OUKA
The University of Osaka
Institutional Knowledge Archive

Title	Śāriputra and the Girl Reborn as a Dog : A Further Tocharian B Parallel to the Old Uyghur Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā
Author(s)	Pinault, Georges-Jean; Peyrot, Michaël; Wilkens, Jens
Citation	内陸アジア言語の研究. 2017, 32, p. 15-31
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/67836
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

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

The University of Osaka

Studies on the Inner Asian Languages 32, 2017.10, 15–31

Śāriputra and the Girl Reborn as a Dog

A Further Tocharian B Parallel to the Old Uyghur *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*

Georges-Jean PINAULT*
Michaël PEYROT**
Jens WILKENS***

1. Introduction

Previous studies have definitely shown that several stories of the Old Uyghur *Daśakarma-pathāvadānamālā* (henceforth *DKPAM*) are based on a Tocharian B model, possibly through a Tocharian A intermediary.[1] The Old Uyghur *DKPAM* may even as a whole go back to a Tocharian original. The best evidence for this was provided by a manuscript of the fonds Pelliot (Bibliothèque nationale de France) bearing the press mark PK AS 13, of which two fragments could be shown to have a close parallel in the Old Uyghur *DKPAM*: PK AS 13B, which belongs to the story of Kalmāṣapāda and Sutasoma,[2] and PK AS 13I, which belongs to the story of Supāraga.[3] The wording of the texts in Tocharian B proves that the Pelliot manuscript originally contained a collection of stories (*avadāna*), which was close to the model of the Old Uyghur *DKPAM*. The present paper is based on the confirmation that one further fragment of the same manuscript, PK AS 13H.1, also contains a legend which corresponds to a story of the *DKPAM*. The first reading of the TochB text was made by Pinault, and the identification of the content has been made by Wilkens in June 2016. The further analysis of the parallel texts has been collaborative work of all three authors.

2. Outline of the tale

The story in question belongs to the chapter of the *DKPAM* which concerns the 9th *karmapatha*, devoted to illustrate by narratives the bad consequences of 'malice'[4] (Skt. *vyāpāda-*, TochB *māntalñe*, TochA *māntlune*, OU *övkä*, *övkä köŋül*). Its original place in the arrangement of this chapter of the *DKPAM* is not

* Professeur, École Pratique des Hautes Études à la Sorbonne
** Researcher, Leiden University Centre for Linguistics, Universiteit Leiden
*** Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter, Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen

1 See Peyrot 2013 and Peyrot – Wilkens 2014; Wilkens 2016, pp. 10–13 with previous literature.

2 Pinault – Wilkens – Peyrot 2014.

3 Pinault – Peyrot – Wilkens 2017.

4 BHSD, p. 518a.

assured yet.[5] The story is about the reincarnation of a girl who had shown her malice by insulting female co-religionists at the time of the Buddha Kāśyapa and is reborn first as a female dog, and finally as the daugther of a wealthy merchant (Skt. *śreṣṭhin-*, OU *bayagut*) or householder (TochB *osta-ṣmeñca*, usual match of Skt. *gṛhapati-*, see the translation of the Tibetan version below). As a reward for the welcoming behavior of the female dog during his visits to the house, Śāriputra, one of the main disciples of the Buddha Śākyamuni, orders the rich man to bury the bones of the animal in a small box inside his house. Later, the wife of the merchant gives birth to a girl, who is however reluctant to listen to the Law. Śāriputra has the bones of the dog taken out and shows them to her. Thereafter the daugher of the merchant realizes through the power of vision entrusted to her by Śāriputra that these bones are from her own corpse from a former incarnation. She confesses her previous faults, immediately enters the order as a nun (*bhikṣuṇī*), and even becomes a venerable woman (*arhantī*). This story is known by several versions, in Sanskrit, Chinese, Tibetan, and Old Uyghur.[6] Its discovery in TochB was to be expected, but is particularly welcome within the framework of the research on the *DKPAM*.

The Tibetan collection of edifying tales entitled *Karmaśataka* contains a story which is identical to the one of the *DKPAM*, and which provides some help for understanding the TochB version. The résumé of the Tibetan version of the tale, entitled "la Chienne" (Skt. *śunī*), 'the female dog', is given here in Feer's translation (1901, pp. 61–63), with adaptation of the Sanskrit terms to the transcription in current use nowadays. Each story confronts the present time, or existence, of the main character, with its former existence:

> *Temps présent.* – Un riche maître de maison de Śrāvastī, devenu père, avait pris, pour amuser son enfant, une jeune chienne qui ne pouvait voir un Tīrthika sans se jeter sur lui avec fureur, tandis qu'elle faisait aux bhikṣu le plus gracieux accueil. Śāriputra, dans sa tournée d'aumônes, s'étant présenté devant cette maison, la chienne lui lécha les pieds avec un tel entrain que le maître de maison, éclairé par là sur le mérite de ce bhikṣu, l'invita à dîner. Il prit tant de plaisir à l'enseignement de la loi par lequel le religieux payait son écot, qu'il renouvela fréquemment l'invitation. Fort reconnaissant envers sa chienne du bienfait dont il lui était redevable, et dont elle-même prenait sa part, il lui donnait les soins les plus empressés ; mais le pauvre animal tomba malade. Heureusement, Śāriputra arriva sur ces entrefaites et prononça les quatre sentences : (1° nul saṃskāra n'est permanent, 2° tout saṃskāra est douleur ; 3° aucune loi n'est le moi ; 4° le Nirvāṇa est le repos). – La chienne mourut dans les

5 Text and translation in Wilkens 2016, pp. 730–737. Previous account of the OU version in Wilkens 2010, p. 29, which is now superseded by the whole edition and the references given in the next note. The title given by Wilkens to the story is "Śāriputra und der *śreṣṭhi*".

6 See the survey by Wilkens 2016, p. 97, and the reconstruction of the OU text by Wilkens 2015, pp. 307–311, with an account of the parallel versions.

meilleures dispositions lorsque Śāriputra revint ; et le bhikṣu conseilla au maître de maison de mettre les ossements de l'animal dans une cachette.

Peu après, la femme du maître de maison donna naissance à une fille qui, devenue grande, résistait aux exhortations à entendre la loi que son père lui adressait. Alors, sur le conseil de Śāriputra, les ossements de la chienne furent sortis de leur cachette et mis par le religieux lui-même sous les yeux de la jeune fille dont les dispositions changèrent immédiatement ; elle devint auditrice de la loi, bhikṣuṇī, Arhatī. Elle ne parlait plus que de ce que Śāriputra avait fait pour elle.

