

National Research University Higher School of Economics

as a manuscript

Ilya Itkin

TOCHARIAN A TEXTS FROM THE BERLIN COLLECTION: NEW DATA

Dissertation Summary
for the purpose of obtaining academic degree
Doctor of Science in Philology and Linguistics

Moscow 2024

The dissertation was prepared at the National Research University "Higher School of Economics".

Tocharian A (East Tocharian) is one of the ancient languages of Central Asia, which, together with Tocharian B (West Tocharian, or Kuchan), forms a special group within the Indo-European language family. Manuscripts in Tocharian languages, most of them dating back approximately to the second half of the 1st millennium AD, were found in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of China (resp., Chinese Turkestan). The first Tocharian text was published in 1892 by the famous Russian orientalist S.F. Oldenburg: in the "Notes of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society" he cited a photograph of a leaf from the collection of the Russian consul in Kashgar N.S. Petrovsky. Decisive success in deciphering Tocharian texts was achieved a decade and a half later by German researchers E. Sieg and W. Siegling: in the article "Tocharisch, die Sprache der Indoskythen" ("Tocharian, the language of the Indo-Scythians" [Sieg, Siegling 1908]) they proved the Indo-European nature of the Tocharian languages.

In 1921 E. Sieg and W. Siegling published 467 Tocharian A fragments, which are included in the Berlin collection of manuscripts from Turfan ("Turfansammlung"; [Sieg, Siegling 1921]). Despite the fact that a whole century has passed since the publication of this edition, these texts still form the basis of all researches on the Tocharian A language. As a matter of fact, over all these years, the East Tocharian corpus has been replenished with only one truly major finding: in 1973, 44 fragments of the manuscript of the Buddhist drama "Maitreyasamiti-nāṭaka" from Yanqi were discovered and in 1998 they were published, see [Ji, Winter, Pinault 1998]. All the other Tocharian A documents (despite their undoubted value) are very few and cannot influence significantly the overall picture.

The **purpose** of this work is a comprehensive study of Tocharian A text fragments from the Berlin collection and the presentation of the results obtained in the course of such study in the most comfortable and clear manner.

The **actuality** of the work is determined primarily by the fact that it lies in the general mainstream of the Tocharian studies of the last two decades. With the development of Internet technologies, students' attention to the problems of paleography, the analysis and publication of previously unpublished texts, as well as the comparative study of Tocharian texts and texts of similar topics in other languages has largely increased. However, most of these studies concern Tocharian B, for which, due to the considerably larger number of surviving texts, an "extensive" approach is still somewhat possible. The Tocharian A corpus requires only an "intensive" approach, thus, each find regarding East Tocharian acquires special value.

The **theoretical relevance** of the dissertation lies, in particular:

- in significant replenishment and clarification of our knowledge about the structure and content of many episodes described in the Tocharian texts, and even of some manuscripts in general, as well as about the lexicon of the Tocharian A language;
- in identifying some techniques used by Tocharian scribes in text creation (in the realm of both graphics and literary art);
- in improving the principles of contextual analysis of word meanings, including parallels from other languages, which allowed for establishing or clarifying the meanings of a number of Tocharian lexemes;

– in the development of general principles for compiling indexes of word forms basing on the material of a limited and poorly preserved corpus of texts. These principles can certainly have **practical application** as well – in preparing indexes of this kind for the corpora of other languages with similar parameters.

The **originality** of the work is directly determined by its content:

– in Chapter I, almost all the joints of two or more text fragments and the parallel passages brought in comparison with some of them are new (that is, established by us). Thus, their proposed translations are also new. A great number of the fragments is published for the first time;

– in Chapter II, the proposed meaning and/or etymology of the lexemes are new; in some cases, these very lexemes have not been previously identified in Tocharian A;

– the index, which forms the basis of Chapter III, systematizes the lexical and grammatical material of several thousand small text fragments that were not included in the edition [Sieg, Siegling 1921]; some of these fragments have never been considered as Tocharian A or even as interpretable in a satisfactory way at all. Many lexemes and word forms in the index were not found in other Tocharian A texts (or were not read). Quite expectedly, most of them are formed according to standard word-formation and inflectional models, but there are also many forms that carry important lexical and/or grammatical information. Compiling the index has required a systematic handwriting analysis of Tocharian A texts, which made it possible to attribute hundreds of unpublished fragments to a certain manuscript with a very high degree of reliability. Since such an analysis has not been carried out before, its results, reflected in the Reference table to the index, are also all-new.

The complex nature of our research called for a range of **methods**, i.e.:

– the paleographic analysis (primarily the one of handwriting) was crucial for attributing text fragments to a certain manuscript. Further search for the same-leaf fragments was premised on possible restitutions, which the compatibility of various segmental sequences allowed for. Also, the collage method, i.e. juxtaposing photographs of two or more fragments to match the break lines, was used¹. To illustrate these three stages of work, let's take the following case. The unpublished fragments THT 2400 and THT 2449 are one of more than 200 fragments from the Berlin collection, the handwriting of which allows to confidently assign them both to the manuscript №№ 144-211. The preserved part of the line THT 2400 a4 is *//// [||] niṣ[kr]a ////*. As evidenced by the entire Tocharian A corpus, such a sequence can have a single restitution: *-māntam || (|| niṣkramāntam ||* – the name of one of the motifs introducing poetic insertions in prosimetric texts). The corresponding restitution is indeed found in line THT 2449 b2. The collage technique shows that the fragments THT 2400 and THT 2449 join together almost without breaks along three lines recto and three lines verso, which doubtlessly proves that they belong to the same leaf;

– when filling the gaps, the method of contextual analysis was used, involving (where possible) similar passages in other Tocharian A texts, as well as parallel passages in other languages of the Buddhist canon. In this part, our work reveals a certain similarity with the book by N.N. Kazansky, dedicated to the reconstruction of partially preserved poems of the ancient Greek lyricist Stesichorus [Kazansky 1997]. For the gap fillings we propose, the method of

¹ The author expresses his most sincere gratitude to S.V. Malyshev, A.V. Kuritsyna and S.V. Dyachenko, whose help has made the practical implementation of the collage technique possible.

probabilistic reliability assessment was used; which, in general, has likely proven to be quite effective – see especially 3.4, section "Reliability Assessment". The method of contextual analysis was also used to establish or clarify the meanings of Tocharian A words, the semantics of which was previously unknown or described inaccurately;

– when reconstructing common Tocharian proto-forms and distinguishing between the proper East Tocharian lexemes and the borrowings from West Tocharian, a traditional comparative method was used, based on the postulate of regular phonetic correspondences between the related languages.

