather, a negation seems required in the first, and a final reading makes the translation much more sensible in both.

B128b5⁶⁵⁰

! *yatt yolyye yamai ! waṣāmñeṣṣe pālskosa cī ! weskau*
 go:2SG.PRS bad way friendship:ADJ mind:PERL you say:1SG.PRS
mapi mārsat te · [10b]
 MAPI forget:2SG.SBJ DEM

'... you are going the wrong way. Because of my friendly mind I am telling [it] to you so that you won't forget this.'⁶⁵¹

B295b6⁶⁵²

paṇāṣsorñe eñcitar ! māpi lyñitve⁶⁵³ lāklemem [3d]
 morals seize:2SG.OPT MAPI go.out:2SG.OPT≠you sorrow:ABL
 'You should keep to the morals, so that you get out of sorrow.'⁶⁵⁴

⁶⁴⁸ Another passage of the same text seems to require a similar interpretation, but here a positive interpretation seems preferable (i.e., without restored negation in the lacuna): B100a6-b1 *yā(kṣ)e weṣṣām oroccu walo amāskaimem amās(k)ai [b1] [4 akṣ] /// puwarne yaptsi mapi tserentar-ñ* 'The yakṣa says, «O great king, (it is) more than difficult – you fool me [about] your entering the fire, don't you?»'

⁶⁴⁹ Cf Krause (1952: 206).

⁶⁵⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

⁶⁵¹ An interpretation /*mā pəy/* with archaic <a> for class. <ā> seems excluded because in this manuscript only /ə/ is written in the archaic way (<ā> even under the accent): we expect /*mā pəy/* to be written <*mā pi*>.

⁶⁵² Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

⁶⁵³ For *lyñit tve*, i.e. *lñit tve*.

For a series of questions introduced with *mapi* where very clearly a negative answer is expected there are solid Sanskrit parallels. Even though in the following example there is a mismatch between ‘sold’ in the Sanskrit version and ‘bought’ in the Tocharian and Chinese versions, the overall structure is clear: questions where a positive answer is expected are left unmarked and all those where a negative answer is expected are preceded by *mapi* in Tocharian, *bù* 不 in Chinese and *mā* in Sanskrit.⁶⁵⁵

THT1111b1

mapi kăryau nestä

MAPI buy:PRT.PTC be:2SG.PRS

‘You have not been bought, have you?’⁶⁵⁶

Skt. *mā vikrītakaḥ* ‘Du bist nicht verkauft worden?’ (Härtel 1956: 79)

Chin. *bù mǎi dé bù* 不買得不 ‘Bist du nicht käuflich erworben worden?’ (Chung 2004: 87, 110)

It is certainly ad hoc to suppose that *mapi* in this interrogation is a bad copy of Sanskrit *mā* and that normally it translates *nanu*. Nevertheless, it must be noted that *mapi* normally has a positive value, also in questions, and it can even be combined with the negation *mā*. Only in the karmavācanā questionnaire and one other example do we find *mapi* with a negative value.

wa ‘yet; for’

wa is attested only a few times and its meaning can hardly be established with certainty. In the first three examples cited, the particle seems to have a light adversative value, underlining that something is different than expected, or something is the case in spite of other things that could lead one to expect that it is not the case. In German, it is therefore often rendered with “doch, aber”, and in English, ‘yet, still’ or ‘nevertheless’ (Adams 1999: 575) would seem appropriate. However, in the last two examples a light causal value seems to give better interpretations; I have rendered this tentatively as ‘for’, while Adams opts for ‘therefore’ (l.c.). If the two senses that have posited are approximately correct, and one were to provide a

⁶⁵⁴ Cf Lühr (1997: 101). The preceding pādas of the strophe are clear enough: B295b4-6 *saṃsāra*_[b5] *ntse śāññāññe* † *ptes tve keśā anaiśai* [3a] *śamñe cmeltse yānmalyñe* † *olypotse spē waimene* [b6] [3b] *k_wce tve mentsi yamāstā* † *k_wcene yes mā cāmpāmoñ* [3c] ‘Pay careful attention to the nature of the saṃsāra and the fact that the human birth [form] is very difficult to attain. What grievance have you caused? Wherein have you been powerless?’ (cf Thomas 1952: 52).

⁶⁵⁵ Contrary to the rules of classical Sanskrit grammar, the present is negated with *mā* instead of *na*. For this particular use of *mā* in questions in Buddhist Sanskrit, see Edgerton (1953: 1, 202, §42.12). In a special note on the karmavācanā ritual he writes that the nun is supposed to reply *na hī* “no!”, i.e., the expectation is that the answer is negative.

⁶⁵⁶ The other questions with *mapi*, 7 in total, are found in THT1111b1-2 and b4.

semantic link between them, this may be that in both uses it highlights the information: either it is contrary to expectation, or it is known in principle, but receives special relevance in the context.

B46b5 and GQa1.2 (Pinault 1987: 160, 163) are left out because they are too fragmentary; for B30a1, which rather reads *wat*, see above (p 288).

B88b1⁶⁵⁷

pilko(s/ *ā*)*ñmālaṣkeṃ lkāṣṣān-me* † *taṅsa sam mñcuṣke*
 look:PERL pitiful look:3SG.PRS-PL.SUFF love:PERL DEM prince
lareṃ pātār ramt : [1c]⁶⁵⁸
 dear father like
mā wa ksa ṣ cwimp [b1] *māsketrā* † *waste comp*
 not WA INDF and DEM:GEN be:3SG.PRS protection DEM
la(*klene* 1
 sorrow:LOC

‘With a pitiful look the prince looks at them with love, like at a dear father. Yet there is not any protection for him in his sorrow.’⁶⁵⁹

AS121b5

krui añme mā nesāṃ kete ñāke tsālpālñe pālskanātrā ·
 if self not be:3SG.PRS who:GEN now deliverance think:3SG.PRS
śāmmaṣṣālñe wa (·)
 fetter PCL

‘If there is no “self”, by whom now is deliverance imagined?’⁶⁶⁰ Nevertheless [there is] a fetter.’

B246b4⁶⁶¹

ñās † *ykāk wa śāyau*
 I still WA live:1SG.PRS/SBJ
 ‘... still I live nevertheless ...’⁶⁶²

⁶⁵⁷ Verse: metre a, b: 8 † 7 † 6, c: 9 † 9, d: 7 † 6.

⁶⁵⁸ Apparently one syllable long.

⁶⁵⁹ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 102).

⁶⁶⁰ Or: ‘whose deliverance is thought of?’

⁶⁶¹ Verse: metre 4 x 5 † 5 † 8 † 7 (5 † 5 † 4+4 † 4+3). Cited is pāda 80d from the 10th until the 14th syllable.

⁶⁶² Adams (1999: 575).