Temps passé. – Cette jeune fille, qui n'était autre que la chienne revenue à la vie, avait été, au temps du Buddha Kāśyapa, la fille d'un maître de maison de Bénarès. Initiée à l'enseignement du Buddha et devenue très savante, elle avait voulu, pour témoigner sa reconnaissance, faire le service des deux assemblées. Un jour, ne trouvant pas dans ses compagnes le concours nécessaire, elle leur reprocha durement de n'être propres à rien, se plaignant d'être elle-même traitée comme une chienne. Sur les représentations charitables des offensées, elle exprima son repentir et fit un praṇidhāna pour obtenir, en récompense du bien qu'elle avait fait, l'avantage de naître dans une famille riche et d'arriver à l'état d'Arhat sous le premier disciple de Kāśyapa quand il serait Buddha.

Conclusion. – En punition des paroles injurieuses lancées à la Confrérie féminine de Kāśyapa, elle était née chienne cinq cents fois. En récompense de son repentir, de son praṇidhāna et de ses autres bonnes actions, elle était née femme pour la dernière fois dans une maison riche, et avait obtenu sous le Buddha Śākyamuni l'état d'Arhat.

It has been noted by Wilkens (2015, pp. 310–311) that in the OU version of the *DKPAM* the girl is reborn as a dog (OU *ıt*) and not as a female dog (Skt. *śunī*-, fem. of *śvan*-). In the TochB text, it is definitely a dog (*ku*, obl. sg. *kweṃ*), but one may consider the possibility that Tocharian had no specific feminine form for the female dog. The agreement with demonstratives and adjective, see lines a6 and a7 of the Toch B text below, shows definitely that the noun had masculine gender.

3. Edition of the Tocharian B fragment PK AS 13H.1

Description

The fragment is the lower right corner (of the recto; upper right corner of the verso) of a leaf of large size. It measures 15,6 cms in width and 11,2 cms in height. The interline spacing is 2,1 cms. The right corner is still visible, and the right and lower margins (of the recto; upper margin of the verso) of the leaf are preserved. The width of the right margin is comparable to that of the margins of PK AS 13B and 13I: between 2,4 and 3,0 cms for the recto, and between 2,1 and 2,7 for the verso. Out of the whole series PK AS 13, only 13H.1 is similar to 13B and 13I as concerns the type of paper, the size of the akṣaras, the interline spacing and the

ductus, which is relatively late.[7] Accordingly, one must assume that each side had 8 lines (which are still found in fragment PK AS 13I), of which no more than 5 have only been partly preserved. As for most fragments of the series PK AS 13, there is no indication of the find site, but one may surmise that it was found in the region of Kucha, as almost all other Tocharian manuscripts of the Pelliot collection. The identification of the recto and the verso has been made possible only with the help of the OU parallel text. The only passage of this fragment which has been quoted until now is a7 *ta-ñim o(sta-ṣmeñcantse)*,[8] with reference to the verso, and with erroneous line numbering. The source was probably a provisional transliteration made by Walter Couvreur, communicated to Emil Sieg. As other readings of unpublished fragments of the Pelliot collection, these data were used later by scholars of Sieg's school.[9]

The text is on the whole written in standard TochB, but shows three instances of careless spelling, two in the same line (b3),[10] one due to the contact of yod and palatal nasal (b1),[11] and two undeniable late forms: *tañim* (a7) for *ptañ̃im*, 1sg. imperfect active,[12] and *särweśe* (b2) for *särwece* 'destiny'.[13] As for the 1sg. imperfect active *ṣeym* (b2), this is not diagnostic by itself for lateness, because the variant *ey* for *ai* (3rd sg. *ṣey* for archaic *ṣai*, etc.) is found already in classical texts.[14]

---

7 Despite its press mark, the tiny fragment PK AS 13H.2, written in the normal classical script type, belongs to a totally different manuscript, so that it does not make any join with our fragment. Actually, the series PK AS 13 gathers 15 fragments of leaves of large size, numbered from 13A to 13K, which belonged originally to (at least) 7 different manuscripts, even though they all contain fragments of Buddhist narratives, cf. Pinault 2007, pp. 176–177. We note in passing that fragment PK AS 13J, which contains part of the Āṭavaka-Avadāna, does belong to a different manuscript, while this popular story is found in the OU *DKPAM*.

8 Bernhard (1958, pp. 44, 174, 196, 240 n. 137), and Thomas (1967, p. 76, with the reference "PK 13 H b4f.") where similar compounds with 'name' as second member and a demonstrative as first member are quoted. This restoration was of course based on the comparison with the second occurrence of the compound *osta-ṣmeñcantse* in the next line. In addition, *särweśe* (b2) has been quoted by Broomhead (1962, vol. II, p. 201), albeit with a typo (*särweśc*), as the singular of *särwecaṃ* (sic) 'an existence-form', with the reference PK 13H a2. Since in the original script a misreading of <śe> as <śc> is impossible, this proves once more that Broomhead prepared his glossary on the basis of notes, most probably of Couvreur, while he did not dispose of photos of the originals (see also Wilkens – Peyrot forth.).

9 See for instance the references to several verbal forms given by Krause (1952), extracted from texts which were not yet published at that time.

10 One may wonder why these mistakes have not been corrected by the scribe or by a reviser. This suggests that the manuscript was written down on the basis of an oral recitation, and not directly copied from a correct and clean manuscript.

11 See the remark about this partly restored passage below.

12 About this interpretation of the sequence *tañim*, see the discussion in the remarks about the transcription and translation below. This has been previously (see above, note 8) interpreted as *ta-ñim*, which would contain a late form of *ñem* 'name'.

