

Tocharian A manuscript №№ 144–211 from Šorčuq: The new data. I*

© 2023

Илья В. Иткин

Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia;
HSE University, Moscow, Russia; ilya.borisovich.itkin@gmail.com

Abstract: The article provides a general description of the Tocharian A manuscript №№ 144–211 according to the publication of Tocharian A texts by E. Sieg and W. Siegling (1921). This manuscript is a collection of stories about prince Nanda, the half-brother of Buddha, and Sundari, his beloved. Many fragments of this manuscript, both published and still unpublished, join together. The article publishes two leaves made up of joined fragments — A 144 + THT 2485 and A 171+156 + THT 2543 + THT 2265 — with a detailed commentary and translation. The first leaf describes the beginning of Buddha and Nanda's journey to the Himalayas and, further, to the world of the Thirty-three Gods (Skr. *trayastrimśa*-). The second leaf presents a dialogue between two followers of Buddha — the young women Viśākhā and Preṣikā. A whole variety of elaborately used figures of speech (realization of the metaphor, chiasmus, deliberate syntactic ambiguity, etc.) allows to call this dialogue, whose text can be reconstructed almost fully, a pearl of the Buddhist literature of the Early Middle Ages.

Keywords: Buddhism, literary language, paleography, Tocharian, textology

Acknowledgements: The author expresses his deep gratitude to S. I. Pereverzeva for the English translation and to S. V. Malyshev for a number of very important remarks, specifications and corrections.

For citation: Itkin I. B. Tocharian A manuscript №№ 144–211 from Šorčuq: The new data. I. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 2023, 1: 132–150.

DOI: 10.31857/0373-658X.2023.1.132-150

Тохарская А рукопись №№ 144–211 из Шорчука: новые данные. I

Илья Борисович Иткин

Институт востоковедения РАН, Москва, Россия; Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», Москва, Россия; ilya.borisovich.itkin@gmail.com

Аннотация: В статье дается общая характеристика тохарской А рукописи №№ 144–211 по изданию тохарских А текстов Э. Зига и В. Зиглинга (1921). Эта рукопись представляет собой собрание историй о единокровном брате Будды принце Нанде и его возлюбленной Сундари. Многие фрагменты этой рукописи, как опубликованные, так и до сих пор неопубликованные, соединяются между собой. Статья содержит публикацию, снабженную подробным комментарием и переводом, двух таких соединенных листов: A 144 + THT 2485 и A 171+156 + THT 2543 + THT 2265. Первый из этих листов описывает начало путешествия Будды и Нанды в Гималаи и дальше — в мир Тридцати трех богов (скр. *trayastrimśa*-). На втором листе приводится диалог между двумя последовательницами Будды — Вишакхой и Прешикой. Благодаря искусному использованию сразу нескольких художественных приемов (реализация метафоры, хиазм, намеренная синтаксическая неоднозначность и др.) этот диалог, текст которого удастся восстановить практически целиком, может быть по праву назван одной из жемчужин раннесредневековой буддийской литературы.

* For subjective and objective reasons, the present article was finished much later than initially thought, so the second article of the same series is presently published, cf. [Itkin 2019].

Ключевые слова: буддизм, палеография, текстология, тохарские языки, язык художественной литературы

Благодарности: Автор выражает искреннюю благодарность С. И. Переверзевой за перевод текста статьи на английский язык и С. В. Малышеву за важные замечания, уточнения и дополнения.

Для цитирования: Itkin I. B. Tocharian A manuscript №№ 144–211 from Šorčuq: The new data. I. *Vo-prosy Jazykoznanija*, 2023, 1: 132–150.

DOI: 10.31857/0373-658X.2023.1.132-150

1. Introductory remarks

The text fragments which got numbers 144–211 in the publication of the Tocharian A texts by E. Sieg and W. Siegling [Sieg, Siegling 1921] belong to the manuscript from the Šorčuq temple compound. This manuscript is a collection of stories (at least partially dramatic) the central characters of which are prince Nanda, the half-brother of the Buddha Śākyamuni, and Sundarī, his beloved. This manuscript was very voluminous — more than half a thousand leaves (in a small fragment No. 196 the beginning of the leaf number, starting with 500, is preserved).

Against this background, the size of the surviving part of the text may seem to be quite small, all the more so since folios Nos. 144–154 and 180 are currently considered lost and only their transliterations are available for studies. However, by the Tocharian standards, its size, on the contrary, is very big: suffice it to say that the number of separate published fragments (68) of the manuscript Nos. 144–211 holds the absolute first place among all the Tocharian A manuscripts currently known.

At the same time, there are two circumstances which make it possible to consider the inquiry into the manuscript Nos. 144–211 as one of the most essential and potentially fruitful goals of the Tocharian studies.

First, as early as on the final stage of preparation of the 1921 edition E. Sieg and W. Siegling discovered that the information about a series of fragments can be substantially specified, namely:

- the correlation between the recto and the verso of some fragments is opposite to the one initially accepted;
- some fragments belong to adjacent leaves;
- some fragments are parts of the same leaf.

E. Sieg and W. Siegling included a number of such observations into their proofreading notes (“Verbesserungen und Nachträge”) to the 1921 edition; later this work was continued in the grammar of Tocharian A [Sieg et al. 1931] and afterwards by E. Siegling in his personal copy of the 1921 edition [Siegling PK].

Particularly, E. Sieg and W. Siegling established that:

- folios No. 171 and No. 156 are parts of the same leaf, probably immediately preceding folio No. 153 [Sieg, Siegling 1921: 253];
- folios No. 192 and No. 145 are parts of the same leaf [Sieg et al. 1931: 466]¹;
- folios No. 187 and No. 193 are parts of the same leaf [Sieg et al. 1931: 230, fn. 4], immediately following leaf No. 192+145 [Siegling PK: 94];
- folios No. 191 and No. 158 are parts of the same leaf [Siegling PK: 84, 95];
- folios No. 186 and No. 202 are parts of the same leaf, which do not join each other [Sieg, Siegling 1921: 253].

Of course, theoretically all these results are known to modern researchers. However, in practice, these results have not received enough attention: the fragments in question are still often

¹ As it was pointed to us by S. V. Malyshev, presently folio No. 192 is wrongly reclassified as THT 1553.

quoted separately and are not regarded as parts of bigger text units. Meanwhile, being put together, two fragments of the same leaf usually convey much more information than each fragment on its own. Take two examples; the first one illustrates this statement from a point of view of content, the second one from a proper linguistic point of view.

Leaf No. 191+158 doubtlessly contains the famous dialogue between Nanda and the Buddha, during which Nanda compares the look of five hundred apsaras with the look of Sundarī (not in favour of the latter). This dialogue is narrated in a more flowery way than, for instance, in Chapter 10 of Āśvaghōṣa's *Saundarananda* and the other sources known to us. Cf., for example, line a5: *//// *es āṣṭraṃ ciñcraṃ kapśiññāñ ñā(kte)ñ[ās](ś)i ♦ sundaris nu kapśa(ñi) ////* 'clean and tender are the bodies of goddesses, whereas Sundarī's body...'.² Obviously, it would be much more difficult, if possible at all, to make such a conclusion having only the left and right separate halves of this line at hand — at least because of the impossibility to reconstruct the key form *ñā(kte)ñ[ās](ś)i*, G Pl of *ñākteññā* 'goddess', which happened to be literally torn in half and partially lost.

At the junction of lines 192+145 b4–5, there is a form *yārsārā* — a variant of the postposition *yārsār* 'around'. This form is not unique, cf. *[c]wā yārsārā* (THT 1649 fgm. a, "a"1) 'around thee' [Itkin, Malyshev 2016: 6], *(p)[uk] yārsārā*³ (SHT 1478 b3, a gloss of the Sanskrit text) 'all around', cf. [Malzahn 2007: 307] with reference to K. T. Schmidt (the word division *yārsār ā...*, proposed in [Siegling PK: 95], is, of course, solely due to the fact that the two spellings with *-ā* given above were unknown to W. Siegling). Nevertheless, the text 192+145 provides an extremely important evidence that the variant *yārsārā* was spread not only in 'late' Tocharian A of italic glosses and in the 'Eastern idiom' (the document THT 1649 was found in Murtuq), but also in the 'classical' texts from Šorčuq.

Thus, a new publication of all the pairs of the fragments mentioned appears to be quite important. The fragments A 175 and A 178 should be added to this list as well, as they are also two parts of one leaf, joining almost end-to-end in lines a5 and b2.

