

## Suspended affixation with Tocharian adjectival suffix A *-ši* / B *-ṣṣe* and its possible parallel in Old Uighur

In this paper, I discuss a hitherto undescribed property of the Tocharian adjectival suffixes (most commonly A *-ši* / B *-ṣṣe*, more rarely also *-tstse* and *-ññe*) to be shared by conjuncts. I will attempt to prove that such constructions are based on coordinated nouns and not on *dvandva*-type compounds, and compare Tocharian data with the situation in the areally close Old Uighur. If my assumption is correct, suspended affixation is possible not only with inflectional morphemes of secondary cases, but also with derivational ones, although the latter phenomenon is less widely spread in Tocharian.

Keywords: group derivation, suspended affixation, Tocharian adjectival suffixes, Old Uighur language, areal contacts

### Introduction

The Tocharian adjectival suffix A *-ši* / B *-ṣṣe* is well known for its agglutinative properties. As pointed out in previous works, it is usually added not to the stem, but to the oblique (= accusative)<sup>1</sup> form of a word, which can be Obl.Sg. as well as Obl.Pl. or Obl.Du. (Sieg, Siegling, Schulze 1931: 23; Krause, Thomas 1960: 144; Pinault 1992: 101; Zimmer 1982/83: 278; Adams 2009: 302). Cf. B *kleśaṣṣe* and *kleśanmaṣṣe* from *kleś* Nom.-Acc.Sg., *kleśanma* Nom.-Acc.Pl. “affliction”; *asaṃkhyaiṣṣe* and *asaṃkhyaintaṣṣe* from Nom.-Acc.Sg. *asaṃkhyai*, Nom.-Acc.Pl. *asaṃkhyainta* “incalculably long period of time”; *ekaṣṣe* and *eśneṣṣe* from Nom.-Acc.Sg. *ek*, Nom.-Acc.Dual. *eśane* “eye”. In this regard A *-ši* / B *-ṣṣe* behaves similarly to secondary case suffixes which also require Obl.

Another remarkable property of A *-ši* / B *-ṣṣe* is the adjectivization of modified nouns (Adams 2009: 304–305), cf.:

*larenämpa*      *śinmalñe-ṣṣe*    *palskalñe* (B 511 a3)  
dear:Pl.m:Comit    coming-Adj    thought<sup>2</sup>  
“The idea of coming together with the dear ones”.

*wrocy*      *akālkāntse*      *knelñe-ṣṣe*      *tsārwo* (B 591 a6)  
big:Acc.Sg.m    wish:Gen.Sg    fulfillment-Adj    joy  
“The joy of the fulfillment of a big wish”.

Already in the edition of Tocharian A texts (Sieg, Siegling 1921) A *-ši* is consequently transliterated separately. According to Zimmer (1982/83: 277), the first editors of Tocharian manuscripts would treat this formant as an enclitical word expressing “grammatical relations of manyfold kind”.

<sup>1</sup> The Tocharian accusative is traditionally called oblique because it serves as the basis for secondary case forms (Pinault 2008: 462; Krause, Thomas 1960: 78).

<sup>2</sup> Here and below only glosses for marked grammatical meanings are indicated. The coinciding Nom-Acc. is unmarked and thus not glossed, e.g. Nom-Acc.Pl.f is glossed as Pl.f.

Indeed, this suffix does not provide any special meaning, and, as noticed in Hajnal 2004: 139, the use of A *-ši* / B *-šše* adjectives generally corresponds to the use of genitive in most other Indo-European languages.

Along with the peculiarities mentioned above, the suffix A *-ši*, B *-šše* has one more agglutinative feature which has not yet been specially described: namely, it can adjectivize coordinated nouns. In such constructions – rather marginal in Tocharian A and quite well presented in Tocharian B – the adjectival suffix behaves similarly to secondary case affixes in that it links only the last word in a chain of conjuncts. Cf. the following Tocharian B examples of adjectivization with *-šše* and examples of suspended affixation<sup>3</sup> with the perlative suffix *-sa* for one and the same pair of words:

- (1) *kest yokai-šše läkle* (B 284 a2)  
 hunger thirst:Acc.Sg-Adj suffering  
 “The suffering of hunger and thirst”  
 vs. *kest yokai-sa* (B 286 b3)  
 hunger thirst:Acc.Sg-Perl  
 “Because of hunger and thirst”
- (2) *sklok pr(o)sk(ai-šše or)k(a)mñe* (PK AS 17K a1)  
 doubt fear:Acc.Sg-Adj darkness  
 “The darkness of doubt and fear”.  
 vs. *sklok proskai-sa* (B 409 a1)  
 doubt fear:Acc.Sg-Perl  
 “Because of doubt and fear”

The problem with the treatment of such constructions is the ambiguity whether adjectivized words comprise a syntagm or a dvandva compound. Namely, hendiadyses are highly frequent in Tocharian literary texts, and if the Nom. and Acc. forms of non-final elements in such expressions coincide, i.e. coordination of non-final elements with the oblique of the final element is not explicitly marked, it is impossible to define their syntactic status – as it is for the words *kest* and *sklok* in the examples cited above.

