



Title	On Tocharian Document No. 174 in the Tokyo National Museum
Author(s)	玉井, 達士
Citation	内陸アジア言語の研究. 2004, 19, p. 95-105
Version Type	VoR
URL	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/11094/16251">https://hdl.handle.net/11094/16251</a>
rights	
Note	

*The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

# On Tocharian Document No. 174 in the Tokyo National Museum\*

Tatsushi Tamai

The Tocharian document which I would like to introduce here was found in Central Asia in the beginning of the 20th century and brought to Japan by the Otani expedition and published in 1915<sup>1</sup> and 1971<sup>2</sup> in Tokyo [Plate XIV], but it was not studied in detail on either occasion.

In 1985 K. Kudara sent a photo of this document to K. T. Schmidt, who studied it in detail. But Schmidt found some problems in the document, so he did not publish a reading of it. In 1998 G. -J. Pinault and D. Q. Adams published this document (Pinault 1998, Adams 1998).

On the following pages I intend to introduce the studies of K. T. Schmidt<sup>3</sup>, then to give my own translation and analysis by collecting the information from other studies and thus to end up with my own conclusion.

In my study, „Toch.“ means Tocharian B, „Skt.“ Sanskrit, „< >“ transliteration, „[ ]“ phonetic interpretation, „/“ phonemic interpretation.

---

\* I would like to express my gratitude to the Tokyo National Museum for allowing me to publish a photo of Document No. 174.

1 *Saiiki Kōko Zufu (Illustrated Catalogue of Central Asian Antiquities)*, Vol. II, Tokyo 1915 (Rpt. Tokyo 1972), pl. 19-1.

2 In: *Tokyo-kokuritsu-hakubutsukan Zuhan Mokuroku; Otani Tankentai Shouraihin Hen (Illustrated Catalogues of the Tokyo National Museum, Central Asian Objects brought back by the Otani Mission)*, Tokyo 1971, p. 157, “Inscribed tablet (Tokhara characters) / Ink on wood. 12.0 x 19.5 cm., thickness 0.7 cm./ Perhaps Kucha”.

3 Dr. K. T. Schmidt has kindly given me permission to publish the relevant parts of his study of this document here. Any faults or inaccuracies are, of course, mine.

## I. Studies of the Text

### Schmidt's Transcription:

- 1 mitrawarddhane<sup>4</sup> ˘ wiryaśānti ˘ aryarakṣite ˘ kalyanamokṣe ˘ aryakoṣe ˘ satyarakṣite ˘ [m]i-
- 2 trasome<sup>5</sup> ˘ śāntisene ˘ moko puttawarme ˘ ynaimyāṣṣi<sup>6</sup> ketasa cāṇeṃ kamānte yāltse
- 3 piś kante ˘ tāy<sup>ā</sup><sub>[ˌ]</sub> saṅkāmiññai<sup>7</sup> ketāntse kom-p[i]kom[e](m)<sup>8</sup> a[mo]<sup>9</sup> kiññe cake sim o-
- 4 motruññaiṣṣe ya[r]taññe<sup>10</sup> ckeṣṣe āte sim kom -[k]laskomeṃ<sup>11</sup> orotsa newiya<sup>12</sup> sim
- 5 oṣṣalemeṃ<sup>13</sup> armokiññe ckeṣṣe āte sim orotsai newiyai taṇtsi ˘
- 6<sup>14</sup> kāyne ṣotri ṣecaki aṣkār laḷākəmane

### Schmidt's translation:

(1) Die ehrwürdigen(?) [Gemeindemitglieder] Mitravardhana, Vīryaśānti, Āryarakṣita, Kalyānamokṣa, Āryakoṣa, Satyarakṣita, (2) Mitrasoma, Śāntisena [und] der alte Buddhavarman haben im [Gemeinde]bezirk (3) 1500 Cane's [ein]genommen. Die Grenze dieses Klosterbezirks(?) [ist] im Osten der Fluss A[mo]k, (4) südlich das Wadi(?) des Flusses Yart, im Westen der große Strom und (5) im Norden das Wadi(?) des Flusses Armok bis hin zum großen Strom.