Second, more than 200 (!) unpublished fragments belong to manuscript Nos. 144–211. In this respect, only manuscript Nos. 399–404 from Sengim can be compared with it; for any other Tocharian A manuscript this number is many times less. We preliminarily assert that the fragments belonging to this Šorčuq manuscript are THT 1132–1151 (probably excluding THT 1135), 1154 (these fragments, as well as the fragment THT 2399, are presently published with transliteration and translation on the website [CEToM]), 1464–1465, 1903, 2180, 2264–2270, 2286–2287, 2388–2550 (with a few exclusions, the most important of which are THT 2396 and THT 2431, belonging to the manuscript Nos. 1–54, and THT 2516 written in Tocharian B), 2552, 2562–2565, 2568, 2579–2580, 2582–2583, 2587–2588, 2596, 2664, 2958, 2960–2968,⁴ 3020–3029, 3031–3032, 3040, 3048, 3114–3115, 3122, 3129, 3149; according to S. V. Malyshev, fragments THT 2178, 2186, 2619, 2663, 3045, and 3047 are of the same origin. It is certainly quite possible that some of the fragments mentioned in this list appeared there by mistake, whereas some fragments which are missing in this list, on the contrary, should be added. Nonetheless, hopefully, the total number of those and other fragments is significantly less than the number of fragments which we correctly determined as belonging to the manuscript Nos. 144–211. Several dozens of these fragments are relatively large and are of interest by themselves; it is not even clear about some of them why E. Sieg and W. Siegling did not consider it appropriate to include them in the 1921 edition. However, the most important fact is that quite many of the unpublished fragments can be reliably put together with the published texts and/or with each other. The critical publication of the joint leaves may be of much benefit in this case as well.

² Here and further on, unless otherwise stated, the translation is ours.

³ The spelling of roots with *rā* instead of *ār* is typical for 'late' Tocharian A, including glosses.

⁴ This way, the siglum *S* (= *Sengim*) on the fragment THT 2966.i is either simply a mistake or *Š* (= *Šorčuq*) with the effaced upper part.

The present work is proposed to be the first in a series of such publications. Below we consider leaf No. 144, whose little, but quite essential addition turns out to be fragment THT 2543 and leaf No. 171+156, which is supplied by the fragments THT 2543 and THT 2265; this supplement allows for a total reconstruction of the text of some lines.

2. Manuscript Nos. 144–211: General characteristics

Manuscript Nos. 144–211 consists of relatively small leaves, which have 6 lines on each side. The leaf numbers, as in the other Tocharian manuscripts, are placed in the left margin of the verso side. A hole for the string to join the leaves together is located between lines 3 and 4, 8 (more rarely 7 or 9–10) akṣaras away from the left edge (in the present article the place of the string hole is denoted by the sign ○).

Not a single leaf of the manuscript has been preserved completely; leaf No. 147 (presently lost, as was said above) is least damaged. On the basis of calculations, which were done primarily for this leaf, E. Sieg and W. Siegling estimated the average length of lines 1–2 and 5–6 as 42 akṣaras [Sieg, Siegling 1921: 75]; this value might be slightly underestimated (by 1 or 2 akṣaras). Since in lines 3–4 the scribe left a gap to the left and right of the string hole, these lines were a little shorter; their expected average length can be estimated as 38–39 akṣaras, but in some cases it could be more. For instance, line 151 a3, the nonextant left side of which is reconstructed with complete certainty (cf., for example, [Ivanov 1992: 259]), contains 41 akṣaras.

3. Way to the Himalayas: Leaf A 144 + THT 2485

3.1. THT 2485

Below is the text of the earlier unpublished fragment THT 2485. The transliteration follows [Sieg, Siegling 1921] (with insignificant differences), the lines are enumerated according to [Tamai 2007]. The expedition number is absent. Lines a4 and b1 are almost completely lost (the former is even not denoted in T. Tamai's transliteration); they are not taken into account in the further analysis:

a1: /// — pla(n)[t]t(ā)r ñu[k] l• ///
 a2: /// — k_ucāṣ nu nas_u — ///
 a3: /// [r]i [m]āc(ar)•[l]• ///
 a4: ...
 b1: ...
 b2: /// [j](e)[t](a)vaṃ ///
 b3: /// [l]yi tmaṣ na[nde] ///
 b4: /// — va[s]u[n]dhari — ///

3.2. A 144 + THT 2485: The combined text

The text is given in standard simplified transliteration. Following the unambiguous⁵ indication of E. Sieg and W. Siegling (“Nr. 144 ist jedenfalls umzudrehen” [Sieg, Siegling 1921:

⁵ Or, in East Tocharian, *sne ālak wkām*.

253]), the sides of folio No. 144 are given below in reversed order as compared to the original publication; the numeration of lines, however, is preserved.⁶ Lines THT 2485 a1–2 and THT 2485 b3–4 directly adjoin lines 144 b1–2 and 144 a5–6, respectively, from the right side. Lines THT 2485 a3 and THT 2485 b2 are a partial supplement of the lost middle part of lines 144 b3 and 144 a4 respectively.

The text of fragment No. 144 as it is, including the evident conjectures made by the editors, is given in roman type. The conjectures in italics (also quite evident) in lines b3 and b4, as well as the addition of the pāda-end sign, which must have opened line a2, belong to W. Siegling [Siegling PK: 76]; some of his other conjectures are discussed below. The text of fragment THT 2485 is given in bold; the letters whose parts are preserved in both fragments are underlined:

- b1 /// lymy ·ś[i] lo kālkaṣṭ k_ucaśś(ā)ll aśśi – **pla(n)[t]t(ā)r ñu[k] l** ///
 b2 /// ñākcyās k_ulewāsaṃ trāṅkñāl nasam **k_ucāṣ nu nāṣ** – ///
 b3 /// ○ ṣ ṣñi nasluneyāṣ kātāk ylā[r]i [m]āc(ar) ·[l]· – [s]· – s(e)yacc oki na(ndena)c kātse yāṣ^s
 b4 /// ○ m·mrāc tsitorāṣ trāṅkṣānn anac pracar n(ande) – te yatār himavant ṣul – || tmāṣ nande
 b5 /// m śākkiśi kapilavāstu ri naṣ [nu] nāṣ t[ā]pārḥ himavant ṣulac – kapilavās(tu)
 b6 /// [p] kātkmām nāmtsu trāṅkāṣ kri ñi āṣānik ṣokyo kri ñi || tmāṣ ptāṅkāt kāṣṣi nande[s] –
 a1 /// t w(ā)knā || [ke]śikam || māmt ne kokaśśi lāmś tsopatsām wrā eṣāk kṣāly kṣālyac ymām^{te} –
 a2 (◆) /// [s] kṣatrim pratri tīm ◆ rātram wśāluṣyām[p]i wśā yokām [ya]tsyām[p]i lānt sew(ā)ññ
 a3 /// ○ ññ oki plawar epreram ◆ 1 || tam ne wkā(ny)o (ptā)ñkāt kāṣṣi ñāktas napenāś(ś)i
 a4 /// ○ lutkāsmām nandenaśśāl ṣyak [j]e[t](a)**vam** – – ·ṃkurāṣ hima(vant) ṣulac kāl[k] ||
 a5 /// plāc kapilavāstu riyam kārśnālyi **tmāṣ na[nde]** ///
 a6 /// nt akmaljo ākārnunt aśā(n)[yo] **vas[u]ndhari** – ///

3.3. A 144 + THT 2485: Commentary

Size of gaps. The left part of the leaf is torn “bis zum Schnürloche” [Sieg, Siegling 1921: 76]; thereby, the number of the lost akṣaras may be approximately 8 in lines 3–4 and, say, 10–11 in lines 1–2 and 5–6. To the right, the loss in lines 1–2 and 5–6 is rather big, even after adding fragment THT 2485: in each of these lines it can be evaluated as 16 akṣaras.

Contents. The text has several difficult spots; its structure itself is not absolutely clear. Judging from the personal pronouns, the speaker in line b1 is a woman (most likely Sundarī); in line b2 it is a man (certainly Nanda; see below). However, as Sundarī and Nanda are apart, it is doubtful that these lines could convey their real dialogue.

Lines b3–a4 are the beginning of the above-mentioned story about Nanda and 500 apsaras. Briefly speaking, their text runs as follows. Having learnt that Nanda is not happy with his life of a monk and longs for his lover, the Buddha invites him to travel to the summit of the Himalayas and then to the world of the Thirty-three Gods (Skt. *trayastrīṃśa*-). Nanda agrees, and the brothers set off in flight from the Jetavana grove. The words *ñākcyās k_ulewāsaṃ trāṅkñāl nasam* ‘I may become attached to the divine women’ can be a sort of a presage of a wish to possess the divine dancers which will carry Nanda away in the heavenly palace; however, one cannot neglect the fact that the lost left part of the line b2 could contain a negation. As shown by the

⁶ The problem of change-over from the initial numeration of lines to the real one, which is relevant for at least many dozens of Tocharian A text fragments, requires special discussion and can have only a complex resolution.

stage direction in line a5, after the Buddha and Nanda leave Jetavana, the scene shifts for a while to the city of Kapilavastu. **Line b1.** For the left part of the line, the conjecture (*kuc kã*)*lymy* (*ā*) *ś(ś)[i]* is highly probable. The collocation *kuc kãlyme* ‘in what direction?’ is not attested directly in Tocharian A texts, but Ji Xianlin, W. Winter and G.-J. Pinault suggest a similar conjecture for one of the lines of the *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka*:

❖ *kuc kãly* [*my ā*] *ś(ś)(i) ytsy onu našt ānāsās was ke aśśi senik kãlpāšt* ❖ (YQ-13[II.6] a5)
 ‘...Where have you set out to go, under the care of whom did you make us miserable ones arrive?’ (translation according to [Ji et al. 1998: 97]).

