

Tocharian A *ārkišoṣi* ‘world with radiance’ and Chinese *suo po shi jie* ‘world of *sabhā*’

TAO PAN

Abstract: This article provides an explanation for the single and puzzling Tocharian B¹ gloss *śaiṣṣe* ‘world’ (instead of Tocharian A *ārkišoṣi*) for Sanskrit *jagat-* ‘world’ on a Sanskrit fragment SHT 4438 with all the other glosses in Tocharian A. Based on a detailed study of the Sanskrit and Chinese texts, Tocharian A *ārkišoṣi* is very likely the loan translation of Sanskrit *sābhāloka(dhātu)-* ‘a world with radiance’, which is preserved in the Chinese translations by Kumārajīva and other translators connected with Kucha. In the Kucha area, the first part *sābhā-* was understood as containing *-(ā)bhā-* ‘radiance’. Buddhist Sanskrit *sa(b)hāloka(dhātu)-* is built from *sa(b)hāpati-* ‘master of *sa(b)hā* world’, epithet of the highest divinity Brahmā in the *sahāloka-*, which derives via Middle Indic from the older epithet *sabhāpati-* ‘owner of the assembly hall’ in *Atharvaveda*. The excursus at the end offers a glimpse into the complicated transmission process of Chinese Buddhist terminology based on the analysis of Chinese *sha men* ‘monk’ and *he shang* ‘teacher, monk’.

Keywords: Tocharian, Sanskrit, Chinese, world, *ārkišoṣi*

Tao PAN, Indological Studies, Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University;
tao.pan.8m@kyoto-u.ac.jp

1. SHT 4438

SHT 4438 (in SHT XI: 33–34) is a Sanskrit fragment with Tocharian and Sanskrit interlinear glosses, and there are numerous Sanskrit fragments with Tocharian glosses in the SHT collection.² However, SHT 4438 turns out to be a special case, because all the Tocharian glosses are written in Tocharian A, except one single Tocharian B gloss, namely TB *śaiṣṣe* ‘world’ for Skt. *jagat-* ‘world’ in line b on the verso. This ‘remarkable’ circumstance is noted

¹ Tocharian B or West Tocharian (‘Westtocharisch’ in German) is abbreviated as ‘TB’; Tocharian A or East Tocharian (‘Osttocharisch’ in German) is abbreviated as ‘TA’.

² See MALZAHN 2007a: 301–319, PEYROT 2014, 2015.

by PEYROT 2014: 163 as well: ‘It is remarkable that all Tocharian glosses to this fragment are in Tocharian A, except for this one.’³ ‘There seems to be no palaeographical difference between the Tocharian A glosses and this gloss in Tocharian B’ (PEYROT 2014: 163 fn. 40).⁴ The suggested explanation by Peyrot,⁵ that TB *šaišše* is shorter than TA *ārkišoši*, can hardly be true, because on the folio there is enough space even for a word of 8 *akšaras* (cf. the manuscript photo of SHT 4438 in IDP). The following text is a philological study of TA *ārkišoši*, based on which another explanation for this remarkable feature is offered.

2. TA *ārkišoši*, TA *ārki* and TB *ārkwī*

According to the current *communis opinio* TA *ārkišoši* corresponds to Skt. *loka-* ‘world’, and this is indeed supported by the following textual evidences: TA *ārkišoši(s āšari)* in A 244 a1–2 corresponds to Skt. *lokācārya-* in *Varṇārhavarṇa* II 21;⁶ TA *poñcn ārkišoši* in A 257 a7 corresponds to Old Turkic *qop yir* ‘the whole earth’ in Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka from Hami act XI, 11b6.⁷ TA *ārkišoši* is therefore glossed as ‘the world, (lit) the white world’ by HILMARSSON 1996: 40 and ‘Welt’ by THOMAS and KRAUSE 1964: 82.⁸

The meaning ‘white’ of TA *ārki* can be confirmed by the following occurrence: TA *šokyo ā(r)ky(am)ś ānkari* ‘very white canines’ in A 213 a6 as the description of the 24th mark of Buddha corresponds to Skt. *suśukladanta-* ‘having very white canines’ and TA *ārki* corresponds to Skt. *śukla-* ‘white’.⁹ The corresponding Tocharian B word *ārkwī* ‘white’ occurs in the Parinirvāṇa story in *Udānālaṅkāra* and functions as attribute of TB *āsta* ‘bones’, and TB *āst=arkwina* ‘the bones (are) white’ is the translation of Skt. *kapotavarṇāny asthīni* ‘the bones (have) the colour of pigeons’.¹⁰ The same phrase

³ His additional note reads: ‘There are also some glosses in Sanskrit and a couple that are so fragmentary that not even the language can be established (see SHT 11: 34–35), which are not discussed in the present article’ (PEYROT 2014: 163 fn. 40).

⁴ See the manuscript picture at the end.

⁵ ‘It is unclear why only this word should be glossed in Tocharian B: might it be because TB *šaišše* is only two syllables, twice as short as the Tocharian A equivalent *ārkišoši*?’ (PEYROT 2014: 163) And this explanation is offered in CEToM as well (<https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?m-sht4438>, accessed on 22 September 2021).

⁶ Cf. SCHMIDT 1987: 157f. and HARTMANN 1987: 101.

⁷ Cf. GENG et al. 1988: 332.

⁸ Cf. further PINAULT 2008: 234; CARLING 2009: 45 and the entry in CEToM (https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?E_B_arkwi, accessed 1 June 2021).

⁹ Cf. Ji et al. 1998: 90f.

¹⁰ Cf. HACKSTEIN et al. 2019: 256–258.

kapotavarṇāny asthīni occurs in *Udānavarga* I 5 as well.¹¹ TA *ārki* and TB *ārkwī* ‘white’ go back to (virtual) **h₂erǵ-u-ḡion-*, from PIE **h₂erǵ-* ‘white, shining’.¹²

3. Semantics of TB *śaiṣṣe* and TA *śoši*

TB *śaiṣṣe* ‘world, people’ is the equivalent of Skt. *jagat-* ‘men and animals, world’ in the bilingual fragment B 148 a4 and Skt. *loka-* ‘world’ in the bilingual *Udānavarga* fragment SI B 117 a2.¹³ TA *śoši* is translated as ‘folk, people [Volk, Leute]’¹⁴ or ‘homines’,¹⁵ but no bilingual fragment containing TA *śoši* is preserved.¹⁶ SIEG et al. 1931: 78 equated TA *māk śoši* ‘many people’ in A 97 a2 with Skt. *bahuloka*, but A 97 contains no Sanskrit words. According to Sieg and Siegling, A 97 belongs to the manuscript containing the Tocharian adaptation of *Saundarananda* by Aśvaghōṣa,¹⁷ but the word *bahuloka-* is not attested in the Sanskrit text of *Saundarananda*. Actually, in the Sanskrit corpus the compound *bahuloka-* in the sense of ‘many people’ does not exist,¹⁸ and the numerous examples containing *bahuloka-* are in fact occurrences of *bahulokadhātu-* ‘many world-regions’. Skt. *loka-* in the sense of ‘folk, people’ is a collective, and the attribute *bahu-* ‘many’ would be redundant.¹⁹

¹¹ Cf. BERNHARD 1965: 96.

¹² Cf. HILMARSSON 1996: 40; CARLING 2009: 45; WODTKO et al. 2008: 317–319.

¹³ Cf. THOMAS and KRAUSE 1964: 147, 246 and the linguistic commentary on SI B 117 a2 in CEToM, where TB *śaiṣṣene* loc. sing. corresponds to Skt. *lokeṣu* loc. plur., which means that TB *śaiṣṣe* can have the collective meaning ‘ensemble of people’.

¹⁴ See THOMAS and KRAUSE 1964: 147.

¹⁵ See POUCHA 1955: 328.

¹⁶ POUCHA 1955: 328 has enumerated the following eleven occurrences: A 8 b4, A 38 b6, A 97 a2, A 173 b2, A 231 a2, A 257 a4, A 259 b4, A 269 b5 (a5 in CEToM), A 306 a5, A 371 b2 and A 381 a1. But A 38 b6, A 231 a2, A 269 b5, A 306 a5 and A 371 b2 are more likely examples of TA *ārkišoši*. So is the case in THT 1409.j b2. TA *śoṣintwaṃ* in A 425.e b3 should be restored as (*ārki*)*śoṣintwaṃ* as translation of Skt. *lokeṣu* in *Udānavarga* XXXIII 56d or 57d (cf. BERNHARD 1965: 490f.).

¹⁷ SIEG and SIEGLING 1921: 51: ‘Die Stücke No. 89 ff. entsprechen inhaltlich den Kapiteln 5 (bhāryāvilāpa) (sic!) und 6 (nandavilāpa) (sic!) des Saundarananda-Kāvya’. The fifth chapter is called Nandapravṛjāna, the sixth Bhāryāvilāpa, and seventh Nandavilāpa (cf. JOHNSTON 1928: 35, 42, 49). The edition used by Sieg and Siegling for the identification of the parallel texts is very likely the one by ŚĀSTRĪ 1910 and the chapter information there is the same as in the edition by JOHNSTON 1928.

¹⁸ The phrase *bahulokārthapūjita* in 14th Paṭalavisara of *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa*, also known as *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (cf. ŚĀSTRĪ 1920: 141) should be understood as ‘on account of the many worlds’.

¹⁹ Cf. the example in *Saundarananda* 5.23: *lokasya kāmair na hi tṛptir asti* ‘For the people/the whole world there is no more satisfaction other than the sensual pleasures’ (JOHNSTON 1928: 31; MATSUNAMI 1981: 38).

It is, however, true that TA *śoṣi* usually has the attribute TA *māk* ‘many’ before it,²⁰ and furthermore, as noticed by Sieg, Siegling and Schulze,²¹ TA *māk śoṣi* ‘many people’ often occurs together with TA *wrasañ* ‘living beings, human beings’. According to SIEG et al. 1931: 18 TA *wrasom* corresponds to Skt. *prāṇin-* ‘breathing, living creature, animal or man’, and in many examples it clearly refers to human beings (Skt. *manuṣya-*), cf. A 3 b4 *yalām wram ypant wrasom nu pālkāṣ māmt ne sālpām por* ‘Denn der Mensch, der das tut, was man tun soll, leuchtet wie glühendes Feuer’.²² TA *māk śo(ṣ)i wra(sañ)* in A 257 a4 corresponds to Old Turkic *tīnlaylar alqu* ‘all the living beings’ in MaitrHami XI: 11a18,²³ and this Tocharian A phrase is in fact a loan translation of Skt. *bahujana-manuṣya-* ‘whose people constitute a great multitude’ or ‘having many people’, a Sanskrit *cliché* in the Buddhist texts: it is attested 31 times in Divy,²⁴ 21 times in AVŚ,²⁵ 7 times in MV,²⁶ 3 times in MPS in SHT²⁷ and so on.

Among all the occurrences Skt. *bahujana-manuṣya-* is always accompanied by Skt. *ākīrṇa-* ‘filled, crowded’, cf. *bahujana-manuṣyākīrṇa-* in MV,²⁸ *bahujanākīrṇa-manuṣya-* in Suv,²⁹ and *ākīrṇa-bahujana-manuṣya-* in several Sanskrit texts from Turfan.³⁰ TA *wrasañ māk śoṣi kākropu(ṣ)* ‘a great multitude of people were gathered’ in the *Puṇyavantajātaka* fragment A 8 b4 is very likely a loan translation of Skt. *ākīrṇa-bahujana-manuṣya-* ‘having crowded and many people’ or *bahujana-manuṣyākīrṇa-* ‘crowded with a great multitude of people’, because its Tocharian B counterpart TB *kraup-* corresponds to Skt. *upaci-* ‘gather, accumulate, heap up’.

Therefore, TA *māk śoṣi* corresponds to Skt. *bahu-jana-* ‘many people’, and TA *śoṣi* means ‘person’ (= Skt. *jana-*). Indirect evidence for this equation can be found in A 97, which contains an adaptation of the 7th canto (Skt. *sarga-*) of *Saundarananda* by Aśvaghōṣa. The name Vasiṣṭha in 7.28 (= TA *vāsiṣṭhe* in A 97 b2) occurs only in the 7th canto;³¹ *yajñe* ‘in sacrifice’ in 7.32³²

²⁰ Cf. SIEG et al. 1931: 78.

²¹ SIEG et al. 1931: 224: ‘Ein Fall besonderer Art ist die Verbindung des Kollektivums *śoṣi* „Leute“ mit dem Plural *wrasañ* „Lebewesen, Menschen“...’.

²² Cf. SCHMIDT 1974: 187.

²³ Cf. GENG et al. 1988: 332.

²⁴ COWELL and NEIL 1886: 292 etc.

²⁵ VAIDYA 1958: 55, 78 etc.

²⁶ SENART 1882–1897: I 36, II 68 etc.

²⁷ WALDSCHMIDT 1950–1951: 102, 104, 304.

²⁸ SENART 1882–1897: I 271f.

