



Title	Bilingual hymn to Mani : Analysis of the Tocharian B parts
Author(s)	Pinault, Georges-Jean
Citation	内陸アジア言語の研究. 2008, 23, p. 93-120
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/16397
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

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

The University of Osaka

Bilingual hymn to Mani

Analysis of the Tocharian B parts

Georges-Jean Pinault

This text has been edited and commented by Werner Winter in collaboration with Annemarie von Gabain in a booklet published in 1958 (TT IX). It has been the basis of the treatment by Larry Clark, which is inserted in his edition of the so-called Manichaean "Pothi-Book" (1982): I refer to the edition (pp. 174-175), followed by a translation (p. 188) and a commentary (pp. 203-204). This work contains a number of improvements concerning the OT parts of the manuscript, but the Tocharian parts are practically not affected: the comparative analysis, as far as Tocharian matters are concerned, is based on the previous work of Winter. After some decades, a new study of the Tocharian text based on the original manuscript is certainly a desideratum, since there have been many advances in the philology and linguistic understanding of the two Tocharian languages (A and B). But the unique Manichaean text known so far in Tocharian has not benefited from these new insights into the history of Tocharian languages. For my own analysis, I have used the reviews of the first edition by two eminent scholars of Tocharology, Werner Thomas (1960) and Walter Couvreur (1961), who have provided several important remarks and corrections. I have tried also to use the works of Turcologists and specialists of Manichaeism that are relevant for the interpretation of this challenging document. In the past years, I have had the privilege to read a new edition (with translation and commentary) of the whole manuscript by Larry Clark, but I should mention that it does not provide, as far as this bilingual hymn is concerned, substantial changes against his article of 1982, that would affect the Tocharian parts of the manuscript. Every new or improved readings of some letters of these leaves can have dramatic consequences for the interpretation of the Tocharian text. One should recognize that some previous solutions have become totally obsolete. It would be of some interest to state the points that are excluded, in addition to the mere possibilities. Despite the number of corrections that are to be made, I would insist on the admirable work done by Werner Winter and Annemarie von Gabain, who have seen the essential features of this document.

As for the Tocharian text, the contribution of Winter has laid the foundations of every future analysis. I would retain two major points. First, Winter has disentangled (TT IX, pp. 29-34) the metrical structure of the original poem in Tocharian B.

It consists of three stanzas of four lines of 22 syllables each, showing the alternation of cola (segments) of 7 (4+3) and 8 (4+4) syllables, according to a scheme 7-8-7. This point is quite essential, since the Uygur translator has conceived his glosses after the division of the text into metrical segments. With some exceptions, he has followed carefully this segmentation. Second, Winter has seen (TT IX, p. 23) that several phonological and morphological features of the Tocharian B text, as far as they can be deduced from the transposition into Manichaean script, point to a specific variety of this language, which he has described at that time as “oriental”, according to his dialectal classification of Tocharian B texts.¹ Now, the publication and analysis of several manuscripts in Tocharian B, that were practically unknown before, have shown definitely that most of these so-called “eastern” features belong actually to a late and vulgar variety of the language, by comparison with archaic and standard varieties, which are represented in the majority of Buddhist manuscripts. Further analysis confirms that many formal peculiarities of the Manichaean text concord with the features of the late manuscripts in Tocharian B from the Turfan oasis, where the orthography and language are no more strictly controlled.²

These two fundamental points have been my guidelines for my reading of this manuscript.³ One should assume, as a working hypothesis, that the source text in Tocharian B was metrically correct. The caesuras between cola and parts of them (units of 4 and 3 syllables) help to restrain the very vast array of possible restorations. One should expect to find some facts proper to poetical texts, where the words are sometimes adapted to metrical requirements. Besides, the overall division of the text into three large stanzas corresponds to its content, since this hymn to Mani follows the praising genre of the Buddhastotra, which is illustrated by numerous Tocharian manuscripts. The three stanzas correspond clearly and successively to the three items of the “triad of gems” (*triratna*), that is Buddha, Law (*dharma*) and Community (*samgha*). It has been proven that the best way to understand or complete some desperate passages of this poem is to resort to the Buddhist phraseology

1 See Winter (1955), especially p. 224 (= 2005, p. 9).

2 Cf. Malzahn (2007), pp. 287-290.

3 I express my gratitude to Dr. Jens Wilkens (Berlin) who has shared with me his remarks about this text. I would like also to thank Dr. Simone-Christiane Raschmann (Berlin) who has helped me several years ago at an earlier stage of my researches on the material kept in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preussischer Kulturbesitz, and specifically concerning the relevant leaves of this manuscript. I had the opportunity to check the original document after having examined excellent photographs. Two seriously mutilated fragments identified by W.B. Henning have been quoted from his transcription by Winter (TT IX, pp. 34-36): He 1 (T.M.177) = M 8533 and He 2 (T II D67) = M 5436. Their Toch. B parts are overlapping and allow to reconstruct a partly parallel Manichaean hymn. I bear full responsibility for all remaining errors.

that is met in other Tocharian texts. As a result, one may dare to restore a continuous text, although some parts are admittedly completed through some educated guess, and with much uncertainty, but the minimal assumption would be that this hymn was coherent in its original wording. As customary in Tocharian issues, a large part of the results will always remain open to discussion.

Remarks on the Tocharian B text.

Thereafter the text is quoted after the continuous numbering of the lines by Clark in his edition (1982).

Line 245 (U99, v. 5).

Since the form *komñiktense* = *kwm[ny]qtynz[yy]* is in genitive case, one should look for a governing noun in the rest of the *pāda*; the restoration of *pärkor* = *prkwr* ‘rising’ can be supported by the letter *jr*[, the dot of which is still visible. The verb *pärk-* ‘to rise’ is quite often associated with the sun, Toch. B *kaum*, A *kom*.⁴ In order to have a complete *pāda*, one should assume a simile, with postposed particle *ra* or *ram*, like in the following lines of the same stanza.

Line 246 (U100, r. 1).

The noun for ‘moon’, matching OT *ay täñri*, lit. ‘moon-god’, is noted *men* = *myn*, standing for *meñ*, instead of *meñ*: this form ought to be the oblique (= accusative) sg. of *meñe* ‘moon’. It has been formerly (TT IX, p. 23) taken as a vocative, but the vocative of the nouns of the inflectional class to which belongs *meñe* ‘moon’ ends in *-u*, cf. *arañcu* of *arañce* ‘heart’, *kauršu* of *kaurše* ‘bull’ (TEB I, p. 103). The form *meñ* of the oblique sg. is easily explained as analogical from the cases where the final nasal of the stem was depalatalized, cf. perlativ sg. *mentsa*, locative sg. *menne*; it is actually attested, written as *menä* in B318 [H.149.213 = IOL Toch62]b4. The interpretation as a vocative form has been rightly rejected by Couvreur (1961), p. 101, Thomas (1960), p. 149, Hofmann (1963), p. 414. With the help of the fragment He 1 [M 8533], r. 2 the line has been ably completed by Winter (TT IX, pp. 34 and 35) as *myn šwmwnšw*, but his interpretation of the sequence *šwmwnšw* as *šommonšu*, vocative sg., presupposes an adjective **šommonše*, meaning ‘strong’, which does not exist. Actually, this reconstruction is based on the restoration of *ärklik* ‘strong’ by A. v. Gabain (TT IX, p. 10, followed by Clark) in the OT part, but this reading is far from being safe (cf. Wilkens [2000], p. 334). It remains possible however to interpret *šwmwnšw* as Toch. B *šomonšo*, which would be a late form of *šaumomšo*, allative sg. of *šaumō* ‘man’, with the ending *-šo* peculiar to metrical texts. The se-

4 See the compounds Toch. B *kaum-pirko*, A *kom-pärkāt* ‘sunrise, east’, and Adams (1999), p. 372.

quence *men somonšo* makes the second part of the colon. As for the first part, it seems likely that the letters s/[belong to the Tocharian text (Wilkens [2000], p. 334). After examination of the original manuscript, initial sequences *st-*, *sp-*, *sm-*, which could start possible Toch. forms, are excluded. According to Wilkens (personal communication), the reading s[w] is not impossible, but s['] should be preferred. The former alternative would lead to the restoration of the adjective *solme* 'complete', adv. 'completely, altogether'; the second alternative could lead to the restoration of s['kry], which would note the adjective *sākre* 'blessed, auspicious, gracious', known as the translation of Skt. *bhadra-* 'blessed, auspicious, fortunate, prosperous, happy', etc. (MW, p. 745c). But the empty remnant of the manuscript excludes the presence of the stop [k] immediately afterwards. Therefore I would suggest to restore a form of *sāmtke* 'medicine, remedy', either as *sāntke*, noted s['ntky] or rather as *sātke*, noted s['tky] with cluster reduction.⁵ The meaning would be that the gracious figure of Buddha-Mani is the moon itself, the light of which is a healing implement for the human beings.

Line 247 (U100, r. 2).

The restoration of *ylaiñiktense* = [yl'ynyq]tynzyy is supported by the fragment He 1 [M 8533], r. 2 (TT IX, pp. 34 and 35) and by the general context.

Line 248 (U100, r. 3).

The sequence *šwkyh* (var. *šwkyy* in line 255) has been interpreted by Winter (TT IX, p. 24) as **šukye* 'bright, resplendent', adjective derived from a root, so far unknown in Tocharian, related to Skt. *śoc-/śuc-* 'to shine, gleam' (MW, p. 1081a). The resulting construction 'bright to be seen' (G. *glänzend zu sehen*) is somewhat redundant. This highly speculative solution has been questioned by Couvreur (1961, p. 101), which proposes instead the straightforward reading as *šuke* (correct writing *śūke*), meaning 'taste, sap; liquid, juice', and matching Skt. *rasa-* (TEB II, p. 246 ; Adams [1999], p. 632). This phrase is based on the metaphor of drinking a delicious liquid for enjoying a beautiful figure with the eyes, transferring the eyesight to taste. It is clearly related to the well-known phrase Toch. A *lkātsi asināt* 'insatiable to be seen' (i.e. 'whose seeing can never be satisfied'), B *ontsoypte lkālñe* 'unsatisfied vision', cf. Skt. *asecanaka-darśana-* 'an dessen Anblick sich das Auge nicht satt sehen kann' (SWTF I, p. 206a). It plays also with the recorded meaning of *rasa-* as 'nectar', that is 'drink of immortality' (*amṛta-rasa-*). This Toch. B phrase *lkāsi* (for *lkātsi*) *šuke* recurs later (line 255) in the same stanza.⁶ It would be matched by OT

5 The form *sātke* is actually attested in B37a5 (MQ manuscript) and is the most frequent in medical texts from Kucha, see Filliozat (1948), p. 138.