However, along with the cases where dvandvas and conjuncts are indistinguishable, at least Tocharian B has examples of adjectivization with *-šše* which can be treated as cases of suspended affixation due to some morphosyntactic characteristics. These cases will be treated further in detail (Section 2.1), as well as the few found examples from Tocharian A (Section 2.2). I will also try to find out whether this derivational model is possible with two other very productive Tocharian B suffixes *-tstse* and *-ññe* (Section 3). After that I will attempt to find typological and areal parallels to such constructions in some other languages, first of all in Old Uighur (Section 4). All sources for used translations will be indicated unless they are specifically proposed by the author.

### 1. A *-ši* / B *-šše* from the diachronic point of view

The exact origin of A *-ši* / B *-šše* is unknown. Traditionally two reconstructions have been proposed: *\*-syo* ~ *\*siyo* (Ringe 1996: 117; Hajnal 2004: 140) or *\*-skyo-* (Van Windekens 1979: 133). However, both PIE morphemes would formally coincide in Tocharian after palatalization.

<sup>3</sup> The term 'suspended affixation' has been introduced in Lewis 1967: 35 for cases “when one grammatical ending serves two or more parallel words” and thus describes group inflection in coordination.

As already noticed in the introduction, synchronically this suffix seems to join the Obl. form of the word which replicates the use of Tocharian secondary case suffixes. However, the statement about A *-ši* / B *-ṣṣe* being added to the oblique (=Acc.) case is hardly applicable to Tocharian A where Nom.Sg. and Acc.Sg forms are usually indistinguishable, and not completely true for Tocharian B where, although rarely, *-ṣṣe* can be found added to the thematic vowel of the oblique stem, cf. *witsakaṣṣe* (in B 530 a2) < Nom.Sg. *witsako*, Acc.Sg. *witsakai*, Acc.Pl *witsakaṃ* “root” (i.e. not *\*witsakaiṣṣe* or *\*witsakaṃṣe*). Thus, it would be probably more appropriate to say that A *-ši* / B *-ṣṣe* is added to the oblique stem, which mostly coincides with the oblique case.

As shown in Hajnal 2004: 141–143, this must have been the exact situation in diachronic perspective: the suffix A *-ši* / B *-ṣṣe* was originally added to the stem and not to the oblique case form, but a formal identity of some stem types (PIE *u-*, *o-* and occlusive stems) and Obl.Sg. in the common Tocharian period resulted in a reinterpretation of the whole derivational model of A *-ši* / B *-ṣṣe*.

At any rate, cases such as *witsakaṣṣe* are relatively isolated, while the enumerated agglutinative features can be observed throughout the whole relative chronology<sup>4</sup> of Tocharian B manuscripts (there has been no special dating of linguistic stages of Tocharian A texts for now).

## 2. Adjectivization of conjuncts by means of A *-ši* / B *-ṣṣe*

### 2.1. Situation in Tocharian B

Word sequences that underlie adjectives ending in B *-ṣṣe* can be regarded as coordinated nouns due to the following reasons.

1. While the form to which the suffix *-ṣṣe* is directly added may be a stem without inflexion (cf. *witsakaṣṣe* mentioned above), the non-final forms which *-ṣṣe* also refers to represent a morphological word. This word is always an Obl. if distinguishable from Nom.:

- (3) *kektseñ reki pälsko-ṣṣe āstreṃ (warṣälñe)* PK AS 7L a2  
 body:Acc.Sg word mind-Adj pure:Acc.Sg.m exercise  
 “(Basis for) a pure exercise of body, word, [and] mind” (CEToM).
- (4) *atiyai pisäl melte ora-ṣṣe puwar* (B 194 b1)  
 grass:Acc.Sg chaff dung wood-Adj fire  
 “A fire of grass, chaff, dung and wood” (Adams 2013: 9).
- (5) *pätär mätär säsuwer-ṣṣe lareṣṣana ñemna* (B 266 a2–3)  
 father:Acc.Sg mother:Acc.Sg son\*-Adj dear:Pl.f name:Pl  
 “The dear names of father, mother, children”<sup>5</sup> (Adams 2013: 595).

(The adjective *säsuwerṣṣe* “pertaining to a son” is based on the independently unattested form *säsuwer*. The latter corresponds morphologically to the verbal noun in *-r* (whose Nom.Sg. and Acc.Sg coincide) from an unattested PpT *\*säsu* “born (?)”, cf. Winter 1985: 260–261).

<sup>4</sup> See Peyrot 2008.

<sup>5</sup> Remarkably, the suffix *-ṣṣe* in *säsuwerṣṣe* is not coordinated with Nom.Pl.f *ñemna* “names” (i.e. Nom.-Acc.Sg. *säsuwerṣṣe* and not Nom.-Acc.Pl.f *\*säsuwerṣṣana*, cf. the following adjective *lareṣṣana* with the same suffix). The probable explanation is that the three attributives *pätär(ṣṣe)*, *mätär(ṣṣe)* and *säsuwerṣṣe* refer logically not to one and the same multitude of “nouns” expressed with the plural *ñemna*, but each corresponds to just one of the components of this multitude (“father’s name, mother’s name and son’s name”).

