



A Linguistic Classification of "Tocharian" B Texts

Werner Winter

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 75, No. 4. (Oct. - Dec., 1955), pp. 216-225.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%28195510%2F12%2975%3A4%3C216%3AALCO%22B%3E2.0.CO%3B2-D>

Journal of the American Oriental Society is currently published by American Oriental Society.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/aos.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion, or roughly simultaneously with it, came the determination to operate with the Arab tribes who were already under his suzerainty and who were deployed, not in the far away south, but along the

Syrian *limes*. These he united under the kingship of Arethas and they performed what the Himyarites could not and would not perform.

A LINGUISTIC CLASSIFICATION OF "TOCHARIAN" B TEXTS

WERNER WINTER

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

1. ANY ATTEMPT to give an accurate description or a reliable comparative evaluation of a linguistic corpus will lead to coherent results only if the corpus is coherent. Any analysis, descriptive or comparative, that neglects the principle of isolating a synchronic and syntopic body of material will at least be in danger of arriving at results distorted by factors alien to the structures at issue. In work on living languages the isolation of a coherent corpus is relatively simple; synchronic uniformity will be arrived at almost automatically, syntopic uniformity (in geographical as well as in sociological terms) can be safeguarded by proper selection of informants. The matter is, however, more complicated in work on older stages of a given language or with extinct idioms. Here synchronic uniformity often cannot be demonstrated, but only inferred from the relative consistency of linguistic data in a group of texts; geographical uniformity is more easily established when the local origin of the texts is known, but even here a countercheck on the basis of linguistic data is necessary to guard against possible outside influences.

2. The purpose of this study¹ is to arrange the texts of "Tocharian" B in groups, each forming

a corpus linguistically as uniform as possible. From the results of this arrangement, conclusions will be drawn as to dialectal diversities.

To establish diachronic differences within the body of B texts seems impossible. Nonlinguistic evidence permits us to infer dates for only a very small fraction of our texts (for caravan passports, Manichaean documents, and possibly monastery records); we apparently do not find enough linguistic development reflected in these sources to venture any conclusion with regard to texts not dateable on external evidence. Even a relative chronology among the undatable texts seems impossible. Forms cited by P. Poucha, *KZ LXVIII* (1944), 88-89, as 'younger' are only conditioned variants of his 'older' forms, occurring beside them. W. Krause's "older" forms (*WTG* I, 6-7) are indeed older in terms of historical linguistics; but since they occur in only one site, they may well be retentions by a more conservative dialect, and need not have any bearing on the interpretation of texts from other sites in terms of chronology.

While synchronic uniformity of our corpus cannot be established, syntopic uniformity can be approximated. The character of our texts, which are almost exclusively Buddhist writings composed

(Göttingen, 1949-53); (part 1 also quoted separately as *UA*);

Fragments: S. Lévi, *Fragments de textes koutchéens* (Paris, 1933);

WTG: W. Krause, *Westtocharische Grammatik, I, Das Verbum* (Heidelberg, 1952).

As for the use of the term "Tocharian" and for matters of transcription see *JAOS* LXXV (1955), 26, 27 f.

Save in special cases in which plene writing is given, Sieg-Siegling's broad transcription is used, except that *ṣ* has been replaced by *š*, and that nonsyllabic vowels are superscribed (without the arc). The interpretation of the text with regard to word division is not always Sieg-Siegling's.

¹ This study was prepared with the generous help of the University of Kansas, and in close friendly contact with G. S. Lane at the 1954 Linguistic Institute at the University of Chicago. Earlier stages of my work profited very much from the access to B materials then still unpublished, kindly granted to me by W. Krause, and from his personal advice and criticism. I am also greatly indebted to B. Bloch for valuable suggestions regarding the form of this study.

The following books are referred to by abbreviations:

A: Sieg-Siegling, *Tocharische Sprachreste* (A) (Berlin-Leipzig, 1921);

B: Sieg-Siegling, *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B*

by scribes probably trained in monastery scriptoria, seems to make it likely that they belong to a single sociological stratum. We have therefore only to establish geographical uniformity. For this we have data: most of the B texts are carefully marked as to their provenience. But by this we know only the place where they were found, not the place where they were written, let alone the home of the scribe or the author. The question of origin proper can, therefore, be approached only by way of linguistic analysis.