6 The same image is found in an hymn of Mātṛceṭa preserved in Tibetan translation, dPe las bstod pa (3), translated by Hartmann (1987), p. 326 : 'Nektar für das Auge'.

körgäli tokılıg, see Wilkens (2008), § 28.

Line 249 (U100, r. 4).

Toch. B *pidär-mani* ‘Father Mani’ was probably written pydrmn̄y or the like, see pydr̄m[ny] again in line 256 (= U101, r.1), matched by OT *kañum mani* ‘my father Mani’.

Line 251 (U100, v. 1).

The first word after the lacuna ends with *ly*, which should be the end of the infinitive *āssi*, written probably as *’ssyy* or *’syy*. The same form has been taken for granted in the apparently similar phrase in line 261 (= U101, v.1), which has the reading [*’s*]syy, according to TT IX (p. 12) and Clark, but *y[]wsyy* according to Wilkens (2000, p. 335 and note 1062, p. 336). The first edition (see Winter in TT IX, pp. 25, 27, 31) has assumed that these two lines had the same content: ‘worthy to be worn on the top of the head’. One finds in the OT text: (251-252) *töz töpütä tutgalı tögimlig* and (261) *töz töpülarintä ... eltgäli tögimlig*. Since two different verbs are used by the Uygur translator, one may assume that the Toch. text had also distinct verbs: OT *tut-* (251) ‘to hold’ could translate Toch. B *ās-* ‘to bring, to fetch’ (WTG, p. 222; Adams [1999], p. 58), the infinitive of which completes in Toch. B the paradigm of the verb *pär-/kām-* ‘to bear away, carry, take up, wear’ (WTG, p. 258). The action of wearing, carrying or putting something on the head is expressed in both Toch. languages with the noun for ‘head’ in the perlicative case, but the same noun is in the locative case when something is understood as fixed on or inside the head conceived as a restricted space, as are for instance the hair, an ornament, a physical peculiarity of the head, or some psychological notion.⁷ One finds in Toch. A the phrase *mrācā pār-* ‘to carry on the top of the head’, as in A69a5 *ñä(ktas na)p(e)nāšši mrācā pārtsi āšām* ‘worthy to be worn on the head of gods and humans’ (see also A391b7); one may compare, with another designation of the head, the phrase A *prop-mahur lāpā tā-* (A130a2, 256a3), B *prāp-mahur āssa tā-* (B109a5) ‘to put a diadem on the head’, with the perlicative sg. of Toch. A *lap* and B *āšce* ‘head’, respectively. Therefore, if one chooses to restore here a form of the noun B *tarne*, synonymous with *mrāce* (A *mrāc*) ‘crown of the head, summit’, to which corresponds neatly OT *töz töpü*, it is preferable⁸ to assume the perlicative sg. *tarnesa*, rather than the locative sg. *tarnene*, as per Winter (TT IX, pp. 11 and 25). The first letter of *tarne* (= *t’rnyy*) is still visible on the manuscript. After this infinitive, the second word after the lacuna is noted *čwryy*, as read by the first editors and by Clark (1982), which remains unexplained so far (see TT IX, p. 25). It would be possible to interpret it as a genitive sg. form,

7 Cf. Carling (2000), pp. 124-126, 194-198.

8 This detail has been already pointed out correctly by Couvreur (1961), p. 102.

expressing the expected agent of the infinitive, see for instance the Toch. A passage quoted above (A69a5). Among the recorded vocabulary, the unique possibility seems to be *cori*, gen. sg. of *cor*, borrowing of the OT honorary title *čor* (Clauson [1972], p. 427b), which is already known in both Tocharian languages. The gen.sg. *cori* would follow the model of the kinship terms whose stem ends in *-r* (e.g. B *pācer*, gen. sg. *pātri*, A *pācar*, gen. sg. *pācri*), which has been also adopted by the noun 'king', *walo*, gen. sg. standard *lānte*, late *lānti*. Those speculations should be left out. Actually, the reading *čwryy* is far from being safe, since the dot of the assumed [r] is not present ; alternatively one could read *čwnyy* with a partly erased [n]. This reading is definitely better, because it is confirmed by *cwnyy* on the Henning fragments [M 5436+8533].⁹ According to the spelling conventions of this text, I propose to read *cuññe* for *culñe*, derived from the borrowing of Pkt. *cālā* 'topknot, peacock's crest, cockscomb, tiger's mane' = Skt. *cadā* 'hair on the top of the head, crest, top, summit' (MW, p. 401a).¹⁰ This noun would mean 'top-ornament', referring to a crown or diadem. Some kind of pun may be involved here, since there exists in Sanskrit a compound *cūḍā-maṇi*- 'a jewel worn by men or women on top of the head', parallel to *cintā-maṇi*-, lit. 'thought-gem', supposed to yield its possessor all desires (MW, p. 398b).

Line 252-253 (U100, v.2-3).

The 2sg. verb form noted *plk'st'r* is translated by OT *ya[ltriyur sän]* 'you gleam', but it is difficult to take it as related to the verb Toch. B *pālk-* 'to shine, illuminate': it would require the creation of a new present stem (of class IX) for this verb besides the recorded athematic (class I) present, 3sg. *palkām* (A *pālkās*), with intransitive value. The form has been restored by Couvreur (1961), p. 101 as *p_alkastar*. But one would expect rather in the verbal system a 'causative' form **pālkāstar*, accented on the first syllable (Schmidt [1974], p. 141), which is at variance with the actual transcription in the Manichaean manuscript. In addition, this 'causative' form should be understood as intransitive, and not, as expected, transitive, with the meaning 'to show', unless one assumes a reflexive meaning 'you show yourself'. In addition, the meter requires here a form with two syllables. Because of these multiple difficulties, it is easier to read the original form as *lkāstar*, 2sg. middle of the present of the verb *lāk-* 'to see', which is already attested (WTG, p. 281). This solution was adopted by Winter (TT IX, p. 25), but his explanation of the initial *p-* is not convincing. It is more appealing to follow Thomas (1960), p. 150, who proposed to interpret this sequence as due to a misunderstanding of an original version of the text in Brāhmī

9 Cf. Yoshida (1999), p. 193, supporting definitely Henning's reading given already in TT IX, pp. 34 and 36.

10 See also CDIAL, No. 4883, p. 266.

script, where, as it is well-known, the letters *pa* and *ša* can be easily blurred in non formal ductus.¹¹ One may add that this mistaken *plkāstar* was wrongly interpreted as belonging to the root *pālk-* through the connection with the adjective *pālkmo* which was found in the next line. The original text had *twe š lkāstar*, where *š* is the reduced form of the coordinative conjunction *šāp/špā* ‘and’ (TEB II, p. 251-252). As for the next word, the best solution has been given by Couvreur (1961), p. 101: it belongs to the causative paradigm of the verb *luk-* ‘to light up’, transitive ‘to illuminate, enlighten’; the regular form of the verbal abstract based on the subjunctive stem ought to be *lyušālñe* (cf. WTG, p. 284; Adams, p. 556), hence late *lyušilñe*, and metri causa *ly_ušilñe*. The perlativ form is translated by the syntagma with hendiadys *čog yalın üzä* ‘through splendor [and] gleaming’, but the translator has amplified the original wording.

Line 254 (U100, v.4).

The final word of the OT translation of this part, restored as *arasinta* ‘among’ implies that the Tocharian text ended with a form of locative plural of a noun referring to a notion with which the luminous Buddha-Mani is compared: see already Winter (TT IX, p. 26), who proposed to restore the locative ending *-ne*. It is easy to restore here a form which is already recorded (cf. B 82a4, 90b1, 389b2) *šcirinne* ‘among the stars’, locative pl. of *šcirye*, obl. pl. *šcirim*, because the image of the moon shining amidst the surrounding stars is commonplace in Buddhist literature.¹² One may consider that the initial cluster *šc-* was simplified as *š-*, like in Toch. late texts, but it is not certain. The possible OT translation would be *yultuzlar arasinta*.

Line 257 (U101, r. 2).

The Toch. B noun to which corresponds OT *az* ‘greed’ (ATG, p. 323a: ‘Gier’) ought to be *entse*, same meaning: ‘greed, envy’ (cf. Adams [1999], p. 87), ‘Selbstsucht, Geiz, Neid’ (TEB II, p. 172); the noun *enkäl*, as restored by Winter (TT IX, p. 26) means rather ‘passion’ (Adams [1999], p. 78), ‘Leidenschaft’ (TEB II, p. 171).

Line 258 (U101, r. 3).

There is no basis any more for the restoration of a verb form, to wit *šemt* (according to Winter, TT IX, p. 26), preceding *wikāššeñca* = wyk’šynč’, since the preceding word ends with *-r*, not with *-t*. As for the OT translation of the two cola (257-258), it is restored and translated by Clark (1982), p. 188 as follows: *azta [ul]atī n[izvanarig] tūdgisiz[n] birtä[m] kälī[r] siz tarkardači* ‘You, who come com-

11 A similar phenomenon accounts for the notation *-nty* = Toch. B *-nte* instead of *-tte* in the form *etänkätte* (258 = U101 r.3) ‘unhindered’, triggered by the confusion between the letters *ta* and *na* in Brāhmī script, especially in ligatures such as *tta*, *nta*.

12 See for instance Rhys Davids (1907), p. 86, No. 184, under *canda-* = Skt. *candra* ‘moon’. In Toch. texts, see for instance A17b2, B90b1, 290.3, 389b2.

pletely unhindered, are the one who will restrain greed and the other passions'. The form of the verb OT *kāl-* 'to come' was also assumed by v. Gabain, albeit with some doubt (TT IX, pp. 12 and 41). Instead of *kāli[r]*, Wilkens proposes now (personal communication, and [2008], §25) to restore *kah[sız]*, which would reinforce *birtām*: 'completely [and] without remainder'. This idea of an immense and innumerable series of passions (*kleśa-*) should be expressed by a monosyllabic word ending in *-r* in the Tocharian text: I can only suggest *kor* 'myriad', borrowed from Skt. *koṭi-* 'ten millions' (MW, p. 312c), which is known in both Tocharian languages. At the syntactic level, this noun is the direct object of the verb *wik-* causative 'to drive away, to cast out', and it stands in apposition to *kleśanma*, meaning 'a myriad of *kleśas*' or 'kleśas by myriads'. It is normally expressed by the perlativ plural B *koranmasa* (A *korisyo*), which was not suitable to the meter.