B231a1⁶⁶³

[a₁] *twe* *nervāṃne* | *ynešne* *ram* *no* *klyaušit* *te* [1c]
 you *nirvāṇa*:LOC manifestly like but hear:2SG.OPT DEM
cai *wa* *ñakti* *tošitšši* | *k_use* *tañ* *šeyem* *šañ* *śamna* • 1
 DEM:PL WA god:PL Tušita:ADJ who you:GEN be:3PL.IPF REFL people:PL
 ‘You (have gone?) into the *nirvāṇa* – may you listen attentively to this! For these
 are Tušita gods who were your relatives.’⁶⁶⁴

B273a5-b3⁶⁶⁵

snai *keś* *wā* *wes* | *cī* *saim* *yāmoš* |
 without number WA we you refuge do:PRT.PTC
tallāñciškaṃ [28a]
 miserable:PL
pātār *mātār* | *rīntsāmtē* *pest* | *cišc* *ikā* [28b]
 father mother abandon:1PL.PRT away you:ALL
 (*māsta*) [b₁] *no* *twe* | *rīne* *rāme(r)* | *n(e)rvvānšai* *pest* [28c]
 go:2SG.PRT but you city:LOC quickly *nirvāṇa*:ADJ away
orāsta *wes* | *kleśānmāššem* | *sānānts* *šwātsi* 28
 leave:2SG.PRT us *kleśa*:PL.ADJ enemy:GEN.PL food
 (*wināške_u*) [b₂] *cā* | *erepāte* | *tsātsaikarnne* [29a]
 honour:1SG.PRS/SBJ beauty form
tsānkaṃ *nno* *ttwe* | *te* *mānt* *pārmānk* | *māskētār* *ñī* [29b]
 arise:3SG.SBJ but you DEM like hope be:3SG.PRS I:GEN
wes *wā* *nnaī*⁶⁶⁶ (*tne* | *yolai*) [b₃] *ñ* *mākā* | *yekte* *perni* [29c]
 we WA PCL here evil very little glory
yust-me *wā* *nnaī*⁶⁶⁶ | *tallāñciškaṃ* | *mā*
 make.ripe:2SG.PRS-PL.SUFF WA PCL miserable:PL not
*west-mešcā*⁶⁶⁷ 29
 say:2SG.PRS-PL.SUFF:ALL

‘For in countless numbers we miserable ones have made you to our refuge [and] we abandoned our father and mother for you ..., but you quickly went away to the *nirvāṇa* city [and] you left us as food to the *kleśa* enemies. I (honour) you in [your] beauty and form. «May you but arise»,⁶⁶⁸ thus is my hope. For we are very

⁶⁶³ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

⁶⁶⁴ Cf Thomas (1957: 74).

⁶⁶⁵ Verse: metre 4 x 4 | 4 | 4.

⁶⁶⁶ So to be corrected for *tnai* in the manuscript.

⁶⁶⁷ Written <šca>.

⁶⁶⁸ This part is difficult because *ttwe* ‘you’ does not fit together with *tsānkaṃ*, a 3sg. Perhaps the construction is to be compared with *spantai kāšši wem* ‘may the teacher speak trustfully’

evil here and of little glory; you make us miserable ones ready, [but] you don't speak to us.⁶⁶⁹

rai 'o!'⁶⁷⁰

The existence of a particle *rai* is ascertained, but its meaning can hardly be established: there are very few examples, and most of them are fragmentary to such a degree that a reliable interpretation is not possible. As far as the syntax is concerned, the particle is sometimes – but not always – sentence-initial and it combines with nouns or adverbs rather than verbs.⁶⁷¹

From the context of the following example we can deduce that *rai* combines well with a high volume of the voice (but what follows is obscured by a lacuna):

AS17Ka6

tume(m) b(rahmadat)t(e) walo a(r)w(ā)r(e) kerciyenne yopsa
 then Brahmadatta king ready palace:LOC.PL enter:3SG.PRT
eñkaucar weṣṣām aṣkār rai w(r)occi lāñc cemeṃ [b₁]
 out.loud say:3SG.PRS back RAI great king:PL DEM:ABL
 'Then king Brahmadatta, [who had become] ready, entered the palace and says out loud: «[Go] back from there!, [you] great kings!»'

And a comparable example from the story of Ulkāmukha and his brothers (Rockhill 1884: 11):

B589b3

/// ñc. *weskeṃ aṣkār rai : pyāmtso sāswentse yaitkor mçuṣkanta*⁶⁷²
 say:3PL.PRS back RAI do:IPV.PL lord:GEN command prince:PL
 '... say: «[Go] back!, act according to the command of the lord.» The princes ...'

Once, it is found with a vocative (*pālskoṣṣu*):

(see 3.5.5, p 238), where a 3sg. is used in direct address. Alternatively, *ttwe* might have to be read *ntwe* for *entwe* 'then', but in that case it is unclear what the subject of *tsānkam* is.

⁶⁶⁹ Cf Carling (2000: 161), Thomas (1954: 760), Adams (1999: 742).

⁶⁷⁰ With two out of four occurrences after *aṣkār*, it is conceivable that *rai* is in origin a variant of *nai* after *-r* (cf 2.5.8, p 90), but with the small number of attestations this must remain just a suggestion.

⁶⁷¹ B126b7 *mākte kca tāñ rai* /// might contain a further example of the particle, but *rai* could also start a new word.

⁶⁷² The rest of the line is too fragmentary for a translation: *ak· – – ka* [b₄].

ñke ‘now’

ñke is a sentence particle⁶⁷⁵ with little semantic content that is regularly found in the second position of a clause (for particle strings, see the note in the introduction to 3.7.5, p 287). It has no modal value and is probably best classified as a “discourse particle”; still, it deserves a short comment because it is frequent in apodoses. Sieg and Siegling have proposed to render *ñke* with “doch” (in their glossary, 1949: II, 199), or with “jedoch” (next to “doch” in the translations, 1949: I, passim). However, the adversative *doch* ‘yet’ and the inferential *doch* ‘as you must agree’ account only for a part of the attestations, and the same is true of Adams’ ‘then’ (1999: 248). In fact, these translations are incompatible to a high degree, but together they cover the usage of *ñke* to a very large extent.

English ‘then’ seems a good way to render the use in apodoses, frequent indeed. However, it is not obligatory in apodoses at all and it can combine with other elements marking the apodosis, especially *ot* (see below). There are many examples of that kind, which do not seem to require any explicit rendering in the translation; after all, Tocharian does not need to mark protasis and apodosis explicitly, and ‘if’ and ‘then’ can freely be added in the translation of any conditional.

B5a6⁶⁷⁶

tom mā tākoṃ śaiṣṣene | mā ñke tsañko(y)
 DEM:PL not be:3PL.OPT world:LOC not ÑKE rise:3SG.OPT
puññākte : [69a]
 Buddha

‘If these were not there in the world, then the Buddha would not arise.’

I am tempted to connect this weak semantics on a much more general anaphoric level, which can be shown with a.o. the following type of examples:

AS7Ba5-6⁶⁷⁷

k_uce te ma_[a6]nt wñāwa | tu ñke weñau anaiśai : [2b]
 what DEM like say:1SG.PRT DEM ÑKE say:1SG.SBJ careful
 ‘What I said like that, that I will say in detail.’

Here it is clear that *tu* is the anaphoric pronoun that takes up the relative *k_uce*, and *ñke* seems to coordinate this: it shifts the attention from the preceding to the way it is continued and establishes a kind of forward link. In paraphrasis, this could be

⁶⁷⁵ Thus Sieg and Siegling (1949: II, 119); Adams’ classification as a conjunction (1999: 248) is contradicted by its frequent combination with conjunctions and the fact that its semantics seem too weak for a conjunction.

⁶⁷⁶ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

⁶⁷⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

illustrated with ‘now’ or ‘well’ as in *what I said before, well, I will say ...* or *what I said before, that now I will say ...* I presume that the apodotic *ñke* is a special type of this anaphoric use (of still weaker semantics): *if A, well, in that case B* or *if A, at that moment B*. Of course, this is perfectly expressed by *then* in English, but the tricky thing is that *then* can also be used in a translation if Tocharian has no *ñke*.⁶⁷⁸

What makes it even more difficult to view *ñke* as a ‘then’ is that it may occur also in protases, or even in both protasis and apodosis (evidently, such difficulties would not arise if one just accepted different functions of the particle instead of trying to unify them in one description). In the example below, the second *ñke* may be the ‘meaningless’ apodotic-anaphoric *ñke*, whereas the first links back to the preceding and presents this conditional as a reason not to worry – this I have rendered by ‘since’ in the translation.

