



HAL
open science

The Uyghur Buddhists as sponsors and disciples of the Tocharians

Georges-Jean Pinault

► **To cite this version:**

Georges-Jean Pinault. The Uyghur Buddhists as sponsors and disciples of the Tocharians. Doctoral. Germany. 2022. hal-03889270

HAL Id: hal-03889270

<https://hal.science/hal-03889270v1>

Submitted on 7 Dec 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



The Uyghur Buddhists as sponsors and disciples of the Tocharians

Georges-Jean PINAULT (EPHE, PSL / ERC HisTochText¹)

Online-Vorlesung. University Göttingen. Seminar für Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde
November 18, 2022

Lecture in a cycle of 13 online lectures (Webinar) of the
Seminar für Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde, Universität Göttingen

This publication belongs to the research conducted under the HisTochText project. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 788205).

1. *Tocharian*, G. *Tocharisch*, Fr. *tokharien*. Independent branch of the Indo-European language family, spoken and written in the Tarim Basin, Xinjiang province, China, roughly during the 1st millenium CE. Group of two different, albeit closely related, languages, Tocharian A and Tocharian B.
2. Documented by manuscripts found in the oases of the trade route, on the northern edge of the Taklamakan desert, roughly between Kashgar and Hami. Three major areas, from West to East: Kucha, Yanqi/Agni (alias Kara-shahr), and Turfan. Manuscripts dated from 4th century CE onwards for Toch. B, from 7th century onwards for Toch. A. Toch. B was the vernacular language in the whole area, and prevalent in the West, around Kucha, and up to Tumshuk. Toch. A manuscripts have been found only in the middle spot (Yanqi/Agni) and in the eastern spots (around Turfan). Date of extinction unknown, probably related to the demise of the Buddhist culture in the West and the adoption of the Old Uyghur (henceforth OU) language by the inhabitants, then probably before 13th c. CE. Manuscripts copied probably until 11th c. CE.
3. The majority of Toch. B and A scriptures consists in texts of Buddhist content, canonical and para-canonical texts, translation or adaptation of texts in Sanskrit or (earlier) in Prākṛit (Middle Indic). But there is a significant number of profane manuscripts and documents, mostly in Toch. B. The whole Tocharian literature was much influenced by the Indo-Buddhist culture imported

by missionaries coming from the West (Gandhāra), affiliated to the Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda schools. The Tocharians have adopted the book format called *pustaka* (alias *poṭhi*) and the Brāhmī script, also imported from North-West India. The North Turkestan Brāhmī (see Sander 2005 with previous references) used by the Tocharians has been adapted from its later variety with some additional signs and diacritics as the Uyghur Brāhmī script.

4. Tocharian languages known by the Uyghurs under two names, attested in the colophons of the *Maitrisimit nom bitig* and DKPAM:

A. TWQRY, present-day transcription *tohri*, formerly *toχri*, or *toxri*. Related by F.W.K. Müller and E. Sieg (1907, 1908) to the ethnonym reflected by Skt. *Tukhāra*, Gk. Τόχαροι, Lat. *Tochari*, Chinese *Tu-huo-luo*, being a clan of the Yuezhi people, known also in Bactria under

the name Skt. *Kuṣāṇa*, Middle Persian *Kuṣān*, so-called “Indo-Skythen”. It has been shown in the meantime that the Kushan rulers adopted as official language a Middle Iranian language, Bactrian. No Tocharian substrate in this language. Furthermore, according to the OU texts in Manichaean script, the countries of Turfan (Khocho, alias Qočo) and Yanqi/Agni belong to the “Four *twyry*” regions (W.B. Henning, 1937-1939, 1949). This word with a voiced dorsal stop or fricative cannot belong to “Tocharian”, because Toch. did not have voiced stops.

The indigenous self-designation of Toch. A was *ārśi*, genitive plural *ārśiśśi*: *ārśi-kāntu* “Ārśi language”, *ārśi-ype* “Ārśi country”, corresponding to Skt. *Agni-deśa*. Sanskrit or pseudo-Skt. *Agni* matches Chinese *Yanqi*.

B. ’WKW KWYS’N = *oku* (*ogu*) *kūsān* (not *kūśān*). The latter term is probably the match of Toch. B *kuśiñ* or *kuśiññe*, based on *Kuśi*, cf. *k_wśiññe pele*, *k_wśiññe reki* ‘language of Kuśi’, title *k_wsinne orotstse walo* = Skt. *Kuci-māha-rāja-*. Toch. B *Kuśi* matches (pseudo-)Skt. *Kuci*, cf. alternative Chinese forms: *Qiū-cí* (Han period) *Qū-zhī* (Xuanzang), known after 14th c. CE as *Kū-chē*, Chinese (pinyin) *Kuqa*, transposed as G. *Kučā*, E. *Kucha*, Fr. *Koutcha*. Basis of Fr. *koutchéen*, coined by S. Lévi (1933) for Toch. B, vs. *agnéen* for Toch. A.