Line 259 (U101, r.4).

As seen by Couvreur (1961), p. 101, the OT translation *ädgü nirvan tözlüg* 'having as nature the good *nirvāṇa*' imposes to restore Toch. B *kartse nervān*, the last letter of which is actually found in the manuscript. In addition, the restoration of the form *tañ*, genitive of the 2nd sg. personal pronoun, as per Winter (TT IX, p. 27), is made unnecessary by the noun *ṣañiññe*, since the stem of the reflexive possessive pronoun *ṣañ* can refer to all persons.

Line 261 (U101, v.1).

The reading of the first word of the line is disputed: the only safe point is that it ought to be an infinitive governed by the following adjective *aṣām* = 'ž'[n] 'worthy of'. The last approach to a better reading is given by Wilkens (2000, p. 335 and note 1062, p. 336); in any case, the previous reading as [s]syy, noting Toch. B *āssi*, as in line 251 (= U100, v. 1) appears now to be obsolete. Furthermore, the construction of this verb *ās-* with the locative case, as represented in the same sentence by *mrās tarnene* = *mr'š t'rnyny* (260) would be unexpected from the syntactic point of view, since the perlativ is normal for an object on which one puts something. One can dismiss the otherwise intriguing idea that Mani should put his foot on the top of the heads of the former prophets (Buddhas), since he surpasses them all (cf. Winter, TT IX, p. 27); compare the translation by Clark (1982, p. 188), following the same line of reasoning: 'You are worthy to be carried on the flat crowns of the heads / Of the former Prophets'. Since the locative case implies that something happens precisely inside the head (or within the limits of the head), I would rather assume the following argument: the doctrine of Mani has matured in the heads of the former Buddhas, whose insight of the Law (Skt. *dharma-*, translated by Toch. *pelaikne*) prefigured the teaching of the final messenger of light. Now, the Uygur translator uses here

the verb *elt-*, and not the verb *tut-* ‘to hold’ as before (251); it means basically ‘to carry’, hence ‘to bring, to carry away’ (Clauson [1972], p. 132a), ‘führen, entführen, hinbringen’ (ATG, p. 338a, s.u. *ilt-*, *ilit-*). Among various usages, it can be said of the child which is carried by the mother in her womb: in that case the notion is that of carrying somebody until full development. Coming back to the reading of the Tocharian infinitive matched by OT *eltäli*, the letter preceding -syy, which is quite erased, can be [w], which would be more likely than [y], the latter being however not excluded. Now, the first letter of this word is also uncertain, but y- is a good assumption; an initial Alif is far less likely. How can we complete the reading y[]wsyy proposed already by Wilkens (2000) ? There is enough place for restoring the missing letter as [w] before -wsyy. If one tries to compare that with the data of Tocharian lexicon and morphology, the allowed reading y[w]wsyy could note correctly *yuwssi*, derived from Toch. B verb *yu-* causative ‘to bring up, ripen’ (Adams [1999], p. 466), ‘reif machen’ (WTG, p. 276). In the paradigm of the causative, the expected infinitive is *yuwässi*, with accent on the first syllable, the verse form of which would be *yuwssi*.

Line 262 (U101, v.2).

The sequence wl[///]ynčs[] with a lacuna of approximately three letters has been taken¹³ by Winter (TT IX, pp. 12 and 39) as noting a further instance of a present participle in -eñca, but it cannot be constructed in the actual sentence ; the restored text and translation were given by him as: *waineyesse wl(äwş)emca* ‘Den Frommen zur Selbstbeherrschung Bringender’. Now, it is read wl[///]ynčs[], and the corresponding OT syntagma is, after the last edition by Clark, *kutrultači (tñlig) [o]glanunñ* ‘of the children of mortals who are saved’. This notion of ‘being saved’ is certainly expressed by Toch. B *vaineyässe(m)* ‘pertaining to the discipline’, which refers to the Law of the Buddha. The final [nčs[’]]¹⁴ ought to note a genitive plural, alternating with the groups °’nz (bwšynt’nz = *poyšintans* 260 and [ynč’nz = (*ostašm*)eñcans 274), °’n’z’ (kryntwmn’z’ = *krentomnatsa* 269), which are used elsewhere in the manuscript. There is enough place to fill the lacuna with wl[wlm]ynčs[’], noting *wlōlmenca*. The form *wlōlme* can be explained by backward assimilation for *wnōlme*. The restored phrase (genitive plural) *vaineyäšsem wnōlmeñts* is the exact match of the attested phrase Toch. A *vainēsindś wrasašśi* (A 251b2) ‘of the beings devoted to the discipline’. To Toch. A *wrasom* (nom. pl. *wrasañ*) B *wnōlme* (prose form *onōlme*) ‘living being’ corresponds usually OT *tñlig* ‘Lebewesen’ (ATG, p. 371b), which has been expanded by the Uyghur translator through the mention of the children. The somewhat redundant and hypercorrect notation of the final clus-

13 The form was then read wrongly as ending in -ynč’, cf. TT IX, p. 12.

14 The reading of a final Alif seems to be allowed at the end of the word.

ter -nčs['] for the genitive plural is probably due to the incoming confusion in the everyday speech of different final groups: -nts (genitive pl.), -ntsa (perlative pl. or sg.), and even -ntse (genitive sg.). The introduction of -c-, taken from the final -ñc of the nominative pl. of some nouns was the means to recharacterize this form as plural.¹⁵ As seen by Wilkens (personal communication and [2008], § 26), the genitive *[o]glanınıñ* 'of the children' ought to be constructed with the ablative pl. *yollarıntın* (264), which has the possessive suffix ; the preceding lacuna can be filled with *[ädgü köñül]lüg*, corresponding to Toch. B *krent-pälskoşše* (= kryntp'lskwš[yy] 263).¹⁶ This compound would be the epithet of the ablative pl. of the Tocharian noun translated by OT *yollarıntın*. The straightforward proposal is to assume Toch. B *yтарые* fem. 'road, path' as matched by OT *yol* ; the correct form of the ablative pl. would be *yтаринмем*, noted here *yтаринмен* = yt'rynmyñ 263. But this form is at variance both with the meter, which requires four syllables, and with the remnants of letters in a very damaged section of the leaf: initial y- is possible but following -t- as well as -m- are definitely excluded ; both yw- and y'w- would be allowed. The first difficulty was got around by Winter through the *ad hoc* restoration of a form *itarıñmем* (TT IX, pp. 28 and 31), giving =*etarıñmем* through sandhi with the preceding adjective *krent-pälskoşšana*, obl. fem. pl. according to regular gender agreement. The last point is not compelling, since the usage of masculine instead of feminine is permitted in verse for metrical purpose. In order to fit the remnants of the first letters of this word, one can resort to the quasi synonym *yoñiya* fem. 'path, way, course', obl. sg. *yoñiyai*, the ablative plural of which ought to be *yoñiyanмем*.¹⁷

Line 264 (U101, v. 4).

The restoration of OT *b[olzun]* is based on the speculative reading of the Toch. form written t'gwwy (TT IX, p. 13 and Clark [1982], p. 175) as the optative, 3sg. act., of the verb *nes-/täk-* 'to be, to become', the standard form of which is *tākoy*, with variant *tāko*, (WTG, p. 255). I have been unable to account for the form *tākowy* assumed by Winter (TT IX, pp. 28 and 39), since such a final cluster of this sort would be quite bizarre, and without any support in the Toch. B corpus. An alternative

15 One can also add that the local language of the area, that is Toch. A, had extended the group -ñc of the nominative pl. to the oblique pl. in several categories of nouns and adjectives, hence oblique pl. forms in -ñcäs, e.g. *läñs* and *läñcäs*, nom. and obl. pl. of *wäl* 'king', obl. sg. *länt*. These forms were prone to cluster simplification in everyday speech, as shown by the form *krañsäš* attested in the MSN (YQ 1.29[I.2]a8), ablative pl. of *käsu* 'good', instead of *krañcsäš* (< **krañcäs*+äš), nom. pl. *krañš* (*krañs*), obl. pl. *krañcäs*.

16 Clark suggests (personal communication) the alternative restoration (*ädgü ög*)lüg, which would have the same meaning.

17 For the inflectional type, see TEB I, p. 135, § 193.

restitution of the optative form as *tākauy* (Couvreur [1961], p. 101), being a reverse spelling for *tākoy*, is not compatible with the sequence t'gww(y) : for the sake of the argument, one should have *t'g'wy according to the spelling habits of the scribe in transposing Tocharian words. One may restore another form of the verb OT *bol-* 'to become'. Now, the sure reading of the form in question is t'gww followed by a dot as punctuation mark, not by a Yodh ; the final sequence -ww would note -ow, which is already recorded as the notation of the evolved stage of the final diphthong -au (see WTG, p. 7). In that case, the form *tākow* would correspond to standard *tākau*: it can be seen as an analogical form of the preterite participle of this verb, the form of which is *tatākau* in the classical Toch. B language. The loss of the reduplication is due to the influence of other preterite participles, as well to the fact that the stem of the preterite of this verb is *tākā-*. Otherwise, one should admit that the late form *tatākow*, for *tatākau*, was truncated *metri causa*. The OT match would be *b[oltu]* or *b[olmiš]*.

Line 265 (U101, v. 5).

After *pākri tākow*, the rest of the colon has been taken separately by the translator, who has joined to it a part of the beginning of the next *pāda*. The reading 'wly'rt[]y (cf. Wilkens, [2000], p. 335) excludes the restoration *oly' āstre* 'sehr rein' by Winter (TT IX, pp. 13 and 28), which was inspired by OT *artukrak arig* 'extremely pure'. It seems possible to me to restore 'wly'rt[sy]y, which would note *olyartse*, a secondary derivative of the adverb *olya* 'more', based on an abstract *olyar* 'superiority, excellence': the adjective *olyartse* would mean literally 'provided with excellence'. The Uygur translator has added the commonplace notion of purity, which has been also triggered by the later mention of proper behaviour, Skt. *śīla-*, following the precepts, see OT *č(a)hšap(a)t* 'precept', which has as standard epithet *arig* 'pure'.¹⁸ According to the meter, there is place for a word that would make a complete colon with the words attested at the beginning of line 266 (= U102, r. 1). Therefore, the restoration depends on the interpretation of those words, and on the continuity of the sentence found in lines 265-267.

Line 266 (U102, r. 1).