Auf einem Stein [befinden sich] als Kennzeichen zurückblickende Löwen.

---

4 "Sic!" (K. T. Schmidt)

5 "Das Vorderglied lässt sich kaum anders als /m]itra-lesen." (K. T. Schmidt)

6 "Fraglich, ob ynaim° für ynāñm° steht." (K. T. Schmidt)

7 "Sic! Zu saṅkrāmiññai (für °māññai) zu verbessern." (K. T. Schmidt)

8 "Zu °pīrkom(ēṃ) zu verbessern." (K. T. Schmidt)

9 "Viell. [rmo]" (K. T. Schmidt)

10 "Weniger wahrscheinlich yat[e]ññe zu lesen." (K. T. Schmidt)

11 "Wz. kālśk- 'untergehen (von Gestirnen).'" (K. T. Schmidt)

12 "Kaum tewiya bzw. tewiyai zu lesen." (K. T. Schmidt)

13 "Bei dem unleserlichen Zeichen nach ṣṣa scheint es sich um einen Fehler im Holz oder um eine (teilweise getilgte?) Verschreibung zu handeln." (K. T. Schmidt)

14 "Anfang der Zeile unbeschrieben." (K. T. Schmidt)

My reading of this document is almost like Schmidt's, but the second word of line 4, which Pinault reads as <yateññe> and Schmidt as <ya[r]taññe>, I would propose to read <yatoññe>.

**My translation** (supplemented elements in brackets):

Mitravardhana, Vīryaśānti, Āryarakṣita, Kalyāṇamokṣa, Āryakoṣa, Satyarakṣita, Mitrasoma, Śāntisena (and) the Elder Buddhavarman, (these) respectable ones have brought 1500 cāṇes to the place (of the saṅgha).

The border of this monastery in the east<sup>15</sup> (is) the river Amoki (or Armoki?).

(In) the southern (direction), the border (of the saṅgha) is the arm of the river Yato.

The border (of the saṅgha) in the west is the great stream.

The border (of the saṅgha) in the north is the arm of the river Armoki down to the great stream.

The symbol on the (landmark) stone(s) (is) lions looking backward.

For the following reasons, this document cannot be regarded as a contract of sale as Pinault assumed (Pinault 1998, p. 364; "The document is obviously a contract for the sale of a piece of land").

1) Neither a date nor the names of the seller and buyer can be found in this document. According to Pinault, this is the "end of the document; the beginning, which should contain the necessary date, was written on another table (Pinault 1998, p. 364)". But this is doubtful, because this document is the only one existing available. The names of 9 monks indicate not persons who made a contract but the subjects of a certificate or decree. The shape of our document with four cuttings presumably indicates that it was made for transportation together with other documents, bound together with it.

2) The boundaries, represented by the word /sim/ which is a loan-word from Sanskrit *śīmā* into Tocharian, are constitutive for the "saṅgha" and cannot be the object of a contract of sale. A Chinese and Uighur document, which contains the corresponding term *sim*, was published by T. Moriyasu & P. Zieme<sup>16</sup>. This bilingual

---

15 The order of the directions is clockwise beginning from the east.

16 Moriyasu & Zieme 1999, pp. 75-83, especially p. 80.

text is no land-sale or land-lease contract either (Moriyasu & Zieme 1999, p. 76). The word *sim* could be used in Uighur meaning ‘boundary’<sup>17</sup> of either small or large lands, but as far as I can see, *sim* appears only in Buddhist texts.

3) The word <kamānte> is the only finite verbal form in our document, and it is very important for the character of this document, too. This word means not ‘(to sell and) receive (money)’ but basically ‘to bring’, as I shall show later on.