Note the several nontrivial coincidences between the lines given: both are a double question addressed to the second person, both parts of which contain an interrogative-emphatic particle *aśśi*.

We cannot suggest a certain reading for the akṣara preceding the form *pla(n)[t]t(ā)r*. A paleographically acceptable and syntactically possible conjecture is [*tu*] ‘thou’.

Line b3. As noted in [Siegling PK: 76], the collocation *ṣṇi naslune* is a calque of a Sanskrit term *svabhāva-* ‘one’s own nature’. However, the precise meaning of the locution *ṣṇi nasluneyāṣ kātāk*, lit. ‘rose from his own nature’, remains not quite clear; probably, the verb *kāt-* has a direct meaning here, and the whole expression means ‘≈ tore himself away from his own business’.

The form [*yl*]*ā[ri]* is an earlier unattested, but a quite regular N Sg f form of the adjective *ylār*; cf. also Acc Sg f *ylāry(ā)m* (THT 1418 fgm. a, a2; the context is lost). On the meaning of this adjective see especially Section 3.4.

The only possible conjecture for the segment ·[*l*]· — [*s*]· seems to be (*k*) [*l*] (*opa*) [*s*] (*unt*). The comparison ‘like a mother to a suffering son’ goes very well together with the Buddha’s deed, who, ‘having abandoned everything’, starts off to his brother. Note that in most versions of this episode the Buddha, on the contrary, calls Nanda to come, cf. Aśvaghōṣa’s: “And so the Sage summoned the joyless and weak-willed Nanda, wishing to take him up” (10.1) [Aśvaghōṣa’s Gold 2015: 335].

Line b4. In the beginning of the line, the pronominal form (*ca*)*m(i)* ‘his’ is reconstructed with a high degree of certainty.

A close analogue of the Buddha’s question can be found in the Pali *Samgāmāvacara-jātaka* (<http://sacred-texts.com/bud/j2/j2035.htm>), cf. “Have you been on pilgrimage in the Himalaya, Nanda?” After the address *pracar n(ande)* ‘brother Nanda’, the negation *mā* should probably be reconstructed: general questions which follow the pattern with negation are attested in Tocharian A texts, cf. *mā te tsinām* (23 b6), lit. ‘Shan’t I touch (the body of the Buddha)?’ The word *ṣul* was evidently followed by a noun, which in collocation with the verb *y-/yp-/yām-* ‘to do’ forms a set expression ‘to go for a trip ~ a pilgrimage’. In theory, one can assume that this noun was *ytār* ‘way’, but this is quite unreliable — the more so because certain examples of the collocation *ytār y-/yp-/yām-* seem to be unknown. At any rate, both Accusativus loci in place of the expected Allative and the most unusual word order (given that this part of the text is written in prose) remain a mystery.

Lines b4–6. In line b5, the only trustworthy candidate for a one-akṣara-long wordform which can govern the allative case seems to be the form PPM *ymām* ‘going’.

The subject of the sentence beginning at the end of line b4 is Nanda. Respectively, line b5 contains Nanda’s words. The word *trānkāṣ* ‘says’ in line b6 also refers to Nanda: it is clear from the content of the subsequent utterance, and besides, in the missing left part of the line there is merely not enough space for the change of the speaker. According to the convincing assumption of S. V. Malyshev (p.c.), in these lines first the inner speech of Nanda is given (such inner speech is introduced by the collocation *āñmaśl=äkk ats trānkāṣ* ‘speaks to himself’ or *āñmaśl=äkk ats pälsānkāṣ* ‘thinks to himself’) and next is his reply to the Buddha’s proposal. The content of Nanda’s thoughts can be tentatively reconstructed like this: ‘Just (on the way to the Himalayas) there is Kapilavastu, a city of the Śākya. Now I, (going) to the mountains of the Himalayas, (will be able to see the city) Kapilavastu’.

The description of the situation when the same character first says or does something and afterwards says something (again) occurs repeatedly in Tocharian A texts. Although all the suitable fragments are not entirely preserved, the rules of building such construction are quite clear. Its second part is introduced by the words *tmāš* (...) *trānkāš* ‘Then (...) says’, and the subject of the first part is not repeated, cf., for instance:

//// *kaṣiñño bādhari trānkāš weyeṃ nasam se tmāš trānkāš* (YQ-4[II.2] b3) ‘...with (trembling) body, Bādhari says: My son, I am stupefied. Then he says’ (translation according to [Ji, Winter, Pinault 1998: 75])

...*tmāš tsar orto caclurāš trānkāš* (YQ-28[I.4] b1) ‘...Then, with his hand raised, he says’ (translation according to [Ibid.: 37]).

E. Sieg and W. Siegling read the consonant preceding *kātkmām* as [p]. However, it seems difficult to propose any convincing conjecture for such reading. In view of the above, the reading (*tmā*)[s] looks much more likely.⁷

Lines b6–a1. Before the name of the tune || [*ke*]śikam ||, the collocation (*tām nu mām*)t w(ā)knā is reconstructed unambiguously. This formula, literally meaning ‘And that in which way?’, is one of the standard means of transition from prose to verse, which is used mostly when the inserted verses contain a detailed depiction of what has been said before them. A visual illustration of this device may be, for example, the text A 8, where the prosaic part of the story states that a painter depicted himself on the wall hanged, and in the verses his self-portrait is described in full detail.

Thus, the previous phrase evidently has some connection with the description of the flight. Grammatically, this phrase almost certainly includes an absolute turn. At the same time, the lost part of the text at the junction of lines b6 and a1 should, again, be very short — no more than 10–11 akṣaras. The reconstruction *tmāš ptānkāt kāšši nande[s]* (*tsarā eṃtsurāš orto kātāk*) satisfies all these conditions. Not absolutely certain, it still seems highly probable, especially taking into account the close parallels in other sources, cf.: “And so the Sugata (...) / Took his hand and flew up into the sky” (10.3) [Aśvaghōṣa’s Gold 2015: 336]; “So saying, the Master took him by the hand, and thus passed through the air” (*Samgāmāvacara-jātaka*).

Line a1. For an elsewhere unattested word *kṣāly*, the translations ‘Knospe’ [Kölver 1965: 66] and ‘leaf (of lotus or similar water plant)’ [Carling 2009: 184–185] have been proposed. The reasons for the B. Kölver’s assumption are unclear to us. G. Carling’s hypothesis is probably based on a parallel with an episode of the famous journey of prince Sarvārthasiddha for a wish-fulfilling stone (Skt. *cintāmaṇi*):

ṣpāt komsā wāltš pāltwāyo oplāsyō wraṃ oplāš oplā kārnm(ām kālkorā)š (1 b1) ‘moving around for seven days, stepping from one lotus to another, in a water with lotuses with a thousand leaves’ (translation according to [CETOM]).

However, first, as becomes clear also from the text No. 1 itself, in Tocharian A the leaves ‘of lotus or similar water plant’ are named by the same word *pālt* as, e.g., tree leaves. Second, the constructions *oplāš oplā* and *kṣāly kṣālyac* have completely different case marking, and to express the meaning ‘from X to Y’, the combination Abl + Perl is as natural as unnatural would be the combination N-Acc + All. Third and last, if the Buddha and Nanda really stepped from lotus to lotus instead of dashing high above the water, their comparison with kings of migrant geese wouldn’t make sense.

It seems that the scholars have not yet paid attention to the fact that the beginning of the Tocharian description of the Buddha and Nanda’s journey bears certain resemblance to the one

⁷ S. V. Malyshev suggests reconstructing the collocation (*lyutār mema*)[s] ‘exceedingly’ before *kātkmām*. Such decision is quite possible, cf. *lyutār memaš kātkmām* (254 a7); the common structure of the considered syntagma remains the same: //// (*tmāš lyutār mema*)[s] *kātkmām nāmtsu trānkāš* ‘(Then, exceedingly) being rejoiced, says...’.

in the Aśvaghoṣa's text, cf. 'Like a pair of greylag geese rising up from a lake, embracing one another with outstretched wings' (10.4) [Aśvaghoṣa's Gold 2015: 336].

Given this parallel, it seems possible to translate the collocation *kṣāly kṣālyac* as 'wing to wing'. If this translation is correct, the collocation in question is of much interest: the word 'wing' has not been known yet in either Tocharian language.

As the tune *keśikaṃ* corresponds to the meter of 4×17 syllables, and all 17 syllables of the first pāda are preserved, the last akṣara of the line a1 cannot contain a syllable. In [Siegling PK: 76] and [Carling 2000: 335] the conjecture *te(ñc)* is suggested for this akṣara. Certainly, besides the reading *te(ñc)*, the reading *ne(ñc)* is also paleographically possible. Both solutions are problematic. On the one hand, the PPM can really go together with Conj of the copula, cf., e.g., *tārkrā[s w](rā)ntu sūmām tākeñc* (340 a9) 'If (...) waters were raining from the cloud...' — whereas there seem to be no reliable examples of collocations of the PPM with the Pr of the copula (excluding the PPM of the verb *kātk-* 'rejoice'). On the other hand, the contracted 3 Pl Conj A form of the existential verb *teñc* (if it exists at all and is not a result of misreading of the same 3 Pl Pr A form *neñc*) has been seen only in the poem *Maitreyāvādānavyākaraṇa*, abundant in linguistic oddities [Itkin 2002: 14]; in all other texts only the regular form *tākeñc* is attested.

