


Notes on the Tocharian A Lexicon

Tao PAN

Abstract: This paper offers detailed philological investigations of Toch. A *ś,kār*, *kār**, *sākāt* and *yusār* based on parallel texts in Sanskrit, Chinese and Old Uyghur. By uncovering several cases of loan translations, the following results have been achieved: Toch. A *ś,kār* probably means “power” (= Skt. *bala-*, OUygh. *küč*, Chin. *lì* “id.”); Toch. A *kār** means “path, ground”; Toch. A *sākāt* means “assembled, arrived” (= Skt. *saṃnipatita-* “id.”); Toch. A *yusār* means “rainy season” (= Skt. *varṣa-* “id.”, OUygh. *yay* “summer”). The present study is inspired by and in part responds to the *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A* in 2023. A preliminary list of problematic entries is provided as addendum, including Toch. A *āral**, A *cwal*, A *karne*, A *tursko* or “*trusko*”, A *p,kāl*, A *porant**, A *prakte*, A *miši*, A *ymatu*, A *lokalok*, A *Vacramukhe*, A *śu* and A *šoş*.

Keywords: Tocharian, Sanskrit, Calque, Chinese, Old Uyghur, Buddhist Philology

Tao PAN, Indological Studies, Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University;
tao.pan.8m@kyoto-u.ac.jp;  0000-0003-0278-4278



This article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Introduction

With the publication of DThTA, Carling and Pinault have for the first time made the Tocharian A lexicon easily accessible to a wider public. This book marks a new stage of Tocharian scholarship, upon which all future studies will be based. However, given the scope of this volume, it is not surprising that there are still a few entries in this lexicon that could be improved. Before embarking on the detailed investigations of Tocharian lexemes, brief remarks on the methodology and logic of the argument seem necessary here.

In the case of Sieg's speculative translations under discussion below, without knowledge of possible loan translations, Sieg adopted another strategy, namely according to his analysis of the context described in the Tocharian passage containing the targeted words. So Sieg's analysis is based on his understanding of what might be suitable or natural in specific situations, for which, although he did not give any reason as to why the text has to be understood in that way. In the current paper, however, the translation and interpretation of unclear Tocharian words will proceed from a comparison of parallel texts, which contain correspondents of the Tocharian words in question.

As for Tocharian Buddhist stories, it is usually the case that the story has no exact parallel in other versions regarding all the plot details. In most cases, the Tocharian version proves to be a local adaptation based on Indian versions, cf. the famous Vyāghrī-story and the detailed study by MENG and PAN (2022). Despite the lack of complete parallelism, certain short episodes and formulaic expressions in the original Indian versions have been faithfully rendered into Tocharian as loan translations (cf. PAN 2019; 2021a; 2021b; 2024). And the abundance of stock phrases in the Buddhist narratives and stories has been well-known since FEER's (1891: 1–14) comprehensive study of the *Avadānaśataka* (AvŚ), one of the most important collections of Buddhist narratives. Building on Feer's work, DEMOTO (1998: 29–62) conducted an almost exhaustive study of stock phrases and repeated passages in AvŚ, drawing on the corresponding Sanskrit texts and Chinese parallels. This prevalence is easily understood in the context of early Buddhism's oral transmission, particularly regarding Buddhist stories. The frequent use of epithets and formulaic language in the Homeric epics is comparable to the Buddhist case as a result of oral transmission, cf. FRIEDRICH (2011) for Homer's Formelsprache.

Therefore, by comparing similar episodes and stock phrases in the Sanskrit Buddhist stories with their Tocharian counterparts, it becomes possible to decipher certain unclear Tocharian phrases and words. This method begins with identifying stock phrases in the Sanskrit and Chinese Buddhist corpora using online databases, e.g. GRETEL (<https://gretel.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretel.html>) for Sanskrit and CBETA (<https://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/>) for Chinese corpus.

The next step involves an internal philological study of passages containing the targeted stock phrases. Due to the fragmentary state of the Tocharian texts and frequent innovations, discrepancies between Tocharian and parallel versions regarding certain plot details are inevitable in the case of narratives. However, differences in minor details do not necessarily invalidate the results derived from the identified calques (cf. footnote 5 below). Finally, an etymological analysis is conducted to ensure that the Tocharian words and their etyma adhere to the regular phonological, morphological, and semantic development. Representative examples of this method include Toch. B *pitke* “fat, grease” and B *ore* “joint, stalk”, cf. PAN (2019) and PAN (2023) respectively.

1. Toch. A *śukār*

1.1. State of Research

In the dictionary recently published by CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 472) Toch. A *śukār* is translated as “sting, spike”. Since SIEG et al. (1931: 41, 50, 108) mentioned Toch. A *śukār* without offering any translation, this explanation probably goes back to SIEG’s (1944: 20) translation “mit Stöcken (?)” for Toch. A *śukrāsyō* in the *Punyavantajātaka* fragment A16a6. Given the footnote to this translation “Oder»Spießen«. Die Bedeutung von *śukār* ist unsicher, nach 98*2 scheint es zum Stechen (*tsop*) gebraucht zu werden”, the proposed meaning “stick, spike [Stock, Spieß]” is merely speculation by Sieg, because the verb Toch. A *tsop*- “to prick”¹ does not necessarily require a complement such as “stick” or “spike”, and it is equally possible to prick “with a weapon”, “with anger” or “with force”. LANE (1947: 52) leaves Toch. A *śukrās* untranslated by writing “with *śukrās* (?)” and cites Sieg’s German rendering “mit Stöcken (?)”.

In the first Tocharian A lexicon, POUCHA (1955: 324) tentatively suggests the meaning “wise (?) [sapens (?)] (sic)” for Toch. A *śukār* as well as its connection with Toch. A *śuk* “provision for a journey” (= Skt. *pātheya*- “id.”, Chin. 資糧 *zī liáng* “id.”, cf. ENOMOTO 1997: 92–93) by observing “Pertinetne ad *śuk*?” In his review of POUCHA (1955), COUVREUR (1955–1956: 70) defends Sieg’s hypothesis by removing Sieg’s question mark and stating “*śukār* nicht «sapens», sondern etwa «Stock, Spiess, Dorn, Stachel»”, but he does not provide any support for his explanation.

An unfortunate circumstance in the history of Tocharian studies should be mentioned here. The founders of Tocharology, such as Sieg, Siegling and Schulze, consistently marked the meanings of unclear Tocharian words with a following question mark. Sometimes, however, these speculative meanings were adopted as being well-established in later literature simply by removing

¹ According to HUARD (2022: 382–383), Toch. B *tsop*- means “frapper, broyer” and is cognate with Toch. B *tsāp*- “mash, crush”.

the question marks without further philological evidence. During this process, some hypotheses became facts without further ado. This situation has already been brought to the fore in PAN (2021c: 13).

Couvreur's or Sieg's interpretation has been incorporated as a secure entry into the glossary of TEB (THOMAS and KRAUSE 1964: 146). Toch. A *śukār* occurs in the phrase *kāruṃṣiṃ śukāryo* in the Tocharian A version of the *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka* (MSN), and Ji et al. (1998: 79, 298) adopt the meaning “sting” for Toch. A *śukār* despite the peculiarity of the resulting phrase “[w]ith the sting of mercy”.² TAMAI (2012: 183) considers Toch. A *śukār* to be a loanword from Skt. *śukra*- “bright, brightness”, apparently due to the formal similarity, but he adds a question mark after it, because his translation “making the people from front to back (= retreat) with the brilliance (Skt. *śukra* ‘fire, light’?) of the monks” sounds suspicious indeed. The speculation of SIEG (1944: 20) has now become *communis opinio*, as registered most recently in DThTA by CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 472), who have cited and adopted the above-mentioned interpretations in COUVREUR (1955–1956), TEB and Ji et al. (1998). However, so far there has been no philological investigation of Toch. A *śukār*, and no counterpart in Sanskrit or Old Uyghur has been discovered.

1.2. “Through the power of compassion”

Toch. A *śukār* is attested in four fragments, as listed in DThTA (CARLING and PINAULT 2023: 472), namely: nom./acc. sg. *śukār* in A91b4 and A98a2, instr. sg. *śukāryo* in YQ II.3a2, instr. pl. *śukrāsyō* in A16a6. The key to its decipherment lies in the phrase Toch. A *kāruṃṣiṃ śukāryo* in YQ II.3a2 in MSN (Ji et al. 1998: 78–79), which occurs in Maitreya's monologue as his self-description. Under the assumption that this Tocharian phrase “through *śukār* of compassion” should have a counterpart in the Buddhist texts, a search for “以慈悲” *yǐ cí bēi* (lit. “through compassion”) has been conducted in the digital corpus of Chinese Buddhist texts (<https://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/>), and this search resulted in two candidates: 以慈悲力 *yǐ cí bēi lì* “through the power of compassion” (= Skt. *karuṇā-balena*) and 以慈悲心 *yǐ cí bēi xīn* “through the mind of compassion” (= Skt. *karuṇā-cittena*). The meaning “mind” for Toch. A *śukār* does not really fit in the context of Toch. A *śukrāsyō neṣ wrasas śkārā ypaṃām* “making people in front backwards with *śukrās*” in A16a6.

Therefore, Toch. A *kāruṃṣiṃ śukāryo* is very likely a calque of Skt. *karuṇā-balena* “through the power of compassion” or *mahā-karuṇā-balena* “through the great power of compassion”, which are clichés in several Buddhist texts; cf. Skt. *karuṇābalena* in LV 24.61 (HOKAZONO 2019: 296), and *mahākaruṇābalena* in

² So is the translation in the Tocharian database CEToM, <https://cetom.univie.ac.at/?m-yqii3>, accessed on 19th June 2024.

GV (VAIDYA 1960: 426), DBh (VAIDYA 1967: 39); cf. further *karuṇābala-* in JM (HANISCH 2005: 5; MEILAND 2009: 14), and *mahākaruṇābala-* in LV (HOKAZONO 1994: 656), GV (VAIDYA 1960: 59, 143, 191), DBh (VAIDYA 1967: 46). Although the Old Uyghur counterpart of Toch. A *kāruṇṣim ś,kāryo* in YQ II.3a2 in MSN is missing in the corresponding section of the second act (cf. GENG et al. 1988: 122–123),³ this phrase occurs elsewhere, namely in the introductory chapter: OUygh. *uluy yrlıqančuči bilig küčintä* “through the great power of compassion” (GENG et al. 1988: 18–19), and in DKPAM OUygh. *ulug y(a)rlıkančuči köñülin* “through the willpower of compassion” is frequently used (cf. WILKENS 2016: III, 1106–1107).

In Chinese Buddhist texts, the phrases Chin. 以慈悲力 *yǐ cí bēi lì* “through the power of compassion” (= Skt. *karuṇābalena*) or Chin. 以大慈悲力 *yǐ dà cí bēi lì* “through the great power of compassion” (= Skt. *mahākaruṇābalena*) are widely attested, cf. Chin. *yǐ cí bēi lì* in *Buddhacarita* (Chin. 佛本行經 *fó běn xíng jīng*, T.193, 4.90a14; on the parallel Tocharian version of T.193, cf. PAN 2023: 310), Chin. *yǐ dà cí bēi lì* in Kumārajīva’s *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* (Chin. 妙法蓮華經 *miào fǎ lián huá jīng*, T.262, 9.23b21) and **Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* (Chin. 大智度論 *dà zhì dù lùn*, T.1509, 25.256c20–21). Both Kumārajīva and the translator of T.193 must have been closely related to the Tocharian-speaking regions. Therefore, Toch. A *ś,kār* probably corresponds to Skt. *bala-* “power, force, vigour”, OUygh. *küč* “power, strength”, Chin. 力 *lì* “power, force”.

1.3. Verifying the New Interpretation

In order to verify the new meaning “power, force, vigour” for Toch. A *ś,kār*, it has to be tested against the other three occurrences.

(1) Instr. pl. *śukrāśyo* in A16a6

Fragment A16 belongs to the Tocharian *Puṇyavantajātaka* (on the various parallel texts, cf. PAN 2022: 95, 118), and the sentence Toch. A *śukrāśyo neṣ wrasas śkārā ypamām* “making people in front backwards with *śukrās*” is located in the episode about prince Puṇyavanta, “the virtuous”. Although there is no direct parallel to this sentence, a similar description is preserved in the Chinese *Puṇyavantajātaka* (Chin. 福力太子因緣經 *fú lì tài zǐ yīn yuán jīng*),

³ Given the correspondence between Toch. A *(ca)kravarttis lānt* “of the Cakravartin-king” in YQ II.3a3 and OUygh. *čkrwrt ilig* “Cakravartin-king” in 2b17 as well as Toch. A *(bādha)ri brāhmaṇ mokoneyo lyutār nām̐tsu tārm̐mām kapśiñño* “Bādhari the Brahmin, with his body trembling excessively because of his advanced age” in YQ II.3a5 and OUygh. *titrāyü ätözin badari braman* “Brahmane Badhari, am Leibe zitternd” in 2b19–20 in the second act (cf. Ji et al. 1998: 78–79; GENG et al. 1988: 122–123), the expected Old Uyghur parallel to Toch. A *kāruṇṣim ś,kāryo* in YQ II.3a2 is simply nonexistent on folio 2 instead of being located in the lacuna of the missing folio 3, because the Old Uyghur version of MSN is not an exact translation of the preserved Tocharian version.

namely Chin. 咸來衛護於福者 *xián lái wèi hù yú fú zhě* “They all came to guard and protect Puṇyavanta” (T.173, 3.434a18). In view of the proposed meaning for Toch. A *śūkār* above and the outlined context, it would not be out of place to render Toch. A *śukrāśyo neṣ wrasas škārā yпамām* as “making people in front backwards with forces”. The sense of instr. pl. form Toch. A *śukrāśyo* can be compared with Eng. *forces* designating “the troops or soldiers composing the fighting strength of a kingdom” (cf. OED, s.v. “force (n.1), sense I.4.a”).