Of course it would be of great importance for the study of the Tocharian culture to demonstrate the existence of a contract in the Tocharian language, but unfortunately we have not found any example of a contract until now. It might be supposed that Toch. documents which include the word *kapci* meaning ‘thumb measure’ are contracts, but I do not think that *kapci* can be connected to Early Middle Chinese *huazhi* 画指 /\*ɣwəijk<sup>h</sup>-tci/, for phonological reasons (Toch. /p/ does not, as a rule, replace Chin. /k/ in loanwords), even if the function of the word is the same or similar, as was shown by S. Konow in the case of this loanword in Tumshuqese<sup>18</sup>. A relation between *kapci* and *huazhi* might be established, for example, if the Early Middle Chinese form of this word was, in fact, 甲 /kaip/, as Konow suggested, but this is open to debate; alternatively, a phonetic interpretation of Chin. /k/ as /p/ in Tocharian could be assumed, but I think that this word is open to other interpretations<sup>19</sup>. All Tocharian documents with *kapci* are fragmentary; for example, in THT 461 line 6 which shows *caiytiška ya(p wāltsa wi ca)kanma caiytiš[k]atse kapci* ‘Caitiška (personal name) ground 2 *cakanma* (pl. of *cāk*<sup>20</sup> ‘one hundred pounds’) of *yap* (< Skt. *yava* ‘barley’) Caitiška’s *kapci*’. *kapci* can thus be seen to be the confirmation at the end of each sentence, not at the end of the document as such. These documents are therefore reports of accounts, as E. Sieg, W. Siegling and W. Thomas proposed<sup>21</sup>.

---

17 Tugusheva 1991, p. 57 (Suggestion by Prof. Zieme).

18 Konow 1935, p. 774.

19 Prof. Zieme has suggested a possible etymology for Toch. *kapci*, e.i. Middle Persian *kafčag* ‘spoon’, Uighur *kävči* <kypcw> which has recently been found in Marālbāši, and will be studied in collaboration with Israfil Yusufu.

20 Cf. the discussion of this word in N. Sims-Williams et J. Hamilton 1990, p. 32. This word and the weighing system could be borrowed from Chinese, but Toch. /ā/ is difficult to interpret.

21 Sieg, Siegling & Thomas 1953, pp. 296-299.

## II. Interpretations of individual words and the underlying concept of the document

### 1. Individual words

<mitrawarddhane> etc.; Skt. /v/ is written <w> here. In Tocharian, there is a sign <v>, but this is only used in Skt. words while /w/ is from the Toch. inventory proper. <ddh> is a typical device of writing Skt. words in Toch., for example, <samudtär> ‘sea’, the grapheme <dh> is used only in Skt. words. /-e/ is a nom. sg.m. ending in Tocharian. <putta> in <puttawarme> reflects Skt. ‘buddha’, as Tocharian had no voiced occlusives in its inventory; this loanword has thus been strongly assimilated.

<ynaimyāṣṣi> adj.nom.pl.m.; I cannot determine the exact meaning of this word, which we find only here. Pinault’s idea to take it as the subject of <kamānte> remains possible (Pinault 1998, p. 365), but I prefer to regard it as a title or an epithet of the “saṅga” itself rather than the name of the land, because this word comes at the end of the list of monks’ names, separated by a comma just like the other names, and I think from the context that it would be natural to have a reference to the “saṅga” here. Regarding the phonological analysis, it is difficult to determine whether this word comes from Toch. /ynāñm/ ‘worthy’. /-āñ-/ > /-āy-/ > /-ai-/ is possible as in /āñme/ leading to /āyme/ ‘desire’ (Skt. *ātman*), but the palatalised /-my-/ is difficult to interpret.

<ketasa> perl.sg.; This is the perlativ<sup>22</sup> case-form of <keta>. The basic meaning of the perlativ is “through”. The word appears here for the first time, and it occurs in our document as <ketasa> and <ketāntse> (genitive).

