‘Tocharian’ is the term commonly used to designate two closely related languages documented in texts from the middle and end of the first millennium AD discovered around the turn of the twentieth century and later in what is now Xinjiaáng. Native names of the languages have not survived, and the identification of the speakers of ‘Tocharian’ with the Tochari and Tökhari of Latin and Greek is far from certain.

There is indirect evidence that speakers of the two languages were present in the general area at least as early as the last pre-Christian centuries. There are clear indications that one of the languages, Tocharian B (Toch. B), also frequently called ‘West Tocharian’, was in actual use in the region of Turfan, Qarašahr, Šorčuq and Kuča. Tocharian A (Toch. A) texts have come to light only in the easternmost of these settlements; there is, though, no evidence that Tocharian A was more than a literary language even here.

Our sources are, often extremely fragmentary, texts of religious and learned content (for Tocharian A and Tocharian B) and monastery records, secular administrative documents, an occasional letter, and a fair number of graffiti (all Tocharian B only); texts of the first type are as a rule Tocharian adaptations of Indic originals, sometimes in the form of straightforward bilingual documents, more commonly translations and reformulations of Sanskrit texts which often are known directly or through translations into other languages of Buddhism.

The fact that so many of the texts had parallels elsewhere made it fairly easy to analyse texts of the first category and to reach insights into aspects of lexicon, grammar and semantics of Tocharian B and Tocharian A; the non-Tocharian subject matter of these texts made it, however, next to impossible to use them as a source of information about the Tocharians. Texts of the second type can contribute more in this respect; however, time and again details of the proper interpretation will still elude us.

It is reasonable to assume that the ancestors of the Tocharians migrated to their historical homelands at a fairly recent date. While it has of late become a popular notion to think that the Tocharians separated early from the main body of Indo-Europeans, there is no direct evidence to support such a conclusion (the arguments for an identification with archaeologically determinable cultures are almost necessarily largely circular). The earlier view that
the forebears of the Tocharians were part of the Indo-Europeans of Europe, a view based on linguistic criteria, derives additional support from the fact that the evidence of wall paintings proves that at least part of the upper strata of Tocharian society were of a European phenotype.

The two Tocharian languages differ too much from each other to be considered dialects of a single language. Such differences include: in Tocharian B, pre-final vowels other than \( *i \) were preserved; Common Tocharian (Toch.) diphthongs were retained; some Common Tocharian consonant developments were preserved better in Tocharian A. Nominal inflection was less thoroughly reshaped in Tocharian B than in Tocharian A; parts of the verbal system of Tocharian A, on the other hand, are more archaic in Tocharian A. While the lexicon shows much overlap between Tocharian B and Tocharian A, there are again major areas of disagreement – the fact that such divergence is found in particular in the area of central Buddhist terminology may reflect different Buddhist traditions that came to affect the two languages.

In spite of the disagreements just mentioned, the comparison of Tocharian B and Tocharian A, together with procedures of internal reconstruction applied to the data, makes it possible to arrive at a reasonably clear picture of an immediate antecedent of Tocharian B and Tocharian A, ‘Common Tocharian’. Common Tocharian may be said to have been characterized, inter alia, by the properties to be discussed in the following.

**Phonology**

Consonants belonged to two almost all-pervasive sets, a plain and a palatalized one. The system of short vowels resembled that of such languages as Greek or Latin (with a high central vowel \( *i \) added that reflected earlier \( *e \) i u). Vowel length apparently was phonemic in Common Tocharian; a thorough reshaping of the pattern occurred after the development of Tocharian B and Tocharian A. Only some of the old word-final consonants survived unchanged; clusters of initial and internal consonants were disrupted by inserted vowels more often than in other IE languages. The pattern of word accent as found underlyingly in Tocharian B can be taken to reflect that of Common Tocharian, which means that the PIE system of accent distribution did not survive into Common Tocharian.

**Morphology**

Nouns: number included singular, dual and plural. The declension was characterized by a two-tiered system: nominative, accusative and genitive (partly based on PIE dative forms) contrasted with ‘secondary cases’ consisting of combinations of accusative and postpositions. Nominal paradigm formation was often based on a two-stem principle, with stem one for the nominative singular and stem two for all other case forms. The three-gender system of PIE had been replaced by a new one consisting of masculine, feminine and alternating nouns.