(2) Nom./acc. sg. *śūkār* in A91b4 and A98a2

Fragments A91 and A98 belong to the Tocharian *Saundaranandacarita-Nāṭaka* (SNCN), and it has already been pointed out by PAN (2021b: 266–267) that the Tocharian drama SNCN deviates from its Indian basis, i.e. the *Saundarananda* (SauN) by Aśvaghōṣa, with respect to wording and structure, although there exist many shared keywords between the Tocharian and Sanskrit versions, e.g. in fragment A91: Toch. A *ṣāmaṃ nām̐tsu* “having become a monk” in a1 matches Skt. *liṅgaṃ... śāstrīvidhipradīṣṭaṃ gātrena* “signs ordained by the teacher on his body” in verse 7.1 of SauN; Toch. A *kronṣe* “bee” in a2 matches Skt. *ālīna-saṃmūrchita-ṣaṭpadāyām* “(mango-trees) thick with settling bees (lit. ‘six-footed’)” in verse 7.3; Toch. A *aṣuk wśā-yokās pokenyo* “with broad gold-coloured arms” in a3 matches Skt. *yuga-dīrgha-bāhur* “long-armed as a chariot yoke” in verse 7.3 (cf. COVILL 2007: 132–133).

The incomplete pada 3c /// *śūkār* | *kālytār sām* | *cut ṣtām̐s posac*: “*śūkār* it is situated next to a mango-tree” in A91b4 is found in a group of verses preceded by a melody name Toch. A *nandavilāpaṃ* “in Nanda’s lament” on the one hand, and the verses have parallels in the seventh canto of Skt. SauN, i.e. Nandavilāpa “Nanda’s lament”, on the other, which can hardly be a coincidence. To be specific, pada 3c probably corresponds to verse 7.8 of Skt. SauN:

latām praphullām atimuktakasya cūṭasya pārśve parirabhya jātām |
niśāmya cintām agamat kadaivam śliṣṭā bhaven mām api sundarīti ||

Next he noticed a cheerful *atimuktaka* creeper which had grown up entwined around the mango-tree at its side, and he thought “When will Sūndari hold me like that?”

(COVILL 2007: 134–135)

Toch. A *cut ṣtām̐s posac* “next to the mango-tree” corresponds to Skt. *cūṭasya pārśve* “near the mango-tree”, the masculine demonstrative Toch. A *sām* “he/it” probably refers to the creeper, and Toch. A *kālytār* “stands, is situated” corresponds roughly to Skt. *jātām* “grown, appeared”. Therefore, Toch. A *śūkār* is used to describe the creeper, and could be completed to Toch. A (*śla*) *śūkār* “with force, vigorously → passionately, zealously”, which would be compatible with Skt. *parirabhya* “having embraced, clasped”, given the fact that a nominal

derivative of the verb Skt. *rabh-* “to embrace, clasp, long for”, i.e. Skt. *rabhas-*, indeed means “force, zeal”.

The occurrence in A98a2, i.e. Toch. A *pot śukār presyo | tsopiñcām | pañcyā laṣyā | ṣu* “young animal, with *śukār* and *pres*, they beat/crush⁴ it, with strap for five (fingers)...”, presents some difficulty. In Skt. SauN there is a reference to leather straps in verse 1.35:

baddhagodhāṅgulītrāṇā hastaviṣṭhitakārmukāḥ |
śarādhmātamahātūṇā vyāyatābaddhavāsasaḥ ||

With their great quivers bristling with arrows, their fingers protected by leather straps, their bows extended in their hands and the arrows drawn back.

(COVILL 2007: 38–39)

If the Tocharian verse above depicts the same scene, Toch. A *pañcyā laṣyā* “with strap for five (fingers)” could correspond to Skt. *baddhagodhāṅgulītrāṇā* “equipped with finger-protector and leathern fence”⁵ and refer to the leathern contrivance for protecting five fingers. Thus Toch. A *ṣu* could be completed to Toch. A *ṣu(tkmās)* “bolts”. Furthermore, Toch. A *pot* “young animal” in A98a2 would match Skt. *nāgeṣu... śvāpadeṣu ca* “among elephants and wild beasts” in verse 1.36; Toch. A *riṣaki* “sages” as counterpart of Skt. *tāpasās* “ascetics” in verse 1.37 is attested in A98b5; Toch. A *tsopats wāl pāpṣuñcāśi* “great king of well-conducted ones” in A98b4 could refer to Skt. *te puṇyakarmāṇaḥ* “their actions being meritorious” in verse 1.39 (cf. COVILL 2007: 38–41). And the meaning “force, strength” for Toch. A *śukār* would fit the context. As a result, the meaning proposed by CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 314) for the rare word Toch. A *pres** could be modified: instead of “goad, spike”, which seems to be based on the previously assumed meaning “sting, spike” for Toch. A *śukār*, it probably designates “strength, force” *vel sim.*, namely a synonym of Toch. A *śukār* “power, force”. Thus Toch. A *pot śukār presyo | tsopiñcām | pañcyā laṣyā |* in A98a2 can be translated as “with force and strength, they crush the young animal, with strap for five (fingers)”.

⁴ Toch. A *tsop-* has the meaning “to beat, crush” according to CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 560).

⁵ According to one anonymous reviewer, Skt. *baddhagodhāṅgulītrāṇā* means more precisely, “protected by a thin leather glove” instead of “leather straps”, and the reviewer thus claims that Carling and Pinault’s interpretation is better. But the discussion here centers on Toch. A *śukār* and *pres*, which are translated as “spike” and “goad” by CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 472, 314). I am not convinced how the change of “strap” to “glove” in the Sanskrit verse could speak for the interpretation of “spike and goad” instead of “force and strength” in the Tocharian verse, whether the Indian archery is involved or not.

1.4. Linguistic Remarks

Based on the philological investigation above it is very likely that Toch. A *śukār* means “power, force, vigour”. Toch. A *śukār* can then be connected with PIE **deuk-* “to pull, tear” (LIV²: 124): **deuk-ro-* > Proto-Toch. **ts’äukræ* > **śukra* > Toch. A *śukār*. On the full-grade **-ro-*formation **R(e)-ro-* with substantival meaning, cf. Skt. *-āśra-* “-cornered” and Gr. ἄκρος “topmost, outermost” < **h₂ekro-* from PIE **h₂ek-* “(to be/become/make) sharp, pointed” (NIL: 287–288; VINE 2002: 341–343). For the semantic development from “to pull” to “force”, cf. Eng. *pull*, which, when used as a noun, can designate “the force exerted in pulling or drawing, pulling power” (OED, s.v. “pull, n.¹, sense II.6.d”).

2. Toch. A *kār**

2.1. State of Research

Toch. A *kār** is first mentioned in TG (SIEG et al. 1931: 96–97), where it is tentatively interpreted as a loanword from Skt. *kāraṇa-* “cause”, and an emendation with a question mark to Toch. A *†kāraṇāntu* is postulated. This explanation entered SIEG’s (1944) translation of the *Puṇyavantajātaka*, where Toch. A *āpāyṣinās kārāntu* in A14b1 is rendered as “the causes for rebirth in an evil state of existence [die Anlässe zur Geburt in einer schlechten Daseinsform]”. LANE (1947: 50 and fn. 155) has adopted the translation of Sieg, but traces Toch. A *kār** back to Skt. *kāra-* with uncertainty (marked with two question marks). POUCHA (1955: 59) lists three occurrences of Toch. A *kār**, but gives no translation.⁶ HILMARSSON (1996: 85–86) regards Toch. A *kār** as cognate with Toch. B *kāre* “pit, hole”, apparently due to their formal similarity, but has offered no philological evidence. CARLING (2009: 115) leaves Toch. A *kār** untranslated in the earlier partial edition of DThTA, although she mentions the meaning “pit, hole” proposed by HILMARSSON (1996: 85). In the complete edition of DThTA, CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 107) have adopted Hilmarsson’s explanation and additionally mentioned “Pinault (2020d:388)” concerning its etymology. However, according to PINAULT (2020: 388 fn. 131), who cites “Carling (2009:115a)” (i.e. CARLING 2009: 115), “its meaning is not fully ascertained”.⁷ Finally, TAMAI (2012: 181) translates Toch. A *āpāyṣinās kārāntu* as “deeds of decadences” without further justification, presumably interpreting Toch. A *kār** as a loanword from Skt. *kāra-* “action”. It can clearly be seen that hitherto no rigorous philological examination has been conducted on Toch. A *kār**, and no equivalent in Sanskrit, Old Uyghur or Chinese has been identified.

⁶ The form Toch. A *kārā* in A382a3, found together with several Old Uyghur names and titles, probably does not belong here and it might be an Old Uyghur word in origin, cf. OUygh. *kara* “Bestandteil von Personennamen” (WILKENS 2021: 334; CARLING and PINAULT 2023: 107).

⁷ The “alternative source” proposed by PINAULT (2020: 388 fn. 131), i.e. “Skt. *kārā-* ‘prison, confinement’”, is obviously based on their formal resemblance, but can hardly be correct, given the admitted semantic uncertainty.

2.2. Parallel and Calque

The solution to the problem concerning Toch. A *kār** can be found in its occurrence in the *Puṇyavantajātaka* A14b1–2: *pñi praskintu* | *wikāṣṣ-ām* | *āpāyṣinās* | *kārāntu* | *pñi* –_{b2} – – (:) “Merit expels his fears, merit ... *kārāntu* of evil existence”. The parallel texts are located in the Chinese translation of the *Puṇyavantajātaka* (福力太子因緣經 *fú lì tài zǐ yīn yuán jīng* T.173):

(1) Chin. 福者捨離惡趣 *fú zhě shě lí è qù* “The virtuous one discards and stays away from evil states of existence” (T.173, 3.431b18–19).

(2) Chin. 福者臨終無疾病，臨終亦復歡喜生，極惡境相不現前，遠離驚怖及苦惱 *fú zhě lín zhōng wú jí bìng, lín zhōng yì fù huān xǐ shēng, jí è jìng xiàng bù xiàn qián, yuǎn lí jīng bù jí kǔ nǎo* “Approaching his end the virtuous one has no illness, joy arises as well, extremely evil situation and appearance do not occur, and he is away from fear and distress” (T.173, 3.434a13–14).

And the situation of people without merit is described in the same Chinese text:

(3) Chin. 無福者墮地獄中，受大苦惱常無間，或墮餓鬼或畜生，受飢渴苦及負重 *wú fú zhě duò dì yù zhōng, shòu dà kǔ nǎo cháng wú jiān, huò duò è guǐ huò chù shēng, shòu jī kě kǔ jí fù zhòng* “People without merit will fall into hell, and experience great suffering without end; or they become hungry ghosts or animals, and will suffer from hunger and thirst as well as bear burdens” (T.173, 3.433c6–7).

Therefore, Toch. A *āpāyṣinās kārāntu* probably corresponds to Chin. 惡趣 *è qù* “evil state of existence”, which translates Skt. *apāya-gati-*, *apāya-patha-*, *apāya-bhūmi-* or simply *apāya-* as well as *durgati-* “id.” (cf. HIRAKAWA 1997: 489) and refers to the rebirths as beings in hells, as animals or as ghosts. Thus Toch. A *kār** (presumed nom./acc. sg. of *kārāntu*) probably corresponds to Skt. *gati-*, *patha-* or *bhūmi-* and means “path, place to go, state, ground”.

Despite its fragmentary context, it is very likely that the phrase Toch. A *kāraṃ lmo* (A316a8) in the so-called “Sonnenaufgangswunder” story refers to Buddha’s action after displaying his miracles, cf. the description preceding this phrase Toch. A *wrāṣ wā(r y)o(kāñ swāñcenāñ) por yokāñ wrim* ||| _{a8} ṣ·lcār : *vaiḍur yokāñ āsānāṣ (oplaṣ nu) ārk(ya)nt wsā-yo(kāñ)* “Aus dem Wasser gingen wasserfarbige (Strahlen) [und] feuerfarbige aus dem... heraus, beryllfarbige aus dem Sitz, (aus dem Lotus aber) weiße [und] goldfarbige” in A315+316a7–8 (cf. SIEG 1952: 29) and one possible parallel Skt. *vividhāny arcīṣi kāyān niṣcaranti tadyathā nīlapītāni lohītāny avadātāni mañjiṣṭhāni sphaṭika-varṇāni* “different kinds of light emerged from his body—they were blue, yellow, red, white, crimson, and the color of crystal” in Divy (COWELL and NEIL 1886: 161;

ROTMAN 2008: 278). Therefore, Toch. A *kāraṃ lmo* probably means “sat down on the ground” and corresponds to Skt. *prajñapta evāsane niṣaṇṇaḥ* “sat down on the designated seat” in Divy (COWELL and NEIL 1886: 161; ROTMAN 2008: 278).

As in the case of A14b1, fear and an evil state of existence are mentioned together in the Buddhist Sanskrit texts as well, cf. Skt. *kumārga-bhaya-* “fear of the evil paths (i.e. evil states of existence)” attested in the reconstructed Sanskrit phrase *sarvakumārgabhayātikrāntaṃ* “beyond fear of any bad ways” and Skt. (*sarva-*) *durgati-bhayam* “fear of (every) evil destiny” in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra* (BRAARVIG 1993: 324, 365). The equivalent in Old Uyghur is OUygh. *üč yavlak yol(lar)* “the three evil states of existence” (WILKENS 2021: 818), cf. Skt. *trīṇy apāyapathāni* in Suv 5.24 (NOBEL 1937: 62).

Chin. 惡趣 *è qù* “evil state of existence” has a synonym, i.e. Chin. 惡道 *è dào* “evil path”, which literally translates Skt. *amārga-*, *asanmārga-*, *kupatha-* or *kumārga-* on the one hand and designates “evil states of existence” and is equivalent of Skt. *apāya-gati-* or *apāya-patha-* (HIRAKAWA 1997: 488) on the other. The Tocharian counterpart is Toch. A *umpar-ytār* “evil path” (CARLING and PINAULT 2023: 66) in the *Varṇāhavarṇa* fragment A246b4, and it corresponds to Skt. *asanmārga-* in verse 2.34 (cf. HARTMANN 1987: 109). The use of the same verb Toch. A *wik^(a)*- “to avoid, expel” in A246b4 and A14b1 points to the affinity between Toch. A *āpāyṣinās kārāntu* “evil states of existence” (Chin. *è qù* “id.”) and Toch. A *umpar-ytār* “evil path” (Chin. *è dào* “id.”).