²⁹ NOBEL 1937: 74, 96, 123.

³⁰ Cf. SWTF I: 225.

³¹ The word *vasiṣṭhavat* ‘like Vasiṣṭha’ in *Saundarananda* 1.3 (JOHNSTON 1928: 1) does not count as an occurrence of the name Vasiṣṭha.

³² JOHNSTON 1928: 46.

corresponds to TA *talkeyam* in A 97 b3; and the Sanskrit name Ambarīṣa- in 7.51³³ corresponds to TA *ambariṣe* in A 97 a3. All these words indicate that A 97 belongs to the 7th canto Nandavilāpa ‘Nanda’s Lament’, but the contexts in which these names occur are quite different in the Sanskrit and the Tocharian versions, and so is the order of these words, which shows that the original Sanskrit poem has been modified in Tocharian. For example, the Sanskrit equivalent of TA *kṣatriñ* ‘warriors’ in A 97 a2, namely Skt. *kṣatriya-*, occurs in 1.27 in *Saundarananda*, its only appearance in the whole poem. In *Saundarananda* the assumed Sanskrit equivalent of TA *māk śoši* in A 97 a2, namely Skt. *bahujana-* ‘many people’ is indeed attested, but it occurs only once in 3.15.

Another piece of indirect evidence comes from the comparison of two Tocharian phrases, namely *māk śoši śominā(s)y(o)* in A 173 b2 and *māk śomināsyō* ‘with numerous girls’ in A 110 a1. It is tempting to interpret TA *māk śoši śomināsyō* as an example of Gruppenflexion, but the members in Gruppenflexion usually have the same number if they can be either singular or plural, e.g. *kuklas y_nkass oñkalmāsyō* ‘with chariots, horses and elephants’ in A 253 b2.³⁴ Therefore, TA *māk śoši* functions in fact as an adjective and is synonymous with TA *māk* ‘numerous’.³⁵ Since most of the Tocharian Buddhist texts are translations and adaptations of Indian texts, the origin of this phenomenon lies in the Sanskrit corpus. In fact, Skt. *bahujana-* ‘many people’ is synonymous with Skt. *bahu-* ‘many’, as recorded in the dictionaries,³⁶ and Skt. *bahujana-manuṣya-* ‘having many people’, which occurs frequently in the Buddhist corpus, has a synonym *bahu-manuṣya-* ‘having numerous people’ attested in Kar-p.³⁷ Similarly, TA *māk śoši wrasañ* ‘a great multitude of people’ has the synonym TA *māk wrasañ* ‘numerous people’ in A 341 b7. A similar

³³ JOHNSTON 1928: 49.

³⁴ Cf. KRAUSE and THOMAS 1960: 91. Due to its very fragmentary state, the translation ‘zusammen mit Frau, Söhnen (und) Töchtern’ for TA */// śyak śām sewā(s) ckācrāśśāl ///* in A 350 a3 by KRAUSE and THOMAS 1960: 91 cannot be considered as secure, because TA *śyak* ‘together (with)’ is placed after the noun in comitative in all the other examples (‘Postpos. u. Präv.’ in THOMAS and KRAUSE 1964: 151). Even if their translation is correct, it would not become a counterexample, because the number of *śām* ‘wife’ cannot be plural here. The example in A 21 b5 *śla pācar mācar pracre(s) śām sewāśśāl śyak* should be syntactically analysed as *śla pācar mācar pracre(s) śām* ‘with (his) father, mother, brother(s) and wife’ + *sewāśśāl śyak* ‘together with the sons’, where the first part is an example of TA *śla* + accusative, and not of Gruppenflexion, cf. KRAUSE and THOMAS 1960: 86 §78 Anm.

³⁵ TA *māk* derives from the collective noun **mōg-h₂* ‘multitude/a lot’, cf. HACKSTEIN 2012: 154f.

³⁶ Cf. the translation for *bahujana-* in pw: ‘die grosse Menge’, and the corresponding Chinese translation 眾 *zhong* ‘numerous’, 眾生 *zhong sheng* ‘numerous beings’ recorded in the Sanskrit-Japanese dictionary by WOGIHARA 1986: 916. In BHS, Skt. *bahujana-* is rendered by ‘many people, a multitude’.

³⁷ YAMADA 1989: 4.

case is found in Eng. *hundred* and NHG *hundert* ‘100’, which originally are compounds of ‘100’ and ‘reckoning, number’.³⁸

4. Morphology of TB *śaiṣṣe* and TA *śoṣi*

TA *śoṣi* and TB *śaiṣṣe* are derivatives of the PIE noun **g^h₃i^h₃-u^o-s-* ‘liveliness, life’ (cf. Ved. *jīváse* ‘to live’, EWAia I: 594), and they go back to **g^h₃i^h₃-u^o-es-₂i^{en}-/₂i^{on}-*,³⁹ whose nom. sing. **g^h₃i^h₃-u^o-es-₂iē(n)* regularly yields TA *śoṣi* and TB *śaiṣṣe* via Proto-Toch. **k^ha-₂ū^äs-₂i^æ* (cf. Ved. *ukṣá* ‘ox’ < PIE **h₂uks-é(n)*).⁴⁰ TA *ārkiśoṣintu* ‘worlds, people (in the world)’ acc.plur. is an *-nt*-stem, as in the case of TA *ārki*, whose nom./acc. plur. f. is *ārkyant* and nom. plur. m. is *ārkyamś*.⁴¹ This coexistence of *-n-* and *-nt-* stems is well attested in Tocharian and other Indo-European languages,⁴² cf. TA *ākrun_t* ~ TB *akrūna* ‘tears’; Gr. ἄκοντες ‘javelins’ ~ ἄκαινα ‘spike’.⁴³ The zero grade **-in-* of **-iē/on-* suffix is generalised in Indo-Iranian, and ‘[the] formation in *-in-* can be used partly – so in proverbs – as substitutes of participles in *-á(n)t-*’⁴⁴ according to LÜHR and MATZINGER 2008: II 177, 256.⁴⁵

5. The Indian origin of TA *ārkiśoṣi*

PINAULT 2008: 234f. offered a detailed explanation of TA *ārkiśoṣi*: ‘le composé *ārki-śoṣi* ne repose pas sur un composé déterminatif dont le premier membre était l’adjectif *ārki* (B *ārkwī*) « brillant, blanc » : « monde brillant ». Il continue en fait un binôme, devenu composé dvandva, de termes complémentaires pour désigner deux aspects du monde’. So according to Pinault, TA *ārki-śoṣi* is a dvandva compound, in which TA *ārki*

³⁸ Cf. EWAhd IV: 1239; PFEIFER 1993: 563, 1097.

³⁹ This transponat may be an *n*-individualisation of the *-(i)jo-*adjective from the abstract noun **g^h₃i^h₃-u^o-s-* ‘liveliness’, namely in the sense of ‘the lively one’ (Neri, pers. comm. 25 May 2020).

⁴⁰ The possibility that TA *śoṣi* derives from **g^h₃i^h₃-u^o-es-₂iō(n)* via Proto-Toch. **k^ha-₂ū^äs-₂ju* cannot be excluded, cf. GOTÖ 2013: 38f.

⁴¹ Cf. HILMARSSON 1996: 40f.

⁴² The *-t*-form probably originates from the nominalisation of the local adverb ending in *-en*, cf. Ved. *hēman* ‘in winter’ and *hemantá-* ‘winter’ (Neri, pers. comm. 25 May 2020). Cf. further the Anatolian forms in *-ant-*, which appear to be extensions of the individualising suffix **-on-* (MELCHERT 2000: 69).

⁴³ Cf. SCHWYZER 1939: 526: ‘Sekundär sind wohl einige andere Stämme zu vt-Stämmen geworden: ἄκοντ- δράκοντ- λέοντ- θεράποντ- waren wegen ἄκαινα δράκαινα usw. in älterer Zeit v-Stämme’.

⁴⁴ The original German text is: ‘[die] Bildung auf *-in-* kann zum Teil – so in der Spruchliteratur – als Konkurrent des Partizips auf *-á(n)t-* zum Einsatz kommen’.

⁴⁵ Cf. AiGr II 2: 347–349 and HOFFMANN and FORSSMAN 2004: 146.

is a substantivised adjective meaning ‘« [monde] brillant » (visible parce qu’éclairé par le soleil)⁴⁶ and TA *śoši* means ‘« monde » comme ensemble d’êtres vivants’. Based on his explanation, TA *ārki* designates the bright part of the world, which is illuminated by the sun. However, this meaning and the claimed semantic transition from ‘shining, bright’ to ‘shining world’ is never attested in the Tocharian corpus.⁴⁷ Furthermore, if TA *śoši* means ‘the world, ensemble of living beings’ and is synonymous with TB *śaiṣṣe* ‘world’, the situation in SHT 4438 becomes unexplainable. Pinault proposed no Sanskrit equivalent of TA *ārkiśoši* in the Buddhist corpus, which further weakens the credibility of his hypothesis.

As in the case of numerous idiosyncratic Tocharian compounds, most of which are in fact loan translations of the underlying Sanskrit compounds, e.g. TB *ñākte-yok* ‘having the colour of a god, similar to a god’⁴⁸ ← Skt. *devavarṇa-* ‘id.’⁴⁹ and TB *swese ysaraṣṣe* ‘blood rain’⁵⁰ ← Skt. *rudhira-varṣa-* ‘id.’,⁵¹ TA *ārkiśoši* goes back to an Indian compound as well. In the Buddhist context the world of living beings is called Skt. *sahāloka-* ‘world of endurance’ or *sahālokadhātu-* ‘world realm of endurance’ (Tib. *mi mjed kyi ’jig rten gyi khams* ‘world realm of endurance/sufferance’ in *Mahāvvyutpatti*),⁵² which is

⁴⁶ PINAULT 2008: 234: ‘le premier membre était en fait l’adjectif en question, mais substantivé, et l’ensemble signifiait *ārki* « [monde] brillant » (visible parce qu’éclairé par le soleil)’.

⁴⁷ Whether the Tocharians were aware of the connection between Skt. *loka-* ‘world’ and the etymologically related verbal root *roc-* ‘shine’ (EWAia II: 481) and coined the Tocharian counterparts accordingly, is difficult to prove and in any case is not supported by the textual evidence, although the semantic development from ‘white, shining’ to ‘world’ is indeed widely attested in the Indo-European languages, cf. OCS *svěťb* ‘light; world’ and PIE **dʰegʰ-om-* ‘earth’ from the root **dʰegʰ-* ‘to shine’ (cf. PEDERSEN 1941: 262; HILMARSSON 1996: 40; NERI and ZIEGLER 2012: 80).

⁴⁸ This compound is only attested in the *Araṇemijātaka* fragments, namely (*ñā*)*kte-yokām* in PK NS 355 a4, *ñākte-yok* in PK NS 36+20 a3 and probably (*ñākte*)-*yok* in B 90 as well. In CEToM the assumed Indian basis is Skt. *devarūpa-*, but Skt. *rūpa-* means ‘form, body’, not ‘colour’.

⁴⁹ Skt. *devavarṇa-* is attested in MV (SENART 1882–1897: III, 117) and *Samādhiraśasūtra* (VAIDYA 1961: 145).

⁵⁰ It is attested as *sw(e)se ys(a)r(a)ṣṣ(e)* in PK NS 36+20 b1. The parallel is found in B 93 b3, but this phrase is unfortunately located in the missing part. The emendation *swese tsainwāṣṣe* ‘weapon rain’ by SCHMIDT 2001a: 324 goes back to COUVREUR 1964: 242, but the trace after (*s)e* cannot be ‘*tsai*’ (cf. the photo in <https://gallica.bnf.fr> and plate III b in COUVREUR 1964 as well); it is more likely ‘*ysa*’, cf. the tiny fragment with the *aṣṣara r(a)ṣṣ(e)*, which is missing on the plate of COUVREUR 1964. The London fragment H 149.240 (= IOL Toch 69) is wrongly cited as ‘H 149.290’ by SCHMIDT 2001a: 323, 325, but correctly given in the title.

⁵¹ Skt. *rudhiravarṣa-* is attested in *Mahābhārata* 6.2.30c and *Mūlasarvāstivādinayavastu* (BAGCHI 1967: 179).

⁵² Cf. ISHIHAMA and FUKUDA 1989: 156 and the definition by BUSWELL and LOPEZ 2014: 736: ‘*sahāloka*: In Sanskrit, lit. “world of endurance,” in the Mahāyāna, the name of the world system we inhabit where the buddha Śākyamuni taught; the term may also be seen written as *sahālokadhātu*’.

widely attested in the Buddhist corpus: 20 times in *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*,⁵³ once in Vkn,⁵⁴ once in Saddh-p,⁵⁵ once in Divy⁵⁶ etc. In pw, PW and MW the entry word is written as *sahalokadhātu-* ‘die von den Menschen bewohnte Welt, die Erde’ or ‘the world inhabited by men, the earth’, which is attested, for example, in MV.⁵⁷

6. *sahā-*, *saha-* or *sabhā-*?

