

**The Tocharian A *Ṣaddanta-Jāta* :**

**The Sieg/Siegling Transcription with Translation and Gloss**

**Gregory C. Richter**

## INTRODUCTION

The following is a detailed transcription, translation, and gloss of the Tocharian A Ṣaddanta-Jātaka, the Buddhist tale of Queen Bhadrā and the six-tusk elephant. It is hoped that as the first extended Tocharian transcription providing word for word gloss and grammatical analysis, the volume will be of interest to two groups of readers: those focused on Asian literature, religious studies or Buddhism, and those focused on linguistics. Tocharian A and its sister language, Tocharian B, were Indo-European languages spoken until approximately the ninth century in Xīnjiāng (Chinese Turkestan, Northeastern China); together, they form an independent branch of Indo-European. The original manuscript pages of the tale were written on palm leaf paper in the North Indian Brāhmī alphabet, used by the Indian missionaries who brought Buddhism to the region. These manuscripts were discovered in Xīnjiāng during the third German Turfan expedition (1905-1907), and date from the seventh or eighth century. Images of the manuscript pages can be seen online in the Tocharian manuscript files of the TITUS project (Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien), digitized by Jost Gippert and housed at the University of Frankfurt. The files include all the Tocharian documents from the Berlin Turfan collection, a collection assembled during the four German expeditions undertaken from 1902 to 1914 under the leadership of Albert Grünwedel, co-director of the Royal Museum of Ethnography in Berlin, and Albert le Coq, also of the Museum. Most of the documents were found in caves; the dry climate of Xīnjiāng, an immense, desert region where life was possible mainly near oases, presumably helped to preserve them.

Like all Tocharian A documents, the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka is a metrical translation of a Sanskrit Buddhist text. (The Sanskrit version from which it was translated has been lost, and the Tocharian version shows discrepancies with respect to all other extant versions of the tale.) In the Tocharian version, the story is presented as a drama, with lines of narrative prose interspersed. The original text includes eleven sections, indicated below by section number and by the manuscript number originally assigned. Sections 1 and 2 and the initial portion of Section 3 are not translated here as few words have been preserved. The material translated here comprises the remainder of Section 3 (beginning within line 2) to Section 11.

All texts transcribed in Sieg and Siegling 1921 were found in Shorchuk (Shorquk), near modern Korla (about 300 km southwest of Ürümqi, capital of Xīnjiāng), and in Sāngim, Qocho, and Bazaklik (Bezeklik), all near modern Turfan (about 150 km southeast of Ürümqi). With the exception of Section 3 (manuscript 403), found in Sāngim, all portions of the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka are from Shorchuk (Sieg and Siegling 1921:iv,1,31).

The transcription in the current volume is based on that in Sieg and Siegling 1921, but also includes proposals found in the footnotes of that volume and proposals from the footnotes of Sieg 1952 (edited by Werner Thomas). Thus, a definitive version of the Sieg/Siegling transcription appears for the first time in the current volume. The 1921 version includes reconstructions based principally on the Tocharian lexicon as attested in other documents. Sieg (1952:7) indicates that his new proposals are based on comparison of the Tocharian text with several versions of the jātaka: the Pāli Chaddanta-Jātaka (no. 514 in Fausbøll 1875-1897, v. 5:36-57); Huber's French translation of the Chinese rendering of the Sanskrit version from the lost Sūtrālamkāra (second century CE), sometimes attributed to Aśvaghōṣa (Kumāralāta and Aśvaghōṣa 1908:403-411); fragments of a Uighur version (trans. Müller 1911 and 1922); and three versions from the Chinese Tripitaka (trans. Chavannes 1910:101-104, 1934:102-104). In Sieg's 1952 reconstructions, the number of syllables missing was also relevant.

Unlike the transcription in Sieg and Siegling 1921, which simply presents running lines of text without sentence divisions, the current transcription is presented in the form of coherent sentences and phrases insofar as possible. The original text in Brāhmī script indicates neither word boundaries nor sentence divisions, but in Sieg and Siegling 1921 word boundaries are mercifully supplied. The current volume aims to provide scholars with a readable version of the text, including reasonable reconstructions; words containing reconstructed material are specifically identified, but the transcription does not indicate specifically which symbols are reconstructions and which degree of certainty is assigned to each symbol. For more technical transcriptions (lacking completions from Sieg 1952), consult Sieg and Siegling 1921 and the highly technical transcription provided online in the TITUS files.

The current project is only a small link in a chain of previous research by highly distinguished scholars well versed in Sanskrit, Buddhist writings, and the gamut of Tocharian translations thereof. In fact, these scholars would perhaps have disapproved of the project. German translations of nearly all extant Tocharian documents are available, including Puṇyavanta-Jātaka (Sieg 1944), and Mūgapakkha-Jātaka, Araṇemi-Jātaka, Koṭikarna-Avadāna, Unmādayantī-Jātaka, and Viśvāntara-Jātaka (Sieg 1952). A smaller number of translations into English are available as well, including Lane's version of Puṇyavanta-Jātaka (1947). However, non-specialists interested in gaining a detailed knowledge of the language have previously been expected to consult a transcription and locate each word in glossaries and reference works. Presumably, though, opinions have changed and the provision of a word for word gloss will be seen as helpful. In preparing the gloss for this volume, the principal reference work was Poucha's dictionary of Tocharian A (1955; all glosses are in Latin). That work lists most of the forms attested in Tocharian A -- often with citations -- but the cross-references are often inadequate, and readers not already familiar with the numerous suppletive stems of the language (cf. English go/went) will be unable to locate many of the main entries.

As recently as 1998, a transcription and English translation of a newly discovered Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka appeared; the manuscript was discovered in 1974 in Yānqī (about 250 km to the southwest of Ürümqi). The translator was the renowned Tocharian scholar Ji Xiānlín, who studied Tocharian in Göttingen in the 1930's and 1940's, and who recently celebrated his ninety-fifth birthday in Beijing. Despite his expert translation, word for word glosses are lacking; the reader is again expected to look up each word in the glossaries provided, but readers not already familiar with suppletive stems will again be unable to locate many of the main entries. (The pleasant exception is the verbs, for which all forms are clearly provided.) Of special interest in the 1998 volume are several previously unknown Tocharian lexemes with their probable meanings.

The current work, then, is the first publication providing an extensive Tocharian text in transcription with translation, word for word gloss, and grammatical analysis. The English translation here is often similar to the German translation (Sieg 1952) and it adopts many of Sieg's hypotheses regarding material to be supplied in the translation when there are gaps in the Tocharian

text or when word meaning is uncertain. With some frequency, though, the new translation differs from the German version, especially where the German version seems somewhat free, given the Tocharian text. Thus Sieg (1952) translates kāswoṇe mā pälkoraṣ (Section 10:77 B 3) as an [seine] Tugend nicht denkend 'not thinking of [his] virtue', while the current version selects the more literal 'not having seen [his] virtue', given pälkoraṣ, absolutive of läk- 'see'. Some of the discrepancies, of course, relate to the fact that a translator must always seek a balance between literalness and idiomaticity in the target language. In the current version, furthermore, portions of the tale not translated by Sieg are translated when reasonable conjectures can be made. Square brackets in the English translation line indicate completions emerging from the context or based on other versions of the tale, sometimes coinciding with proposals by Sieg (1952). Square brackets above the Tocharian text indicate the speaker when this can be determined. Within each section, "A" and "B" indicate recto and verso portions of the manuscript, respectively. Section 3, for example, contains subsections 403 A and 403 B, both of which contain seven lines of text, while the A and B portions of Sections 4 through 11 all contain six lines of text. Line numbers are indicated in square brackets; on several occasions, line number occurs in the middle of a phrase or sentence. \* indicates that portions of the transcription for a word are proposed in the footnotes to Sieg 1952, while \*\* indicates that the transcription for the entire word is posited there. /// indicates that the edge of the manuscript page has been damaged; many syllables may have been lost. (For the number of syllables missing at each break in the manuscript, see Sieg 1952.)

The glosses provide all identifiable grammatical information. Complete information, however, is not always available, e.g. the gender of many Tocharian nouns is unknown. For each form found in Poucha 1955, relevant information is provided as listed there. Sieg et al. 1931 and Krause and Thomas 1960 have also been consulted as needed.

## THE TALE

The story of the Ṣaddanta, the six-tusk elephant, is one of the jātaka tales, the accounts of the previous lives of the Buddha (cf. Sanskrit and Pāli jātaka 'birth'), which form part of the Buddhist canon. These arose as oral literature in Northern India, perhaps existing in some form even before the advent of Buddhism, but presumably acquiring Buddhist traits relatively soon after the death of the Buddha. There are about five-hundred such tales. These were first reduced to writing in Pāli in the first century BCE, mainly in Ceylon. In addition to the Pāli Chaddanta-Jātaka, the Pāli commentary to the jātakas contains another, quite distinct version of the tale (discussed in Feer 1895). Subsequently, Sanskrit versions of many of the tales appeared. One version of the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka was contained in the Sūtrālamkāra (Kumāralāta and Aśvaghōṣa 1908). That work, produced in the second century CE and presumably identical to the lost work known as Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā, is no longer extant. The Sanskrit text, brought from India, was translated into Chinese in Kucha (Xīnjiāng) by the monk scholar Kumārajīva (344-413), to whom scores of other translations are also attributed. As the Sanskrit original was lost, it is based on Kumārajīva's Chinese translation that Huber produced his French version. (Soon after the appearance of the French version, fragments of the Sanskrit text were, in fact, found near Turfan and published as Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā (Lüders 1926), but these do not include a Sanskrit version of the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka.) Since the Sanskrit manuscript included a poem in praise of the Indian philosopher and writer Aśvaghōṣa, active in the first half of the second century CE, the body of the work was attributed by Kumārajīva and his contemporaries to him. Probably, though, it was produced by his somewhat younger contemporary, Kumāralāta, active in the second half of the second century CE (Lüders 1926:25-26). Another version of the tale, the Ṣaddanta-Avadāna, appears as no. 25 in the Sanskrit collection known as Kalpadruma-Avadāna, which contains about eighty jātakas and other tales (Feer 1895). There also exists a Sanskrit version from Nepal (Mitra 1971), and it is from a lost Sanskrit version that the Tocharian A Ṣaddanta-Jātaka was translated. Foucher (1911:235) indicates that all the Chinese versions, dating from the third to the fifth century, were translated from Sanskrit versions; Sieg and Siegling (1921:31) indicate that the Uighur version and the Tocharian A version

were translated from the same lost Sanskrit source.