2.3. Linguistic Remarks

Given the multiple origins of Toch. A *k*, the exact origin of Toch. A *kār* “path, place to go, state, ground” cannot be determined with certainty, and there are at least two possibilities, namely derivatives by means of a *-ro*-suffix from PIE **ǵ^heH-* “to move” (LIV²: 172) or **ǵ^heh₁-* “to come, arrive” (LIV²: 196): **ǵ^hH-ro-* or **ǵ^hh₁-ro-* > Proto-Toch. **karæ* > Toch. A *kār*. On the semantic development from “to move, come” to “path, place to go, state”, cf. Skt. *gati-* “going, path, place of origin, state”. Despite their semantic discrepancy, Toch. A *kār* “path, state, ground” and Toch. B *kāre* “pit, hole” could be cognates, because the semantic connection between “ground” and “pit, hole” is not unlikely, cf. Eng. *ground* in the sense of “bottom, hole in the ground”.

According to PINAULT (2020: 388), the variant form Toch. B *kārre* in B358a3 (unearthed in Murtoq, dated to the classical period, cf. PEYROT 2008: 221) contains an etymological geminate *rr*, and he derives Toch. B *kārre* from PIE **ǵ^urh₃-d^hro-* with an *ad hoc* explanation: “**kārtræ* > **kārθræ* > Toch. B **kārhre* reshaped as *kār-re* under the influence of the allomorph **kār-* (linked with **kār-*) abstracted from the subjunctive stem of the verb Toch. B *kār-* ‘to gather,

collect”, where not only the proposed sound changes “*kārtræ > *kārθræ > Toch. B *kārhræ” are unparalleled inside Tocharian but also the assumed influence from a semantically unrelated verb is unmotivated. In fact, the geminate writing *rr* can be attributed to regional or scribal features, cf. Toch. B *trrice* (in Kizil WD-II-3b2) for *trice* “third”, B *pārriitar* (in PK AS 15Hb3) for *pārriitar* 2. sg. mid. impv. of *riit-* “to be attached” (MALZAHN 2010: 825) and B *amārraṣṣe* “immortal” (in B152 b5, Kizil) (probably from Skt. *amara-* “undying”).

3. Toch. A *sākāt*

3.1. State of Research

Until now, Toch. A *sākāt* has been unanimously interpreted as the correspondent of Skt. *tūṣṇīm* “calm, silent” and translated as “silent, quiet(ly)”, cf. POUCHA (1955: 362) (“tacite, quiete”, “= Scr. tuṣṇīm” (sic)), THOMAS and KRAUSE (1964: 153) (“ruhig, still, schweigend”, “skt. tūṣṇīm”), Ji et al. 1998: 299 (“quiet”), PEYROT (2013: 645) (“quietly kept in your minds” for Toch. A *sākāt kālymām pāltsäkyokk*), TAMAI (2017: 263) (“quietly”), CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 512) (“quiet”). But in reality, there exists no Skt.-Toch. A bilingual text containing Skt. *tūṣṇīm* and Toch. A *sākāt*, and this explanation goes back to SIEG’s (1952: 22) translation of the following sentence in the *Mūgapakkhajātaka* (MpJ): A74a3 /// (*bodhi*)sattu mā kaś wāworāṣ sākāt lyām || “Der Bodhisattva saß schweigend, ohne [darauf] zu achten”. This description has no equivalent in any of the parallel texts, including Pāli, Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese and Khotanese versions of the *Mūgapakkhajātaka*,⁸ and, on the other hand, undoubtedly does not refer to his pretended muteness because in the preceding fragment A84 he talks with his father and explains his desire to become a monk. Sieg’s interpretation, “silent [schweigend]”, could have been prompted by the phrase *mā kaś wāworāṣ* “without giving any consideration”.

⁸ The Pāli version is found in Jātaka no. 538 *Mūgapakkhajātaka* (FAUSBØLL 1896: 1–30; COWELL and ROUSE 1907: 1–19). The Sanskrit version is located in Kṣemendra’s *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* no. 37 (VAIDYA 1959: 239–243). The Tibetan version is preserved in the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya* (MSV) (cf. its German translation by SCHIEFNER 1877) and the Tibetan version of *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*. There are four Chinese versions, namely T.154 六度集經 *Liù dù jí jīng* by Kang Senghui (no. 38 太子墓魄經 *Tài zǐ mù pò jīng* “sutra of prince Mūgapakkha”), T.167 太子慕魄經 *Tài zǐ mù pò jīng* by An Shigao, T.168 太子墓魄經 *Tài zǐ mù pò jīng* by Dharmarakṣa, T.1442 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 *Gēn běn shuō yī qiè yǒu bù pí nài yē* by Yijing (episode of 水生太子 *shuǐ shēng tài zǐ* “water-born prince”). A very brief retelling is found in the Khotanese *Jātakastava*, cf. DRESDEN (1955). I want to thank Mengji Huang (Heidelberg) for the valuable information of various versions.

3.2. Stock Phrase and Calque

Toch. A *sākāt* is attested five times,⁹ to be precise three times together with the verb Toch. A *lām*- “to sit” and twice with Toch. A *käly*- “to stay, be situated”: A74a3 *sākāt lyām*, A147b6 *sākāt lmorāṣ*, A162a2 *sākāt klyantrā*, A213b7 *sākāt kälýmām*, YQ III.11b2 *sākāt lmaryo*. This circumstance can best be explained in terms of calques from Sanskrit stock phrases, which are frequently encountered in the Tocharian Buddhist corpus. In the Buddhist Sanskrit texts, descriptions of gathering scenes and sitting in an assembly usually contain *saṃniṣaṇṇa*- “sat down, sat together” (from *sad*- “to sit”) + *saṃnipatita*- “assembled, arrived” (from *pat*- “to”), which is a fixed expression attested in e.g. (*samāje*) *sanniṣaṇṇo ’bhūt sannipatitaḥ* “he has arrived and sat down (in the assembly)” in MPS 11.12, 26.7 (WALDSCHMIDT 1950–1951: 182, 254 *passim*), (*parṣadi*) *saṃniṣaṇṇo ’bhūt saṃnipatitaḥ* “id.” in Divy (COWELL and NEIL 1886: 19, 44 *passim*),¹⁰ (*parṣadi*) *saṃniṣaṇṇā saṃnipatitā* “she has arrived and sat down (in the assembly)” in AvŚ (VAIDYA 1958: 183; SPEYER 1906–1909: II, 22).¹¹ In contrast, the phrase *tūṣṇī(m)* “quietly” + *sad*- “to sit” is a rare phrase in Sanskrit, where the usual collocations are *tūṣṇī(m)* + *bhū*-/*as*- “to become, be”. Therefore, Toch. A *sākāt* probably corresponds to Skt. *saṃnipatita*- and means “assembled, arrived”.

3.3. Verifying the New Interpretation

Based on the proposed meaning and interpretation, the five occurrences of Toch. A *sākāt* listed above will be analysed and translated accordingly in this section.

(1) A74a3 *sākāt lyām* “arrived, he sat down”

The sentence Toch. A (*bodhi*)*sattu mā kaś wāworāṣ sākāt lyām* “the Bodhisattva arrived and sat down, without giving any consideration” in A74a3 probably refers to the scene in MpJ, where the Bodhisattva as prince was summoned by the king, who was planning his son’s marriage with daughters of other kings, but the Bodhisattva was indifferent to it after his arrival in the assembly. In the closest parallel, i.e. 水生太子 *shuǐ shēng tài zǐ* “water-born prince” in the Chin. MSV, the prince expresses clearly his aversion to sensual enjoyment, cf. Chin. 我不求受欲，猶如於毒果 *wǒ bù qiú shòu yù, yóu rú yú dú guǒ* “I do not want or experience sensual enjoyment, just like poisonous fruits” (T.1442, 23.725b1).

⁹ The occurrence in “YQ II.5 b4” given by CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 512) is situated in the lacuna and restored based on A213b7, cf. Ji et al. (1998: 92–93, 94 note 18).

¹⁰ Cf. the translation by ROTMAN (2008: 62, 99): “was seated in the ... assembly. As one of those assembled”.

¹¹ Cf. the translation by FEER (1891: 277): “était dans l’assemblée, assise au milieu de la réunion”.

(2) A147b6 *sākāt lmorāš* “having arrived and sat down”

The sentence Toch. A *tmāš rišak prañk sākāt lmorāš śla poto oki lāntac trānkā(š)* in A147b6 can be rendered as “After that, the sage, at the moment, **having arrived and sat down**, as with respect, speaks to the king”. This is comparable to the formulaic expressions in the Buddhist texts, cf. Skt. *tena khalu punaḥ samayena... tasyām eva parṣadi saṃniṣaṇṇo ’bhūt saṃnipatitah... aṇḍjalīm kṛtvā... idam avocat* “And at the moment verily ... in the very assembly he has arrived and sat down ... with hands respectfully folded, and said this (to someone)” in Divy (COWELL and NEIL 1886: 19; cf. ROTMAN 2008: 62).

(3) A162a2 *sākāt klyantrā* “they are assembled”

In view of the words, Toch. A *(na)nde sundariṃ opyā(c)///* “Nanda (thought/ thinking of) Sundarī” in line a4, fragment A162 might belong to the episode describing Nanda’s lament in SNCN, whose Sanskrit parallel is found in canto 7 of SauN, cf. Skt. *sasmāra tām aśrumukhīm sabāśpaḥ priyām* “he remembered with sobs his mistress with her tear-strewn face” in verse 7.6 (COVILL 2007: 132–133; JOHNSTON 1932: 36). On Toch. A *kāklont poryo* “fallen with fire” in A162a5, cf. *kāmāgnināntarḥrdi dahyamāno* “[b]urning in his heart with the fire of passion” in verse 7.12 (COVILL 2007: 134–135). Line a2 /// *māš¹² sākāt klyantrā* “they are assembled” could refer to the bees gathering around mango-trees in verse 7.3, the tiny flowers falling from mango-trees in verse 7.4, or people coming to Nanda for help in verse 7.5 (cf. JOHNSTON 1932: 36).

(4) A213b7 *sākāt kālymām* “remaining assembled/accumulated”

According to YQ II.5b4 (cf. Ji et al. 1998: 90, 92), the sentence in A213b7 can be restored as Toch. A *(k_upāraṃ māskyās sa)ñceyntu sākāt kālymām pāltsäkyokk ats (lyukrā sārki ppārksāc-ām)* and translated as “you (pl.) should ask him, one by one, deep and difficult questions, **remaining assembled/accumulated** in your mind only”. The translation “quietly kept in your minds” by PEYROT (2013: 645) is problematic, because Toch. A *kāly-* “to stand, be situated” is intransitive (MALZAHN 2010: 593) and *kālymām* “standing, remaining” can hardly be rendered as “kept”.

(5) YQ III.11b2 *sākāt lmoryo* “having arrived/assembled and sat down”

This occurs in a typical scene of hosting and respecting monks, and its parallel, though fragmentary as well, is found in the Old Uyghur MSN, cf. “führten sie sie mit Verehrung ins Haus, ließen sie auf einem hohen ... Platz sitzen und beehrten (Hend.) sie mit lieblichen, süßen [Speisen und Getränken]” (GENG et

¹² The syllable *-māš* could belong to the nom. pl. m. of an adjective in *-m*, cf. *klyomāš* “noble people” nom. pl. m. According to İTKIN (2019: 41), a very small fragment THT2587 belongs to A162, but it does not offer enough information for further identification.

al. 1988: 211). The Tocharian sentence Toch. A (*saṅka*)*sth(e)r trāṅkāṣ kāsu kāsu dānapati wārpācci pissāṅk sākāt Imoryo* can thus be rendered as “the senior of the community says: well, well, O lord of liberality, **having arrived/assembled and sat down**, the community has been (well) received by you”.¹³ Toch. A *sākāt Imoryo* “having arrived/assembled and sat down” can be regarded as an absolute construction in the instrumental, cf. the preceding ablative absolute *sākāt Imorāṣ* “having arrived and sat down” in A147b6. Apart from the common ablative absolute, examples of *perlativus absolutus* and *genitivus absolutus* can be identified in Tocharian as well, cf. PAN (2021a: 129).

3.4. Toch. A *[s]ākāts* and Skt. *pakṣupāsaka*

A form which is probably related to Toch. A *sākāt* “assembled, arrived” is Toch. A *[s]ākāts*,¹⁴ which is a hapax in the Skt.-Toch. A bilingual fragment A369 and not recorded by CARLING and PINAULT (2023). In A369a3 Skt. *pakṣi* “winged, bird” is rendered by Toch. A *[s]ākāts lu*, and Toch. A *sākāts* means accordingly “winged”. There is a relevant gloss in the same fragment, namely Toch. A *salat lu wāsak* for Skt. *pakṣupāsaka*; the sentence in question reads: ^{a4} • *niyataṃ pakṣupāsaka : ṣakk atsek sās sala(t) l(u) !!!* ^{a5} *salat lu wāsak* •. In SWTF (III, 65) the original manuscript reading *pakṣupāsaka* in A369a4 has been incorrectly changed to **pakṣūpāsaka*. The editor was presumably thinking of a compound of *pakṣu-* and *upāsaka-* “layman”, and it is interpreted thus by POUCHA (1955: 292) and CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 431) as well. However, a compound of “flying animal”¹⁵ and “layman” sounds peculiar.¹⁶ In fact (Buddhist-)Skt. *pāsaka-* stands for *pāśaka-* “noose, snare”, cf. Pāli *pāsaka-* “a loop or noose” (CONE 2020: 455), and the sentence Skt. *niyataṃ pakṣupāsaka(m)* thus means “the snare for birds is tied tightly”, probably a metaphor for the bondage of people with passion, cf. Skt. *saṃraktacittasya hi mandabuddheḥ ... avekṣā etad dṛdham bandhanam āhur āryāḥ* “die Beachtung aber des Dummkopfs, dessen Denken von Leidenschaft ergriffen ist, die nennen Edle eine feste Fessel” in

¹³ The translation “sitting quietly” by Ji et al. (1998: 193) can hardly fit the context, because both parties, i.e. the lord of liberality as host and the monks as guests, are unlikely to be “sitting quietly” during the process of giving and taking alms.