In this analysis, the following rules will be observed:

(a) Unless there is evidence to the contrary, all differentiation will be ascribed to geography, not to chronology.

(b) A form occurring in only one area will be considered indigenous to that area, constituting a feature of the local dialect.

(c) Isolated texts, containing forms of a dialect different from the local dialect thus determined, will be considered to result from transfer either of the text or of the scribe.

(d) Mixed texts, containing local forms combined with nonlocal, will be considered adaptations of imported texts by local scribes or for local use, provided the nonlocal forms are not so rare in the text or so slightly different from the local ones as to make the assumption of a scribal error seem preferable.

3. Deviations and agreements between two languages can be stated without giving preference to either one. But in comparing several languages, it expedites the procedure to state the peculiar features of each with reference to one, chosen either arbitrarily or on the basis of convenience. The convenience may be due to features that are linguistic (one idiom may occupy a position intermediate between the others) or extralinguistic (one of the idioms may happen to be better known than the others).

4. In recent studies of B texts, so far as they were based primarily on Berlin texts, it has become customary to consider as normal form that of the texts found in Šorčuq (= Š) in the central part of the B area, near Qārašahr. When deviating forms occurred in other texts, they were frequently treated as misspellings, or singled out (by marking

them 'sic') as not conforming to a norm²). Only in the case of the so-called "MQ-Schreibungen" (forms typical for texts found at Ming-öy Qizil near Kučā, in the West of the B area) has Krause made an attempt to consider such forms in their own right (cf. *WTG* I. 1-4); but still he hesitated to take them as representing linguistic reality, referring them rather to the level of writing. More recently, though, has Krause used (*OLZ* 1955, p. 252) the term 'sprachliche Besonderheiten' with reference to certain features of MQ texts, which seems to indicate a modification of his previous opinion.

If, in this study, Š texts are again used as a basis for comparison, this is done only for practical reasons. Under no circumstances is this procedure to be understood as setting up Š forms as an all-B 'norm,' to which other forms could be referred as 'mistakes.' The reasons for choosing Š as such point of reference are, first, that a number of phonological features are most closely observable in Š texts (e. g., the conditioned interchange of *ä* : *a* and *a* : *ä*); second, that all Š texts except a couple of deviating manuscripts are written in a uniform dialect; third, that texts of the Š type have been found in large numbers also in eastern and western areas, alongside numerous non-Š texts, which would make it impossible to arrive at consistent statements about *all* texts found in either the West or the East.

5. Deviations from the Š forms will be listed in their graphic shape; no attempt is made here at phonemic or historical interpretation.

The following deviations from forms found in Š texts have been observed (a slant line separates forms in regulated distribution, a comma indicates apparent random distribution):

I. Vocalism:

1.	š	ä/a	i/a
2.		ä/a	ä
3.		ä/a	ä, a
4.		a/ä	a
5.		a/ä	a, ä
6.		ai	aiy
7.		oy	o ⁺
8.		au	e ^u (ew)
9.		au	o ^u (ow), au ^u (auw)
10.		au + nasal	om (aum) + nasal
11.		o ... a	o ... o

² Cf. *Language* XXXI (1955), 107-108.

II. Consonantism:

12.	š	-tsi	-si
13.		-st	-s
14.		-mt	-m
15.		-kt	-k
16.		-mts	-ms, -s
17.		-c	-ś
18.		-ñc	-ś
19.		-śc-	-śc-
20.		-ñm	-ym
21.		-lñe	-ñe
22.		C ₁ C ₂	C ₂
23.		C ₁	C ₁ C ₁
24.		-p-	-w-
25.		štw-	św-

6. Since the MQ texts were already considered by Krause (following Sieg-Siegling) to be somewhat apart from Š, the texts found at Ming-öy Qizil will be examined first. The arrangement of groups follows the degree of deviation from Š; in ambiguous cases, an effort has been made to group a text with the lowest-ranking category in question, i. e., rather list it with a more Š-like group. A plus sign in the tables denotes occurrence of a non-Š form, a minus denotes occurrence of an Š form; in some cases when only an affirmative statement is possible (as with the doubling of a consonant, the conditions of which are still unknown), only a plus is marked. Isolated forms of a special interest are given in brackets.