The Sanskrit epithet Ṣaddanta derives from Sanskrit ṣaṭ- 'six' + danta 'tooth'; the Pāli version of the term, Chaddanta, illustrates regular phonological changes. In Tocharian A, the Sanskrit term is borrowed as ṣaddande, while in Chinese it is translated as liùyáxiàng 'six-tusk elephant'.

At this point, it will be useful to provide summaries of various versions of the tale, beginning with the metrical Pāli Chaddanta-Jātaka (Feer 1895, Foucher 1911):

The Chaddanta, a completely white, six-tusk elephant and future bodhisattva, lives in the forest with his two wives, both called Subhaddā [highly virtuous]. He leads a great herd of elephants. On one occasion, he shakes a tree, from which fragrant blossoms come pouring down on the first Subhaddā, while only leaves and ants descend upon his second wife. Later, he makes the gift of a lotus to his first wife, while the second Subhaddā receives nothing. She therefore makes an offering of wild fruit to the pratyeka-buddhas living in the forest, praying that she will, in a future life, become the queen of Benares [Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh], and be in a position to have the Chaddanta killed through the power of the king. She dies, overcome with jealousy. Later, she is reborn as Subhaddā, the daughter of the king of Madda; she marries the king of Benares. She tells him that she has a wish, but does not reveal it until all the hunters of the kingdom have been summoned. Then she announces that in a dream she has seen an elephant with six tusks; these tusks she now wishes to possess. She recognizes one of the hunters, Soṇutara, already a foe of the Chaddanta in her previous life, and selects him to carry out the mission. She pays him a thousand pieces of money, giving him precise directions. Having reached the abode of the Chaddanta, the hunter hides in a pit and shoots the elephant with an arrow. At the Chaddanta's cry, the other elephants flee; the Chaddanta also sends his remaining spouse, the elephant Subhaddā, away to safety. Still alive, he discovers the hunter in the pit and notices his saffron garment, immediately resolving to spare the hunter's life. The hunter reports that the queen has sent him to collect the Chaddanta's tusks,

and the elephant kneels to make the task easier for him. However, as the hunter is not strong enough to carry out the task, the Chaddanta saws off his tusks himself. He instructs the hunter to take them to the queen, and dies, achieving buddhahood. The hunter returns to the palace, whereupon the queen sees the tusks, recalls the virtues of her previous husband, and falls dead.

Foucher comments (1911:242): "Remaining alone in the presence of the man, the beast prepares to kill him. The fact that he stops short, recognizing that the hunter is wearing the color of monastic robes, is the only indication of the Buddhist adaptation of the tale." Foucher goes on to argue that the color of the robes is actually ambiguous: the kāṣāya was adopted for monastic use specifically because it bore the color worn by the lowest castes, which included hunters.

Furthermore, it seems doubtful that in the oldest oral version of the tale the elephant makes the supreme sacrifice of sawing off his own tusks. Rather, the earliest version of the tale may have had a simpler conclusion: the elephant kneels and the hunter saws off the tusks without difficulty, whereupon the elephant dies, having sufficiently demonstrated his virtue. Indeed, in the Chinese Zábǎozàngjīng (see below), it is the hunter who saws off the tusks. One can hypothesize that the theme of the elephant sawing off his own tusks developed as a further example of the great virtue of the bodhisattva.

It is important to note that two stanzas from the Pāli jātaka, commenting on the virtues desirable in those who wear the saffron robe, appear as verses 9 and 10 of the Dhammapada (Babbitt 1936):

9: He who wishes to put on the yellow robe though still impure and disregardful of temperances and truth is unworthy of the yellow robe.

10: But whoever has cleansed himself from impurity, is well-grounded in all virtues, and regards also temperance and truth, is indeed worthy of the yellow robe.

Again, the content of these verses suggests that they are relatively late additions to the tale, given the ambiguity of the saffron garment. Yet by the time the Pāli version was composed, the hunter's wearing of the saffron garment was certainly regarded as the impious act of one "still impure and disregardful of temperances and truth."



In the very extensive version of the tale found in the Pāli commentary to the jātakas, numerous changes appear. The most interesting of these is perhaps the assertion that the Chaddanta has two tusks only, but that they exhibit six colors. This is perhaps an effort to distinguish the Chaddanta from six-tusk elephants encountered elsewhere: Indra rides a six-tusk elephant, and North-Indian texts relate that Siddhārtha entered the womb of his mother, Māyādevī, as a little six-tusk elephant (Feer 1895:49). Based on Feer 1895, this version can be summarized as follows:

The Chaddanta lives with his two wives, Subhaddā Mahā and Subhaddā Cūla, as the leader of 8,000 elephants. They inhabit a forest near a lake, surrounded, in turn, by seven rings of concentric mountains. The forest is inhabited by many pratyeka-buddhas, whom the Chaddanta reveres, and to whom he brings offerings of food. Subhaddā Cūla, feeling slighted by her husband, prays for vengeance and dies fasting. She is reborn as a queen. After she announces her wish for the tusks, a hunter is selected and preparations are made for the quest: saws, axes, hammers, and shovels are assembled. The hunter undertakes a journey of seven years, seven months, and seven days to reach the abode of the Chaddanta; he must cross through eighteen jungles -- and the seven concentric rings of mountains -- but manages to do so using the tools with which he has been provided. He digs a pit, insidiously disguises himself with the saffron garment, and shoots the Chaddanta with an arrow. Not until after he has been injured does the Chaddanta notice the garment, whereupon he determines to spare the life of the hunter. The other elephants had fled in fear, but when Subhaddā Mahā returns with the herd, she finds the dead Chaddanta, who has now attained buddhahood. While pratyeka-buddhas recite sacred texts, two elephants use their tusks to carry the body of the Chaddanta to an immense funeral pyre.

Also on the basis of Feer 1895, the Sanskrit version from the Kalpadruma-Avadāna can be paraphrased as follows:

The Ṣaddanta, shining like the snow and covered with spots of gold, lives on the

southern flanks of the Himalayas with his two wives, Subhadrā and Bhadrā (cf. Sanskrit subhadra 'highly virtuous', bhadra 'virtuous'). One day the Ṣaddanta gives Subhadrā a beautiful lotus, but Bhadrā, receiving nothing, is jealous. She addresses an old muni, expressing the wish to marry a king in her next life and to have a throne made from the six tusks of the Ṣaddanta. Again, she dies fasting. Reborn into a noble family, she marries King Brahmadata. She tells him that she wishes to construct a throne from the six tusks of an elephant she has seen in a dream, and that she will die if she cannot have her wish. A hunter is summoned, but he knows that the Ṣaddanta is a bodhisattva and that to kill him would be a great sin. Bhadrā insists, and a second hunter is summoned. Brahmadata first pays him, only later specifying the task. The hunter insidiously dons a saffron garment, but digs no pit and does not hide. Subhadrā sees him and warns her husband. The Ṣaddanta ignores her warning, saying that there is nothing to fear from the saffron garment, but is then immediately shot with an arrow. While deploring the hypocrisy of the hunter, the Ṣaddanta protects him for the sake of his garment; he comforts Subhadrā, saying it is his own karma that is to blame. He asks the hunter why he has come, and the hunter, feeling remorse, reluctantly responds that he has been sent by Queen Bhadrā to collect the elephant's tusks. Recalling his past lives, the Ṣaddanta now breaks off his own tusks against a rock; the whole world trembles. He dies and achieves buddhahood. As the hunter is returning to the queen, bearing the tusks, his hands fall from his arms, rotten away. The new throne is constructed, but when Bhadrā is seated upon it, she dies and falls into hell. The kingdom of Brahmadata is destroyed by plagues and invasions.