13 On the latter, see the remarks about the transcription below.

14 Discussion in Peyrot 2008, pp. 58–59, 2012, pp. 107–108, and Malzahn 2010, pp. 253–256.

Transliteration[15]

a 4. /// kintarikn· || a[ñm]· – – ·[ñ]· – – [l]yk[ā][1]

5. /// pakenta prentse lkāṣṣītr̲a̲ : pelaikneṣṣe

6. /// maimañcu pitka ce$_u$ srukoṣ̲ kweṃ

7. /// weṣṣ̲a̲ṃ maimañcī ceṃ kweṃ tañim̲ o

8. /// sta-ṣmeñcantse tkācer̲ meleṃ wawā

b 1. /// [tr]·yo[2] ñäkcīye ek̲ wasa nauṣ ṣa

2. /// [ṣe]ym̲[ä] ñī se s̲a̲rweśe ste • || k̲a̲

3. /// [e]rsnasa[3] plontimar ñirś[ä][4] ce lmelne[5]

4. /// ·[dh]·rv[e]ṃts̲[6] rīye erepate mā ṣek̲ tne : tkā

5. /// [āro][7] – – ṅkal[ñ]e śai[ṣ·]e ··[ṃ] [ṣ(·)ark̲a̲] – l(·)esa

Textual notes

1. The extremity of the stroke marking the °*ā* or °*o* vocalism on the right of the akṣara is still visible.
2. The right half of the preceding akṣara, which is almost completely erased, is barely seen, but it is definitely a ligature. There is place for a vocalic sign on the top, either °*e* or °*i*, but not °*ā,* nor °*o*, °*au*.
3. The reading of the first akṣara of this word is almost certain. The initial *e*° is identical to the instances in b1 and b4, even though the ink has been slightly effaced by humidity. The little trace above is most probably a stain.
4. Sic! The reading is sure. The intended form can only be the 1st singular pronoun *ñiś*. This mistake is due to perseveration of the /r/ of the preceding ligature <rñi>. Note that the final *-ś* is written, as it is often the case for the 1st singular personal pronoun, without Fremdzeichen, but with notation of the vowel <ä> on the top of the standard akṣara.
5. Sic! The reading is sure. The form *lmelne* does not make sense. The only possible form is *cmelne*, locative singular of *camel* ‘birth’. The scribe has anticipated the initial *l*° of the next ligature. The form *cmelne* is well attested as the verse variant of the locative sg. of *camel* ‘birth’, prose form *camelne*. The phrase *ce cmelne* is found in B 14 a4, B 32 b3, B 50 a3, B 102 2, B 123 b6, B 146 a2, B 146 b7, PK AS 6C b5; *cek cmelne* in B 25 b3.7, B 69 b5, B 547 a2.
6. One may hesitate to read <rveṃ>, and not <rvaṃ>, because the ink has vanished on the top of this akṣara. But there is a slight trace of the /e/ and the place of the anusvāra on top of the akṣara implies that there was a vocalic sign immediately to the left. Furthermore, the “thematic” form *gandharve* (from Skt. *gandharva-* masc.) is best attested in TochB, cf. nom. sg. *gandharve* (B 177 a2!), *gandharwe* (B 177 a3), nom. pl. *gandhārvi* (B 73 b5, B 408 a3) *gandharvvi* (B 382 a1). However,

15 We follow the usual conventions for editing Tocharian manuscripts, see Wilkens – Pinault – Peyrot 2014, p. 9 n. 18.

TochA has the non-thematic form *gandharv*, see references in Carling (2009, p. 188b).

7. The paper is rather damaged on the left, where the ink has been severely erased. With few exceptions, this line preserves only the top of some akṣaras. After an akṣara with °*o* vocalism (°*au* being excluded), there is place for two large akṣaras, before the next complete word, *(e)ṅkalñe*, which is the only possible restoration. Therefore, one may admit that this lacuna contained the final punctuation of the previous verse part.

Transcription and restoration

a 4. /// (||) kintarikn(e) || añm(alāṣṣäl)ñ(esa pä)lykā-(ne)

5. /// (: mā śtwār=empreṃtse) pakenta prentse lkāṣṣīträ : pelaikneṣṣe

6. /// maimañcu pitka ce_u srukoṣ kweṃ

7. /// weṣṣäṃ maimañcī ceṃ kweṃ tañim o(stne eneṅka)

8. /// (o)sta-ṣmeñcantse tkācer meleṃ wawā(skäṣṣusa)

b 1. /// (pu)tr(i)yo ñäkcīye ek wasa nauṣ ṣa(ñ)

2. /// ṣeym ñī se särweśe ste ⋅ || kä(ryorttaññene ||)

3. /// (krenta) ersnasa plontimar ñi{ś} ce {c}melne

4. /// (ga)ndh(a)rveṃts rīye erepate mā ṣek tne : tkā(cer)

5. /// āro(y) – – (e)ṅkalñe śaiṣṣe(me)ṃ ṣ(p)arkä(ṣṣa)l(ñ)esa

Metre

The restorations that can be proposed depend partly on the identification of the metrical parts. On the basis of the edition of fragment PK AS 13B, one can assume that each line of the leaves of this manuscript had approximately 35 to 40 akṣaras, and that lines 4–5, being affected by the string hole space, had approximately 4 or 5 akṣaras less.[16] The tune name in a4 is attested otherwise only in B 91 b6, which contains only the beginning of the first pāda, so that the structure remained unknown.[17] The extant words *rājavat yok matsi cwimp* in B 91 may be segmented as 4+3 or 6 + something, excluding any segment of 5 syllables at the beginning. Line a5 of our fragment has the end of one pāda, presumably the third one, which can be segmented 5+3 or 3+5. A stanza of 4×13 syllables would fit the available space. At the beginning of line a5, the last 5 syllables of pāda a, all 13 syllables of pāda b, and the first 5 syllables of pāda c would be missing. The total length of line a5 would then be the 23 syllables that are lost plus the 12 akṣaras that are preserved, which corresponds nicely to the somewhat smaller number of akṣaras in the lines with the string hole space, to which a5 certainly belongs. At the beginning of a6 the last 9 syllables of pāda d are lost,

16 Wilkens – Pinault – Peyrot 2014, p. 11, Pinault – Peyrot – Wilkens 2017.

17 Sieg – Siegling 1953, p. 29 n. 13; idem in Thomas 1983, p. 114 n. 13. The text is translated by Schmidt (2001, p. 322) without identification of the metre.

followed by approximately 20 akṣaras of prose until the preserved /// *maimañcu* ‘o clever one!’, which must be the beginning of a stretch of direct speech since it is a vocative. This analysis of the metre forces us to assume variation between a subdivision 6/7 for pāda a, and possibly b, and a subdivision 5/5/3 for pāda c. While 5/5/3 is the more regular subdivision, 6/7 is attested also.[18] The beginning of pāda d would fit both possibilities.

