

Fanny Meunier, Ph. D. student (supervisor : Georges-Jean Pinault)  
EPHE – UMR 7528 Mondes iranien et indien.

### Some aspects of the translation of Sanskrit compounds in Tocharian.

The problem of the “underlying Sanskrit” is well-known to the scholars who study the Tocharian languages in terms of morphology, syntax and even stylistics. Many isolated phenomena of influence of the source-language can be brought to light in the aforementioned fields. Nevertheless I would think no global study could be undertaken because of the diversity of these influences and the randomness of their action.

I would like to contribute to this research by analyzing some features of the translation of Sanskrit compounds. This subject has already been studied by F Bernhard (1958) in his dissertation and W. Thomas (1977), whose article is a very interesting survey of the different ways to translate the three types of Sanskrit compounds (dvandva, tatpuruṣa and bahuvrīhi). Stefan Zimmer, in an article of 1982 about the *-ṣi/-ṣṣe* adjectives, refers to the fact that the high number of compounds in the source-language must have been a kind of issue for the Tocharian scribes, as the nominal composition was not a productive device of their language, and says that their translation by the *-ṣi/-ṣṣe* adjectives sometimes seemed to be “mechanical”. That is true to a certain extent, but a distinction definitely has to be made between the different types of compounds.

I am currently writing a Ph. D. about the syntax of genitive in Tocharian; an important part of it is the concurrence between genitive and derived adjectives, which are widely attested in Tocharian, as it was discussed by Adams (2009). Such would be the main frame of the present study. Focusing on tatpuruṣa compounds, I will compare the genitival tatpuruṣa to the karmadhāraya and see whether derived adjectives and genitive can commute or not. Besides, one should not forget that in the Tocharian languages there are different formations of derived adjectives; we should not only consider the *-ṣi/-ṣṣe* adjectives here, but also the *-ñi (-eṃ)/-ññe* and other (less productive) formations, in order to see if a semantic differential can be shown.

The first relevant fact, already mentioned by Thomas, Zimmer and precised by Pinault (2001) in an important study of compared stylistics between Tocharian and Old Turkic, is the close connection between metaphorical karmadhāraya and derived adjective in *-ṣi/-ṣṣe* (e.g. PK AS 6A a 1 *cmel(a)ṣṣe serke* “the circle of the births” translates Uv. XXXI. 6 *jātisaṃsāra-*). Genitive is impossible here, whereas an apposition can be found. This questions the existence of a *genitivus definitivus*, despite the few examples given by Zimmer (1985). This kind of metaphor is widely spread within all the Tocharian literature; the numerous metaphorical phrases like [derived adjective (topic) + substantive (vehicle)] that are found when no karmadhāraya appears in the Sanskrit text, or no immediate Sanskrit text underlies, are an example of this development. In the same vein, one will note that some phrases of this kind may be added within some translations from Sanskrit; this especially happens in the *Udānālankāra*, a Tocharian commentary of the *Udānavarga* (e.g. B 30 b 4 *cmelṣe samudtār totte ykuweṣo* “having overcome the ocean of the births” translates Uv. XII. 16 *bhavasya pārāga-* “having overcome the existence”).

All the same, it seems difficult to find some examples of *-ñi (-eṃ)/-ññe* adjectives in the translation or imitation of metaphorical karmadhāraya; Skt. *Varṇārḥavarṇastotra* II. 23 *nṛṣimha-* “the lion-man” is, for instance, translated by A 244 b 1 – 2 *oñi-cmolṣim (śiśāk)* “the lion of the human-birth”, with the development of the first term of the karmadhāraya (topic of the metaphor, *nṛ-*) by a phrase, preferred – it seems – to the simple adjective *oñi* because it was not bearing the *-ṣi* suffix. Nonetheless

we find in A 66 b 4 *k<sub>n</sub>leñci ñemi* “the jewel of a woman”, a syntactic calque of Skt. *strīratna-*, that seems to prove that other adjectives than the *-ṣi/-ṣṣe* ones could translate a metaphorical karmadhāraya: one may then assume that the morphological criteria governing the derivation of a noun in adjective were more compelling than the semantics of the adjectival suffix. These considerations will be confronted with the patterns of distribution which have been outlined by Adams (2009).

However, the genitive seems to be the most common way to translate a Skt. genitival tatpuruṣa, even if the commutation with the derived adjective is possible (e. g. B 3 b 6 *śakātaṣṣa sālyye* “the line of the stick” for Uv. I. 16 *daṇḍarājī-* vs. PK AS 6A a 2 *ostantse mrāce* “the top of the house” for Uv. XXXI. 7 *grhakūta-*), and if some internal syntactic rules of the Tocharian, such as the verbal rection of verbal nouns, may interfere. In some cases indeed, the choice of the Tocharian scribe seems to depend on stylistic considerations. My paper will try to describe these phenomena and sketch a hierarchy between them.

### Short bibliography

D. Q. Adams (2009). “Genitive and Adjective in Tocharian”, *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, Vol. 37, n° 3 et 4, pp. 299-320.

F. Bernhard (1958). *Die Nominalkomposition im Tocharischen*, Diss. Göttingen.

G.-J. Pinault (2003). “Contacts linguistiques en Asie Centrale à la lumière des textes tokhariens”, in: *Indien und Zentralasien Sprach- und Kulturkontakt. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposiums vom 7. bis 10. Mai 2001*, Wiesbaden, pp. 45-83.

W. Thomas (1973). “Zur tocharischen Übersetzung der Sanskrit-Nominalkomposita des Udānavarga”, *KZ* 87, pp. 161-189.

S. Zimmer (1982/83). “Die Funktion der tocharischen *ṣi/ṣṣe*-Adjektive”, *KZ* 96, pp. 277-289.

S. Zimmer, (1985). “Die Gebrauchsweisen des adnominalen Genetivs im Tocharischen”, in: Bernfried Schlerath (ed.), *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Idg. Gesellschaft (Berlin, 20.-25. Februar 1983)*, Wiesbaden, pp. 560-574.