In the extensive and highly lyrical version from the lost Sūtrālamkāra the element of remorse appears once again: the hunter is overcome with guilt and is no longer willing to saw off the tusks himself (Foucher 1911:243). This version consists of metrical verses uttered by the Ṣaddanta, the hunter, and a heavenly deva, all woven together with interludes of narrative prose. Based on Kumāralāta and Aśvaghōṣa 1908, the text can be summarized as follows:

In the forest, the bodhisattva lives as an elephant with six tusks. The queen bears great enmity toward this elephant and sends a hunter to bring her the tusks. The hunter observes the elephant speaking with his consort, and in a soliloquy compares him to a great white mountain; the tusks he compares to the white roots of water lilies. He now dons a monk's garb and slowly approaches the elephant. The elephant's consort warns him of the impending danger; the elephant responds that since the hunter wears the kāṣāya there is nothing to fear. His consort is comforted. The hunter penetrates farther into the forest, and at the right moment shoots the elephant with a poisoned arrow. The elephant's consort asks how this can be; he responds that though wearing the garment of deliverance, the hunter has been blinded by the kleśas [greed, anger, and delusion]. The elephant's consort declares that she will now crush the hunter to death, but the elephant chides her and she desists. After protecting the hunter from the other elephants as well, he invites him to remove his tusks. Now feeling remorse, the hunter utters numerous verses praising the elephant's virtue. The elephant asks the hunter why he has come for the tusks, and the hunter responds that he has been sent by the king. Once again the elephant offers him his tusks, asking only that he remove them quickly, but the hunter responds that were he to remove them, his hands would surely fall from his arms. Thus, using his trunk, the elephant tears out his own tusks. Soon, he is drenched in his own blood. Upon seeing this noble act, a heavenly deva utters verses in praise of his virtue. Finally, holding his severed tusks with his trunk, he delivers them to the hunter, telling him that he feels no hatred toward him. Rather, he wishes to obtain the fruit of enlightenment (the bodhi) and deliver all beings from the kleśas.

In a final Sanskrit version, the version from Nepal as rendered in English by Mitra (1971:299), several differences are evident: the hunter shoots no arrow, and no wound is inflicted. Rather, the elephant immediately yields up his tusks upon learning of the nature of the hunter's quest. This version concludes as follows: "The hunter, assuming the garb of a Bhikshu, appeared before the king

elephant, which lived amidst 500 other elephants. The elephant, seeing that he was a Bhikshu, received him with respect, and enquired the object of his mission. The hunter confessed what he wanted, and pleaded his poverty for the repulsive work he had undertaken. The elephant pitied his poverty, and, knocking his tusks against a rock, broke them, and gave them to him."

At this point, we can turn to two Chinese versions of the tale, adduced by Chavannes (1910 and 1934). Both are found in the Chinese Tripitaka. One, entitled Liùyábáixiàng [six-tusk white elephant], is found among approximately eighty jātaka tales in the Liùdùjījīng [six virtue compiled sutra], produced by Sēng Huì (d. 280 CE). The other bears no title, and is found among the jātaka tales of the Zábǎozàngjīng [various treasure Buddhist sutra], produced in 472 CE by Tán Yào. (A third version is very brief.) Liùyábáixiàng can be summarized as follows (Feer 1895, Chavannes 1934:100-102):

The Śaddanta lives with his two wives in a mountainous forest region. One day he finds a lotus of great beauty and makes a gift of it to his second wife, Xián [virtuous], but his first wife, Shàn Xián [kind and virtuous] takes it from her. Apparently, the Śaddanta makes no efforts to rectify the situation. Xián, devoured by jealousy, visits a forest shrine, praying to be reborn as a human and to gain possession of the Śaddanta's tusks for herself. She then ends her own life by casting herself down from a mountain precipice. Later, as queen, she states that she wishes to have a bed made from the elephant's tusks. King Brahmadata dispatches a hunter, who reaches the abode of the Śaddanta and insidiously dons the disguise of the saffron garment. Shàn Xián notices the hunter and warns her husband, but he replies that the saffron garment is always good, never evil. Again, though, he is immediately shot with a poisoned arrow. Shàn Xián chides him, but he declares that the fault lies not with the saffron garment, but in the human heart. For the sake of the saffron garment, the Śaddanta protects the hunter from the wrath of the other elephants. He asks the hunter why he has come. The hunter informs him that he has been sent by Brahmadata to return with the elephant's tusks, but that he now realizes he must not do so: were he

to do so, his hands would rot and fall from his arms. Therefore, the Śaddanta breaks off his tusks himself against a nearby tree. He then dies, hoping, through his death, to save all beings from the three kleśas. Later, at the sight of the tusks, the queen feels remorse. Expressing the hope that the Śaddanta will soon become a buddha and that she will achieve enlightenment as an arhat, she leaves the palace and becomes a nun.

The Chinese version from the Zábǎozàngjīng evinces numerous differences with respect to the version from the Liùdùjīng -- most notably the fact that the queen, rather than attaining arhat-hood, ends up in hell (Feer 1895, Chavannes 1910:102-104):

The Śaddanta lives in a distant region, far to the south, with his two wives. He reigns over five-hundred elephants, and vows some day to obtain buddhahood in order to save all living beings. One day he finds a lotus flower of a delightful color and makes a gift of it to his first wife. The second wife, devoured by jealousy, vows to kill him in the future with a fearsome poison. Later she perishes in a rage. She is reborn as the daughter of a good family, and marries the king. She says to him one day that she has dreamed of an elephant with six tusks and that she wishes to have a jeweled ornament (or table) fashioned from their ivory: she says she will die if she does not get her wish. The king responds that she surely will not die, but she answers that indeed she will! He convenes four of his ministers and tells them that he himself has dreamed the dream. He asks them whether such an elephant has ever existed. Uncertain, the ministers summon the archers of the four points of the compass to question them. The Archer of the South declares that he has heard of such an elephant from his deceased father. He is then given specific instructions by the queen: he is to disguise himself in a monk's robes, kill the elephant, and remove the tusks. He departs, disguises himself, hides in a pit, and proceeds to shoot the elephant with an arrow. The injured elephant finds the hunter in the pit, wearing the kāṣāya, and treats him with respect. He asks the hunter why he has come, and the hunter

immediately answers that he wishes to have his tusks. Though greatly suffering, the elephant grants him permission to saw off his tusks, asking only that the hunter do so quickly. Before dying, he lectures the hunter on the practice of the virtues (pārāmitas) by bodhisattvas. He then advises the hunter to walk backward in his previous tracks, lest the other elephants find him. When the hunter is gone, he emits a great cry, falls dead, and is immediately reborn as a buddha in heaven. The elephants lament their great loss. The hunter returns to the queen; reaching out to touch the tusks, she is immediately struck by lightning. She perishes, spitting blood, and enters hell."

Thus, the major elements of the plot are retained in all the versions, from the Pāli Chaddanta-Jātaka to the Chinese versions just summarized, but differences appear as well. An important area of discrepancy is the degree to which the Śaddanta assists the hunter in obtaining the tusks: in the Zábǎozàngjīng the hunter must saw off the tusks, while in other versions the elephant himself provides them -- by sawing them off, by pulling them out with his trunk, or by knocking them against a tree or stone. The degree of remorse felt by the hunter also varies: in the Pāli Chaddanta-Jātaka, presumably the earliest version, the hunter wounds and kills the elephant without remorse, and there is no mention of a deliberate disguise. In the Pāli commentary to the jātakas, the hunter insidiously disguises himself, still feeling no remorse, yet the elephant protects him. Elsewhere, except in the Liùdùjīng, the hunter feels deep remorse. In the Sanskrit version from Nepal, the plot is dampened to the point that the hunter inflicts no wound. In the Pāli Chaddanta-Jātaka, the hunter is physically unable to remove the tusks, while in most other versions, it is his remorse that makes this impossible. In all versions, though, the elephant magnanimously grants the hunter permission to take his tusks. In the Chinese versions and the Kalpadrūma-Avadāna, Bhadrā's fate is mentioned -- she either seeks buddhahood or descends to hell -- while the other versions (e.g. Sūtrāḷaṃkāra) conclude before she is presented with the tusks. (For more detailed comparative analyses addressing selected versions, see Feer 1895 and Foucher 1911.)

Concerning the Tocharian A version of the Śaddanta-Jātaka, Sieg and Siegling comment

(1921:31): "[the manuscript relates] the Śaddanta tale, which corresponds to the Pāli jātaka. Yet our tale, it seems, is structured much more extensively and is presented more skillfully. For example, the Pāli text contains nothing about the selection by Bhadrā of her spouse, described in some detail here." The plot of the Tocharian A version can now be briefly summarized. (In the current volume, more detailed section summaries are provided as well.)

The elephant Bhadrā venerates a pratyeka-buddha in the hope of being reborn as the daughter of King Mahendrasena. She then casts herself down from a mountain and meets her death (as in the Liùdùjīng). She is reincarnated as the daughter of King Mahendrasena. The neighboring kings and princes seek her hand in marriage, but King Mahendrasena fears their enmity if he gives her in marriage to any of them. She declares that she will choose her husband freely, thus avoiding enmity among neighboring kingdoms. King Mahendrasena gladly sends messengers from the city of Videhak to announce that all worthy suitors should come on the day appointed. Bhadrā, recalling how she had cast herself down from the mountain as an elephant, longs to marry King Brahmadata, and at the place of marriage, she selects him as her husband. As queen, Bhadrā claims to have seen four images arousing in her the desire to obtain the tusks of the Śaddanta-Bodhisattva; Brahmadata promises to send hunters to satisfy her wish. Bhadrā fears that none of them is sufficiently skilled to perform the task, but one hunter expert in the five skills of archery is found. He disguises himself in a monk's robe and shoots a poisoned arrow into the elephant's heart, yet the wounded Śaddanta-Bodhisattva treats him with compassion. Subhadra, spouse of the bodhisattva, condemns the hunter, but he chastises her for her doubts and declares the hunter, and the saffron garment, without fault: he declares that it is only under the power of the kleśas that the hunter has pierced his heart. He then protects the hunter from the wrath of the elephants, sending them away, and telling him: "Take what you wish!" The hunter is amazed by his virtue. He confesses his sin and declares that just as he has pierced the heart of the Śaddanta-Bodhisattva

with a poisoned arrow, the bodhisattva has pierced his heart with the arrow of virtue. Clearly, this hunter feels deep remorse. Then (as in the Sūtrālamkāra) the Śaddanta tears out his own tusks with his trunk, causing himself immense suffering, but enabling him to attain buddhahood. Indra descends to the earth and praises his noble act. The bodhisattva declares that remembering the torments of those in hell, he has endured his pain for the benefit of others. He invites Indra to observe what will next occur: the six tusks immediately reappear in their place, and gods and men rejoice. Indra assures the Śaddanta-Bodhisattva that he will attain buddhahood. Later, upon the hunter's return, Bhadrā falls to the ground in a faint. Then, revived, she recalls her past lives and confesses her guilt. She departs from the royal palace and becomes a nun (as in the Liùdùjīng). As an arhat, she finally comes before the Buddha. Falling at his feet and confessing her sins in all incarnations, she attains his forgiveness.