On the verso side, the existence of a metrical part is warranted by the punctuation mark in line b4. In line b2, the single dot before the double daṇḍa marks the end of a prose section, which belongs to a passage with direct speech. Accordingly, this speech continues in verse, see the first person singular in b3. The only tune name beginning with *kä-* that is so far known is TochB *käryorttañ̈ñene*,[19] which is well identified as having 4×12 syllables, rhythm 5/7, and fits here perfectly. At the beginning of line b3, the rest of the tune name, *ryorttañ̈ñene*, must have been lost, and 24 syllables of pādas a and b, followed by the first two akṣaras of pāda c. The preserved portion of line b3 thus contains nearly the whole pāda 1c, which ended with *ce {c}melne*, while the following verse punctuation was probably found at the beginning of line b4. The total length of line b3 must accordingly have been the 30 syllables that are lost plus the 10 akṣaras that are preserved, which fits perfectly for a line without string hole space. At the beginning of line b4, the 24 syllables of pādas 1d and 2a, as well as the first syllable of 2b must have been lost. Pāda 2b ends with *ṣek tne*. The total length of line b4 was then the 25 syllables that are lost plus the 14 akṣaras that are preserved. Line b5 contained the last 11 syllables of pāda 2c and the whole of pāda 2d. The end of the second strophe, probably the end of this metrical section, must have been found just before the first preserved traces of line b5.

In several Tocharian texts one may notice some accordance between the choice of a given tune and the general narrative content or thematics of a given passage. The name *käryorttañ̈ñe* is based on *käryorttau* ‘merchant’, and this would comply with a scene which takes place in the house of a rich householder or chief of guild (Skt. *śreṣṭhin-*).[20]

Translation

a 4. … (||) In the *kintarik* [tune] || With sympathy he looked (at her) …

5. … She did (not) see in an instant (the four) parts (of the truth), the … of the Law …

6. … O clever one! Order this dead dog (to be dug up) …

7. … he says: O clever ones! I did worship (with a reliquary) that dog (inside the h)ouse …

8. … the daughter of the householder made her nose turn away.

---

18 See Thomas 1983, pp. 273–274.

19 Found in B 350 b3 (written *käryortañ̈ñene*), PK NS 31 b5, NS 36.A a1 (restored). The TochA match is *kuryartānaṃ*, in A 118 b5.

20 MW, p. 1102c.

b 1. … he offered [his] divine eye to the (girl), (for seeing) her own former (existences) …
2. … I was … This is my destiny. || (In the [tune] of the merchant ||)
3. … I enjoyed a (nice) shape in this existence.
4. … (Like) a city of Gandharvas, beauty here (= in this world) is not forever. (As the) daughter
5. … may come to an end. Through dispersing the attachment out of the world …

Remarks on the transcription and translation of the fragment

a4–5. The description in verse concerns most likely Śāriputra and the teaching which he delivered to the girl, when she was reluctant to study the *dharma*, *DKPAM*, 09588–09590 (transl. Wilkens 2016, p. 735). By comparison with the *Karmaśataka* and the OU version, one may assume that Śāriputra continued the efforts of the householder to lecture his daughter about the Law.

a4. The final verb form, which belongs certainly to the preterite of the verb *pälkā-* 'to seek, look at', must have been followed by a suffixed pronoun, *(pä)lykā-(ne)*, because of the vocalism of the second syllable. A middle form *(pä)lykā(te)* is probably no option, since the middle does not show medial palatalisation on the evidence of IOL Toch 145 b3 *pälkāte*. The motif of the gracious or compassionate gaze of a superior person is commonplace; it is often said of the Buddha or a Bodhisattva, and in the present case of a major disciple of the Buddha.

a5. The word *pakenta* 'parts', plural of *pāke*, was most probably preceded by a number. It referred to the fundamental points of the Buddhist doctrine taught by Śāriputra to the daughter of the rich merchant, see OU *nom tıŋlamatın*, *DKPAM*, 09589. Consequently, the subject of the verb *lkāṣṣīträ* is probably the girl, and the whole sentence is negative. According to the restitution of the metre proposed above, there are five syllables of the pāda missing before *pakenta*. There is then enough place for the negation and for the numeral *śtwāra*, referring to the four noble truths (Skt. *ārya-satya-*), alternatively for the numeral *śak wi*, referring to the twelve parts of the chain of causes (Skt. *pratītyasamutpāda-*). The proposed restoration corresponds to the former possibility. It is possible as a further alternative that the content of the teaching was detailed in the next pāda.

a6. The vocative sg. masc. *maimañcu*, of *maimantse* 'skillful, clever, excellent' is addressed by Śāriputra to the rich merchant, the householder (*osta-ṣmeñca*). This word is already known as a term of address, see for instance B 99 a3. There is seemingly an OU parallel passage which reads, *DKPAM*, 09567–09568 "O edler *śreṣṭhi*, befiehl, dass man diesen Hund … in der Erde begräbt!" (transl. Wilkens 2016, p. 733). But we surmise that Śāriputra gives order to *excavate* the corpse of the dog in order to show it to the girl. This is the stratagem of Śāriputra to overcome the failure of the previous teaching to the girl. This interpretation seems to be needed in view of the fact that the daughter has already seen the corpse of the dog in line a8. If a6 referred to the burial of the dog, there would not be enough space to recount the events until the excavation of the dog. The excavation of the dog is not extant in the OU version.

a7. Since there is no separate vocative plural form in the Toch. languages, *maimañcī*, formally the nom. pl. masc. of *maimantse*, must stand for a vocative, addressed to all possible attendants of the scene, the people of the house, family, servants, including the householder and his daughter. Accordingly, Śāriputra is speaking again (*weṣṣäṃ*). He replies to the reaction of surprise or amazement on the part of the audience, which was possibly expressed by some question of the attendants, after the order given by the monk. Śāriputra then explains the history of this dog, which he has known many years ago. The sequence of the narrative leads to revise the reading and restitution *ta-ñim o(sta-ṣmeñcantse)*, which had been admitted by the first interpreters of this text, starting most probably by Sieg himself: 'that dog of the so-and-so named householder'. Actually, this interpretation raises several problems, at formal and semantic levels. 1) The alleged compound *ta-ñim*, as standing for *ta-ñem*, recalls similar naming formulations: IOL Toch 92 a4, b 1.3 *ñiś te-ñemtsa pañäkte*, B 81a4 *su (t)e-ñem walo* (mistakenly *ke-ñem* in the manuscript),[21] A 381.1.4 *ñuk (tä)ṣne-ñomā aśi*, A 130b1 *tämnek-ñomā wäl*, etc.[22] In that case, *ta-* is wrong, because one would expect *te-ñim*, with the neuter demonstrative pronoun as first member. 2) As for *ñim* itself, this would be a late variant of *ñem* 'name', which would not be so disturbing in a late text, see the examples recorded by Peyrot (2008, p. 59).[23] But all other instances belong to Eastern late texts,[24] whereas PK AS 13H.1 most probably stems from the region of Kucha. It is likely that these examples of *ñim* for *ñem* 'name' were the motivation for the interpretation reported by Bernhard (1958) and Thomas (1967).[25] 3) The alleged mention of the 'so-and-so householder' seems totally superfluous, unless one admits that the dog is not buried where the dialogue takes place. In all instances of TochB *te-ñem* or *te-ñemtsa*, as well as of the similar TochA phrases, the name has been given in the preceding context or it will be given immediately afterwards. But it is expected that the daughter of the householder, who is not married, is still living at the home of her father. All attendants belong to the same house, which Śāriputra knows very well, because he has been a regular guest and alms-receiver of the head of this house, the father of the girl. Reminding the name of the

---

21 Sieg – Siegling 1949, p. 19 n. 9; Thomas 1983, p. 104 n. 9.

22 Further examples in Thomas 1967, pp. 65, 75–76.

23 Note however that this form from PK AS 13H.1 was not quoted by Peyrot (2008, p. 59), nor previously by Stumpf (1990, p. 125).