B78a3

krui ñke cai tänwamñeñ-cä ot ñke ñis ysape
 if ÑKE they love:3PL.PRS/SBJ-2SG.SUFF then ÑKE I close
ykāk källāt
 still obtain:2SG.SBJ

‘Since if they are kind to you, then you will find me close (to you) all the same.’

A similar example is the following, where it seems necessary to let *ñke* refer to the first clause with *pyāmtso* and take *ñis yesām pānto* as an intervening addition:

B29a8⁶⁷⁹

(po spe)l(k)e pyāmtso | warkšältsa ñis yesām pānto : [15a]
 all zeal do:IPV.PL energy:PERL I you:GEN.PL help
mā walke ñke⁶⁸⁰ ñis ksemar | tu postām onmiṃ
 not long ÑKE I extinguish:1SG.SBJ DEM after regret
tākam-me : [15b]
 be:3SG.SBJ-PL.SUFF

‘Exert all zeal energetically [with] me as your help, since before long I will go to extinction and after that you will have regret.’⁶⁸¹

⁶⁷⁸ In a very limited number of cases, and seemingly only in verse, *ñke* may come very late in the apodotic clause or even close it. As far as I can see, this is possible only with the apodotic *ñke* and its preferred position is then directly following the finite verb (e.g. B384b4, IT233+368b5).

⁶⁷⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 8 (4+3 | 3+5; here apparently 3+4 | 3+5).

⁶⁸⁰ *mā walke* is normally transcribed as two words, but *mā* often serves as a nominal negation, yielding a kind of compounds: *ñke* would then still stand in second position.

⁶⁸¹ Cf Sieg and Siegling (1949: II, 48).

In the above example, one could be tempted to take *nike* as a strong adversative “jedoch”: ‘exert all zeal: I am your help. But before long I will go to extinction’. In other cases, this temptation may be even stronger, but I find it hard to believe that such strong adversivity would combine with the weak meanings elsewhere. Even in an example as the one below, it is possible to do without a ‘but’; if needed, it could perhaps be taken from *ñake* ‘now’ rather than *nike*:

B85b₄ = B86a₁

ykāk tv(e) śāmane nest ñake nike cai ñ(i)ś pās
 still you alive be:2SG.PRS now ÑKE DEM:PL I away
śuwam
 eat:3PL.PRS/SBJ
 ‘You are still alive, now that these eat me up.’⁶⁸²

However, strong and weak meanings may occur side by side, and it cannot be excluded that in certain contexts *nike* means ‘but’ or “jedoch”.⁶⁸³

In my view, all nuances are in line with the evident etymology of *nike*, which as the only word starting with *nik-* must derive from *ñake* ‘now’ with assimilation of *ñk* to *nik* (Adams 1999: 248). Its co-occurrence with *ñake*, as in the example above, shows that not only its form was weakened, but its meaning, too. I think that the linking value of *nike* is very similar to developments found in e.g. Greek for *vú(v)* or even in English for *now*.

Further support for this semantic derivation is the striking fact that among the examples that I have assembled past tenses do not occur at all: all finite verbs are present (here I include nominal clauses), subjunctive, or optative.

ot ‘then’⁶⁸⁴

The adverb *ot* is frequent in apodoses: it then starts the clause and we may assume that it was accented. When used in conditionals, little difference can be noted vis-à-vis *nike*, but if there is any, *ot* is without doubt the stronger of the two. That they are not isofunctional is clearly shown by the fact that they may co-occur (see above). Just like *nike*, *ot* certainly is not a pure apodosis marker: in its other functions the differences with *nike* become immediately apparent.

⁶⁸² Cf Couvreur (1954b: 101, see also Schmidt 2001: 315).

⁶⁸³ In admitting this, I think of Dutch *maar*, the regular adversative conjunction, but at the same time an adverb meaning ‘only’ and a particle softening imperatives to well-meant suggestions (deriving from ‘only’ through ‘there is nothing better to do – only that, so just consider doing it’). The account of Haeseryn e.a. (1997: 457) is unsatisfactory.

⁶⁸⁴ I do not discuss *entwe* ‘then’ because its meaning is not disputed. It may occur in the apodosis of conditionals, but it is an adverb that can also connect a main clause to a preceding text unit, ‘thereupon’ (Adams 1999: 85; Siegling 1949: II, 98).

ot is a temporal adverb and it can be used in future and past contexts alike (unlike *ñke*, which is not used in past contexts); I have found no good examples of present usage, nor co-occurrence with *ñake* ‘now’. The relatively high semantic content of *ot vis-à-vis ñke* is in my view also demonstrated by the fact that it is never repeated: one token suffices. If it is used in non-conditional contexts, it may anaphorically refer to a preceding subclause, i.e. *at that time*, and its syntactic behaviour then does not seem to be different from conditionals.

B77.2-3

ente se krentau(nattse a)_[a3]rañemi ñemtsa walo šai ot
 when DEM virtuous Arañemi by.name king be:3SG.IPF then
rano sū ololyesa ākteke wantare yamaša :
 too DEM extremely wonderful thing do:3SG.PRT
 ‘When this virtuous one was a king called Arañemi, then he did an even more wonderful thing.’⁶⁸⁵

It may, however, also mark an important turn in a narrative, or start a new episode. In that function, it is rare at the beginning of the clause, but rather tends to be placed towards the end of it.

B5a1-2⁶⁸⁶

nānok pudñakt(e māskitrā | śrā)_[a2]vastī spe sānkāmpa : [66a]
 again Buddha be:3SG.IPF Śrāvastī close community:COM
kokaletstse iyoy su | prasenacī walo ot . [66b]
 driver drive:3SG.IPF DEM Prasenajit king then
šem kautāte koklentse | waiptār pwenta kāškānte : [66c]
 axis break:3SG.PRT car:GEN apart spoke:PL scatter:3PL.PRT
 ‘Again the Buddha stayed close to Śrāvastī with the community. As a driver then drove king Prasenajit. The axis of the car broke and the spokes were scattered apart.’

B23b6⁶⁸⁷

a(I)l(o)ñkn ∘ ostwaśco mas ∘ ānande ot pintwāto : [24a]
 other house:ALL.PL go:3SG.PRT Ānanda then alms
śéswer ompostām masa pudñāktentse tw ākša : [24b]
 eating after go:3SG.PRT Buddha:GEN DEM announce:3SG.PRT
 ‘Then Ānanda went to other houses for alms. [But] he went after eating [and] this he told to the Buddha.’

⁶⁸⁵ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 99).

⁶⁸⁶ Verse: metre 4 x 7 | 7 (4+3 | 4+3).

⁶⁸⁷ Verse: 5 pāda metre 4 x 5 | 8 (usually 5 | 4+4) + 1 x 8 | 8 | 5.

B42b4⁶⁸⁸

śrāvastn ∘ *osta-(ś)me(ñca)* † | *(sn)ai* (*ke*)ś *ñāṣṣitr*
 Śrāvastī:LOC householder without number desire:3SG.IPF

ākālk † | *seyi* *cmelñeṣṣe* : [26b]
 wish son:GEN birth:ADJ

tumem *wnolm* ∘ *alleksa*⁶⁸⁹ † | *cwi* *śnoy* *kātsane* *ot* †
 then being other ∘ INDF DEM:GEN wife:GEN womb:LOC then

camel wārpāte : [26c]
 birth receive:3SG.PRT

‘In Śrāvastī a householder incessantly cherished the wish for the birth of a son. Then another being received birth in the womb of his wife.’

Examples of apodotic *ot* can be found throughout this study. I have not been able to establish a clear rule that explains its presence or absence in conditionals, but I have noted some points. The conjunction *kr_{ui}* does not seem to combine with *ot* very often, as I have found only B78a3. If we leave fragmentary protases as in AS15Aa5, B273b3-5 or B326a1 aside, we see that the protasis is unmarked in B273a2-3 and B331b2-5 and formed with *ente* (*inte*) in B77.1-2 and THT4092b2. Present and subjunctive apodoses are both found, but it may be telling that in spite of that present, B590a6-7, B590a8-b1 and THT4092b2 seem to have future reference.