The following provisions are submitted for defense:

No matter how well the corpus of the published Tocharian A fragments from the Berlin collection has been studied, new results in this area are still possible to be achieved. Indeed, there is a number of areas in which we think we have gained certain progress:

1) Clarification and (sometimes) addition to the readings adopted in the publication

The 1921 edition is remarkable by its exceptionally high level. For a language that was deciphered only a little over ten years earlier, such a high quality of publication should be considered almost unique in the history of first editions of ancient texts. Nevertheless, in this edition there are errors and inaccuracies, most of which are of a completely objective nature and are associated with the publishers' lack of various kinds of information obtained (also by themselves) during the further development of Tocharian studies. In addition, E. Sieg and W. Siegling tended not to include in the transliteration the damaged aksharas (syllabic signs) located immediately after or before the torn edge, and sometimes even those lines at the edge that did not contain a single reliable reading. Clarifying incorrect readings and "reading through" the unread aksharas allows for finding new examples of rare words and phrases, and sometimes helps to discover previously unknown word forms and even lexemes.

2) Identification of the same-leaf fragments and parallel places

Many Tocharian A fragments, published (or stored) separately, are in fact parts of the same paper leaf. The first observations on this matter were made by E. Sieg and W. Siegling themselves – both directly in the 1921 edition and in the grammar [Sieg, Siegling, Schulze 1931], as well as in the copy of the 1921 edition belonging to W. Siegling [Siegling PK]. Several clarifications of this kind were proposed later – cf. [Couvreur 1967: 159] about the fragments A 461 and A 465, [Malyshev 2019] about A 454 and A 456.

However, firstly, these results are only partially taken into account by modern Tocharian studies: often, the corresponding fragments are still quoted separately and are not considered as parts of larger text unities.

Secondly, the work in question is by no means complete. Individual clarifications can be suggested even for the texts included in the publication (cf. [Itkin 2019b: 282-291] about the fragments A 175 and A 178), although the main scope consists of unpublished fragments: as we show, dozens of them can reliably join with the already published fragments and/or with each other.

Sometimes the fact that two partially preserved leaves of the manuscript followed immediately one after another can be established. Such information also turns out to be useful, since it allows (at least to some extent) to guess the content which embraces more than one leaf.

Identifying parallel passages preserved in two different manuscripts is also important. Since the loss of text of the damaged leaves is occasional, the combined text obtained by

comparing parallel versions almost always turns out to be more complete than the text available in each of them separately.

3) Content identification of texts

It is still unknown whether there are entirely original Buddhist works in Tocharian A; in any case, the vast majority of the extant East Tocharian texts are doubtlessly translations or adaptations of the corresponding Sanskrit ones. The Sanskrit originals of many Buddhist works have been lost, but these works have survived (in whole or in part) in other languages – particularly, in Chinese, Tibetan, and Old Uyghur. Old Uyghur is especially important for Tocharian researches: the texts of two very popular works in medieval Buddhism – the above mentioned drama "Maitreyasamiti-nāṭaka" and the collection of legends and didactic stories "Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā" – were translated into Old Uyghur from Tocharian A.

The Uyghur text of "Maitreyasamiti-nāṭaka" – "Maitrisimit nom bitig" – is known in two versions: from Turfan (the agreed notation is MaitrSāṅgim) and Hami (MaitrHami). The first one was published by Ş. Tekin [Tekin 1980]; the publication of the second one, begun at the end of the last century (see primarily [ZusTreff 1988; Geng, Klimkeit, Laut 1998]), still continues regarding the new findings (see the review in [Laut, Wilkens 2017: 15]). The literature devoted to the comparative study of "Maitreyasamiti-nāṭaka" and "Maitrisimit nom bitig" is enormous (see first of all [Pinault 1999]), but the subject is by no means closed.

The consolidated text of the Uyghur "Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā", made up from countless fragments stored in the collections of different cities around the world, was recently published by J. Wilkens [Wilkens 2016]. For the publication of the Tocharian A document THT 1590, which is a snippet from the story, known from "Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā", about a noble king named Hariścandra ("Hariścandrāvadāna"), and for its comparison with the Uyghur text of the same story, see [Itkin, Malyshev, Wilkens 2017].

The publication in 2014 of R. Kritzer's annotated translation of the Tibetan version of the famous "Garbhāvakraṅtisūtra" ("Sutra on Entering the Womb") [Kritzer 2014] (see also the informative review by V.P. Ivanov [Ivanov 2015]) appears to be a very significant event. "Garbhāvakraṅtisūtra" is a story told by the Buddha to his younger half-brother Nanda and 500 monks about the development of an embryo in the womb, its birth and the following sufferings in the world of *samsāra*. Being primarily a religious and philosophical work, "Sutra on Entering the Womb" also contains many extremely interesting anatomical and medical details. The Indian original of "Garbhāvakraṅtisūtra" is lost; in addition to Tibetan, Chinese translations have survived. The fragments of the Tocharian text of "Sutra..." are found in several dozen fragments (both published and not) of the manuscript № 144-211; one small fragment in Tocharian B (B 603) is also known.

In the Tocharian A manuscripts, some other topics are also revealed, known in one or more languages of Buddhist preaching – cf., for example, [Malyshev 2017] about fragments A 393 and THT 1486, reflecting two episodes of "Mahauśadha-Jātaka", and [Kremmer 2022] about fragments A 110-111, the parallel of which is the commentary on the hymn "Viśeṣastava" by the Indian poet Udbhatasiddhasvamin, preserved only in the Tibetan translation.

Content identification of texts allows to much more fully understand the meaning of poorly preserved, sometimes very small fragments, and to propose convincing hypotheses about the meaning of a number of words and the reading of certain word forms. In our work, see on this subject first of all:

– in Chap. 1: publication of a fragment of THT 1308.a (section 1.4.4) based on a parallel with the 20th Chap. of "Maitrisimit nom bitig";

– in Chap. 2: sections on lexemes *kṣāly* "wing (?)" (parallel with "Saundarananda" by Aśvaghōṣa), *noṣpeṃ* "≈ maid, chambermaid" (parallel with the Uyghur version of "Ṣaddanta-Jātaka" from the collection "Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā"), *lepās** "jackal" (parallel with "Śānti Parva", the 12th book of the "Mahābhārata"), *śolye** "needle" (parallel with "Maitrisimit nom bitig");

– in Chap. 3: dictionary entries *caramabhavik** "having reached the last rebirth", *prākrapratim* "decisive", *ṣar* "sister", *saṃjīp* "Saṃjīva (name of hell)" (parallels with "Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā"), *śaṅkhe* "Śaṅkha" (parallel with the 23rd Chap. of "Maitrisimit nom bitig") and some others.