A major discovery has been made by Wilkens, who has identified with the help of a mirror imprint on the preceding leaf the otherwise missing objects of *ačta[či]*, the agent noun of the verb *ač-* 'to open':¹⁹ *h[u]jaların čäč[ä]klärin*, 'the blossoms',

18 Cf. BT IX, 2. Teil, p. 53a and UigWb, pp. 186-187. The corresponding Toch. terms, B *papāšsorñe* and A *pāšsune* have also B *astare/āstre* and A *āštār* 'pure' as favourite epithet.

19 ATG, p. 317a ; the first sense is physical: opening a door, untying a knot, clearing the sky, etc., cf. Clauson (1972), p. 18b and UigW, p. 37-38.

lit. ‘the flowers [and] blossoms’ (hendiadys). This image of the opening of blossoms refers to the release of their good smell. We find here the expression of the well-known metaphor of the ‘fragrance of good behaviour’, Pali *śīla-gandha*.²⁰ Among the commonplace objects that are ‘fragrant, sweet-smelling’, the sandal-wood, Skt. *candana*-, is mentioned in association with various flowers, as jasmine, lotus, etc. The noun borrowed from Skt. *candana*- is attested in Tocharian B as *candām*, *cantām*, see also *candām-were* ‘smell of sandal-wood’; it can be recognized here if one restores [č’]nd’[n], while assuming that the first syllable of this word was noted at the end of the preceding line. Due to metrical constraints, and by metonymy, the poet has reduced this phrase to the mention of the sandal-wood. Since the sandal-wood, which is not native in the Turkic-speaking world, is quite often associated with fragrant flowers, the Uygur translator has expanded and explained the metaphor by mentioning clearly the flowers that are opened by the Law of the Buddha, see the translation now proposed by Wilkens (2008), § 27: ‘For this reason [I bow] to the *dharma* jewel which opens the blossoms of the extremely pure [precepts]’. In the Tocharian part the epithet of *candān* = [č’]nd’[n] lies in the preceding line, 265 (= U101, v. 5): I propose to restore *śilše*, written [šy]l[š]yy, an adjective (‘pertaining to good behaviour’) which is already recorded, as derived from *śīl*, itself borrowed from Skt. *śīla*-. *śilše* would be the expected verse form with syncope, contrasting with the prose form *śilaṣṣe*, accented on the second syllable.²¹ The OT agent noun *ačtačī* should translate a corresponding agent noun in Tocharian, but there is not enough place (three syllables) to assume at the end of the colon a form of the verb *wāk*- intr. ‘to burst, split apart’, especially ‘bloom’ (of flowers), tr. ‘to split, separate’.²² In addition, this verb would not take easily *candām* as direct object in the meaning of ‘giving off a fragrance’. For those reasons, I assume very tentatively an agent noun of the verb *sāt*k- ‘to spread out’ (WTG, p. 298; TEB II, p. 254), *sātkauca*, based on the preterite participle *sātkauc*.²³ In accordance with the stage of phonetic evolution shown by this text, it would have the form *sātkaoca*. The bottom of the letter -k- in the middle of this word is still visible on the manuscript.

20 Cf. Rhys Davids (1907), p. 81, No. 164. See for instance *Dhammapada*, st. 54, 55 and *Udānavarga* 6.16, 17; translation of the latter stanza by Hahn (2007), p. 35: ‘Im Vergleich mit Tagara und Sandel,/ mit Wasserlilien und Jasmin,/ erweist der Duft der Sittlichkeit / sich allen Wohlgerüchen überlegen’.

21 Cf. Adams (1999), p. 630; there is no phonological contrast between *śil* and *śīl*, and one may assume that both vowels would be noted by the letter -y- in Manichaean script. The spelling *śīl* instead of *śil* in Toch. B is partly due to the influence of the Sanskrit form.

22 Cf. Adams (1999), p. 585.

23 About this productive type of agent noun, see WTG, pp. 44-45, § 36.

Line 268 (U102, r. 3).

Through combining the evidence of the Tocharian and OT parts, one sees immediately that the beginning of the third stanza mentions the well-known triad of virtues that one should practice in order to attain the liberation according to the Buddhist faith: 1. morality, 2. concentration, 3. wisdom, Pali *śīla-*, *samādhi-*, *paññā-*, Skt. *śīla*, *samādhi-*, *prajñā-*.²⁴ They are expressed in Tocharian by the following terms, found in various texts²⁵: 1. B *papāṣṣorñe*, A *pāpṣune* (alternatively loanword AB *śīl*, variant *śīl*), 2. B *ompalskoññe*, A *plyaskem*, 3. B *aiśamñe*, A *knānmune*. Two of them are actually attested here, but not in the same order: 1) B *papāṣṣorñe*, translated by OT *č(a)hšap(a)t* (indirectly related to Skt. *śikṣāpada-* ‘precept’, through a Sogdian intermediary), 3) *ompolskoññe*²⁶ ‘meditation’, translated by OT *amwardišin* (269) ‘collection’.²⁷ This change had obviously metrical reasons, since the first colon of the first pāda should feature 4+3 syllables: it was then impossible to have *papāṣṣorñe ompolskoññe* (4+4 syllables). The Uygur translator did not question this order, and it is a supplementary indication of his effort to follow faithfully the Tocharian text. The second term of the list should then correspond to *prajñā-* and it is seemingly expressed by *boṣgut*, but this noun does not mean ‘wisdom’: it means exactly ‘instruction, teaching’,²⁸ derived from a verb meaning ‘to learn, receive instruction’.²⁹ The normal equivalent of Skt. *prajñā-* is OT *bilgä bilig* ‘wisdom’.³⁰ For this reason, it does not seem commendable to restore (after Winter, TT IX, pp. 28, 31) in the lacuna after *papāṣṣorñe* Toch. B *aiśamñe* ‘wisdom, knowledge’ which would fit the meter. The two notions are clearly connected, since knowledge is based in part on instruction. One may instead put there a form related to the verb *ākl-* ‘to learn’, caus. ‘to teach’ (WTG, p. 219; Adams [1999], p. 38), hence the verbal noun *aklyilñe* ‘learning’, probably under the form *aklyiññe*. At the end of the second colon, before *ce* = *čyy* (269), a three-syllables word is required, the OT translation of which has been lost, but there is still place for some letters after *mwrđšn*, followed by the space for the string hole, and before the next Toch. part: since the leaf has been torn up into two fragments the width of the lacuna cannot be evaluated with certainty. Actually, in the lists of virtues, forces or perfections (Skt. *pāramitā-*) to be acquired, one finds several other terms, by addition to or subdivision of the above quoted triad. Among

24 See Eimer (1976), pp. 34-41 ; Lamotte (1976), pp. 45-51.

25 See for instance B42b2, 285a5, A20b5, 237.2, 243b3, 282b2, 336a1.2.

26 This variant, due to vowel assimilation, has been found so far in manuscripts from the Turfan area: B296b6 (Qocho), B297.3.7 (Toyoq), 586.7 (Sängim). It is in accordance with the place of composition of the Manichaean text.

27 About this Manichaean term of Parthian origin, see TT IX, p. 20 and UigWb, p. 128.

28 Cf. ATG, p. 331a: ‘Unterweisung’.

29 Cf. Clauson (1972), p. 379b.

30 Cf. ATG, p. 329b and Clauson (1972), pp. 339a and 340b.

those nouns the equivalent of Skt. *vīrya*-, Pali *virīya*- ‘energy’³¹ do surface in lists attested in Toch. texts: B *tsirauñe*, A *tsraṣṣune*, cf. A20b6, A218a6, B281b4, B586.7, PK.AS.4A (= S4 Lévi) b1, etc. Because it would fit the meter, I have inserted this noun in my restoration under the form *tsiromñe* (in accordance with the phonological features of the text), but it remains a conjecture.

Line 269 (U102, r. 4).

The sequence *kryntwmn’z*’ has been interpreted by Winter (TT IX, pp. 13 and 23) as a genitive plural, restored as *krentomnasä*, for *krentomnañts*, standard *krentaunañts*, of *krentauna*, plur. tantum, ‘virtue’. It complies partly with the other forms of the genitive plural *-nts* attested in the text, which are spelt with the sequence *-(’)nz*, see above. One may compare the notation of the cluster *-entse* of the genitive singular as *-ynzyy*, cf. (*ylaiñik*)*tense* 247 (U100, r. 2). Thomas has proposed instead to take this form as the perlicative plural, i.e. *krentomnasa*, for standard *krentaunasa* (1960), p. 150. It is contradicted by two facts: 1) the spelling of the perlicative ending *-sa* ought to be *-s’*, which is effectively attested several times, in *tusa* = *tws’* (passim), and in *äkikesa* = ‘gtygys’ (272) ; 2) the OT translation, with hendiadys, is *äträmliḡ ärdinilär* [*yinčülär*] ‘jewels [and] (pearls) of virtue’ (Clark [1982], p. 188), which implies that the Tocharian text had a purely nominal construction with dependent genitive: a perlicative would be totally out of place, and could not be transposed by an adjective with suffix *-liḡ*. Nevertheless, the meter requires a four-syllables form, which is effectively noted by *kryntwmn’z*’: it is not the mere prose form of the genitive plural, i.e. *krentomna(ñ)ts*, but a verse form with a final vowel. One may choose to note this vowel that counts for the prosody as *-ä*, but in the Tocharian Brāhmī <ä> notes a short high vowel that can be syncopated, as seen otherwise in this text, cf. *etañk(ä)tte* = ‘yt’ngk’nty 258, that ought to count for three syllables. In standard metrical text this final vowel is noted normally as *-o* (so-called “movable *-o*”),³² but sometimes as *-a*, since the colour of this vowel was not distinctive. Another example of this final *-a* lies possibly in the genitive plural *wl(olm)encsa* = *wl[wlm]ynčs[’]* 262 (see the discussion above).

Line 270 (U102, r. 5).