24 B 199b4 (late, Murtuq, *ñim* corrected into *ñem*), B 297.1b3 (late, Tuyuq, *ñimtsa*), B 296a9 (late, Xočo, *tiyśiṃ* for *tiṣyeṃ*, proper name), etc.

25 See the references given above, note 8. Among these examples one could have been especially understood as supporting the reading of *ta-ñim*: *ṣañim* (B 297.1 b4), interpreted by Sieg as *ṣañem* for *ṣañ ñem* (Sieg and Siegling 1953, p. 47 n. 8 and 189 n. 2), and canonized by Schmidt (1974, pp. 311–312 and 562). Actually, B 297.1 b4 reads *ṣañim lāntso s_asū(wa) wsāsta brāhmaṇets* 'you gave yourself, the queen and [your] sons to the Brahmins', so that *ṣañim* stays for *ṣañ āñm*, which is meant as well by the form *ṣañem*, found also in a fragment from Tuyuq: B 109 b2 *$k_u$catākmeṃ ṣañem ette ṣallāte* 'she threw herself down from the tower'. Both spellings can be explained starting from the reflexive pronoun, classical *ṣañ āñm*, through raising of the second vowel (**ṣañañm*) and palatalization between two palatal nasals (**ṣañeñm*, **ṣañiñm*) and subsequent dissimilation of the second nasal (Pinault 2013, p. 342 n. 1), hence *ṣañem* and *ṣañim*, in the latter case in the text which contains (B 297.1 b3) *ñimtsa* for *ñemtsa*.

householder to the addressees seems to be irrelevant for the narrative. According to the legend as told in the *Karmaśataka* (see above), Śāriputra had ordered to bury the dead dog in a small box put in a secret place,[26] but not outside of the house, nor in a different house. In the OU version the dog is buried 'in the earth' (*yer-dä*),[27] understood as the ground of the abode, because its relics should ensure the prosperity of the house. Since many years have passed, this would be enough to explain that some people of the house have to search for these remnants, because they had not themselves been witness of the burial. Of course, the restoration of *o(sta-ṣmeñcantse)* was motivated by its occurrence in the next line, but alternative restorations would be perfectly acceptable, while involving a form a house (*ost*), such as the locative *ostne*, or the phrase *ostne eneṅka* 'inside the house', as proposed here. A further possibility would be *ostaṣṣai keṃne* 'in the ground of the house'.

It is then commendable to interpret *tañim* in a way that fits the order of events and the logic of ideas. On the formal side, the most promising possibility is the 1sg. imperfect active of some verb, with present stem in *-ññä-* (class XII).[28] The simplification of the geminate *-ñ-* does not come as a surprise in a late text,[29] which shows in addition instances of careless spelling. Śāriputra recalls his past action: this verb probably means something like 'to worship, honor', because Śāriputra decided to have this dead dog buried with honors and prayers inside the house, as tribute to the animal which was so friendly to him, in order to further its good rebirth. The underlying idea is that Śāriputra anticipated and prepared the rebirth of the dog as a human, and precisely as the girl born in the same house as daughter of the householder. Since the loss of intial *p-* before obstruent is common in late texts, one is free to restore the verb as *ptañim*, for *ptañ̃im*, of a verb stem *ptañ̃ä-* (< **pät-äñ̃ä-*) 'to make a stūpa, to honor with a stūpa', denominative of *pat* (< **pät*) 'stūpa', plural *ptanma*.[30] The box where the remnants of the dog had been put for burial was symbolically similar to the reliquary enclosed in a shrine. The notion is akin to the one of Pāli *cetiya-pūjā* 'worship of a shrine'.[31] The formation of denominative verbs in *-ññä-* has been productive in Tocharian, and continues to be so in both languages, compare B *täṅkw-äññ-* (A *tuṅk-iññ-*) 'to love' (B *taṅkw*, A *tuṅk*), B *kwipe-ññ-* 'to be ashamed' (B *kwīpe*), B *winā-ññ-* (A *win-äññ-*) 'to enjoy, find pleasure in' (B *wīna*), A *sklok-äññ-* 'to despair' (A *sklok*), etc. A broad translation of the whole restored passage: 'O clever ones, I have honored that dog by a shrine set inside the house. Now, see it again through your own eyes'.

a8. The restoration of the verb form at the end remains uncertain. It must belong to the reduplicated preterite participle of a verbal root *wāC(C)-*, of which it can be an inflected form as the main predicate, or the derived absolutive. The verb *wākā-* (pret. part. *wawākau*, absol. *wawākarmeṃ*) would be formally