Given the mixed statistics, we have to be very careful with conclusions. Nevertheless, since *ot* can also be used in the past tense, I would expect that it correlates with *when*-protases rather than *if*-protases (cf two times *ente* vs one time *kr_{ui}*): it clearly refers to real tense rather than hypothetical situations. However, the material does not afford to apply such a classification too rigorously: it is found in the notoriously general *prātimokṣa* conditionals (e.g. B331b2-5, B326a1) as well as in *stotra* poetry of general content (e.g. B273a2-3).

ente ‘where’⁶⁹⁰

The basic meaning of *ente* must be ‘where’; probably, it was in origin only interrogative, but it is often used as a relative (Adams 1999: 85). From its original local meaning it was shifted to a temporal meaning ‘when; when?’. As a relative temporal conjunction it may occur in conditionals, functionally close to *kr_{ui}* ‘if’. Whereas past tense use of *kr_{ui}*, i.e. like English *when*, is exceedingly rare, it is well attested for *ente*, e.g.:

⁶⁸⁸ Verse: metre 4 x 6 † 6 † 5.

⁶⁸⁹ For *allek ksa*.

⁶⁹⁰ On the variant *inte*, see Peyrot (2008a: 172).

B77.2-3

ente se krentau(nattse a)_[a3]raṇemi ñemtsa walo ʃai ot
 when DEM virtuous Araṇemi by.name king be:3SG.IPF then
rano sū ololyesa ākteke wantare yamaša :
 too DEM extremely wonderful thing do:3SG.PRT
 ‘When this virtuous one was a king called Araṇemi, then he did an even more
 wonderful thing.’⁶⁹¹

Probably it means ‘when’, not ‘if’ in conditionals with future reference. That is to say, it refers to a specific and not a hypothetical future point of time.

B77.1-2

ente se kr(e)ntaunatts(e) sunetre wal(o) p(a)ñ(ā)kt(e) ʃaiʃsen(e)
 when DEM virtuous Sunetra king Buddha world:LOC
tsānka(m) ot cwi sp(aktaniki alā)_[2]läcci tākam
 rise:3SG.SBJ then DEM:GEN servant:PL indefatigable be:1PL.SBJ
 ‘When this virtuous king Sunetra rises as a Buddha in the world, then we will be
 his indefatigable servants.’⁶⁹²

Derived from the conditional use is the indefinite use of reduplicated *ente*, as illustrated below.

IT305b3

ente ente wirotānta weñau te kāršanalle ||
 when when incompatibility:PL say:1SG.SBJ DEM know:PRS.GER
 ‘Whenever I recite the incompatibilities, this is to be understood.’

Interestingly, *ente* is also frequent in abhidharma texts, of philosophical content. It is unclear whether much value must be attached to this use, since the texts are often very close to Sanskrit originals (which are unfortunately mostly lost). If one would insist that this use cannot be captured under a *when*-meaning, it is theoretically possible that in the latest phase of Tocharian B, where these texts are from, *ente* had further shifted to ‘if’. In this particular example, we could even translate *ente* with ‘where’, especially since it is taken up with *omte* ‘there’.⁶⁹³

⁶⁹¹ Cf Couvreur (1954b: 99).

⁶⁹² Cf Couvreur (1954b: 99).

⁶⁹³ Cf the parallel in the Abhidharmakośa of Vasubandhu, where we read “L’espace a pour nature de ne pas empêcher (*āvṛṇoti*) la matière (*rūpa*) qui, en effet, prend place librement dans l’espace; et aussi de ne pas être empêché (*āvriyate*) par la matière, car l’espace n’est pas délogé par la matière.” (de La Vallée Poussin 1980: I, 8).

B178b3

ente rūpaṣṣe svabhāp tsāṅkau tākaṃ mā omte
 when matter:ADJ nature arise:PRT.PTC be:3SG.SBJ not there
ākāśāntse pkante māskētār
 space:GEN hindrance be:3SG.PRS

‘When (where?) the nature of the matter⁶⁹⁴ has come about, it is no hindrance for *ākāśa* [space].⁶⁹⁵’

kr_{ui} ‘if’

The conjunction *kr_{ui}* has been studied in detail by Pinault (1997: 473-479). He noted that *kr_{ui}* is an important element in conditional constructions, where it marks the protatic clause of all types of conditionals. However, it need not be there, and, importantly, it is also attested in non-conditional past temporal subclauses.

The most frequent non-conditional type is the past iterative clause, which is formed with an optative subclause and an imperfect main clause (the imperfect being preferred for repeated past actions). This type can easily be unified with the conditional type because in many languages such clauses take the same conjunction as conditionals, e.g. German *wenn* or Dutch *als*: both ‘if’, but used for past iteratives, too.⁶⁹⁶

B246a1-3⁶⁹⁷

lkoym-c kr_{ui} ynemane † ypauna kṡṡainne ci⁶⁹⁸ † plu_{[a2]ṡṡi-ñ}
 see:1SG.OPT if go:PRS.PTC land:PL village:LOC.PL you leap:IPF.3SG
saksa palsko⁶⁹⁹ ārañce † yapit wat no
 happiness:PERL mind heart enter:2SG.OPT or but
wertsyaine [79c]
 community:LOC

ñakty āñcāl_{-[a3]ṡarne † kemññi rāmnoyeṃ † ... [79d]}
 god:PL añjali-hand:DU knee:DU bow:3PL.IPF

‘Everytime I saw you going through lands and villages, my mind and heart leapt for joy, or everytime you entered the community the gods bowed their knees with *añjali* hands.’⁷⁰⁰

⁶⁹⁴ It seems that this should mean ‘matter in a natural way’ (cf footnote 693).

⁶⁹⁵ Thomas (1967: 267).

⁶⁹⁶ Cf Thomas’ translation of the following example with “[Immer] wenn ich dich sah” and “[immer wenn] du in die Versammlung eintratest” (1957: 69).

⁶⁹⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 (5 | 5 | 4+4 | 4+3).

⁶⁹⁸ *ci* is added later in the manuscript, but it is difficult to understand, since *lkoym-c* already contains the 2sg. suffixed pronoun *-c*.

⁶⁹⁹ In the manuscript corrected to *palskw*, the form needed to arrive at the correct number of syllables in this unit.

There is one completely isolated example of a non-iterative *kr_{ui}* clause in a past context. If it is not due to a calque on a Sanskrit model (which is, admittedly, an ad hoc solution), I can only think of the following alternative interpretation. The most straightforward, traditional interpretation takes the two *kr_{ui}* clauses as indicating the moment at which the event of the main clause occurred. Thus, the three actions – being born, roaring for friendship, seeking to understand – have apparently taken place in a negligibly small time span and are equated with the realisation of happiness. It is theoretically possible to take the *kr_{ui}*'s as *ifs* and make the whole strophe an inferential conditional. Of course, the content of such a reasoning is rather surprising, but this might have served a stylistic purpose; i.e., perhaps the overall sense is not 'if A, B, C, then D', but 'since A, B, C, therefore D'. In any case, the two clauses of the first *kr_{ui}* complex make up one set of events, the first indicating the background and the second the action.⁷⁰¹

B224a2-b1⁷⁰²

*kr_{ui} twe pārweṣṣa*⁷⁰³ † *lāc* *mā*_[a3]*tri* *kektseñmeṃ* [4a]⁷⁰⁴
 if you first go.out:2SG.PRT mother:GEN body:ABL
metār pontām̄ts †⁷⁰⁵ *kārtseṣc* *nawatai* *ṣāp* [4b]⁷⁰⁶
 maitrī all:GEN.PL good:ALL roar:2SG.PRT and
lāk̄lentants (·)-*rma* *ṣāp* †⁷⁰⁷ *ritātai* *kr_{(u)ī}* †_[b1] *kārsatsi* [4c]
 sorrow:GEN.PL seed? and seek:2SG.PRT if know:INF
tusa krentewnants † *p(o)* *ak(e)* *sakyānasta*⁷⁰⁸ 4
 thus virtue:GEN.PL all end happiness/fulfil:2SG.PRT

⁷⁰⁰ Cf Thomas (1957: 69, 213).