The highest divinity in the *sahāloka* is Brahmā, and one of his epithets is *sahāmpati* ‘Lord of the Sahā World’.⁵⁸ Both *sahālokadhātu-* and *sahāmpati-* have variant forms in the Sanskrit corpus, which is analysed in detail in the following section, in order to clarify the development of these terms.

6.1. *sahāloka(dhātu)-*

Neither Skt. *sahāloka-* nor *sahālokadhātu-* is attested in the Vedic texts, and both are essentially elements of Buddhist terminology. The variants can be summarised as follows:

- (1) *sahālokadhātu-*: This is the prevalent form; cf. some of its occurrences above.
- (2) *saha- lokadhātu-*: The phrase *saha-* + *lokadhātu-* occurs frequently in place of *sahālokadhātu-*: 14 times in Kar-p;⁵⁹ 19 times in Saddh-p;⁶⁰ 14 times in Vkn⁶¹ etc.
- (3) *sahaloka-*: In the Buddhist texts it is attested twice in MV: *sahalokadhātu-*⁶² and *sahalokanātha-*.⁶³ Otherwise, in *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* Skt. *sahaloka-*⁶⁴ and *sahalokapāla-*⁶⁵ are attested.

⁵³ Vaidya 1960a: 6, 7, 8 etc.

⁵⁴ Takahashi et al. 2004: 386.

⁵⁵ Wogihara and Tsuchida 1934: 341.

⁵⁶ Cowell and Neil 1886: 293.

⁵⁷ Senart 1882–1897: II 380.

⁵⁸ Cf. Buswell and Lopez 2014: 736.

⁵⁹ Yamada 1989: 26, etc.; with *sahālokadhātu* on p. 132 and p. 237.

⁶⁰ Wogihara and Tsuchida 1934: 210, 227 etc.

⁶¹ Takahashi et al. 2004: 360, 362 etc. These 14 occurrences are found only in the 9th (10 times) and 11th (4 times) chapter.

⁶² Senart 1882–1897: II 380.

⁶³ Senart 1882–1897: II 385.

⁶⁴ In *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 10.86.10, cf. Shastree 1997: 301.

⁶⁵ In *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 8.20.32, cf. Shastree et al. 1998: 67. In the text edition, *saha* and *lokapālāḥ* are separated, which must be a misprint.

- (4) *sabhāloka*:- It is attested 6 times in *Guṇakāraṇḍavyūha*⁶⁶ and 5 times in *Mokṣopāya*.⁶⁷

In contrast to classical Sanskrit, *dhātu*- ‘element’ is used both as masculine and feminine in Buddhist Sanskrit,⁶⁸ while in Pāli it is essentially feminine.⁶⁹ Therefore *sahālokadhātuḥ* can easily be analysed as *sahā* nom.f. + *lokadhātuḥ*, which gives rise to the phrase *saha-lokadhātu*-, from which a new compound *sahaloka(dhātu)*- came into being. Sometimes both *sahalokadhātu*- and *sahālokadhātu*- can occur in the same text; cf. these two words in MV (SENART 1882–1897: II 379, 380). Instead of *sahālokadhātu*-, *lokadhātu*- is used much more frequently in the Buddhist corpus, e.g. in Saddh-p Skt. *sahālokadhātu*- occurs only once, while *lokadhātu*- has 224 occurrences.

6.2. *sahāṃpati*-

In the Vedic texts only *sabhāpati*- is attested, while in the Buddhist corpus several variants are recorded, which can be summarised as follows:

- (1) *sabhāpati*:- In the Vedic texts *sabhāpati*- is attested only in two case forms, namely a) *sabhāpatibhyas* in *Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā* 17.3.3 (Kāṇva) and 16.24 (Mādhyandinī), *Taittirīya-Saṃhitā* 4.5.3.2, *Maitrāyaṇi-Saṃhitā* 2.9.4 and *Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā* 17.13; b) *sabhāpatim* in AVP 13.7.5d.⁷⁰ It is also attested in SBhV I (7 times)⁷¹ and the Sanskrit texts from Turfan,⁷² namely CPS, MPS and *Mahāgovindasūtra*. Skt. *sabhāpati*- is attested in *Mahābhārata* (e.g. 7.24.22 and 8.65.28) as well.
- (2) *sabhāṃpati*:- attested in SBhV II (5 times)⁷³ and CPS 8.18.
- (3) *sahāpati*:- attested e.g. in *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (15 times),⁷⁴

⁶⁶ *Guṇakāraṇḍavyūha* is a 15th-century Nepalese reworking of the Mahāyāna sūtra *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, which is about ten centuries earlier. However, in *Kāraṇḍavyūha* there is only *sahālokadhātu*- (cf. VAIDYA 1961: 290).

⁶⁷ It is attested once in the first book *Vairāgyaprakaraṇa* 1.31.23 and 4 times in the sixth book *Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa*.

⁶⁸ Cf. *saho lokadhātuḥ* in Vkn 9.6 (TAKAHASHI et al. 2004: 364), but *iyaṃ sahālokadhātuḥ* in *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra* (VAIDYA 1960b: 164) and *imāṃ sahāṃ lokadhātum* in Saddh-p (WOGIHARA and TSUCHIDA 1934: 210).

⁶⁹ Cf. EDGERTON 1953: II 282; CONE 2010: 480.

⁷⁰ LOPEZ 2000: 175.

⁷¹ GNOLI 1977–1978: I 128, 130 etc.

⁷² Cf. the lemma ‘Sabhāpati’ in SWTF IV 296.

⁷³ GNOLI 1977–1978: II 170, 191 etc.

⁷⁴ VAIDYA 1960a: 129, 191 etc.

Abhidharmakośavyākhyā (3 times),⁷⁵ Divy (4 times),⁷⁶ Kar-p (once)⁷⁷ and LV (19 times).⁷⁸

- (4) *sahāṃpati-*: attested e.g. in AVŚ (19 times),⁷⁹ Divy (once),⁸⁰ LV (once),⁸¹ MV (twice),⁸² Saddh-p (thrice),⁸³ Suv (twice),⁸⁴ *Kāraṇḍavyūha* (thrice)⁸⁵.
 (5) *sahaṃpati-*: attested in MV (once).⁸⁶

Based on the epic Sanskrit *viśāṃ-pati-* and other similar words, *sahāṃ-pati-* was built from *sahā-pati-*,⁸⁷ and such is also the relationship between *sabhāṃpati-* and *sabhāpati-*. The form *sahaṃpati* in MV is due to the law of two morae in Middle Indic (cf. Pāli *sahaṃpati-*). The form *sahapati-* listed in PW and MW is just a variant in chapter 5 recorded only once on manuscript T2 of LV, which is adopted in the edition by MITRA 1877 and later cited by Böhlingk and Roth, from whom Monier-Williams had adopted the form.⁸⁸

The god Brahmā is the personification of the neuter Ved. *brāhman-* ‘formulation, forming’, and is first attested in the younger Vedic texts, namely in the Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣad.⁸⁹ The epithet *sabhāpati-* ‘owner of the assembly hall’⁹⁰ for Brahmā probably originates from its occurrence in the *brahmodya* ‘speech about Brahman, rivalry in sacred knowledge’ verse in AVP 13.7.5: *indraṃ tvānu prchāmi sākṣāt sabhānāṃ ca sabhāpatiṃ* ‘I ask you about Indra before my eyes and the lord of the highest assembly (of gods)’.⁹¹

The oldest form of the epithet for Brahmā is thus *sabhāpati-* with Skt. *sabhā-* ‘assembly, society’, and this is also the dominant variant in the Sanskrit manuscripts from Turfan. The regular sound change in Prakrit *-bh-* > *-h-*, e.g.

⁷⁵ WOGIHARA 1971: I 103.

⁷⁶ COWELL and NEIL 1886: 613, 652.

⁷⁷ YAMADA 1968: 4.

⁷⁸ HOKAZONO 1994: 398f., 416f. etc.

⁷⁹ VAIDYA 1958: 121, 132 etc.

⁸⁰ COWELL and NEIL 1886: 638.

⁸¹ HOKAZONO 1994: 356f.

⁸² SENART 1882–1897: II 63, 136.

⁸³ WOGIHARA and TSUCHIDA 1934: 3, 67.

⁸⁴ NOBEL 1937: 84, 91.

⁸⁵ VAIDYA 1961: 258 line 20 and 27 etc.

⁸⁶ SENART 1882–1897: III 381.

⁸⁷ Cf. AiGr II 1: 46, 246, 248.

⁸⁸ HOKAZONO 1994: 264, 356f. For all the other occurrences of *sahā(ṃ)pati-*, it is always written with *-hā-* on manuscript T2.

⁸⁹ Cf. KEWA II 452; EWAia II 236.

⁹⁰ Cf. EWAia II 701.

⁹¹ LOPEZ 2000: 175, 202, 208.

Skt. *ābhā-* ‘splendour’, *prabhā-* ‘radiance’ > Pkt. *āhā-*, *pahā-*, gives rise to the forms *sahāpati-* and *sahāṃpati-* widely attested in the Buddhist texts,⁹² whence the new interpretation of Brahmā as ‘the lord of the earth’ taking the first member to be *sahā-* ‘earth ← the bearing one’ (cf. *sarvaṃsaha-* ‘all-bearing’ in Pāṇini 3.2.41 and *sarvaṃsahā-* ‘earth’ in *Amarakośa* 2.1.5⁹³). However, in Pāli and Gāndhārī words with *-bhā-* ‘light’ always keep the labial element, e.g. Gāndhārī *pravha-* or *prabha-*, Pāli *pabhā-* ‘radiance’ (= Skt. *prabhā-*) and Gāndhārī *abha-* ‘splendour’, Pāli *ābhā-* ‘splendour’ (Skt. *ābhā-*).⁹⁴ The Gāndhārī epithets *sahāṃpati-* and *sahāpati-* of Brahmā in the inscriptions are therefore more likely derived from Skt. *sahāṃpati-* and *sahāpati-*.

6.3. The evidence of Chinese translations

In the Chinese Buddhist corpus, the world-system in which living beings dwell is called Chin. *suo po shi jie* (娑婆世界), where Chin. *suo po* /sâ buâ/ is the transliteration of Skt. *sabhā*⁹⁵ and Chin. *shi jie* ‘world’ corresponds to Skt. *loka-* ‘world’ or *lokadhātu-* ‘world-region’. It is widely attested since the beginning of 5th cent. AD: 35 times in the Chinese Saddh-p by Kumārajīva (405–406) from Kucha; 6 times in the Chinese Vkn by Kumārajīva; twice in *Fo shuo guan ding jing* (T.1331[1] and T. 1331[11], 5th cent.); 35 times in the Chinese Kar-p by Dharmakṣema (419), an Indian monk who had stayed in Kucha for some time; and so on.

In order to clarify the detailed situation of the Chinese translations, two cases are selected, namely the Chinese Saddh-p by Kumārajīva (T.262) and Dharmarakṣa (286, T.263); and Chinese Vkn by Zhi Qian (T.474) and Xuanzang (602–664, T.476), both of which have well-preserved Sanskrit texts.

In Saddh-p there is no occurrence of Skt. *sabhāloka-*, and the phrase *saha-lokadhātu-* corresponds to Chin. *suo po shi jie* (= Skt. *sabhālokadhātu-*) by Kumārajīva⁹⁶ and Chin. *ren shi jie* ‘world of endurance’⁹⁷ (= Skt. *sahālokadhātu-*) by Dharmarakṣa.

⁹² Cf. von HINÜBER 2001: 161.

⁹³ The feminine gender is probably due to the influence of other Sanskrit words for ‘earth’, e.g. Ved. *pr̥thivī-*, *urvī-* (since RV) and Skt. *medinī-* (since *Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka*).

⁹⁴ Cf. von HINÜBER 2001: 161f.

⁹⁵ Cf. KARASHIMA 2001: 261.

⁹⁶ Cf. *sahām lokadhātum* in chapter 11 (WOGIHARA and TSUCHIDA 1934: 210 line 23) corresponds to Chin. 娑婆世界 *suo po shi jie* (T.262, 9.33a8).

⁹⁷ Chin. 忍世界 in T.263, 9.103b10. It is also attested three times in Zhi Qian’s translation of Vkn (T.474, before 250?).

In Vkn, the phrase *saha-lokadhātu-* occurs only in the 9th and 11th chapter, and *sahālokadhātu-* occurs once in the 9th chapter.⁹⁸ In the 9th and 11th chapter instead of the phrase *saha-lokadhātu-*, the compound *lokadhātu-* alone occurs many times,⁹⁹ which is used as a synonym of *saha-lokadhātu-*.¹⁰⁰ In Vkn, Skt. *saha-lokadhātu-* or *sahālokadhātu-* corresponds to Chin. *suo po shi jie* ‘*sabhā* world’ or simply *shi jie* ‘world’ by Kumārajīva¹⁰¹ and Chin. *kan ren shi jie* ‘world of endurance’ (= Skt. *sahālokadhātu-*)¹⁰² by Xuanzang. Another Chinese rendering is Chin. *suo he shi jie* ‘*sahā* world’, which is used e.g. by Paramārtha (499–569)¹⁰³ and Amoghavajra (705–774),¹⁰⁴ where Chin. *suo he* is simply the transliteration of Skt. *sahā-* ‘the enduring one’.