Adjectives: number included again singular, dual and plural. The case
system had been reduced to the ‘primary’ cases, with accusative often selected instead of the genitive in complex nominal phrases. The forms showed traces of older adjectival inflection alongside the patterns transferred from the deictics. Feminine plural forms had in part been replaced by collective formations. Stem gradation prevailed, though in a form somewhat different from that found in other IE languages.

Deictics: these matched adjectives in having contrasting stems for masculines and non-masculines; likewise, the case system contained only primary cases. The neuter survived as a nominal form referring to entire clauses; as such, it could be used in both primary and secondary cases.

Personal pronouns: forms for singular, dual, and plural can be reconstructed, with separate stems for the singular. Both primary and secondary cases were formed.

Verbs: the parameters of person (first, second, third), number (singular, dual, plural), tense (non-past, past), aspect (durational, non-durational), mood (indicative/subjunctive, optative, imperative), diathesis (active, mediopassive) can safely be assumed to have been reflected in finite verb forms; of non-finite forms, participles, gerunds, infinitives, privatives can be ascribed to Common Tocharian in spite of some divergence between Tocharian B and Tocharian A in details of form.

Syntax
All statements about Tocharian syntax suffer from the fact that most of the Tocharian B and Tocharian A texts are translations. Nevertheless, some points are reasonably clear: the so-called ‘group inflection’ was a natural consequence of the fact that only accusative forms could be combined with postpositions. The evidence of prose texts suggests that a basic ‘word order’ SOV can be posited for Tocharian A and Tocharian B, which makes it possible to assume the same for Common Tocharian. As this basic order can be said to have been complemented by A + N, G + N, N + Postpos, a pervasive pattern Modifier + Head can be posited for Common Tocharian.

In the following, the general comments just made will be discussed in greater detail.

Phonology
Consonant Systems
The inventories of Tocharian B and Tocharian A can be said to have been:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Palatalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>č &lt;č&gt; [tʃ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c &lt;ts&gt; [ts]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
n  n  ǹ <n> [ɲ]
s  s  š <ʃ> [ʃ]?
r  
l  l' <l> [l]
w  y

Toch. B /y/ is both the palatalized counterpart of Toch B. /w/ and a plain consonant; in Tocharian A, there are no more than hints as to the existence of an earlier /w/. In Tocharian A, /s/ is the palatalized counterpart of both /c/ and /k/; in Tocharian B, only the latter pairing remained productive.

For Common Tocharian, the following system may be reconstructed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Palatalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>̆p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>ć</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>ć</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>̆s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kʷ</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>ní</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>̆s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>l'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>w ̆w [y]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PIE *p b bʰ yielded CToch. *p/p; PIE *t ḏʰ resulted in CToch. *t/ć; PIE *d became CToch. *c/ć, except that it was lost before continuant; PIE *k ̃g ̃gʰ and *kʷ g gʰ developed to CToch. *kʷ (in some environments *k) beside *š. PIE *m was reflected by CToch. *m/ń, PIE *n by CToch. ń/ń, PIE *r by CToch. *r, PIE *l by CToch. *l/l, PIE *w by CToch. *w/ onBindViewHolder[w], and PIE *y by CToch. *y. Reflexes of PIE aspirates apparently lost their aspiration preceding other aspirates.

Vowel Systems
The vowel systems of Tocharian B and Tocharian A differ:

Tocharian B  i  i  u
       e  o
       a

Tocharian A  i  i  u
       e  o
       a
       ĕ  ŏ
       ā
Toch. A e, o, ē, ō resulted from monophthongization of earlier *ai *au, *āi, *āu; it is hence possible to reconstruct a pre-Toch. A system as follows:

\[ \begin{align*}
i & \quad i \\
i & \quad u \\
\text{‘a’} & \\
\text{‘ā’} &
\end{align*} \]

The difference between pre-Toch. A *‘a’ and pre-Toch. A *‘ā’ probably was one of tongue height. Toch. A a corresponds very frequently to both Toch. B e and Toch. B o; it thus seems appropriate to reconstruct a short-vowel system of Common Tocharian identical with that of Tocharian B. For a partly parallel long-vowel system, the evidence is strongest for CToch. *ē deriving from both PIE *ē and PIE *ō; it seems probable that at least some instances of Toch. B <o> reflect a CToch. *ō.