Finally, given that the Uighur and Tocharian versions were presumably translated from the same Sanskrit source, a close translation of Müller's German rendering of the Uighur text (1911, 1922) is provided here for comparison. Like the Tocharian version, the Uighur version is only fragmentary, and overlaps only partially with the Tocharian version. The Uighur version is found in two separate manuscripts, which overlap only briefly. The first, collected during the second German Turfan expedition, begins with the conversation between Mahendrasena and his daughter. It then continues to her selection of her spouse, providing much more detail than the Tocharian version, and concludes with her recounting of her dreams to her husband, Brahmadata. The second manuscript, found in Murtuq during the third German Turfan expedition, begins with Bhadrā's selection of her spouse, continues with her recounting of her dreams to Brahmadata, and progresses to subsequent portions of the tale -- often in greater detail than the Tocharian version. It concludes with the Śaddanta's pronouncement that if he has truly felt no anger toward the hunter, his six tusks will immediately reappear in their place. (Notations from Müller 1911 and 1922 are included below: [ ] indicates material supplied by Müller, and ( ) indicates Müller's own clarifications. Although many words and sentences are missing, ellipses are omitted here when the text is comprehensible.)



"When I have become princess (queen), I wish to inflict pain and compulsion on the elephant." Thinking in this manner, the maiden Bhadrā then spoke to her father, the prince: "May my father, the great king, not be sad and pensive! If it is appropriate for the princes of the world [to obey you], may they all come here! Let us set the new date of the great spouse selection (svayamvara); I myself shall choose a princely man." King Mahendrasena heard these words, and greatly rejoicing, he said: "O my daughter! Through wisdom you have won victory. Through love to (your) father, joy and gladness have arisen in my heart. Just as you have said, a new date shall [be set], and you may choose a princely man yourself! Thus the princes [will no longer be able to speak] evil words to me." Then, after King Mahendrasena had summoned the caravans and messengers who had come from the four regions, he pronounced to them in entirety the words setting the date of the svayamvara for three months hence. When they had heard this, the messengers quickly returned each to his own country. After three months had passed, all the princes of Jambudvīpa, without exception, came to the kingdom of Videha. Svayamvara... Like the gods living in the divine realm of Trayastriṃśat, they rejoiced together at the place of competition. Then, on the appointed day, [at the] place (of selection), like Śacī (consort of Indra), the princess entered, the maiden Bhadrā. She asked the maidservants surrounding her: "You, my noble ones! What will be the emblem (?) of Prince Brahmadata?" Her favorite maidservant, named Kāminī, answered her thus: "My princess! King Brahmadata's ... coming after, visible from afar, is standing there." [At this time] the maiden Bhadrā, seated on a cart adorned with jewels, rode down the row as she saw fit. Brahmadata, the kingly emblem (?)... approached as prescribed. With her beautiful eyes, resembling the padma flower, she sent Brahmadata a glance like a beam, as it were. In her mind, she secretly harbored deception and evil. [Because she] had harbored revenge and hatred [in a] past life, [she had] ... King Brahmadata even more (Müller 1911:20-23).

She approached [the king] and flung her colorful wreath of supuṣpa flowers upon King Brahmadaṭṭa. Then, amidst the great multitude, he made the maiden Bhadrā his highest consort. Then the kings from the four regions returned each to his own land. Due to her evil thoughts in a past life, this Queen Bhadrā was wont to act thus: with evil, womanly thoughts she would lie to King Brahmadaṭṭa. When she wished to carry out a deed which ought not to be carried out, she would say: "I have had this or that dream." Then, to entice the king's love, she would daily speak to him with noble, soft words. When... knew the love of the king... Thus she spoke... gratified... flower... [The king responded]: "I have never [heard of] such an elephant." Queen Bhadrā spoke: "May the king not doubt my dream! The dream I have dreamed is not otherwise!" Then King Brahmadaṭṭa summoned the hunters and related to them, in detail and in order, the dream of his beloved spouse Queen Bhadrā... "If you carry out this task of mine, great pains await you, but if you cannot carry it out, I will completely exterminate you unto the seventh generation." When they heard such words from the king, the hunters were overcome with fear, so they answered: "O great King, ruler of the brown earth! The locks of our black hair have become gray; many years and months have passed; we have long [practiced] hunting; we have become old, [but] of such an [elephant in] such [a] place [we have heard nothing]. [Queen] Bhadrā spoke: "He is of purer heart. Put on a [monk's robe] and go fearlessly into that forest. The elephant will surely not be afraid or be startled. Draw your firm bow, shoot the poisoned arrow into his heart and destroy his dear life! Tear out his six tusks each in turn and bring him pain and torment! If you do these things to him, a very great reward awaits you. If you cannot do this, prepare to be separated from your life!" When the hunter had received this command from [the queen, he smeared] his arrow with halāhala poison four [times?, and went to the] Himavanta... [A hunter] in the forest... approached. Between... as beautiful as nirvāṇa, he saw how he slowly passed by. Hurriedly [he hid] among the nāgapuṣpa flowers. At this

sight, Subhadrā [said to the] Bodhisattva-[Elephant]: "In our forest may it not be so! From this man danger and harm will come to us. We must not remain here! Let us make our way to another place rich in grass, well watered, and adorned with flowers!" The Bodhisattva-Elephant responded: "My noble one! In what way was the man of good aspect?" Subhadrā, the female elephant, answered: "He wore a monk's robe!" Greatly rejoicing, the Bodhisattva-Elephant said: "Be without worry and suspicion! O my spouse Subhadrā, from the monk's garment what [harm can threaten us]? If [he looks like this], then there is no fear. In donning the kāṣāya, living beings give up their [own] life. They bring no harm to others; they bring no danger to the lives of others. Has the monk's robe not been praised as the best by countless sublime ones? In its own essence, it is not dangerous. It also protects others from harm and danger. As many good beings as are to be found in this world, they can all be recognized from the kāṣāya. This must be known. The monk's garment is a guide going forth before all good beings. As many buddhas as have appeared previously in the world, as many as the grains of sand, including Maitreya and the (other) buddhas, [they have all worn the monk's garment.]" While the Bodhisattva-Elephant was still speaking in this way, the hunter laid a poisoned arrow (onto the bowstring), drew back (the bow) powerfully, and shot into the heart of the Bodhisattva-Elephant. Then the Bodhisattva-Elephant uttered a powerful cry. This terrible sound spread throughout the forest. Then the Bodhisattva-Elephant looked to all four sides, and saw the hunter in the distance. Then that hunter also felt pity and uttered with a sweet voice... The bodhisattva's [comrades] gathered together. His spouse, called Subhadrā, in anguish about the separation... as if driven mad, spoke thus to the [bodhisattva]: "Dear one, have you not thought of the things (words)? [Thus] now this harm has [come]." The Bodhisattva-Elephant answered: "Living beings... to the... sinful passions those... of the good, worthy living beings. When I [leave] this world..." [The other elephants said]: "... completely... [the hunter's] body we shall... and cast down...

tread upon and crush like a reed." At these words of the [other] elephants, the hunter [thought] in his heart: "I shall not be able to save my life... this majestic creature... calls: "Whatever may come, in order to kill him [I] shall not let [him] go." Those five-hundred elephants... [threatened?] the hunter, standing in a circle around the Bodhisattva-Elephant. [But] the Bodhisattva-Elephant addressed the hunter thus: "[Come] near [to me]!" [The hunter said]: "My life completely... I shall... I am unable to take your tusks." Again, twice, thrice [he pulled upon it]. He said: "...do! Now this tusk..." ...All of this he told the elephant in detail. The Bodhisattva-Elephant said: "Therefore [she has committed] this terrible [deed]. Since I had not given (?) her my lotus flower, due to her jealousy she has [now] brought me into this terrible state. So, my son, take these six tusks with you. In this way, [the queen's] wish shall be fulfilled and I will have given my life." When he had heard this, [the hunter] wished to [tear out the tusks] in order... pains... completely... [The elephant] finished, and in [pulling] one of his tusks... from its socket, [he strained] with the great power of the bodhisattvas. Thus the nerves of all the tusks were torn through and severed and a tusk came out with its roots. Through the great pain he became un[conscious] and fell to the ground. At this sight [a] great and powerful god residing [in the heavens] said to his spouse: "Behold, my noble one, this virtuous being... He lies there unconscious, not breathing." [Indra appears and questions the elephant.] He asked: "Tell me, my noble one, what do you wish, that you toil like me? Is it your wish to sit on the throne of God Indra? Or do you desire God Brahma's throne? For what reason have you submitted to such great torments? ... my arrow quickly." When he heard God Indra speak in this way, [the Bodhisattva]-Elephant [said]: "...the divine..." ...[The elephant answered:] "If [it is true that] in the deep darkness of the passions of samsāra I am a knower of the way and a guide, if I (furthermore) have harbored no anger, not even for a moment, toward the hunter who tore out my tusks, on the basis of this real truth may my six tusks reappear [completely] as before!" When he had

[said] this... then... boddhisattva... God Indra... (Müller 1922:53-61).