5. Major works of the first phase of OU Buddhism have been translated from Tocharian.

Toch. A *Maitreyasamiti-nāṭaka* (MSN) “Drama on the Encounter with Maitreya”, in 27 acts (Toch. A *nipāt* < Skt. *nipāta-*) and a prologue. Very popular text, known by 5 (or even 6) different manuscripts, which covered each around 300 *pustaka* leaves. Altogether 110 fragments have been kept, around 20% of the whole Toch. A corpus. Finding place: Buddhist ruins in Shorchuk, near Yanqi/Agni, alias Kara-shahr.

Translated without any intermediary as OU *Maitrisimit nom bitig* “Text of the Law [= Sūtra] about the Encounter with Maitreya” (Skt. *Maitreya-samiti-*), text in 27 chapters (*ülüş*) and a prologue (*yükünč*), the latter much longer than in the Toch. version. Each chapter covers around 15 *pustaka* leaves. There are two versions, which presuppose a common archetype: so-called Turfan (actually Sängim and Murtuk) version (ca. 9th c. or 10th c. CE) and Hami version (ca. 11th c. CE).

6. The Toch. A text is based on a compilation of previous texts in Sanskrit, framed in a complex narrative with Maitreya, the future Buddha, as protagonist. It tells the career of Maitreya, first in his previous birth as Brahman student who met the Buddha Śākyamuni, and received from him the prophecy (*vyākaraṇa-*) of future Buddhahood ; second, the rebirth of Maitreya in a future golden age, his career as Bodhisattva, his enlightenment (*bodhi-*), and his life and converting venture as Buddha, up to his death (*parinirvāṇa-*). It shows the interchange of prose and verse which is usual in Toch. narrative (in so-called *campū* style) and dramatic texts. The term *nāṭaka-* ‘drama’ in the title of the work does not correspond adequately to the shape of the text, which is not very different from an elaborated narrative based on a Skt. *avadāna* or *jātaka*. Compared to Toch. texts (especially in Toch. B) which show definitely the structure of a Skt. drama, the MSN lacks some major features of Indian dramaturgy, such as the theatrical specific

characters, and stage directions about gestures, acting, entrance and exit of actors. Major difference: the OU *Maitrisimit* is entirely in prose and does not translate the dramaturgical indications occurring in the Toch. A text, especially at the beginning and the end of each act. The OU text renders the direct speeches of the various characters who feature in the narrative. Putting the matter in the canvas of the destiny of Maitreya, the Toch. A text was obviously inspired by didactic trends and designed for disseminating many teachings of the Buddhist doctrine according to the Sarvāstivādin school.

7. Colophons, actually sub-colophons, at the end of the sections. Each act/chapter has a name that corresponds to a major event of the narrative. In the Toch. A text, these titles are borrowed from Sanskrit, whereas in the OU text they have been translated. The Toch. A colophons state that the work has been ‘composed’ (*raritwu*, from the verb *ritw-* causative ‘to arrange, combine, compose, create’) by Āryacandra the Vaibhāṣika. The OU colophons give additional information about the transmission process: the model was composed (*yarat-miš*) from the “Indic language” (*änätäk tilintin*) in the Toch. language (*tohri tilinčä*) by Āryacandra born in Agnideśa, then translated (*äviri-miš*) from the Toch. language (*tohri tilintin*) into the Turkic language (*türk tilinčä*) by Prajñārakṣita, the Karmavācaka. Toch. A *ritw-* causative is matched by OU *yarat-* ‘zurechtmachen, schmücken, verzieren, ausstatten, einrichten’, causative of *yara-* ‘geeignet sein, passend sein, passen, angemessen sein, entsprechend sein, günstig sein’, parallel to the basis verb, intransitive, Toch. A *ritw-*, B *ritt-* ‘verbunden sein, sich ziemen’, E. ‘be attached, linked to, persist; be suitable for’.

8. *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* (DKPAM) “Garland of legends pertaining to the ten courses of actions”, OU *Daśakarmapatavadanamal nom bitig*. 410 numbers in the catalogue by Wilkens (2010). Translation elaborated in mid-10th c. CE, somewhat later than *Maitrisimit nom bitig*. Copies made until 12th c. at the latest. Collection of exemplary legends which have been gathered in cycles according to the successive *karmapathas*, and inserted into a frame story, featuring a teacher who instructs his pupil in a cemetery. Edition of the DKPAM by Wilkens (2016) with previous literature.