4) **Discovery and clarification of the meaning and etymology of Tocharian A lexemes**

As the corpus of Tocharian A texts is limited and the direct analogues in other languages for many of these texts are absent (or not found yet), the meaning of a significant part of East Tocharian lexemes is unknown or known only hypothetically. Our dissertation examines more than 20 such lexemes. The integrated use of paleographic analysis, contextual analysis, comparison with texts in other languages (Tocharian B, Sanskrit, Old Uyghur, Chinese) allowed us to provide semantic interpretation for these lexemes with varying degrees of reliability. This interpretation may directly determine the intra-Tocharian – and sometimes, more broadly, – the Indo-European etymology of the words in question.

5) **Introduction into scientific practice the unpublished Tocharian A fragments in a thoroughgoing way**

E. Sieg and W. Siegling included in the 1921 edition not all Tocharian A text fragments at their disposal, but, as far as one can judge, only the largest and/or the most remarkable ones from their point of view. Both in the publication and, to an even greater extent, in the grammar of the Tocharian A language [Sieg, Siegling, Schulze 1931] there are numerous word forms cited from unpublished fragments (unfortunately, without any references or clarifications).

In recent years, photographs of several thousand Tocharian A and Tocharian B fragments from the Berlin collection that were not included in the editions [Sieg, Siegling 1921; 1949; 1953] have been posted on the websites TITUS, CEToM and idp.bl.uk. Strictly speaking, some of these fragments have now been published – cf., for example, works such as [Schaefer 2013; Ogihara 2014; Itkin, Malyshev 2016]. In a certain sense, posting a fragment on the CEToM website, including its transliteration and translation, and sometimes also philological and linguistic commentary, can be equated to its publication. However, these publications, firstly, still cover a great minority of the Berlin fragments available for study; secondly, they are not always of the necessary quality and, which is more important, they are based on completely different editorial principles. A thorough collected edition of all these fragments remains a matter of the future; however, their study from the photographs using the preliminary transliteration prepared by the Japanese researcher T. Tamai [Tamai 2007] brought many significant results, primarily related to morphology and vocabulary, as well as spelling techniques.

All of these areas are certainly closely related to each other; therefore, only with a very large degree of convention can we say that Chapter I of the dissertation correlates with section 1)–2), Chapter II – with section 4), Chapter III – with section 5); as for section 3), it has been shown above that the content identification of texts is equally important for all our research.

Approbation of the dissertation

Various statements of this work were reported at Russian and international scientific conferences and seminars:

School-conference on folklore "Folklore text and ritual" (2005);
Nostratic Seminar (2006);
Scientific seminar of the Department of Languages of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences "Problems of general and oriental linguistics" (2013, 2017, 2023);
International conference "Typology of morphosyntactic parameters" (2013);
Scientific seminar of the School of Linguistics of the National Research University Higher School of Economics (2016);
Conference "Problems of theoretical and applied linguistics in the research of Moscow linguists" (2017);
International Symposium "Deutscher Orientalistentag „Asien, Afrika und Europa“" (2017);
Inter-institutional conference "Orientalist readings 2018. Lexicology and lexicography" (2018);
Seminar of the Institute for Higher Humanitarian Studies of the Russian State University for the Humanities (2018);
Seminar on comparative historical linguistics and ancient languages at the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences (2019);
Linguistic Forum 2022 "Traditional speech forms and practices" (2022).
About 15 reports were made on the topic of the dissertation altogether.

The main scientific results of the dissertation are presented in the following publications in Russian and English:

Itkin I.B. *Ukazatel' slovoform k neopublikovannym tokharskim A tekstam iz sobraniya Berlinskoj biblioteki* [Wordform index for the unpublished Tocharian A texts from the Berlin library]. Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies, 2019.

Burlak S.A., Itkin I.B. Toxarskij tekst A 446: eščë odna rukopis' toxarskoj versii *Maitreyasamiti-Nātaka* [The Tocharian text A 446: One more manuscript of the Tocharian version of "Maitreyasamiti-Nataka"]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 2004, No. 3. Pp. 24–35.

Burlak S.A., Itkin I.B. *Yreki et autres addenda et corrigenda – 2*. In: *Issledovanija po lingvistike i semiotike. Sbornik statej k jubileju Vjač. Vs. Ivanova*, edited by Tatjana Michajlovna Nikolaeva. Moscow: Jazyki Slavjanskich Kul'tur, 2010. Pp. 342–58.

Itkin I.B. Nekotorye nabljudenija nad formami imperfekta v toxarskom A jazyke [Some observations on the imperfective forms in the Tocharian A language]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 2014, No. 2. Pp. 27–45.

Itkin I.B. Prolog v chetyrekh s polovinoj variatsiyakh: k rekonstruktsii nachal'nykh strok teksta [Prologue in four and a half variations: towards a reconstruction of the initial lines of "Maitreyasamiti-nāaka"]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 2018, No. 2. Pp. 122–131.

Itkin I.B. *Noṣpeṃ Priyasundarī et autres addenda et corrigenda-3* // *Vestnik Instituta vostokovedeniya RAN*, 2018, No. 6. Pp. 166–175.

Itkin I.B. Tokharskaya A rukopis' №№ 144–211 iz Shorchuka: novye dannye. [Tocharian A manuscript №№ 144–211 from Šorčuq: the new data. II]. *Vestnik Instituta vostokovedeniya RAN*, 2019, No. 3. Pp. 275–292.

Itkin I.B. Buddha uveščevaet Nandu (toxarskij tekst A 125 + THT 1425 fgm. e + A 117). [Buddha admonishes Nanda (the Tocharian A text A 125 + THT 1425 fgm. e + A 117)]. *Trudy Instituta vostokovedenija RAN*, 2020, No. 27. Pp. 220–228.

Itkin I.B. Neopublikovannye tokharskie tekсты iz sobraniya Berlinskoi biblioteki: nekotorye novye nablyudeniya [The unpublished Tocharian texts of the Berlin Turfan collection: some new observations]. In: *Problemy obščei i vostokovednoi lingvistiki. Issledovaniya yazykov Azii i Afriki: traditsii i perspektivy*. Moscow: Institute of oriental studies, RAS, 2023. Pp. 229-250.