¹⁴ The consonant sign before *-ā-* is very likely an *s-*, cf. the forms of the akṣara *sā* in line 3 and *sa* in line 4. Here it is assumed that *[s]ā-* is the initial syllable of the word. Toch. A *sākāt* and Toch. A *sākāts* probably derive from the same root and differ only in their suffixes, i.e. with **-to-* and **-tjo-* suffix respectively.

¹⁵ Skt. *pakṣu-* “bird” corresponds to Toch. A *salat lu* “flying animal” (CARLING and PINAULT 2023: 431), cf. Toch. B *salamo luwo* “flying animal” in B404a3 and Toch. B *hwāsa ṣlyamāna* “flying animals” in B29b8.

¹⁶ Also problematic is the explanation for Skt. *pakṣu-* “N. pr. eines Schlangendämons” by THOMAS and KRAUSE (1964: 152), which in turn is based on the questionable entry in MW. Instead of “N. of a serpent-demon” (MW s.v.), Skt. *pakṣu-* means “bird”, cf. Skt. *vidrutās ca bhayatrastā vinedur mṛgapakṣuṇaḥ* “Terrified beasts and **birds** fled screeching” in *Rāmāyaṇa* book 5 *Sundarakāṇḍa* 5.40.2 (GOLDMAN and GOLDMAN 1996: 228).

UV II. 5–6 (BERNHARD 1965: 113; HAHN 2007: 17–18). Therefore, *pace* CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 431), Toch. A *wāsak* in A369a5 is a loanword from Middle Indic or Buddhist-Skt. *pāsaka*- “noose, snare”.

3.5. Linguistic Remarks

Morphologically, the adjective Toch. A *sākāts* “winged” would presuppose the existence of a noun Toch. A *sākāt*-* or *sāk** “wing”, because Toch. A *-ts* is very likely the adjective suffix from Proto-Toch. **-tjæ*. Since Skt. *patatra-/pat(t)ra*- “wing” derives from *pat*- “to fly, fall” (EWAia: II, 71),¹⁷ Toch. A *sākāt* “assembled, arrived” (= Skt. *saṃnipatita*-, from *pat*- “to fall, fly”) and Toch. A *sākāts* “winged” (= Skt. *patatrin*- or *patrin*- “id.”) are probably cognates and derive from the same root Toch. A *sāk*^(a)- “to fall, fly, come, remain” (cf. MALZAHN 2010: 933),¹⁸ which goes back to PIE **seh₁k-* “to be there, have arrived” (LIV²: 519): PIE **sh₁k-to* > Proto-Toch. **saktæ*- > Toch. A *sākāt* “assembled, arrived”; **sh₁k-tjo*- > Proto-Toch. **saktjæ*- > Toch. A *sākāts* “winged”.

Another related word is probably Toch. A *sākār* “auspicious, good, favourable” (CARLING and PINAULT 2023: 513), which is the underlying adjective of Toch. A *sākronē* “kindness” (= Skt. *bhadravattā*-) in Skt.-Toch. A bilingual fragment A386b1, and it can be a derivative from PIE **seh₁k-* “to be there, have arrived” as well, namely **sh₁k-ro* > Proto-Toch. **sakrae*- > Toch. A *sākār*. The semantic connection between “to come, fall” and “pleasing, good” is well attested: cf. OHG *gifallan* “to fall, fall to, please” (EWAhd: III, 39); Gr. *ικανός* “sufficient, satisfactory” and *ἵκω* “I come” from PIE **sejk-* “to reach, arrive”; Gr. *ἄσμενος* “rescued, glad” and *véomai* “I come” from PIE **nes-* “to get away” (LIV²: 454).

3.6. Tentative Restoration of Toch. A *sākū(t)* in A314b1¹⁹

The line A314b1: */// ·m· – ·puk nu c(a)my (ak)ml· – – – – – ·y·nāk sās tri wältsem ārkisōši puk sākā(t) ·r· (ś)ś(ä)*²⁰*ll ok(i) : sne ś· ///* in the so-called “Sonnenaufgangswunder” story is left untranslated by SIEG (1952: 30) due to its fragmentary state, but the words *c(a)my (ak)ml· ... sās tri wältsem ārkisōši puk* “his face ... this whole three-thousand-world” and the description of Buddha’s rays of light in the preceding and following lines (Toch. A *swāñcenyō* “through ray of light” in line a8 and Toch. A *swāñcenāśśi* “of

¹⁷ Cf. also the remark on PIE **peth₁-* “fallen” in LIV²: 478: “Zu trennen von 2. **peth₂-* ‘fliegen’, doch im Iir. offenbar damit zusammengefallen, wobei sich semantisch weitgehend **peth₂-* durchsetzt”. In the online Addenda und Corrigenda zu LIV² (KÜMMEL 2024: 69), there is only **pet*- “fliegen, stürzen, fallen”.

¹⁸ The semantic connection between “to fall, come” and “to remain” can be confirmed by Skt. *patita*- “fallen, being in”.

¹⁹ The small point after *ka* perhaps belongs to a *t*- sign.

²⁰ On the writing of *śśä* with two points over the normal sign, cf. Toch. A *pkaśśäl* in A3b6. As noted by one anonymous reviewer, “*śä* without Fremdzeichen is frequent in Tocharian A”.

rays of light” in b3) probably belong to a cliché in the Buddhist texts, cf. Skt. *svaṃ mukhaṃaṇḍalaṃ pracchādyā ... raśmibhiḥ ayaṃ trisāhasramahāsāhasro lokadhātur udāreṇāvabhāsenā sphuṭo 'bhūt* “having covered **his face ... through rays of light this three-thousandfold-great-thousandfold world** system was **filled with exalted splendour**” in KarP (YAMADA 1968: 48–49), *ūrṇākośāt prabhāṃ utsṛjati sma yayā prabhayā trisāhasramahāsāhasro lokadhātur mahatā suvarṇavarṇāvabhāsenā sphuṭo 'bhūt* “from the circle of hair between his eyebrows he released **rays of light**, and through the rays the **three-thousandfold-great-thousandfold world** system was filled with great **golden-coloured splendour**” in LV (HOKAZONO 2019: 348) and *sa(r)v(a)ś c(ā)y(aṃ) l(oka udā)reṇāvabh(āsenā s)phuṭo 'bh(ūt)* “and this **whole world** was **filled with exalted splendour**”, in MAV unearthed in Turfan (cf. FUKITA 2003: 62; SWTF: IV, 439). Therefore, the tentative restoration Toch. *sākā(t)* in A314b1 probably renders Skt. *sphuṭa-* “filled, open, expanded”. On the semantic affinity of “to fly” and “open, expanded”, cf. Eng. *fly* in the sense of “spread” (e.g. Eng. *rumours were flying*) and PIE **peth₂-* “to spread, extend”²¹ with a remark in LIV²: 478–479: “Originally identical with 2nd **peth₂-* ‘to fly’ ← ‘to spread the wings’ [Urspr. identisch mit 2. **peth₂-* ‘fliegen’ ← ‘die Flügel ausbreiten’]”.

4. Toch. A *yusār* “rainy season”

4.1. State of Research and Brief Review

Toch. A *yusār* is only attested twice in A65b5 and A70b4 (see section 4.3 below), and in addition a related word A *yusāri* is found in A265a4. SIEG (1952: 44 fn. 9) considers A *yusār* in A70b4 to be a correspondent of Skt. *navā navāḥ* and translates it as “always new [immer wieder neuen]”. Sieg’s interpretation is adopted by THOMAS and KRAUSE (1964: 130). According to SCHMIDT (1994: 280) Toch. A *yusār* means rather “spring”, and he connects it with PIE **uesōr* “spring”, i.e. Toch. A *yusār* < **yān w’āsār* < **en uesōr* “in spring”. Schmidt’s explanation is adopted by HILMARSSON (1991: 190) and BLAŽEK (2006: 3).

PINAULT (2021: 2²²) as well as CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 371) translate Toch. A *yusār* as “season” and interpret Toch. A *yusāri* as a dual form. This interpretation goes back to PINAULT (1993: 143–157). PINAULT’s (1993: 146–147) explanation of Toch. A *yusār* as “season” is based upon the occurrences Toch. A *yusār yāpsant śme-śārme* in A70b4 in the *Viśvāntarajātaka* (VJ) and A *yusār praṣṭā* in A65b5 in MpJ. Although the phrase Toch. A *yusār yāpsant śme-śārme* in A70b4 indeed should belong to the description of a scene in VJ, for which Skt. *ṛtu-prayatna-racita-* is used (HANISCH 2005: 82; MEILAND 2009: 224), PINAULT’s (1993: 146)

²¹ According to SCHUMACHER and MATZINGER (2013: 974), EWAhd VI: 1348 and KÜMMEL (2024: 78), the root should be established as PIE **(s)peth₂-* “to spread” with *s*-mobile in view of Lat. *spatium* “space”.

²² I.e. the second page of the PDF file uploaded by Pinault, which is not paginated.

conclusion that “*yusār* rend apparemment skr. *ṛtu-*” is problematic, because the Sanskrit compound cannot be an exact equivalent of the Tocharian phrase²³ and Toch. A *ṣme-śārme* “summer (and) winter” clearly does not correspond to Skt. *prayatnaracita-* “carefully crafted” (MEILAND 2009: 225).

In the case of Toch. A *yusār praṣṭā* in A65b5, PINAULT (1993: 147) regards it as rendering of Sanskrit compound *ṛtu-kāla-* “proper season; menstruation period”, but he translates Toch. A *yusār praṣṭā* as “at the time of season [au moment de la saison]” in the sense of “at a time that is normally favourable for wheat growth [au moment normalement propice à la croissance du blé]” without offering any textual evidence for this unusual interpretation, which is not attested in the Sanskrit texts. The phrase underlying PINAULT’s hypothesis (1993: 146), i.e. “summer” (Skt. *grīṣma-*) + “winter” (Skt. *hemanta-*) + “season” (Skt. *ṛtu-*), as basis of Toch. A *ṣme-śārme-yusāri* in A265a4 is not attested in the Sanskrit corpus either. PINAULT’s (1993: 146, 150) theory of the so-called “good season [belle saison]” and “bad season [mauvaise saison]” of the Tocharian calendar, for which he does not cite any relevant literature,²⁴ seems not to be grounded in historical texts and is therefore weakly credible.

4.2. Parallel and Calque

SCHMIDT’s (1994: 280) interpretation is obviously based on the occurrence in MSN, i.e. Toch. A *ṣme-śārme-yusāri nasl(aṃ)*²⁵ /// in A265a4, for which the Old Uyghur parallel reads *yaz kūz yay [qīšlīy]²⁶ äv ba[rq ordu qaršīsīn* “Seinen Frühlings-, Herbst-, Sommer- [und Winter- Haus-] Palast” (GENG et al. 1991: 270, 285). Schmidt is correct in pointing out that Toch. A *ṣme* means “summer”²⁷ and Toch. A *śārme* means “winter”,²⁸ but he has not provided the original Sanskrit phrase.²⁹

²³ The Tocharian VJ is not an exact parallel to the Sanskrit version in Āryaśūra’s JM, cf. Sieg 1952: 44 fn. 1 and PAN (2022: 103–104).

²⁴ According to PINAULT (1993: 150), autumn and winter are “bad season [mauvaise saison]”. But autumn is the season of harvest in many cultures, and winter with a lot of snow is auspicious as a sign of next year’s bounteous harvest in China, cf. the common Chinese proverbs 冬雪丰年 *dōng xuě fēng nián* “snow in winter and (new) year with a rich harvest” and 瑞雪兆丰年 *ruì xuě zhào fēng nián* “plenty of snow is a sign of new year with a bounteous harvest”.

²⁵ So is the restoration by PINAULT (1993: 147).

²⁶ Instead of OUygh. *qīšlīy* it could also be restored as *qīšlīq* “winter residence [Winterquartier]” (literally “for winter”) or *qīšqī* “wintry, of winter [winterlich, des Winters]” (cf. WILKENS 2021: 374–375). I would like to thank my colleague Dr Ma Fu for this information.

²⁷ Its counterpart Toch. B *ṣmāye* “summer” corresponds to Skt. *grīṣma-* “hot season” and *varṣa-* “rainy season”, cf. OGIHARA (2011: 129).

²⁸ Its Tocharian B counterpart *śramṣṣe**, as claimed by Pinault (*apud* OGIHARA 2012: 170), is semantically problematic. In addition, only *[r]·[mṣ]·* is discernible in the fragment, making their restoration highly uncertain.

²⁹ In the Buddhist Sanskrit corpus there is no such compound as Skt. *grīṣma-hemanta-*

Toch. A *ṣme-śārme-yusāri nasl(aṃ)* /// in A265a4 and its Old Uyghur parallel refer to prince Siddhārtha's three palaces for three seasons, cf. Skt. *grīṣmikavārṣikahaimantikeṣu prāsādeṣu* "in the palaces for summer, rainy season and winter" in LV (HOKAZONO 2019: 124); Pāli *bandhumā rājā vipassissa kumārassa tayo pāsāde kārāpesi ekaṃ vassikaṃ ekaṃ hemantikaṃ ekaṃ gimhikaṃ* "King Bandhumā caused three palaces to be built for Prince Vipassī, one for the rainy season, one for the cold season, and one for the hot season" in DN II (DAVIDS and CARPENTER 1903: 21; WALSHE 1987: 207); Pāli *tassa mayhaṃ bhikkhave tayo pāsādā ahesuṃ eko hemantiko eko gimhiko eko vassiko* "Moreover, monks, I had three palaces: one for winter, one for summer, and one for the rainy season" in AN I (MORRIS, rev. WARDER 1961: 145; WOODWARD 1979: I, 128). Therefore, Toch. A *ṣme-śārme-yusār* is very likely a calque of Skt. *hemanta-grīṣma-varṣa-* "winter, summer and rainy season",³⁰ a common compound attested e.g. in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (PRADHAN 1975: 177), *Manusmṛti* 3.281 (OLIVELLE 2005: 122, 502), and *Carakasamhitā*.³¹ Furthermore, Toch. A *nasāl* (*naslaṃ* acc. pl. f.) is a calque of Skt. *bhavana-* "house, palace",³² and Toch. A *yusāri* is probably gen. sg. of Toch. A *yusār* "rainy season" under the influence of the kinship nouns ending in *-r* (cf. KRAUSE and THOMAS 1960: 105). OUygh. *yay* "summer" (= Skt. *varṣa-* "rainy season", cf. WILKENS 2021: 879) is thus a suitable correspondent of Toch. A *yusār* "rainy season". The hypothetic interpretation of Toch. A *yusāri* "two seasons" in A265a4 by CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 371) goes against the above-cited parallel texts in Sanskrit and Pāli and should be revised.