I. MQ = Š:

Mss. B	234-236	411
	242	
	243? (<i>kacoāp</i> = 23?)	510
	246	518
	249	520
	311	567-570
	313	594
	396-397	595
	409 (<i>śimāwa</i> = 1!)	603
	410	607

II. MQ = Š — 23 (C₁C₁ instead of C₁):

Mss. B	244 (NB. <i>lyuśsi</i> = 12!)
	519
	600 (NB. <i>śinmalñe</i> = 1!)

III.³ MQ = Š — 3 (ä, a), 5 (a, ā), 6 (aiy), 23 (C₁C₁):

³ It is characteristic of subgroup III a that the distribution of ä : a and a : ā follows that of Š more closely than in subgroup III b. The deviations from Š seem, however, important enough to justify separating the texts in III a from those in groups I and II.

a)	Mss. B	3	5	6	23	
	19, 34-40	+	+	—	+	(<i>komt</i> = 10?)
	86, 96-98	+	+	—	+	(<i>päs ś-</i> = 13)
	149-153, 155-156,					
	158-160, 162-168,					
	391-393	+	+	—		
	220-223	+	+	±	+	
	431	—	—	+		
	503-505	+	+	—		
	604	+	+	—		
b)	Mss. B	3	5	6	23	
	117-131	+	+	—	+	
	132	+	—	—		
	215-219	+	+	—		
	228-230	+	+	—		
	237-238	+	—	—		(<i>cimpyāstaṃñ</i> = 1!)
	239	+	—	—		
	240	+	+	—		
	241	+	+	±		
	252-254, 256-265	+	+	—	+	
	276-278	—	+	—		
	279-280	+	+	—		
	291	+	+	—		
	314-317, 319-323	+	+	±		(<i>os ne</i> = 13!)
	336	+	+	—	+	
	349-351	—	+	—	+	
	402-403	—	+	—		
	414	+	+			
	490	+	+	±		
	499	—	+			
	574-576	+	+	—	+	
	590	+	+	—		
	593	+	+			

IV. MQ = Š — 3 (ä, a), 4 (a), 6 (aiy), 23 (C₁C₁):

	3	4	6	23	
Mss. B	148	+	+	±	
	203, 205-209	+	+	±	(Once ā in <i>śaktālyi</i> .)
	247	+	+	±	(No double dots in
	552-557	+	+	±	[<i>ms.</i> , no <i>ś.</i>])

In 552, ä and a seem to change without any system whatsoever, cf. *pratikapañākti* : *pratikapañakte* (the text is prose!). Note the orthographic similarities (use of anusvāra beside conjunct writing to denote virāma) with part of the Hoernle fragments and with the Yogaśataka text edited by J. Filliozat.

V. MQ = Š — 3 (ä, a), 5 (a, ā), 6 (aiy), 7 (oi), 9 (ow), 23 (C₁C₁):

Mss. B	3	5	6	7	9	23
210-214	+	+	±		±	+
250	+	+				+
281	+	+	—		+	
295	+	+	—	+	+	+
304	+				+	
362	+	+	±		±	+
413	+			+		
545-546	+	+	—	+		

For reasons for including 304 and 362 here see § 8.