Itkin I.B. The tender ghost (Tocharian B *lalaṃṣke* "tender" – Tocharian A ?). In: *Tocharian and Indo-European studies*, vol. 17. Copenhagen, 2016. Pp. 65-75.

Itkin I.B. Tokh. A *pāśrāk**, (?) B *paśrāk* "уступ, терраса / gradin, terrasse / ledge, terrace". *Trudy Instituta vostokovedenija RAN*, 2018, No. 19. Pp. 251-255.

Itkin I.B. On Tocharian A cognates of the Tocharian B words meaning 'spleen' and 'liver'. *Journal of Language Relationship*, 2022, vol. 20, iss. 3-4, Pp. 177-180.

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

Itkin I.B., Kuritsyna A.V. Chapter XX of the "Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka" and its hellish sufferings: the fragment THT 1308.a. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European studies*, vol. 18. Copenhagen, 2017. Pp. 63-69.

Itkin I.B., Kuritsyna A.V., Malyshev S.V. Tocharian A text THT 1331 and the "Höllenskapitel" of the "Maitrisimit nom bitig": some more remarks. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European studies*, vol. 18. Copenhagen, 2017. Pp. 71-81.

Itkin I.B., Malyshev S.V. Notae Tocharicae: *apālkāts, pārsā(n)ts, letse* et autres addenda et corrigenda-4. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 2021, No. 3. Pp. 47-75.

The dissertation consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion, a list of accepted abbreviations and symbols, and a list of references.

Chapter I, "Text Fragments: Connections and Identifications", examines fragments related to 6 different Tocharian A manuscripts included in the edition [Sieg, Siegling 1921]. Section 1.1 presents a republication of the leaf A 10ext (manuscript №№ 1-54), where an episode from the Ramayana is retold. Adding two small unpublished fragments, THT 1646.c and THT 1370.b, allows for a much more accurate and thorough reconstruction of Vibhiṣana's monologue addressed to his foolish brother, king Daśagriva.

Section 1.2 discusses the leaf A 125ext (manuscript №№ 89-143). We show that this leaf consists of three fragments – two of which are published in the edition as A 125 and A 117 and the unpublished THT 1425.e is located between them – and follows immediately the leaf A 128+130. The text of the leaf A 125ext is the beginning of the Buddha's exhortation to his brother Nanda. Some of the Buddha's remarks find parallels in the 5th canto of the Sanskrit poem "Saundarananda" by the outstanding Buddhist poet Aśvaghōṣa.

Section 1.3 is devoted to the manuscript №№ 144-211. This is the largest Tocharian A manuscript currently known: it includes 68 published fragments and more than 200 unpublished ones. We attempt to republish the leaves A 144ext, A 166ext, A 169 (it is shown for the first time that the London fragment IOL Toch 287 contains another copy of the same text, and the unpublished Berlin fragment THT 2388 is the beginning of the next leaf), A 171ext (including leaf A 156), A 174ext, A 175ext (including leaf A 178) and A 184ext. From a content point of

view, leaves A 144ext and A 171ext are of particular interest. The first one describes the beginning of the journey of Buddha and Nanda to the Himalayas and further – to the world of the Thirty-three gods (Skr. *trayastrimśa-*). The latter contains a dialogue between the two followers of Buddha – Viśakha and Preṣika. Because of the skillful simultaneous use of several artistic techniques (implementation of metaphor, chiasmus, deliberate syntactic ambiguity), this dialogue, which we managed to restore almost entirely, can rightfully be called a pearl of the early medieval Buddhist literature. The final part of the section presents 16 previously unpublished fragments of manuscript №№ 144-211, which join in pairs.

Section 1.4 embraces several topics related to the study and reconstruction of the text of the famous Buddhist drama "Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka" ("The Play about the Meeting with Buddha Maitreya"), which was translated into Old Uyghur as "Maitrisimit nom bitig". The section begins with a synopsis of all currently known unpublished fragments relating to the "Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka" manuscripts; several fragments are identified to belong to the final part of the drama (the so-called "Hell Chapters" ("Höllenskapitel", 20-25) and "Final Chapters" ("Schlußkapitel", 26-27)) for the first time. The text of the drama opens with a poetic Prologue, the initial stanzas of which we were able to restore much more fully than had been done before by comparing three previously published leaves (from the manuscripts №№ 251-294 and 306-310) and three unpublished fragments. The author of the Prologue had a remarkable literary skill and a brilliant technique of versification, which allowed him to masterfully comply with the requirements of poetic meter. The introductory address to Maitreya, which in prose would look like *kus ne kārumṣinām epreraṃ maitrāṣinām swāñcenyō ṣtmo ypic maññ oki* '<The one> who in the merciful sky with a friendly ray became like the full moon', turned into *maitrāṣinām swāñcenyō kārumṣinām e[pr](eram) <...> ṣtmo kus n[e ypi]c [m]aññ (o)k[i]* under the pen of the Tocharian poet: an inversion that any luminary of the "golden age" of Latin literature would be honored with! As we show further, in the manuscript №№ 251-294 there was an Epilogue (also poetic) along with the Prologue: the final stanzas of the Epilogue can be found in the fragment THT 1152 (unfortunately, only a narrow strip at its left edge has survived). The identification of this fragment allows to precisely establish that the manuscript №№ 251-294 consisted of 268 leaves. The section also contains the republication of leaf A 291, which lists the physical characteristics of the great man, with the addition of a small fragment THT 1909, and the publication of 4 unedited fragments of the manuscript №№ 251-294, which again join in pairs.

In Section 1.5, we discuss leaf A 318ext (manuscript №№ 312-331). It was already the edition which suggested that the separately published fragments A 318 and A 319 are parts of the same leaf [Sieg, Siegling 1921: 174]. In 2015, the text A 318 + A 319 was republished, with comments and translation, by M. Malzahn and H. Fellner [Malzahn, Fellner 2015: 63-68]. However, firstly, the Austrian researchers were unaware of the fact that the fragment THT 1418.d belonged to the same leaf, which not only allows us to supplement the text, but also significantly changes the understanding of some passages. Secondly, the interpretation of M. Malzahn and H. Fellner, in our opinion, sometimes requires specifications not related to the identification of THT 1418.d. Leaf A 318ext is a vivid description of the procession of the Vidyādhara – a special type of supernatural beings, good demigods who master magic. The text has a complex syntactic organization and contains several ἄπαξ λεγόμενα; its analysis is much complicated by the fact that fragments A 318 and A 319 are considered lost, so it is impossible to verify the publishers' readings from photographs. One of the previously unknown Tocharian A words found in this text, presumably meaning some kind of vegetation, *tsāl** (or *tsal**), apparently has a Tocharian B cognate *tsālo** (also ἄπαξ λεγόμενον).