The simile, expressed by the particle *ram* = *r’m* implies the reference to a river or stream, as shown by the OT translation *ögüz täḡ* (271) ‘like a river’. Couvreur (1961), p. 102 has brilliantly proposed to put in the preceding lacuna the monosyllabic noun which is required by the meter, that is Toch. B *āp* ‘river’ (Adams [1999], p. 44; same form in Toch. A). Unfortunately this restoration does not comply with

31 Cf. Eimer (1976), pp. 43-51, 111-115.

32 After the term « bewegliches -o » used by Krause (WTG, p. 7-9) and others.

the possible remnants of letters on the manuscripts: *āp* would be noted 'p or 'p, but the latter sign seems to be excluded. As an alternative, the noun *war* 'water', noted wr, would be conceivable since one sees a trace of the diacritical dot of the letter <r>. However, the expected spelling of *war* should be w'r, for which there is not enough space, as it seems. Actually, one can read something more between the <t> that precedes and the lacuna, to wit -mw-, although these two letters are somewhat erased. If this reading is accepted, it becomes quite easy to restore [s']mwtr, noting *samutār*, borrowing of Skt. *samudra*- 'ocean'. This noun is known in Tocharian under several variants³³: in Toch. B *samudtār* (B29a7, 29b2, 30b4, 73b6, 75b3, 76a5, 429a2 and in other cases B11b6, 30a8, 282b3, 400b5, 425a1-2, 408a3), *samudrā* (B221a1, 242a5, 618a6), *sāmudrā* (B73b3, 221b2 and 30a4), *samūdrā* (B104b3), *sāmudrā* (B412a1), *samutrā* (207a3), plural *samudtārnta* (B45b7, 73b6), *samudtārntaṃts* (B51b5); in Toch. A *sāmudtār*, *sāmudrā*, *sāmudrā*, *sāmutrā*, etc.³⁴ OT *ögüz* designates properly a 'river',³⁵ but the reference to any great mass of water can be taken as acceptable, since the 'ocean' was conceived as an enormous stream that surrounded the earth. This usage is documented by the expression OT *taluy ögüz* 'oceanic stream' found in Orhon inscriptions: it alternates with simple *taluy* (*toluy*, *talu*) 'ocean' in the Buddhist Tale of the princes Kalyāṇaṃkara and Pāpaṃkara.³⁶ One needs still a monosyllabic word at the beginning of the colon in the Tocharian text. The simplest solution is to find here the familiar image of the flood or stream (ocean, river, lake, rain, etc.) of precious stones or metals. An indication is offered by the OT part: since *ögüz* does not bear a possessive suffix, the preceding word should be the name of the river; otherwise, we have to assume an adjective in -IXg which would require too much space at the end of the preceding line. Wilkens (personal communication and [2008], §28) proposes now to restore the name starting with 'y[(featuring initial 'Ain) as 'y[ncw = *inčü*, for *yinčü* 'pearl'.³⁷ The phrase *yinčü ögüz* 'Pearl River' is actually used in the Orhon inscriptions as the common name of the Jaxartes or Syr Darya.³⁸ Going back to the Tocharian part, we can find the monosyllabic noun matched by OT (y)*inčü*: *wmer*- as regular allophone of *wāmer* 'jewel, gem, pearl'³⁹ in the compound *wmer*-

33 The forms attested in texts of the Berlin collection are representative for the whole corpus: the most frequent variant is *samudtār*, which is due to a learned correction of expected *samutār*/*samutrā* under the influence of the Sanskrit form.

34 See the references in Poucha (1955), p. 364.

35 Cf. ATG, p. 351b and Clauson (1972), p. 119b.

36 Cf. Hamilton (1971), pp. 66 and 128.

37 ATG, p. 386b ; Clauson (1972), pp. 944b-945a ; BT IX, 2. Teil, pp. 48a ('yncw) and 146b (yyncw) 'Jewel'.

38 Cf. Tekin (1968), p. 403b and Rybatzki (1997), p. 115 n. 307.

39 Toch. B *wamer* and A *wmār* are the matches of Skt. *maṇi*- as shown by the hybrid phrase B *cintāmaṇi wamer*, A *cindāmaṇi wmār*.

samutār ‘ocean of gems’,⁴⁰ that would translate Skt. *maṇi-samudra*-. It is interesting to note that the Uygur translator has used an expression that was already traditional in Turkic as equivalent to this metaphoric compound belonging to Indic phraseology.

Line 272 (U102, v. 2).

OT *eyin* = ’yyyn ‘according to, in accordance with, properly’⁴¹ translates Toch. B *ayātautse*, noted ’y’t’wts[y] 271 (= U101, v.1), for standard *ayātotse*; the restoration of the final letter is allowed by the manuscript. This is a straightforward derivative of the uninflected adj. *ayāto* ‘suitable, fitting, pleasant’.⁴² The hypercorrect -*au-* for standard -*o-* is a consequence of the monophthongization of the diphthong /*au*/ > /*o*/ in Toch. B late and vulgar texts. The next word in the OT part is *ädgü* ‘good’. Afterwards, an initial Alif is certain, and a following -*w-* is not excluded. The surface of the paper is quite damaged. It would be tempting to restore ’[wygly] and to obtain the fixed phrase *ädgü ögli* ‘good friend’,⁴³ which is quite common in Buddhist texts, especially about Maitreya; it matches Skt. *kalyāṇa-mitra*- ‘friend of virtue, good counsellor’. This would be rendered by Toch. B *kartse wāšmo*, that fills exactly the colon with the verse form of *wašamo* ‘friend’.⁴⁴

Line 273 (U102, v. 3).

The text contains the metaphor of the ‘farmer’ who makes profit from meritorious acts: OT *tarigčt* (274). The reading *k’rš’*[offers a sound basis for the restoration of *kāršake*, an obvious loanword from Sanskrit *karṣaka-* or *kārṣaka-*, meaning ‘one who ploughs’, hence ‘peasant, farmer’ (MW, pp. 260a, 276c).⁴⁵ As usual, the OT suffix -*lüg* of the adjective that precedes corresponds to a Toch. adjective with suffix B -*šše* (A -*ši*), here noted -*šyy*. This kind of syntagma is well attested in metaphorical expressions.⁴⁶ Winter (TT IX, p. 28) proposed to restore (*ša*)*tomñešše*, derived from *šatomñe*, for standard B *šatauñe* (A *šātone*) ‘wealth’; the phrase would mean ‘Reichtums-bauer’, which does not sound appropriate to the context. The alternative

40 The difference is due to the fact that the Toch. B accent falls on the last syllable of the first member of the compound.

41 ATG, p. 340a and § 296, p. 141 (*iyin* ‘infolge von, folgend, entsprechend’); Clauson (1972), p. 274a.

42 See Toch. B *eṃšketse* on *eṃške* ‘until, up to’, *olypotse* on *olypo* ‘more’, *yparwetse* on *yparwe* ‘first’, etc.

43 Cf. UigWb, pp. 353-355.

44 It is a fixed phrase in Toch. B as well, see for instance B282a1, 308a3, 600b3, b4.

45 The form *kārṣaka-* is attested in Sarvāstivāda texts, cf. SWTF II, p. 66b. The metaphor of the Buddha as the true ploughman in the spiritual sphere is well-known in Buddhist literature, see Rhys Davids (1907), p. 75, no. 118; see especially the *Kasibhāradvājasutta* of the *Sutta-nipāta*, I.4, and the discourse about ‘ploughing’ (*kaṣṭ*) in the *Samyutta-nikāya*, VII.2, § 1.

46 Cf. Pinault (2003), pp. 48-51.

restoration (*kren*)*tomñešše* as per Couvreur (1961), p. 102 looks much better at first sight: ‘Pflüger von Tugenden’. It entails however the *ad hoc* making of an abstract **krentomñe*, for standard **krentauñe*, which does not exist: the sole and regular abstract of the adjective *kartse* ‘good’ is *kärtsauñe* ‘goodness, virtue; good work, service’ (Adams [1999], p. 146). One cannot exclude totally the analogical remodelling of the abstract on the allomorph of the same adjective: obl. sg. masc. *krent*, nom.-obl. pl. fem. *krenta*, etc. A possible model for that would be the noun *krentauna* ‘virtue(s)’, but it is illusory: since the two nouns *krentauna* and *kärtsauñe* are practically equivalent, one does not see the motivation for the replacement of *kärtsauñe* by **krentauñe*. This solution is better left out. Through looking at the list of the attested abstracts in *-auñe*, there is one that fits the required phonological and metrical shape: *mäktauñe*, from *makte*, intensive reflexive pronoun (equivalent of lat. *ipse*), which is attested as translating Skt. *parāyana*:- ‘final end or aim, goal, last resort or refuge, chief matter’, etc. (MW, p. 587c), ‘letztes Ziel, Zuflucht’ (SWTF III, p. 83a), see also Pali *parāyana*- ‘final end, i.e. support, rest, relief’ (PED, p. 421a). The idea would be that the community, the founder of which is identified to a ploughman, grants to faithful men the access to their last resort.

Line 274 (U102, v.4).

The sequence ”ywršyy notes *āyoräšše*, adjective derived from *āyor* ‘gift, alms’, a fundamental concept of Buddhist social practice. The form as such can hold four syllables; it is not necessary to postulate for metrical reasons an analogical formation *āyuwer* on the same verbal root, as per Winter (TT IX, p. 28). One would expect a quite different transposition in the Manichaean script. Nothing has been suggested so far for the genitive plural that precedes. The OT translation gives a decisive hint, as it mentions at the corresponding place *bayag(ut)* = b’y’k[wt] 274, ‘rich man’ (Clark, [1982], p. 188). A plural form can have been lost in the lacuna, to wit the genitive pl. OT *bayagut(larniñ)*. This reference to ‘rich men’ would point clearly to the wealthy laymen, the householders that support the community through their gifts. Their canonical designation is Skt. *gṛhapati*- or *gṛhasṭha*-, which is transposed by the well-known term Toch. B *osta-šmeñca* (TEB II, p. 177). As a consequence, bwš[275 (= U 102, v. 5) ought to be restored as bwš[y], noting OT *buši* ‘alms’,⁴⁷ a loanword from Chinese adopted by the Buddhists and the Manichaeans: it would match perfectly Toch. B *āyor*. Now, the construction of this adjective *āyoräšše* is not self-evident. It cannot be taken as an inaccurate writing of *āyoräššem*, obl. plur. constructed with the noun *osta-šmeñcans*, for standard genitive pl. *osta-šmeñcamts*. There would be no ground for the inversion of the normal word order in verse, since both words have the same metrical value. The underlying topic of the passage, that

47 Cf. Clauson (1972), p. 377a ; ATG, p. 332b.

holds for Manichaeans as well as for Buddhists, is that the religious community owes its living to the liberality of laypeople. The next constituents of the Toch. text have adverbial value: *preke preke* ‘time after time, at every time’ and *snai-yärm* ‘immeasurable’. For this last compound, one may alternatively restore *snai-keś* ‘numberless’, with a synonymous monosyllabic noun. There is no trace of this word after syn’y 275 (= U102 v. 5) noting *snai*, but there is certainly place for a few letters before the punctuation mark and the beginning of the OT translation. The noun *yarm* ‘measure’ is definitely to be preferred, since for the alternative *keś*, noted probably kyš, one would expect the left part of the foot of the initial k- under the final letters of syn’y, immediately before the lacuna. The only noun with which *āyoräṣše* can be constructed is then *āñm* ‘wish, desire’ restored in line 276 as corresponding to OT *tap* (see next paragraph), which makes the direct object of the agent noun meaning ‘evoking, producing’. The construction of a noun meaning ‘wish’ with a secondary adjective derived from a verbal noun which formulates the content of this wish is well attested in both Toch. languages.⁴⁸ The agent who calls up this desire is actually the community mentioned in the next clause. The restitution of the syntactic and semantic continuity gives thus: ‘this jewel of the community, arousing in heart much desire about [the giving] of alms of the rich householders, every time [and] without limit’. Unfortunately, part of the relevant OT translation is damaged, but one may suspect that this rather involved phrasing has puzzled the Uygur translator.