Lines a3–4. Most probably, the mention of gods, people, and animals here is part of the description not of the Buddha's specific actions, but of his ability to do good (to give gifts, bring liberation, etc.). The precise meaning of the form *lutkasmām* PPM K of *lutk-* (K only) 'create, turn into' remains unclear without context.

Line a4. The conjecture *(na)ṃkurāṣ* [Siegling PK: 76] was proposed (somewhat implicitly) already in [Sieg et al. 1931: 445]. Despite the non-standard transition *nk* → *mk*, this conjecture should be considered certain: the construction 'having disappeared from the place X, went to the place Y ~ appeared in the place Y' is represented in other Tocharian A texts as well, cf., for example:

|| *tmāṣ wlāñkāt epreraṃ nankurāṣ bodhisatvāp anaprā* //// (67 a2) 'Then Indra, having left the sky (lit. 'having disappeared in the sky'), before the Bodhisattva (appeared)'.

The placename *jetavaṃ* has been seen in Tocharian A only together with the word *saṃkrām* 'monastery', but its case form is not clear. Since movement away from some point is described, one could have expected the Abl form here, but in the example given above, the Loc form is presented, and there are no more doubtless examples.

Line a5. The conjecture (|| *sās nu tāpārk*) *plāc* lit. 'Now this very speech...' is evident: it reproduces a standard beginning of a stage direction which introduces a subsequent scene of action. There was almost certainly no text between the end of line a4 and the beginning of the stage direction: as in other similar cases, the scribe had to divide one scene from another with a small gap.

Line a6. The reading *vas[u]ndhari*, unexpected as it seems, is absolutely certain. The same name has been found (practically without a context) in one of the small fragments of manuscript Nos. 144–211: //// *vasundhari kuc* //// (THT 1148 a3); thus, the word division //// *va sundhari* and M. Peyrot's comment: "sic, certainly for *sundari*" [CETOM] — should be corrected. Cf. also *[v]asu[ndh]a[rī]* //// (THT 3024 a1; the reading is not very certain because the fragment is badly damaged). It looks as if fragments THT 1148 and THT 3024 cannot be parts of leaf A 144 + THT 2485, but they may quite well belong to the adjacent leaves. Whether the name *vasundhari* is another name of Sundarī or it refers to a different character, remains unclear. The mention of 'eyes full of tears' can stand for the former assumption; however, one should note that such cases of 'renaming' are rather untypical for Tocharian A texts.

3.4. On the meaning of the adjective *ylār*

At the first stage of the Tocharian studies, the adjective *ylār* was thought to be related to the Tocharian B *lāre* 'beloved, dear'; cf. the translations 'freundlich' [Sieg et al. 1931: 15], 'comis,

benignus' [Poucha 1955: 251]. However, in [Sieg 1944: 8, fn. 10] E. Sieg himself renounced such approach and preferred to compare *ylār* with Tocharian B *ylāre* 'weak, flaccid'. Most likely, this decision was based primarily on purely formal considerations: the correspondence between A *ylār* and B *lāre* does not follow any standard pattern, whereas the correspondence between A *ylār* and B *ylāre* is phonetically perfect. Accordingly, in most of later works the translations of *ylār* are variations of 'alt, gebrechlich, schlaff' proposed by E. Sieg, cf. 'gebrechlich' [Thomas 1964: 132], 'faible, caduc, flasque' [Van Windekens 1976: 599], 'decrepit' [Ji et al. 1998: 294], etc.

Note firstly that the Tocharian B *ylāre* can relate to both people and body parts, and it is always used together with change-of-state verbs, cf. a typical example:

//// (*mā*)cik yenti no ṣṇaura yl(ā)re (*k*)lutkāskem (PK AS 7M b3) 'The same winds, however, make the sinews weak' (translation by G.-J. Pinault [CEToM]).

Although most examples of usage of the Tocharian A *ylār* are strongly fragmented, one can see that it functions as an attribute of designation of people and is never found in change-of-state contexts:

- (1) || *tmāṣ sām bādhari brāhmaṃ ṣāññuneyā ylār ā* //// (212 a5 = YQ-8[II.4] a4) 'Thereupon Bādhari the Brahmin, *ylār* ... by his own nature...' (translation based on [Ji et al. 1998: 83], *ylār* = 'weak');
- (2) *ṣāññā ylāre olariñ metrakṣiñi māskantrā* ♦ *ypantrā cesmaṃ ortune ṣokyo skassuṣ plantantrā* ♦ (254 a8) 'By nature the Maitreya people are *ylāre* companions. They make friends with them [i.e. the fashioned beings], [they are] very happy [and] rejoice' (translation based on [CEToM], *ylāre* = 'feeble').
- (3) *tm=āk ylār pācar seyacc oki cam o(ñknac)* //// (79 a1) 'Immediately (he says), like a *ylār* father to [his] son, (to) the man...' (translation based on G. Carling's translation [CEToM], *ylār* = 'old')
- (4) //// *ylār nātāk* ♦ (99 a3) '...Oh, *ylār* lord!'
- (5) || *hā kāruṇik ylār nātāk* (101 b1) '...Oh, merciful *ylār* lord!'
- (6) *pkolye perāk ylār pācarr oki tāk* ♦ (317 a4) 'like a kind, plausible, *ylār* father <he> became'
- (7) *ylā[r]i [m]āc(ar) (k)[l](opa)[s](unt) s(e)yacc oki na(ndena)c kātse yāṣ* (144+2485 b3) '(Buddha-god the teacher...) like a *ylāri* mother to a suffering son, goes to Nanda'.

Examples (1)–(2) are ambiguous. Brahman Bādhari is weak and feeble indeed, and he says so himself several lines below. But he is weak and feeble not 'by his own nature', but because he has reached the age of 120. In the phrase preceding the one in question, Bādhari's disciples beg him for forgiveness; in such case the assessment of not physical, but rather inward qualities looks more natural.⁸ The story of the miraculous vision caused by Maitreya, of which the example (2) is part, has a complex modality. Nevertheless, one cannot but recognize that the words 'feeble companions' as a denotation of Maitreya's people in a play that is entirely devoted to the glorification of Maitreya is somewhat strange. As for the second pāda, the translation given above assumes that the antecedent of the pronoun *cesmaṃ* is far away from the verse fragment, which seems at least unusual. In this regard, a different interpretation of this pāda seems possible to us: '<Those, who> show (lit. 'do') friendliness towards them [i.e., Maitreya's people], are very happy and rejoice'.

⁸ The honorable Bādhari is unlucky: the author of this article has already had occasion to defend him from accusations of being a bad teacher, see [Itkin 2014].

In all the other examples, attributing a negative meaning to the adjective *ylār* directly contradicts the content of the text. Example (3) is about the charity of the Bodhisattva-elephant Śaddanta towards a hunter who had wounded him. G. Carling uses a neutral adjective ‘old’ to translate *ylār* in this episode, but ‘old’ in Tocharian A is *mok*; moreover, the role of the father’s age in such comparison is not clear. In examples (4)–(5) the word *ylār* is part of a respectful address; in example (6) it forms a coordinating construction with adjectives *pkolye* ‘trustful, kind’ and *perāk* ‘true, trustful’. And of course, any negative connotations are out of question in example (7).

The abstractum *ylārone** is also worthy of notice: cf. ♦ *ylāroneyo sāsnotku* (108 a4). The precise meaning of the verb *snotk-* is unknown, but it is remarkable that the example of its use which is syntactically closest to what was just given looks like this:

tmāṣṣ ānand sāsno(o)tku oki wsokone kākcey[o] (313 a6) ‘Then Ananda, as if being *sāsnotku* with glee and joy...’

Thus, in Tocharian A it is quite possible to be *sāsnotku* with positive emotions.

All this leaves no doubt that whatever the correspondence between the Tocharian A adjective *ylār* and Tocharian B adjectives *lāre* and *ylāre* is from the historical point of view, the meaning of the Tocharian A adjective proposed by E. Sieg and W. Siegling is generally correct, and its later revision should be totally rejected. We assume that the most precise translation of *ylār* is ‘affectionate, careful’.