While there was a great deal of interference with regular development through, for example, umlaut phenomena and pre-pausal changes, clear patterns nevertheless can be noted.

PIE *e yielded CToch. *i preceded by a palatalized consonant (in word-initial position, CToch. *y- developed). PIE *o is reflected by CToch. *e following a plain consonant. PIE *ē became CToch. *ē after palatalized consonant, while CToch. *ē after plain consonant was the reflex of PIE *ō. PIE *ā resulted in CToch. *ō, while PIE *a was retained as CToch. *a. Both PIE *i and PIE *u became CToch. *i. What are taken to be reflexes of PIE *i and PIE *u in other IE languages are to be reconstructed for CToch. as sequences of semivowels followed by *a or *i, depending on the nature of the PIE laryngeal that caused the lengthening of *i and *u. PIE *n m r l in syllable-peak position were reflected by CToch. *-iR- in non-initial position and by *ēR- initially.

**Laryngeals**

Questions remain as to the reflexes of laryngeals. PIE *h₁ definitely yielded CToch. *a in peak position (cf. Toch. B pācer ‘father’); the same seems to have been the case for PIE *h₂ (cf. Toch. A knānmām ‘knowing’). For PIE *h₂ the only strong case for a development to CToch. *a is the marker of the mediopassive present participle; but the neuter dual and the optative marker (both CToch. *yi < *-yE) provide powerful counterarguments.

**Suprasegmentals**

The place of the word accent can be determined in ‘Central’ and ‘Eastern’ Tocharian B texts on the basis of vowel alternations. On the phonemic level, no single general rule of accent distribution can be given; in terms of morphophonemics, however, a simple statement is possible: in all accented forms, the place of the accent was on the second syllable of a word. In the case of morphophonemically disyllabic forms, the accent was retracted to the first syllable. It can be assumed that the underlying
Tocharian B pattern can be projected back into Common Tocharian, which means that Common Tocharian accent deviated radically from that of late Proto-Indo-European.

The word accent of Tocharian A is as yet poorly understood; it seems that a leftward retraction occurred when this syllable contained a non-high vowel.

Even less is known about phrasal and clausal accentuation patterns. There is evidence indicating that monosyllabic verb forms, like various particles, lacked accent; whether this applied to polysyllabic finite verb forms too, cannot be said at this point.

Paradigmatic Morphology

Like other IE languages, Tocharian B and Tocharian A preserved, apart from relatively few synchronically unchangeable items, two major form classes, one with forms subject to case marking, the other, with person marking. Shifts in class membership were easily exacted; some of these shifts appear to have had unlimited productivity (e.g. participle or infinitive formation).

Nouns

Nouns are morphologically modified for number (singular, dual, plural) and case. Three genders (masculine, feminine, alternating) are found. Two major declension-based types can be distinguished, characterized by (a) nominative plural ≠ accusative plural; (b) nominative plural = accusative plural. In the singular, plural forms of type (b) are normally matched by forms identical for nominative and accusative; type (a) forms are commonly found beside singular forms differing for nominative and accusative, but in CToch. *-e-stems this is the case only if the noun denotes a human being.

In the singular, nominative and accusative forms of Tocharian B and Tocharian A are characterized by the absence of an overt ending (except where [+human] is signalled); in Tocharian A, this has led to an almost complete convergence of the two case forms, while in Tocharian B preserved stem alternation prevented a formal identity of nominative and accusative except in descendants of PIE *-o- masculines and of PIE neuters.

In the genitive singular, very few direct traces of PIE genitive forms survived; in kinship terms and proper names, the reflex of a PIE dative (Toch. B Toch. A -i) is found. Elsewhere, the case is marked by Toch. B -ntse, Toch. A -ys < CToch. *-nse.

The vocative singular, attested as a live category in Tocharian B, varies too much across declensional classes to permit generalizations. Nominative and accusative dual agree in form both in Tocharian B and Tocharian A.