2. Adjectivized chains of words can demonstrate either single use of the suffix *-ṣṣe* that is joined only to the final element, or its repetition after each word. Therein as well, the suffix *-ṣṣe* behaves similarly to the secondary case affixes, for which suspended affixation is optional. Cf. the example (3) mentioned earlier, B 7 a8 and B 386 b3:

- (6) *kektseñ reki-ṣṣana krenta : ///* (B 7 a8)  
body:Acc.Sg word-Adj:Pl.f good:Acc.Pl.f  
“The good (deeds) in (mind), body and words” (CEToM).
- (7) *kektseñä-ṣṣe (re)k(i)-ṣṣe se śīl westrä • ///* (B 386 b3)  
body:Acc.Sg-Adj word-Adj this moral behavior speak:Mid.3s.Prs  
“This moral behavior of body and word is spoken of” (Adams 2013: 634).

Another case of variative repetition of *-ṣṣe* is found in the following examples with the enumeration of the beings of different rebirths (Nom-Acc.Sg. *nrai* “hell (beings)”, Nom-Acc.Pl. *lwāsa* “animals” and Acc.Pl. *preteṃ* “preta ghosts”) quite frequent in Tocharian and other Buddhist texts from East Turkestan:

- (8) *ñākcīyana śāmñāna rūpanma sātkasamai*  
divine:Pl.f human:Pl.f form:Pl pervade:Mid.1s.Pt  
*taisa nrai lwāsa prete-ṣṣana •* (IOL 4 b5)  
thus hell animal:Pl ghost-Adj:Pl.f  
“I have pervaded divine and human forms ..., thus [also] hell, animal and preta [forms]” (CEToM).
- (9) */// po wešeññai ñākcyai śāmñai nrai lwasā-ṣṣai*  
all voice:Acc.Sg divine:Acc.Sg.f human:Acc.Sg.f hell animal:Pl-Adj:Acc.Sg.f  
*preteṃ-ṣṣai : (PK AS 13C b7)*  
ghost:Acc.Pl-Adj:Sg.f  
“Every voice, divine [or] human, [or of] animals, [or of] hell [or of] pretas” (CEToM).
- (10) *nrai(-ṣṣe lwā-ṣṣe) preteṃ-ṣṣe tnek nai kṣanti kälale* (B 554 b5-b6)  
hell-Adj animal-Adj ghost:Acc.Pl-Adj here Emp forgiveness achieve:Ger  
“For hellish [being], animal or preta, only here [is] forgiveness achievable” (Adams 2013: 295). It should be however noticed here that the suffix is a conjecture for two first adjectives in this example.

A parallel to these adjectives is provided by the examples with variative repetition of the secondary case Loc. B *-ne*:

- (11) *nrai lwāsa śle prete(n-ne nekä)t lakle*  
hell animal:Pl and ghost:Acc.Pl-Loc destroy:2s.Sbj suffering  
*eṃṣketstse : 2 ||* (PK AS 17A b4–5)  
completely  
“You will completely destroy sorrow among the hell-[beings], the animals and the pretas” (CEToM).
- (12) *nrai-ne läklenta preteṃ-ne śle lwāsā-ne : (B 284 b3)*  
hell-Loc suffering:Pl ghost:Acc.Pl-Loc and animal:Pl-Loc  
“The sufferings among hellish (beings), pretas and animals”.

3. The adjectivized chains of conjuncts can vary in length, e.g. the following cases with the enumeration of the concepts *kleś yāmor vastu* (Skt. *kleśa karma vastu*) “affliction, deed, basis”:

(13) *kleś yāmor vastu-ṣṣe* /// (B 174 a5)  
affliction deed basis-Adj

(14) *kleś yāmor-ṣ(ṣ)e ṅare* (B 286 a5-a6)  
affliction deed-Adj thread  
“Thread of affliction and deed”.

(15) *yāmor-ṣṣe vastu-ṣṣe menā(k-sa)* (B 174 b1)  
deed-Adj basis-Adj example-Perl  
“Through the example of deed and matter”.

Also, with the already mentioned expression *kektseñe reki pälsko*\*<sup>6</sup> “body, word (and) mind”:

*kektseñ reki pälskoṣṣe* (PK AS 7L a2) and *kektseñ rekiṣṣana* (B 7 a8)  
(from the examples 3 and 6)

(16) *kāyacittāvasthāviṣṣata • kektseñ pälsko-ṣṣai avastha-ṣṣai wāki-meṃ* (B 197 b3)  
body:Acc.Sg mind-Adj:Acc.Sg.f state-Adj:Acc.Sg.f difference:Abl  
“Skt. From the difference of the condition of body and mind”.

4. As it was already shown in some examples above, the suffix -*ṣṣe* can be shared by three (examples 3, 5, 8, 13) or more (four in example 4) nouns. In this regard, one of the most interesting examples is PK AS 2A a3–5 with a Sanskrit parallel in the preceding line of the same manuscript:

(17) ||(*e*)*raṅḍabilvā bṛhatidvayaṃṅica mātuluṅga : pāṣāṅabhi tṛkaṭu mūlakṛtakaṣāya :*  
*hirant • pīlamāti • wi praha(ti)nta • mā(tu)l(uṅk pāṣā)ṅa(bhit) • klyotaiṣṣana witsaka-ṣṣe*  
*kaṣāy* (PK AS 2A a3–5)

“A decoction consisting of ricinus, of the heart of the fruit of Aegle marmelos, of two Solanum indicum, of citron, of (Coleus) aromaticus [and] roots of Tribulus terrestris” (CEToM).