I cannot accept Adams’ interpretation proposed in his dictionary: “A possible etymological connection with *kāt-* ‘scatter (to some purpose), sow’ would give the meaning ‘seed-field’ or the like (Adams 1999, p. 192)”, because a root-vowel /ä/ could not be exchanged with /e/ except in the present class II (only *käs-* and *tānk-*). *kāt-* has a class VI present and a class V subjunctive. According to W. Krause & W. Thomas (TEB Band I, p. 189), the suffix <-a> ( /-ä/ ) can build agent nouns, thus yielding a meaning ‘sowing (man)’, not ‘sowed (field)’.

---

22 This is a special term for the Tocharian case of nouns, which comes from Latin *perlatus*, like *ab-latus* (past participle of *fero* ‘I bring’). See TEB Band I, p. 84, §77.

If this word were an original Tocharian word, the interchange of <a> and <ā> would not be motivated. There is no /a/ in Tocharian B. If <a> stands for /ā/, then it must mean unaccented /ā/. If it represents /ä/ ([ə]), then <a> is accented /ä/. Generally, we would expect that <a> in the second syllable of <ketasa> must be accented like <ā> in <ketāntse> (as the accent falls on the second syllable in three syllable words in Tocharian B). Thus it is possible that we have /ket'āsā/ here, but <ā> in <ketāntse> must reflect an accented <ā>; so why should there be a different stem in the genitive? On the other hand, it is also possible that the <e> of <ketasa> is accented although it stands in the first syllable. We do find this accentuation in other perlatives, but only in very rare cases. If we accept this solution, the underlying word is /ketā/. Note that there is no suffix -ā in Tocharian and that an Indo-European set-root  $\sqrt{\text{keth}_2}$  is not attested.

Therefore I think this is an indirect loanword from Sanskrit, as many words were borrowed from Indian Buddhist terminology into Tocharian Buddhism. Its model would then be Skt. *kṣetra*<sup>23</sup>. The meaning of this word is not only 'a field (of Buddha)', but also 'a land for (rice) cultivating', corresponding to Chin. *tian* 田 (Mahāvvyutpatti, No. 5291). It is difficult to find a similar form of this word in other terms of Buddhism, for example in Iraninan (H. W. Bailey, B. Gharib), Old Turkish (G. Clauson) and Tibetan languages (H. A. Jäschke), so I suppose a Prākṛit form to be the immediate source of Toch. /ketā/. In Pischel's grammar we can see many examples of the sound changes *kṣa* > *kkha*, *ccha* (§§317-322) and *tra* > *tta* (§288). *khetta-* is the normal outcome of Skt. *kṣetra* in Prākṛit. We would expect /-ta/ instead of /-tta/ if the /e/ was long, in accordance with the two-mora-law of Middle Indic. If our /ketā/ came from a Prākṛit form, there is a minor difficulty about its /kh/, because Tocharian did possess the grapheme <kh>. But Tocharian had no /kh/ in its phonological inventory, <kh> appearing only in Sanskrit words. In the representation of <khe> by <ke> I would thus like to see a so-called "Tocharization".

<cānēm> acc.pl.; In Toch., there exists a word /k<sub>u</sub>šāne/ 'copper coin', but its relationship with our /cānēm/ is unknown. If this is the same word, it is impossible to derive it from Chin. *qian* 錢 \*dzian because of its /k<sub>u</sub>/. It is also impossible that Chin.

---

23 Suggestion by Prof. J. Gippert.

/-ia-/ became Toch. /-ā-/ (whereas /e/ is a possible outcome). In Toch. [š] and [c] are exchangeable to a certain extent. If the original of /k<sub>u</sub>šāne/ was /k<sub>u</sub>cāne/, which is not attested, then it is possible that /cāne/ came from /k<sub>u</sub>cāne/, because of the accent, as Toch. /se/ from /k<sub>u</sub>se/ 'who'. In any case this word must be studied further<sup>24</sup>.