In plurals of type (a) in Tocharian A, the accusative ending is always Toch. A -s, while in the nominative Toch. A -n̥ is found after stem-final vowel, Toch. A -i (with or without preceding palatalization) in consonant stems (except for Toch. A lāṁs 'kings', Toch. A pracre 'brother'). In Tocharian B, the accusative ending is Toch. B -m throughout. The nominative has a marker Toch. B -i in
Toch. B e-stems, an ending Toch. B -\( \tilde{n} \) in stems ending in other vowels, and an ending Toch. B -i (following a palatalized consonant) in consonant stems (an exception is Toch. B \( \tilde{l}\ddot{a}nc \) 'kings'). In plurals of type (b), the ending is always Toch. B -a (normally matched by zero in Toch. A); in addition, plural is marked by a stem change (cf. Toch. B \( \text{palsko} \), Toch. A \( \text{pälsäk} \) ‘thought’; Toch. B \( \text{pälskonta} \), Toch. A \( \text{pälskant} \) ‘thoughts’).

The genitive plural in Toch. B ends in Toch. B -ts or Toch. B -mts, the latter probably originally limited to nouns of type (a). In Tocharian A, the ending is Toch. A -\( \ddot{s}s \); in nouns of type (b), the ending of the genitive singular is found beside that of the plural (cf. Toch. A \( \text{Iwäkis} \); Toch. A \( \text{Iwässi} \) ‘of animals’). A Common Tocharian form can only be reconstructed if one assumes that Toch. B \( \text{lc} \text{lt}s \) and Toch. A \( -(s)s(i) \) both derived from underlying CToch. \*-c-.

The secondary cases in both Tocharian B and Tocharian A are based on forms of the accusative followed by postpositions (which in Tocharian A were fused with the noun to yield single word forms, while in Tocharian B univerbalization affected only the ablative and the rare causal). With the exception of the locative, there is no equivalence in the forms of Tocharian B and Tocharian A, as clearly shown by a listing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Tocharian B</th>
<th>Tocharian A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>-nem</td>
<td>-( s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. ('allative')</td>
<td>+( s )c</td>
<td>-ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. ('perlative')</td>
<td>+sa</td>
<td>-( \ddot{a} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>+ne</td>
<td>-am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com.</td>
<td>+mpa</td>
<td>-( a\ddot{s}s )l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>=( \ddot{n} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximative</td>
<td>+spe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discrepancies between Tocharian B and Tocharian A are to be explained by differing results of decomposition processes affecting sequences of Common Tocharian accusative forms of the singular or the plural followed by postpositions which were only in part identical in the two languages.

**Adjectives**

Plural forms of the adjective in Tocharian B are of type (a) (see p. 159) in the masculine, of type (b) in the feminine; in Tocharian A, the masculine has type (a) throughout, while in the feminine, depending on form class, both (a) and (b) occur. In the singular, again depending on class, formal identity or non-identity between nominative and accusative is found in both Tocharian B and Tocharian A. In the dual, these case forms never differ. A neuter form, identical for both cases, occurs only in the singular.

In all genders, the nominative singular is markerless in Tocharian B and Tocharian A. The accusative singular is characterized either by stem change
or the addition of a final nasal to the overt or underlying form of the nominative; in Toch. B, *-aN is reflected by Toch. B -ai. The genitive singular feminine ends in Toch. B -ai, Toch. A -e; that of the masculine in Toch. B -epi (-pi after vowel), Toch. A -yä-p/-äp, added to the stem of the accusative (without the nasal ending). A few genitive masculine forms ending in Toch. B -e (< PIE *-os) survived.

The nominative plural masculine shows a variation identical with that incurred in nouns: Toch. B -i is found in -e- stems, Toch. B -n in stems ending in other vowels, palatalization in consonant stems; an accusative is formed by the addition of a nasal to the stem. Corresponding endings of the nominative are Toch. A -e, Toch. A -n, palatalization, or Toch. A -i preceded by palatalization. For the accusative plural masculine, the basic ending is Toch. A -s which is often added not to the stem but to the form of the nominative; merging of paradigms has led to further irregularity.

The feminine singular is characterized by a gender-shifting suffix Toch. B -ya-, Toch. A -yä- common to all case forms. In the feminine plural, two conflicting patterns can be observed: either the stem of the singular is retained in the plural – as in all type (a) forms of Tocharian A and in some Tocharian B paradigms – or a masculine singular form (nominative or accusative) is used as a basis for a type (b) form. Dual forms are derived from either masculine (= neuter) or feminine stems; the assignment of specific forms to genders is, however, beset with difficulties.