4.3. Verifying the New Interpretation

The correspondence between Toch. A *ṣme-śārme-yusāri nasl(aṃ)* "palaces for summer, winter and rainy season" and OUygh. *yaz kūz yay (qīšlīy äv ba)rq ordu qaršīsīn* "his palace (house) for spring, autumn, summer (and winter)" merits attention. The reason why OUygh. *yaz* "spring" could correspond to Toch. A *ṣme* "summer" (= Skt. *grīṣma-*, Pāli *gimha-*) and OUygh. *kūz* "autumn" to Toch. A *śārme* "winter" (= Skt. *hemanta-*, Pāli *hemanta-*), lies in the fact that

vasanta-, *hemanta-grīṣma-vasanta-* or *vasanta-grīṣma-hemanta-*, which underlies Schmidt's interpretation, namely Toch. A *ṣme* = Skt. *grīṣma-* "summer", Toch. A *śārme* = Skt. *hemanta-* "winter" and Toch. A *yusār* = Skt. *vasanta-* "spring".

³⁰ In the case of Sanskrit calques, the Tocharian translations sometimes deviate slightly from their Sanskrit models with respect to word order, cf. PAN (2021c: 47–48).

³¹ Cf. Skt. *śītoṣṇavarṣalakṣaṇāḥ punar hemantagrīṣmavarṣāḥ samvatsaraḥ sa kālah* "Time is year which again consists of winter, summer and rainy seasons with (dominant) characters of cold, heat and rains respectively" (SHARMA 2014: I, 76–77).

³² On the correspondence between the Skt. *-ana-* suffix and Toch. gerundive suffix in the designation of concrete objects, cf. PAN (2021a: 128). Toch. A *naslune* usually translates Sanskrit abstract nouns, e.g. Toch. A *mā yulā naslune* rendering Skt. *anavahitatā-* "inattentiveness" in A385a5–b1 (cf. THOMAS and KRAUSE 1964: 43 fn. 12).

the Indian *grīṣma*-season corresponds to spring and summer in the four-season system, on the one hand, and the Indian *hemanta*-season to autumn and winter in the four-season system, on the other, cf. SANGPO (2012: II, 1089). It also indicates that the Old Uyghur calendar differs from the Indian calendar, which is understandable given the very different climates.

The newly established meaning of “rainy season” also fits the context of A65b5. Toch. A *k₁yalte yusār praṣṭū wrasom wsār tāpaṣ kucne tmāṣ oko kälṣāl tāṣ cam sāb₆(m neṣā tāppu tākiṣ tāmyo tsmāraṃ t)āppus sām wsār māskatār •* in A65b5–6 with restoration by SIEG (1952: 26 fn. 9) can be translated as “If a person eats grain **during the time of the rainy season**, (then he would have eaten beforehand) the fruit that he would get from it. (Therefore) the grain is (already) eaten (in the root)”. Rice, millet and maize are commonly sowed and grown during the rainy season and harvested from September to October, and eating the grain during the rainy season is thus equal to consuming the foundation. The Chinese parallel is located in the episode of 水生太子 *shuǐ shēng tài zǐ* “water-born prince” in the Chinese MSV, where “formerly” and “in former times” refer to a period before the harvest and could be regarded as a reference to the rainy season:

Chin. 此大穀聚若先不食根本者 *cǐ dà gǔ jù ruò xiān bù shí gēn běn zhě* “This great heap of grain is like the one who **formerly** did not consume the foundation” (T.1442, 23.724c13–14).

Chin. 如若先時不食他物便成大聚 *rú ruò xiān shí bù shí tā wù biàn chéng dà jù* “If **in former times** he did not consume (the grain), that thing would become a great heap (of grain).” (T.1442, 23.725c4)

Cf. SCHIEFNER’s (1877: 127) German translation of the Tibetan parallel in MSV: “Wenn dieser Getreidehaufen nicht von Anfang an von der Grundlage verzehrt würde, würde er gross werden”.

The occurrence in A70b4 presents some difficulty because of the hapax *yāpsant*, which is partly faded in the manuscript. CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 371–372) propose to read it as “*yā[ṣ]sant*” and change the text to *yusāryāṣ sant*, which consists of a hypothetical “Abl.Du.” *yusāryāṣ* meaning “from the two seasons” and an invented hapax *ṣant* with an *ad hoc* meaning “really happening”.³³ The strategy of creating a new hapax in order to explain an existing hapax can hardly be recommended, and the strangeness of the resulting phrase “during the really happening summer [and] winter” further weakens their explanation. Since the meaning “season” for Toch. A *yusār*, as well as the dual form assumed by PINAULT (1993: 146–147), prove to be questionable, the reading *yāpsant* should

³³ The hapax *ṣant* is glossed by CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 508) as “true, real, happening”, but translated as “really happening”.

be kept.³⁴ Although the meaning of Toch. A *yäpsant* is unclear (cf. MALZAHN 2010: 798), the whole Tocharian phrase *yusār yäpsant šme-šärme* in A70b4 should correspond roughly to Skt. *ṛtuprayatnaracita-* “carefully crafted by the seasons” or Skt. *ṛtu-* “season” alone in a description of the beauty of the forest in VJ (MEILAND 2009: 224–225). Therefore, the meaning “rainy season” for Toch. A *yusār* is also suitable in A70b4.

4.4. Linguistic Remarks

Toch. A *yusār* “rainy season” is probably a collective of A *yus** “falling water”, which might derive from PIE **ĵes-* “to boil, foam” (LIV²: 312–313). Morphologically, a possessive derivative from an *-u*-stem abstract noun **isū-* “boiling, foaming” would result in **isū-o-* “characterised by or equipped with boiling and foaming”, and **isū-o-* > Proto-Toch. **iäsū-æ* > Toch. A **yus* “falling water”. For the phonological development, cf. Toch. A *yuk* “horse” < Proto-Toch. **äku-æ* < PIE **h₁ék-ū-o-* “equipped with speed, characterised by rapidity” (HACKSTEIN 2013: 99); for the semantic development, cf. Middle Irish *ess* “waterfall” < Proto-Celt. **ĵes-tu-* ← PIE **ĵes-* “to boil, foam” (O’RAHILLY 1942: 144). Similar formations are found in Toch. A *oñk* B *eñkwe* “man” from PIE **ñk-ū-o-* “characterised by dying or death → mortal” from PIE **nek-* “to die”.

5. Conclusion

Based on the philological investigation above, the following improvements may be suggested:

(1) Toch. A *kār** probably means “path, place to go, state, ground”. Toch. A *āpāyšinās kārāntu* corresponds to Chin. 惡趣 *è qū* “evil states of existence”, the equivalent of Skt. *apāya-gati-*, *apāya-patha-*, *apāya-bhūmi-* “id.”.

(2) Toch. A *yusār* probably means “rainy season” and corresponds to Skt. *varṣa-* “id.” and OUygh. *yay* “summer”. Toch. A *šme-šärme-yusār* “summer, winter and rainy season” is a calque of Skt. *hemanta-grīṣma-varṣa-* “winter, summer and rainy season”. Toch. A *nasāl* is a calque of Skt. *bhavana-* “house, palace”.

(3) Toch. A *wāsak* in A369a5 is a loanword from Middle Indic or Buddhist-Skt. *pāsaka-* “noose, snare” (= Skt. *pāśaka-*).

(4) Toch. A *śūkār* probably means “power, force, vigour” and corresponds to Skt. *bala-* “id.”, OUygh. *küč* “id.”, Chin. 力 *lì* “id.”. Toch. A *kāruṃṣiṃ śūkāryo* “through the power of compassion” is a calque of Skt. *karuṇā-baleṇa* “id.”

³⁴ In fact, in the Tocharian A corpus the consonant group *-šs-* is only attested once in Toch. A *rākṣās* < **rākṣātsās*, acc. pl. of Toch. A *rākṣats* “demon”.

(= Chin. 以慈悲力 *yǐ cí bēi lì* “id.”); cf. further OUygh. *uluy yrlıqančuči bilig küčintä* “through the great power of compassion”, Chin. 以大慈悲力 *yǐ dà cí bēi lì* “id.”.

(5) The hapax †*sant* “true, real, happening” postulated by CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 508) is to be given up.

(6) Toch. A *sākāt* probably corresponds to Skt. *saṃnipatita-* and means “assembled, arrived”. Toch. A *sākāt* + *lām-* “to sit” or *käly-* “to stay, be situated” are calques of Skt. *saṃniṣaṇṇa-* “sat down, sat together” + *saṃnipatita-* “assembled, arrived”. Toch. *sākā(t)* can be restored in A314b1 and probably translates Skt. *sphuṭa-* “filled, open, expanded”.

(7) Toch. A *[s]ākäts* “winged” probably occurs in A369a3, and Toch. A *[s]ākäts lu* “winged animal” renders Skt. *pakṣi* “winged, bird”.

6. Addendum

A preliminary list of problems and inconsistencies in other entries in DThTA is presented here:

(1) P. 41b–42a on Toch. A *āral and p. 189b on Toch. A *cwal*:** *cwal ārlā* in A3b5 is mistakenly given as *cwal †ārlā* on p. 189b (correct on p. 41b), and without any further philological evidence or reference is translated as “in the beginning [and] at the end” (p. 189b), which is simply rendered from SIEG’S (1944: 6) tentative German translation “beim Beginn (?) und beim Aufhören”. Given the very fragmentary state of A37a3 and THT1146b4, even if we accept the postulated existence of Toch. A *ārlā* there by CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 41b), it is impossible to establish the meaning of *ārlā* based on A37 and THT1146, for which the two editors have not provided any parallel text, and the meaning “ending, ceasing” for *āral** is solely based on A3b5. This is another example of the circumstance outlined in section 1.1 above.

Toch. A *ṣñi ṣñaṣṣesā ortāsā (tāmne) emtsu cwal ārlā* in A3b4–5 can be rendered as “held/guarded by his own kinsmen and friends, (and so) by companion and blood relative” and corresponds to Skt. *mitrair amātyaiś ca tathā suhr̥dbhiḥ sālohitai(h) [pr](i)[ya](tamo) [gr](h)[ītaḥ]* “held/guarded as the dearest by friends and kinsmen, and so by companions and blood relatives” in the *Śikhālakasūtra* (Olav Hackstein, p.c.; cf. OGIHARA 2009: 147; MATSUDA 1996: 866).³⁵ Therefore, Toch. A *cwal ārlā* renders Skt. *suhṛdbhiḥ sālohitaiḥ* “by companions and blood relatives”. Toch. A *cwal* means “companion, friend”,

³⁵ The Chin. parallels are 善友貴重人 ... 同氣親兄弟, 善能相攝受 *shàn yǒu guì zhòng rén ... tóng qì qīn xiōng dì, shàn néng xiāng shè shòu* (T.99, 2.353b15–16) and 親友臣同恤, 愛樂有齊限, 調攝在親中 *qīn yǒu chén tóng xù, ài lè yǒu qí xiàn, wèi shè zài qīn zhōng* (T.26, 1.641c29–642a1).

and Toch. A *āral** or *āräl** means “blood relative”. Note that OGIHARA (2009: 149–150) has already dealt with Toch. A *cwal ārlā* in detail and his 2009 paper is indeed listed in the bibliography of DThTA on p. XXXVII.

(2) P. 97b on Toch. A *karṇe*: in translating *śuddhodan nu karṇe oki mṣapantiṃ* ṣeṣ “but Śuddhodana was lord of a field, like Karṇa” in A118b3, Carling and Pinault explain *karṇe* as “[f]rom Skt. *Karṇa* ‘n. of a king of Aṅga’ (MW: 256b)”, which goes back to CARLING (2009: 104b). Under the entry *Karṇe* (CARLING and PINAULT 2023: 97b), Toch. A *mṣapantiṃ* is translated as “member of the reigning order” (following CARLING 2009: 104), but under the entry *mṣapantiṃ* (CARLING and PINAULT 2023: 357b), it is translated as “member of the warrior class, warrior”.

In fact, Toch. A *Karṇe* in A118b3 is the name of a king in the Śākya family.³⁶ Detailed information on the Śākya lineage is, for instance, preserved in the *Sanḡhabhedavastu* from Gilgit (cf. GNOLI 1977: 21, 26, 31), according to which Karṇa was the king of the city Potalaka (Skt. *potalake nagare... karṇo nāma rājābhūt*), one of his successors was Virūdhaka, who again was predecessor of Siṃhahanu, father of Śuddhodana (= father of Buddha), and they all belonged to the lineage of Mahāsaṃmata (Skt. *mahāsaṃmatavamaśah*, GNOLI 1977: 32).³⁷ On Toch. A *karṇe* and *mṣapantiṃ* cf. further PAN (2024).

(3) P. 229a on Toch. A *tursko* or “*trusko*”: Toch. A *tursko* is only found in a Skt.-Toch. A bilingual fragment A361 of the *Samyuktāgama*, where Toch. A (*tsraṣṣu*) *neṣi śkaṃ tār-tursko ñi* “and (manliness) is like my *tār-tursko*” corresponds to Chin. 精進無廢荒 *jīng jìn wú fèi huāng* “manliness (makes the land) free of weeds” (T.99, 2.27b2), whereas the corresponding Pāli text is *viriyam me dhuradhorayhaṃ* “manliness is my draught animal”. Carling and Pinault have altered Toch. A *tursko* to †*trusko*, which is not actually attested, in order to connect the word to Pāli *dhoraṃ* “draught animal” and derive it from Toch. A *trusk-* “to connect”.