<kamānte> pret.3.pl.med.; This is the most important word of the document. I have examined all attestations of the verb *kām-* in the "Berliner Sammlung" (/kamāte/- THT 12b3; 25a6; 490bI,6; 526/1,1; 560a5; /kamānte/ - 107b3; 431b3), but I could not detect the meaning 'to receive' supposed by Pinault (Pinault 1998, p. 365). The basic meaning of this word is 'to bring' (as a part of a suppletive paradigm involving the roots *pār-* and *ās-*).

<ārte> nom.sg.; This word is attested only here. From the context it can mean the arm of a river, but a meaning 'Wadi' is also feasible. I cannot understand why Adams assumes an Iranian origin for this word in his Dictionary<sup>25</sup>. If it could be derived from Proto-Iranian /arda-/, we would expect /erde/, as in Toch. /perne/ from /farna(h)-/. I will assume the meaning 'arm of a river' provisionally.

<kāyne> loc.sg.; The meaning of this word is also very difficult to determine. Up to now we find this word attested only here. If this word is an original Tocharian word with a monosyllabic stem, that stem would be *koy*, like *soy* 'son'; but this could be a bisyllable like *āyo* (*āy* plus "o mobile") 'bone'. It is also possible that this word is a form of /kārweñe/ 'stone', but this possibility is difficult to explain; I therefore think that we should regard this as a bisyllabic loanword. Schmidt has found a similar word in PK.NS 96a5 (L.C.XXI, 5) in the Paris collection, viz. *kāñne sotri*, which may mean 'the sign on the stone(?)', but I found another example of *kāñ* in the Hoernle collection (H. 149: 045b1) *kāñcelleṣṣe kāñä iscemne tse(tseku)* 'the kāñ of kiñjala (a medical ingredient) is burned in the brick'. In this reference it is difficult, if not impossible, to detect a meaning 'stone'; *kāñ* and *kāy* would thus appear to be different words. I prefer to translate *kāy* as 'stone or rock'.

24 Prof. Zieme suggests a possible solution: *canaq* (Kashghari and later) 'a hollow conical object' or 'the hopper of a flour-mill' (G. Clauson 1972, p. 425b) from Chin. *zhan* 𪎭 \*tʃəin 'wine cup' + *aq* (diminutive in Turk.), if Toch. *cāne* is not a currency unity.

25 Adams 1999, p. 51, "the possibility of relating it to the Khufi (an Iranian language of the Pamirs) word, *wurδ/würδ*".

<aṣkāṛ lākāskemane>; /aṣkāṛ/ is 'back (zurück)'. Toch. /-māne/ is a participial suffix and functions as active, medial and passive, but the passive usage is very rare (TEB Band I, p. 184). Other examples of /lākāskemāne/ in the Berlin Collection are from fragmentary contexts. Only THT. 99b4 *yakṣaṃ lkāskemane weṣṣaṃ* 'looking at the Yakṣa he says' has a longer context, and here the meaning is surely active.

## 2. The concept of "saṅgha"

At this point it will be helpful to have a look at the concept of "saṅgha" (the community of monks) as it is used in documents from Ceylon, where Hīnayāna Buddhism was dominant, as is the case in Tocharian. For this purpose, I have investigated four text editions (indicated below). I will not deal with the date and place of the temples concerned, because there is no direct connection with our document, but concentrate on the concept of "saṅgha".

### 1) *Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon*, by E. Müller:

Here we can clearly see that the king donated taxes (p. 111) which were taken from his land to the "saṅgha" for his own merit. All people had to pay land fees (taxes), but the people of the "saṅgha" were exempted (p. 117). This means the land of a "saṅgha" was holy and did not have a commercial value.