Adjectival patterns of Tocharian B and Tocharian A have enough in common to permit the reconstruction of their Common Tocharian antecedents. Two types of declension have to be recognized – one in which the accusative singular masculine is characterized by the addition of a nasal ending, the other, by a change of stem over against the nominative. The second type shows a stronger influence of the inflection of deictics than the first one; the relative recency of this development is shown by the contrast of the accusative forms of ‘other’ found in Toch. A älamwāc: Toch. B ālyauce ‘each other’.

Deictics

The morphologically simplest type of deictic is found in Tocharian B; the nominative singular forms masculine Toch. B se, feminine Toch. B sā, neuter Toch. B te are close parallels to, for example, Gk ὁ ἡ τὸ. The second stem of the feminine (acc. Toch. B tā, pl. Toch. B toy) is likewise simple and highly archaic, except that the accusative singular form shows no trace of an underlying final nasal (neither does the accusative masculine singular, Toch. B ce). Among forms to be related to the simple stem of the neuter are Toch. B tanē /ti+nel/ ‘here, there’ and possibly Toch. B tsa ‘indeed’.

The same vocalism as in Toch. B tanē is found in the stems of the complex deictics Toch. B su, Toch. A säim (= Skt sas), Toch. B samp (= Skt asau), and
Table 6.1 Deictic pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>*sc / *si-</td>
<td>*sa</td>
<td>*te / *ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>*cē</td>
<td>*ta</td>
<td>*te / *ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>*cēpi</td>
<td>*tay</td>
<td>*tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>*cēy</td>
<td>*tōy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>*cēns</td>
<td>*tōns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Toch. A *sās* (= Skt *ayam*), while the forms signalling close deixis (Toch. B *sēm*, Toch. A *sām*) are derivable from the fuller base form. The modifying elements were added to complete forms of the simplex, not to a stem, and are therefore to be considered particles, not suffixes.

The genitive singular masculine deviates from other forms of the second stem in showing a vocalism Toch. B -i- rather than Toch. B -e- as in the adjective. The genitive singular neuter has a nominal rather than a pronominal ending.

Based on what seem to be the more archaic components of the Tocharian B system, the Common Tocharian simple deictic paradigm may be reconstructed as in Table 6.1.

In Tocharian B, the forms of the feminine plural seem to have been reassigned to different deictic paradigms once type-(b) inflection had become the rule in the feminine.

There is not enough evidence to reconstruct a subparadigm of the dual.

Palatalization in the second stem of the masculine is to be viewed as reflecting a generalization of *tē* of the accusative singular, in its turn reshaped after the accusative of personal pronouns (cf. Lat. *mē, tē*); feminine Toch. B *tā* does not continue PIE *tām*, but a form without a nasal, and thus shows an influence of the accusative singular masculine.

**Cardinals**

The Tocharian cardinals are characterized for gender (one to four in Toch. A, one, three to four in Toch. B), number (‘one’ only) and case. Major parts of the Common Tocharian inventory of terms for the lower numbers can be reconstructed (see also Chapter 2, p. 67):
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‘two’ masculine CToch. *wu (Toch. A wu), feminine CToch. *wey (Toch. A we, Toch. B wi)
‘five’ CToch. *pīnši (Toch. B pīš, Toch. A pān)
‘six’ CToch. *šīki (Toch. A šāk)
‘seven’ CToch. *šipti (Toch. A šāt)
‘eight’ CToch *okti (Toch. B okt, Toch. A okāt)
‘nine’ CToch *niwī (Toch. B Toch. A niu)
‘ten’ CToch. *čiki (Toch. B šāk, Toch. A šāk)

Of higher numerals, CToch. *kinte ‘100’ can safely be reconstructed on the basis of Toch. B kante, Toch. A kānt; Toch. B yaltse, Toch. A wālts can be derived from CToch. *wilce ‘1,000’.