3.5. A 144 + THT 2485: The combined text with conjectures and translation

Below is the combined text of leaf A 144 + THT 2485, given without division into fragments and with the conjectures, and its translation. In lines a2 and a3 the number of syllables (**not** the number of the akṣaras!) lost in the pādas 2 and 4 is indicated. All the conjectures added to the text in comparison with the version in Section 3.2 are in italics. The less certain restitutions — both in the Tocharian text and in its translation — are underlined by a dotted line:

A 144+2485:

b1 //// (*kuc* *kä*)lmy (*a*)ś(*ś*)[i] lo kälkāṣt k_ucaśś(ä)ll aśśi [*tu*] pla(n)[t]t(ā)r ñu[k] l- ////
b2 //// ñākcyās k_ulewāsaṃ trāñkñāl nasam k_ucāṣ nu nāṣ — ////
b3 //// ○ ṣ ṣñi nasluneyāṣ kātāk ylä[r]i [m]āc(ar) (*k*)[*l*](*opa*)[*s*](*unt*) s(e)yacc oki na(ndena)c kātse
yāṣ s·
b4 //// (*ca*) ○ m(*i*) mrāc tsitorāṣ trāñkṣ=ānn anac pracar n(ande *mā*) te yatār himavant ṣul — ||
tmāṣ nande
b5 //// m śākkiśi kapilavāstu ri naṣ [nu] nāṣ t[ā]pār_k himavant ṣulac (*y**mām*) kapilavās(tu)
b6 //// [s] kātkmām nāmṣu trāñkāṣ kri ñi āṣānik ṣokyo kri ñi || tmāṣ ptāñkāt kāṣṣi nande[s] (*tṣa*
a1 *rā* *emṣurāṣ* *orṭo* *kātāk* *tām* *nu* *mām*) t w(ā)knā || [ke]ṣikam || mām_t ne kokāśśi lāmś tsopatsām
wṛā eṣāk kṣāly kṣālyac ymām ne(*ñe*)
a2 (♦ ————— [s] kṣatrim pratri tim ♦ rātram wsāluy-ām[p]i wsā yokām
[ya]tsy-ām[p]i lānt sew(ā)ññ āmpi ♦ kaṣ ka
a3 ————— ○ ññ oki plawar epreram ♦ 1 || tam ne wkā(ny)o (ptā)ñkāt kāṣṣi ñāktas
napenās(ś)i [l](wā)śśi okāk
a4 //// ○ lutkāsmām nandenaśśāl ṣyak [j]e[t](a)vaṃ (*saṃkrāmam*, *na*)mṣurāṣ hima(vant) ṣulac
kāl[k] ||
a5 (|| *sās* *nu* *tāpār*k) plāc kapilavāstu riyam kārśnālyi tmāṣ na[nde] ////
a6 //// nt akmalyo ākārnunt aśā(n)[yo] vaṣ[u]ndhari — ////

- b1: "...in what direction, indeed, have you gone, whom do you rejoice with? I..."
 b2: "...I can (cannot?) get attached to the divine women. Because of what do I...?"
 b3: ...(The Buddha-god the teacher...) has torn himself away (?) (lit. risen) from his own business and goes to Nanda, like a careful mother goes to a suffering son.
 b4: ...having touched the crown of his head, says to him: "Brother Nanda, (won't) you go for a (pilgrimage) to the mountains of the Himalayas?" || Then Nanda
 b5: (says to himself:) "...just... there is Kapilavastu, a city of the Śākya. Now I, (going) to the mountains of the Himalayas, Kapilavastu..."
 b6: ...(Then,) (...) being rejoiced, says: "<This is> my wish, oh arhat, <this is> my very wish!" || Then Buddha-god the teacher, Nanda
 a1: (having taken by the hand, rose up). And that in which way? || On the tune K. || Like kings of migrant geese, over the great water wing to wing (?) flying (lit. 'going')...
 a2: ... kṣatriya-brothers these two, both in red clothes, both with the gold-coloured skin, both king's sons; span (?)...
 a3: ...like ..., swam in the sky. || In this way the Buddha-god the teacher... to the gods, the people and even the animals
 a4: ...turning into (?), together with Nanda, from the monastery Jetavana having disappeared, to the mountains of the Himalayas went. ||
 a5: (|| Now this very) speech <as taking place> in the city of Kapilavastu should be understood. Then Nanda...
 a6: ...with ... face and eyes full of tears, Vasundhari...

4. The decoration of ears:

Leaf A 171+156 + THT 2543 + THT 2265

4.1. THT 2543

Fragment THT 2543 has not been published before. Its expedition code is unknown. The numeration of lines accepted in [Tamai 2007] is changed to the factual one (a1–3 → b1–3, b1–3 → a4–6). The right margin is preserved.

a4: //// (|| sās) [n]u [t](ā)[pa]®k [p]l[ā]c^ā_[N]

a5: //// – viśākh[ā]nac traṅka

a6: //// [ā]rkiśoṣṣi –

b1: //// – k[āt]s ṣ –

b2: //// tsu pattāñāktāśśā_[l]

b3: //// *m [s]amk®āmac^ā [yi]ñc^ā

4.2. THT 2265

Fragment THT 2265 has not been published before and has never been regarded as written in Tocharian A; in particular, it is absent in the list of Tocharian A THT-fragments in [Adaktylos et al. 2007: 76–78]. The expedition code is again unknown. The numeration of lines accepted in [Tamai 2007] is changed to the factual one (a1–2 → a5–6). Note T. Tamai's perfect transliteration; our reading differs from it in being just a little fuller:

4.3. A 171+156 + THT 2543 + THT 2265: The combined text

A 171+156 + THT 2543 + 2265:

Hereafter, we use the designation A 171ext for leaf A 171+156 + THT 2543 + THT 2265 taken as a whole. A part of a line belonging to A 171ext inside any of the four fragments is called a “segment”; furthermore, the factual numeration is employed for the lines of fragments THT 2543 and THT 2265: e.g., *tsu pättāññaṭṭasāḷ* is the segment THT 2543 b2.

4.4. A 171text: Metrical analysis

Leaf A 171text contains three poetic fragments written in three different meters.

Lines a1–3. The akṣara which is partially preserved in line a2 after the word *pyā[pyā]ñ* is a pāda-end sign (◆). As it is evident from the general structure of the text, this sign closes the third pāda of the stanza which begins in line a1; thus, the third pāda consists of 10 syllables. Among all the meters attested in Tocharian poetry, this stanza can correspond only to the meter 20+22+10+15 (metrical scheme 5/5/5/5 + 8/7/7 + 5/5 + 8/7) [Pinault 2008: 400]. Gaps in the right part of line a2 and between segments 171 a3 and 156 a3 are approximately equal, so the middle part of the fourth pāda has been preserved in its entirety, and the border between the cola is likely to be after the word *ymām*. As 16 out of 20 syllables of the first pāda are preserved, the verse starts immediately with the word *ekapuṇḍarik*, and the gap between segments 171 a1 and 156 a1 contain only the greater part of the tune's name. Among the known names of the tunes which introduce the meter 20+22+10+15, only (a very frequent) || *subhādrenam* || could stand in line a1; unfortunately, the badly damaged akṣara after || does not allow either to prove or to disprove this reading with certainty.

Lines a6–b1. The calculation shows that the stanza written in an elsewhere unattested tune *svapnadarśnam* occupies about 55 akṣaras altogether. Thus, the tune in question should correlate with the meter of 4×12 syllables (no shorter meters seem to be attested in Tocharian A). The third pāda, almost entirely preserved, follows the metrical scheme 5/4/3. This pāda misses just one syllable, which allows to reconstruct its ending as *kāru(nik)* 'merciful'. The collocation *yokeyutts oki* is the first colon of the second pāda.

Lines b5–6. The tune *yarāssinam* corresponds to the meter of 4×18 syllables (metrical scheme 4/3/4/3/4 [Pinault 2008: 399]). As noted in [Siegling PK: 88, 84], the second pāda of Viśākhā's monologue ends with the word *wampe*, and the third one — with the word *tā[k]*; the punctuation mark after *wampe* is, again, partially preserved and can be read quite reliably. Thereby, the second pāda misses 4 syllables in the beginning, and the first one misses 2 syllables in the beginning and one syllable in the end. The fourth pāda is completely lost: its beginning was in the right part of line b6 and its continuation was in the left part of line a1 of leaf A 153, which follows leaf A 171text.

4.5. A 171text: Commentary

Leaf number. E. Sieg and W. Siegling define the leaf number as "204 oder 304" [Sieg, Siegling 1921: 88]; however, we assume the reading "[3]04" to be much more likely: the traces of the third 'stroke' are clear enough.

Line a1. On the left side of line a1, the adverb [*y*]w[*ār*] can be reconstructed with certainty. The precise meaning of this adverb, which usually goes together with the verb *triw-* 'be mixed, be joined', is unknown; it is usually translated as 'together', cf., e.g., *ywār triwantrā puk* |||| (THT 1134 b3) '...they are all mixed together...' (translation by M. Peyrot [CEToM]).

On a not entirely clear word *ekapuṇḍarik* 'marvellous (?)', see [Carling 2009: 71].

For the end of the line, the conjecture *suk wārpnātrā* 'they feel happiness' looks plausible; cf. *suk wārpnātrā* (YQ-44 [III.3] b3) as a parallel. Unfortunately, this is not certain — especially because in this case, taking into account the requirements of the meter, the last colon of the first pāda should include, in addition to *suk wārpnātrā*, some semantically 'empty' monosyllabic word.⁹

⁹ Presumably, in Tocharian A poetry the sentential pronoun *tām* 'this' can sometimes take this role, cf., e.g., |||| *r camī šūñkāš pre tsāknātār tām* ◆ (117 b6) '...the tongue hangs out of his mouth *tām*'.