---

26 See also Wilkens 2015, p. 308.

27 See *DKPAM*, 09568 and 09572; Wilkens 2016, p. 732 (text) and 733 (translation).

28 Krause – Thomas 1960, pp. 216–217; Malzahn 2010, pp. 473–479.

29 Peyrot 2008, p. 64.

30 Adams 2013, p. 377.

31 PED, p. 371a.

possible, but these forms belong to the intransitive paradigm, meaning ‘to split apart, bloom’, said mostly of flowers.[32] The verb *wālā-* ‘to cover, surround, conceal’, pret. part. *wawālau*,[33] is an alternative which is not so appealing because one would expect the hand of the girl to be mentioned for blocking up her nostrils. The best option seems to be the verb *wäsk-*, intr. ‘to stir, move, wake’, in the causative-transitive paradigm ‘to move away’, [34] pret. part. *wawāskäṣṣu*, fem. nom. sg. *wawāskäṣṣusa*, alternatively absol. *wawāskäṣṣormeṃ*. See the OU parallel text, which is somewhat more developed, *DKPAM*, 09592–09594 “Nachdem jenes Mädchen den Leichnam des Hundes im Haus des *śreṣṭhi* gesehen hatte, ekelte sie sich sehr [vor] ihrer Nase und wandte ihr Gesicht ab” (Wilkens 2016, p. 735). The TochB text implies the attitude of disgust on the face of the girl, while seeing and smelling the stinking corpse of the dog. Therefore, the verb *wäsk-* should express here the main action of the sentence, i.e. that the girl wrinkles her nose. It is likely that the Uyghur translator misunderstood the phrase and chose to translate the verb *wäsk-* by using two verbs, i.e. *yarsı-* (‘to feel disgust’) and the phrasal verb *ınaru yüzlän-* (‘to turn away’). Thus he had to construct the first phrase with the argument in the ablative case (*burunıntın* ‘from her nose’) and the second with the accusative case (*yüzin* ‘her face’), both with possessive suffixes. At the beginning of line a8, there is enough space for a short sentence, continuing the direct speech of Śāriputra, so that the whole restored text would be as follows: ‘Look at it (the remnants of the dog inside the reliquary)! Thereupon, having seen the corpse of the dog, the daughter of the householder made her nose turn away’.

b1. The subject of the verb *wasa* is Śāriputra. The phrase ‘divine eye’ is literally translated by OU *t(ä)ŋridäm köz*, *DKPAM*, 09595–09596. Judging from the OU parallel text, the preceding word ought to refer to the girl (OU *kızka*), the merchant’s daughter. One should then take °*yo* as the final syllable of a feminine noun that followed the inflection of stems such as *śana* ‘wife’, obl. sg. *śano*, *lāntsa* ‘queen’, obl. sg. *lāntso*, *ṣarya* ‘darling’, obl. sg. *ṣaryo*, etc.[35] We restore *(pu)tr(i)yo*, a form which would follow this pattern, obl. sg. of *putriya*, loan from Skt. *putriyā*, which was itself the Buddhist Skt. match of Skt. *putrikā-*, Pkt. *puttikā-*, *puttiā-*, enlarged equivalent of Skt. *putrī-*, see Pāli *puttī-*, Pkt. *puttī-*, meaning ‘daughter’ and generally ‘girl’, also ‘doll, puppet’, feminine based on *putra-* masc., familiar doublet *putraka-* ‘little son’, Pāli *puttaka-*, Pkt. *puttaya-*.[36] According to the TochB parallel, the restoration *[körü]p* ‘looked’ in *DKPAM*, 09596 has to be reconsidered. Instead, the lacuna has to be filled in with *[b]e[ri]p* ‘gave’, ‘presented’. In view of line verso 4 of fragment Kr II 2/17, there is obviously no space for an accusative suffix. The subject of the verb *ötür-* in the same line is most likely the girl. Lines 09594–09596 would run as follows: *ayagka tägimlig šariputre arhant ridilıg küčin kızka t(ä)ŋridäm köz [b]e[ri]p öŋräki [a]žunın ötür- […]* ‘By means of his supernatural powers the venerable Arhat Śāriputra [pr]es[ent]ed the girl with the divine eye so that

---

32 Malzahn 2010, pp. 862–863.

33 Malzahn 2010, p. 871.

34 Malzahn 2010, pp. 873–874.

35 Krause – Thomas 1960, p. 121 (§ 163.4).

36 CDIAL, p. 468 (Nos. 8266, 8269, 8271); see also MW, pp. 632c–633a.

she [may] remember her former [e]xistence'. The verb 'to give' (TochB *ai-/wäs-*, TochA *e-*) is regularly constructed with two objects: the given thing is in the oblique (accusative) case and the beneficiary is in the genitive case (which is used as a dative as well).[37] Therefore, one would expect the genitive(-dative) of the noun referring to the girl, that is *(pu)tr(i)yoy*, according to the inflection of this class, gen. sg. lantsoy of *lāntsa*, *śnoy* of *śana*, etc. One should then surmise a careless spelling of °*yoy ñä*°, which would not be disturbing in the present context.

b1. At the end of the line, the segmentation is probably *nauṣ* 'before, former' and *ṣa(ñ)* 'own', presumably followed by *cmela* 'existences', alternatively *träṅkonta* 'sins'. With the lone exception of *nauṣṣameṃ* (B 577 a1), the suffixed and derived forms of *nauṣ* do not feature gemination of the sibilant, and are regularly written as *nauṣañ̃ñe* (variant *nauṣaṃñe*, and other inflected forms), ablative *nauṣameṃ*, so that *nauṣṣameṃ* or *nauṣṣañ̃ñe* are unlikely. TochB *nauṣ* is translated by *öŋräki* 'anterior' in *DKPAM*, 09596, followed by *ažunın* 'ihre frühere Existenzform' (transl. Wilkens 2016, p. 735).

b2–5. The merchant's daughter is speaking, first in prose, then in verse. She reviews her former lives, after having "opened her eyes" under the impulse of Śāriputra. In the parallel OU text, the girl expresses at length her regrets for her previous faults, and her devoutness to the Buddha.

b2. The form *särweśe*, nom. sg., should be confronted to the already recorded forms: obl. pl. *särwecäṃ* in B 45 a6, 46 b6 (classical)[38] and *särwecaṃ* in B 229 a2–3 (MQR, archaic).[39] The latter spelling, if not a mistake, can be explained from hesitation in the writing of /ə/ in the archaic phase of the language,[40] especially on the consonants <c, ñ, w>, or because of the tendency to avoid three dots on the same final akṣara, i.e., the two dots noting the vowel, plus the dot marking the anusvāra.[41] In any case, this obl. pl. form points to an obl. sg. form *särwec*, which ought to be matched by a nom. sg. *särwece*, following the inflectional pattern of class V.2, e.g. *kektseñe* 'body', obl. sg. *kektseñ*, *arañce* 'heart', obl. sg. *arañc*, etc.[42] The form *särwece* is given correctly as the lemma, albeit not attested, besides the attested form särweśe in the handbooks.[43] The latter is evidently due to levelling after the obl. sg. *särweś*, which was the late variant of *särwec*, according to the evolution of final *-c* > *-ś* in late and colloquial texts.[44] This phenomenon is well attested in various morphemes, including nouns of the same inflectional pattern as särwece, see the obl. sg.

---

37 Krause – Thomas 1960, p. 82 (§ 74.4).

38 Peyrot 2008, p. 219.

39 Peyrot 2008, p. 220.

40 This weak and short vowel (alias "Fremdvokal") is perhaps closer to /i/ (IPA, cf. Pinault 2008, pp. 415, 420–422), but this does not matter for the present purpose.