9. Colophons state that the work was translated (*äviri-miš*) by Saṅghadāsa the Vaibhāṣika from Toch. B (*ogu küsän tilintin*) into Toch. A (*tohri tilinčä*), and again translated (*äviri-miš*) by Śīlasena from Toch. A into the Turkic language (*tohri tilintin ... türkčä*), see the colophon of the 6th chapter, concerning the 6th *karmapatha* (about *pāruṣya-vāda-* ‘Tadeln des Sprechens grober und unflätiger Worte’), text and translation in Wilkens (2016, 614-615), Kasai (2008, 165). There is no extant text of the DKPAM in Toch. languages, nor any trace of the title of the

complete work. Several fragments of legends (*avadāna*) in Toch. A as well as in Toch. B have been identified as parallel to parts of the DKPAM. In some instances the parallel is so close that one can surmise that the Toch. text was the model of the OU text. It has been confirmed that the original version was in Toch. B, through identifications made by Wilkens, Peyrot, and Pinault, see Peyrot – Pinault – Wilkens (2014, 2017a, 2017b), giving previous literature. Most probably these *avadānas*, which are preserved only in part, far from being isolated pieces, belonged to the DKPAM already in Tocharian.

10. OU interlinear glosses in Brāhmī inserted in Sanskrit, Toch. A and Toch. B manuscripts, surveyed by Maue, 2009 and 2010. With the exception of the mention of OU proper names in manuscripts found in Shorchuk (alias Šorčuq), near Yanqi (A 142, 382 [mentioning Maitreya], 302 and 303 [belonging to the MSN]), all those pieces have been found in the Turfan area (Khocho, Sängim, Murtuk). The texts pertain to the various genres of Toch. literature, canonical (Vinaya, Sūtra, Abhidharma), as well as para-canonical: narratives (*jātaka*, *avadāna*), poetry (*stotra*). The bilingual (Skt./Toch. A) fragments A 460-466 (THT 1094-1100), with OU interlinear glosses, belong to a compilation of extracts and key-words from the *Dīrghāgama* of (Mūla)sarvāstivādin school (Maue 2010, 319-321, 332-336). This reflects a practice which the Buddhist Uyghurs have learned from the Tocharians.

11. Toch. B/OU bilingual in Brāhmī script, U 5208 and 5207, written on the verso of a Chinese manuscript (ed. Peyrot – Pinault – Wilkens, 2019). Translation in OU of Toch. B individual words or phrases, which in most cases do not make a continuous text. Extracts from a literary Toch. B text based on Skt. literature, since several items have an unmistakable Indian flavor. Working text for pedagogical purpose, kind of exercise reflecting the educational process of Uyghur translators, in the same milieu which was responsible for the translation of the DKPAM. The OU layer may belong to the late 10th or early 11th c. CE. The Toch. forms reflect the late form of Toch. B, from the 7th c. onwards, presumably 8th c. or somewhat later for this piece.

12. OU proper names in the colophons of chapters of the MSN. Evidence for OU donors as sponsors of copies of this text. See Kasai (2008, 11-15, 171-203).

The colophon of the act IV of MSN contains a long list of donors in Toch. A, but not in the OU text of the so-called Turfan recension:

OU colophon of chapter IV in MaitrSängim, Taf. 27 (Tekin, 1980. BT IX, I : 89), v. 3-11.

[6] alkap töpülärintä tuta tängiti[7]lär maytrisimit nom bitigdä [8] tegin ügä atıña abišek [9] kılmak at(1)g törtünč ülüş-š [10] tükädi : : : (ornament) / blank of 4 lines / [11] namo but namo d(a)rm namo saṅ / blank of 4 lines at the bottom of the page.

«... die Gemeinde wurde unendlich froh und erfreut, pries und lobte die Predigt des Göttergottes Buddha. Sie hielten sie ehrfurchtsvoll auf ihren Scheiteln. / Das vierte Kapitel

namens „Vollziehen der Weihe für die Nachfolgerschaft“ in dem *Maitrisimit*-Sūtra ist beendet.
/ Verehrung dem Buddha! Verehrung der Lehre! Verehrung der Mönchsgemeinde! »

Note that in the title of the chapter, the translator uses both the loan from Skt. *abhiṣeka*- (through Toch. A intermediary), preceded by a gloss of Toch. A *se-lāntune* ‘status of royal heir’ (compound of *se* ‘son’ and *lāntune* ‘kingship’), OU *tegin ügä* ‘Thronfolger, Nachfolger’.