Line a2. As the form *klyoṣṣaṃ* can be N-Acc Pl f both of the I and of the II AV of the verb *klyo-s-* ‘hear, listen to’, the spelling *lkālaṃ* may stand both for *lkālaṃ* (N-Acc Pl f of the I AV of *lāk-/pālk-* ‘see, look’) proper and (*pā*)*lkālaṃ* (N-Acc Pl f of the II AV of the same verb). The first option appears much more likely: in this case, the noun phrase *lkālaṃ klyoṣṣaṃ vra[mā]ṃ (ci)ñcraṃ* lit. ‘visible and audible tender things’ fully occupies the first colon of the second pāda.

For the form *wenantrā*, instead of the commonly accepted meaning ‘are opening’, the meaning ‘are falling’ is significantly more likely [Itkin, Malyshev 2021: 60–61].

Lines a2–3. The general meaning of the fourth pāda remains unclear; it must be noted that its left part might contain a negation.

Lines a3–4. At the junction of lines a3 and a4, the conjecture (*śu*)*laṃ yāś* ‘goes up the mountain’ is possible, cf. *pāṣāṇak śulaṃ yeś* (YQ-1[I.10] a2) ‘he went up the Pāṣāṇaka Hill’. However, it is not certain: as the main character in this sentence is Sundarī, what mountain could she come up and what for?

Line a4. Leaf A 171text is the only one of all the leaves of the manuscript Nos. 144–211 which preserves its name — precisely, an initial part of its name: *saunda[r](·) [-] ////*. Another copy of the same composition is presumably the manuscript Nos. 89–143 [Sieg, Siegling 1921: 252, 253];¹⁰ this manuscript also has a leaf which preserves a part of its name, this time a final one: (*////*) *ritanāṭkaṃ* (127 a2). These two pieces of evidence allow reconstructing the name of the play as **saundaranandacaritanāṭāk*, cf. [Ibid.: 253; Ivanov 1992: 232]. This self-suggesting decision, however, is not free from paleographic difficulties: the akṣara which follows *nda* in the line 171 a4 bears much more resemblance to [*ryā*] than to *ra*, and the hardly visible remnants of the next akṣara are not quite similar to *na*¹¹.

The conjecture (*na*)[*nda*]*vihārapālaṃ* was presumably first proposed in [Sieg et al. 1931: 236].

On the conjecture (|| *sās*) [*n*]*u* [*t*](*ā*)[*pā*](*r*)*k* [*p*]/[*ā*]*c* see above, leaf A 144 + THT 2485, line a5.

Line a5. The gap between segments 171 a5 and 156 a5 is rather big — about 8–9 akṣaras. Immediately before the word *śomiṃ*, a name of one of the female characters in this scene, *preṣikā*, which is known from line b6, can be certainly reconstructed. For the remaining part of the gap, the conjecture *ālyākyāṃ praṣṭaṃ* lit. ‘at another time’ is likely (although not 100 % certain), cf., e.g., the beginning of the 12th act of the play *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka*:

|| || *tmāś ālyākyāṃ praṣṭaṃ metrak bodhisattu* (253 a6) ‘Then in the other time the Bodhisattva Maitreya...’.

The structure of the collocation *tsrā ymār* is not clear enough. Perhaps, the adjective *tsār* ‘sharp’ is used here metaphorically as ‘very’.

In the right part of the line, the collocation *ślāñcālyī* ‘with reverently folded hands’ turned out to be torn apart between three different fragments. The vowel adjacent to *ly* is badly damaged, thus, the reading [*ī*] (and not [*i*]) is rather tentative.

Lines a6–b1. At the junction of the two sides of the leaf, one can reconstruct the collocation [*ā*]*rkiśoṣṣi*[*s*] (*w*)*amp(e)* ‘the decoration of the world’, which, of course, refers to Buddha.

Line b1. The text in question presents a rather rare structure, in which the expression *ślak śkaṃ* ‘and also’ marks not a transition from a prosaic part of some character’s monologue to verses, but, on the contrary, a transition from verses to prose. At least in the two usages of such structure *ślak śkaṃ* is followed by a vocation, cf. (*śla*)*k śkaṃ pācar* (83+76 a3) ‘And also, father...’, *ślak śkaṃ sewāñ* (212 b2 = YQ-8[II.4] a8) ‘And also, sons...’. If the text A 171text

¹⁰ E. Sieg and W. Siegling affirm that manuscripts Nos. 89–143 and Nos. 144–211 were doubtlessly written by different hands. Although their handwriting is very similar, this assessment can be accepted. Moreover, there are several small, but distinct linguistic differences between these two groups of texts: in particular, the PP form of the verb *lā-n-t-* ‘go out’ in the texts Nos. 89–143 looks as *laltu*, whereas in the texts Nos. 144–211 it looks as *lantu*.

¹¹ S. V. Malyshev (p.c.) proposes to see here the word *saundarya-* ‘beauty’. The meaning of the whole name, however, is not enough clear in this case.

follows the same pattern, the conjecture $[n](\bar{a}ši)$ ‘(oh) lady’ can be proposed for the word after *ślak śkaṃ* (Preṣikā calls Viśākhā just ‘lady’, not ‘sister’ vel sim., see line b4).

The subject of Preṣikā’s first prosaic phrase is doubtlessly Nanda (the verse part of her monologue refers exclusively to the Buddha). Preṣikā could have used the expression *nande māṣkit* ‘prince Nanda’ (cf. lines b3 and b6).

Segment THT 2265 b1 is clearly the end of the collocation $(ptāñkāt k\bar{a})[s]y(\bar{a})p$.

The comparison with line b5 shows that the part of line b1 which begins with the akṣara $[n]$ and ends with the akṣara p should be 11–12 akṣaras long. In case of linked spelling of the collocation *ptāñkāt k\bar{a}syāp* (more frequent than the separate one presented in the line b5), the sequence $[n](\bar{a}ši nande māṣkit ptāñkāt k\bar{a})[s]y(\bar{a})p$ consists of exactly 12 akṣaras. Alternatively, of course, there could have virtually been no word *nāṣi* in the text (if so, the consonant following *śkaṃ* is most likely just a beginning of the name ‘Nanda’), there could have been a different characteristic instead of the word *māṣkit*, etc. Generally, however, the beginning of Preṣikā’s phrase seems clear in its meaning.

Reconstructing the end of line b1 is a more difficult task. As for the meaning, this part of the story is dedicated to the description of relationship between the Buddha and Nanda. Nanda was Siddhārtha’s half-brother, as well as his maternal cousin; in many Buddhist works, he is solemnly referred to as ‘the son of maternal aunt of the Buddha’.¹² As for the graphics, the state of affairs is as follows. In segment THT 2543 b1, the word $k[\bar{a}t]s$ ‘stomach’ is unambiguously distinguished. The preserved part of the preceding akṣara allows for a reading $[cr]$ (along with some other readings) and, correspondingly, for the conjecture $(m\bar{a})[cr](i)$. The word following $k[\bar{a}t]s$ looks as $ś[kr]$ and may be read as $ś(a)[r](i)$ — an unattested, but expectable (considering peculiarities of declension of the words ‘mother’, ‘father’, and ‘brother’) G Sg of the noun *śar* ‘sister’.¹³ The general meaning of the syntagma *ptāñkāt k\bar{a}syāp mācri k\bar{a}ts-śari se* ‘the son of the full (?) sister of the mother of the Buddha-god the teacher’, which includes three successively subordinated genitives, satisfies the expected one; however, the possibility of existence of the compound **k\bar{a}ts-śar* is questionable. The unclear form *kāṣṣar* (YQ-1[I.10] b7), which was found in the colophon of the first act of the play *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka* in the manuscript from Yanqi, could manifest its existence, assuming that the spelling *kāṣṣar* is a result of the *tsś* → *śś* assimilation that occurred at the junction of the compound’s parts in ‘late’ Tocharian A. As a possible parallel to this development, cf. the spelling *ywārt-tāś* (LP-3 a1) ‘head of the central region’, which was marked in one of the caravan passes in Tocharian B, where *ywārt* < *ywārc* ‘semi-; among’, cf. [Adams 2013, II: 564–565] (D. Q. Adams himself seems to consider the form *ywārt* to be primary). Note also that in the unpublished Tocharian B fragment THT 3766 (line b2) the syntagma $[k]a[ts]āṣṣe [pro](cer)$ lit. ‘belly brother’ can be restored with high probability. At the same time, the inner form of the compound *k\bar{a}ts-śar** (lit. ‘womb-sister’) attests to the meaning ‘half-sister’, whereas, according to the Buddhist tradition, Mahāmāyā and Mahāprajāpati Gautami were full sisters. It is possible, however, that these two kinds of kinship in the Tocharian A system did not differ and that the word *k\bar{a}ts-śar** in Preṣikā’s utterance is used as an emotional intensifier rather than as a term. In addition, in the Tocharian B *Udānālankāra* Nanda is named *poysintse mātārsa procer* (B PK AS 6B a5) ‘the maternal brother of the Omniscient (= the Buddha)’ (sic!), which makes the matter even more complicated.