While the ‘teens’ do not permit setting up a Common Tocharian prototype, the decades thirty to ninety can be fairly well reconstructed:

‘thirty’ CT *tiryaka (Toch. B tāryāka)
‘forty’ CT *śīwaraka (Toch. B śīwārka, Toch. A śwarāk)
‘fifty’ CT *pīnšaka (Toch. B pīšāka)
‘sixty’ CT *śīksa (Toch. B šīksa, Toch. A šīksāk)
‘seventy’ CT *šiptinka (Toch. B ŝuktanka, Toch. A šāptuk)
‘eighty’ CT *oktuka (Toch. A oktuk)
‘ninety’ CT *niwimka (Toch. B ņumka)


The ordinals show a term for ‘first’ independent of that for ‘one’ (Toch. B pārwesse, Toch. A maltow-inu); a CToch. *pirwe can be reconstructed from the Tocharian B word and Toch. A pārwat ‘first-born son’. Ordinals from ‘2nd’ through ‘6th’ contain a suffix CToch. *-te; so does Toch. B ikante ‘20th’. ‘7th’ through ‘9th’ have a suffix identifiable as CToch. *-nte. Ordinals based on decads have a complex suffix -nci in Tocharian A.

Personal Pronouns

These are commonly characterized for case and number in IE languages, with number distinction signalled by stem alternation. In addition, there tends to be a contrast not only in endings, but also in stems between nominative and non-nominative forms. Tocharian proves to be fairly conservative here; there is, however, a striking innovation to be noted: Tocharian A distinguished a masculine from a feminine first-person singular.

The following reconstruction can be proposed:
Singular

'I'  CToch. *n̥iši (Toch. B
n̥as)  'thou' CToch. *tiwe (Toch. B
tuwe, Toch. A tu)
'
me'  CToch. *n̥iši (Toch. B
n̥as)  'thee' CToch. *ciwe (Toch. B ci,
Toch. A cu)
'my'  CToch. *n̥i (Toch. B
Toch. A n̥i)  'thy' CToch. *tiu (Toch. B
tan, Toch. A tan)

Dual

'we, us'  CToch. *we-ne (Toch. B
we-ne)  'you' CToch. *ye-ne (Toch. B
ye-ne)
'
'our' ?  'your' ?

Plural

'we, us'  CToch. wes (Toch. B
wes, Toch. A was)  'you' CToch. *yesi (Toch. B
yes, Toch. A yas)
'
'our' ?  'your' ?

The masculine form Toch. A n̥as 'I, me' may reflect an old plural form while its feminine counterpart Toch. A n̥uk could derive from the singular. Only the forms of the second-person singular nominative and accusative have clear IE equivalents (cf. Skt tvam, Gk sé).

Verbs

The finite forms of the Tocharian verb signal morphologically the following properties:

number (singular, dual, plural)
person (first, second, third)
tense (non-past, past)
aspect (durational, non-durational; durational aspect was marked by suffixation if a verb stem was inherently non-durational – a primarily durational verb stem could not be shifted by affixation)
mood (indicative, optative, imperative; the so-called subjunctive is the non-past of the non-durational aspect)
voice (active, mediopassive – with special intransitive/passive subparadigms in some form classes)

(in)transitivity (marked in a number of form classes)

Non-finite forms are: participles (present active, present mediopassive, preterite), gerunds (of both aspects), infinitives (neutral as to voice, with special intransitive/passive forms attested for some verbs); abstract nouns are based on gerunds; a number of adjectival and nominal derivatives with limited productivity are to be noted.

In Tocharian B and Tocharian A, there was a highly developed system of
causatives derived from non-causatives – partly from basic stems, partly from complex ones (erroneously called Grundverben) which frequently were denominative formations. Both causatives and complex non-causatives were notably productive form classes.

Basic stems were either athematic or thematic formations. An athematic first (i.e. 'present') stem was matched by an athematic second ('subjunctive') stem. A thematic first stem had beside it a morphologically identical second stem. A basic athematic second stem (in Tocharian A frequently extended by a suffix -n-) formed a thematic present stem with a suffix Toch. B Toch. A -s- or Toch. B -sk- (Toch. A -s) depending on the place of the phonological accent; Toch. B Toch. A -n- or a change-over to thematic inflection in the first stem were further, less common, shift indicators.