The enumeration of six names of medical ingredients gets one common suffix -*ṣṣe*, although the latter has no morphological correspondence in the Sanskrit version (functionally it renders the PPt *kṛta*). In this example, not only the length of the chain of conjuncts is remarkable, but also the fact that two of these conjuncts (*wi praha(ti)nta* “two Solanum indicum” and *klyotaiṣṣana witsaka<ṃ>* “roots of Tribulus terrestris”) are modified noun phrases, with a cardinal number (*wi* “two”) and an adjective (also in -*ṣṣe*) as modifiers respectively.

This Tocharian B example is unique, but, in my opinion, it shows especially convincingly that constructions with the derivational suffix -*ṣṣe* should be treated as syntactic ones.

5. Although -*ṣṣe* is usually added to nouns, some rare examples can be found in which it is shared by two homogenous gerundives<sup>7</sup> (examples 18–19). Thus, the discussed affixation model seems to be quite productive in Tocharian and cannot be reduced to derivation from lexicalized expressions.

(18) *anāṣṣälle satāṣṣälle-ṣṣe ime*<sup>8</sup>  
inhale:Ger exhale:Ger-Adj idea  
“The idea of how to inhale and to exhale”.

<sup>6</sup> The expression *kektseñe reki pälsko*\* is attested only in oblique forms *kektseñ reki pälsko-*.

<sup>7</sup> Tocharian verbal adjectives in -*lle* with the meaning of necessity or possibility of some action.

<sup>8</sup> BHS *prāṅāpānasmṛti* (Thomas, 1972: 443, footnote 5).

- (19) /// *lle päkšalle-šše nräi-ššemts lakle* : /// (B 150 a6)  
 X:Ger cook:Ger-Adj hell-Adj:Gen.Pl. suffering  
 “The (roasting?) and cooking suffering of the hellish (beings)”.

### 2.1.1. Some ambiguous cases

Along with the already given examples 1–2, there are some more cases where non-final conjuncts demonstrate no coordination markers (Nom=Acc), making the interpretation of such constructions ambiguous. These are the following cases:

- (20) *kā(madhātu) rūpadhātu-ššana klešanma* (PK AS 16.3 a1)  
 sphere\_of\_desire sphere\_of\_form-Adj:Pl.f affliction:Pl  
 “Afflictions of the realm of desire and of the realm of form”.
- (21) *ašiš mañkāl-šana rekau(na)* (PK AS 17K a4)  
 greeting blessing-Adj:Pl.f word:Pl  
 “Words of greeting [and] blessing”<sup>9</sup>.
- (22) *kewye kuñcītā-šše pelaikne-šše šūke* (B 27 a8)  
 butter sesame-Adj law-Adj taste  
 “The butter (and) sesame taste of the law” (CEToM).
- (23) *tagaram palāšapatreṇa • tagar palāšā-šše pilta-sa •* (B 308 b5)  
 “Skt. With the leaf of *tagara* and *palāśā*”.
- (24) *asaṃkhyai-nta kalpa-nma-ššai lālyīs= aškār mā maukaṃ* (B 591b6)  
 asaṃkhyeya-Pl kalpa-Pl-Adj:Acc.Sg.f effort:Perl back Neg desist:3s.Sbj  
 “(Who) does not desist because of the effort of *asaṃkhyeyas* and *kalpas*”<sup>10</sup>.

Differently from the hendiadyses like *sklok prosko* “doubt and fear” (example 2) or *ašiš mañkāl* “greeting and blessing” (example 21) where the words are semantically close and may easily build compounds, the pairs like *kewye kuñcīt* “butter and sesame” or *tagar palāś* (Sanskrit names of two different plants) (examples 22 and 23) have no other attestations and cannot be recognized as collocations.

Overall, around 20 examples of the suffix *-šše* adjectivizing conjuncts have been found in Tocharian B. All of them are quite equally distributed between archaic, classical and late manuscripts and are possible in prose as well as in poetry.

### 2.2. Situation in Tocharian A

As already mentioned in the introduction, the examples of this derivational model are marginal in Tocharian A. There are two occurrences of the adjective *pācar mācarši* “pertaining to father and mother”:

<sup>9</sup> Cf. further the Tocharian A example 28.

<sup>10</sup> This line is translated in Peyrot 2013: 675 as “... who does not turn back from the effort for countless ages”; however, the rendering of *asaṃkhyainta kalpanma* as “countless ages” is, in my opinion, not very precise, because literally these are two nouns in Nom-Acc.Pl (with the noun plural suffixes *-nta* and *-nma* respectively), so the Nom-Acc.Pl. form *asaṃkhyainta* could hardly serve as an attribute for Nom-Acc.Pl. *kalpanma*.

- (25) *pācar mācar-šiṃ kāpñiune pukaṃ tampewāts wrasaśsi* (YQ II.3 b5)  
 “The love for father and mother (is) the strongest (sentiment) among the beings”  
 (Ji, Winter, Pinault 1998: 79).
- (26) *sām pācar mācar-ši wci märkampal-ši* (A 291 a2)  
 “(Two bodies of the Buddha) The one (stems) from father and mother, the second from the Law” (CEToM).

However, Adams (2015: 183) treats Nom-Acc *pācar mācar* “father (and) mother” as a compound with the meaning “parents”. Indeed, this expression is highly frequent in the languages of the world in general (cf. Wälchli 2005: 3–5) and in the languages of East Turkestan in particular (cf. Rastorgueva 1981: 445), so that the syntactic status of this hendiadys is at least disputable, and the adjective can be translated simply as “parental”.