A comparison of the Tocharian and Uighur versions does suggest that they were translated from the same Sanskrit text, especially given the extended portrayal of Bhadrā's selection of her spouse, common to both translations. Where there is overlap, the Tocharian and Uighur versions generally show clear correspondences, yet discrepancies are also noted. These may have arisen due to varying interpretations of the Sanskrit original and to the introduction of embellishments upon it. Thus, in the Uighur version, King Brahmadata tells the hunters that great pains await them if they carry out his order, while in the Tocharian version the king simply states that it will be good if the hunters return with the tusks. In the Uighur version, Indra asks the Ṣaddanta whether he has endured his torments in a desire to sit upon the throne of Indra or Brahma, but in the Tocharian version, he asks only whether the Ṣaddanta has obtained satisfaction (in atoning for his own faults). In the Uighur version, the hunter is physically unable to remove the tusks, while in the Tocharian version he apparently makes no attempt to do so. Further, the Uighur version itself seems to contain internal inconsistencies, e.g. the hunter alternately feels remorse, vows to slay the elephant, and feels remorse again. Similarly, the tusks are removed by the elephant himself, but are later referred to as having been torn out by the hunter. These discrepancies may reflect discrepancies in the Sanskrit source itself; their presence may reflect a layered, historical accretion of details.

The Ṣaddanta-Jātaka has often been artistically depicted in India and Pakistan; Foucher (1911:234-235) and Chavannes (1934:100) mention several depictions of scenes from the tale. A scene of the queen fainting at the sight of the Ṣaddanta's tusks is painted on the wall of Cave 10, Ajañṭā (Maharashtra, third century CE); another scene from the tale is depicted in Cave 17. A medallion, from Amaravātī (Maharashtra, first or second century CE) depicts the hunter amidst numerous elephants; a second medallion, originating from Barhut (Madhya Pradesh, second century BCE), depicts the Ṣaddanta with only two tusks. A fragment of a bas-relief from a staircase in the Karamar region (first or second century CE) depicting scenes from the jātaka is now located in the Lahore Museum, and a lintel at the great stupa of Sanchi (Madhya Pradesh, second century BCE) depicts a six-tusk Ṣaddanta with numerous elephants. There also exists a bas-relief in Goli (Andhra Pradesh)

depicting the hunter as he saws off the elephant's tusks, and the queen as the hunter presents them to her. The Chinese monk-traveler Xuán Zhuǎng (early seventh century) also reported visiting a stupa near Benares depicting the Śaddanta (Feer 1895:57).

## LINGUISTIC APPROACHES TO TOCHARIAN

Below, a brief discussion of the linguistic structure and historical linguistics of Tocharian A is presented, with some reference to Tocharian B. In the discussion of phonology, the native phonemic inventories for Tocharian A vowels and consonants are presented, both accompanied by a list of borrowed phonemes. Correspondences between phonemes and symbols of the transcription are clarified in the discussion of notation. A discussion of meter briefly addresses the verse forms observed in Tocharian A and specifically in the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka. A discussion of morphology provides information on inflection and derivation in Tocharian A, and a brief discussion of syntax addresses sentence structure, discontinuous dependencies, and syntactic raising. Finally, a historical discussion clarifies the relationship of Tocharian A and B to other Indo-European languages and to English.

### Phonology

Based on Krause and Thomas 1960 (39ff.), phonemic inventories for Tocharian A can be diagrammed as follows:

#### **Native Oral Vowel Phonemes of Tocharian A**

	front	central	back
high	i		u
mid	e	ə	o
low			a,ā

To each of the seven oral vowels of Tocharian A corresponds a nasal vowel phoneme, indicated by <ṃ> (anusvāra) in the orthography. Often, word-final anusvāra alternates with /n/ in paradigms, cf. tkan-ā, perrelative singular of tkam 'place'. In Sanskrit borrowings, it may alternate with /ṅ/, cf. kāruṅ-is, genitive singular of kāruṅ 'compassion'. Anusvāra in Sanskrit loans presumably functioned as in native forms, triggering nasalization of the preceding vowel. Given such alternations, it is clear that orthographic representations such as tkam 'place' actually reflect underlying representations in which nasality functions as a phonological segment.

The vowel system of Tocharian A is simpler than that of Tocharian B, which features long vowel

phonemes /ī/ and /ū/, and the diphthongs /oi/, /ai/, /au/, and /āu/, in addition to all the vowels of Tocharian A. In Tocharian A, diphthongs appear only in borrowings; /ī/ and /ū/ are phonemic only in the non-native lexicon.

There is little information on lexical stress; Baldi states that "accent [stress] in Tocharian A is very poorly understood" (1983:146), but it was presumably phonemic. Sanskrit borrowings may have retained Sanskrit stress patterns, especially when Sanskrit forms were borrowed without phonemic changes.



## Native Consonant Phonemes of Tocharian A

	bilabial	dental	alveolar	palatoalv	palatal	velar
<u>stops</u>						
voiceless	p	t				k
<u>fricatives</u>						
voiceless			s	š	ç	
<u>affricates</u>						
voiceless			t <sup>s</sup>	č		
<u>nasals</u>						
voiced	m	n				ñ
<u>glides</u>						
voiced	w					y
<u>liquids</u>						
voiced lateral			l			l <sup>y</sup>
voiced trill			r			

All consonants demonstrate phonemic length. The consonant system of Tocharian B is identical to that of Tocharian A.

The Tocharian lexicon also includes numerous Sanskrit borrowings, and in these forms Sanskrit phonemes also appear. These are /ph/, /th/, /t/, /tʰ/, /čh/, /kh/, /b/, /d/, /d̪/, /j/, /g/, /bh/, /dh/, /d̪h/, /jh/, /gh/, /v/, /ŋ/ and /h/. The synchronic phonology of Tocharian A is complex. Phonological processes are observed in the context of both inflectional and derivational morphology. Given the constraints imposed by poetic meter, sandhi rules are also observed (though these may not have played a role in the spoken language), e.g. *śloko* 'with fruit' (*Ṣaddanta-Jātaka* Section 58 B 2) from *śla* 'with' + *oko* 'fruit'. Sieg et al. 1931 adopts a traditional approach to Tocharian phonology. For a generative treatment with a discussion of abstract vs. concrete approaches, see Green 1982.

### Notation

Pronunciation of symbols used in the transcription is generally unproblematical. Those requiring comment are listed below.

<ä> = mid central vowel similar to schwa, as in the first syllable of English *about*, but perhaps higher. Its precise quality cannot be determined, but Sieg and Siegling (1921:viii) remark that it may

have approached /i/ since the symbols transcribed as <ä> and <i> often alternate in representations of the same words. In other cases, though, the symbols transcribed as <ä> and <a> alternate in the same words.

<c> = voiceless palatoalveolar affricate /č/.

(pronunciation similar to that of English orthographic <ch>)

<j> = voiced palatoalveolar affricate /j/.

(pronunciation similar to that of English orthographic <j>)

<k<sup>u</sup>> = voiceless labiovelar stop, presumably a coarticulation of [k] and [w], and analyzable as /kw/.

<ly> = palatalized lateral /l<sup>y</sup>/, presumably a coarticulation of [l] and [y].

<ś> = voiceless palatoalveolar fricative /š/, with retroflexion.

(pronunciation similar to that of English orthographic <sh>, but perhaps more retroflex)

<ṣ́> = voiceless palatal fricative /ç/.

(pronunciation similar to that of English orthographic <h> in he)

For Sanskrit phonemes, subscript dot (except in anusvāra) indicates retroflexion.

In the current volume, an effort has been made to regularize the glosses. In many instances, <a> appears in the transcription by Sieg and Siegling (1921), while <ä> appears in glossaries and dictionaries -- presumably based on other Tocharian documents. In such cases, the version with <ä> is adopted in the gloss, while <a> is retained in the transcription. Often, following a consonant, a final superscript <ä> may appear in the transcription (indicating that the vowel is not counted in the given meter); this additional superscript <ä> is removed in the gloss when not found in Poucha 1955. In some cases, <a> appears in the text, while <ä> is substituted in the gloss. In some cases, <m> appears in the text, while <ṃ> is substituted in the gloss. Discrepancies of other types also occur. If competing versions of a form appear in Poucha 1955, yet none is identical to the version in the transcription, the version most similar to the transcription is adopted in the gloss. If the discrepancy is significant, though, the version in the transcription is carried over into the gloss and a brief discussion is provided.