### 2) *Epigraphia Zeylanica* Vol. I, by Z. Wickremasinghe:

A "saṅgha" could not be a criminal or dishonest entity, because it was religious in nature (p. 6). No one was allowed to earn money in a "saṅgha" (p. 57). The expenses for ceremonies in the "saṅgha" had to be written down for the report. This, too, is not a commercial procedure (pp. 107-112). The land of a "saṅgha" was not bought or sold, but given as a donation (p. 148), and its size and location was determined in four directions (p. 161), just as in our document. The boundary was a "sīmā", which was constitutive for the "saṅgha". The king gave the land to the "saṅgha" and it had to remain independent from others (p. 175).

### 3) *Epigraphia Zeylanica* Vol. II, by Z. Wickremasinghe:

The village belonging to the "saṅgha" was otherwise independent (pp. 24, 56). The products which were dedicated to the "saṅgha" were freed from taxes (p. 69). This again meant that a "saṅgha" had no commercial activity of its own. The king bestowed gifts for the ceremonies in order to be purified (p. 118).

The properties of the “saṅgha” were dedicated and protected by the king (pp. 217-218) and maintained by the royal family (p. 225). There was a hierarchy in the “saṅgha”, suggesting that our <yainmyāṣṣi> could be an equivalent of the Sinhalese “Theras” (p. 283).

4) Epigraphical Notes by M. Dias:

Donations to the “saṅgha” were given for religious purposes (p. 36). The monks could not earn any money, their only income consisting of donations (pp. 39, 44, 67). The term *baddhasīmā* ‘boundary fixed or consecrated’ was used to mark the boundaries for the *uposatha kamma* of the Bhikkhus residing in the vicinity (p. 68).

Similar documents engraved on copper-plates were found in India (for example, from Tippera<sup>26</sup> or from Goa<sup>27</sup>).

We thus see that many donations (money, lands and others) were given to the “saṅgha”. It is also clear that “saṅgha” could not sell their lands, because they received them together with other donations, which gave the donors religious merits.

Next I will quote some sentences from P. Kieffer-Pülz’s publication on the concept of “sīmā”:

The “sīmā” is important for the completeness (*sāmaggī*) and must be fenced off (p. 27). If there are less than 10 monks, it cannot function (p. 28). When a “sīmā” is built, it constitutes a “saṅgha” (p. 49). The “sīmā” is fixed for the confession (p. 52). If a “sīmā” is fixed, it must be marked with signs (p. 57). If an incomplete “saṅgha” makes a confession, it is a *Dukkaṭa-misdemeanour* (p. 71). Even if a monk was sick, he had to come to the confession place in his bed, so that the “saṅgha” was complete (p. 98). And also if someone captured the monk so that he could not come to the confession place, the others had to go away from the “sīmā” (p. 99). If a monk resided within another “sīmā”, he could not attempt to establish another “saṅgha” (p. 157). The boundary mark was a stone, big like a bullock or small like a lump (p. 172; <kāy> in our document?). The mark of

---

26 Tsukamoto 1996 (Part I), pp. 168-172.

27 Tsukamoto 1996 (Part I), pp. 396-397.

Khaṇḍasīmā (small “sīmā”) was stones (pāṣāṇa) (pp. 246-247). The establishment of a Khaṇḍasīmā was a first step, preceding that of a “Mahāsīmā” (pp. 253-254). The “sīmā” could be fixed across rivers (p. 296), and one could reshape a “sīmā” (p. 324). With Mūlasarvāstivādins, the “sīmā” could be established without distinguishing a mahatī-sīmā (p. 372) or a khuḍḍalikā- and mahatī-sīmā (p. 371). The announcement of the marks was undertaken by special monks in four directions (p. 387).

I think that we can thus grasp the central idea of the “sīmā”. It is not known which kind of Buddhism prevailed with the Tocharians (Sarvāstivādin, Mūlasarvāstivādin or another), and it is not known either whether there were different systems of “sīmā” in Central Asia. But here I would like to indicate some possibilities.