⁷⁰¹ A (rather imprecise) parallel from the Sanskrit Rāhulastava is construed with a *yathaiva* – *tathaiva* 'like – so' correlation: *yathaiva prathamam cittam* [a] *utpannam tava bodhaye* | [b] *tvam tathaivāsya lokasya* [c] *pūjyaś copari ca sthitaḥ* || 3 || [d] "Schon als dir der erste, zu deiner Erleuchtung führende Gedanke entstand, da warst du für diese Welt ein zu Verehrender und ein über ihr Stehender." (Schlingloff 1955: 89).

⁷⁰² Verse: not very regular metre 4 x 5 † 7 (5 † 3+4) or perhaps (5 † 4+3).

⁷⁰³ For *pārweṣṣe*.

⁷⁰⁴ The preceding unit is one syllable short; perhaps one should read *lāco*, if the subdivision is 5 † 4+3. If pāda 4b is correct, the subdivision is rather 5 † 3+4, i.e. the unit *kektseñmeṃ* should then become one syllable longer.

⁷⁰⁵ The preceding unit is one syllable short; perhaps one should read *pontām̄tso*.

⁷⁰⁶ The preceding unit is one syllable short; perhaps one should read *kārtseṣco*.

⁷⁰⁷ The translation 'seed' follows Thomas (1957: 175, 234). It requires a reading *lāk̄lentantsarm ṣāp* or *lāk̄lentants sarm ṣāp* (with arch. *sarm* for classical *sārm**). As an alternative, *lāk̄lentantsarmna ṣāp* can be proposed (the singular *sārm* is not attested elsewhere), but this would require a reading *ṣp* for *ṣāp* to make the metre fit.

⁷⁰⁸ For *sak kyānasta*.

‘If [when] you first left the body of [your] mother, you have roared friendship (*māitrī*) for the benefit of all, and if you have sought to understand the seed of the sorrows, then you have achieved happiness, the ultimate of the virtues.’

I must admit that my interpretation may seem far-fetched, but the complete isolation of this type calls for an explanation: it is not economical to give up the analysis of *kr_{ui}* as an *if*-conjunction because of just one example.

Although the example below is fragmentary, it clearly contains *kwri* in a non-iterative past context. In this case, an inferential interpretation is unproblematic.

AS17Kb57⁰⁹

i – *cek* *warñai* | *kwri* *kālpāsta* *kos* *rā* *tsa* : [2a]
DEM until if obtain:2SG.PRT as.much also EMPH

pālka *tomp* *ñake* | *mākte* *ynāñ(m)o* *tākañ-cā* (:) [2b]
look:IPV.SG DEM now how worthy be:3SG.SBJ-2SG.SUFF

‘Even if you have obtained as much as that, look at that now, so that it will be worthy to you!’

Pinault adduces yet another example to show that *kr_{ui}* does not mean ‘if’, as it seems superfluous; he would rather see it as indefinite adverb of time, ‘anytime’ (1997: 478-479).

B284a2-37¹⁰

cmetār *ka* *ksa* [a₃] *kr_{ui}* | *nemcek* *postām* *sruketrā* [3b]
be.born:3SG.SBJ EMPH INDF if certainly afterwards die:3SG.PRS

‘If someone is hardly born, certainly he dies afterwards.’

I agree that it is not easy to put an *if* in the translation, but I would insist that it is a regular general conditional indeed, where in Tocharian B the conjunction *kr_{ui}* may always be used. That it is a general truth and not a specific conditional is of no relevance, in view of the striking frequency of *kr_{ui}* in texts of general content, such as the Karmavibhaṅga. Needless to say, my synchronic analysis of Tocharian B *kr_{ui}* as an *if*-conjunction is wholly independent of, and not in any way disadvantageous for Pinault’s arguments on Tocharian A *k_upre* and *k_uprene*, and his reconstruction of these words.

Interestingly, Pinault also noted that the word patterns of *kr_{ui}* are remarkable (1997: 474): it is often placed at the beginning of the protatic clause, and regularly so in prose, it seems, but very often in the middle or towards the end of it in verse. Although word order is much more flexible in verse than in prose, this phenomenon

⁷⁰⁹ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

⁷¹⁰ Verse: metre 4 x 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3).

definitely cannot be explained from “lax” word order alone, as the tendency is much stronger and more regular than other specifically metrical word order patterns.

3.7.6 PRESENT-SUBJUNCTIVE

Since the difference between present and subjunctive plays such an important role in the syntax of Tocharian B, it is striking that a large number of verbs do not make the distinction: counting attested stems only, I found that the ratio between subjunctive stems and present-subjunctive stems was approximately 3 to 2.⁷¹¹ Moreover, most productive classes have a difference between present and subjunctive, whereas the verbs with present-subjunctive follow patterns that are less frequent, so that it is not unexpected that some rather frequent verbs of the basic vocabulary are found here, such as ‘go’, ‘live’, ‘eat’ and ‘drink’. In view of this, the present-subjunctive is not only an interesting morphological category, but it is important on the syntactic level, too.

Of course, the present-subjunctive is useless if the difference in usage between present and subjunctive needs to be described. Rather, the question to be answered is whether the usage of the present-subjunctive is different from that of distinct presents and subjunctives. In particular, one might wonder whether the lack of a distinction is compensated by certain adverbs, particles, different construction patterns, or perhaps a shift in the usage of neighbouring moods, such as the optative, which could theoretically take over part of the function of the subjunctive.⁷¹²

Although it is not easy to prove that present-subjunctives are used exactly like normal presents and normal subjunctives, regardless of the ambiguity, I have found no positive indications for a different syntactic behaviour.

In the Udānavarga bilinguals and the Udānālānkāra, no attempt at a distinction is found. These bilinguals are valuable because the correspondences for normal presents and subjunctives are clear, but of course they cannot serve as evidence for genuine Tocharian syntax. Below, I first give two examples of present-subjunctives rendering a Skt. present, followed by a passage from the Udānālānkāra where a present-subjunctive translates a Sanskrit future.

⁷¹¹ Two caveats are due: 1) as the present stem is better attested than the subjunctive stem, the ratio of present vs present-subjunctive stems would be more in favour of the present stem, and 2) I have counted attested present-subjunctive stems, but these are not necessarily attested in subjunctive function – were all deducible subjunctive stems to be counted as well, then the ratio would also be much better for the subjunctive stems.

⁷¹² One may compare the tendency in German to use Konjunktiv I only when it is different from the present, but Konjunktiv II when Konjunktiv I and present are identical, i.e. 3sg. Konj.I *habe* ‘has’ vs 3sg. prs. *hat*, but 3pl. Konj.II *hätten* vs 3sg. prs. *haben* (= 3pl. Konj.I *haben*).

THT1355b3, IT164b3

papātkarmem yaṃ
 dissociation:ABL go:3SG.PRS/SBJ
 'He goes in dissociation.'

Uv32.19c

viśreṇayitvā carati
 in.dissociation go:3SG.PRS
 'He is/lives dissociated.'⁷¹³

THT1350⁷¹⁴b1

(*olya*)*potse śākw śayem*
 very happiness live:1PL.PRS/SBJ
 'Very happily we live.'