Skt. *sabhā(m)pati-* corresponds to Chin. *suo po shi jie zhu* ‘master of the *sabhā* world’ by Kumārajīva¹⁰⁵ and Narendrayaśas,¹⁰⁶ while Chin. *suo he shi jie zhu* ‘master of the *sahā* world’ is adopted by Xuanzang,¹⁰⁷ Amoghavajra¹⁰⁸ and Yijing (635–713).¹⁰⁹ Chin. *suo he zhu* ‘*sahā* master’¹¹⁰ is very rarely attested, which is probably an abbreviation of Chin. *suo he shi jie zhu* ‘master of the *sahā* world’.

Based on the detailed information above, it is clear that the translators connected with Kucha consistently use the Chinese terms whose underlying Indic words contain *sabhā-*, independent of the attested forms in the extant manuscripts, which means that these Chinese terms had become fixed terminologies transmitted from earlier periods in certain contexts. This may be compared with the case of Skt. *śramaṇa-*, on which see the discussion below in section 9.1.

⁹⁸ TAKAHASHI et al. 2004: 386.

⁹⁹ TAKAHASHI et al. 2004: 356, 358 etc.

¹⁰⁰ Skt. *asya ca lokadhātor* in chapter 9.6 (TAKAHASHI et al. 2004: 364) corresponds to Chin. *ci tu* 此土 ‘this earth/land’ (T.475, 14.552b15 by Kumārajīva and T.476, 14.579c7 by Xuanzang), which refers to *saho lokadhātuḥ* ‘the enduring world’ (= Chin. 堪忍世界 *kan ren shi jie* by Xuanzang, but 娑婆世界 *suo po shi jie* by Kumārajīva) in the same passage.

¹⁰¹ Cf. TAKAHASHI et al. 2004: 360 [= T.475, 14.552b1] and 386 [= T.475, 14.553a28].

¹⁰² Chin. 堪忍世界 in T.476, 14.579b14–15, b23, etc.

¹⁰³ Cf. Chin. 娑訶世界 in T.669, 16.469a17–18.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Chin. 娑訶世界 in T.404, 13.614b22.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Chin. 娑婆世界主 in T.262, 9.2a18 and T.227, 8.540a9.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Chin. 娑婆世界主 in T.397 (14), 13.299a1. On the authorship of this part, cf. <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/4240/> (accessed 9 November 2021).

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Chin. 娑訶世界主 in T.1545, 27.890a3.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Chin. 娑訶世界主 in T.404, 13.646a17.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Chin. 索訶世界主 in T.665, 16.425b25.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Chin. 索訶主 in Chin. *Yogācārabhūmi* (T.1579) or 娑訶主 in *Guan cha zhu fa xing jing* (T.649).

The reason why Kumārajīva and Dharmakṣema abandoned the earlier rendering Chin. *ren shi jie* ‘world of endurance’ by Dharmarakṣa and Chin. *ren jie* ‘id.’ by Zhi Qian (fl. 223–253),¹¹¹ whose Sanskrit basis *sahālokadhātu-* or *saha-lokadhātu-* is the dominant variant attested in the extant manuscripts, and chose the translation Chin. *suo po shi jie* (= Skt. *sabhālokadhātu-*), which is only rarely attested in the extant manuscripts, is that the Sanskrit words in the manuscripts used by Kumārajīva and Dharmakṣema are probably different from the ones in the extant Sanskrit texts. This possibility is indirectly supported by the fact that *sabhāpati-* ‘master of *sabhā* world’ is attested almost exclusively in the Sanskrit manuscripts from Turfan, and *sabhāloka(dhātu)-* was probably the widespread form in the Kucha area, which was motivated by *sabhāpati-*. Even if Skt. *sabhāpati-* and *sabhāloka(dhātu)-* were transmitted into the Tocharian region via Gāndhārī, as in the case of Skt. *śramaṇa-*, the hybrid Buddhist Sanskrit based on Gāndhārī would not change *sabhā-* to *sahā-*, because *-bh-* of *bhā-* ‘shine’ is usually preserved in Gāndhārī.¹¹² On the other hand, Skt. *sahāloka(dhātu)-* was probably created based on *sahāpati-* (cf. section 6.2 above), and instead of a compound with *sahā-* ‘the bearing one, earth’, it is interpreted as ‘the world of endurance of suffering, the world that must be endured’ in the Buddhist context, both of which (*sahā-* as ‘the bearing one’ and ‘endurance of suffering’) belong to folk etymology.¹¹³ Therefore, the history of the Chinese renditions can be summarized as: *sahā-* (Dharmarakṣa and Zhi Qian) → **sabhā-* (Kumārajīva and Dharmakṣema) → *sahā-* (Xuanzang etc.). Kumārajīva’s deviation is probably attributed to his etymologisation in terms of ‘hall’/‘light’.

7. The meaning of TA *ārkišoṣi*

In the Sanskrit corpus of the Turfanfunde, Skt. *sabhā-* ‘assembly hall’ is not a common word. As simplex it is only attested twice, and the only compound, Skt. *deva-sabhā-* ‘assembly hall of the gods’, occurs twice in one single fragment.¹¹⁴ Instead of Skt. *sabhā-*, the word Skt. *śālā-* ‘hall, house’ is used

¹¹¹ Cf. *ren jie* 忍界 in his translation of Vkn (T.474, 14.532b1). On the authorship of T.474, cf. HE [RADICH] 2019: 16–18, according to whom the ‘extant text of T.474 is a revision of a Zhi Qian original text by Dharmarakṣa or someone very closely associated with Dharmarakṣa’s circle’.

¹¹² Cf. von HINÜBER 2001: 161f.

¹¹³ In the Buddhist lexicographical works compiled in the Tang Dynasty, Chin. *suo po* is even considered to be the incorrect form, while Chin. *suo he* (= Skt. *sahā-*) is regarded as the correct word meaning ‘capable of enduring’, because the people in this world can endure suffering, cf. the explanations in *Yi qie jing yin yi* ‘The Sounds and Meanings [of the words in] the Scriptures’, a Buddhist dictionary completed in 807 by uilin (T.2128, 54.356c10) and in *Fa yuan zhu lin*, a Buddhist encyclopaedia compiled by Daoshi in 668 (T.2122, 53.278a18–20).

¹¹⁴ Cf. SWTF II 492, IV 296.

much more frequently, and in the Sanskrit texts from Turfan, beside the simplex the following compounds are attested: *upasthāna-śālā-* ‘Versammlungshalle (eines Klosters) [assembly hall (of a monastery)]’, *kūṭāgāra-śālā-* ‘Halle mit Spitztonnendach [hall with pointed tunnel vault roof]’, *catuḥ-śāla-* ‘mit vier Hallen versehen [equipped with four halls]’, *dīrgha-śāla-* ‘ausgedehnte Räume habend [having broad space]’, *dvāra-śālā-* ‘Eingangshalle [entrance hall]’, *mahā-śāla-* ‘dessen Haus groß ist [having a big house]’.¹¹⁵

In the *Mahāgovindasūtra* preserved in the Sanskrit fragments SHT 32/61–64 and SHT 165/18–19 from Qizil (MQR), the epithet ‘Sabhāpati’ of Brahmā is attested twice, and in the manuscript SHT 32/64 V3 it is written *sābhāpati-: /// (b)r(a)hm[ā] sābhāpa(tir bra)hmaloke*. In section 15 the missing part about the appearance of Brahmā is preserved in the Pāli parallel *Janavasabhasūta* (DN II: 209): *yathā ... uḷāro āloko sañjāyati obhāso pātubhavati brahmā pātubhavissati brahmuno h’ etaṃ pubbanimittaṃ pātubhāvāya yadidaṃ āloko sañjāyati obhāso pātubhavati* ‘When such eminent light arises and such radiance shines forth, Brahmā will appear. The appearance of such radiance is the first sign of Brahmā’s approaching manifestation’.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, in the manuscript SHT 32/64 V3 Brahmā’s epithet is written as *sābhāpati-*, so this variant, if not attributed to scribal error, is evidence for the reinterpretation of the original title *sabhāpati-* as containing *-bhā-* ‘light, radiance’, from which the hypercorrect form *sābhāpati-* (< *sa-ābhā-pati-*) ‘the lord with radiance (*ābhā-*)’ was built. The uncommonness of Skt. *sabhā-* ‘hall’ against *-śālā-* ‘id.’ and other divine names such as Ābhāsvara and Ābhasvara in the Tocharian region must have contributed to this new interpretation as well.¹¹⁷

Based on the detailed analysis above, a new explanation for TA *ārkiśoṣi* can be suggested. TA *ārkiśoṣi* is very likely a loan translation of Skt. *sābhāloka(dhātu)-*, which is preserved in the Chinese translations by Kumārajīva and other translators connected with Kucha. In the Tocharian region, the first part *sābhā-* was understood as containing *-(ā)bhā-* ‘radiance’, which is supported by the evidence of the Sanskrit manuscripts from Kucha, and therefore TA *ārki-* ‘having radiance, shining, white’¹¹⁸ and *śoṣi-* were used to render the whole compound. TA *ārkiśoṣi* literally means ‘the world with radiance, the shining world’.

¹¹⁵ Cf. SWTF IV 197 etc.

¹¹⁶ Cf. SCHLINGLOFF 1963: 40: ‘Ein Lichtglanz verkündet das Erscheinen des Gottes Brahmā’. The English translation is based on that of WALSHE 1995: 295 with modification.

¹¹⁷ Cf. SWTF: I 266f.

¹¹⁸ It is perhaps unnecessary to suppose that for the Tocharians TA *ārki-* from **h₂erǵ-u-ṣon-* still has the possessive nuance ‘having radiance’, where **h₂erǵu-* is a substantivised adjective meaning ‘the shining thing’ (cf. Hitt. *harki-* ‘white, bright’ and as a neutral noun ‘the white (of eyes)’, WODTKO et al. 2008: 317).

8. The gloss TB *śaiṣṣe* in SHT 4438 explained

In the Tocharian B corpus there is no exact equivalent of TA *ārkišoši*, whose hypothetical form would be TB †*ārkwīśaiṣṣe*. In view of the much greater extent of the Tocharian B corpus,¹¹⁹ the accidental loss of this compound is not very convincing. As long since observed by Tocharian scholars, the Tocharian A corpus contains almost exclusively Buddhist texts¹²⁰ and is more closely connected with Buddhism than Tocharian B, which has borrowed numerous Buddhist words from Tocharian A.

Historically, TB *śaiṣṣe* and TA *śoši* go back to the same Proto-Tocharian word built from PIE root **g^wiēh₃*- ‘to live’, and this Proto-Tocharian word can mean both ‘living beings, people’ (= Skt. *jana-*) and ‘the world as ensemble of people and animals’ (Skt. *jagat-* or *loka-*), both of which are still preserved in TB *śaiṣṣe*. Due to close contact with the Sanskrit Buddhist texts TA *ārkišoši* was created as a loan translation of Skt. *sā(b)hāloka(dhātu)-*, for which Skt. *loka(dhātu)-* can be used as a synonym (cf. section 6.3 above). The existence of TA *ārkišoši*, which literally means ‘the world with radiance, the shining world’ referring to the world inhabited by human beings¹²¹ and later simply ‘the world’, narrows the original semantic field of TA *śoši*, namely both ‘living beings, people’ and ‘the world’, so that only the meaning ‘person, people’ (= Skt. *jana-*) is preserved, as reflected in the preserved Tocharian A corpus.¹²²

Although the content of SHT 4438 has not yet been determined, the incomplete sentence *kāmair anāry[ai]r jagat* in SHT 4438 Rb, where TB *śaiṣṣe* is written under Skt. *jagat* as explanation, is similar to the verse *lokasya kāmair na hi trptir asti* ‘For the people/the whole world there is no more satisfaction other than the sensual pleasures’ in *Saundarananda* 5.23.¹²³ The commentator of SHT 4438 must have been well-versed in Sanskrit, because

¹¹⁹ According to the statistics in CEToM, there are 1744 manuscripts containing TA and 8072 containing TB; cf. <https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?statistics&show=manuscripts> (accessed 21 September 2021).

¹²⁰ Cf. MALZAHN 2007b: 290 fn. 48 and OGIHARA 2014.

¹²¹ Despite the distinction in form, when using Chin. *suo po shi jie* (= Skt. *sabhālokadhātu-*), the Buddhist exegesis of ‘the world of endurance of suffering’ (Skt. *sahālokadhātu-*) is probably meant as well, since the Sanskrit parallels all contain *sahālokadhātu-* or *saha-lokadhātu-*. Such is probably the case with TA *ārkišoši*. As words with multiple semantic fields are often difficult to translate, such words are frequently loaned (e.g. Chin. *suo po shi jie*) or transmitted by means of loan translation (e.g. TA *ārkišoši*).