Line b2. The gap between segments 171 b2 and 156 b2, as well as in the correlative line a5, is about 8–9 akṣaras long. The words *śom pācrā* ‘from the same father’ might be followed by the traditional mentioning of the Buddha’s possession of the 32 marks of the Great Man, but this is

¹² Cf., for instance, the several times repeated *брат Благословенного, сын его тети по матери* ‘brother of the Blessed one, son of his maternal aunt’ in the Russian translation of *Nanda Sutra* (*Udana*, III, 2; <https://coollib.net/b/431894-siddhartha-gautama-sbornik-buddiyskih-sutr/read>) — a brief retelling of the same story about Nanda and five hundred apsaras.

¹³ The reading $ś(a)[r](e)$ is also possible, of course, but we see no morphological reasons why the Tocharian A word ‘sister’ could have the ending *-e* in G Sg.

uncertain, because in Preṣikā's story Nanda is compared to the Buddha not by his appearance, but by his character. The fact that Nanda is passionate is once again mentioned on the next leaf: *sām śkaṃ āśānik śāññuneyā enka(ḥsu) ///* (153 b1) 'And this arhat, passionate by his nature...'

Line b3. After *jetavaṃ saṃkrāmaṃ*, the PP *ka(kmu)* 'having come' should be most probably reconstructed — either with the copula or, as in line a5, without it.

At the beginning of segment 156 b3, the reading ∙ [o]ki 'as if' is possible.

Segments THT 2265 b3 and THT 2543 b3 contain the beginning and the end of the name of Jetavana monastery, which has already been mentioned in the same line.

Line b4. The gap between segments 171 b4 and 156 b4 should be about 7 akṣaras long, considering the gap around the string hole. This assessment goes well with the conjecture *tā(m ka-klyuṣurāṣ viś)[ā]khā* 'Having heard that, Viśākhā...'

Lines b4–5. The gap between the end of segment 156 b4 and the right edge of the folio is 8–9 akṣaras long. In Tocharian A, the meaning 'to put out, to pull' is expressed by the verb *tsāk-*, sometimes together with elative preverbs, cf. *waštāṣ lo tskāt* (100 a2) '(he) pulled out from home', *pre tsakar ñi* (360, 2) '(they) pulled me out'; a small stroke of ink at the very edge of segment 156 b4 could fairly well belong to the subscribed *k*. A solitary *y* at the beginning of line b5 is obviously the end of the G form *preṣikāy*. The conjecture *(pre ts)[k](orāṣ preṣikā)* *y* is 7 akṣaras long, but includes a long akṣara *tsko*; there could possibly be no other words in this part of the line b4.

Line b5. The verb *plānk-* has been seen in the Tocharian A texts only one more time:¹⁴

✦ *tām ne=k (ā)kntsāñ kākōṣṭuṣ pe pāplāñkuṣ pe* ✦ *tsru ke kālpoṣ n_unak sātkaṃtār omāskenam* ✦ (4+1370.e¹⁵ b2–3) 'Thus (i.e. like the *krośavati* grass) also the ignorant ones, even beaten, even..., having got the smallest chance, spread out in evil-doing again'.

Trying to bring together the two rather different usages, scholars usually presuppose the meaning like 'zwicken, zupfen' (cf. [Malzahn 2010: 743] and the references; [CEToM] proposes 'nipped' as the translation of the PP *pāplāñkuṣ*, which is more ambiguous — among the meanings of the verb *nip* there are both 'pinch' and 'squeeze'). But first, as text No. 4 indicates, *plānk-* is undoubtedly a transitive verb; so, in the text A 171ext **preṣikāy śomine klośām plānkāmām* lit. 'having nipped the ears of the girl Preṣikā' would be expected. Second, in the general context of the story, this 'touching detail' looks quite superfluous and senseless. As Viśākhā's words ('... earrings ... accept') leave no doubt that she is giving a gift, it is natural to expect that Viśākhā, having taken the earrings out of her ears, merely puts them in Preṣikā's ears. In this case, the most likely meaning for *pāplāñkuṣ* in text No. 4 is '≈ squeezed', which presupposes a clear antithesis: no matter how the ignorant ones are squeezed, they still spread out in evil-doing.

The monologue of the grateful Viśākhā undoubtedly begins with the words (*klośni*)s *wampe* 'the decoration of ears', which she repeats one more time afterwards. The akṣara following the word *nāñi* is quite certainly read as [ws], which allows for the conjecture [ws](āṣt) 'you gave'. This word ends the first pāda of the monologue.

Lines b5–6. The final -s before *t[a]rkaṣ* is the ending of the Acc Pl form of some deictic pronoun. Technically, the gender of the word *tark** 'earring' is unknown, but virtually it can be identified as masculine with certainty: nearly all the nouns of the class II,2 (with N Pl in -añ) — *kam* 'tooth', *kukāl* 'chariot', *prañk* 'island', *ṣul* 'mountain', *ṣont* 'street', etc. — are of masculine gender. Therefore, the pronoun in question should look like (*cesā*)s. At the beginning of the second pāda, there could have been, say, the word *tāmyo* 'thus', but this is uncertain.

Line b6. Before the word *ākṣiñāṣt*, a partially preserved akṣara [ñi] can be seen, which is the end of the word (*nā*)[ñi], G of *ñuk* 'I (f)'. One of the two missing syllables evidently belongs to the pronoun *tu* 'thou' (cf. line b5); the other syllable could have been, for instance, the adverb *śkā* 'also', although other variants are possible as well.

¹⁴ The following speculations base on the presumption that in both cases it is actually the same verb, which is yet not quite certain.

¹⁵ The fragment THT 1370.e is a wee exfoliated flap of the back side of the leaf A 4.

4.6. A 171text: The combined text with conjectures and translation

The principles of the presentation of the combined text are the same as for leaf A 144 + THT 2485 (see above, 3.5).

A 171text (= A 171+156 + THT 2543 + THT 2265; leaf [3]04):

- a1: [y]w[āṛ tri]wos brahmasva[r wa]śem klyoṣ[tā]r || s[ṣu](*bhāḍreṇam*) || ekapuṇḍarik vaijayant
 ṣtāṅkaṃ ṇākcyās wimāntwaṃ su(*k wārpnāntrā*) — ◆
 a2: lkālaṃ klyoṣlaṃ wra[mā]ṃ (ci)ñcraṃ kālpnāntrā māmt ne — (-----) kte ◆ meṣ
 tkam ṇkāt lykāly lykāly wenantrā pyā[pyā]ṇ ◆ (-----)
 a3: ytāraṃ ymām er[k]āt tāki (---◆1) || tāṃ kaklyuṣurāṣ sundari kuc yārmaṃ tsarwatār ///
 (śu)
 a4: laṃ yāṣ || saunda[r] ◆ [-] /// /// (na)[nda]vihārapālaṃ ṇom śkāṣt sarg āṛ || (|| sāṣ)
 [n]u [t](ā)[pā](r)k [p]l[ā]c
 a5: śrāvastyam kārsnāl(y)i ◆ tmās (*āḷyākyāṃ praṣṭam preṣikā*) śomiṃ tsrā ymār kakmus
 [ka]remām akmalyo ślāñcā[lyī] viśākh[ā]nac trāṅkā
 a6: ṣ || svapnada[rś](na)ṃ [||] (-) ◆[ā] — (-----) — nāṣ ◆ yokeyutts oki — (-----) ◆
 sā[m ā]rkiśoṣṣi[s] (w)a
 b1: mp(e) nāmtsu kāru(*nik*) ◆ (-----) yāṣ kar ◆ 1 || ślak śkaṃ [n](*āṣi nande māṣkī*)
ptāñkāt kā)[s]y(ā)p (mā)[cr](i) k[āt]s s(a)[r](i)
 b2: se ptāñkātśāl śom pācrā /// /// syo yetu pracar ṣeṣ sā[m] p(e)nu [eṇ]kal[su] wras[o]m
 ṣ(ā)maṃ [n]āmtsu pātāñkātśāl
 b3: ṣyak jetavaṃ saṃkrāmaṃ ka(*kmu*) /// /// ◆ [o]kī śrāvastiṣiṇi wrasaṃ cam māṣkitam lkātsi
 [j]e(*tava*)ṃ [s]aṃk(r)āmac [yi]ñc
 b4: tāṣ nāṣse kārsor tāṣ || tā(*m kaklyuṣurāṣ* viś)[ā]khā vāskāñc kātkmām nāmtsus ṣṇi kloṣnāṣ
 tarkas (*pre ts*)[k](*orāṣ preṣikā*)
 b5: y śomine kloṣ[n]aṃ plānkāmām trāṅkāṣ || yārā[s](sinam || *kloṣni*)s wampe wākmatsām
 ptāñkāt kāṣyāp ṇom klyossi tu nāṇi [ws](*āṣt*) ◆ — — *cesā*)
 b6: s t[a]rkas nu pūrpār tu ṇkāṣ preṣikā kloṣnis wampe ◆ (*tu*) (-) (*nā*)[ñi] ākṣiñāṣ nande
 māṣkit waṣtāṣ lāc ṣāmaṃ lo tā[k] ◆) ///