Compare the parallel Toch. A text:

A 302 (THT 935) b7 (*ptāñākte kāsṣiyā*)*p weñlune ārtā(nt pāla)nt lcār pomś* || *vaibhāṣikyāp āryacandres raritwunt* [b8] (*maitreyasamitināṭkaṃ abhiṣe*)*k ñomā štärt nipāt (ār ||) kulapakāṃ praśāntasenāṃ neṣontā śākwepināñ pra(cre ṣarsaśśāl caṣ postak piksi wotkar ... co)spā śeri kātṭuṃ tarmots lārat* – – – – – *kiññā elāk parno(ts) ākkāc hkhuttem wām parnots nā(cci)*

«... they approved [and] praised the speech of the Buddha-lord the teacher. All have left. || In the MSN composed by the Vaibhāṣika Āryacandra the fourth act named *abhiṣeka* (“Royal consecration”) is finished. || The twelve brothers, starting with Praśāntasena, the chief of the family (Skt. *kulapaka*-), together with [their] sisters ordered to copy this book : ... NN. »

List of names, several surely of feminine gender, certainly of various origins (mostly Old Turkic, but also Sogdian, possibly also Chinese), some mixed with titles and onomastic elements of Toch. A form: *parno*, masc. ‘glorious’ (derivative of *parām* ‘glory, dignity, rank’ [Toch. *perne* < Common Toch. **pærnae* < Iranian *farnah*], fem. *parnots*, for *parnoṃts* ; *tarmots*, feminine epithet or title with the same suffix, based on *tarm**, loan of Skt. *dharma*- (see also *tārm**), indirect calque of Skt. *dhārmikā*, fem. or *dharmiyā*, fem. “righteous, pious”; *nācci* ‘lady, princess’, feminine of *nātāk* ‘lord, prince’.

Note the mention of the family relationships, which is also found in OU colophons.

13. The same persons are listed in a poem of praise (meter 20+22+10+15 syllables), in a fragment (A 303) which belongs to the same manuscript of the MSN:

A 303 a5 //(tso)*patsām maitreyasamit postāk śpālmeṃ pekamāt was p_ikis* [a6] (*kāswac*) ... *oppatyuti śeri kātṭuṃ tarmots lārat hkhuttem wām nācci elā(k)* ... [a7]r(c)e *pai teñkohkh* 4
« We have copied perfectly the great book Maitreyasamiti, for the good of all ... NN. »

Female names:

elāk, possibly based on OU *el* and *ak* ‘weiß, hell’, see *Ak* ‘Bestandteil eines Personennamens’, *Ak Hatun*, female. The vocalism of the second syllable of *elāk* precludes any identification to OU *elig* ‘König, Herrscher’, also recorded as first component of PNs.

oppatyuti, loan from a Toch. name based on Skt. components, probably through Middle Indic intermediary, Skt. *Utpaladyuti**, see *dyuti*- ‘splendour, brightness, lustre’ as name (MW: 500a), and *utpala-caḥṣuṣ*- ‘lotus-eyed’ (MW: 180c), *utpala-varṇā* ‘N. of a woman’ (MW: 181a). Well-attested noun Toch. A *oppal* (B *uppāl*) ‘lotus’, borrowed via Middle Indic from Skt. *utpala*- ‘the blossom of the blue lotus’.

śeri, probably Turkic transposition of Middle Indic *Śirī* (BHSD: 528a, 535b), corresponding to Skt. *Śrī*, from *śrī*- ‘light, beauty, grace’, often used for naming women (MW: 1008c).

kātṭuṃ, cf. OU *hatun* (*katun*) < Sogd. *x’twn*, *γ’twnh* ‘(edle) Dame, Frau, Herrin, Königin, Gemahlin des Herrschers’, plus *Hatun* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’. Written alternatively as *hkhātūṃ*, THT 1033 (quoted by Sieg & Siegling [1921, 222] in the introduction to A 399-404).

hkhuttem, cf. OU *kut* ‘Majestät, (königliches) Charisma, Würde, Rang’, etc., *Kut* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’. Possibly Turkic basis plus Toch. A suffix *-eṃ*, masc./fem.

wām, loan via Tocharian from Skt. *bhāma*- ‘light, brightness, splendour’ (MW: 751a), compare *bhāminī*- ‘a beautiful woman; N. of the daughter of a Gandharva’.

lārat, possibly Toch. onomastic basis, with indigenous suffix, cf. Toch. B *lāre* ‘dear, beloved’ (Skt. *priya*-), and PN (female) *Lariśka*, in monastic records, with diminutive suffix.

Male names:

cospā (also in 303 b1), cf. the title known by Niya Pkt. *cozbo*, Tumshuqese Saka *cazbā*-.

pai, cf. OU *bay* ‘reich, wohlhabend’, *Bay* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’, several instances. *teṅkohkh*, possibly, through Toch. spelling, OU **Dengök*, derived from *den* (< Sogd. *dyn-*, *dynh*) ‘religion, doctrine’ (more or less equivalent of Skt. *dharmā-*), with suffix *-gOk*, which makes characterizing nouns from nominal basis, see *yalıḡok*, *yalḡok* ‘Mensch, Geschöpf’ (Skt. *martya-*) < *‘the naked one’, based on *yalıḡ* ‘nackt, leer’ (Erdal, 1991, 158-159).