¹²² This kind of semantic development is widely attested, cf. Eng. *meat* vs. *sweetmeat*. The general sense ‘nourishment, food’ is preserved in the compound, while *meat* alone is used in a narrow sense and designates only one kind of nourishment, namely ‘flesh’, cf. OE *mete* ‘nourishment’, OHG *maz* ‘food’ (EWAhd: VI 218).

¹²³ JOHNSTON 1928: 31; MATSUNAMI 1981: 38.

some of the glosses are even written in Sanskrit (e.g. the gloss Skt. *aprameyaṃ* for *atulam* in SHT 4438 Ve). Therefore, he must have known that TA *ārkiśoṣi* corresponds to Skt. *sā(b)hāloka(dhātu)*- in the strict sense and not *jagat*-, while TA *śoṣi* only means ‘person’ as the equivalent of Skt. *jana*-. One possible solution would be the resort to TB *śaiṣṣe* (= Skt. *jagat*- or *loka*-).

9. Excursus: Further examples of Chinese Buddhist vocabulary influenced by Tocharian

9.1. Chin. 沙門 *sha men* ‘monk’

It remains the case that mainstream scholars of Buddhism and Tocharian specialists normally work independently, although the former group is aware that numerous Chinese Buddhist texts were translated by those closely related to the Tocharian region or more precisely the vast region from Kucha to Turfan, probably with Kumārajīva being the most prominent example. Therefore, for the Buddhist scholars unfamiliar with the Tocharian historical phonology and Tocharian Buddhist vocabulary, it is no wonder that the *communis opinio* would be that a Chinese Buddhist term such as *sha men* ‘monk’ is borrowed directly from Gāndhārī (Gāndh. *ṣamana* or *ṣamaṇa*).¹²⁴

Chin. *sha men* (沙門) ‘Buddhist monk’ is the standard translation of Skt. *śramaṇa*- in all the above cited Sanskrit texts, but strictly speaking Skt. *śramaṇa*- or Gāndh. *ṣamana* should be transliterated¹²⁵ as Chin. *sha men na* (沙門那), which indeed is attested. However, the token frequency of Chin. *sha men* against *sha men na* is 71915 : 191 in the whole CBETA corpus,¹²⁶ which makes the latter simply a minor variant. Chin. *sha men* MC /ʃai mwən/ is in fact the transliteration of TA *ṣāmaṇ* ‘Buddhist monk’, which itself is borrowed (probably directly from Khotanese *ṣṣamaṇa*) via Gāndhārī *ṣamaṇa*- from Skt. *śramaṇa*-, namely Chin. /ʃai mwən/ ← TA *ṣāmaṇ* ← (Khot. *ṣṣamaṇa* ←) Gāndh. *ṣamaṇa*- ← Skt. *śramaṇa*- ‘Buddhist monk’. The reason for the absolute prevalence of Chin. *sha men* is that since its early introduction from Tocharian by the pioneer translators,¹²⁷ it has become the fixed and standard *terminus technicus*.¹²⁸

¹²⁴ E.g. BOUCHER 1998: 477 fn. 38: ‘A common example that could be cited is *shamen* (Early Middle Chinese: *ṣa-mən*) 沙門, which transcribes *śramaṇa* but appears to reflect the particular Gāndhārī development of *śr* > *ṣ*, (*ṣamaṇa*).’

¹²⁵ In such cases ‘translation’, ‘transliteration’ and ‘transcription’ are all in use, but ‘transliteration’ is the most suitable term, cf. de JONG 1981: 111–112; BOUCHER 1998: 477 fn. 38.

¹²⁶ Cf. <https://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw> (accessed 21 September 2021).

¹²⁷ Cf. 沙門 in the translations by Lokakṣema (2nd cent. AD).

¹²⁸ Cf. BOUCHER 1998: 477 fn. 38: ‘Once these terms became part of the indigenous Chinese Buddhist vocabulary, translators often defaulted to them even if their Indic text may not have reflected the same phonology or exact meaning.’

Another important detail which speaks against the assumption of a direct borrowing from Gāndhārī must be brought to the fore. The 32nd chapter of the Sanskrit *Udānavarga* is called *Bhikṣuvarga* (BERNHARD 1965: 431) and throughout the whole chapter the Sanskrit keyword is *bhikṣu-*. However, in the Chinese translation of *Udānavarga* by Zhu Fonian (4th cent., T.212), the title is called 沙門品 *sha men pin* ‘chapter on *sha men*’, but throughout the whole chapter Chin. 比丘 *bi qiu* ‘bhikṣu’ occurs almost exclusively. The same situation is encountered in the Chinese translation of *Udānavarga* T.210 by Zhi Qian and [Zhu] Jianguan (3rd cent.): the title of *Bhikṣuvarga* is called Chin. *sha men pin*, but the main text contains almost exclusively Chin. *bi qiu*. In the 10th century translation by Tianxizai (active 980–1000), the title is ‘normal’, namely Chin. *bi qiu pin*.

The ‘directly from Gāndhārī’ theory certainly could not explain this strange circumstance, because in the Gāndhārī Dharmapada Gāndh. *śamaṇa-* and *bhikhu-* are clearly distinguished, cf. verse 80d: *so bramaṇo so śamaṇo so bhikhu* ‘a Brahman, an ascetic, a monk’ (BROUGH 1962: 130), cf. further the Pāli version in verse 142d of *Dhammapada*: *so brāhmaṇo so samaṇo sa bhikkhu* (von HINÜBER and NORMAN 1995: 40).

This peculiar translation is very likely to be attributable to Tocharian influence, since it is exactly the case in Tocharian, where TB *šamāne* and TA *šamam* are used to translate Skt. *bhikṣu-* ‘Buddhist monk’, which are etymologically unrelated, cf. *sa(manvā)gato bhikṣu • kekenu šamāne* ‘the monk endowed with’ in B 547 a1–2 and *bhikṣur na tāvatā bhavati | šamam mā tāpprem šolār māskaträ* ‘he becomes a monk not to that extent’ in a *Samyuktāgama* fragment A 360 a11 (= Uv. 32.18a). Skt. *bhikṣu-* is only preserved in the compound TA *pis-saṅk* ← Skt. *bhikṣu-saṅgha-* in e.g. A 428 a5.¹²⁹

The same situation is attested in Khotanese, where Khot. *ššamana* ‘monk’ is used to translate Skt. *bhikṣu* (cf. SKJÆRVØ 2004: II, 348), and this translational convention is very likely the origin of the Tocharian practice mentioned above, which is not surprising in view of other Khotanese loanwords into Tocharian, cf. TA *pissanṅ* < Khot. *bīsaṅga-** < Skt. *bhikṣusaṅgha-*; TA *mātār* TB *mādār* ‘sea-monster’ < Khot. *mādara-* < Skt. *makara-* ‘id.’ (TREMBLAY 2005: 434).¹³⁰

¹²⁹ According to TREMBLAY 2005: 434 the borrowing process should be: Skt. *bhikṣusaṅgha-* > Khot. *bālsaṅg(h)a-* > Khot. *bīsaṅga-** > TA *pissanṅ*.

¹³⁰ Although it cannot be excluded for sure that instead of the Tocharians the Khotanese translators had first introduced this peculiar usage into the Chinese translations, the preserved early Chinese translations by the translators in Khotan provide no supporting evidence, cf. for example the Chinese translation of *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra* produced by

9.2. Chin. 和尚 *he shang* ‘teacher, monk’

Chin. 和尚 *he shang* MC /fiwa dzjaŋ/ has several variants including Chin. 和上 *he shang* /fiwa dzjaŋ/, 和闍 *he she* /fiwa dzja/, 和社 *he she* /fiwa dzja/, 殭社 *wen she* /ʔwən dzja/, 鶻社 *hu she* /fiwət dzja/ and 烏社 *wu she* /fiwət dzja/. According to the lexicographical work *Yi qie jing yin yi*, Chin. 和上 *he shang* /fiwa dzjaŋ/ is an older and mistaken *hu* ‘foreign’ rendition, and the correct form is Chin. 鄔波柁耶 *wu bo duo ye* MC /ʔuo p(w)a da ya/, namely Skt. *upādhyāya-* ‘teacher’ (T.2128, 54.384c1).¹³¹ It is further recorded that Chin. 鶻社 *hu she* /fiwət dzja/ is used in Khotan and Shule (Kashgar).¹³²

However, in the Khotanese textual corpus there is no trace of Skt. *upādhyāya-* ‘teacher’: the standard word for ‘teacher’ is Khot. *āsāria-/āsiria-* < Gāndh. *ayariya-/aśariya-**¹³³ < Skt. *ācārya-*, which is also used to translate Skt. *bhikṣu-* ‘monk’; another popular word is Khot. *pīsaa-* ‘teacher’ < **upa-/pati-daisaka-* from Iran. **dais-* ‘to show’ (SKJÆRVØ 2004: II, 304); other less frequent words for ‘teacher’ are: Khot. *uysdīsāka-, kṣī’a-, nyūjāka-, nvaḍūdva-, śāstāra-* (← Skt. *śāstar-* ‘teacher’), *ācārī-* (← Skt. *ācārya-*).

That the Tarim Basin region was highly multilingual during the early transmission of Buddhism is confirmed by the manuscripts in numerous languages unearthed there.¹³⁴ As in the case of Chin. *sha men*, Gāndhārī, which is significant for the development of early Buddhism, very likely functioned as a crucial mediator. Skt. *upādhyāya-* ‘teacher’ corresponds to Gāndh. *uvaḥaya-* (cf. Pāli *upajjhāya-*), and taking into account that the initial *uva-* may be written *va-* in Gāndhārī, the word for ‘teacher’ would be *vaḥaya-**, cf. Gāndh. *vaśada-* for *uvaśada-* ‘calmed; Skt. *upaśānta-*’ (BROUGH 1962: 87), Gāndh. *vasapaḍa-* = *uvasampada-* ‘full ordination; Skt. *upasampadā-*’; cf. further Khot. *vavaj-* ‘to be reborn’ translating Skt. *upapadya-* ‘id.’ (e.g. Khot. *vavajīndā* ‘they are

Wuluocha in Khotan in 291, i.e. *Fang guang ban ruo jing* (T.221), where Chin. 沙門婆羅門 *sha men po luo men* and 沙門被服 *sha men pi fu* correspond to Skt. *śramaṇabrāhmaṇa-* and *śramaṇaveśa-* respectively while Chin. 比丘 *bi qiu* to Skt. *bhikṣu-*.

¹³¹ Chin. 鄔波柁耶, 梵語唐云親教師, 古譯云和上, 本是胡語詭略 *wu bo duo ye, fan yu tang yun qin jiao shi, gu yi yun he shang, ben shi hu yu e lie*. According to BOUCHER 2000: 11 when used to describe the Indic manuscripts, Chin. *hu* very likely refers to the ‘*kharoṣṭhī* manuscripts’. The variant Chin. 鄔波馱耶 *wu bo duo ye* MC /ʔuo p(w)a da ya/ is attested several times in the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya T.1442.

¹³² Cf. Chin. 和上, 謂之塢波地耶, 然其彼土流俗謂和上殭社, 于闐疏勒乃云鶻社, 今此方訛音謂之和上 *he shang, wei zhi wu bo di ye, ran qi bi tu liu su wei he shang wen she, yu tian shu le nai yun hu she, jin ci fang e yin wei zhi he shang* (T.2128, 54.441b14).

¹³³ On the sound change in Gāndhārī -y-> -ś- and ‘aus der chinesischen Übersetzung rekonstruierbar ...: Skt. *vinaya* : *vināśa*’, cf. von HINÜBER 2001: 174 § 213.

¹³⁴ Cf. the map on page 20–21 of the brochure ‘Turfan Studies’: http://turfan.bbaw.de/bilder/Turfan_engl_07.pdf (accessed 25 April 2021).

reborn’ in Khot. Suv 12.50, SKJÆRVØ 2004: I, 246), which is borrowed from Gāndh. *vavaj-* (cf. Gāndh. *vavajadi* < Skt. *upapadyate* ‘is reborn’).

If the 3-syllabic word Gāndh. *vājaya*-* [wa:dza:yə] was borrowed into Tocharian A, it would surface as TA *wājāya** > *wājā** (TA *-āya*- > *-ā-*, cf. WINTER 1965: 128), which would be borrowed into Chinese as 和社 *he she* /fiwa dzja/, Chin. 鶻社 *hu she* /fiwət dzja/ etc.; cf. Toch. A *wasāmpāt* ← Gāndh. *(u)vasampada-* ← Skt. *upasampadā-* ‘full ordination’, Toch. A *wāsak* ← Gāndh. *(u)vasaga-* ← Skt. *upāsaka-* ‘lay-disciple’, cf. further the attested variants TA *upādhyā/opādhyā* and *„pādhyā* (POUCHA 1955: 36). Within the Tocharian corpus both early and late loanwords can coexist, cf. TA *wašir* ([← Khot. *vašāra-*] ← Gāndh. *vayira-/vašira*-* ← Skt. *vajra-*) vs. TA *vājār* (← Skt. *vajra-*); TA *kantarw* (← Gāndh. *g(h)a(m)dhārva-* or Skt. *gandharva-*) vs. TA *gandharv* (← Skt. *gandharva-*); TA *tārme* vs. TA *dharm* (both from Skt. *dharma-*); TB *tarmarakši(t)e* in THT 2689 a2 vs. TB *dharmarakšite* in B 440 a2 (← Skt. *dharmarakṣita-*).