Uv30.44a

susukhaṃ bata jīvāmaḥ
 very.happily INT live:1PL.PRS⁷¹⁵
 'Ah, so happily we live.'⁷¹⁶

B27b6⁷¹⁷

kakārpaṣ wikāskem † pālskaucañ marantse †
 descend:PRT.PTC drive.away:3PL.PRS/SBJ think:AG.N.PL Māra:GEN
śanmau kleśaṣṣe : [69b]
 fetter kleśa:ADJ

'The thinkers that have descended [it] will drive away the *kleśa*-fetters of Māra.'

Uv12.11c-d

pratīpannakāḥ prahāsyanti † dhyāyino mārabandhanam⁷¹⁸ †
 practising drive.off:3PL.FUT thinker:PL fetters.of.Māra
 'The thinkers that have practised it will drive off the fetters of Māra.'

⁷¹³ 32.19 *yas tu puṇyaṃ ca pāpaṃ ca* [a] *prahāya brahmacaryavān* [b] *viśreṇayitvā carati* [c] *sa vai bhikṣur nirucyate* [d] 'whoever abandoning good and evil, living chastily, dissociated, he verily is called an elder (monk).' (Bernhard 1965: 437; Edgerton 1953: II, 502).

⁷¹⁴ To be turned over.

⁷¹⁵ Although this form could theoretically also be a subjunctive, this would be extremely surprising in the text and the possibility is better neglected.

⁷¹⁶ 30.44b-d *yeṣāṃ no nāsti kiñcanam* [b] *mithilāyāṃ dahyamānāyāṃ* [c] *na no dahyati kiñcanam* [d] '[we], who have not any possessions; if Mithilā burns down, no possession of ours is burnt' (Bernhard 1965: 404; Hahn 2007: 122). This line is repeated in THT1350b5 = Uv30.47a, THT1350b6 = Uv30.48a, THT1368b2 = Uv30.45a.

⁷¹⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 6 † 6 † 5.

⁷¹⁸ Uv12.11a-b *eṣo hi mārgo nāsty anyo* [a] *darśanasya viśuddhaye* [b] 'This is the path to purity of vision, there is no other' (Bernhard 1965: 195; Hahn 2007: 48).

In the following example, it seems that the Sanskrit future is rendered by a Tocharian B present-subjunctive with the addition of the adverb *nike* ‘then’. Possibly, *nike* is used to disambiguate *lyaśāṃ*, but we have to be very careful with conclusions because the passage is extremely fragmentary and this usage of *nike* has no parallels elsewhere.

IT233+368b5

/// (*lya*)śā(ṃ) *nike*
 lie:3SG.PRS/SBJ then
 ‘... will lie then ...’⁷¹⁹

Uv1.35b

prthivīm adhiśesyate
 earth lie.on:3SG.FUT
 ‘[This body] will lie on the earth.’

Apparently with no special marking, the present-subjunctive can be used to render the notion of future, just like the regular subjunctive (see 3.5.2, p 233).

B45a5⁷²⁰

mā tn̄ onuwaññe śāya nauṣ | mā ra śaiṃ
 not here immortal live:3SG.PRT before not also live:3SG.PRS/SBJ
ksa t̄ ompostām | [32b]
 INDF DEM after

‘No-one has lived immortally before here, and no-one will live [immortally] hereafter.’

The following lines are from the casuistics of *pātayantikā* 1 about lying (Skt. *mṛṣā*), cf the detailed commentary and parallels in Pinault (1994: 136-184), who cites the following structural parallel from Pāli (p 169): *aññaṃ bhaṇissāmīti aññaṃ bhaṇati* ‘[if he says], «I will say this» [and] he says another thing’. In the first line, we have a neat contrast between *āyu* ‘I will give’ and *āyaṣaṃ* ‘he gives’, but in the other three the present-subjunctives *yam*, *śū* and *yoku* are used as subjunctives without special marking.

NS58b1 = B336b5

*se*⁷²¹ *ṣamāne te weṃ te ñiś tañ ā(y)u*
 which monk DEM say:3SG.SBJ DEM I you:GEN give:1SG.SBJ

⁷¹⁹ Peyrot (2008b: 85).

⁷²⁰ Verse: metre a, b: 8 | 7 | 6, c: 9 | 9, d: 7 | 6 (a, b: 5+3 | 4+3 | 6; c: 4+5 | 4+5; d: 4+3 | 6).

⁷²¹ Relative; B336b5: *kuse*.

m / *āyaṣaṃ-ne* 60⁷²²

not give:3SG.PRS-3SG.SUFF

‘Which monk says this, «I will give this to you», [but] does not give it;’

NS58b1 = B336b6

*cimpa wa(t ya)m*⁷²³ *mā yaṃ* 60⁷²²

you:COM or go:1SG.PRS/SBJ not go:3SG.PRS/SBJ

‘or, «I will go with you», [but] he does not go;’

NS58b2 = B336b7

*weṣṣāṃ*⁷²⁴ *mā śpā śū nano śūwaṃ* 80⁷²²

say:3SG.PRS not and eat:3SG.PRS/SBJ again eat:3SG.PRS/SBJ

‘... (which monk) says, «I will not eat anymore», [but] eats again;’

NS58b2

mā śp yoku nano yokāṃ 60⁷²²

not and drink:1SG.PRS/SBJ again drink:3SG.PRS/SBJ

‘«I will not eat anymore», [but] he eats again ...’

In the example below, the different functions of the present-subjunctive *prāskau* ‘I fear’ etc are very clear. The first occurrence in *pāda a* is almost certainly a present. Since the not-fearing of *pāda a* is in direct conflict with the fearing of *pāda c*, the latter must be a conditional subjunctive. The rhetorical question in *pāda b* could be a present, but this is less certain (see 3.5.8, p 243).

B298⁷²⁵

arai srukalyñe † *cisa nta kca mā prāskau* [a]

INT death you:PERL ever INDF not fear:1SG.PRS/SBJ

pontas srukelle † *kā ñiś ṣeske tañ prāskau* [b]

all:GEN.PL die:PRS.GER why I always you:GEN fear:1SG.PRS/SBJ

s / *ārai ñi palsko* † *cisa prāskau pon prekenne* [c]

DEM INT I:GEN idea you:PERL fear:1SG.PRS/SBJ all time:LOC.PL

twe ñke kalatar-ñ † *apiś wārñai nreyentane* : [d]

you then bring:2SG.SBJ-1SG.SUFF Avīci until hell:LOC.PL

‘O death, I do not fear you at all: all have to die, why would I fear you always? O, this is my idea: «if I fear you in all times, then you will bring me to the hells, including the Avīci!»’

The present-subjunctive *aiśtrā* can probably be compared to the subjunctives of the type *māmt tākaṃ* ‘so it will be’ in 3.5.6 (p 239), from the same text.

⁷²² <60> and <80> are here used as punctuation marks.

⁷²³ B336b6: *yāmā*.

⁷²⁴ B336b7: *weṣṣā(ṃ)*.

⁷²⁵ Verse: metre a-b: 5 | 7 (5 | 4+3), c-d: 5 | 8 (5 | 4+4).

AS12Hb2

arwer se ñäke kanthäke yäkwe • mäkte säswentse soy preke
 ready DEM now Kanthaka horse how lord:GEN son time
aišträ •

know:3SG.PRS/SBJ

'The horse Kanthaka [is] ready now! The son of the lord may know the [right] time [to leave].'⁷²⁶

In the conditional of general content below, both the protasis and the apodosis contain the present-subjunctive form *yänem* ~ *yanem*. Whereas the first in pāda 3b is certainly used as a subjunctive because it is conditional, additionally marked with *kr_ui* 'if', the second in pāda 3c must be used as a present because it is parallel to *mäskenträ*. In any case, in such a general conditional we would expect a present apodosis.