14. This fragment has some stanzas in common with the leaf A 311 (THT 945), from a different manuscript, which contains stanzas of introduction (or conclusion) to a Buddhist text, belonging apparently to Maitreya literature and cult. Stanzas in meter 20 (5/5/5/5)+22 (8/7/7) + 10 (5/5) + 15 (8/7) syllables.

A 311 a2 *laläkkompe seyaśśäl şyak şaṣṣuträ postäk pekamät 1 kusne wrasom caş postäk pe(katrä bodhisatv)enām ytāraṃ ymām (şolam [5 syllables missing]:) (sām metrakşinām opşlyaşśäl şyak kumnä)ş : tämyo pekamät śla wsokoneyo : śmimäs şakkats metrak ptāñkte ketuma(ti ri) tām praşṭ 2 (...)*

« (...) together with the son of NN. we have copied the book *Şaṣṣūtra*. The living being who copies this book, going (in his life...) on the path pertaining to Bodhisattva, he will (come together with the feast of Maitreya). Therefore we have copied with joyfulness. May we come indeed to Maitreya the Buddha-lord, to the city of Ketumatī, at that time!»

A 311 a5 [5 syllables missing] *ākşinñār-ām krañś ptāñkte märkampal pekluneşi pñi : pūk pñintwaṃ tpār sumerr oki koṃ ñkätt oki luksanu pūk kleśāśşi prakte ypant : [10 syllables missing] (saṃsarşinās puk klopañtwä)ş tsälşant källānt nervānac 4*

Similar text in A 303 b4-6.

« The good ones (...) have taught to us the merit of writing the Law of the Buddha-lord. Among all merits, (this merit of writing is) as high as the Sumeru (mountain), as bright as the sun(-god), making the hindrance of all impurities, liberating from all sufferings of the Samsāra, leading to the Nirvāṇa.»

Some standard and stereotyped poems of praise about the merit of writing could be inserted in colophons, and were re-used in different works.

15. Proper names of OU origin in a dedicatory poem written supposed to accompany an image of the Buddha. Stanzas in meter 20 (5/5/5/5)+22 (8/7/7) + 10 (5/5) + 15 (8/7) syllables.

A 382 (THT 1016) [a2] (...) : *kāruṇik pācar sem waste nātäk : cwaṃ ynānmūñyā cwaṃ wsokoñyā peke ptāñkte arä(mpāt :) /// [a3] ///(şari) pracre poñś : bhek uri helkis āpruts lpik kokuntām hkhonāñc kārā cor lpi(k) o/// (āşā)[a4]nikām metra(knaśśäl) ///*

« (...) O compassionate one, o father, o refuge [and] protection, o lord! Through reverence to you, through joyfulness in you, I have painted the figure of the Buddha-lord. (...) all (sisters and) brothers : NN. (...) (May we come) together with the venerable Maitreya! »

bhek (known also in Toch. B), cf. OU *bäg* ‘Fürst, Herrscher’.

uri, cf. OU *uri* ‘Jüngling, junger Mann’, *Uri* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’.

helicis, probably reflecting a compound, cf. *el* ‘Reich, Land, Staat’, *El* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’, *kiz* ‘Mädchen, Tochter, Jungfrau’, *Kiz* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’.

āpruts, name with Toch. feminine suffix (cf. *tarmots*, *parnots*, in A 302), possibly adaptation of OU *avirta* ‘Hebamme, Amme’, *Avirta* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’.

lpik, cf. OU *alp* ‘tapfer, mutig, mannhaft, heroisch, heldenhaft’ ; ‘Krieger, Heerführer, Held’ (Skt. *śūra-*), also part of several OU PNs. This PN occurs in Toch. B under the form *Ālp* (B = THT 289 b2). The suffix itself would be Tocharian, cf. A *-ik* (B *-ike*), probably from Middle Iranian origin, cf. Bactrian *-ıyo*, found in A *kākmartik* (B *kamart(t)ike*) ‘chief’, A *spaktānik* (B *spaktāñke*) ‘servant’.

kokuntām, cf. OU *kuk*, from Chinese *gu* (LMC *kəwk*) ‘Nabe des Rades’ or *guo* (LMC *kuëk*) ‘Reich, Land’.

hkhonāñc, cf. Toch. A *kom* ‘sun’, plus feminine suffix *-āñc* (of Sogdian origin), plus OU *kün* ‘Sonne’, and *Kün* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’, and in titles of rulers.

kārā, cf. OU *kara* ‘black’ and first element of several PNs.

cor, cf. OU *čor* ‘ein Titel ; Bestandteil von Personennamen’.