In fact, the Chinese materials testify to two variants, namely Chin. 和社 *he she* /fiwa dzja/ with a final vowel *-ǎ* and Chin. 和上 *he shang* /fiwa dzjaŋ/ with a final nasal *-n*. This again may be connected with the inner-Tocharian development by which proper names with vocalic stems frequently become nasal stems with individualising meaning after being borrowed into Tocharian. Among the numerous examples, the following ones are sufficient to elucidate this development: TA *devadatte* (← Skt. *devadatta-*) with abl. sing. *devadattenāš* (acc. sing. TA *devadattēm**),¹³⁵ TA *bādhari* (← Skt. *bādhari-*) with acc. sing. *bādhariṃ*. Like the development from Latin to Romance languages, instead of nominative the accusative or oblique form is used as the ‘Universalkasus’ form,¹³⁶ Chin. 和上 *he shang* /fiwa dzjaŋ/ could continue the accusative form of the *n*-stem, namely TA *wājām**.¹³⁷

The statement in *Yi qie jing yin yi*, that Chin. 鶻社 *hu she* /fiwət dzja/ is used in Khotan and Kashgar, does not necessarily speak against the theory above, since Tocharian was in wide use in the Tarim Basin region, and in addition to the northern Silk Road from Kucha to Turfan Tocharian texts have

¹³⁵ The origin of Tocharian A nouns in *-e* is unclear, but ‘there are indices that it somehow reflects an *n*-stem final’ (HILMARSSON 1996: 71, 85), cf. further PINAULT 2008: 480.

¹³⁶ ‘It is conventional to cite the accusative of all Latin noun types, except the 1st declension, as the virtual proto-form for the Romance reflexes’ (WEISS 2020: 544). However, proper names often retain the nominative, cf. Spanish *Carlos, Marcos* or French *Charles, Jacques* with the old nom. sing. ending *-s*.

¹³⁷ The accusative form with its final nasal was probably sufficiently frequent that it could be (mis)interpreted by Chinese speakers as the underlying stem.

also been discovered in Tumshuq (TREMBLAY 2001: 37; SCHMIDT 2018: 1–47) and along the southern Silk Road (e.g. Endere and Miran). Cf. further the so-called Kucha-Kharoṣṭhī script (SCHMIDT 2001b: 7–27).¹³⁸

9.3. Direct borrowings from Gāndhārī?

Concerning the origins of Chin. *sha men* ‘monk’ and Chin. *he shang* ‘teacher, monk’, the proposed borrowing processes above can be summarised as follows:

Chinese	← Tocharian A (← Khotanese)	← Gāndhārī	← Sanskrit
<i>sha men</i> /ʃaɪ mwən/	← <i>ṣāmaṃ</i> (← <i>ṣṣamana</i>)	<i>ṣamana-</i>	← <i>śramaṇa-</i> ‘monk’
<i>he shang</i> or <i>he she</i> /fiwa dzjaŋ/ or /fiwa dzja/	← <i>wājām*</i> (acc. sing.)/ <i>wājā*</i>	← <i>uvajaya-/vajaya-*</i>	← <i>upādhyāya-</i> ‘teacher’

If Chin. *sha men* was borrowed ‘directly’ from Gāndhārī *ṣamana*, it would have to be assumed that the stem vowel of Gāndh. *ṣamana* was reduced or simply not transcribed. Further analysis based on other examples will prove this explanation to be simplistic and not in line with the reality.

In both inherited words and loanwords, final **-æ* in Proto-Tocharian is dropped (> \emptyset) in Tocharian A and turns into *-e* in Tocharian B. For inherited lexemes, cf. PIE **gōmbʰos* ‘row of teeth’ > Proto-Toch. **kæmæ* > TB *keme* TA *kam* ‘tooth’ and PIE **h₂egōmh₁no-* > Proto-Toch. **akæmanæ* > TB *akémane*, TA *ākmāṃ* ‘leading’ (HACKSTEIN 2017: 1311); for loanwords, cf. TA *kaṣ* TB *keṣe* ‘fathom’ < Proto-Toch. **kæṣæ* < OIran. **kaša-* ‘armpit’; TA *parām* TB *perne* ‘glory’ < Proto-Toch. **pærnae* < OIran. **(s)farnah-* (TREMBLAY 2005: 425). TB *ṣamāne* ‘monk’ besides TA *ṣāmaṃ* confirms that when the Gāndhārī word became known to the Tocharians, the final vowel of Gāndh. *ṣamaṇa-* (sing. nom./acc. *ṣamaṇa/ṣamaṇo/ṣamane*) was preserved and still pronounced.¹³⁹

¹³⁸ LIN 1995: 440 traced Chin. *he shang* back to Khot. *āṣana-* ‘worthy’, which is phonologically and semantically impossible.

¹³⁹ But the exact quality of the preserved final stem vowel of the Gāndhārī word is unclear, ‘since the Tocharian ending might have been assigned according to a rule of morphological equivalence by speakers that knew both languages well’ (RINGE 1996: 92). It is, however, quite arbitrary to assume that approximately during the same period another group of Gāndhārī speakers in direct contact with the early Chinese translators tended to drop the final *-a/-o/-e*, if no other evidence exists.

Therefore, the claimed development that the stem vowel was reduced or simply not transcribed must be attributed to the habit or convention of the ancient Chinese translators or speakers, who allegedly tended to drop the final *-a/-o/-e* in borrowing the Indic Buddhist terms. But the final *-a/-o/-e* in Middle Chinese of native Chinese words were apparently not subject to such reduction.

Chin. 波逸提 *bo yi ti* corresponds to Skt. *pāṭayantika-/pāyattika-/pāyantika-/prāyaścitta-* ‘transgression’ (Pāli *pācittiya-*, Gāndh. *payati-*). Chin. *bo yi ti* MC /p(w)a yit dei/ is certainly a loanword, and Gāndh. *payati-* seems to be the source. However, in this case there are two problems with the hypothesis of direct borrowing from Gāndhārī: (1) the stem vowel *-i* of Gāndh. *payati-* is preserved and the third syllable *-ti-* corresponds to Chin. 提 *ti* MC /dei/; (2) the second syllable *-ya-* in Gāndh. *payati-* could hardly correspond to Chin. 逸 *yi* MC /yit/, cf. Chin. 夜叉 *ye cha* MC /ya(eH) tṣʰaj/ borrowed from Skt. *yakṣa-* (Gāndh. *yakṣa-*). In fact, Gāndh. *payati-* has been borrowed into Tocharian as TA/TB *pāyti*, and TB *pāyti* must come from TA *pāyti*, because according to the accent rule in Tocharian B,¹⁴⁰ Gāndh. *payati-* would surface as TB †*payāti* if borrowed directly into Tocharian B (cf. TA *ākās* TB *akāse* ← Skt. *ākāsa-* ‘open space’). TA/TB *pāyti* matches the Middle Chinese reconstruction /p(w)a yit dei/ of Chin. *bo yi ti* perfectly, since the consonant group *-yt-* in TA *pāyti* (from TA *pāyti**¹⁴¹ with reduction of *ā* in the post-accentual open syllable) was very likely pronounced with an epenthetic schwa */-yət-/*.

Therefore, the hypothesis of direct borrowing from Gāndhārī would inevitably lead to the conclusion that in borrowing Gāndhārī words, the Chinese translators would drop the final vowel of *a*-stems but keep the stem vowel *-i-*. This theory would make more sense if someone could explain why the *a*-stems and *i*-stems were treated differently by the Chinese translators. However, in Tocharian A *a*-stem and *i*-stem loanwords indeed undergo different sound changes, cf. TA *saṅghāṭi* (← Skt. *saṅghāṭi-* ‘waist-cloth’) vs. TA *saṅghāt* (← Skt. *saṅghāta-* ‘multitude’).¹⁴²

Furthermore, if Gāndh. *uvaṅjaya-/vaṅjaya-** (← Skt. *upādhyāya-* ‘teacher’) had been borrowed directly into Chinese by reducing the stem vowel, instead of MC /fiwa dzja/ it should be †/fiwa dzjaṯ/, and the variant with final nasal

¹⁴⁰ ‘The default accent rule for words with more than two syllables in West Tocharian is that the peninitial syllable hosts the accent’ (HACKSTEIN 2017: 1306).

¹⁴¹ In the second syllable of Tocharian A words, ‘both *ā* and *a* are weakened to *ä/Ø* in words of three or more syllables, if the first syllable contains *ā*, *a*, *e*, or *o*’, cf. TA **ākamām* > *ākmām* ‘leading’ and TA **pāplāntu* > *pāplāntu* ‘delighted’ (HACKSTEIN 2017: 1308).

¹⁴² Cf. KRAUSE and THOMAS 1960: 42–43. It is not useful to assume that the *i*-stem loanwords were borrowed from Tocharian but *a*-stems loanwords came directly from Gāndhārī, since such a differentiation itself needs justification.

MC /fiwa dzjaŋ/ becomes equally inexplicable, since for *a*-stems in Gāndhārī ‘the distinction between nominative and accusative singular had already been lost at the time when the Dharmapada manuscript was written’ (100–200 AD) ‘and examples were quoted of *-o*, *-u*, and *-a* used apparently indifferently for nominative and accusative masculine and neuter’ (BROUGH 1962: 113).

9.4. Borrowing of Buddhist terminology from Tocharian A into Tocharian B

Concerning the lexical interchange between Tocharian A and B, the *communis opinio* is that the lexical borrowing is predominantly from Tocharian B to A.¹⁴³ The identification of Buddhist Chinese vocabulary of Tocharian A origin opens the door to a renewed investigation of the transmission of Buddhist terminology between Tocharian A and B. Based on the word pair TB *šamāne* and TA *šāmaṃ* ‘monk’ from Gāndhārī *šamaṇa-* ‘id.’, it is reasonable to draw the conclusion that if Gāndh. *niṣīdana-* (← Buddhist Skt. *niṣīdana-* ‘sitting mat’, cf. Pāli *niṣīdana-* ‘id.’) was borrowed into Tocharian, it would likewise surface as TB *niṣīdane** and TA *niṣīdam**. In fact, the Tocharian B word for ‘sitting mat’ is indeed attested, and four times alone in the Pātayantika fragment IOL Toch 247 a3–5 (parallel in IOL Toch 210).¹⁴⁴ The TB form is not TB †*niṣīdane**, but *niṣīdam*, which must therefore have been borrowed from Tocharian A after apocope in the latter language. TA/TB *niṣīdam* ‘sitting mat’ is then very likely the direct source of Chin. 尼師壇 *ni shi tan* MC /ni ši dan/ ‘id.’.¹⁴⁵

This list can be extended by numerous Buddhist terms in Tocharian B, cf. TB *andhávaṃ* in IOL Toch 247 a3 pre-TA *andhāvam** ← Middle Indic *andhavana*,¹⁴⁶ TB *ārth* (not †*ārthe*) ← TA *arth* ← Skt. *artha-* ‘meaning’, TB *cākkār*¹⁴⁷ ← TA *cākkār* ← Skt./Gāndh. *cakra-* ‘wheel’, TB *wasāmpāt*¹⁴⁸ ← TA *wasāmpāt* ← Gāndh. (*u*)*vasāmpada-* ← Skt. *upasāmpadā-* ‘full ordination’. With respect to the Buddhist terminology of Indo-Aryan origin, it is thus

¹⁴³ For the abundant examples, cf. WINTER 1961.

¹⁴⁴ On this Vinaya rule in IOL Toch a3–5, cf. PAN 2021: 126–131.

¹⁴⁵ Chin. *ni shi tan* is widely attested in the Taisho corpus (714 times in 312 volumes in CBETA database <https://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw>, accessed 21 September 2021), but not used in the Chinese MSV. However, the marginal variant Chin. 尼師但那 *ni shi tan na* /ni ši dan na/ (75 times in 29 volumes in CBETA) from Buddhist Skt. *niṣīdana-* or Gāndh. *niṣīdana-* ‘sitting mat’ occurs almost exclusively in the Chinese MSV.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. MALALASEKERA 1937–1938: 111. THOMAS and KRAUSE 1964: 163 (‘*Andhave* skt. *Andhava*’) did not recognise the original Indic form and even misread the syllable on the manuscript. This mistaken interpretation was adopted by SCHMIDT 1974: 400. Cf. OGIHARA 2009: 395–397, who has offered the correct reading and interpretation.

¹⁴⁷ Instead of TB †*cākre-*, cf. TB *sākre** vs. TA *sākār* ‘blessed’.