The next pair of words *ásiṣ mañkal* “greeting and blessing”, already seen in Tocharian B (example 21), can be used in Tocharian A with a common plural suffix *-ntu* (*ásiṣ mañgalntu* in A 63 a5) which also does not support the assumption about a syntactic relation between the two words:

- (27) *ásiṣ mañkalšinās rakentuyo* (A 16 a6)  
 “With words of blessing and good luck” (CEToM).

There is, however, one example which quite convincingly shows that the Tocharian A suffix *-ši* also refers to conjuncts: it is shared by two abstract nouns derived by means of the very productive suffix *-une* / *-one* from the adjectives *kāwālte* “beautiful” and *ciñcār* “tender”:

- (28) *kus ne ārkisōṣṣaṃ k(ā)wāltune ciñcronesi wākā(m) ṣ[e](ṣ)* (A 175+178+THT 2968 fgm. g a5)<sup>11</sup>  
 “Who was the paragon of beauty and tenderness in the world”.

Cf. the use of the same words *kāwāltune* “beauty” and *ciñcrone* “tenderness” in the following line: *ote tāpreṃ kāwāltun[e] ote tāpreṃ ciñcro[ne]* “Ah, such a beauty, ah, such a tenderness!” (A 186+1143+202 b4)<sup>12</sup>.

### 3. Tocharian B suffixes *-tstse* and *-ññe*

#### 3.1. *-tstse*

Along with *-šše*, there are two other particularly productive adjectival suffixes in Tocharian B, namely the suffixes *-tstse* and *-ññe*<sup>13</sup>. To our knowledge, the ability of these suffixes to adjectivize syntactic groups has not yet been specially described, although at least examples for *-tstse* referring to subordinated noun phrases are well attested, e.g. *kārtse yāmor-cepi* Gen.Sg. < *kārtse yāmor-tstse*\* “having deeds of welfare (=virtuous)” in B 121 a2 or *orotstse cimpamñe-cci* Nom.-Acc.Pl. < *orotstse cāmpamñe-tstse*\* “having great capabilities” in B 506 a3. Noticeably, the suffix *-tstse* does not require an Obl form from the adjective Nom.Sg. *orotstse* (\**orocce cimpamñe-cci*), which would be the case with *-šše*, cf. *läksaññai klautsai-šše ṣpel* “fish ear (i.e. gill) pellet” (*läksaññai klautsai* Acc.Sg.f < *läksaññe klautso* “fish ear”) in PK AS 3b B2.

Moreover, *-tstse* adjectivizes prepositional phrases, such as *śle krake-tse* from *śle krake* “with dirt (=dirty)” (PK NS 54 b4) or *snai yparwe-ccē* Acc.Sg. < *snai yparwe-tstse* from *snai yparwe* “end-

<sup>11</sup> Join according to Itkin (in print).

<sup>12</sup> Join according to Ilya B. Itkin (personal communication).

<sup>13</sup> See more on their use and semantics in Krause, Thomas 1960: 146–147.

less (lit. “without beginning”)) (IOL Toch 5 b6). In Tocharian, prepositional phrases like *śle krake* and *snai yparwe* are usually lexicalized and function both as nouns and as adjectives. It is thus possible that their semantically excessing adjectivization with *-tstse* serves to distinguish between nominal and attributive functions of such constructions.

We have found only one example of *-tstse* possibly referring to a coordinated group; this example also belongs to the adjectives derived from prepositional phrases (preposition *snai* “without”):

- (29) • *asaṅgam anapragraham* • *snai trenkāl snai krämpālyñetse* (B 251 b2)  
 “Skt. Without attachment (to the world), without distraction”.

However, the interpretation “Without attachment (to the world), having no distraction”, i.e. with *-tstse* referring only to the second prepositional phrase, is plausible as well.

It should be noticed that the suffix *-tstse* can be added to verb stems, e.g. *prekṣātstse* < *pärk-* “ask” (B 331 b1), *kautātstse* < *kaut-* “destroy” (THT 1681 a5), *tsakātstse* < *tsāk-* “sting, bite” (B 88 a3–4), *rīnātstse* < *rīn-* “renounce” (B 245 a4), *anaiwatstse* < *aiw-* “turn” with the negative prefix *\*e(n)-* (B 5 a5–6)<sup>14</sup>. It is probably the ability of *-tstse* to link syntactically non-independent verbal stems which explains its low productivity in the discussed derivational model: perception of the suffix *-tstse* by Tocharian speakers to be more “bound” within a word could impose a restriction on wide-scope affixation with conjuncts. On the contrary, the suffix *-ṣṣe* never occurs with verbal stems.

### 3.2. *-ññe*

Cases of group derivation by means of the suffix *-ññe* are exceedingly rare. As for subordinated groups, it occurs in the adjective *śwālyai paiyye-ññe* from *śwālyai paiyye* “right foot” (the adjective *śwālyai* is indeclinable).

Another possible example is PK NS 32 a4-a5, although the word *aiṣṣeñcaññe* (from agent noun *aiṣṣeñca* “one who gives”) is treated in CEToM as an abstract noun “giving” derived with the identical nominalizing suffix *-ññe*:

- (30) *ambari lānte pontamts aiṣṣeñca-ññe kärtse-ṣṣe*  
 Ambara king:Gen.Sg all:Gen.Pl giving-Der virtue-Adj  
*ñem-kālywe klyauṣāte* (PK NS 32 a4–5)  
 fame hear:Mid.3s.Pt

“The king Ambara was heard of, [namely] the goodness based on the giving of everything” (CEToM).