In Sieg and Siegling 1921, underline indicates orthographic details of the original Brāhmī

orthography: in the manuscript, two different symbols indicate /p/, two different symbols indicate /t/, two different symbols indicate /k/, etc., while in Sieg and Siegling 1921, the transcription for one of each pair is underlined. (The characters transcribed with underline are sometimes referred to as the "strange symbols.") In this edition, underline is omitted, as such orthographic details are not relevant to a linguistic description of the language. Superscript dot over <n> to indicate velar nasal is also omitted here as dental and velar nasal are in complementary distribution: velar nasal occurs only before a velar consonant in the morpheme, and is thus an allophone of /n/. Finally, the ligature over <k<sup>u</sup>> in transcription (Sieg and Siegling 1921) is omitted in the current volume.

In several cases, the current transcription supplies without comment an obvious vowel or consonant missing in the manuscript and in previous transcriptions, e.g. it restores the /i/ in Videhak (ancient city, Section 4:66 B 6), and the /s/ in rse 'hatred' (Section 10:77 A 6, end of line). Word divisions have been corrected where appropriate, e.g. in Sieg and Siegling 1921 paplunšitar appears as a single word, while the correct analysis is paplu 'extinguished' and nšitar 'may vanish' (Section 7:75 A 1), as separate words. Conversely, where a nonessential space appears in the original transcription, it has been eliminated, e.g. šakkatsek 'certainly' replaces šakk atsek (passim). Sieg and Siegling (1921:ix) comment that word divisions in the representation of compounds may be arbitrary, and this continues to be an issue, though in the current volume hyphen generally appears between the components of a compound, e.g. ptā-ñkāt 'Buddha-god', N masc, nom sg (see Abbreviations and Symbols below). Similarly, the derivational suffix ši, forming adjectives from nouns, is treated as a separate word in the 1921 transcription, but is respelled as a suffix with hyphen in the current transcription, e.g. wrok-šinäs 'pearl', ADJ, obl pl masc/neut of wrok-ši 'pearl', ADJ, from wrok 'pearl', N. The same treatment is adopted for enclitics such as -nāk (emphatic) and -ām (pronominal object suffix, unspecified person and number).

### **Meter**

The entire text of the Šaddanta-Jātaka, like all texts in Tocharian A, is a metrical one: numerous meters are employed, and each meter is named in the text with a Sanskrit term (plus Tocharian A locative singular suffix <aṃ>) when it appears. Interestingly, these terms are not used in Sanskrit

texts to designate Sanskrit meters, which differed from those used in Tocharian A (Sieg and Siegling 1921:x). Apparently the Tocharian A meters are entirely native: they appear to have arisen independently, uninfluenced by Sanskrit verse forms. The Tocharian A verse consists nearly always of four lines with a caesura (not indicated in the current translation); these four lines may contain either differing or identical numbers of syllables. In the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka, many Sanskrit terms may be used to designate a single meter. Thus, a meter of 20 + 22 + 10 + 15 syllables is referred to in the text as devadattenam, kokāliknam and subhādreṇam. Similarly, asitakirinam, ṣāckāckeyam and hastinivāsam all designate a meter of 18 + 18 + 18 + 18 syllables. Superscript <ā> and <u> -- as in Sieg and Siegling 1921 -- indicate vowels not counted in the given meter. In such cases, two syllables are written in the Brāhmī manuscript as one compound symbol: the second syllable is written beneath the first, as in lac<sup>ā</sup> 'departed' V, 3 sg pret act of lāt- 'depart' -- written as one symbol. In Tocharian A verse forms, vowel length is not considered: <ā> and <a> both count as one syllable, and the same is true of long and short <i> and <u> in borrowings.

### **Morphology**

A brief description of Tocharian A morphology may be helpful. In the morphology of Tocharian A, three inflecting categories are observed: verbs, nouns, and adjectives. Of these, the verb is the most complex. Tocharian A shows typical Indo-European verbal morphology: verbs feature three tenses (present, preterit, and imperfect), two voices (active and mediopassive), and four moods (indicative, subjunctive, imperative, and optative). The subjunctive mood often indicates future tense, and also appears in if-clauses. For many verbs, distinct causative stems are also attested. In the glosses, verbs are indicative unless marked subjunctive, imperative, or optative. A complete discussion of conjugation cannot be provided here, but details are found in Sieg et al. 1931 and in Krause and Thomas 1960. Tocharian A also features a large number of non-finite and deverbal categories. These occur with great frequency and are easily identifiable.

Three participles are found:

1) Present participle active (with suffix ant or ānt) is declined as an adjective, cf. eṣant 'giving', PART pres act, nom sg masc, of e- 'give'. In context, such forms may also function as nouns, e.g. the

form may be translated as 'the giving one.'

2) Present participle mediopassive (with suffix mām) is indeclinable, cf. armām 'ending', PART pres med of ar- 'end'.

3) Preterit participle (with suffix o or u) is declined as an adjective, and carries active or passive sense, depending on transitivity and context, cf. sātko 'spread', PART pret, nom sg masc, of sāt- 'spread'. Reduplication of the initial stem consonant is often observed, cf. kakmu, PART pret, nom sg masc, of kām- 'come'. In the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka the preterit participle may appear alone to express perfective aspect, e.g.

**kakmuṣ ārtañ** (Section 4:66 A 2)

**The messengers have come.**

kakmuṣ 'come'. PART pret, nom pl masc, of kām- 'come'.

ārtañ 'messengers' N masc. nom pl of ārt 'messenger'.

Gerunds and verbal adjectives have the same form; both take the suffix āl, äl, or al. Poucha refers to both as verbal adjectives, while Ji refers to both as gerundives; below, the two are distinguished according to syntactic function (noun vs. adjective). Gerund I and verbal adjective I are derived from the present indicative stem of the verb; gerund II and verbal adjective II are derived from the present subjunctive stem. Below, this is indicated when it can be determined, cf. kāckāl 'rejoicing', GER I, nom sg, of kātk- 'rejoice'; yātal 'possible', VADJ II, nom sg neut, of yāt- 'be able'. Verbal adjectives may take inflectional suffixes, cf. cāmplyi 'able', VADJ, nom sg fem, of cāmp- 'be able', with feminine suffix /i/. Given cāmpāl (nom sg masc), it is clear that in the feminine form the vowel of the VADJ suffix is deleted, and that /l/ is palatalized, suggesting the underlying representation /čomp-əl-i/.

Verbal nouns I and II are derived from indicative and subjunctive verb stems, respectively, by suffixation of lune, sometimes leading to minor phonological changes. They can be translated in English as infinitives, gerunds, or abstract nouns, cf. sne trānklune 'without clinging', with VN I, obl sg, of trānk- 'cling'. Consider also wlalune 'to die, dying, death', VN II, nom sg, of wäl- 'die'. Often, case suffixes appear, cf. wmāluneyam 'in setting', VN II, loc sg, of wām- 'set'; wleṣluneyo 'by showing', VN II, instr sg, of wles- 'show'.

Infinitives (always present active) take the suffix tsi or si, cf. yatsi, INF of ya- 'do'; ritāsi, INF of rit- 'want'.

Absolutives are formed by suffixation of raṣ or rāṣ (occasionally rā or rāṣ) after final u or o of the preterit participle, and can be translated in English as perfective participles, active or passive, depending on context, cf. kaklyuṣurāṣ, ABS of klyos- 'hear'; tatmurāṣ, ABS of tām- 'bring forth'; ritorā, ABS of rit- 'desire'.

Tocharian A nouns exhibit three genders -- masculine, feminine, and neuter. (As in Albanian, gender may differ for singular and plural forms.) Nouns and adjectives show a complex array of suffixes (often identical), and are inflected for numerous cases; within the paradigm, stems are often suppletive. There are three primary cases -- nominative, genitive, and oblique -- whose singular, plural, and rarer dual forms are assigned according to various declensions. (For nouns, nominative singular and oblique singular are often identical; nominative plural and oblique plural of nouns may also be identical.) Nominative case marks subjects, vocatives, predicate complements, and (in some forms) non-final constituents of compounds. Genitive case marks possessors, indirect objects, and objects of certain prepositions and postpositions; in passive constructions, genitive nouns may be translated using agentive by. Oblique case marks direct objects, objects of certain prepositions and postpositions, duration of time, destination, absolute constructions, and both objects of kāly- 'teach'. In such contexts, the function of oblique case is similar to that of cases designated as accusative for other languages. Crucially, though, in a string of conjoined nouns, case is often clarified only on the last noun, the preceding nouns being marked as oblique, e.g.

**lāñcās maṣkitāśśi** (Ṣaddanta-Jātaka, Section 5:58 A 2)  
**of the kings and princes**

lāñcās 'kings' N masc. obl pl of wāl 'king'.

maṣkitāśśi 'of princes' N masc. gen pl of maṣkit 'prince'.

Six secondary cases also occur. These are indicated by unchanging suffixes, added directly to oblique singular or oblique plural stems -- sometimes with minor phonological rules applying. The uses of the secondary cases are complex, but some basic functions are listed below, with examples

from the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka.

Instrumental yo indicates instrument, and often corresponds to English 'with': pyāppyāsyo 'with flowers' N fem, inst pl of pyāpi 'flower' (Section 3:403 A 2).

Ablative āṣ indicates motion from, and often corresponds to English 'from': ṣulāṣ 'from the mountain' N masc, abl sg of ṣul 'mountain' (Section 3:403 A 6). Various abstract senses are also observed.

Locative aṃ indicates location, and often corresponds to English 'in': waṣṭaṃ 'in the house' N masc, loc sg of waṣṭ 'house' (Section 3:403 B 1). Various abstract senses are also observed.