B295a4-5⁷²⁷

sportomäne sämsarne † šänñe sómo k_use kat⁷²⁸ ra : [3a]
 turn:PRS.PTC saṃsāra:LOC relative man who whose INDF
šärmänmasā šeššänmoš † alyaucempa yänem kr_ui [3b]
 cause:PERL.PL bind:PRT.PTC one.another:COM.PL go:3PL.PRS/SBJ if
nanauta(r)mēm [a5] šärmänmats † nāno yanem waiptār
 disappear:ABS cause:GEN.PL again go:3PL.PRS/SBJ apart
cai : [3c]
 DEM

šänñem šamnāmnts enälyñe † mā špä pälkoš mäskenträ 3
 relative:PL man:GEN.PL clinging not and look:PRT.PTC be:3PL.PRS

'Who is in the turning saṃsāra the relative of someone else? When they are bound by causes, they go together with each other, [but] when the causes have disappeared they go separate ways again and have no eye for the clinging of their relatives [anymore].'⁷²⁹

3.8 MEANING

There is little difference between the use of the subjunctive in Tocharian A and Tocharian B. In main clauses, the basic meaning is future and in subclauses it is uncertainty.

⁷²⁶ For the translation cf Couvreur (1953b: 282).

⁷²⁷ Verse: metre 4 x 7 † 7 (4+3 † 4+3).

⁷²⁸ For *ket*.

⁷²⁹ Thomas (1957: 274).

3.8.1 THE TOCHARIAN SUBJUNCTIVE IN MAIN CLAUSES

In main clauses, the subjunctive principally denotes future events in both Tocharian A and Tocharian B. Direct support for this observation is the fact that in both languages the default rendering of Sanskrit futures is a subjunctive, and it is used in predictions (or neutral, pure futures). In addition, in Tocharian B the subjunctive is well attested in contexts where the idea of future is expressed. That I have found no comparable examples for Tocharian A is certainly to be ascribed to chance, as this language has no competing expression for future that Tocharian B does not have, and those contexts are not attested at all, i.e. there is no positive evidence that they would be expressed otherwise.

For first person subjunctives, a volutative reading is often very likely, but this is without doubt the result of inference from the future meaning: if it is not evident that the first person does not want to carry out a future action, it is often possible to assume that (s)he actually wants to do so. In both languages, there are also clear non-volutative examples. In Tocharian A, we find neutral predictions, which are probably lacking in Tocharian B by chance. In Tocharian B, there are good examples of events that are so unfavourable for the speaker that a volutative reading can easily be excluded. Whether the lack of the latter type in Tocharian A is a matter of chance I do not know, but I have found no alternative means to express the same.

When examining the attitude of various other possible modal sources, namely subject, speaker and hearer, the result was mixed. For both languages, it was not difficult to find examples of events with a positive effect: actions to the benefit of the subject; wishes, which obviously relate to an event desired by the speaker; and promises, which normally turn out in a positive way for the hearer. Although in quite some instances a translation with an English *will*-future is unnatural, these uses can without difficulty be derived from a notion of futurity. First of all, they take place in the future, and second, in the relevant context the intended value can easily be deduced. Finding negative events for the same parameters was more difficult. I have found good examples in Tocharian A for the subject and for the speaker, but not for the hearer. In Tocharian B I have found only one good example for the hearer, and none for subject or speaker. It is not clear to me why these parameters could not be found, but it must be said that the total number of subjunctive clauses that qualifies in the first place is not overwhelming. I can only base myself on the results from the other study foci, namely that of the predictive future and the first person, to argue that the subjunctive is free of modal value with respect to these possible modal sources. There is a possibility that the difference between Tocharian A and B is significant, but the numbers are small and it is more likely that in fact we have to take the two together. Then both languages complement each other perfectly, which further suggests a non-modal future meaning of the subjunctive in main clauses.

The relationship of the optative to the subjunctive is sufficiently clear, and there is no difference between Tocharian A and B. Those few cases where the subjunctive is best translated as a wish all concern discourse situations where the “wish” is not a

deep-felt, serious wish (as with the optative), but more a formula to stimulate the hearer to some (mostly verbal) action.

The relationship between the present and the subjunctive is more delicate, and it seems that Tocharian A offers more examples of presents with future reference than Tocharian B. Striking similarities are found with the verbs ‘say’ and ‘give’, which in discourse situations are often used in the present to denote immediate futures. The same parameter is probably at the basis of the frequent occurrence of ‘go’ in the present in Tocharian A, but here it should be noted that in Tocharian B this verb has been left out of consideration completely because it forms a present-subjunctive. Why other Tocharian B verbs of motion, i.e. ‘come’ and ‘leave’, do not mirror the situation in Tocharian A, where these are more often in the present than other verbs, I do not know. The verb ‘become’ may also express futurity with a present form in both languages, but here the future meaning is inherent in the lexical meaning of the verb, which is made overly clear by its lacking a subjunctive. For this particular verb, the match with syntactically identical Sanskrit *bhav-* ‘become’ is striking, and “tense calquing” is certainly not excluded.

Understanding the nuances of the use of the subjunctive and other verbal forms, like the present and the optative, in rhetorical questions seems hardly feasible. There are only few examples in the various different moods and the semantic differences can only partially be deduced from those established elsewhere. Suffice it to say that rhetorical questions must be studied separately as they deviate too much, and that they can in no way be used to argue against the general picture emerging from positive clauses.

3.8.2 THE TOCHARIAN SUBJUNCTIVE IN SUBCLAUSES

The subclause uses of the Tocharian A and B subjunctives can best be unified as expressing uncertainty. The two languages behave very similar, but various subtypes can be distinguished, of which the conditional is probably the most salient.

In conditional sentences, the subjunctive may denote realistic protases and future apodoses. Thus specific conditionals with future reference have typically a subjunctive protasis and a subjunctive apodosis, e.g. *If it rains [sbj.] tonight, you will need [sbj.] an umbrella*. Generic conditionals have a subjunctive protasis, but a present apodosis, e.g. *If it rains [sbj.], the street gets [prs.] wet*. Exceptions are mainly of two types: 1) specific apodoses with a present, which can be compared with the sporadic use of the present for the future in main clauses, or 2) inferential conditionals. In inferential conditionals, the apodosis results from the protasis through reasoning, and the tenses and moods are variable, just like in English, e.g. *If the streets are wet, it must have rained*. Inferential conditionals are sporadically attested in Tocharian B, but not in Tocharian A – presumably by chance. Past, counterfactual and implausible conditionals are expressed with the optative and with periphrastic constructions.

Other subjunctive subclause types are eventual, in which the realisation of an event is given as uncertain; iterative, in which an event takes place several times; indefinite, in which the event is not exactly known; and concessive, in which an event is given as irrelevant. All these types are well attested for both languages and in principle they have a present in the main clause. In both languages, a subjunctive clause may also express the goal of a main clause, for instance an imperative clause, e.g. *Make your homework so that you can pass your test*. Only in Tocharian A, a subjunctive subclause is attested in comparisons, e.g. *It looks like it were a fashioned or painted figure*. Since English *would* and *were* etc otherwise often render Tocharian optative clauses, one might have expected an optative in such comparisons (like in Tocharian B).

3.8.3 TOWARDS A UNIFIED MEANING

As the meaning of the Tocharian subjunctives in main clauses is future and that in subclauses is uncertainty, I must quote Krause's description of the meaning of the Tocharian B subjunctive again:

“Der Konjunktiv steht in Haupt- wie in Nebensätzen mit der Funktion der Vermutung, Erwartung, Annahme, also der Ungewißheit, woraus sich die Funktion des reinen Futurs entwickelt hat, sowie als Jussiv.” (1952: 30)

Although I disagree in some points, his idea is generally correct: if any of the two notions future and uncertainty should be more basic, I would opt for uncertainty and thus follow Krause in his view that the future meaning has developed from that of uncertainty.