16. These texts have in common the reference to the ‘merit of writing’. The notion of ‘merit’ is crucial in Buddhism: Skt. *puṇya-*, Toch. A *pñi* (plural *pñintu*), OU *buyan*. Toch. B has a different term: *yarpo* (plural *yärponta*). In Tocharian as well as in OU colophons (cf. Zieme 1992, 2013) the merit of writing can be transferred to several persons from the same family or clan, including deceased persons, as in a Toch. A fragment from the Pelliot collection, kept in the Musée Guimet (Pinault 2007). This prayer (in verse) may have followed a colophon and contains also the wish of meeting Maitreya in the future. This fragment contains some names of presumably Chinese origin, besides names of unknown source, but predominantly OU names. It refers to brothers and sisters, some of which are deceased:

kättum (a3), obl.sg., fem., see above.

kutlukām (a3), obl.sg. fem. (with Toch. A ending), see OU *kutlug* ‘Charisma besitzend, heilig, glücklich, glückverheißend, vom Glück gesegnet’, *Kutluk* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’, numerous instances.

ārslānām (a2), obl. sg., masc. (with Toch. A ending), cf. OU *arслан* ‘lion’, plus *Arslan*, part of several OU PNs.

ātāk (a2), obl.sg., masc., cf. OU *adig* ‘Bär’, *Adig* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’.

lpik (a2), see above.

cor, nom.sg., masc. in the sequence *inām cor* (a4), for *ināmcor*, cf. OU *čor* (see above) and *inañc* ‘Vertrauter, Angehöriger des Hofstaats’, also *Inanč* ‘Bestandteil von Personennamen’.

tāppāk, nom.sg., masc. (a4), cf. OU *tapig* ‘Dienst, Verehrung, Bewirtung, Kult’ and *Tapigl(i)g* ‘Bestandteil eines Personennamens’.

yāppāk, nom. Sg., masc. (a4), cf. OU *yapig* ‘Konstituente, Bestandteil; Gebäude, Fundament’ (Skt. *skandha-*), also PN, and part of PNs.

17. OU Buddhist vocabulary. The Buddhist terms of ultimate Skt. origin came to OU by various channels. The available material has been covered by Moerlose (1980) and Wilkens (2021). There has been a layer of transmission by Sogdian intermediary, see Laut (1986, 89-119), going back to the first acquaintance of the Uyghurs with Buddhism. This concerns several fundamental notions.

OU *bodis(a)t(a)v* < Sogd. *pwδystβ* ~ *pwδ’ystβ* ~ *pwtystβ* < Parth. *bōdisadf* < Skt. *bodhisatva-*, vs. Toch. A *bodhisattu*, B *bodhisatve*, *podhisatve*, *bodhisātve*, borrowed from Middle Indic (Gāndhārī) *bodhisatva-*, nom. *bodhisatvo*.

OU *ačari* < Sogd. *’c’ry* < Skt. *ācārya-* vs. Toch. A *āsari*, B *ašari*, from Skt. through Middle Indic.

OU *arhant* < Sogd. *’rx’nt* < Skt. *arhant-* vs. Toch. A *ārānt*, B *arhānte*, *arahānte*, cf. Khot. *arahanda-*, Pkt. *arahaṃta-*, etc.

OU *arži* < Sogd. *rz’y* < Skt. *ṛṣi-*, vs. Toch. A *rišak*, B *ršāke*, cf. Sogd. *rš’k*, *rš’y*, *rš’yk*, etc.

OU *č(a)hšap(a)t* < Sogd./Manich. *cxš’pt*, *cxšp’δ(δ)* << Skt. *śikṣāpada-* vs. Toch. A *śikṣāpat*, B *śikṣapāt* from Sanskrit source, cf. Sogd./Buddh. *škš’pt*, *škš’pwt*, *škš’pt*.

OU *nirvan* < Sogd. *nyrβ’n* < Skt. *nirvāṇa-* vs. Toch. A/B *nervām*, maybe itself borrowed from Sogdian, in competition with the internally coined term B *kselñe*, A *ksalune* ‘extinction’, verbal abstracts from *käs-* ‘to come to extinction, be extinguished’.

OU *pratikabut* < Sogd. *prt’ykpwt* ~ *prt’ykpwt* < Skt. *pratyekabuddha-* vs. Toch. A *prattika-ptāñkāt*, B *pratika-pañäkte*, verse *-puđñäkte*, through combination of the loan of the first

member with the regular term for Buddha, A *ptāñkāt*, B *pañäkte*, verse *pūdñäkte*, lit. ‘Buddha-lord’.

OU *ärdini* < Sogd. Manich. *rtny* < Skt. *ratna-*, cf. Parth. *radan* vs. Toch. A *ñemi*, B *naumiye*.
OU *buyan* ~ *buy(a)n* < Sogd. *pwny'n* < Skt. *puṇya-* vs. Toch. A *pñi* (< **pāñi*) from the Skt. source through Middle Indic.