Perlative ā may indicate motion, but is more often associated with a range of abstract meanings: kāpñuneyā 'with love' N, perl sg of kāpñune 'love' (Section 11:80 A 3); mānwā 'according to opinion' N, perl sg of mnu 'opinion' (Section 4:66 B 1); lāntsānā 'by the queen' N fem, perl sg of lānts 'queen' (Section 6:78 B 1).

Comitative aśśāl indicates accompaniment, and often corresponds to English 'with': ratkaśśāl 'with an army' N masc, comit sg of ratāk 'army' (Section 4:66 A 3).

Allative ac indicates motion toward, and often corresponds to English 'to': ypeyac 'to a country' N masc, all sg of ype 'country' (Section 4:66 B). Various abstract senses are also observed.

Often, a noun appears in a given case because it is governed by a preposition or postposition requiring that case, e.g. the postposition kārmem 'to' requires an object in the perlative case: āriñcā kārmem 'to the heart' (Section 8:79 A), with perl sg of āriñc<sup>ā</sup> 'heart'.

Adjectives are marked for feminine vs. masculine/neuter agreement; only demonstrative and interrogative adjectives show neuter forms distinct from the masculine. Adjectives may appear with the secondary case suffixes, but these are rarer in adjectives than in nouns: adjectives in the oblique case may modify nouns in any case but nominative. This can be illustrated with examples from Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka (Ji 1998):

**kloymant metrakyāp mosam** (Section 1:22a)

**for the noble Maitreya**

klyomant 'noble' ADJ. obl sg masc of klyom 'noble'.

metrakyāp 'Maitreya' N masc. gen of metrak 'Maitreya'.

mosam 'for' POST.

**parnont wrasomantaśśäl** (Section 1:22b)  
**with radiant being**

parnont 'radiant' ADJ. obl sg masc of parno 'radiant'.

wrasomāntaśśäl 'being' N masc. comit sg of wrasom 'being'.

**kurosām kapsiñño** (Section 1:22b)  
**with weakened body**

kurosām 'weakened'. PART pret, obl sg fem, of kur- 'weaken'.

kapsiñño 'body' N fem. inst sg of kapsañi 'body'.

Tocharian A features three demonstratives, with nom sg masc forms sās, sām, and sam, respectively. In usage it is difficult to identify semantic differences among them. They can all function as demonstrative adjectives or demonstrative pronouns, and may also be equivalent to definite article or a personal pronoun in English. Thus they are translated as 'this', 'that', 'the', or personal pronoun, depending on context. The demonstratives feature complete paradigms, including neuter forms distinct from the masculine, and it is only based on collocation with a demonstrative or interrogative that masculine and neuter gender of nouns can be differentiated for Tocharian A.

For more detailed discussions of the morphology of Tocharian A, see Sieg et al. 1931, and Krause and Thomas 1960.

## **Syntax**

An extensive discussion of syntax is not provided here; an examination of the data themselves will reveal major structural tendencies. It is clear that Tocharian A had relatively free word order, as is typical of languages with highly developed case systems. Overwhelmingly, though, adjectives precede rather than follow the head noun. The language features both prepositions and postpositions, but the extant lexicon includes many more of the latter. In the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka, only two prepositions are attested -- śla 'with' and sne 'without' -- while numerous postpositions appear.



In this text, on the sentence level, verb-final structures are common, as in:

**onkalmāñ ñātse mā \*kleñci** (Section 8:79 A 3)  
**The elephants shall bring no harm.**

onkalmāñ 'elephants' N masc. nom pl of onkalām 'elephant'.

ñātse 'harm' N masc. obl sg of ñātse 'harm'.

mā 'not' ADV.

kleñci 'will bring' V. 3 pl pres subj act of kāl- 'bring'.

Yet, contrary to Baldi's claim (1983:149) that Tocharian texts consistently demonstrate Subject-Object-Verb order, other structures also occur in the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka. These include Verb-Subject and Verb-Object, or Object-Verb-Subject as in:

**swāraṃ rake klyosneñc pe klośām nāñi** (Section 5:58 B 3)  
**My ears also hear the sweet word.**

swāraṃ 'sweet' ADJ. obl sg neut of swār 'sweet'.

rake 'word' N neut. obl sg of rake 'word'.

klyosneñc 'hear' V. 3 pl pres act of klyos- 'hear'.

pe 'also' ADV.

klośām 'ears' N. nom dual of klots 'ear'.

nāñi 'my' PRO. gen of ñuk 'I' (1 sg fem).

The text of the Ṣaddanta-Jātaka is characterized by syntactic movement, often producing discontinuous dependencies. Movement of a possessive pronoun out of an underlying noun phrase is especially common, as in:

**ciñcrone puk kalymentwaṃ satko tñi** (Section 4:66 A 2)  
**Your beauty [has] spread in all directions.**

ciñcrone 'beauty' N. nom sg.

puk 'all' ADJ, not declined.

kalymentwaṃ 'in directions' N fem. loc pl of kālyme 'direction'.

sātko 'spread'. PART pret, nom sg masc/neut, of sātk- 'spread'.

tñi 'your' PRO. gen of tu 'you' (2 sg).

Here, tñi 'your' moves out of the underlying noun phrase ciñcrone tñi 'your beauty', yielding a structure in which the verb phrase intervenes between the possessive and the head noun.

Of particular interest is the presence of syntactic raising in Tocharian A (creating a clause union structure), cf. kossi wotkā-m 'I commanded [someone] to kill him' (Section 10:77 B 3), where <m> 'him' (enclitic pronoun), the deep object of the lower verb kossi 'kill', is raised to the position of object of the higher verb wotkā 'I commanded'.

Unfortunately, the extent to which the syntax of the Tocharian text was influenced by that of the Sanskrit original cannot be determined, nor can it be determined to what extent the requirements of a given meter may have affected the syntax of the text. Tocharian never reaches the degree of "scrambling" observed in some Latin and Greek writings. Yet constraints on movement apply in all languages, and it can be assumed that even in Tocharian metrical translations certain constraints applied. Clearly, though, it will be possible to make observations only about the syntax of individual texts or of Tocharian texts collectively -- not about that of the spoken language.

### **Tocharian and Indo-European**

Finally, it will be useful to summarize briefly what is known of the historical linguistics of the languages commonly designated as Tocharian A and B. The designation Tocharian itself is a misnomer: the term was originally used by Greek historians to refer to a nationality of Iran and Afghanistan. In Sieg and Siegling 1908, the first work demonstrating that Tocharian forms an independent branch of Indo-European, the authors adopted the term to designate the language of the documents first found in Xīnjiāng in the early 1890's. For better or worse, the designation has stuck. According to Sieg and Siegling (1921), the native term for the language group and its speakers was ārśi, but the etymology of this term is unclear; Poucha (1955) adduces hypotheses from several sources.

Although Tocharian clearly constitutes one of the branches of Indo-European, relatively little evidence of either variety has been preserved. Most documents date from the seventh and eighth

centuries, but the languages may have been spoken as late as the tenth century, by which time they were supplanted by the Turkic language Uighur. According to the simplest analysis, the center of the Tocharian A language area was Turfan, while the center of the Tocharian B language area was Kucha (Kuqa) -- about 600 km farther to the west. Although all documents in Tocharian A are translations from Sanskrit of scriptures, tales, dramas, and other texts (with minimal scribal commentary), the Tocharian B materials also include original documents, including commercial texts and monastery records. The differences between the languages are significant. Etymologically related roots often have distinct functions in the two languages. Most surprisingly, the inflectional affixes are completely different.

The sites in which Tocharian documents have been found provide some evidence concerning the interactions of the two languages. It must be noted that Tocharian B documents have been located at all sites where Tocharian A texts have been found, but the reverse does not apply: no Tocharian A documents have been found in Kucha. A manuscript from Sängim shows Tocharian B glosses written beside many of the words in a Tocharian A document, "representing the production of a monk who was not fluent in Tocharian A" (Sieg and Siegling 1921:iv), but no Tocharian B documents with Tocharian A glosses have been discovered. Baldi (1983:144) comments: "[Tocharian] A seems to have borrowed extensively from [Tocharian] B vocabulary," and Lockwood (1972:254) states: "Tocharian B was the language proper of Kucha and may therefore be called Kuchean, while Tocharian A was spoken at Karashahr and Turfan. ...The presence of Kuchean at these latter settlements is perhaps evidence of missionary activity emanating from Kucha."

Crucially, although constituting the easternmost branch of Indo-European, Tocharian belongs to the centum subdivision of Indo-European languages, in which /k/ did not undergo spirantization to /s/, as occurred in the satem languages. (The designations for these major subdivisions derive from the Latin and Sanskrit words for 'hundred', respectively.) Thus, the satem branches (Indo-Iranian, Baltic, Slavic, Albanian, and Armenian) geographically separate Tocharian from the other centum branches (Greek, Germanic, Celtic, Italic, and Hittite). Clearly, the satem languages diverged

collectively from earlier Indo-European, but the speakers did not include the ancestors of Tocharian speakers. Also notable are Tocharian mediopassives marked by /r/ (cf. pālkār 'look' V, 2 sg impv med of lāk- 'look'), which may reflect a special relationship between Tocharian, Celtic, and Italic, all of which feature /r/ as the main marker of the mediopassive system.