41 See discussion in Peyrot 2008, pp. 35, 39–40.

42 Krause – Thomas 1960, pp. 130–131 (§ 184).

43 Thomas – Krause 1964, p. 254; see also Adams (2013, p. 751), based on the preceding glossary. The source of *särweśe* cited by Krause and Thomas was probably an early transcription of fragment PK AS 13H.1 communicated to Sieg by Couvreur.

44 Peyrot 2008, p. 77, with many examples.

plāś < *plāc*, of *plāce* ‘speech’, and obl. sg. *araṃś* (later reduced to *araś*) < *arañc*, of *arañce* ‘heart’. The meaning of *särwece* (*särweśe*) is not yet fully assured. ‘Daseinsform’, as per Sieg and Siegling (1949, Glossar, p. 185, with due caution), is certainly acceptable, but the present text would point to some differentiation from the current term for ‘existence’, which is TochB *camel* (A *cmol*), meaning basically ‘birth, rebirth’. One may assume that *särweśe* here refers to the actual result of the past existences or to the whole course that leads to the present status, for which ‘destiny’ could be a possible rendering.[45] But ‘form of existence’ would be possible as well, by contrast with the previous birth of the girl as a dog (or as a female dog).[46]

b4. The simile of the city of Gandharvas (Skt. *gandharva-nagara-*), for referring to an illusion or an impermanent object, has become standard in the Mahāyāna literature, see references in Lamotte (1944, pp. 369–373). The corresponding term is unknown in the Pāli canon. It is not found either in the canonical literature of the Sarvāstivādins, according to *SWTF*, Vol. II, pp. 165–166.

b5. The restoration of the optative form is tentative. TochB *eṅkalñe* ‘attachement, clinging (to existence)’ is the equivalent of Skt. *upādāna-* (BHSD, p. 145a), being one of the steps, the ninth *nidāna*, of the *Pratītyasamutpāda*.[47]

Parallel passage in the Old Uyghur DKPAM:[48]

U 6440

verso

09588 01 … n]*o*mladı :

09589 02 … tört kertü **no]*m*** tıŋlamat*ın*

09590 03 … šari]putr*e* [arhant]

Kr II 2/17

verso

09591 01 [ol] *b*[a]*y*agut /[ ]/[ ]/ ʾ*w*[ ]ʟ[ ]

09592 02 [ ]*ᴋ* kövdöŋin körüp ol **kız burunın-**

09593 03 **[tın] ärtiŋü yarsıp yüzin ınaru yüz-**

09594 04 **länti** : ayagka tägimlig šariputre arhant

---

45 This may be confirmed by the etymology of the word (different, in our view, from the proposal by Adams 2013, p. 251), but this point will be treated on a different occasion.

46 Compare B 46 b6 *waiptār särwecän* **:** *ñäkcye rūpsa śāmñe rūp(sa)* /// ‘different forms of existence, in divine shape, in human shape’, THT 3597 b7 *oṅkol(m)a(ññai särwe)śne* ‘in elephant’s form of existence’, if correctly restored.

47 Pinault 1988, pp. 121, 128, 131.

48 Words and phrases which correspond with the TochB version are in bold typeface. Words which cannot be restored with certainty appear in transliterated form (in small capitals). For the line numbers see Wilkens 2016.

09595 05 *r*idilıg küčin **kızka t(ä)ŋridäm köz**

09596 06 **[beri]p öŋräki** (P) **[a]ž̌unın ötü*r*-**

09597 07 [ ]*ǫ̈* (P) [ ]

Translation:

09588 [...] he [p]reached [the *dharma*]. (09589–09590) [The girl meanwhile,] not listening to [the four truthful **dharm]as** (i.e. the four noble truths) […] (09590) The [Arhat] Śāriputra [… said]: [small lacuna] (09591–09594) [Then] that girl looked at the corpse [of the dog brought from the house of that] merchant, **felt extremely disgusted [by] her nose and turned her face away.** (09594–09597) By his supernatural power the venerable Arhat Śāriputra **[present]ed the girl with the divine eye, [that she may] remember her former [e]xistence** (as a dog).

Synoptic table of the contents

As an overview of the extant parts of the tale in both versions we have compiled the following table:

Old Uyghur version	Tocharian B version of PK AS 13H.1
Story of the past (at Buddha Kāśyapa's time) 09528a–09528g	
Story of the past (the nun's anger) 09528h–09528n	
Story of the present (the dog's friendly behaviour towards the monks and its angry behaviour towards the heretics) 09529–09535	
Śāriputra enters the house of a merchant and receives alms; the merchant often serves the monks; the dog rejoices at seeing the venerable Śāriputra 09536–09563	
The dog falls ill and dies; Śāriputra advises the merchant to bury the corpse because then wealth will increase; the merchant does as he is told; the dog is reborn as the merchant's beautiful daughter 09564–09578	
The girl grows up and indeed the household prospers 09579–09584 (09585–09587 fragmentary)	
	Śāriputra looks with sympathy at the girl a4

Śāriputra preaches the dharma; the girl does not pay attention 09588–09590	The girl does not see the four parts of the truth and does not listen to the preaching of the dharma (partly reconstructed) a5
	Śāriputra instructs the householder to have the corpse of the dog retrieved (probably by servants) a6
	Śāriputra explains to the attendants, including the girl, the origin of the dog's relics (partly reconstructed) a7
The merchant's daughter sees the dead body of the dog and is disgusted; Śāriputra presents her with the divine eye in order to contemplate her former existence 09591–09597	The merchant's daughter is disgusted; Śāriputra presents her with the divine eye in order to contemplate her former existence a8–b1
	b2–5 reflections of the girl on the transitoriness of life
The girl's repentance 09598–09613	
Story of the present: 09614–09618 (fragmentary) 09619–09632 explanation of the karmic link by the Buddha or Śāriputra	
Frame narrative (fragmentary): The pupil is afraid of committing the offence of anger and asks for further instruction 09632–09639	

Abbreviations

BHSD	see Edgerton (1953)
CDIAL	see Turner (1966)
DKPAM	*Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*
MW	see Monier-Williams (1899)
PED	see Rhys Davids & Stede (1921–1925)
OU	Old Uyghur
Skt.	Sanskrit
SWTF	see Waldschmidt (1973–)
TochA	Tocharian A
TochB	Tocharian B

References

Adams, Douglas Q. (2013): *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged 2nd Edition*. Amsterdam – New York, Rodopi (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 10).

Bernhard, Franz (1958): *Die Nominalkomposition im Tocharischen*. Dissertation, Universität Göttingen.

Broomhead, J.W. (1962): *A Textual Edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kuchean Manuscripts*. Ph.D. thesis, Trinity College, Cambridge [2 volumes].