In my opinion, *pontamts aiṣṣeñca-ññe* can be understood as an adjective derived from the phrase *pontamts aiṣṣeñca* “giving to all” (*pontamts* Gen.Pl. “all”, *aiṣṣeñca* “giving”). This adjective is an attribute for *kärtse* “virtue” which is in turn the basis for the adjective in *-ṣṣe* that modifies the dvandva *ñem-kālywe* “fame”. The structure of all these nested noun phrases can be schematized as follows: [[*ambari lānte [pontamts aiṣṣeñca]-ññe kärtse*]-ṣṣe *ñem-kālywe klyauṣāte*] “The fame of King Ambara’s virtue of giving to all was heard”.

Adjectivization of coordinated groups with the suffix *-ññe* can be found just in one example where it refers to three words *yasa ñkante wrāko\** “gold, silver, pearl”:

<sup>13</sup> See in Adams 2013: 14.



- (31) *şaḍvarginta yasa ñkante wrāka-ññeṃ wmera makci priyeṃ* (PK AS 18A a2)  
*şaḍvargi:Pl gold silver pearl-Adj:Acc.Pl jewel:Pl Refl wear:3pl.Ipf*  
 “The *şaḍvargi*-monks wore by themselves jewels of gold, silver and pearls”.

Again, it is remarkable that *-ññe* is added to the oblique stem *wraka-* (Nom. *wrako*, Obl. *wrakai* “shell, pearl”) while the non-final conjuncts Nom-Acc *yasa* “gold” and Nom-Acc *ñkante* “silver” are morphological words (cf. the same for example 5). An interesting parallel is found in B 109 a4 where each of the same material names is adjectivized with its own suffix: *ysāşşe* with *-şşe* from Nom.-Acc.Sg. *yasa*, *ñ(i)kañce* with stem-final palatalization and the suffix *-e* from Nom.-Acc.Sg. *ñkante*, *wrākaññe* with the suffix *-ññe* from Nom.Sg *wrāko\**, Acc.Sg. *wrakai*, cf.:

- (32) *ysāşşeṃ ñikañceṃ wmera wrākaññeṃ* (B 109 a4)  
*gold:Adj:Acc.Pl silver:Adj:Acc.Pl jewel:Pl pearl:Adj:Acc.Pl*  
 “Jewels of gold, silver and pearls”.

#### 4. Suspended affixation with adjectival suffixes in some other languages

The phenomenon of suspended affixation with derivational morphemes has so far received relatively little attention in the typological perspective. On the one hand, in Spencer, Luís 2012: 200 it is noticed that “wide scope affixation can be found with inflectional and derivational morphology in a number of languages, and it is often a symptom of recent and not quite complete morphologization”. On the other hand, this special type of suspended affixation is denied, for example, for the agglutinative modern Turkic, cf. “Suspended affixation is impossible with any of the derivational morphemes of the language” (Broadwell 2008: 7); some examples of a similar kind are traditionally treated as affixation of compounds, cf. Kabak 2007: 336.

Recently, discussion on the presence of this phenomenon in modern Turkic and, probably, in some other languages has been raised, for instance, by F. Akkuş (2016), who points out that cases of suspended affixation with derivational morphemes are “rather uncommon to find, quite many to ignore” (2016: 1). According to Akkuş, nouns sharing a common derivational morpheme can be treated as syntactic groups as they can change their positions like *tuz ve biber-lik* (“of salt and pepper”) vs. *biber ve tuz-luk* (“of pepper and salt”) or be complemented by further conjuncts as well as receive a reiterated suffix, cf. *bir ve yedi-nci bölüm-ler-i-ni...* “first and seventh chapters (of the book)...” vs. *bir, yedi ve yirmi bir-inci bölüm-ler-i-ni* “(first, seventh and twenty first chapters (of the book))” (Akkuş 2016: 8–10).

But the most interesting thing is to compare Tocharian data with the situation in other ancient languages of East Turkestan because they show mutual lexical borrowings as well as a tradition of literary translation (especially from Tocharian into Old Uighur).

Adjectivization of subordinated groups, as well as some further agglutinative features, are indeed known in some Eastern Iranian languages, e.g. in Sogdian (Gershevitch 1945: 13) or in Khwarazmian (Windfuhr 2009: 323)<sup>15</sup>. However, we have not found any examples or descriptions of derivation from coordinated groups in these languages.

As for Old Uighur, the observation made in Erdal 1991: 141–142 about the adjectival suffix *-lXg*<sup>16</sup> is noteworthy: “Exceedingly interesting is the formational, syntactic and semantic similarity between *-lXg* and Tokharian *-ši* / *-şşe* [...] The parallelism between the two conjunction-formatives which is maintained in details [...] has no likeness in other Indo-European lan-

<sup>15</sup> Remarkable typological parallels to Tocharian group inflection in general can be observed in Ossetic, cf. Belyaev 2014.