Tocharian historical phonology is simple in some respects. Assuming three Proto-Indo-European (PIE) stop series (voiceless, voiced, and voiced aspirate), these all reduce to Tocharian voiceless stops /p t k/. Tocharian /s/ and /š/ derive from the sole PIE fricative, \*/s/. The other fricatives and affricates result from changes within Tocharian. The Tocharian affricate /tʰ/ and the palatal fricative /ç/ developed from certain instances of Proto-Tocharian \*/k/, while the palatoalveolar affricate /č/ reflects certain instances of Proto-Tocharian \*/t/. Most of the remaining native phonemes are carried over directly from Indo-European (cf. Krause and Thomas 1960).

The lexicon has been analyzed by various scholars taking different approaches. Windekens (1941) lists ca. 800 native lexemes for Tocharian A and ca. 930 for Tocharian B; compounds, fragments, and borrowings are not included. Windekens adduces Tocharian A cognates for Tocharian B forms, and vice versa, establishing their etymological relationships. He proposes Indo-European cognate sets for nearly all of the forms, but reconstructed PIE roots are not systematically mentioned, and it is difficult to determine how many PIE roots may be involved in the etymologies. Poucha (1955) provides the most exhaustive treatment of the Tocharian A lexicon: he lists about 3000 entries, which comprise nearly all attested forms. These include the 800 native lexemes also found in Windekens 1941, as well as compounds, proper nouns, undefined fragments, and Sanskrit borrowings. (In the glosses for the current volume, Sanskrit borrowings are identified at their first occurrence.) Clearly, only a small portion of the actual lexicon has been preserved: our knowledge of Tocharian is very incomplete. To account for the etymology of the native lexicon of Tocharian A, Poucha adduces 681 reconstructed PIE roots. However, since the three PIE stop series all reduced to Tocharian /p t k/, some of the proposed Indo-European relationships may be spurious -- especially when the semantic correspondences are tenuous. Pokorny (1959), by contrast, provides the most conservative analysis. 288 reconstructed PIE roots are adduced as being reflected in the native

Tocharian (A and B) lexicon. Presumably, he felt that etymologies for most of the native lexicon cannot be reliably proposed. Indeed, Baldi comments: "A large part of the vocabulary defies precise etymology" (1983:143). Gamqrelize (1995) has also made valuable contributions to the discussion, adducing several probable Indo-European cognate sets involving Tocharian. Within Tocharian, it is clear that borrowings are common. Sanskrit borrowings are frequent throughout Tocharian; Chinese, Tibetan, Iranian, and Uighur borrowings have been identified in Tocharian B.

As a matter of interest, the 288 relevant entries in Pokorny 1959 were examined in detail during the preparation of this volume. It was found that nearly all the PIE roots claimed by Pokorny to have Tocharian reflexes appear, according to his analysis, in other centum languages as well. Only one root (PIE \*akru 'tear') is reflected in Tocharian and satem languages only, while 33 (11%) are unattested in satem languages. Among the five other centum subgroups, Germanic shows the greatest number of Tocharian cognates: 242 of the 288 PIE roots from Pokorny (84%) are represented in Germanic, 227 (79%) in Greek, 207 (72%) in Italic, 173 (60%) in Celtic, and 69 (24%) in Hittite. Of the roots reflected in Tocharian, 37 (13%) are represented in only one other centum group, 48 (17%) in two others, 56 (19%) in three others, 101 (35%) in four others, and 45 (16%) in all five of the others. Thus, given Pokorny's analysis, if a PIE root is reflected in Tocharian, it is most likely to be reflected in four other centum groups as well.

Furthermore, an examination of Watkins 1985 reveals that 95% of the Tocharian forms adduced by Pokorny have cognates in Modern English (in a Germanic form, in Greek or Latin borrowings, or in both). A sampling of reliably established cognates for Tocharian A and English follows. Here \* marks reconstructed PIE roots. As in Watkins 1985, the symbols y and w are used in reconstructions (rather than i and u with glide subscript); as in Watkins 1985, a palatalized velar stop series is not assumed, and no distinction is made between Cw and C<sup>w</sup>. Otherwise PIE roots are listed as in the main headings of Pokorny 1959, with meanings as proposed there. (Here, if both long and short vowels are proposed in Pokorny's main entries, only short vowels are adduced. See Pokorny 1959 for extended forms and ablaut grades.) Only one English form is selected for each set: "EG" indicates a Germanic form -- sometimes illustrating Grimm's law -- and "EL" indicates a Latin

borrowing in English. "TA" indicates a Tocharian A form. When meanings in Tocharian A and English differ, interesting semantic shifts are observed.

## Tocharian A - English Cognate Sets

- \*ank 'bend', TA ańcāl 'bow', EG ankle
- \*arə 'plow', TA āre 'plow', EL arable
- \*ās 'burn', TA as- 'dry', EG ash
- \*awes 'shine', TA wās 'gold', EG east
- \*bhelegh 'shine', TA pālk- 'shine', EG black
- \*bhrāter 'brother', TA prācar 'brother', EG brother
- \*dher 'dark', TA tārkar 'cloud', EG dark
- \*dher 'grumble', TA trānk- 'speak', EG drone
- \*dhug(h)əter 'daughter', TA ckācar 'daughter', EG daughter
- \*e-newen 'nine', TA űu 'nine', EG nine
- \*gembh 'tooth', TA kam 'tooth', EG comb
- \*gwem 'come', TA kum- 'come', EG come
- \*gwou 'steer', TA ko 'cow', EG cow
- \*kāu 'strike', TA ko- 'kill', EG hew
- \*kā-ro 'dear', TA krant 'good', EG whore
- \*ken 'bend', TA kñuk 'neck', EG neck
- \*kwetwer 'four', TA stwar 'four', EG four
- \*kwon 'dog', TA ku 'dog', EL canine
- \*leuk 'light', TA luk- 'shine', EG light
- \*lus 'louse', TA lu 'animal', EG louse
- \*māter 'mother', TA mācar 'mother', EG mother
- \*medhu 'honey', TA mit 'honey', EG mead
- \*mēlg 'milk', TA malke 'milk', EG milk
- \*mē-nōt 'moon', TA mañ 'moon', EG moon
- \*nu 'now', TA nu 'now', EG now
- \*okw 'eye', TA ak 'eye', EG eye

\*ped 'foot', TA pe 'foot', EG foot  
 \*peg 'shoulder', TA pāsām 'breasts', EL pectoral  
 \*penkwe 'five', TA pāñ 'five', EG five  
 \*pewōr 'fire', TA por 'fire', EG fire  
 \*pətēr 'father', TA pācar 'father', EG father  
 \*sal 'salt', TA sāle 'salt', EG salt  
 \*seu 'bear offspring', TA se 'son', EG son  
 \*slēg 'loose/weak', TA slākkār 'sad', EG slack  
 \*smei 'smile', TA smi- 'smile', EG smile  
 \*stā 'stand', TA ṣtām 'tree', EG stem  
 \*sweks 'six', TA ṣāk 'six', EG six  
 \*swesor 'sister', TA ṣar 'sister', EG sister  
 \*terk 'turn', TA tark 'earring', EG thwart  
 \*tong 'think/feel', TA tunk 'love', EG think  
 \*trei 'three', TA tre 'three', EG three  
 \*wal 'be strong', TA wāl 'king', EG wield  
 \*we 'we', TA was 'we', EG we  
 \*wē 'blow', TA want 'wind', EG wind  
 \*wel 'turn', TA walyi 'worms', EG waltz  
 \*wekw 'speak', TA wak 'voice', EL voice  
 \*were 'raised place', TA ri 'city', EG wart  
 \*wēs 'you' (2 pl), TA yas 'you' (2 pl), EG you  
 \*wiro-s 'strong/man', TA wir 'young', EL virile  
 \*yes 'boil', TA yās- 'boil', EG yeast



## **ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS**

(Abbreviations for syntactic categories and deverbal forms are indicated in upper case. Abbreviations for other grammatical terms are indicated in lower case.)

abl = ablative

ABS = absolutive

act = active

ADJ = adjective

ADV = adverb

all = allative (designated as dative in some reference works)

caus = causative

comit = comitative

COMP = complementizer (subordinating conjunction)

CONJ = conjunction (coordinating conjunction)

DEM = demonstrative

fem = feminine

gen = genitive

GER = gerund

impf = imperfect

impv = imperative

INF = infinitive

inst = instrumental

INT = interjection

loc = locative

masc = masculine

med = mediopassive

N = noun

neut = neuter

nom = nominative

(indicated as voc when fulfilling vocative function)

NP = noun phrase

NUM = numeral

obl = oblique

opt = optative

ORD = ordinal

PART = participle

perl = perlativ (designated as a-case in some sources)

pl = plural

POST = postposition

PREP = preposition

pres = present

pret = preterit

PIE = Proto-Indo-European

PRO = pronoun

REL = relative

sg = singular

subj = subjunctive

V = verb

VADJ = verbal adjective  
VN = verbal noun  
voc = vocative

\* (before transcription) = Portions of the transcription for a word are proposed in the footnotes to Sieg 1952.

\*\* (before transcription) = The transcription for the entire word is proposed in the footnotes to Sieg 1952.

/// = Edge of the manuscript page has been damaged; many syllables may have been lost (though possible completions are also indicated when provided in the footnotes to Sieg 1952).

# = A portion of a syllable is missing in the manuscript and in Sieg and Siegling 1921; there is no suggested reconstruction.

... = At least one syllable is missing; there is no suggested reconstruction.

[ ] (beneath section number) indicates section summary.

[ ] (in English translation) indicates completions based on the context or on other versions of the tale.

< > indicates orthographic representations, as opposed to phonemic representations, when convenient.