¹⁴⁸ Instead of TB †*wasāmpata*, cf. TB *nānda* ← Skt. *nandā* and TB *nandābala* ← Skt. *nandabala*.

necessary to distinguish earlier borrowings of (pre-)Proto-Tocharian date such as TB *šamāne* and TA *šāmaṃ* from later ones discussed here, and further investigation of such borrowings from Tocharian A into B is a desideratum.

9.5. A note on textual chronology

It is true that the earliest identified Tocharian A manuscripts were written later than the earliest Tocharian B manuscripts, but if based on this circumstance someone tries to argue that Tocharian A could not have had any influence on Buddhist terminology in Tocharian B or Chinese texts, this would be a naive mode of thinking. Following this logic, the *R̥gveda* must be later than the Aśoka inscriptions and could not have any influence on the Middle Indic and Classical Sanskrit texts, because the earliest preserved Vedic manuscripts were written around the 12th cent. AD,¹⁴⁹ whereas the Aśoka inscriptions are dated to the 3rd cent. BC. In fact, Chin. 沙門 *sha men* occurs already in the translations by Lokakṣema, which means that already in the 2nd cent. AD people using Tocharian A were in contact with Chinese translators. Furthermore, it is well known that Buddhist, Vedic, Jaina and Avestan texts were transmitted exclusively orally before scripts and writing instruments became available. Even after the invention of scripts and writing materials these texts continued to be transmitted orally for many centuries, in some cases even down to the present day.

10. Conclusion

The results from the philological and linguistic investigation above can be summarised as follows. Different from TB *šaiṣṣe* meaning both ‘world’ and ‘people’, TA *šoši* designates only ‘person’ (= Skt. *jana-*). Furthermore, just as Skt. *bahujana-* and Skt. *bahu-* ‘many (people)’, the phrase TA *māk šoši* ‘many people’ (= Skt. *bahu-jana-*) is interchangeable with TA *māk* in the phrases TA *māk šoši šomināsyo* and *māk šomināsyo* ‘with many girls’ as well as in TA *māk šoši wrasañ* and TA *māk wrasañ* ‘numerous people’, and this circumstance furnishes thus an indirect evidence for the equivalence of TA *šoši* and Skt. *jana-*.

The Buddhist terms *sahāloka(dhātu)-* and *sahā(ṃ)pati-* are later than *sabhā-pati-* ‘lord of the assembly’, an epithet of Brahmā attested in the younger Vedic texts. Due to the sound change of *-bh-* > *-h-* in Middle Indic, the latter then came to be reinterpreted as *sahā-pati-* ‘lord of the earth (← the bearing, enduring one)’, whence *sahāloka(dhātu)-* ‘world (realm) of endurance’, i.e. the world-system of living beings, originated. This is further corroborated by

¹⁴⁹ Cf. WITZEL 2018.

the Chinese evidence, where the first part of the compound is rendered either with *-bh-* phonetically as Chin. *suo po (shi jie)* ‘*sabhā* (world)’ and *suo po (shi jie zhu)* ‘(master of) the *sabhā* (world)’ or with *-h-* as Chin. *ren (shi jie)*, *kan ren (shi jie)* ‘(world of) endurance (*sahā*)’ and *suo he (shi jie)* ‘the *sahā* (world)’. Remarkably, the translators associated with Kucha (Kumārajīva and Dharmakṣema) consistently use the former, showing that the older variant with Skt. *sabhā-* was prevalent there. Therefore, TA *ārki-śoši* is very likely a loan translation of Buddhist Skt. *sābhā-loka(dhātu)-* around Kucha, where the uncommon word Skt. *sābhā-* was understood as containing *-(ā)bhā-* ‘radiance’ and thus rendered with TA *ārki* ‘radiant, shining, white’. This would then explain the singular Tocharian B gloss *śaiṣṣe* for Buddhist Skt. *jagat* in the fragment SHT 4438: since TA *śoši* ‘person’ corresponded to Skt. *jana-* and TA *ārkiśoši* to Skt. *sābhāloka(dhātu)-*, the commentator opted for TB *śaiṣṣe*, which can mean ‘world’ and is suitable for glossing Skt. *jagat-*.

The excursus offers a glimpse into the complicated interaction of languages at play in the transmission of Buddhism from India through Xinjiang to China. This is exemplified by Chin. *sha men* ‘monk’, which must have been borrowed not ‘directly’ from Gāndhārī *śamana-*, but from Tocharian A *śamaṃ*. Chin. *he shang* ‘teacher, monk’ and its variants serve as another example. The Gāndhārī form *uvaṣaya-/vaṣaya-** (< Skt. *upādhyāya-* ‘teacher’) must have been borrowed into Tocharian A as *wājā**, whence the Middle Chinese variants /fiwa dzja/ or /fiwa dzjan/ (the latter presumably from the accusative form TA *wājām**) originated.

Acknowledgements

I want to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Olav Hackstein for his teaching and guidance. I am also grateful for the important comments and corrections by my colleagues Dr. Sergio Neri and Dr. CHEN Ruixuan (陈瑞翹). The important and meticulous notes and comments of the two anonymous Reviewers have enabled me to improve this article further. Last but not least, I want to thank Dr. Małgorzata WIELIŃSKA-SOLTWEDEL sincerely for accepting this paper and for her editorial work. None of these scholars is to be held responsible for the views expressed and possible mistakes in this article.

Funding

This article is a staged achievement of the National Social Science Fund, China (No.19VJX086).¹⁵⁰

¹⁵⁰ 国家社科基金冷门绝学专项《藏汉文献中吐火罗史料为切入研究青藏高原与西域古国间早期文化交流史》。

Abbreviations

A	manuscripts written in Tocharian A, published in SIEG and SIEGLING 1921.
AiGr	<i>Altindische Grammatik</i> . See WACKERNAGEL 1905; WACKERNAGEL and DEBRUNNER 1954.
AVP	<i>Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā Paippalāda</i> . See LOPEZ 2000.
AVŚ	<i>Avadāna-Śataka</i> . See VAIDYA 1958 and SPEYER 1906–1909.
B	manuscripts written in Tocharian B, published in SIEG and SIEGLING 1949; 1953.
BHSD	<i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary</i> . See EDGERTON 1953.
CBETA	Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association.
CEToM	A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts (https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian)
Chin.	Chinese
CPS	<i>Catuṣpariṣatsūtra</i> . See WALDSCHMIDT 1952–1962.
Divy	<i>Divyāvadāna</i> . See COWELL and NEIL 1886.
DN II	<i>The Dīgha Nikāya</i> . Vol. II. See DAVIDS and CARPENTER 1903.
Eng.	English
EWAhd	<i>Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen</i> . See LLOYD, LÜHR et al. 1988–2021.
EWAia	<i>Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen</i> . See MAYRHOFER 1986–2001.
Gāndh.	Gāndhārī
Gr.	Greek
Hitt.	Hittite
IDP	International Dunhuang Project
IOL	India Office Library
Kar-p	<i>Karuṇāpuṇḍarīkasūtra</i> . See YAMADA 1989.
KEWA	<i>Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen</i> . See MAYRHOFER 1956–1980.
Khot.	Khotanese
LV	<i>Lalitavistara</i> . See HOKAZONO 1994.
MaitrHami	<i>Maitreyasamitināṭaka</i> from Hami. See GENG et al. 1988.
MC	Middle Chinese reconstruction.
MPS	<i>Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra</i> . See WALDSCHMIDT 1950–1951.

- MSV Mūlasarvāstivādinaya. See BAGCHI 1967.
- MV *Mahāvastu*. See SENART 1882–1897.
- MW Monier-Williams, Monier 1899. *A Sanskrit-English dictionary: etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- NHG New High German
- OCS Old Church Slavonic
- OE Old English
- OHG Old High German
- PIE Proto-Indo-European
- PK NS Pelliot Koutchéen Nouvelle Série
- Pkt. Prakrit
- PW Böhrling, Otto von and Rudolph von Roth 1855–1875. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. 7 vols. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- pw Böhrling, Otto von 1883–1886. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- RV *Die Hymnen des Rigveda*. See AUFRECHT 1877.
- Saddh-p *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*. See WOGIHARA and TSUCHIDA 1934.
- SBhV *Saṅghabhedavastu*. See GNOLI 1977–1978.
- SHT Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden as catalogue and the 12-part publication by Ernst Waldschmidt, Lore Sander et al. 1965–2017.
- SI B SerIndia Berezovsky collection
- Skt. Sanskrit
- Suv *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*. See NOBEL 1937.
- SWTF WALDSCHMIDT, BECHERT et al. 1994–2018.
- T TAKAKUSU, Junjiro and Kaigyoku WATANABE 1924–1934. *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō, The Tripitaka in Chinese*. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taisho Issaikyo Kankokai.
- TA Tocharian A
- TB Tocharian B
- Tib. Tibetan
- Toch. Tocharian
- Ved. Vedic
- Vkn *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*. See TAKAHASHI, MAEDA et al. 2004.

References

- AUFRECHT, Theodor 1877. *Die Hymnen des R̥igveda*. 2nd ed. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.
- BAGCHI, Sitansusekhar 1967. *Mulasarvāstivādavinayavastu*. Darbhanga: Mithilāvidyāpīṭhapradhānena prakāśitam.
- BERNHARD, FRANZ 1965. *Udānavarga*. Band I: *Einleitung, Beschreibung der Handschriften, Textausgabe, Bibliographie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- BOUCHER, Daniel 1998. ‘Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered’. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118(4): 471–506.
- BOUCHER, Daniel 2000. ‘On Hu and Fan Again: the Transmission of “Barbarian” Manuscripts to China’. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23(1): 7–28.
- BROUGH, John 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London: Oxford University Press.
- BUSWELL, Robert E. and Donald S. LOPEZ 2014. *The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- CARLING, Gerd 2009. *A Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Volume 1: *A–J*. In Collaboration with Georges-Jean Pinault and Werner Winter. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CONE, Margaret 2010. *A dictionary of Pāli*. Part 2: *g–n*. Bristol: Pali Text Society.
- COUVREUR, Walter 1964. ‘Nieuwe Koetsjische fragmenten van het Araṇemijātaka’. *Orientalia Gandensia* 1: 237–249 [+ plates I–VII].
- COWELL, Edward and Robert NEIL 1886. *The Divyāvadāna: a collection of early Buddhist legends*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DAVIDS, T. W. Rhys and J. Estlin CARPENTER 1903. *The Dīgha Nikāya*. Vol. II. London: Pali Text Society.
- EDGERTON, Franklin 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- GENG, Shimin 耿世民, Hans-Joachim KLIMKEIT and Jens Peter LAUT 1988. ‘Das Erscheinen des Bodhisattva. Das 11. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der *Maitrisimit*’. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 15(2): 315–366.
- GNOLI, Raniero 1977–1978. *The Gilgit manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu: being the 17th and last section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. 2 vols. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio et Estremo Oriente.
- GOTŌ, Toshifumi 後藤 敏文 2013. *Old Indo-Aryan morphology and its Indo-Iranian background*, in co-operation with Jared S. Klein and Velizar Sadovski. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- HACKSTEIN, Olav 2012. ‘Collective and Feminine in Tocharian’. [In:] Hackstein, Olav and Ronald I. Kim, eds, *Multilingualism and History of Knowledge*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 143–177.

- HACKSTEIN, Olav 2017. ‘The phonology of Tocharian’. [In:] Klein, Jared S. et al., eds, *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*. Vol 2. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, pp. 1304–1335.
- HACKSTEIN, Olav, Hiromi HABATA and Christoph BROSS 2019. *Tocharische Texte zur Buddhalegende*. Dettelbach: Röhl Verlag.
- HARTMANN, Jens-Uwe 1987. *Das Varṇārhavarṇastotra des Mātrceṭa*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, Band 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- HE, Shuqun 何書群 [RADICH, Michael] 2019. ‘Zhu Fahu shi fou xiuding guo T474?’ 竺法護是否修訂過 T474? *Foguang xuebao* 佛光學報 *New Series* 5(2): 15–38.
- HILMARSSON, Jörundur 1996. *Materials for a Tocharian historical and etymological dictionary*. Reykjavík: Málvisindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- HINÜBER, Oskar von 2001. *Das ältere Mittellindisch im Überblick*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- HINÜBER, Oskar von and K. R. NORMAN 1995. *Dhammapada*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- HOFFMANN, Karl and Bernhard FORSSMAN 2004. *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen.
- HOKAZONO, Koichi 外園 幸一 1994. *Raritavisutara no kenkyu* ラリタヴィスタラの研究. Tokyo: Daito Shuppansha.
- ISHIHAMA, Yumiko 石濱 裕美子 and Yoichi FUKUDA 福田 洋一 1989. *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvvyutpatti. Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology*. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.
- Ji, Xianlin 季羨林, Werner WINTER and Georges-Jean PINAULT 1998. *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- JOHNSTON, Edward H. 1928. *The Saundarananda of Āsvaghoṣa*. London, Oxford University Press.
- de JONG, J. W. 1981. ‘Fa-hsien and Buddhist Texts in Ceylon’. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 9: 105–16.
- KARASHIMA, Seishi 辛嶋 静志 2001. *A Glossary of Kumārajīva’s Translation of the Lotus Sutra*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism.
- KRAUSE, Wolfgang and Werner THOMAS 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band I Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- LIN, Meicun 林梅村 1995. *Civilization in the Western Region* 西域文明. Peking: Dongfang Chubanshe.
- LLOYD, Albert L., Rosemarie LÜHR et al. 1988–2021. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. 7 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- LOPEZ, Carlos Alfredo 2000. *The Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda: A Critical Edition, Translation, and Study of Books 13 and 14*. Dissertation Harvard University.