Chapter II, "Vocabulary", contains a discussion of approximately 20 Tocharian A lexemes whose meaning and/or morphemic structure were previously unknown or described inaccurately; sometimes their very existence in Tocharian A (such as *ykār* "liver" and *lyäk-* "lie") remained unknown. In addition to solving a number of purely paleographic issues and applying methods of contextual analysis, parallels in other languages of the Buddhist canon are widely drawn to interpret these lexemes.

For the word *kšāly*, known only from the already mentioned scene of the flight of Buddha and Nanda to the Himalayas, we propose a translation "wing", taking into account the description of this journey by Aśvaghōṣa.

For another *δῖς λεγόμενον*, *noṣpem*, the meaning "≈ maid, chambermaid" (= Turkic *tapıgçı*) is assumed. This idea is based on a comparison of the East Tocharian and Old Uyghur versions of a popular story about the elephant-bodhisattva Śaddanta and allows to explain the main collocational feature of this lexeme: it has an obligatory dependent denoting females (*bhādrāy noṣpem* "noṣpem of Bhādrā", *temi=k noṣpem* "her very (= goddess Padma's) noṣpem").

For the word *pāśrāk**, "built up" from several fragmentarily preserved contexts, the meaning "ledge, terrace" is confidently established, since it is found in descriptions of the sacred Mount Meru, which are very close to the ones in Sanskrit: this mountain has four ledges, each inhabited by a certain category of deities.

The meaning "copper" for the word *plāk** is revealed by comparing the Tocharian A syntagma *añcwā-ṣim pat plāk-ṣim* "of iron or of *plāk*" with the Tocharian B *eñcuwa pilke wat* "of iron or of copper"; the correspondence A *plāk** ~ B *pilke* is regular, and the meaning of Tocharian B *pilke* itself is established with complete reliability thanks to another text – a bilingual, in which this lexeme is a translation of Skt. *tāmraṃ* "copper".

The appearance of the word *yreki* suggests that it is a borrowing from the unattested Tocharian B *yreki**, where the word is reliably divided into the locative prefix *y-* and the noun *reki* (N-Acc Sg) "word, speech". As for the meaning, this word may be a conjunction "as, as if"; the synonymy of comparative conjunctions is common for Tocharian A texts, so the phrase *yreki* [*ś*] *la tu(nk)* "...with love" may continue the series *śla tuñk oki* and *śla tuñk me(nākyo)*: *oki* "as if" and *menākyo* "like" are also comparative conjunctions.

The discovery of words denoting liver and spleen in Tocharian A, *ykār* and *spālcāk* respectively, seems significant not only for Tocharian studies, but also for Indo-European studies. The identification of these lexemes became possible thanks to the recent discovery of A. Huard and R. Chen, who almost simultaneously and independently showed that the mysterious sequence *ya (-) r spalyco* in the Tocharian B text PK AS 7M should be interpreted as *ya(kā)r spalyco* "liver [and] spleen", both words having an undisputed Indo-European etymology [Huard 2022: 127-243; Chen 2022].

The contexts in which the word *lepās** was found, which is also in quite a large list of Tocharian A *δῖς λεγόμενα*, give reason to assume that it denotes some kind of predatory scavenger. A careful analysis of one of these contexts reveals that the corresponding passage in the Tocharian text is an elegantly organized reference to an episode from the "Śānti Parva" (Book 12 of the "Mahābhārata"), which describes a dispute in a cemetery between a kite and a jackal. It is kites and jackals that are depicted in cemetery scenes on the walls of the Mingoï Kizil caves, one of the main places where Tocharian manuscripts were found [Howard, Vignato 2014: 109].

Tocharian A *sāntāk* and Tocharian B *sāmtke* are traced back to Proto-Tocharian **sāntake* – an early borrowing from some Prakrit source going back to Skt. *śāntaka-* "painkiller, sedative". In all Tocharian researches A *sāntāk* and B *sāmtke* are translated as "medicine", but in

the Old Uyghur parallel to the passage from "Maitreyasamiti-nāṭaka", partially preserved in Tocharian A fragment THT 1308.a, the word *sāntāk* corresponds to *ot* "(medicinal) herb, plant, medicine". Since this passage is about attempts to deliberately induce a miscarriage, a herbal product used for this purpose can be called *a drug* or *a potion*, but not *a medicine* in the literal sense. The hypothesized meaning of the lexeme – "(medicinal) herb" – is confirmed by Tocharian B, cf. ♦ *saṃtkentasa stānasa wāsaryantsa* (THT 1311 a5) "..., trees, lawns". Obviously, in this context, the form Pl *saṃtkenta* denotes not medicines, but herbs in their natural, growing state. Thus, not only Old Uyghur *ot*, but also Tocharian A *sāntāk* and Tocharian B *sāṃtke* show the same polysemy as Skt. *auśadha-* "(medicinal) herb, medicine". This fact seems important for studying the medical knowledge and practices of speakers of Tocharian languages.

The material for analysis in **Chapter III, "Index of word forms to unpublished Tocharian A texts from the collection of the Berlin Library"**, was several thousand small text fragments that were not included in the edition [Sieg, Siegling 1921]. Many of these fragments have never before been considered as Tocharian A, or even as admitting any satisfactory interpretation. The chapter includes four main sections – "Reference Table", "Principles of Index Organization", the "Index" itself and "Dark Places: Four Years Later" – and several auxiliary ones.

The reference table comprises information on all unpublished text fragments from Berlin that can be considered with reasonable certainty to contain text in Tocharian A (even those in which not a single complete word form survives), except for a few documents written in difficult-to-read italic and not yet having satisfactory transliteration. For each of the fragments, the following information is provided (if known):

- the place of its discovery;
- the content of the text;
- its belonging to a particular manuscript and leaf, its direct joinability with any other fragment;
- the presence of parallel texts;
- the researcher(s) which obtained the main data regarding this fragment.