- a1: ... (with...) joined a voice like Brahma's voice is heard: || On the tune S. || "In the marvellous (?) mansion Vaijayanta, in the gods' palaces happiness... (they feel),
 a2: eyes and ears pleasing (lit. 'visible and audible tender') things they get. As if... The goddess of Earth trembles, the flowers are falling little by little...
 a3: ...Walking the path, hostile will be (?)...". || Having heard that, Sundarī is glad to some extent...
 a4: ...up the mountain... goes. || In <the work> *Saundarananda-carita-nāṭaka*, the sixth chapter, named "Nandavihārapālana", is over. || (|| This) speech now
 a5: <as happening> in Śrāvastī should be understood. Then (at another time) the girl (Preṣikā) very (?) quickly (lit. 'sharply quickly') came, with smiling face, with reverently folded hands says to Viśākhā:
 a6: || On the tune S. || "...like thirsty (f)... He, the decoration of world
 b1: having become, merciful... does (?) || And also, lady: (prince Nanda,) the Buddha-god the teacher's mother's full (?) sister's
 b2: son, from the same father as the Buddha-god... brother was decorated; he <i.e. Nanda>, although a passionate man, became a monk, with the Buddha-god
 b3: together to the monastery Jetavana (came)... As if ..., people from Śrāvastī go to the monastery (Jetavana) to see this prince.

- b4: Be it known to the lady!” || (Having heard) that, the lay-disciple Viśākhā, being overjoyed, (having put) the earrings out of her ears
 b5: and putting <them> in the ears of the girl (Preṣikā), says: || On the tune Y. || “Oh, the decoration (of ears), you have let (lit. ‘given’) me hear the beautiful name of the Buddha-god the teacher! (For this) these
 b6: earrings accept from me, you, Preṣikā, the decoration of ears! (And also you) have told me: prince Nanda left his home, became a monk”.

4.7. Viśākhā and Preṣikā

The final lines of leaf A 171ext deserve the utmost attention from an aesthetic point of view.

At first sight, the expression *ārkišoṣṣis wampe* ‘the decoration of the world’ looks as a rather common epithet of the Buddha. But as it turns out, this expression has **never** been attested with certainty in all the known corpus of Tocharian A texts.¹⁶ There is no doubt that its appearance in Preṣikā’s story makes a parallel with the expression *klośnis wampe* ‘the decoration of ears’, which is crucial for the whole scene: Viśākhā calls the news told by Preṣikā a ‘decoration of ears’ **because** this is the news about the Buddha, the decoration of the world. In Viśākhā’s reply, the words *klośnis wampe* are repeated twice: they open the first pāda of her monologue in verse and close the second one — a perfect chiasmus (as was said above, the lines of Viśākhā’s monologue follow the pattern 4/3/4/3/4, i.e. they are strictly mirror-symmetrical). The meaning of this figure of speech is defined by what Viśākhā not only says, but **simultaneously** does. The news about the Buddha is a ‘decoration of ears’ in a figurative sense, whereas the earrings that Preṣikā was given for bringing this news are a decoration of ears in a very literal sense: a striking example of metaphor realization. Moreover, the syntactic structure of the lines in question is such that the words ‘the decoration of ears’ in both cases can be attributed **also to Preṣikā herself** as a bearer of good news.

No matter to what extent the author of the Tocharian text was guided by a Sanskrit source and to what extent he followed his own ideas, it is no exaggeration to say that the scene of the conversation between Viśākhā and Preṣikā is an outstanding masterpiece of the literary art.

ABBREVIATIONS

A — actiſum
 Abl — ablatiſus
 Acc — accuſatiſus
 All — allatiſus
 AV — adiectiſum ſeriale
 Conj — coniunctiſus
 f — femininum
 G — genetiſus
 K — Kauſatiſum

Loc — locatiſus
 N — nominatiſus
 Perl — perlatiſus
 Pl — pluralis
 PP — partiſipium praeteriti
 PPM — partiſipium praesenti medii
 Pr — praesens
 Sg — ſingularis

¹⁶ S. V. Malyshev has drawn our attention to the fact that for the junction of the lines A 27 a4–5 the conjecture (*ārkišoṣṣi*)/s (at [CEToM] inexactly (*ārkišoṣi*)/s. — I.I.) *wampe yetwe sām* ‘... this one [is] the decoration [and] ornament of the (world)’ was proposed at the [CEToM] website. Taking into account the parallel diſcovered by us in the text A 171ext, this conjecture ſhould be regarded as highly probable.

REFERENCES

- Adaktylos et al. 2007 — Adaktylos A.-M., Fellner H., Koller B., Malzahn M., Simma K., Staudinger R. A concordance to the unedited Tocharian texts of the Berlin Turfan Collection. *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Malzahn M. (ed.). Heidelberg: Winter, 2007, 39–78.
- Adams 2013 — Adams D. Q. *A dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and greatly enlarged*. Vol. I–II. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013.
- Aśvaghōṣa's Gold 2015 — *Aśvaghōṣa's Gold*. Translations of Buddhacarita and Saundarananda by Mike Cross. E-publication, 2015. <http://mike-cross.buddhasasana.net/asvaghosas-gold/asvaghosas-gold.pdf>.
- Carling 2000 — Carling G. *Die Funktion der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000.
- Carling 2009 — *Dictionary and thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Vol. 1: A–J. Compiled by Gerd Carling in collaboration with Georges-Jean Pinault and Werner Winter. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009.
- CETOM — *A comprehensive edition of Tocharian manuscripts*. <http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/>.
- Itkin 2002 — Itkin I. B. The linguistic features of Tocharian A manuscript Maitreyāvadānavyākaraṇa. *Manuscripta Orientalia*, 2002, 8(3): 11–16.
- Itkin 2014 — Itkin I. B. Apologia for the brahmin Bādhari: Some remarks on the meaning of the Tocharian A words *štare*, *pi*- and *māl*. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, 2014, 15: 69–77.
- Itkin 2019 — Itkin I. B. Tokharskaya A rukopis' №№ 144–211 iz Shorchuka: novye dannye. [Tocharian A manuscript №№ 144–211 from Šorčūq: The new data. II]. *Vestnik Instituta vostokovedeniya RAN*, 2019, 3: 275–292.
- Itkin, Malyshev 2016 — Itkin I. B., Malyshev S. V. Three unedited Sanskrit/Tocharian A bilingual texts of the Vārṇārhavarṇastotra. *Manuscripta Orientalia*, 2016, 22(2): 3–8.
- Itkin, Malyshev 2021 — Itkin I. B., Malyshev S. V. Notae Tocharicae: *apālkāts*, *pārsā(n)ts*, *letse* et autres addenda et corrigenda-4. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 2021, 3: 47–75.
- Ivanov 1992 — Ivanov Vyach. Vs. Pamyatniki tokharoyazychnoi pis'mennosti [Monuments of the Tocharian writing]. *Vostochnyi Turkestan v drevnosti i rannem srednevekov'e*. Moscow: Nauka, 1992, 222–270.
- Ji et al. 1998 — Ji Xianlin (in collaboration with W. Winter and G.-J. Pinault). *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nātaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China* [Transliterated, translated and annotated by ...]. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998.
- Kölver 1965 — Kölver B. *Der Gebrauch der sekundären Kasus im Tocharischen*. Ph.D. diss., Univ. Frankfurt am Main, 1965.
- Malzahn 2007 — Malzahn M. A preliminary survey of the Tocharian glosses in the Berlin Turfan collection. *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Malzahn M. (ed.). Heidelberg: Winter, 2007, 301–319.
- Malzahn 2010 — Malzahn M. *The Tocharian verbal system*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Pinault 2008 — Pinault G.-J. *Chrestomathie tocharienne. Textes et grammaire*. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- Poucha 1955 — Poucha P. *Thesaurus linguae Tocharicae dialecti A*. Praha: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství, 1955.
- Sieg 1944 — Sieg E. Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen I. *Abhandlungen der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historische Klasse 16*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1944.
- Sieg, Siegling 1921 — *Tocharische Sprachreste*. Bd. 1.: *Die Texte*. Sieg E., Siegling W. (Hg.). Berlin: De Gruyter, 1921.
- Sieg et al. 1931 — Sieg E., Siegling W. *Tocharische Grammatik*. Im Auftrage der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften bearbeitet im Gemeinschaft mit W. Schulze. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931.
- Siegling PK — Personal and annotated copy of [Sieg, Siegling 1921] by Wilhelm Siegling. Scanned by Douglas Q. Adams with the technical assistance of Michael Tarabulski and Kevin Dobbins. <http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?Siegling,pers.copy>.
- Tamai 2007 — Tamai T. *A preliminary edition of unpublished texts from the Berlin Turfan Collection*. E-publication, 2007. <http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/tocharic/thtframe.htm>.
- Thomas 1964 — Thomas W. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Bd. 2. Heidelberg: Winter, 1964.
- Van Windekens 1976 — Van Windekens A. J. *Le Tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*. Vol. 1: *La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale, 1976.