<sup>16</sup> We use the spelling with the invariant *-lXg* as in Erdal 1991 and Erdal 2004.

guages [...] As Uigur is also isolated among the Turkic languages in the extraordinary rich use which it makes of *-lXg*, all we can say is that it must be an areal phenomenon common to Uigur and Tokharian”. Erdal analyses contextual and semantic similarities between A *-ši*, B *-şşe* and Uighur *-lXg* and provides examples of derivation from subordinated noun phrases (1991: 139–150); such cases are not specifically considered in this paper.

However, there are also quite a few examples of adjectives built from hendyadises by means of *-lXg* in Old Uighur. According to Erdal, “when added to binomes, *-lXg* is usually repeated, [...] Occasionally, however, the two terms do receive it in common” (1991: 147). Along with some ‘binomes’ which are attested either only with repeated or only with single adjectival suffix, some constructions of this type demonstrate optional suffix iteration (33–36) as well as changing order of elements (35–36), cf.:

(33) *örtlüg yalınluğ* (Erdal 2004: 330)

vs. *ört yalınluğ* (DTS: 389)

“fiery and flaming”.

(34) *čogluğ yalınl(ı)ğ* (Mainz 751/09 = DKPAM 07740 (Wilkins 2016 II: 630))

vs. *čog yalınluğ* (DTS: 152)

“shiny and brilliant”.

(35) *asığ tusuluğ* (Maitr 5 v25, (Erdal 1991: 148))

vs. *asığluğ tusuluğ* and *tusuluğ asığluğ* (DTS: 60)

“advantageous and beneficial”.

(36) *ačuq adırtluğ*

vs. *adırtluğ ačuğluğ* (DTS: 12–13)

“clear and obvious”.

As for ‘binomes’, Erdal indicates that numerous lexemes in Old Uighur are used in “fixed two-word sequences to render a single notion” and can either show or lack morphological fusion (2004: 533), so it must be difficult to define whether such paired lexemes underlying the adjectives are compounds or nouns in coordination.

However, the suffix *-lXg* can refer to longer sequences of words as well. The most remarkable example of this kind known to us is found in the Uighur version of Maitrisimit (MaitrHami, XX, leaf 14, 10–11). The adjective in *-lXg* here is an attribute to *otın* “fire”, the suffix is shared by four conjuncts:

(37) *ačmak [suvsə]mak busuš kadguluğ otın*

“(Suffering from) fire of hunger (and) thirst, sorrow (and) distress”.

We now know the original version in Tocharian A for this line of the Old Uighur manuscript; however, it differs from the translation in structure as well as partially in content. Namely, it has no adjectival correspondence to the Uighur construction in *-lXg*. The word *por* “fire” in the Tocharian version is not the syntactic head but one of three homogenous Instr forms in *-yo*; Uighur hendyadises *ačmak suvsamak* “hunger and thirst” and *busuš kadgu* “sorrow and distress” render single words *kašt* “hunger” and *šurām* “sorrow” of the Tocharian original, cf.:

(38) *[ka]štjo [šurā]m[yo po](ryo) ///* (THT 1308 b2)

“(Tormented by) hunger (and) sorrow (and) fire”<sup>17</sup>.

It might be interesting to collect more examples like (37) (with *-lXg* linking longer chains of conjuncts) to evaluate how widespread this type of group affixation is in Old Turkic.

<sup>17</sup> Identification and restoration according to Itkin, Kuritsyna 2017: 67.

## 5. Conclusion

The suffix A -ši / B -šše has an almost exclusive ability among derivational morphemes of Tocharian to link conjuncts. This suffix can refer to significantly more than two nouns, its iteration or suspension is optional, and the coordinated nouns in such adjectives can represent extended noun phrases. Some rare examples of this kind can also be found with other productive suffixes – B -tstse and -ññe. This phenomenon replicates Tocharian suspended affixation, when a secondary case suffix is added to a chain of conjuncts. Such a model probably arose after A -ši / B -šše had acquired the ability to link morphological words (Nom-Acc. or explicitly Acc. forms). A typological and areal parallel may be represented in Old Uighur, at least with the adjectival suffix -lXg. In Old Turkic constructions, however, the boundary between morphological and syntactic units is hard to define, while in the Tocharian examples coordination markers can occur inside such constructions. The Tocharian data presented in this paper can contribute to the discussion on which types of affixes can be affected by suspended affixation in typological perspective.