1) From the Ceylon documents it is conceivable that the “saṅgha” received its land as a donation, as well as the money which was spent for the expenses of the ceremonies.

2) The 9 or 10 (if “ynaimyāṣṣi” is a name or epithet of a monk) monks’ names at the beginning are mentioned as persons involved for the *sāmaggī* (completeness). The geographical declaration of the “sīmā” is necessary for the *samānasaṃvāsa* (living together with equals). If <kāy> means ‘stone’, it might refer to a *pāṣāṇa* (mark of a Khaṇḍasīmā). The money mentioned may be the donation for the ceremonial requisites, e.g., flowers, repairs, wall-painting etc. as in Ceylon.

3) In case a “saṅgha” had to be enlarged because the number of monks increased, they had to make a new “sīmā”. They received the donation for the new “saṅgha”, and every donation had to be recorded in a written document (certificate or decree).

### III. Conclusion

Our document is not a contract, but a document pertaining to a donation. It is not mentioned who made the donation and for what purpose the 1500 cāṇes were spent (‘brought’), but it is impossible to imagine that the Buddhist monks sold their “sīmā” at this price.

## Abbreviations & Bibliography

- SIAL *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages.*
- SPAW *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Berlin.
- TEB W. Krause & W. Thomas, *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*, Band I. Heidelberg 1960.
- THT Tocharische Handschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Staatbibliothek zu Berlin. Preussische Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung.
- D. Q. Adams, "On the History and Significance of Some Tocharian B Agricultural Terms." In: V. H. Mair (ed.), *The Bronze Age and Early Iron Age People of Eastern Asia*, vol. 1. Philadelphia 1998, pp. 372-378.
- D. Q. Adams, *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam-Atlanta 1999.
- H. W. Bailey, *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge 1979.
- G. Clauson, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford 1972.
- M. Dias, *Epigraphical Notes*. Colombo (Sri Lanka) 1991.
- B. Gharib, *Sogdian Dictionary*. Teheran 1995.
- H. A. Jäschke, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*. London 1881 (Rpt. Delhi 1975).
- P. Kieffer-Pülz, *Die Simā. Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten*. Berlin 1992.
- S. Konow, "Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt." SPAW 1935, pp. 772-823.
- T. Moriyasu & P. Zieme, "From Chinese to Uighur Documents." SIAL XIV 1999, pp. 73-102.
- E. Müller, *Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon*. London 1883 (Rpt. New Delhi 1984).
- M. Nawabi (ed.), *Opera Minora. Articles on Iranian Studies*, I-II. Shiraz (Iran) 1981.
- G. -J. Pinault, "Tocharian Languages and Pre-Buddhist Culture" In: V. H. Mair (ed.), *The Bronze Age and Early Iron Age People of Eastern Asia*, vol. 1. Philadelphia 1998, pp. 358-371.
- R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Strassburg 1900.
- E. G. Pulleyblank, *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver 1991.
- R. Sakaki, *Mahāvīyutpatti*. Tokyo 1962 (Rpt. 1981).
- N. Sims-Williams et J. Hamilton, *Documents turco-sogdiens du IX<sup>e</sup>-X<sup>e</sup> siècle de Touen-houang (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II, Vol. III)*. London 1990.
- E. Sieg, W. Siegling & W. Thomas, *Tocharische Sprachreste Sprache B*. Göttingen 1953.
- K. Tsukamoto, *A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions*, Part I-III. Kyoto 1996 - 2003.
- L. Yu. Tugusheva, *Ujgurskaja versija biografii Sjuan' Czena. Fragmenty iz leningradskogo rukopisnogo sobranija Instituta Vostokovedenija AN SSSR*. Moskva 1991.
- R. L. Turner, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London 1966.
- Don Martino de Zilva Wickremasinghe, *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, I-II. London 1912-1928.