In arguing for the meaning of Toch. A *tursko* Carling and Pinault cite and rely on ENOMOTO (1997), and they claim that: “The word is attested in a translation of the *Samyukta-āgama* (see ENOMOTO 1997: 97), which corresponds to Pa. (SN I:172, Sn:14) *viriyam me dhuradhorayhaṃ* ‘energy is my beast of burden.’” However, as early as Sieg and Siegling’s publication of Tocharian A texts in 1921, the passages and verses of Pāli parallel texts were explicitly noted in the

³⁶ PW s.v.: “bei den Buddhisten ein Sohn Mahāsaṃmata’s”. This piece of information in PW originates from FOUCAUX (1848: 411), who described the origin of the Śākya family based on the Tibetan *Abhiniṣkramaṇasūtra*.

³⁷ On this episode and the relationship between the Tibetan *Abhiniṣkramaṇasūtra* and Sanskrit *Sanḡhabhedavastu*, cf. SILK (2008: 258 footnote 16). The Chinese parallel text is located in the 眾許摩訶帝經 *Zhòng xǔ mó hē dì jīng* (T.191, 3.936c–937c).

introduction preceding the fragment A361 (cf. SIEG and SIEGLING 1921: 202). Furthermore, Enomoto's paper in fact compares the Sanskrit portion of this bilingual fragment with the corresponding Chinese *Samyuktāgama* text, which Carling and Pinault probably have not consulted. Therefore, they repeated a fact already stated by Sieg and Siegling in 1921.

Moreover, the translation “and the beast of burden of energy is my draught animal” by CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 229a) deviates significantly from the metaphor in the Pāli version, because their translation would be tantamount to saying “beast is animal”. Could such a statement really be what Buddha is preaching here? The syntagma “X-*ṣi* Y” here probably means “X is like Y” (literally “X-like Y”), cf. Pāda 2a Skt. (*śraddhā*) *bījaṃ tapo vṛṣṭi(h)*, which matches Toch. A *perāk_nneṣi śāktālyī pāṣuneṣi* (*swase*) “faith is like seed, penance is like rain”. The postulated meaning “carrier, beast of burden” (CARLING and PINAULT 2023: 207b) for Toch. A *tār* and their etymology of “[l]oan from Skt. *dhāra-*” are problematic as well, since Skt. *dhāra-* never means “beast of burden”.

It has already been proven that the Sanskrit and Tocharian A versions of the *Samyuktāgama* in A361 are more in line with the Chinese parallel, while the Pāli version differs from them (PAN 2021c: 69–70). Therefore, Toch. A. *tār-tursko* corresponds to Chin. 無廢荒 *wú fèi huāng* “free of weeds” and means “cutting of weeds” literally. Accordingly, Toch. A. *tār* means “weeds” and *tursko* means “cutting”, cf. further PAN (2021c: 77–80).

(4) **P. 288b on Toch. A *p_nkāl***: perl. pl. †*puklākā* is a ghost form, and the two occurrences A54a6 and A289b8–288a1 cited by Carling and Pinault should be emended differently. In A54a6, the vowel sign after *-klā-* is probably *-o* (cf. the pointed right tip, which is different from *ā* in *kā*), so instead of *puklā(k)[ā]*, it is more likely *puklā(y)[o]* instr. pl. In A289b8–288a1, it should be restored as Toch. A *okāk (w)älts puklāk(am)* “up to 1000 years” with *puklākam* loc. pl., because as a preposition Toch. A *okāk* “up to” governs locative case, cf. CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 76–77) and CARLING (2000: 345) for other examples.

(5) **P. 297a on Toch. A *porant****: section R “Possibly, *ype-* in 229 a1 (sic!) is not ►*ype* ‘country’ but a loan from TB *yape* ‘spider’”. First, Toch. A *ype* occurs not in “229 a1” but in A229 a2, which is correctly registered in section T; second, on p. 378a the occurrence of Toch. A *ype* in A229a2 is still included under the entry *ype* “land” without mentioning the presumed borrowing from Toch. B on p. 297a.

(6) **P. 303a on Toch. A *prakte***: the translation “punishment, expiation” by Carling and Pinault corresponds to the tentative rendering “poena, punitio (?)” by POUCHA (1955: 195). The reason for this interpretation was pointed out by

Ji et al. (1998: 53–54, note 1), who translated the occurrence Toch. A *k_uyal mā prakte kälpitār* in the MSN fragment A215b2 as “Why are you not punished?” (so is the translation by Ji 1988: 148 fn 1), thus Toch. A *prakte* means “punished”. This translation is based on its Old Uyghur parallel, because “[t]hese sentences have their counterparts in Ui. II, but not quite equivalent to each other” (Ji et al. 1998: 53, note 1). “Ui. II” refers to the “Chinese translation done by Prof. Geng Shimin” (Ji et al. 1998: 18), and the Chinese translation is “你将受惩罚” *nǐ jiāng shòu chéng fá* “You will get punishment” (cf. GENG 2008³⁸: 76). Geng’s Chinese translation is based on his edited text “qǐzyütīng bolzun”. However, according to GENG et al. (1988: 96–97), instead of OUygh. *qǐzyütīng bolzun*, the text is *qiz qisga bolz-un* “**Mangel und Knappheit** mögen sein!”, i.e. with *qiz qisga* or *kiz kisga* “beschränkt, kurz” (WILKENS 2021: 376). The reading *qiz qisga* is confirmed by ZIEME (pers. comm. on 24th June 2024) against the manuscript photo. It is unclear why Geng changed the text to *qǐzyütīng*. According to WILKENS (2008: 427–428) the reading “*kizgutun bolzun*” meaning “Mögest du bestraft werden!” in the “Xinjiang-Edition” is better than “*kiz kisga*” by GENG et al. (1988: 96) because it is closer to the Tocharian text *k_uyal mā prakte kälpitār* “Why are you not punished?” However, WILKENS’s (2008: 428) understanding of the Tocharian sentence is based on the interpretation by Ji et al. (1998: 53–54, note 1) and THOMAS’s (1990: 20) German translation, which again is based on the English translation by Ji (1988: 148 fn 1), which is repeated in Ji et al. (1998: 53–54, note 1). Therefore, the supposed superiority of the reading “*kizgutun*” claimed by WILKENS (2008: 427–428) is hardly credible due to its reliance on a *de facto* circular argument.

Moreover, the meaning “punishment” for Toch. A *prakte* can hardly fit the context in A311a5: *ptāñkte märkampal pekluneši pñi pūk pñintwaṃ tpār sumerr oki koṃ-ñkātt oki lukšanu pūk kleśāsī prakte ypant* “the merit of writing the law of Buddha-god is the highest among all the merits like Sumeru, (is the) brightest like the sun-god, (is) making **prakte** of all the afflictions”. A search for “*puṇya*–” “merit” and “*kleśa*–” “affliction” in the Buddhist Sanskrit corpus shows that instead of “punishment” of the afflictions, which is nowhere attested, the afflictions are extinguished (Skt. *upaśamaya*– “to extinguish”), destroyed (Skt. *samuddhṛ*– “to destroy utterly”) or eradicated (Skt. *unmūlaya*– “eradicate”) due to the accumulated merits, e.g. through writing Buddhist sūtras, cf. the following examples:

a. *Samghāṭasūtra* § 78: Skt. *evam evāsyā samghāṭasya dharmaparyāyasya lekhanād yat puṇyaṃ tan na śakyam upamāṃ kartuṃ. imaṃ sarvasūra samghāṭaṃ sūtraṃ puṇyanidhānāni darśayati. sarvakleśān upaśamayati* “it is impossible to find an adequate comparison for the merit

³⁸ Ji Xianlin apparently made use of an earlier Chinese translation of the 1st act made by Geng before 1998 (cf. Ji 1988: 148 fn 1), and this version was later published in GENG (2008).

made by **writing the Saṃghāṣūtra**. For, the Saṃghāṣūtra makes the treasures of merit visible (*puṇyanidhāna*), **extinguishes all impurities** (*kleśa*)” (von HINÜBER 2021: lxv, 31 (Ms F)).

b. *Saṅghastotrastava*: *puṇyakṣetram ayaṃ saṃghaḥ kleśakakṣa-samuddhṛtaḥ* “Dieser Orden ist ein Feld der **Tugend**, der das Gestrüpp der **Leidenschaften ausgerottet** hat” (SCHLINGLOFF 1955: 92).

c. *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* No. 39 *Kapilāvadānam* verse 107cd: Skt. *vyasananipatitānām līlayā puṇyaśīlā | nikhilam atulamūlaṃ kleśam unmulayanti* “The **virtuous ones** easily **uproot** completely the deeply rooted **affliction** of those who have fallen into misfortune” (VAIDYA 1959: 254).

Therefore, as correspondent of Skt. *sarvakleśān upaśamaya*- “to extinguish all the afflictions”, Toch. A *pūk kleśāśsi prakte ypant* in A311a5 can be translated as “extinguishing/destroying/eradicating all the afflictions”, and Toch. A *prakte* means “extinguishment, destruction, eradication” accordingly. Toch. A *ākā konaṃ¹ | šom nšā t_ukār yāt¹ | k_uval mā prakte¹ | kälpitār* (YQ I.6b8+A215b2) can be rendered as “finally today (lit. on the day) you are niggardly to me alone, why wouldn’t you get destruction?” (cf. Thomas 1990: 20). This curse by Nirdhana the Brahmin would match its Old Uyghur parallel *qiz qisga bolzun*, “there should be misery and deficiency (for you)!”. Toch. A *(o)mäskenäśsi prakte (ype)ñcā* in A322a5 thus means “they eradicate the evils”. And Toch. A *šñi kätwes mätkont prakte ypamtār kārūñik* in A300b3 can be rendered as “we (= creatures in hells) cause (lit. make) destruction of our own tongue mutually (lit. towards selves),³⁹ O compassionate one!”, cf. its OUygh. parallel in the 20th chapter of the *Maitrisimit* from Singim: *tylymzny pycyšwr pyz* “Unsere Zungen zerschneiden wir uns gegenseitig” (TEKIN 1980: 176, Taf. 174 verso line 30), and Toch. A *prakte yap-* (mid.) corresponds to OUygh. *pycyš-* or *bičiš-* “sich gegenseitig (ab)schneiden” (WILKENS 2021: 167). Etymologically, Toch. A *prakte* “extinguishment, destruction” could be cognate with OHG *brechan* “break” and probably derives from PIE **b^hreǵ-* “break” (cf. EWAhd II: 307–309).

(7) **P. 348a on Toch. A *miši***: in section T “Perl.Sg. 62 a1” is recorded, but in section F there is no “Perl.Sg.”. In section T the presumed occurrence “*mišā*” in A62a1 is interpreted as “Perl.Sg.”, but immediately preceding it this very occurrence “*mišā*” in A62a1 is changed to “(*miši*)” and regarded as “Obl.Sg.”. In fact, the manuscript reading is very likely *mi[šī]*, instead of the “*mi[s]ā*” noted by SIEG and SIEGLING (1921: 35), given the slightly different position of the right stroke of the vowel signs *ī* and *ā*.

³⁹ Instead of “punishment, expiation”, CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 121) translate Toch. A *prakte* here as “torture”, cf. their translation “we make torture to ourselves to our own tongue”.

(8) **P. 378b–379a on Toch. A *ymatu*:** in section R, we read: “According to Huard (p.c.), the phrase *ymatu miši* corresponds to Skt. *dvipādaka-puṇyakṣetra*- ‘a human field of merit’ (BHSD:274b)”, but in section S *ymatu miši* is rendered as “animate (i.e. personified) field [of merits] (Skt. *dvipādaka-puṇyakṣetra*-)”, and in section T as “living field [of merits]”. Thus, the word “human” in BHSD was changed by Carling and Pinault to “animate” or “living”, although “human” (two-footed), “animate” (two-footed, four-footed or many-footed) and “living” cannot simply be regarded as synonyms. Furthermore, while Carling and Pinault *apud* Huard admit that the underlying Skt. word must be *dvipādaka*- “two-legged”, they give “Skt. °*gama*-” as the counterpart of Toch. A *ymatu* at the beginning of this entry.⁴⁰

In fact, Toch. A *ymatu* means not simply “going”, but rather “rushing, running” and corresponds to Tib. *rgyug pa* “running” or *mg-yogs pa* “rapid” and Chin. 急行 *jí xíng* or 馳走 *chí zǒu* “rushing” in the corresponding passages of the *Garbhāvakraṇṭisūtra*. Toch. B *yärpontaṣṣe ynamont miṣṣi* “moving field of merit” and Toch. A *ymatunt miši* “moving field” are renderings of Skt. *jaṅgamaṃ puṇyakṣetram* “moving field of merit”, which is attested in the *Avadānaśataka* (SPEYER 1906–1909: I, 158 line 10) as an epithet of Buddha and is reminiscent of another epithet in the *Varṇārhavarṇastotra* by Mātṛceṭa, i.e. Skt. *jaṅgamaṃ puṇyatīrthaṃ* “moving/wandering pilgrimage site of merit” (HARTMANN 1987: 67). Skt. *jaṅgama- puṇyakṣetra-* “moving field of merit” is rendered into Chinese as 行福田 *xíng fú tián* “moving field of merit”. On Toch. A *ymatu*, cf. PAN (2024).

(9) **P. 405b on Toch. A *lokalok*:** this word occurs in an episode in the *Puṇyavantajātaka*, where bones of a lion were scattered in a mountain called *lokalok*. Toch. A *lokalok* is translated as “quite far away” and interpreted as an “[i]terative compound based on” Toch. A *lok* “far, away” by Carling and Pinault, which goes back to CARLING (2009: 135a, “far away”). In fact, as a name of a mountain Toch. A *lokalok* is borrowed from Skt. *lokāloka-* “world and non-world” (cf. LANE 1947: 48) as “N. of a mythical belt or circle of mountains ... dividing the visible world from the region of darkness” (s.v. in MW). Cf. Skt. *prakāśaścāndhakāraśca lokāloka ivācalaḥ* “both shining and not shining like the mountain Lokāloka (which is lighted on one side and dark on the other)” in *Raghuvamśa* 1.68 (KALE 1997: Skt. 21, transl. 7; SHARPÉ 1964: 26). Skt. *lokāloka-* is also attested in the Sanskrit texts from Turfan, cf. SWTF IV: 65 and von SIMSON (2000: 261 fn. 60).