Reference table (a fragment)

Number of a fragment	Provenance	Content / type of the text	Manuscript	Other copies	Who suggested an interpretation
1189	T III Š	MSN	№№ 251-294?		
1217	T III M	Abhidharma-kośa	№№ 384-386		E. Sieg, W. Siegling
1306	T III Š	MSN			E. Sieg, W. Siegling
1308 fgm. a	ohne Sigel	MSN act XX	№№ 251-294?		(3) [Itkin, Kuritsyna 2017] [Itkin, Kuritsyna 2017]
1322 fgm. a fgm. e	T III Š	MSN act XVI act IV	№№ 295-305 part of leaf A 305	A 267+268 "a"4-6 A 279 a7-8	E. Sieg, W. Siegling (3) [Schaefer 2013: 338]
1331 fgm. a	T III Š	MSN act XXV	№№ 306-310		E. Sieg, W. Siegling [Schaefer 2013: 337]

Number of a fragment	Provenance	Content / type of the text	Manuscript	Other copies	Who suggested an interpretation
fgm. b		act XXIII			[Itkin, Kuritsyna, Malyshev 2017]
1336	T III Š				
1351: a4	T III Š	inscription on the book?	№№ 55-88?		
1353	T III M	bilingual	№№ 387-390		

The section "Principles of Organization of the Index" contains detailed methodological comments regarding the organization of dictionary entries and other aspects allowing the data obtained to be presented in a clearest and a most explicit way. The concept of a "letter" of Tocharian writing system is introduced, which is understood as a part of akshara (syllabic sign), having a separate, further indecomposable correspondence in Latin transliteration. Instead of the "-" sign of the standard transliteration, two signs are introduced, "-" and "[-]", which approximately mean "unreadable akshara" and "ambiguously readable akshara". Despite the inevitable conventionality of the boundary between "unreadability" and "lack of unambiguous reading", this division seems very important. While the first case is not much different from the mere absence of akshara (visible remnants of lines are compatible with almost any conceivable conjecture), in the second case the number of possible conjectures is limited (most often 2-3), which significantly narrows the search area. We prove the usage of several different marks of previously unknown lexemes and word forms depending on the degree of their importance for the study of the vocabulary and grammar of the Tocharian A language to be crucial. Much attention is paid to assessing the level of reliability of our hypotheses. There are three degrees of reliability: "reliable" (no mark), "not quite reliable" (mark "<?>") and "doubted" (mark "(?)"). We list the main requirements to include the context of a given word form in the dictionary entry. In particular, it seems necessary to provide a context when it significantly affects the interpretation of an incompletely preserved or ambiguous word form, for example:

tränk-/we- "to speak": <...> [w]e 1978 a2 ([š](l)[yok w]e). <The word [š](l)[yok] "śloka" allows us to establish that the word form [w]e here is not a feminine form of the numeral "two", but its homonymous form 3 Sg Pt A of *tränk-/we-* "to speak": a collocation **šlyok we* lit. "śloka two" is grammatically impossible, while the phrase *šlyok we* "śloka said" is quite usual.>

The issue of indicating the nature of damage to the text is specially considered. For the fragments on which the Index was compiled, the entirely preserved lines are a rare exception; in the vast majority of cases, a leaf, which the given fragment was once a part of, is torn either on the left or on the right, and most often on both sides. In accordance with the editorial practice of E. Sieg and W. Siegling, a line break is indicated by the sign "////". However, taking into account the very wide use of suffixes and the extremely limited use of prefixes, typical of the Tocharian A grammar, the designations "////", "(////)" and "..." are not only used to the left and right from the word forms in the Index with quite different frequencies, but actually provide different information. As a rule, if the left side of a word form is lost, it either can be reconstructed unambiguously even without a context, or cannot be reconstructed at all. If the right side of a word form is lost, most often it cannot be reconstructed unambiguously, but generally it is clear which lexeme (or at least which root) it is. Consider a case in point:

kapśaṇi "body": <...> Loc Sg <...> (ka)pśiṇṇaṃ 1909 a6, kapśi[ṇṇ]• //// 1382.b a3. <The sequence *pśiṇṇaṃ* is undoubtedly part of the form *kapśiṇṇaṃ*: no other Tocharian A forms end like this. The notation "////" in a case like this would be redundant. The sequence *kapśi[ṇṇ]•* may

stand for any form of the word "body", except for N-Acc Sg; the notation "////" in case like this is necessary.>

Thus, to the right of the word forms, the mark "////" (and some others, more special) is most widely used, whereas to the left of the word forms it is used very rarely – often in combination with the marks <?> and (?), i.e. when the proposed interpretation of the given piece of text is possible, but still not quite reliable.

As seen above, the "Index..." as such includes all word forms that can be read with a certain degree of reliability in unpublished text fragments from the collection of the Berlin Library. Some of these word forms belong to lexemes that neither appeared in published Tocharian A texts at all, nor had a satisfactory interpretation. The examples of such lexemes are: **ākāts** "pointed", **oñkālmāñc** "she-elephant", **kālm-** "to give an opportunity, allow (?)", **kāsk-** "to scatter (?)", **pāśrāk*** "ledge, terrace", **pāl-** "prick up (ears)", **motār** "shore", **lyäk-** "lie", **wārtsonē*** "width", **ṣonta-ṣont** "from street to street". There are even more word forms in the "Index..." belonging to the lexemes which are already known and yet filling the gaps in their inflectional paradigms that could not have been unambiguously reconstructed – particularly, because there are two or more models that compete in the grammatical spot in question, cf.: *ārāntāp* G Sg from **ārānt** "arhat", [*o*]rtāp G Sg from **ort*** "friend", [*kā*]ckār 3 Pl Ip f A from **kāt-** "rejoice", *kārṣtu* 1 Sg Pt A from **kārṣt** - "to cut, dissect", *kotruntyo* Instr Sg from **kotār** "family", *krākeyāntu* N-Acc Pl from **krāke** "dirt, filth", *klawmār* 1 Sg Pr M from **klā-** "to fall", *corām* Acc Sg from **cor**, an Old Uyghurs' title, *p[ñ]ärk* 2 Sg Imp A K from **närk-only K** "to hold", *nitṣānt* 3 Pl Ip f M K from **nitk- only K** "to encourage, force (?)", *pont[ās]śi* G Pl f from **puk 1** "everybody"; 2) "everything", *mahursyo* Instr Pl from **mahur*** "diadem", *mkowāñ* N Pl from **mko*** "monkey", *ruku* <?> 1 Sg Pt A from **ruk-** "to be exhausted, to lose strength (?)", *lālamṣk[em]* Acc Sg m from **lālamṣke** "tender", *lākñāṣ* 3 Sg Conj A K from **lāk-/pālk-** "look, see", *wal[us]e* G Sg f from PP of **wäl-** "to die", *śāk-[tā]ryā-ppyam* Loc from **śāk-tāryā-pi** "13", [*t*]sākneñc <?> 3 Pl Pr A from **tsāk-** "to prick".