18. The most influential intermediary for the Uyghurs, at the stage of early Uyghur Buddhism (9th to 11th c. CE) was Tocharian, and mostly Toch. A, see Laut (1986, 120-142). This is obvious for *Maitrisimit*, since many of these terms are effectively attested in the MSN, in all cases where parallel texts are available. Whenever there is a precise relationship, the form shows that the donor language was Toch. A, not Toch. B. The whole picture is somewhat more complex, however. In several cases, for instance for Skt. PNs, there is no difference between Toch. A and Toch. B forms. Causes: 1) Toch. B was the vernacular language also in the Turfan area. 2) Toch. A itself has borrowed many words from Toch. B, including Buddhist technical terms and terms pertaining to Sanskrit culture. See also Pinault (2003), with previous literature. In any case, the contacts of the Uyghurs with Buddhist Tocharians happened first in the Kara-shahr region (Agnideśa), at the time after the move from Mongolia in 840, where the Uyghurs established first the capital of the Western kingdom in Ark (Chin. Yanqi). Later their main city, besides Bešbalık, will be Khocho, where the *Maitrisimit* and the DKPAM will be copied.

19. List of the ten wrong (*akuśala-*) courses of action (*karmaṣā-*) which have to be avoided. This can be reconstructed on the basis of several passages, one from the *Maitreyāvādānavyākaraṇa* (A 227/8 b 6-7) and from a Toch. B fragment (B 596), which gives the match of some TA words (Pinault 1999, 229-230).

1. killing living beings, 2. theft, 3. fornication, 4. lying, 5. harsh speech, 6. spiteful speech, slander, 7. idle, disconnected speech, 8. envy, covetousness, 9. malevolence, malice, 10. heretical view.

Sanskrit	Toch. A	OU
1. <i>prāṇātighāta-</i>	(<i>wrasas</i>) <i>kolune</i>	<i>öliüt öliürmäk</i>
2. <i>adattādāna-</i>	<i>ālu kāmłune</i>	<i>ogrı ogurlamak</i>
3. <i>kāmamithyācāra-</i>	<i>ālu yśalmas wärpālune</i>	<i>adıñ amrakın amranmak</i>
4. <i>mṛṣāvāda-</i>	<i>smale</i>	<i>üzüg</i>
5. <i>paiśunya(vāda)-</i>	<i>wişām</i>	<i>čaşut</i>
6. <i>pāruşya(vāda)-</i>	<i>tsär weñłune</i>	<i>sarsıg sav sözlämäk</i>
7. <i>sambhinnapralāpa-</i>	<i>käsko weñłune</i>	<i>askanču tagon sav sözlämäk</i>
8. <i>abhidhyā-</i>	<i>rapurñe</i>	<i>az</i>
9. <i>vyāpāda-</i>	<i>māñtlune</i>	<i>övkä</i>
10. <i>mithyādṛşti-</i>	<i>keṃ-pälkune</i>	<i>tärs tätru körum turgurmak</i>

Strikingly the OU terms consisting in action nouns with suffix *-mak/-mäk* are parallel to Toch. A terms resorting to the abstract suffix *-une*, making action nouns based on verbal adjectives. Some kind of learned imitation. There was definitely a Toch. A intermediary for the translation of Buddhist notions expressed originally in Sanskrit.

20. Judging from the comparison between the MSN and the OU *Maitrisimit*, the OU translator(s) tried to render faithfully, but not slavishly, the Toch. A text. Some discrepancies betray in cases partial misunderstanding of the Toch. A text, whose syntax was at times difficult for a native speaker of a Turkish language. This concerns especially the translation of the stanzas of the Toch. A text, which are quite numerous. Further divergences are due to stylistic habits already anchored in Uyghur literature, as well as to parallel influences from other texts.

There are some variations between the two versions (Sängim/Murtuk and Hami). A full investigation of the parallel texts remains to be done. For the time being, it seems that the OU translators strive to convey the Buddhist message in a way which was easier to understand by the Uyghur audience, probably not familiar with the peculiarities of Sanskrit culture and poetics. The Toch. A text was composed in a milieu which was strongly influenced by the Indo-Buddhist culture, prevailing in the oases of the northern route in the Tarim Basin, since the beginnings of Tocharian Buddhism.