⁴⁰ This is based on PEYROT’s (2016: 206–207) identification in “A 425e+f a1”. However, Peyrot adds that “[i]t must be admitted, however, that ‘moving’ or ‘going’ is not obviously correct for all passages”, and as for Toch. A *ymatunt* in A62a1 and A251b4, Peyrot prefers the meaning “gathered” or “assembled”, which “is derivable from a more basic ‘having come’.”

(10) P. 413a on *Vacramukhe*: in section D, we read “From Skt. *vajra-mukha*-, lit. ‘top of diamond’”. The Tocharian name is reminiscent of a deity called Vajramukha (Chin. 金剛面 *jīn gāng miàn*) with the head of a wild boar in the tantric Buddhism, and his name Skt. *vajramukha*- means rather “having a face as hard as a *vajra*”. Cf. the explanation in the *Dictionary of Buddhist Iconography* (CHANDRA 2005: 4010–4011): “Vajramukha (Jap. Kongōmenten) is one of the Twenty Devas in the outer circle of the six sub-maṇḍalas of the Vajradhātu in the Genzu version (AD 806)”. In the story of Krośavatī (A4b3–5), which the king chews (Toch. A *trāskaṣ* from *trāsk*- “to chew”) and destroys, the king’s Tocharian name *vacramukhe* could mean “having a mouth as hard as a *vajra*”.

(11) P. 472: Toch. A *śu* is missing, but on the next page a compound “*śu-ype**” is given as an independent entry, where “*śu*, adv. ‘near, close’” as an independent word is indeed specified in section D. Toch. A *śu* in A3b2 is regarded by PINAULT (2008: 236) as an independent word with unknown meaning. On the same page (i.e. OGIHARA 2009: 146⁴¹) containing the discussion of Toch. A *lyālyoryo* cited in DThTA (p. 410b), Ogihara gives a detailed analysis of Toch. A *śu*, according to which Toch. A *śu ypeyā mskantāsac* renders Skt. *pratyantavāsine* “to someone staying near the border” (cf. Chin. 邊境民 *biān jìng mǐn* “people near the border”), and Toch. A *śu* probably means “frontier, border”.

However, OGIHARA’s (2009: 146) translation “frontier, border” for Toch. A *śu* evokes doubt because such a meaning can hardly fit its context in A69a6: *mā py ārkīšoṣi cu sem śu yāmtsāt* “the world did not make you (their) protection either”, where Toch. A *śu* + *yām*- (middle voice) governs double accusatives, i.e. *cu* “you” and *sem* “protection”. Given the fact that Toch. A *śu ypeyā* corresponds Skt. *praty-anta*- “near the border”, as admitted by OGIHARA (2009: 146) himself, Toch. A *śu* + *yām*- (middle voice) probably renders Skt. *prati*- + *kar*- (middle voice) “make sth. as sth.” with double accusatives, cf. Skt. *pura imāṃl lokān pratikaravāmahā* “let us make these worlds as citadels in opposition” in the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* 1.23 (AUFRECHT 1879: 19; KEITH 1920: 125). Thus Toch. A *śu* corresponds to Skt. *prati*- and means “towards, near”. Etymologically, Toch. A *śu* could go back to **k̑iōh₁* “with this, near this”, as instr. sg. of PIE **k̑iō*- “this one” (DUNKEL 2014: II, 412–413), and **k̑iōh₁* > Proto-Toch. **k̑iō* > Toch. A *śu* (for the sound change of word-final **-ō*, cf. HACKSTEIN 2017: 1314).

(12) P. 497 and pp. 73–74: according to CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 497) there is no Toch. A *šoṣ*, and Toch. A *šoṣ* after Toch. A *lyālyoryo* in A3b2 is interpreted as a sandhi form of *ešoṣ* “termite mound”, which is a hapax and regarded as “[p]robably cognate with” another hapax *eṣuṣ* meaning “termite”. The argument of CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 73) regarding Toch. A *eṣuṣ* is dubious, because

⁴¹ It is unclear, why by writing “Ogihara (2009a: 136, 143, 170)” CARLING and PINAULT (2023: 473) simply leave out the very page, i.e. 146, where Ogihara gives a detailed analysis of Toch. A *śu*.

simply by saying that “[t]he text describes a series of creeping animals: ants, worms, scorpions, etc.”, they proposed the meaning “termite, white ant” for the hapax *eṣuṣ* without any philological evidence.

(13) Some typos:

p. 135b under entry Toch. A *kip*, section T: *sñi* >> *ṣñi* (correct in CARLING 2009: 146a).

p. 208a under entry Toch. A *tārśom*: “Nom./Obl.Sg. *tārśom*” in section F, but in section T no example of nom. sg. is specified.

p. 284b: under entry Toch. A *pässāk*: “fem.” and “Obl.Pl. ... (passākās) 327 a6”, but p. 168b: “PPrt. Obl.Sg.Masc. 327 a6 ///(kā)k[l]epsunt pässākā//”.

p. 356b under entry Toch. A *mrāc*: “B *mrāc*” acc. sg. is given, but nom. sg. B *mrāce* is indeed attested, namely in PK AS 6Aa2, which is absent in ADAMS (2013: 514).

p. 369a under entry Toch. A *yāslu*: *yāslu** with a following “*”, but the nom. sg. form is indeed attested.

p. 397b under entry Toch. A *lālaṃṣāk**, section F, Nom.Pl.Masc: *lālaṃṣkeñ* >> *lālaṃṣkeñ*.

p. 425a under entry Toch. A *warpiške*: B *werpiške* >> B *werpiške*, it is usually written with short *i*, and only once as *werpiške* in B406b2.

p. 467b under entry Toch. A *śaktālyi*: B *śaktālye* >> B *śaktālye*, Toch. B *śaktālye* also occurs as *śaktālye* in two MQ fragments B209 and B205 (with *śaktālyi* in line a2), but **śaktālye* is not attested.

p. 476a under entry Toch. A *śol-śoluneyum*, section T: *śolumeyumāñcäs* >> *śoluneyumāñcäs*.

Funding

This publication was made possible by an Early Career Research Fellowship from The Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation Global. This work is also supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K12159 and 23KK0217.

Acknowledgements

I want to express my gratitude to the two anonymous reviewers whose important and detailed notes have helped me to improve this paper. I want to thank Dr. Małgorzata Wielińska-Soltwedel for accepting this paper and for her editorial work. None of these scholars is to be held responsible for the views expressed and possible mistakes in this article.

Abbreviations

AN I	<i>Aṅguttara-Nikāya</i> , Part I, see MORRIS, rev. WARDER (1961); WOODWARD (1979).
AvŚ	<i>Avadānaśataka</i> , see VAIDYA (1958); SPEYER (1906–1909).
BHSD	Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary, see EDGERTON (1953).
Celt.	Celtic.
Chin.	Chinese.
DBh	<i>Daśabhūmikasūtra</i> , see VAIDYA (1967).
Divy	<i>Divyāvadāna</i> , see COWELL and NEIL (1886).
DKPAM	<i>Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā</i> , see WILKENS (2016).
DN II	<i>Dīgha Nikāya</i> , Vol. II, see DAVIDS and CARPENTER (1903); WALSHE (1987).
DThTA	<i>Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A</i> , see CARLING and PINAULT (2023).
Eng.	English.
EWAhD	<i>Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen</i> , see LLOYD et al. (1988–2021).
EWAia	<i>Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen</i> , see MAYRHOFER (1986–2001).
Gr.	Greek.
GV	<i>Gaṇḍavyūha</i> , see VAIDYA (1960).
Jap.	Japanese.
JM	<i>Jātakamālā</i> , see HANISCH (2005); MEILAND (2009).
KarP	<i>Karuṇāpuṇḍarīkasūtra</i> , see YAMADA (1968).
LIV ²	<i>Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben</i> , see RIX et al. (2001).
LV	<i>Lalitavistara</i> , see HOKAZONO (1994, 2019).
MAV	<i>Mahāvadānasūtra</i> , see FUKITA (2003).
MpJ	<i>Mūgapakkhajātaka</i> .
MPS	<i>Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra</i> , see WALDSCHMIDT (1950–1951).
MSN	<i>Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka</i> , see Ji et al. (1998).
MSV	<i>Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya</i> .
MW	Monier-Williams' <i>Sanskrit-English Dictionary</i> , see MONIER-WILLIAMS (1899).
NIL	<i>Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon</i> , see WODTKO et al. (2008).

OUygh.	Old Uyghur.
OHG	Old High German.
Pa.	Pāli.
perl.	perlative.
PIE	Proto-Indo-European.
PK AS	Pelliot Koutchéen, Ancienne Série, Paris.
PW	Petersburg <i>Wörterbuch</i> , see BÖHTLINGK and ROTH (1855–1875).
SauN	<i>Saundarananda</i> , see COVILL (2007).
Skt.	Sanskrit.
Sn	<i>Suttanipāta</i> .
SN	<i>Samyutta-Nikāya</i> .
SNCN	<i>Saundaranandacarita-Nāṭaka</i> .
Suv	<i>Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra</i> , see NOBEL (1937).
SWTF	<i>Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden</i> , see WALDSCHMIDT et al. (1994–2018).
T.	Taishōzō.
TEB	<i>Tocharisches Elementarbuch</i> , see KRAUSE and THOMAS (1960); THOMAS and KRAUSE (1964).
TG	<i>Tocharische Grammatik</i> , see SIEG et al. (1931).
THT	Tocharische Handschriften der Turfansammlung, Berlin.
Tib.	Tibetan.
Toch.	Tocharian.
VJ	<i>Viśvāntarajātaka</i> .
YQ	Yanqi Qianfodong.

References

- ADAMS, Douglas 2013. *A dictionary of Tocharian B*. Revised and Greatly Enlarged. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- AUFRECHT, Theodor, ed. 1879. *Das Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. Mit Auszügen aus dem Commentare von Sāyaṇacārya und anderen Beilagen*. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.
- BERNHARD, FRANZ 1965. *Udānavarga*. Band I: *Einleitung, Beschreibung der Handschriften, Textausgabe, Bibliographie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- BLAŽEK, Václav 2006. “Review of *Våre arveord. Etymologisk ordbok* by Harald Bjorvand & Frederik Otto Lindemann”. *Linguistica ONLINE* 1–2. <http://www.phil.muni.cz/linguistica/art/blazek/bla-005.pdf> (accessed 1 September 2024).
- BÖHTLINGK, Otto and Rudolph ROTH 1855–1875. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. 7 vols. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- BRAARVIG, Jens 1993. *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*. Vol. 2: *The Tradition of Imperishability in Buddhist Thought, Translation with Introduction*. Oslo: Solum Forlag.
- CARLING, Gerd 2000. *Die Funktion der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin: de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110815955>
- CARLING, Gerd in collaboration with Georges-Jean PINAULT and Werner WINTER 2009. *A Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Vol. 1: *Letters A–J*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CARLING, Gerd and Georges-Jean PINAULT 2023. *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CETOM. *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*. <https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian> (accessed 19 June 2024).
- CHANDRA, Lokesh 2005. *Dictionary of Buddhist Iconography*. Vol. 14 (Vajrakumāra – Vasumitrā). New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- CONE, Margaret 2020. *A dictionary of Pāli*. Vol. III: *p–bh*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- COUVREUR, Walter 1955–1956. “Bemerkungen zu Pavel Pouchas Thesaurus linguae tocharicae dialecti A”. *La Nouvelle Clío* 7–8: 67–98.
- COVILL, Linda, trans. 2007. *Handsome Nanda by Aśvaghoṣa*. New York: New York University Press.
- COWELL, Edward and Robert NEIL, eds 1886. *The Divyāvadāna, a Collection of Early Buddhist Legends*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- COWELL, Edward and W. H. D. ROUSE, trans. 1907. *The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha’s Former Births*. Vol. VI. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DAVIDS, Thomas W. Rhys and Joseph E. CARPENTER 1903. *The Dīgha Nikāya*. Vol II. London: Luzac.
- DEMOTO, Mitsuyo 出本充代 1998. “*Avadānaśataka* no Bon-Kan hikaku kenkyū の梵漢比較研究” [Comparative Study of Sanskrit and Chinese *Avadānaśataka*]. PhD thesis, Kyoto University.

- DRESDEN, Mark J. 1955. "The Jātakastava or 'Praise of the Buddha's Former Births': Indo-Scythian (Khotanese) Text, English Translation, Grammatical Notes, and Glossaries". *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 45(5): 397–508. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1005767>
- DUNKEL, George E. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.
- ENOMOTO, Fumio 1997. "Sanskrit fragments from the *Saṃgītanipāṭa of the Saṃyuktāgama". [In:] Kieffer-Pülz, Petra and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds, *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ, Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica, pp. 91–106.
- FAUSBØLL, V., ed. 1896. *The Jātaka Together with Its Commentary Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*. Vol. VI. London: Trübner & Co.
- FEER, Léon, trans. 1891. *Avadāna-Çataka: cent légendes (bouddhiques)*. Paris: Leroux.
- FOUCAUX, Ph. Éd., trans. 1848. *Rgya tch'er rol pa ou développement des jeux (Lalitavistāra)*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- FRIEDRICH, Rainer 2011. "4. Formelsprache". [In:] Rengakos, Antonios and Bernhard Zimmermann, eds, *Homer-Handbuch: Leben, Werk, Wirkung*. Stuttgart: Metzler, pp. 45–64.
- FUKITA, Takamichi 2003. *The Mahāvadānasūtra: A New Edition Based on Manuscripts Discovered in Northern Turkestan*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- GENG, Shimin 耿世民 2008. *Hui hu wen ha mi ben Mi le hui jian ji yan jiu* 回鹘文哈密本《弥勒会见记》研究 [Study on the Uighur Maitrisimit (Hami version)]. Beijing: Minzu University of China Press.
- GENG, Shimin, Hans-Joachim KLIMKEIT, Helmut EIMER and Jens Peter LAUT 1988. *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit*. Teil I: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GENG, Shimin, Hans-Joachim KLIMKEIT and Jens Peter LAUT 1991. "Die Weltflucht des Bodhisattva. Das 13. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der Maitrisimit". *Altorientalische Forschungen* 18(2): 264–296. <https://doi.org/10.1524/aof.1991.18.2.264>
- GNOLI, Raniero, ed. 1977. *The Gilgit manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu: being the 17th and last section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Part I. Roma: IsMEO.