The section "Dark Places: Four Years Later" is of the same content as the section "Dark Places" in the "Index..." [Itkin 2019a: 231-233], but for each sequence, which allows any interpretation, a respective comment is given, for example:

1152 a7: (////) [ṣ]koppīške·[ā] (–) r₁

The reading [ṣ]koppīške [pā](ca)r "father Ṣkoppīške" is likely, where [ṣ]koppīške is a personal name with the Toch. B diminutive suffix *-ške*.

1411 fgm. c, b5: //// – kāntwārkim•• ////

The reading *kāntwārki m••* //// "the tongue white...", with inversion and devocalization *u* → *w* metri causa, is undoubted, cf. ♦ *ārkwī māskētār=ne kāmtwo* (B 118 b7) "white becomes his tongue" (apparently, the so-called "coated tongue" is meant). It is even possible that the Toch. A syntagma exactly corresponds to the one in Toch. B, so the form *m[s](k)a(tr=ām)* should be reconstructed on the right; yet it is quite uncertain.

1417 fgm. d, a5: //// p^āṣam (sic!)

The spelling *p^āṣam* is anomalous; the similarity between the signs *pā* and *ṣ* allow to assume careless copying of the akshara *ṣṣam*. There is only one, yet quite frequent, word form

ending in *-ṣṣaṃ*: *ārki-śoṣṣaṃ* Loc Sg from *ārki-śoṣi* "world, universe". The conjecture *//// (ārki-śo) <s>ṣaṃ tatmu* yields a natural enough meaning: "born in the world". Though we are unaware of any other collocations of the form *ārki-śoṣṣaṃ* with the verb *tām-* "to be born", similar examples are found in Toch. B, cf. ♦♦ *ñākcyē śaiṣṣene cme[t](si) ////* (B 14 a3) "to be born in the divine world".

1645 fgm. d, b1: *//// [-] kte[ñ]*

The surviving part of the akshara before *kte* allows the reading *[mu]*. The form *[mu]kte[ñ]* may hypothetically be N Pl of **mukte* – a borrowing from Skr. *muktā* "pearl". However, this borrowing has not been found yet in any of the Tocharian languages.

2095 a2: *'acäk·ä ////*

Line a2 is preserved as *//// [ñ]c·śśi se acäk·ä ////* "of <so-and-so> son...". Usually in Toch. A the proper name precedes the hypernym. However, as shown in [Itkin 2018: 168], if such a collocation has a dependent in G, the proper name moves to the right: *daśārathes lānt se rām* (10 a4) "son of King Dasharatha Rama". Thus, the segment *acäk·ä ////* can be the beginning of the son's name; note that, judging by the peculiarities of vocalism, this name might be either properly Tocharian or completely phonetically adapted. Compare a similar example: *ñi se a[t]·[āś]ik* (68 b6) "my son A..." – also with an "exotic" (and not completely preserved) name. The connection between *acäk·ä ////* and Toch. B *[a]cakarm* (B 576 b1; ἄπαξ λεγόμενον) "?" is unclear.

2546 b1: *//// – ññ[ā]ntāk*

The reading *//// (sa)ññ[ā]t tāk* "was controlled" is probable. The adjective *saññāt* "managed, controlled" (< Skr. *saṃyata-*) has not been found in the Toch. A, but it is attested in Toch. B; cf. especially an example of the same copular use: *pāst sañāt tākoy* (IOL Toch 5 a6) "let <mind> be under control!"

3403 b2: *//// [-] kasām*

As the *ts* → *s* effect is typical of "eastern" manuscripts, the possible reading of the given passage is *[mo]kasām* Acc Sg m of *mokats* "mighty", cf. *mokatsām* (394 a4-b1) without this effect. But, like in some other cases, the lack of context does not allow this hypothesis to be verified.

In **Conclusion**, the results of the research are summed up and the prospects for further work are outlined, i.e., among others, the republication of a number of leaves included in the edition [Sieg, Siegling 1921], the publication of unedited fragments and the study of parallel passages in Tocharian A and Tocharian B texts.

ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONS

Skr. – Sanskrit

Toch. – Tocharian

only K – causativum tantum

A – active voice

Acc – accusative

Conj – conjunctive

f – feminine gender
G – genitive
Imp – imperative
Instr – instrumentalis
Ipf – imperfect
K – causative
Loc – locative
m – masculine gender
M – medial voice
N – nominative
N-Acc – nominative-accusative
Pl – plural number
PP – past participle
Pr – presence
Pt – preterit
Sg – singular number
1, 2, 3 – first, second, third person

REFERENCES

- Ivanov 2015 – Ivanov V.P. [Review of: Kritzer 2014]. *Pis'mennye pamyatniki Vostoka*, 2015, 1. Pp. 208-211.
- Itkin 2018 – Itkin I.B. *Noṣpeṃ Priyasundarī* et autres addenda et corrigenda-3. *Journal of the Institute of Oriental Studies RAS*, 2018, 6. Pp. 166-175.
- Itkin 2019a – Itkin I.B. *Ukazatel' slovoform k neopublikovannym tokharskim A tekstam iz sobraniya Berlinskoi biblioteki* [Index of word forms to unpublished Tocharian A texts from the collection of the Berlin Library]. Moscow, 2019.
- Itkin 2019b – Itkin I.B. Tokharskaya A rukopis' №№ 144-211 iz Shorchuka: novye dannye. II [Tocharian A manuscript №№ 144-211 from Šorčuq: The new data. II]. *Journal of the Institute of Oriental Studies RAS*, 2019, 3. Pp. 275-292.
- Chen 2022 – Chen R. *Gone with the Winds: A Tocharian B witness to Saṅgharakṣa's Yogācārabhūmi*. Report at 34. Deutscher Orientalistentag 12.-17.09.2022 Freie Universität Berlin.
- Couvreur 1967 – Couvreur W. Sanskrit-Tochaarse en Sanskrit-Koetsjische trefwoordenlijsten van de Dīrghāgama (Dīghanikāya). *Orientalia Gandensia*. T. 4. Gent, 1967. Pp. 151-165.
- Geng, Klimkeit, Laut 1998 – Geng Shimin, Klimkeit H.-J., Laut J.P. Eine buddhistische Apokalypse. Die Höllenkapitel (20-25) und die Schlußkapitel (26-27) der Hami-Handschrift der alttürkischen Maitrisimit. Unter Einbeziehung von Manuskriptteilen des Textes aus Sāṅjim und Murtuk. In: *Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften* 103. Wiesbaden, 1998.
- Howard, Vignato 2014 – Howard A.F., Vignato G. *Archaeological and visual sources of meditation in the ancient monasteries of Kuča*. Leiden, 2014.
- Huard 2022 – Huard A. *Recherches sur les textes de méditation en tokharien*. Thèse de doctorat, Université Paris sciences et lettres, 2022 (URL: <https://theses.hal.science/tel-03768156v1/document>).