Line 276 (U103, r. 1).

One sees a remnant of an Alif before]k[, that would support the restoration of m’k’ = *māka* ‘much’. Winter’s restitution of the Toch. part is relatively distant from the OT rendering, which is by chance complete. I prefer to have good equivalence: *māka* = OT *kop* ‘much’⁴⁹ and *ulug* ‘great’, *arañc-sa* (perlativ sg. of *arañce* ‘heart’) = OT *köñülin* (instrumental), *āñm* (oblique sg. of *āñme* ‘wish, desire’⁵⁰) = OT *tap* ‘wish’,⁵¹ *eršeñca* (present participle act. from *er-* ‘to evoke, call up, produce, bring forth, yield’) = OT *örittäči* (agent noun of *örit-* ‘to arouse, produce’⁵²).

48 See for instance Toch. B *kselñeṣše akālksa* ‘by wish towards extinction’, *ostmem lalñeṣše akāl* ‘the desire of leaving home’ (= becoming a wandering monk), A *bodhisattu lkālšim akālyo* ‘by desire to see the Bodhisattva’, *tsälpāluneši akāl* ‘the desire of being liberated’, *šwātsiši akāl* ‘the desire of eating’.

49 Cf. ATG, p. 359a: ‘alle, ganz viel’; Clauson (1972), p. 579b: ‘thoroughly, completely’ with adjectives and verbs, ‘all’ with nouns.

50 It remains of course uncertain if this noun had this standard form or the more evolved form *āym*, as in Toch. A, with dissimilation of the first nasal consonant.

51 Cf. ATG, p. 367a: ‘Wunsch’.

52 The meaning of this verb is close to the one of the Toch. verb, cf. ATG, p. 352a: ‘erheben, (Gesinnung) erwecken, entstehen lassen’; Clauson (1972), p. 208a: ‘to arouse [feelings, emotions]’.

Line 277 (U103, r. 2).

The noun *nomiye* (= nwmyyy) should here refer to the third jewel (*ratna*-), the one of the community of monks (*saṃgha*-) in Buddhist idiom. The corresponding OT phrase, which is almost complete is: *bo ančaman k[u]vraglig id[uk] ärdinigä* (277-278) ‘to the holy jewel of this community (hendiadys)’. The group *kuvraglig* (...) *ärdini* could be expressed directly in standard Toch. B as *saṅkaṣṣe naumiye* ‘the jewel of the community’, cf. Toch. A *pissankši ñemi*, same meaning. It is much likely that a similar expression was used above for ‘the jewel of the Law’: *pelaikneṣṣe nomiye*, translated by OT *nom ärdinigä* (267).⁵³ But one may surmise that the redactor has deliberately avoided here any form of the loanword *sāṅk*, which would evoke too clearly the Buddhist term *saṃgha*-, referring specifically to the community of monks (Skt. *bhikṣu*-). Instead, the Manichaeans should glorify the assembly of the elect, named by the specific term *ančaman* (going back to Parthian or Sogdian),⁵⁴ which has not surfaced so far in Tocharian. Before nwmyyy one finds s’r, that can be readily read as *sār*, a direct borrowing from Skt. *sāra*- ‘core of anything, essential part, best part, quintessence’ (cf. MW, 1208a). It would convey the notion of a selected group of pious men, which is described in OT by *iduk* ‘holy, sacred’ (ATG, p. 336b). Both texts run in quite parallel ways. In Tocharian we have a binominal group *sār naumiye*, since the first term refers also to something quite precious and rare. Therefore, I take *kuvrag* ‘community’ (known elsewhere as equivalent of Skt. *saṃgha*-)⁵⁵, which glosses here *ančaman*, as precisely the match of a Toch. B word, to wit *kraupe* ‘group, community’, being attested also as equivalent of Skt. *saṃgha*-, see for instance B36b1. OT *kuvrag* ‘crowd, gathering’ and Toch. B *kraupe* (A *krop*) are quite parallel formations indeed on the semantic side, since the latter is the resultative action noun of the root B *krap-* (A *krop-*) ‘to gather, amass’.

Line 278 (U103, r. 3).

The last pāda of the original Toch. B poem is restored by Winter (TT IX, pp. 15 and 31) as: *yarke (peti yamas)kau* ‘tue ich Verehrung’. I prefer an alternative restitution, which is more in accordance with the usual phraseology of a Buddhastotra, using the verb *wināsk-* ‘to venerate, worship’. One may restore the final group as *[k’]w*, which would be close to the standard final **kau*, but *[k[w]w* is more likely,

53 The phrase *pelaikneṣṣe naumiye* (verse form *naumye*) is quite well attested in Toch. B texts, cf. B 100b5, 103b5, 312b5, 587a1, etc.; Toch. A has the parallel *mārkampalši ñemi*. Facing OT *nom ärdinigä*, in dative case, one would expect in the Toch. text the allative (*nomiyešo*), which would give the required segment of four syllables, but it remains uncertain.

54 Cf. UigWb, p. 135.

55 Cf. ATG, p. 360b: ‘Versammlung, Schar, Gemeinde der Mönche’; Clauson (1972), p. 585a. It is derived from the verb *kuvra-* ‘to come together, assemble’.

noting *°kow*, like in the nom. sg. masc. of the preterite participle that we have met above, *tākow* for *tākau* (264). This final sentence has been much expanded by the Uygur translator, preparing the mention of the donor.

Line 280 (U103, r. 5)

The colophon is entirely in OT, but one may suspect, on the tracks of Winter (TT IX, p. 29), that the part in red ink contains renderings of Tocharian words: *k[ä]si bät-ti täñri* would correspond to the well-known phrase Toch. B *käṣṣi pud-ñäkte* (or *pa-ñäkte*),⁵⁶ A *pättāñkät* ‘teacher Buddha-god’; *küsän* would refer to the language of the original poem, that is Toch. B. Winter restored a complete title of the poem: ‘Ein den Lehrer Buddha-Gott preisender, in küsän-Sprache verfaßter (oder: vorgetragener) Hymnus’. One may concede that OT *bätti täñri* has some likeness to Toch. A *pättā-ñkät*. In addition, *küsän* is much likely the name of the Toch. B language as transmitted in Toch. A, and known also as OT *küšän*: it transposes a form Toch. A **küšän* or **küšin*, which is the expected match of the noun B *kuśiññe* (*k_wśiññe*) ‘Kuchean’, i.e. an adjective that means ‘belonging to Kucha’,⁵⁷ derived from *Kuśi*, variant of the name *Kuci*. This somewhat speculative construction is however undermined by the fact that the first word of the line is actually *k[']s*, with a possible, although erased, Alif, but without final -y. This elusive -y is given as dubious in the first edition (TT IX, p. 15), followed by Clark in his most recent edition. Clark (1982), p. 175 had printed *kesi* without any sign of doubt.⁵⁸ Besides, *bätti* = b’ḏḏy is not the most straightforward transposition of Toch. A *pät* (even less *pättā*), unless one assumes that it ends with the possessive suffix, added to a noun of Tocharian origin. Therefore, the interpretation of this line is loaded with many uncertainties, and one should not take for granted Winter’s interpretation, albeit brilliant and intriguing. Besides *täñri* = tñgryy, as part of a name, the noun *küsän* = kwys’n remains as a relatively safe item. Since this name of the Toch. B language goes back to a form of Toch. A, one may still assume that this conclusive mention added by the copyist is external to the bilingual hymn itself: it keeps undeniable traces of Tocharian A, the local language of the Uygur kingdom, from which the Buddhist Uyghurs have borrowed many technical terms and adapted several texts. A supplementary issue, which would go far beyond the limits of the present contribution, would be to account for the choice of a *Buddhastotra* in Toch. B, and not in Toch. A, as the pattern for a Manichaean hymn. I would suggest that the reason was the high prestige of Toch. B as medium of

56 Actually, Toch. B *pud-ñäkte* is the verse form (closer to the Skt. source *Buddha-*), and the standard prose form is *pañäkte* (vulgar *pañikte*) < **pät-ñäkte*, both being parallel to OT *burhan täñri*.

57 On this form and related issues, cf. Pinault (2002), p. 316, with references to previous literature.

58 It has been taken over by Wilkens (2000), p. 337, under the form *k[ä]si*.

Buddhism in the whole Tarim basin and the presence of an important Toch. B speaking community in the Uygur kingdom at the epoch⁵⁹ of the composition of the text.

List of Tocharian B words.

The words that are effectively read in the manuscript are listed as such. Because many forms are incomplete, to this group one has joined the words which are restored at least on the basis of remnants of letters.⁶⁰ Besides two other types of words are distinguished: the words which are deduced from the OT parallel text are marked by a preceding asterisk, and the words which are assumed as to fill the context are preceded by the sign ±. When necessary, the words are compared to their standard form.⁶¹

**aklyiññe*, for standard *aklyilñe* ‘learning, study’: 268!

ayātautse for standard *ayātotse*, derived from the uninflected adj. *ayāto* ‘suitable, pleasant’: ’y’t’wts[y] 271.

**arañcsa*, perlativ sg. of *arañce* ‘heart’: 276!

aṣān, for *aṣām*, uninflected adj., ‘worthy’: ’ž’n 251, ’ž’[n] 261.

aktikesa, adverb based on the uninflected adj. *aktike* ‘wonderful’: ’gtygy’s 272.

**āñm*, or *āym*, obl. sg. of *āñme* ‘wish, desire’: 276!

āyorāṣṣe, adj. derived from *āyor* ‘gift, alms’: ’ywršyy 274.

āssi, infinitive of the verb *ās-*, in suppletion with *pār-* ‘to take up, wear’: [’ssy]y 251.

etankätte, nom. sg., ‘unhindered’, privative of the verb *tāñk-* ‘to hinder’: ’yt’ngk’ ntyy 258, through confusion between *-nte* and *-tte* in Brāhmī script.