- GOLDMAN, Robert P. and Sally J. Sutherland GOLDMAN, trans. 1996. *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki: An Epic of Ancient India*. Vol. V: *Sundarakāṇḍa*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- HACKSTEIN, OLAV 2013. “Indogermanisch **h₁k̑-u-o-s*, **h₁ek̑-u-o-s* ‚Pferd, Hengst, Stute’: Genusindifferenz als morphologische Persistenz”. [In:] Cooper, Adam I., Jeremy Rau and Michael Weiss, eds, *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European linguistics in honor of Alan J. Nussbaum*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, pp. 94–104.
- HACKSTEIN, Olav 2017. “The Phonology of Tocharian”. [In:] Klein, Jared, Brian Joseph and Matthias Fritz, in cooperation with Mark Wenthe, eds, *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*. Vol. 2. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 1304–1335. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110523874-030>
- HAHN, Michael 2007. *Vom rechten Leben: buddhistische Lehren aus Indien und Tibet*. Frankfurt: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- HANISCH, Albrecht 2005. *Āryaśūras Jātakamālā: philologische Untersuchungen zu den Legenden 1 bis 15*. Teil 1: *Einleitung, Textausgabe, Anhänge, Register*. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- HARTMANN, Jens-Uwe 1987. *Das Varṇārḥavarṇastotra des Māṭrceṭa*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- HILMARSSON, Jörundur 1991. *The Nasal Prefixes in Tocharian. A Study in Word Formation*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- HILMARSSON, Jörundur 1996. *Materials for a Tocharian Historical and Etymological Dictionary*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- HINÜBER, Oskar von 2021. *The Saṃghāṭasūtra. A Popular Devotional Buddhist Sanskrit Text*, editio maior. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology Soka University.
- HIRAKAWA, Akira 1997. *A Buddhist Chinese Sanskrit Dictionary*. Tokyo: Reiyukai.
- HOKAZONO, Koichi 1994. *Raritavisutara no kenkyu*. Vol. I. Tokyo: Daito Shuppansha.
- HOKAZONO, Koichi 2019. *Raritavisutara no kenkyu*. Vol. III. Tokyo: Daito Shuppansha.
- HUARD, Athanaric 2022. “Recherches sur les textes de méditation en tokharien”. PhD thesis. École Pratique des Hautes Études. <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-03768156/> (accessed 1 September 2024).
- ITKIN, Ilya B. 2019. *Ukazatel' slovoform k neopublikovannym toxarskim A tekstam iz sobranija Berlinskoj biblioteki*. Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

- Ji, Xian-lin. 1988. “Translations from the Tocharian Maitreyasamitināṭaka – Two sheets (76 YQ 1.16 and 1.15) of the Xinjiang-Museum version transliterated, translated and annotated”. [In:] P. Kosta, G. Lerch and P. Olivier, eds, *Studia Indogermanica et Slavica, Festgabe für Werner Thomas zum 65. Geburtstag*. München: Otto Sagner, pp. 141–151.
- Ji, Xianlin, Werner WINTER and Georges-Jean PINAULT 1998. *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China*. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs [TiLSM] 113. Berlin: de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110816495>
- JOHNSTON, Edward H. 1932. *The Saundarananda or Nanda the Fair*. London: Oxford University Press.
- KALE, M. R., ed. and trans. 1997. *The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa, with the Commentary Sañjīvanī of Mallinātha. Cantos I–V*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- KEITH, Arthur Berriedale, trans. 1920. *Rigveda Brahmanas: The Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda*. Harvard Oriental Series 25. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- KRAUSE, Wolfgang and Werner THOMAS 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band I: Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- KÜMMEL, Martin 2024. Addenda und Corrigenda zu LIV². Pdf-Version (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271767803_Addenda_und_Corrigenda_zu_LIV) last change: 03.02.2024.
- LANE, George S. 1947. “The Tocharian Puṇyavanta-jātaka: Text and Translation”. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 67(1): 33–53. <https://doi.org/10.2307/596045>
- LLOYD, Albert L., Rosemarie LÜHR et al. 1988–. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- MALZAHN, Melanie 2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Brill’s Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 3. Leiden: Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004188440>
- MATSUDA, Kazunobu 松田和信 1996. “Bonbun Chūagon no Katomandu dankan 梵文『中阿含』のカトマンドウ断簡” [Sanskrit Fragments of the Madhyama Āgama in Kathmandu]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 44 (2): 868–862.
- MAYRHOFFER, Manfred 1986–2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- MEILAND, Justin, trans. 2009. *Garland of the Buddha’s Past Lives by Āryaśūra*. Vol. I. Clay Sanskrit Library. New York: New York University Press.

- MENG, Yu and Tao PAN 2022. “The Vyāghrī-story in Xinjiang – A new textual version rediscovered in Tocharian”. *Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions* 17: 22–42.
- MONIER-WILLIAMS, Monier 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MORRIS, Richard, ed. 1961. *The Aṅguttara-Nikāya*. Part I: *Ekanipāta, Dukanipāta, and Tikanipāta*. Second edition, revised by A. K. WARDER. London: Pali Text Society.
- NOBEL, Johannes, ed. 1937. *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra: das Goldglanz-Sūtra: ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- OED, s.v. “force (n.1), sense I.4.a”. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “force (n.1), sense I.4.a”, June 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/7007607263>
- OED, s.v. “pull, n.¹, sense II.6.d”. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “pull, n.¹, sense II.6.d”, September 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/6526893974>
- OGIHARA, Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏 2009. “Tokarago A *Puṇyavanta-Jātaka* ni okeru Agon kyōten no in'yō ni tsuite トカラ語A «*Puṇyavanta-Jātaka*» に於ける阿含經典の引用について” [Sur la Citation de l'Āgama-Sūtra dans le «*Puṇyavanta-Jātaka*» en Tokharien A]. *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* (TULIP) 28: 133–171.
- OGIHARA, Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏 2011. “Notes on some Tocharian Vinaya fragments in the London and Paris collections”. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12: 111–144.
- OGIHARA, Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏 2012. “A fragment of the *Bhikṣu-prātimokṣasūtra* in Tocharian B”. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13: 163–179.
- OLIVELLE, Patrick 2005. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-dharmaśāstra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'RAHILLY, T. F. 1942. “Notes, Mainly Etymological”. *Ériu* 13: 144–219.
- PAN, Tao 2019. “TB *pitke* ‘fat, grease, oil’ and PIE **peih₁*- ‘to be fat, be bursting with’”. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 124(1): 265–278. <https://doi.org/10.1515/if-2019-0010>
- PAN, Tao 2021a. “A New Look at the Skt.-Toch. Bilingual *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*-Fragment THT 542”. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 73(2): 117–146.
- PAN, Tao 2021b. “Tocharian A *ārkiṣoṣi* ‘world with radiance’ and Chinese *suopo shi jie* ‘world of *sabhā*’”. *Acta Asiatica Varsoviensia* 34: 263–294. <https://doi.org/10.60018/AcAsVa.abdn5783>

- PAN, Tao 2021c. “Untersuchungen zu Lexikon und Metrik des Tocharischen”. Dissertation, LMU München: Fakultät für Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaften. <https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/27774/> (accessed 1 September 2024).
- PAN, Tao 2022. “Philologische Bemerkungen zum toch. Puṇyavantajātaka”. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 74(2): 73–130.
- PAN, Tao 2023. “Tocharian B *ore* (plural *wrenta*) and nominal reduplication in Tocharian and PIE”. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 128: 305–320. <https://doi.org/10.1515/if-2023-0012>
- PAN, Tao 2024. “Comparative study of the Tocharian Rāma Story”. [In:] Barbera, Gerardo, Matteo De Chiara, Alessandro Del Tomba, Bhikkhunī Dhammadinnā, Federico Dragoni and Paola Orsatti, eds, *Siddham. Studies in Iranian philology in honour of Mauro Maggi*. Beiträge zur Iranistik 52. Wiesbaden: Reichert, pp. 325–344.
- PEYROT, Michaël 2008. *Variation and change in Tocharian B*. Leiden Studies in Indo-European 15. Amsterdam: Rodopi. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004358218>
- PEYROT, Michaël 2013. *The Tocharian subjunctive. A study in syntax and verbal stem formation*. Leiden: Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004248793>
- PEYROT, Michaël 2016. “Further Sanskrit-Tocharian bilingual Udānavarga fragments”. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 17: 153–211.
- PINAULT, Georges-Jean 1993. “Tokharien *Amālkārteṃ* et autres mots”. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 6: 133–188.
- PINAULT, Georges-Jean 2008. *Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et Grammaire*. Leuven: Peeters.
- PINAULT, Georges-Jean 2020. “Tocharian lexicon in the light of contact phenomena”. [In:] Garnier, Romain, ed., *Loanwords and Substrata: Proceedings of the Colloquium Held in Limoges 2018 (5th–7th June, 2018)*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 164. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, pp. 367–401.
- PINAULT, Georges-Jean 2021. “New material extracted from revised Tocharian A texts. Tokharian texts, Dec 2020, Leiden, Netherlands”. *hal-03381812*. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03381812/document> (accessed 1 September 2024).
- POUCHA, Pavel 1955. *Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A*. Praha: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství.
- PRADHAN, Prahlad 1975. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*. 2nd ed. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

- RIX, Helmut, Martin KÜMMEL et al. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- ROTMAN, Andy, trans. 2008. *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna*. Part 1. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- SANGPO, Gelong Lodrö, trans. 2012. *Abhidharmakośa-Bhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Translated into French by Louis de La Vallée Poussin. Annotated English Translation by Gelong Lodrö Sangpo. With a New Introduction by Bhikkhu KL Dhammajoti. 4 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- SCHARPÉ, Adriaan 1964. *Kālidāsa-Lexicon*. Vol. 1: *Basic Text of the Works*. Part 4: *Raghuvamśa*. Brugge: De Tempel.
- SCHIEFNER, Anton 1877. "Indische Erzählungen. IV. Der stumme Krüppel". *Bulletin de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St.-Petersbourg* 22: 123–127.
- SCHLINGLOFF, Dieter 1955. *Buddhistische Stotras aus ostturkistanischen Sanskrittexten*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- SCHMIDT, Klaus T. 1994. "Zur Erforschung der tocharischen Literatur: Stand und Aufgaben". [In:] Schlerath, Bernfried, ed., *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands, pp. 238–283.
- SCHUMACHER, Stefan and Joachim MATZINGER 2013. *Die Verben des Altalbanischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- SHARMA, Priyavrat, ed. and trans. 2014. *Carakasamhitā*. 2 vols. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia.
- SIEG, Emil 1944. *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen I*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- SIEG, Emil 1952. *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- SIEG, Emil and Wilhelm SIEGLING 1921. *Tocharische Sprachreste*. I. Band. *Die Texte. A. Transcription*. Berlin, Leipzig: de Gruyter.
- SIEG, Emil, Wilhelm SIEGLING and Wilhelm SCHULZE 1931. *Tocharische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- SILK, Jonathan A. 2008. "Incestuous Ancestries: The Family Origins of Gautama Siddhārtha, Abraham and Sarah in Genesis 20:12, and The Status of Scripture in Buddhism". *History of Religions* 47(4): 253–281. <https://doi.org/10.1086/589781>
- SIMSON, Georg von 2000. *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins 2: Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- SPEYER, Jacob S. 1906–1909. *Avadānaçataka: A century of edifying tales belonging to the Hīnayāna*. 2 vols. St.-Petersbourg: Académie Impériale des Sciences.
- TAMAI, Tatsushi 2012. “Tocharian *Puṇyavantajātaka*”. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 15: 161–187.
- TAMAI, Tatsushi 2017. “The Tocharian *Mūgapakkha-Jātaka*”. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 20: 251–275.
- THOMAS, Werner. 1990. *Tocharische Maitreya-Parallelen aus Hami*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- THOMAS, Werner and Wolfgang KRAUSE 1964. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Band II. *Texte und Glossar*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- VAIDYA, P. L., ed. 1958. *Avadāna-Śataka*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute.
- VAIDYA, P. L., ed. 1959. *Avadāna-Kalpalatā of Kṣemendra*. Vol. I. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute.
- VAIDYA, P. L., ed. 1960. *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtram*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute.
- VAIDYA, P. L., ed. 1967. *Daśabhūmikasūtram*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute.
- VINE, Brent 2002. “On full-grade *-ro- formations in Greek and Indo-European”. [In:] Southern, Mark R. V., ed., *Indo-European Perspectives*. JIES Monograph 43. Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, pp. 329–350.
- WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst 1950–1951. *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pali nebst einer Übersetzung der chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins. Auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften herausgegeben und bearbeitet*. 3 vols. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst, Heinz BECHERT et al. 1994–2018. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*. 4 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- WALSHE, Maurice, trans. 1987. *Thus Have I Heard: The Long Discourses of the Buddha Dīgha Nikāya*. London: Wisdom Publications.
- WILKENS, Jens 2008. “Maitrisimit und Maitreyasamitinātaka”. [In:] Zieme, Peter, ed., *Aspects of research into Central Asian Buddhism. In memoriam Kōgi Kudara*. Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 407–433.
- WILKENS, Jens 2016. *Buddhistische Erzählungen aus dem alten Zentralasien: Edition der altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. 3 vols. Turnhout: Brepols.

- WILKENS, Jens 2021. *Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen. <https://doi.org/10.17875/gup2021-1590>
- WODTKO, Dagmar, Britta IRSLINGER and Carolin SCHNEIDER 2008. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- WOODWARD, F. L., trans. 1979. *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Anguttara-Nikāya)*. Vol. I. Reprint. London: Pali Text Society.
- YAMADA, Isshi, ed. 1968. *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka: The White Lotus of Compassion*. 2 vols. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.