References

- CEToM. A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts. Vienna University. 2012-2022. <http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/>.
- Erdal, Marcel. 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon*. 2 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Geng Shimin – Hans-Joachim Klimkeit. 1988. *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit*. In Zusammenarbeit mit Helmut Eimer und Jens Peter Laut herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert. 2 Teile. Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz.
- Geng Shimin – Hans-Joachim Klimkeit – Jens Peter Laut. 1998. *Eine buddhistische Apokalypse. Die Höllenskapitel (20-25) und die Schlußkapitel (26-27) der Hami-Handschrift der alttürkischen Maitrisimit*. Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Bd. 103. Opladen/Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Kasai, Yukiyo. 2008. *Die uigurischen buddhistischen Kolophone*. Turnhout: Brepols (Berliner Turfantexte XXVI).
- Kasai, Yukiyo – Abdurishid Yakup – Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst (eds.), 2013. *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit. Symposium anlässlich des 100. Jahrestages der Entzifferung des Tocharischen (Berlin, 3. und 4. April 2008)*. Turnhout: Brepols (Silk Road Studies. XVII).
- Laut, Jens Peter. 1986. *Der frühe türkische Buddhismus und seine literarischen Denkmäler*. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, Bd. 21. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Malzahn, Melanie (ed.), 2007. *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2008. *Variation and change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 15).
- Maue, Dieter. 2009. Uigurisches in Brāhmī in nicht-uigurischen Brāhmī-Handschriften. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 62, 1-36.
- Maue, Dieter. 2010. Uigurisches in Brāhmī in nicht-uigurischen Brāhmī-Handschriften. Teil II. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 63, 319-361.
- Moerloose, Eddy. 1980. Sanskrit loan words in Uighur. *Journal of Turkish Studies* 4, 61-78.
- Peyrot, Michaël – Georges-Jean Pinault – Jens Wilkens. 2014. A Tocharian B parallel to the legend of Kalmāṣapāda and Sutasoma of the Old Uyghur *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 67, 1-18.
- Peyrot, Michaël – Georges-Jean Pinault – Jens Wilkens. 2017a. Tocharian B parallels to the Supāraga-Avadāna of the Old Uyghur *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 70, 295-315.
- Peyrot, Michaël – Georges-Jean Pinault – Jens Wilkens. 2017b. Śāriputra and the girl reborn as a dog. A further Tocharian B parallel to the Old Uyghur *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. *Studies in the Inner Asian Languages* 32, 15-31.
- Peyrot, Michaël – Georges-Jean Pinault – Jens Wilkens. 2019. Vernaculars of the Silk Road – A Tocharian B – Old Uyghur bilingual. *Journal Asiatique* 307.1: 65-90.

- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1999. Restitution du Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka en tokharien A. Bilan provisoire et recherches complémentaires sur l'acte XXVI. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 8, 189-240.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2003. Contacts linguistiques en Asie Centrale à la lumière des textes tokhariens. In: Sven Bretfeld – Jens Wilkens (eds.), *Indien und Zentralasien. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposiums vom 7. bis 10. Mai 2001*. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, Bd. 61. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 45-83.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2007. Le tokharien pratiqué par les Ouïgours : à propos d'un fragment en tokharien A du Musée Guimet. In : Jean-Pierre Drège (ed.), *Études de Turfan et Dunhuang*. Genève, Librairie Droz (École Pratique des Hautes Études. Sciences historiques et philologiques. Hautes études orientales, 41), 327-366.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2016. Les Tokhariens, passeurs et interprètes du bouddhisme. In : Michel Espagne – Svetlana Gorshenina – Frantz Grenet – Shahin Mustafayev – Claude Rapin (eds.), *Asie Centrale. Transferts culturels le long de la Route de la Soie*. Paris : Vendémiaire, 167-200.
- Sander, Lore. 2005. Remarks on the Formal Brāhmī Script from the Southern Silk Route. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, New Series, Vol. 19, 133-144.
- Sieg, Emil. 2014. *Tocharologica. Selected writings on Tocharian*. Edited and introduced by Georges-Jean Pinault and Michaël Peyrot. (Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, Bd. 22). Bremen: Hempen.
- Sieg, Emil – Wilhelm Siegling. 1921. *Tocharische Sprachreste*. I. Band. *Die Texte*. A. *Transcription*. Berlin – Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
- Tekin, Şinasi. 1980. *Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule*. 1. Teil: *Transliteration, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen*. 2. Teil: *Analytischer und rückläufiger Index*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Berliner Turfantexte IX). THT = Tocharische Handschriften der (Berliner) Turfan(sammlung)
- Wilkens, Jens. 2010. *Buddhistische Erzähltexte*. (Alttürkische Handschriften. Teil 10). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag (VOHD, Bd. XIII, 18).
- Wilkens, Jens. 2016. *Buddhistische Erzählungen aus dem alten Zentralasien. Edition der altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. 3 vols. Turnhout : Brepols (Berliner Turfantexte XXXVII, 1-3).
- Wilkens, Jens. 2021. *Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen. Altuigurisch – Deutsch – Türkisch*. Herausgegeben von der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag.
- Zieme, Peter. 1992. *Religion und Gesellschaft im Uigurischen Königsreich von Qočo. Kolophone und Stifter des alttürkischen buddhistischen Schrifttums aus Zentralasien*. Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Bd. 88. Opladen/Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Zieme, Peter. 2013. Stifter und Texte von der Seidenstraße nach Zeugnissen des altuigurischen Buddhismus. In : Barbara Schuler (ed.), *Stifter und Mäzene und ihre Rolle in der Religion. Von Königen, Mönchen, Vordenkern und Laien in Indien, China und anderen Kulturen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 43-55.