## References

- Adams, Douglas Q. 2009. Genitive and adjective in Tocharian. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 37 (3/4): 299–320.
- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. *Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. Amsterdam – New York: Brill / Rodopi.
- Adams, Douglas Q. 2015. *Tocharian B: A grammar of syntax and word-formation*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Akkuş, Faruk. 2016. Suspended affixation with derivational suffixes and lexical integrity. In: Nikos Koutsoukos, Francesca Masini, Jenny Audring (eds.). *Online Proceedings of 10th Mediterranean Morphological Meeting*: 1–15. Available online at: <http://mmm.lis.upatras.gr/index.php/mmm/article/view/2720> [accessed 10.11.2018].
- Belyaev, Oleg I. 2014. Osetinskij kak jazyk s dvuxpadežnoj sistemoj: gruppovaja fleksija i drugie paradoksy padežnogo markirovanija. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 6: 31–65.
- Broadwell, George A. 2008. Turkish suspended affixation is lexical sharing. In: Miriam Butt, Tracy Holloway King (eds.). *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference*: 198–213. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Burlak, Svetlana A., Itkin Ilya B. (in progress). *Formal'naja Grammatika Toxarskogo A Jazyka: fonologija, morfonologija, morfologija*.
- CEToM = *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*. Available online at: <http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/> [accessed 05.12.2018].
- DTS = V. M. Nadel'ae, D. M. Nasilov, E. R. Tenišev, A. M. Ščerbak (eds.) 1969. *Drevnet'urkskij Slovar'*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Geng, Shimin, Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, Jens Peter Laut. 1998. *Eine buddhistische Apokalypse. Die Höllenskapitel (20–25) und die Schlußkapitel (26–27) der Hami-Handschrift der alttürkischen Maitrisimit. Unter Einbeziehung von Manuskriptteilen des Textes aus Sänjim und Murtuk (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 103)*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Erdal, Marcel. 1991. *Old Turkic Word Formation. A functional approach to the lexicon. Vol. I*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz.
- Erdal, Marcel. 2004. *A Grammar of Old Turkic (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 8 Uralic & Central Asia. Vol. 3)*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Gershevitch, Ilya. 1945. Sogdian compounds. *Philological Society* 44 (1): 137–149.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 2004. Zur Genese agglutinierender Flexionsmuster im Tocharischen: die Adjektive auf B -šše / A -ši. In: P. Anreiter, M. Haslinger, H. D. Pohl (eds.). *Artes et Scientiae. Festschrift für Ralf-Peter Ritter zum 65. Geburtstag*: 137–157. Wien: Praesens Verlag.
- Itkin, Ilya B. (in print). *Toxarskaja A rukopis' №№ 144–211 iz Šorčuka: novye dannye*.
- Itkin, Ilya B., Kuritsyna, Anna V. 2017. Chapter XX of the “Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka” and its hellish sufferings: the fragment THT 1308.a. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 18: 63–71.

- Ji, Xianlin, Werner Winter, Georges-Jean Pinault. 1998. *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China. Transliterated, translated and annotated by Ji Xianlin in collaboration with Werner Winter, Georges-Jean Pinault (TSM 113)*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.
- Kabak, Barış. 2007. Turkish Suspended Affixation. *Linguistics* 45 (2): 311–347.
- Krause, Wolfgang, Werner Thomas. 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Vol. 1*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Lewis, Geoffrey L. 1967. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford University Press.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2008. *Variation and change in Tocharian B (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 15)*. Amsterdam / New York: Rodopi.
- Pinault, G.-J. 1992. *Introduction au tokharien. LALIES 11. Actes des Sessions de Linguistique et de Littérature (Cortona, 20–31 août 1990)*: 3–163. Paris: École Normale Supérieure.
- Rastorgueva V.S. (ed.). 1981. *Osnovy Iranskogo Jazykoznanija. Sredneiranskie jazyki*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Ringe, Donald A. Jr. 1996. *On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian. Vol. 1: From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Tocharian (American Oriental Series 80)*. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society.
- Schmidt, K.H. 1969. Agglutination und Postposition im Tocharischen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 25: 105–112.
- Sieg, Emil, Siegling, Wilhelm. 1921. *Tocharische Sprachreste. Bd. I. Die Texte. A: Transkription*. Berlin / Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sieg, Emil, Wilhelm Siegling, Wilhelm Schulze. 1931. *Tocharische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Sieg, Emil, Wilhelm Siegling. 1949. *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Heft 1. Die Udānālānkāra-Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Glossar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Spencer, A., A. R. Luís. 2012. *Clitics: An Introduction (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, Werner. 1972. Zweigliedrige Wortverbindungen im Tocharischen. *Orbis* 21: 429–470.
- Van Windekens, Albert Joris. 1979. *Le Tokharien Confronté avec les Autres Langues Indo-Européennes. Vol. II, 1: La morphologie nominale. (Travaux publiés par le Centre International de Dialectologie Générale de l'Université Catholique de Louvain 12)*. Louvain: Centre international de dialectologie générale.
- Wälchli, Bernhard. 2005. *Co-Compounds and Natural Coordination (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistics Theory)*. Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, Jens. 2016. *Buddhistische Erzählungen aus dem alten Zentralasien. Edition der altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā. 3 vols*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Windfuhr, G. (ed.). 2009. *The Iranian Languages*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Winter, Werner. 1985. Tocharian B soy, A se and related forms. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105: 259–264.
- Zimmer, Stefan. 1982/1983. Die Funktion der tocharischen *ṣi/ṣṣe*-Adjektive. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96 (2): 277–289.

А. В. Курицына. К вопросу о групповой аффиксации в тохарском (посредством адъективного суффикса А -ṣi / В -ṣṣe) и ее возможных параллелях в древнеуйгурском

В статье рассматривается не описанная ранее способность тохарского суффикса А -ṣi / В -ṣṣe (в единичных случаях также -tstse и -ññe) образовывать прилагательные от однородных членов. Предпринимается попытка доказать, что в основе таких конструкций лежат сочиненные именные группы, а не композиты-двандвы. Полученные данные сравниваются с материалом ареально близкого древнеуйгурского языка. Если наше предположение верно, то групповая аффиксация сочиненных групп в тохарских языках возможна не только со словоизменительными морфемами вторичных падежей, но и со словообразовательными, хотя и менее распространена для последних.

Ключевые слова: групповая флексия, групповая деривация, тохарские адъективные суффиксы, древнеуйгурский язык, ареальные контакты