**entse*, obl. (= nom.) sg., ‘greed’: 257!

eršeñca, nom. sg. masc. of the present participle of the verb *er-* ‘to arouse, create’: [’yr]šynč’ 276.

59 The dating of the “Pothi-Book” is not yet settled: the tenth century is admitted by Moriyasu (2004), p. 11, and the end of the same century is proposed by Wilkens (2008). The writing of the Toch. B poem used as basis of the bilingual section should be put earlier, probably by some decades.

60 I have kept the conventions used for the edition of OT texts: restored letters are between square brackets and defective writings are between brackets. In the quotation and restoration of Tocharian forms, I have followed the usual conventions, that are exactly opposite.

61 Several phonetic peculiarities of late and vulgar B texts and of eastern B texts (cf. Schmidt [1986], pp. 638-643) are found in this poem: palatalization of *-ä-* in palatal context, monophthongization of diphthongs, evolution of /aun/ > /om/, vowel assimilation, cluster reduction, consonant assimilation (e.g. *-lñ-* > *-ññ-*), consonant dissimilation, simplification of final affricates (*-c* > *-ś*, *-ts* > *-s*), infinitive suffix *-tsi* > *-si*. This list is not exhaustive.

ompolskoññe, for standard *ompalskoññe*, nom. sg., ‘meditation’: ‘wmpwl[skwnyy] 268.

olyartse ‘superior, excellent’: ‘wly’rt[sy]y 265.

osta-šmeñcans for standard *osta-šmeñcants*, gen. pl. of *osta-šmeñca* ‘householder’, regular match of Skt. *grhastha-* : [‘wst’šm]ynč’nz 274.

**kartse*, nom. sg. masc. of the adjective ‘good’: 259!, 271!

kāršake, nom. sg., ‘ploughman, farmer’, borrowing from Skt. *kārśaka-* (MW, p. 276c): k’rš’[ky] 273.

kātko, for standard *kātkau*, nom. sg. masc. of the preterite participle of the verb *kātk-* ‘to pass’: k’tkw 259.

komñiktense, gen. sg. of *kom-ñikte*, for standard *kaum-ñakte* ‘sun-god’: kwm[ny]qtynz[yy] 245.

kor, obl. (= nom.) sg., ‘myriad’, borrowing from Skt. *koṭi-* through MIndic: [kw]r 258.

krent-pālskošše, for correct *krent-pālskoššem*,⁶² obl. pl. masc. instead of fem. *metri causa*, of the compound adjective *krent-pālsko-šše* ‘consisting of good thought’: kryntp’lswš[yy] 263. The lexical elements of this compound are: *krent*, obl. sg. masc. of *kartse* ‘good’ and *pālsko*, compound form of *palsko* ‘mind, thought’.

krentomnatsa, for standard *krentaunantso*, verse form of *krentaunants*, gen. pl. of *krentauna*, plurale tantum, ‘virtue’: kryntwmn’z’ 269.

**kraupešše*, nom. (= obl.) sg. masc. of an adjective derived from *kraupe* ‘gathering, community’, as equivalent of Skt. *saṃgha-* : 277!

klešanma, obl. (= nom.) pl. of *kleš* ‘affliction, passion’, borrowing from Skt. *kleśa-* : klyš’nm’ 257.

candān, obl. (= nom.) sg., borrowing from Skt. *candana-* : [č’]nd’[n] 265-266.

± *ci*, oblique of the 2sg. personal pronoun: 278!

cintāmaṇi, nom. sg., name of a fabulous jewel, borrowing from Skt. *cintāmaṇi-* : čynt’m’nyy 250.

cuññe, for standard *culñe* ‘top-ornament’, obl. (= nom.) sg.: čwnyy 251.

ce, for standard *cai* (or *cey*), nom. plur. masc. of the demonstrative pronoun *se* : čyy 269.

tarnene, loc.sg. of *tarne*, masc. ‘crown of the head’: t’rnyny 260. The two following letters (yy) are a decorative device of the scribe to fill up the end of the line.

tarnesa, perl. sg. of *tarne*, masc. ‘crown of the head’: t[’rnys’] 251.

62 Concerning the neglect of the final anusvāra which was probably present in the source text written in Brāhmī script, compare above (262) *vaineyāšše*, for *vaineyāššem*.

tākow, for standard *tatākau*, with haplology *metri causa* or through analogy: t'gww 264.

tusa, demonstrative adverb, 'thus, thereby': tws' 249, 250, 256, 262, [tw]s' 256, 267.
twe, personal pronoun of 2sg., nom. : tyvy[y] 252, t[yvy]y 254.

nervān, for *nervām*, borrowing from Skt. *nirvāna*- 'extinction': [nyrv']n 259.

nesalye, verbal adj. (gerund) of the verb *nes*- 'to be': nys'lyy 272.

nomiye, for standard *naumiye* 'jewel': nwmyyy 277.

nomyenta, for standard *naumyenta*, nom. pl. of *naumiye*, verse form of *naumiye* : nw-mynt['] 269.

**nomiyešo*, verse form with "movable -o" of the allative sg. of *nomiye* : 266!

paṇāṣṣorñe, nom. sg., 'moral behavior': p'p'šwrmny 268.

pākri, uninflected adj., 'clear, obvious': p'gryy 264.

pärkor, nom. (= obl.) sg., verbal noun of *pärk*- 'to rise', about the sun: [p]r[kwr] 245.

pälkmo, *metri causa* for *pälkamo*, nom. sg. of the agent noun of the verb *pälk*- 'to shine': pl[mw] 254.

pällamar, 1sg.mid. present of *päl*- 'to praise': pl'[m'r] 250, pl'm'r 267, to be assumed in 256 and 262.

pässak, nom. sg., 'garland': ps'k 248.

pidār-mani, voc. sg., 'father Mani', borrowing from Parthian, cf. pydr /pidar/ 'father': pyḍrm['ny] 256, to be assumed also in 249.

**pelaiknešše*, obl. (= nom.) sg. of an adjective derived from *pelaikne* 'law', equivalent of Skt. *dharma*- : 266!

poyšintans, for standard *poyšintaṃts*, gen. pl. of *poyši* 'omniscient', also used to designate Buddhas (calque of Skt. *sarva-jña*-): bwšynt'nz 260.

preke 'time': p[y]rygyy 260, pyrygyy 275, [py]rygyy 275.

bramñiktense, gen. sg. of *bram-ñikte*, for standard *bram-ñäkte* 'Brahmā-god': br'mny'k[tynzyy] 247.

mant, conjunction, 'so, thus': m'nd 252, to be assumed in 254.

māka, uninflected adj., 'much, many': [m']k['] 276.

mäktomñešše, for standard *mäktauñešše*, adj. derived from *mäktauñe* 'final aim or goal, support, relief': [m'q]twmnyšyy 273.

mukur, nom. sg., 'diadem', borrowing of Skt. *mukuṭa*- through MIndic: mwkr 247.

men, for *meṃ*, analogical and late form of *meñ*, obl. sg. of *meñe* 'moon': myn 246.

mrās, for standard *mrāc*, obl. sg. of *mrāce* 'summit, top': mr'š 260.

yarke 'homage': y'rgyy 278 ; probably at the perlative sg. case, *yarke-sa*.

± *yāmu*, preterit participle, nom. sg. masc., of the verb *yām*- 'to make': 246!

± *yärm*, compound form of *yarm* 'measure': 275!

yuwssi, verse form of *yuwässi*, infinitive of the verb *yu-* causative ‘to ripen [tr.], bring to its full end’: *y[w]wsy* 261.

yoñiyanmen, ablative pl. of *yoñiya* ‘path’: *y(w)[ny’nmy]* 263.

ylainiktense, gen. sg. of *ylai-ñikte*, for standard *ylai-ñakte* ‘Indra’, lit. ‘king-god’: *[yl’ynyq]tynzy* 246-247.

ra, particle, ‘as, like’, in junction with *wamer* : -*r’h* 250.

ram, for standard *ramt*, particle, ‘as, like’: *r’m* 247, 248, 270.

lkäsi, for standard *lkätsi*, infinitive of *läk-* ‘to see’: *lk’s[y]y* 248, *[l]k[’]sy* 255.

lkāstar, 2sg.mid. present of *läk-* ‘to see’, here with passive value: *lk’st’r* 252.

l_wšilyñesa, contracted variant *metri causa* for *lyušälyñesa*, perlative sg. of *lyušälyñe*, abstract of the verb *luk-* causative ‘to illuminate, enlighten’: *lšyls’y* 253.

vaineyäšše for *vaineyäššem* with neglect of the final nasal (anusvāra in Brāhmī script), obl. pl. masc. of *vaineyäšše* adjective derived from the borrowing of Skt. *vaineya-* ‘converted’: *w’ynyšy* 262.

wamer, nom. sg., ‘gem’, followed by the particle *ra* ‘as, like’: *w’myr’h* 250.

warñai, postposition ‘beginning with’ (cf. Skt. compounds with *-adi-*): *[w’rn]y’y* 257. The dot of the [r] is still visible.

**wāšmo*, nom. sg., verse form of *wašamo* ‘friend’: 271!

wikäššeñca, present participle, nom. sg., of the causative or the verb *wik-* ‘to drive away’: *wyk’šynč’* 258.

wināskow, for standard *wināskau*, 1sg. act. of the present of the verb *wināsk-* ‘to venerate, worship’: *[wyn’s]k[w]w* 278.

**wmer*, variant form of *wamer* ‘gem’: 270!

wlolmencsa, noting *wlolmentsa*, for standard verse form *wnolmeñtso*, genitive pl. of *wnolme*, verse form of *onolme* ‘living being’: *wl[wlm]ynčs[’]* 262.

šäte, adj., nom. sg. masc., ‘rich’: *š’dyy* 270.

šilše, verse form for *šīlašše*, obl. (= nom.) masc. sg. of an adjective based on *šīl*, borrowing from Skt. *śīla-* : *[šy]l[š]y* 265.

šuke, nom. sg., ‘sap, juice’: *šwkyh* 248, *šwky* 255. Compare the writing *šuke* in standard Toch. B.

šomonšo, for *šomonšo*, allative sg. of *šomo*, for standard *šauomo* ‘man’: *š[wmwnšw]* 246.

± *šcirinne*, locative pl. of *šcirye* ‘star’: 254!

š, reduced form of the coordinative particle, wrongly read as <p> from a manuscript written in Brāhmī: in *p-lk’st’r* 252.