- LÜHR, Rosemarie, ed. 2008. *Nominale Wortbildung des Indogermanischen in Grundzügen. Die Wortbildungsmuster ausgewählter indogermanischer Einzelsprachen*. Band 2: *Hethitisch, Altindisch, Altarmenisch*. Bearbeitet von Joachim Matzinger. Hamburg: Kovač.
- MALALASEKERA, G. P. 1937–1938. *Dictionary of Pāli proper names*. 2 vols. London: Murray.
- MALZAHN, Melanie 2007a. 'A preliminary survey of the Tocharian glosses in the Berlin Turfan Collection'. [In:] Malzahn, Melanie, ed., *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Heidelberg: Winter, pp. 301–319.
- MALZAHN, Melanie 2007b. 'The most archaic manuscripts of Tocharian B and the varieties of the Tocharian B language'. [In:] Malzahn, Melanie, ed., *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Heidelberg: Winter, pp. 255–297.
- MATSUNAMI, Seiren 松濤 誠廉 1981. *Asvaghosa's Saundarananda, a Japanese Translation from the Original Sanskrit* 馬鳴 端正なる難陀. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- MAYRHOFER, Manfred 1956–1980. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. 4 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.
- MAYRHOFER, Manfred 1986–2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.
- MELCHERT, Craig 2000. 'Tocharian Plurals in *-nt-* and Related Phenomena'. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 9: 53–75.
- MITRA, Rājendralāla, ed. 1877. *The Lalita Vistara or memoirs of the early life of S'a'kya Siñha*. Calcutta: Lewis.
- NERI, Sergio and Sabine ZIEGLER 2012. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Dialekte*. Private digital version.
- NOBEL, Johannes 1937. *Suvarnabhāsottamasūtra: das Goldglanz-Sūtra; ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- OGIHARA, Hirotoši 荻原 裕敏 2009. *Researches about Vinaya-texts in Tocharian A and B*. PhD dissertation, École Pratique des Hautes Études.
- OGIHARA, Hirotoši 荻原 裕敏 2014. 'Fragments of secular documents in Tocharian A'. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 15: 103–129.
- PAN, Tao 潘涛 2021. 'A New Look at the Skt.-Toch. Bilingual *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*-Fragment THT 542'. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 73(2): 117–146.
- PEDERSEN, Holger 1941. *Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichung*. København: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- PEYROT, Michaël 2014. 'Notes on Tocharian glosses and colophons in Sanskrit manuscripts I'. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 15: 131–179.
- PEYROT, Michaël 2015. 'Notes on Tocharian glosses and colophons in Sanskrit manuscripts II'. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 16: 107–130.

- PFEIFER, Wolfgang 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*. 2 vols. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- PINAULT, Georges-Jean 2008. *Chrestomathie tocharienne. Textes et Grammaire*. Leuven/Paris: Peeters.
- POUCHA, Pavel 1955. *Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A*. Praha: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství.
- RINGE, Donald 1996. *On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- SĀSTRĪ, T. Gaṇapati 1920. *The Aryamanjusrīmūlakalpa* 1. Trivandrum: Government Press.
- ŚĀSTRĪ, Haraprasāda 1910. *Saundaranandaṃ Kāvyaṃ*. Bibliotheca Indica; A Collection of Oriental Works. New Series 1251. Calcutta: Asiatic Society.
- SCHLINGLOFF, Dieter 1963. 'Zum Mahāgovindasūtra'. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientalforschung* 8: 31–50.
- SCHMIDT, Klaus T. 1974. *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. Dissertation. Universität Göttingen.
- SCHMIDT, Klaus T. 1987. 'Zu einer metrischen Übersetzung von Mātṛceṣas Buddhastotra Varnārhavarṇa in tocharischer Sprache'. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 1: 152–168.
- SCHMIDT, Klaus T. 2001a. 'Die westtocharische Version des Araṇemi-Jātakas in deutscher Übersetzung'. [In:] Bazin, Louis and Peter Zieme, eds, *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*. Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 299–327.
- SCHMIDT, Klaus T. 2001b. 'Entzifferung verschollener Schriften und Sprachen. Dargestellt am Beispiel der Kučā-Kharoṣṭhī Typ B und des Kučā-Prākṛits'. *Göttinger Beiträge zur Asienforschung* 1: 7–27.
- SCHMIDT, Klaus T. 2018. *K. T. Schmidt: Nachgelassene Schriften*. Zimmer, Stefan, ed. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- SCHWYZER, Eduard 1939. *Griechische Grammatik 1: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. München: Beck.
- SENART, Émile, ed. 1882–1897. *Le Mahāvastu*. 3 vols. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.
- SHASTREE, K. K. 1997. *The Bhāgavata*. Vol. IV [Skandha X]. Ahmadabad: B. J. Institute of Learning and Research.
- SHASTREE, K. K. et al. 1998. *The Bhāgavata*. Vol. III [Skandha VII to IX]. Ahmadabad: B.J. Institute of Learning and Research.
- SIEG, Emil and Wilhelm SIEGLING 1921. *Tocharische Sprachreste. I. Band. Die Texte. A. Transcription*. Berlin & Leipzig: de Gruyter.
- SIEG, Emil and Wilhelm SIEGLING 1949. *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Heft 1. Die Udānālankāra-Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Glossar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- SIEG, Emil and Wilhelm SIEGLING 1953. *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Heft 2. Fragmente Nr. 71–633*, aus dem Nachlass hg. v. Werner Thomas. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- SIEG, Emil, Wilhelm SIEGLING and Wilhelm SCHULZE 1931. *Tocharische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- SKJÆRVØ, Prods O. 2004. *The most excellent shine of gold, king of kings of Sutras*. 1: *The Khotanese text with english translation and the complete sanskrit text*. Vol. 2: *Manuscripts, commentary, glossary, indexes*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- SPEYER, Jacob, ed. 1906–1909. *Avadānaçataka*. 2 Volumes. St.-Petersbourg: Acad. Impériale des Sciences.
- TAKAHASHI, Hisao 高橋 尚夫, Takashi MAEDA 前田 崇 et al., eds 2004. *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*. Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations. Tokyo: Taisho University Press.
- THOMAS, Werner and Wolfgang KRAUSE 1964. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Band II: *Texte und Glossar*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- TREMBLAY, Xavier 2001. *Pour une histoire de la Sérinde: le manichéisme parmi les peuples et religions d'Asie Centrale d'après les sources primaires*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- TREMBLAY, Xavier 2005. 'Irano-Tocharica et Tocharo-Iranica'. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 68: 421–449.
- VAIDYA, P. Lakṣmaṇa, ed. 1958. *Avadāna-Śataka*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute.
- VAIDYA, P. Lakṣmaṇa, ed. 1960a. *Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute.
- VAIDYA, P. Lakṣmaṇa, ed. 1960b. *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 5. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute.
- VAIDYA P. Lakṣmaṇa, ed. 1961. *Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha* 1. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute.
- WACKERNAGEL, Jacob 1905. *Altindische Grammatik*. Band II, 1: *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- WACKERNAGEL, Jacob and Albert DEBRUNNER 1954. *Altindische Grammatik*. Band II,2: *Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst 1950–1951. *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*: Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pāli; nebst einer Übersetzung der chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst 1952–1962. *Das Catuspariṣatsūtra*. 3 Bände. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst, Heinz BECHERT et. al. 1994–2018. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*. 4 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- WALSHE, Maurice 1995. *The Long Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Digha Nikaya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- WEISS, Michael L. 2020. *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.
- WINTER, Werner 1961. 'Lexical Interchange between "Tocharian" A and B'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 81(3): 271–280.
- WINTER, Werner 1965. 'Zur Vorgeschichte einiger Verbformen in Tocharisch A'. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 79: 203–210.
- WITZEL, Michael, ed. 2018. *The Two Oldest Veda Manuscripts*. Facsimile Edition of Vājasaneyi Samhitā 1–20 (Samhitā- and Padapāṭha) from Nepal and Western Tibet (c. 1150 CE). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- WODTKO, Dagmar S., Britta IRLINGER and Carolin SCHNEIDER 2008. *Nomina in indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- WOGIHARA, Unrai 荻原 雲来, ed. 1971. *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā by Yaśomitra*. 2 vols. Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store.
- WOGIHARA, Unrai 荻原 雲来 1986. *Sanskrit-Japanese Dictionary* 漢訳対照梵和大辞典. Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- WOGIHARA, U. 荻原 雲来 and C. TSUCHIDA 土田 勝弥, eds and trans. 1934. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-Sūtram*. Tokyo: Seigo Kenkyūkai.
- YAMADA, Isshi 山田 一止 1968, ed. *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka: the White Lotus of Compassion*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.



Fig. 1. Manuscript picture of SHT 4438 b containing TB *śaiṣṣe*
 ©Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz / Photograph
 Left: TA *kārpisyo* ‘with the vulgar (desires)’ (= Skt. *anāryaiḥ*);
 Right: TB *śaiṣṣe* ‘world’ (= Skt. *jagat*)



Institute of Mediterranean and Oriental Cultures
Polish Academy of Sciences

ACTA ASIATICA
VARSOVIENSIA

No. 34

Warsaw 2021

Editor-in-Chief

MAŁGORZATA
WIELIŃSKA-SOLTWEDEL

Editorial secretary

Central & East Asia Department
NICOLAS LEVI

Central & South-East Asia Department

OLENA LUCYSZYNA
MAŁGORZATA GLINICKA

English Text Consultant

JO HARPER

Board of Advisory Editors

ABDULRAHMAN AL-SALIMI

MAX DEEG

HIROMI HABATA

MING-HUEI LEE

PETRA MAURER

MAREK MEJOR

THUAN NGUYEN QUANG

KENNETH OLENIK

JOLANTA

SIERAKOWSKA-DYNDO

BOGDAN SKŁADANEK

HAIPENG ZHANG

MONIKA ZIN

© Copyright by Institute of Mediterranean and Oriental Cultures,

Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw 2021

PL ISSN 0860-6102

eISSN 2449-8653

ISBN 978-83-7452-091-1

Contents

- **MALGORZATA WIELIŃSKA-SOLTWEDEL:** Editorial 5
- **DIWAKAR ACHARYA:** The Androgynous Form of Viṣṇu and the Yet
Unpublished *Vāsudevakalpa* 7
- **HERMINA CIELAS:** Elements of Animate and Inanimate Nature
in the Practice of *Avadhāna* 29
- **MAX DEEG:** Indian Regional *nāga* Cults and Individual *nāga*
Stories in Chinese Buddhist Travelogues 51
- **NICOLAS LEVI, ROMAN HUSARSKI:** Buddha under Control.
Buddhism's Legacy in North Korea 79
- **HONG LUO:** The Karmabhedavastu of Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* 97
- **OLENA ŁUCYSZYNA:** Sāṃkhya on the Validity (*prāmāṇya*)
and Invalidity (*aprāmāṇya*) of Cognition 145
- **KATARZYNA MARCINIAK:** The Thirty-Two Marks of a Great Man
in Two Metrical Lists in the *Mahāvastu* 177
- **XIAOQIANG MENG:** A Preliminary Study of the Dunhuang Tibetan
Fragments of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Ekottarakarmaśataka* (I):
Tarjanīyakarman 205
- **MARTA MONKIEWICZ:** Calendrical Terminology in the Early
Vedic Astronomical Treatises of the *Jyotiṣavedāṅga* 243

- **TAO PAN:** Tocharian A *ārkiśoṣi* ‘world with radiance’
and Chinese *suo po shi jie* ‘world of *sabhā*’ 263
- **DAVID PIERDOMINICI LEÃO:** A New House for the God in Tenkasi:
Divine Dreams and Kings in 15th–16th-century Pāṇṭiya
Inscriptions and Sanskrit Courtly Production 295
- **BARBARA STÖCKER-PARNIAN:** The Tomb Inscription for Liu Zhi
at the End of the Qing Period (1910). Commemoration
of an Islamic Scholar by a Traditional Inscription to Support
Modernisation 313
- **HANNA URBAŃSKA:** The Twilight Language of Siddhas
and Sanskrit Figures of Speech in *Viśākha Ṣaṣṭi* 329
- **AIQING WANG:** *Breaking an Eagle* and Pick-Up Artists in
a Chinese Context 357
- Editorial principles 376