Complex stems were usually characterized by a suffix Toch. B -a-, Toch. A -ä- (the latter subject to syncope) in the subjunctive stem. In the case of transitive verbs, present stems were derived by an insertion of a suffix -n- before Toch. B -a-, Toch. A -ä-. Intransitive complex verbs, on the other hand, had present-stem forms marked by either a suffix Toch. B -e-, Toch. A -a- or Toch. B -o-, Toch. A -a-.

In addition to the formations just enumerated, there were others with a more limited distribution, such as denominative verbs. Suppletion occurred both with a utilization of etymologically unrelated stems and with stems which, though related, disrupted normal paradigmatic patterns.

The affixes used in Tocharian B and Tocharian A paradigms permit in many cases a reconstruction of Common Tocharian antecedents by mere comparison; frequently, however, discrepancies occur which call for the assumption of either innovations in one or both languages, or of the coexistence of competing forms in Common Tocharian; a decision will usually depend on evidence from outside Tocharian. Thus, the forms of the present participle of the mediopassive (Toch. B -mane, Toch. A -mäm) permit the reconstruction of CToch. *-mane, and a prefix *pi- can safely be posited for the Common Tocharian imperative. Tocharian A and Tocharian B differ in the formation of the present participle of the active (Toch. A -ant, Toch. B -eńca); here Tocharian B can be identified as the innovating language so that CToch. *-enta can be reconstructed. The infinitive in Toch. B Toch. A -tsi is derived from the subjunctive stem in Tocharian B, from the present stem in Tocharian A: here no decision as to the state of affairs in Common Tocharian seems possible. On the other hand, if several non-past forms in Tocharian B appear to be based on forms with PIE secondary endings, while Tocharian A shows descendents of primary ones, it becomes possible to assume that reflexes of both primary and secondary endings survived until Common Tocharian times.

The patterns of stem formation throughout the various paradigms may be illustrated by a few examples:
Unextended forms, athematic

Unextended forms, thematic

Basically non-durational verbs, with athematic subjunctive

Extended forms

Causatives based on unextended stems


Causatives based on extended stems


At least partial agreement is also found in non-finite forms: the active present participle ended in Toch. B -eñca, Toch. A -ant; its mediopassive counterpart was Toch. B -mane, Toch. A -mâm; the past participle, Toch. B

Table 6.2 Endings of finite forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Tocharian B</th>
<th>Tocharian A</th>
<th>Mediopassive Tocharian B</th>
<th>Tocharian A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sg.</td>
<td>-u/-w</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sg.</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-tar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 sg.</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-tär</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pl.</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-mäs</td>
<td>-mtär</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pl.</td>
<td>-cer</td>
<td>-c</td>
<td>-tär</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pl.</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-y(ñc)</td>
<td>-ntär</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 dual</td>
<td>-tem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sg.</td>
<td>-wa</td>
<td>-ä/-wä</td>
<td>-mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sg.</td>
<td>-sta</td>
<td>-st</td>
<td>-tai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 sg.</td>
<td>-sa/-a</td>
<td>-sâ/-äs-</td>
<td>-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pl.</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-mäs</td>
<td>-mite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pl.</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pl.</td>
<td>-r/-re</td>
<td>-r</td>
<td>-nte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 dual</td>
<td>-ys</td>
<td>*-ynas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Toch. A -u, with or without reduplication depending on form class. The gerund was formed in Toch. B -lle, Toch. A -l, both derivable from PIE *-lyo-; the gerund-based abstract ended in Toch. B -lläñe (-lñe), Toch. A -lune. The infinitive had the suffix -tsi in Toch. B and Toch. A. The privative had a complex suffix -tte in Toch. B, while its counterpart Toch. A -t may reflect simple PIE -to-. A semi-productive adjectival formation based on PIE *-mön- is found in forms with Toch. B -mo, Toch. A -m. Several classes of deverbative nouns with severely limited productivity can be reconstructed for Common Tocharian from Tocharian B and Tocharian A data.

A brief survey such as that offered here can give no more than a partial picture of Tocharian and of aspects of its prehistory. Still, even the limited information should have made it clear that Tocharian A and Tocharian B, just as other IE languages, present evidence for both innovations and retentions, which means that Tocharian can contribute important insights for a reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European.

Note: This view has been revised in winter 1997.
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