šañiññe, for standard *šañññe* ‘own character, personal nature’, abstract of *šañ* ‘own’: *š’nyny* 259.

samutār, nom. (= obl.) sg. ‘ocean’, borrowing from Skt. *samudra-*: *[s’]mw(t)r* 270.

sātke, for standard *sām̐tke* ‘medecine, remedy’, obl. (= nom.) sg. : s(’)[tky] 246.
sār, nom. (= obl.) sg., borrowing of Skt. *sāra*- ‘best part, quintessence’: s’r 277.
sātkocai, for standard *sātkaucai*, obl. sg. masc. of *sātkauca* ‘spreading out’, agent
 noun of the verb *sātk-* : [st]k[wc’y] 266.
 **se*, demonstrative pronoun, nom. sg. masc. : 277 !
snai, preposition, ‘without’: syn’y 275.
 ± *tsiromñe* for standard *tsirauñe*, nom. (= obl.), sg. ‘energy’: 268 !

Restitution of the complete *stotra* in Tocharian B.

- I. 1. (4+3) komñiktense (pä)r(kor ram)
2. (4+4) sã(tke yãmu) men šomonšo
3. (4+3) ylaiñiktense mukur ram
4. (4+3) bramñiktense pässak ram
5. (4+4) lkãsi šuke (pidär-mani)
6. (4+3) tusa tusa pällāmar
7. (4+3) cintāmañi wame(r) ra
8. (4+4) t(arnes=äss)i cuññe ašām
9. (4+3) mant twe š lkāstar ly,šālñesa
10. (4+3) (mant) t(w)e pälk(mo) (šćirin)ne
11. (4+4) lkãsi šuke pidär-mani
12. (4+3) tusa tusa (pällāmar)
- II. 13. (4+3) (entse warñ)ai klešanma
14. (4+4) etañkätte (ko)r wikāššeñca
15. (4+3) (kartse nervā)n šaññiññe
16. (4+3) kätko-preke poyšintans
17. (4+4) mrāš tarnene yuwssi ašām
18. (4+3) tusa tusa (pällāmar)
19. (4+3) vaineyäšše(ñ) wl(olm)encsa
20. (4+4) krent-pälskošše(ñ) yo(ñiyanmen)
21. (4+3) päkri tākow olyart(se)
22. (4+3) (ši)l(š)e (ca)ndā(n sāt)k(ocai)
23. (4+4) (pelaiknešše nomiyešo)
24. (4+3) tusa tusa pällāmar
- III. 25. (4+3) papāšsorñe (aklyiññe)
26. (4+4) ompol(skoññe) (tsiromñe) ce
27. (4+3) krentomnatsa nomyenta
28. (4+3) (wmer-sa)mutär ram šäte
29. (4+4) ayātautse (kartse wāšmo)

30. (4+3) āktikesa nesalye
31. (4+3) (māk)tomñeṣṣe kārṣa(ke)
32. (4+4) (osta-ṣm)eñcans āyorāṣṣe
33. (4+3) preke preke snai (yärm)
34. (4+3) (mā)k(=arañcs=āñim) (er)ṣeñca
35. (4+4) (se kraupeṣṣe) sār nomiye
36. (4+3) yarke(sa ci winā)skow

Translation of the Tocharian text.

- I. (1) (Like the rising) of the sun-god, (2) having made the moon as medicine for the man, (3) like the diadem of god Indra, (4) like the garland of god Brahṃā, (5) [you are] a nectar to be seen, o Father Mani, (6) therefore, therefore I praise [you]. (7) Like the *cintāmaṇi*-jewel, (8) [you are] worthy to be worn on the top of the head as ornament. (9) As you also, you are seen through your enlightening, (10) as you are gleaming among (the stars), (11) [you are] a nectar to be seen, o Father Mani, (12) therefore, therefore I praise [you].
- II. (14) Driving away the myriad, without being hindered, (13) of the passions, starting with greed, (15) the good *nirvāṇa* [is] your own nature, (17) [you are] worthy to be brought forth in the top of the head[s] by the omniscients of past time ; (18) therefore, therefore I praise [you]. (20) From the paths of good thoughts (19) (taken) by the converted human beings, (21) he has appeared obviously as superior. (23) To the jewel of the Law, (22) having spread the sandal [fragrance] of pure behaviour, (24) therefore, therefore, I praise.
- III. (25) Moral behaviour, (teaching), (26) meditation, (energy), these (27) [are] the jewels of the virtue. (28) Rich like an ocean of gems, (29) appropriately (a good friend), (30) it will become manifest as a wonder (in the world), the ploughman of the relief, (32) concerning the alms of the (householders), (33) time after time, without (limit), (34) arousing (much desire in the heart), (35) (this) jewel of the quintessence (of a community) ; (36) with reverence (I worship you).

References and abbreviations

- Adams, Douglas Quentin (1999): *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam-Atlanta (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 10).
- ATG = Gabain, Annemarie von (1974): *Alttürkische Grammatik*, 3. Auflage. Wiesbaden.
- BT IX = Tekin, Şinasi (1980): *Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule*.- 1. Teil: Transliteration, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen.- 2. Teil: Analytischer und rückläufiger Index. Berlin (Berliner Turfantexte IX).
- Carling, Gerd (2000): *Die Funktionen der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin-New York.

- CDIAL = Turner, Ralph Lilley (1966): *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London-New York.
- Clark, Larry (1982): The Manichean Turkic Poethi-Book. In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 9, pp. 145-218.
- Clauson, Gerard (1972): *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish*. Oxford.
- Couvreux, Walter (1961): review of TT IX. In: *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, XVIII, N° 1/2, January-March 1961, pp. 100-102.
- Eimer, Helmut (1976): *Skizzen des Erlösungsweges in buddhistischen Begriffsreihen*. Bonn (Arbeitsmaterialien zur Religionsgeschichte. 1).
- Filliozat, Jean (1948): *Fragments de textes kouchéens de médecine et de magie*. Texte, parallèles sanskrits et tibétains, traduction et glossaire. Paris.
- Hahn, Michael (2007): *Vom rechten Leben. Buddhistische Lehren aus Indien und Tibet*. Aus dem Sanskrit und aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt und herausgegeben. Frankfurt am Main-Leipzig.
- Hamilton, James Russell (1971): *Le Conte bouddhique du Bon et du Mauvais Prince en version ouïgoure*. Texte établi, traduit et commenté. Paris.
- Hartmann, Jens Uwe (1987): *Das Varṇārhavarṇastotra des Mātṛceṣa*, herausgegeben und übersetzt. Göttingen (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden. XII).
- Hitch, Doug (1993): The Kuchean Hymn in Manichean script. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 6, pp. 95-132.
- Hofmann, Erich (1963): review of TT IX. In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 113, pp. 412-414.
- Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim (1989): *Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts. Iranische und türkische liturgische Texte der Manichäer Zentralasiens*. Opladen.
- Lamotte, Étienne (1976): *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*. I: *Des origines à l'ère Śāka*. Louvain-la-Neuve (Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste, 14).
- MIndic = Middle Indic.
- Malzahn, Melanie (2007): The most archaic manuscripts of Tocharian B and the varieties of Tocharian B language. In: M. Malzahn (ed.), *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Heidelberg, pp. 255-300.
- Moriyasu, Takao (2004): *Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße*. *Forschungen zu manichäischen Quellen und ihrem geschichtlichen Hintergrund*. Wiesbaden.
- MW = M. Monier-Williams (1899): *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford.
- MSN = Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka in Tocharian A.
- OT = Old Turkic.
- PED = T.W. Rhys Davis and William Stede (1921-1925): *The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary*. London.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean (2002): Tokh. B *k_ucaññe*, A *k_ucim* et skr. *tokharika*. In: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 45, pp. 311-345.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean (2003): Contacts linguistiques en Asie Centrale à la lumière des textes tokhariens. In: S. Bretfeld & J. Wilkens (eds.), *Indien und Zentralasien. Sprach- und Kulturkontakt* (Vorträge des Göttinger Symposions vom 7. bis 10. Mai 2001). Wiesbaden, pp. 45-83.
- Poucha, Pavel (1955): *Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A*. Praha (Monografie Archivu Orientálního, Vol. XV, Pars 1).

- Rhys Davids C.A.F. (1907): Similes in the Nikāyas. In: *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 1906-1907, pp. 52-151.
- Rybatzki, Volker (1997). *Die Toñuquq-Inscription*. Szeged (Studia uralo-altaica, No. 40).
- Schmidt, Klaus T. (1974): *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. Diss. Göttingen.
- Schmidt, Klaus T. (1986): Bemerkungen zur westtocharischen Umgangssprache. In: Annemarie Etter (ed.), *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*. Berlin-New York, pp. 635-649.
- SWTF = Waldschmidt, Ernst et al. (1973-): *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfanfunden*. Begonnen von Ernst Waldschmidt, hrsg. von Heinz Bechert et al. Im Auftrag der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Göttingen, 20 fascicles and 2 volumes published so far.
- TEB I = Krause, Wolfgang and Werner Thomas (1960): *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Bd. I: *Grammatik*. Heidelberg.
- TEB II = Thomas, Werner unter Mitwirkung von Wolfgang Krause (1964): *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Bd. II: *Texte und Glossar*. Heidelberg.
- Tekin, Talat (1968): *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. Bloomington, Indiana University (Uralic and Altaic Series, Vol. 69).
- Thomas, Werner (1960): review of TT IX. In: *Kratylos* 5, pp. 147-154.
- TT IX = Gabain, Annemarie and Werner Winter (1958): *Türkische Turfantexte IX. Ein Hymnus an den Vater Mani auf „Tocharisch“ B mit alttürkischer Übersetzung*. Berlin, Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jg. 1956, Nr. 2.
- UigW = Röhrborn, Klaus (1977-): *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien*. Wiesbaden.
- Wilkins, Jens (2000): *Altürkische Handschriften*. Teil 8: *Manichäisch-türkische Texte der Berliner Turfansammlung*. Stuttgart (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Bd. XIII, 16).
- Wilkins, Jens (2008): Musings on the Manichaean “pothi” book. *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 23, pp. 209-231.
- Winter, Werner (1955): A linguistic classification of “Tocharian” B texts. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 75, pp. 216-225 (= 2005, pp. 1-10).
- Winter, Werner (2005): *Kleine Schriften/Selected Writings*. Selected and edited by Olav Hackstein. Volume 1. Bremen.
- WTG = Krause, Wolfgang (1952): *Westtocharische Grammatik*. Bd. I: *Das Verbum*. Heidelberg.
- Yoshida, Yutaka (1999): review of Dieter Weber (ed.), *Iranian Manichaean Turfan texts in publications since 1934. Photo edition* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum. Supplementary series, Vol. 4). London, 2000. In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, N.S. Vol. 13, pp. 191-196.