Carling, Gerd. (2009): *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A. Part 1: A–J. Compiled by Gerd Carling, in collaboration with Georges-Jean Pinault and Werner Winter*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Edgerton, Franklin (1953): *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit grammar and dictionary*. Volume II: *Dictionary*. New Haven (Conn.), Yale University Press.

Feer, Léon (1901): Le Karma-çataka. *Journal Asiatique*, 9e série, tome XVII, pp. 53–100, pp. 257–315, pp. 410–486.

Geng Shimin – Laut, Jens Peter – Wilkens, Jens (2006): Fragmente der uigurischen *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* aus Hami (Teil 2). *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* Neue Folge 20, pp. 146–169.

Geng Shimin – Laut, Jens Peter – Wilkens, Jens (2007): Fragmente der uigurischen *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* aus Hami (Teil 3). *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* Neue Folge 21, pp. 124–140.

Krause, Wolfgang (1952): *Westtocharische Grammatik*. I: *Das Verbum*. Heidelberg, Winter Universitätsverlag.

Krause, Wolfgang – Thomas, Werner (1960): *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Band I: *Grammatik*. Heidelberg, Winter Universitätsverlag (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Erste Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher).

Lamotte, Etienne (1944): *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra)*. Tome I : Chapitres I–XV, Première partie. Louvain, Institut Orientaliste. Reprint 1981. Louvain-la-Neuve, Peeters.

Malzahn, Melanie (2010): *The Tocharian verbal system*. Leiden, Brill (Brill Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 3).

Monier-Williams, Sir Monier (1899): *A Sanskṛit-English dictionary*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Peyrot, Michaël (2007): *An Edition of the Tocharian Fragments IOL Toch 1 – IOL Toch 822 in the India Office Library*. London. IDP, http://idp.bl.uk.

Peyrot, Michaël (2008): *Variation and change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam – New York, Rodopi (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 15).

Peyrot, Michaël (2012): Tocharian ‘eat’ and the strong imperfect in Tocharian A. In: Hackstein, Olav – Kim, Ronald I. (eds.): *Linguistic developments along the Silkroad: Archaism and innovation in Tocharian*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 85–119.

Peyrot, Michaël (2013): Die tocharische *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. In: Kasai, Yukiyo – Yakup, Abdurishid – Durkin-Meisterernst, Desmond (eds.): *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit*. Turnhout, Brepols, pp. 161–182 (Silk Road Studies XVII).

Peyrot, Michaël – Wilkens, Jens (2014): Two Tocharian B fragments parallel to the Hariścandra-Avadāna of the Old Uyghur *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 67, pp. 319–335.

Pinault, Georges-Jean (1988): Le Pratītyasamutpāda en koutchéen. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 2, pp. 96–165.

Pinault, Georges-Jean (2007): Concordance des manuscrits tokhariens du fonds Pelliot. In: Malzahn, Melanie (ed.): *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Heidelberg, Winter Universitätsverlag, pp. 163–219.

Pinault, Georges-Jean (2008): *Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et grammaire*. Leuven – Paris, Peeters (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, 95).

Pinault, Georges-Jean (2013) : Body and soul: the reflexive in Tocharian. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118, pp. 339–359.

Pinault, Georges-Jean – Peyrot, Michaël – Wilkens, Jens (2017): Tocharian B parallels to the Supāraga-Avadāna of the Old Uyghur *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 70, pp. 295–315.

Rhys Davids, T.W. – Stede, William (1921–1925): *The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary*. London, Luzac.

Schmidt, Klaus T. (1974): *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. Dissertation, Universität Göttingen.

Schmidt, Klaus T. (2001): Die westtocharische Version des Araṇemi-Jātakas in deutscher Übersetzung. In: Bazin, Louis – Zieme, Peter (eds.), *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*. Turnhout, Brepols (Silk Road Studies, Vol. V), pp. 299–327.

Sieg, Emil – Siegling, Wilhelm (1921): *Tocharische Sprachreste*. I. Band. *Die Texte*. A. *Transcription*. Berlin – Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Sieg, Emil – Siegling, Wilhelm (1953): *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B*. Heft 2: *Fragmente Nr. 71–633*. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Werner Thomas. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Stumpf, Peter (1990): *Die Erscheinungsformen des Westtocharischen. Ihre Beziehungen zueinander und ihre Formen*. Reykjavík, Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Supplementary Series, volume 2).

Thomas, Werner (1967): Zu den Ausdrücken mit A *ñom*, B *ñem* im Tocharischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 72, 1967[1968], pp. 58–78.

Thomas, Werner (1983): *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B*. Teil I: *Die Texte*. Bd. 1: *Fragmente Nr. 1–116 der Berliner Sammlung*. Herausgegeben von Emil Sieg und Wilhelm Siegling, neubearbeitet und mit einem Kommentar nebst Register versehen. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Thomas, Werner – Krause, Wolfgang (1964): *Tocharisches Elementarbuch.* Band II: *Texte und Glossar*. Heidelberg, Winter Universitätsverlag (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Erste Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher).

Turner, Ralph L. (1966): *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. Volume I: *Text*. London: Oxford University Press.

Waldschmidt, Ernst (1973–): *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden [und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule]*. Begonnen von E. Waldschmidt. Im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen hrsg. von Heinz Bechert, Klaus Röhrborn & Jens-Uwe Hartmann. 4 volumes in 28 fascicles. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wilkens, Jens (2010): *Buddhistische Erzähltexte*. Stuttgart (Alttürkische Handschriften 10; Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII,18).

Wilkens, Jens (2015): The *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* in Old Uyghur: Recent identifications. In: Malzahn, Melanie – Peyrot, Michaël – Fellner, Hannes and Illès, Theresa-Susanna (eds.). *Tocharian Texts in Context. International Conference on Tocharian Manuscripts and Silk Road Culture (June 25–29th, 2013)*. Bremen, Hempen Verlag, pp. 301–314.

Wilkens, Jens (2016): *Buddhistische Erzählungen aus dem alten Zentralasien: Edition der altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte XXXVII).

Wilkens, Jens – Peyrot, Michaël (forth.): Weitere Parallelen in Tocharisch B zur altuigurischen *Daśakarmapathāvadāna-mālā*: Mahendrasena- und Ṣaḍdanta-Avadāna.

Wilkens, Jens – Pinault, Georges-Jean – Peyrot, Michaël (2014): A Tocharian B Parallel to the Legend of Kalmāṣapāda and Sutasoma of the Old Uyghur *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 67, pp. 1–18.