However, I cannot agree with his claim that any of the notions presumption, expectation and assumption is a basic component of the subjunctive in main clauses, nor that it expresses uncertainty there. Of course the future is always less certain than the present and the past, and the inference of uncertainty is easily made, but the subjunctive is used for futures that are in no way uncertain, too, and uncertainty nuances find their own explicit form of expression, for instance by means of particles. Also the jussive use he distinguishes – for main clauses only, as is clear from the example sentences that follow – is only inferred from the notion of future, as it can be shown to be in explicit conflict with other derived notions.

Krause's formulation is also imprecise as far as subclauses are concerned. Whereas the general characterisation “uncertainty” covers the meaning of the subjunctive there very well indeed, and assumption can successfully be identified with conditionality, I think, expectation and presumption are no recognisable semantic features of the subjunctive in subclauses. His wording is ambiguous, I would say, as to whether he thinks that future and jussive should also be uses in subclauses, but in any case, these are certainly absent.

My reason to follow Krause in taking the uncertainty meaning as primary, and to derive the future from it, is that there is no overlap between uncertainty and future in subclauses, whereas future and uncertainty can be unified for main clauses. In other words, the subjunctive has no time reference at all in subclauses, and the difference between present and future tense is simply left unmarked. Some of the subclause types describe future events indeed, but they are presented as possible or uncertain, not as future. Other subclause types have clear present reference that is incompatible with future tense.

On the other hand, since future events are always less certain than present or past events, one possible inference about an event that is presented as uncertain is that it has not yet taken place. Indeed, very few main clause subjunctive types are incompatible with an uncertainty reading, and the flexible way in which the subjunctive can be combined with explicit markers of uncertainty further confirms this. However, it can hardly be overemphasised that uncertainty is not inherent in the main clause subjunctive, as there are many cases where uncertainty clearly is subordinate at most, and in the predictive future type it is even incompatible with it.

To summarise, the uncertainty meaning and the future meaning of the Tocharian subjunctive are evidently linked, but they cannot be subsumed under one unified meaning on the synchronic level: the subclause subjunctive is not a future and the main clause subjunctive does not denote uncertainty. At a seemingly shallow historical level, it is probably the future meaning that derives from that of uncertainty.

3.8.4 THE TOCHARIAN SUBJUNCTIVE AND ASPECT

There seems to be no special syntactic correlation between the Tocharian subjunctive and aspect. Even the present-subjunctive, a considerable category in Tocharian B, shows no systematic correspondence with aspect. It harbours a fair number of verbs with a durative Aktionsart, but next to many that are explicitly non-durative (especially among causative verbs, but also among non-causatives); worse, there are also many non-present-subjunctives with a durative Aktionsart. Thus, any correlation based on the Aktionsart of the present-subjunctive must be searched for by means of diachronic reconstruction – for a synchronic analysis the idea is simply untenable.

The present and subjunctive stems are rarely found in a simple contrast: mostly, they are in complementary distribution. If we take derived infinite forms, the infinitive shows no contrast between present and subjunctive stem because in Tocharian A it is formed from the present stem only, and in Tocharian B from the subjunctive stem only: there is no contrast between a present infinitive and a subjunctive infinitive. The same is true of the verbal noun, the present participle, the TB verbal adjective in *-mo*, and the privative. While most agent nouns are formed from the present stem, there is one formed from the subjunctive stem in Tocharian B, too. However, I have not been able to find any difference in usage between this subjunctive agent noun and the present agent nouns.

The only derived form where present and subjunctive stem are in contrast is the gerund: both languages exhibit a systematic contrast between a present and a subjunctive gerund. The meaning of these gerunds is clearly distinct, but in my view it does not have anything to do with aspect: the present gerund expresses necessity and the subjunctive gerund possibility. I do not mean to exclude that this difference can be explained from an earlier difference in aspect, but as such, it is clearly one of mood, which is completely in line with the difference in meaning between the present and subjunctive finite categories.

If we continue our indirect approach, we arrive at the contrast between imperfect and optative, which in Tocharian B is morphologically just a difference between the present stem for the imperfect and the subjunctive stem for the optative, and in Tocharian A a combined contrast between the present stem and past endings for the imperfect and the subjunctive stem and present endings for the optative. However, the meanings of the imperfect and the optative are difficult to compare because they differ in several different domains, the imperfect being an imperfective past tense and the optative a deontic mood, mostly with non-past reference. As the imperfect is never modal, it is probably best to compare it with the one function of the optative in past contexts: the iterative past.

In the iterative past, the past tense is expressed by the imperfect, which is the imperfective past tense used for background information and repeated events. If such an iterative imperfect clause has a subclause next to it, that subclause is in the optative. It is not completely evident how we should interpret the different contributions of imperfect and optative. Without doubt, the imperfect provides the past reference, as the optative is not otherwise used in past contexts. It also invites the iterative reading: first, it can be iterative without optative subclause, too, and second, it is the finite verb of the *main* clause. It seems that not much is left for the optative, apart from marking the subclause. If it should add any meaning of itself, it must be the indefinite or irrelevant number of events in the subclause. Although in this construction the imperfect clearly has imperfective aspect indeed, nobody will be able to maintain that the optative expresses the opposite, perfective aspect. It is just as iterative, and consequently as imperfective, as the imperfect, but contains an element of indefiniteness in addition.

The same contrast is found for the finite present and subjunctive themselves, but in this case without past reference. The distribution of functions is completely parallel: the iterative clause is expressed by the present, and therefore the present can be said to be imperfective. However, the preceding subjunctive subclause is in no way less imperfective, and it expresses, just like the optative, that the number of events is unknown or irrelevant.

As in other types of subclauses present and subjunctive are distributed according to parameters totally different from aspect, namely principally certainty and uncertainty, it makes no sense to look for evidence for a perfective use of the subjunctive there. However, there are some phenomena in main clauses that could in fact point to aspect.

The point of attack is of course the use of the present for future events: the clear default expression for future is the subjunctive and that for present is the present (the subjunctive is never used for the present tense in main clauses). If we exclude the “technical” future, i.e. events that are so close to the moment of speaking that a present can be used without any risk of ambiguity, there seem to remain two classes of exceptions: events at an undefined point in the future, and events stretching from the moment of speaking into the future. Both of these uses are compatible with imperfect aspect: in the first, beginning and end point are undefined because the whole event is undefined, and the second has no defined end point.

However, if we reverse the question and ask ourselves why the subjunctive is not used in those cases, the answer can hardly be given in terms of aspect, since the subjunctive is abundantly attested for events without clear beginning or end points. Rather, it seems to be just a matter of tense: events starting at the moment of speaking evidently have present reference as a part of their meaning, and of the undefined future it can also be said that it is just not expressed by the subjunctive because it is not a clear future.

Likewise, the contrast between inhibitive and preventive negative commands reminds of a difference in aspect (as found e.g. in Vedic, see Hoffmann 1967: e.g. 105), but it can also be explained otherwise. One could argue that the imperfective present is used for events that have already started (inhibitive), while the perfective subjunctive is used for events that still have to begin (preventive). However, a tense interpretation is at least as good: in a negative command with present reference (inhibitive) a present is used, whereas in a negative command with future reference (preventive) a subjunctive is used.

In conclusion, there is no evidence for a syntactic perfective use of the subjunctive. The present is often imperfective indeed, but the subjunctive is not its aspectual counterpart. In most uses, an aspectual difference is simply not there, and in the few cases where something with aspect seems to be going on, better explanations present themselves.