Itkin, Kuritsyna 2017 – Itkin I.B., Kuritsyna A.V. Chapter XX of the “Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka” and its hellish sufferings: the fragment THT 1308.a. *Tocharian and Indo-European studies*. Vol. 18. Copenhagen, 2017. Pp. 63-69.

Itkin, Kuritsyna, Malyshev 2017 – Itkin I.B., Kuritsyna A.V., Malyshev S.V. Tocharian A text THT 1331 and the “Höllenskapitel” of the “Maitrisimit nom bitig”: some more remarks. *Tocharian and Indo-European studies*. Vol. 18. Copenhagen, 2017. Pp. 71-81.

Itkin, Malyshev 2016 – Itkin I.B., Malyshev S.V. Three unedited Sanskrit/Tocharian A bilingual texts of the Varṇārḥavarṇastotra. *Manuscripta Orientalia*. Vol. 22, № 2. St. Petersburg, 2016. Pp. 3-8.

Itkin, Malyshev, Wilkens 2017 – Itkin I.B., Malyshev S.V., Wilkens J. THT 1590: Tocharian A Hariścandrāvadāna. *Tocharian and Indo-European studies*. Vol. 18. Copenhagen, 2017. P. 83-93.

Ji, Winter, Pinault 1998 – Ji Xianlin (in collaboration with W. Winter and G.-J. Pinault). *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China* [Transliterated, translated and annotated by ...] (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs, v. 113). Berlin – New York, 1998.

Kazansky 1997 – Kazansky N.N. *Principles of the reconstruction of a fragmentary text (new Stesichorean papyri)*. St. Petersburg, 1997.

Kremmer 2022 – Kremmer V. In too deep: the tale of Vyāsa and Kāśisundarī in Tocharian A. A new reading of THT 743 and 744 (A 110-111). *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*. Vol. 21. Copenhagen, 2022. Pp. 107-142.

Kritzer 2014 – Kritzer R. *Garbhāvakrāntisūtra: The Sūtra on Entry into the Womb* (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series XXXI). Tokyo, 2014.

Laut, Wilkens 2017 – Laut J.P., Wilkens J. Alttürkische Handschriften: Die Handschriftenfragmente der Maitrisimit aus Sängim und Murtuk in der Berliner Turfansammlung. In: *Alttürkische Handschriften (Teil 3). Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*. Stuttgart, 2017.

Malyshev 2017 – Malyshev S.V. The Tocharian A version of the Mahauśadha-Jātaka. *Tocharian and Indo-European studies*. Vol. 18. Copenhagen, 2017. Pp. 105-125.

Malyshev 2019 – Malyshev S.V. A Sanskrit–Tocharian A bilingual text of the Vinayavastu. *Tocharian and Indo-European studies*. Vol. 19. Copenhagen, 2019. Pp. 71-92.

Malzahn, Fellner 2015 – Malzahn M., Fellner H. Lifting up the light: *tlāś* and *lkās* in Tocharian A. *Tocharian and Indo-European studies*. Vol. 16. Copenhagen, 2015. Pp. 61-79.

Ogihara 2014 – Ogihara H. Fragments of secular documents in Tocharian A. *Tocharian and Indo-European studies*. Vol. 15. Copenhagen, 2014. Pp. 103-129.

Pinault 1999 – Pinault G.-J. Restitution du Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka en tokharien A: Bilan provisoire et recherches complémentaires sur l'acte XXVI. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*. Vol. 8. Copenhagen, 1999. Pp. 189-240.

Schaefer 2013 – Schaefer Ch. Zur Katalogisierung der tocharischen Handschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung // In: Y. Kasai, A. Yakup, D. Durkin-Meisterernst (eds.), *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkisch Maitrisimit. Symposium anlässlich des 100. Jahrestages der Entzifferung des Tocharischen, Berlin, 3. und 4. April 2008. (Silk Road Studies 17)*. Turnhout, 2013. S. 325-348.

Sieg, Siegling 1908 – Sieg E., Siegling W. Tocharisch, die Sprache der Indoskythen. Vorläufige Bemerkungen über eine bisher unbekannt indogermanische Literatursprache.

Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Bd. 39. München, 1908. S. 915-932.

Sieg, Siegling 1921 – Sieg E., Siegling W. *Tocharische Sprachreste. Bd. 1. Die Texte*. Berlin – Leipzig, 1921.

Sieg, Siegling 1949 – Sieg E., Siegling W. *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B, Heft 1. Die Udānālānkāra-Fragmente. [I] Text, [II] Übersetzung und Glossar*. Göttingen, 1949.

Sieg, Siegling 1953 – Sieg E., Siegling W. *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B, Heft 2. Fragmente Nr. 71-633*. Edited by Werner Thomas. Göttingen, 1953.

Sieg, Siegling, Schulze 1931 – Sieg E., Siegling W. *Tocharische Grammatik. Im Auftrage der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften bearbeitet im Gemeinschaft mit W. Schulze*. Göttingen, 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 (URL: http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?Siegling_pers_copy).

Tamai 2007 – Tamai T. A preliminary edition of unpublished texts from the Berlin Turfan Collection. In: *Thesaurus indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien (TITUS): Tocharian manuscripts from the Berlin Turfan collection*. 2007 (URL: <http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/tocharic/tht.htm>).

Tekin 1980 – Tekin, Ş. Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule. 1. Teil: Transliteration, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen. 2. Teil: Analytischer und rückläufiger Index. In: *Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients, Berliner Turfantexte, IX*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1980.

Wilkens 2016 – Wilkens J. *Buddhistische Erzählungen aus dem alten Zentralasien. Edition der altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā. 3 Bde*. Berlin, 2016.

ZusTreff 1988 – Geng Shimin, Klimkeit H.-J., Eimer H., Laut J.P. *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit. Teil I: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Asiatische Forschungen 103*. Wiesbaden, 1988.