VI. MQ = Š — 3 (ä, a), 5 (a, ā), 6 (aiy), 7 (oi), 8 (e^u), 9 (ow), 23 (C₁C₁):

Mss. B	3	5	6	7	8	9	23	
282-283	+	+	±		±			(naumye!)
333-335	+	+	±	+	+	+	+	
365	+	+	±		+		+	
388-390	+	+	—				+	(NB. prašciye)
407	+	+	±		+		±	(kacāp : kaccap)
571-573	+	+	—		+		+	

VII. MQ = Š — 2 (ä), 5 (a, ā), 6 (aiy), 7 (oi), 8 (e^u), 9 (o^u), 19 (šc-), 23 (C₁C₁):

Mss. B	2	5	6	7	8	9	19	23	
133-147	+	+	±	±	+	+	+	+	
224-227	+	+	—	—	+	+	+	+	
245	+	+	—	—	+	+	+	+	
248	+	+	—	+	±				
255	+	+	—		+	+	±	+	
273	+	+	—		+		±	+	
274-275	+	+	±		+		±	+	(NB. prašcyce)
284-285	+	+	—	+	—	+	—	+	
394-395	+	+	+		+	+	—	—	
514-515	+	+	—		+			+	
587	+	+	—		+	+			
588	+	+	—		—		—		

VIII. MQ = Š — 3 (ä, a), 5 (a, ā), 6 (aiy), 7 (oi), 8 (e^u), 9 (o^u), 19 (šc), 23 (C₁C₁).

Only one manuscript, B 338-344. NB. -owwa = 9!

IX. MQ = Š — 1 (i/a), 6 (aiy), 10 (omN), 12 (-si), 13 (-s), 15 (-k), 16 (-ms), 17 (-š), 18 (-š), 21 (-ñe), 23 (C₁C₁), 24 (-w), 25 (šw-):

Mss. B	1	6	10	12	13	15	16	17	18	21	23	24	25
433-487	+	±	+	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+
492		+						+					
493	+												—
496	+	±	+				+		+	+	+		

Note the simplifications of consonant sequences in šattälyem, kemarcune, šilarakite, pikala!

7. It is evident that group IX stands quite apart from all other MQ groups—it shows numerous differences from Š, but none of them except 6 and 23 are shared with any other MQ group, if the isolated instances of 10 and 13 in group IIIa are left out of consideration.

This leads us to neglecting group IX for the moment and to discussing groups I—VIII separately. In these groups, certain further features deserve our attention.

8. Without consistency, but nevertheless in a great number of cases Sieg-Siegling add to their

description of the B manuscripts published in the second volume of the texts brief remarks about the character of the script. It goes, of course, without saying, that statements like "gute Schrift" or the like have little or no value for our purposes; another classification, dubious as it may appear without further elaboration, bears, however, much more weight: A number of samples are given the label "old script," and whether one wants to accept this term or not, these manuscripts are clearly set apart from the others. The important fact, now, is that, as far as I was able to discover, all occurrences of "old script" are confined to documents found at Ming-öy Qizil. The distribution of "old script" texts in the various groups of MQ is as follows:

Group	I	II	IIIa	IIIb	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Total of mss. in group	19	3	7	22	4	8	6	12	1
"Old script" mss. in group	1	—	—	2	—	3	4	10	1
%	5.3	0	0	9	0	37.5	66.7	83.3	100

There is an obvious relation between degree of divergence from Š and frequency of use of 'old script.' Even though we have only limited information as to the occurrence of this ductus (some examples may not have been mentioned by Sieg-Siegling), the results can hardly undergo very substantial changes in view of the already now extremely high frequency of 'old script' in groups VI-VIII. The figure for class V may be subject to some correction: B 304 lacks some characteristic forms that would enable us to decide about its grouping with III, V, VI, or VIII—the 'old script' makes it less likely that 304 should be listed under III, forms with -au- instead of -auw- suggest that the grouping with VI and VIII is unlikely, but the two forms with -au- are not absolutely conclusive. In the case of B 362 there can be doubt about grouping with V or VI, but neither of the two cases 304 and 362 substantially influences the overall correlation between high degree of divergence from Š and high frequency of occurrence of "old script."

The more important becomes the use of "old script" in one member of group I, B 520. If the interpretations of Sieg-Siegling and Krause were correct, we would have here a combination of an old ductus and consistently used recent linguistic forms. How could that be possible? An old text may be copied in a more recent script or in an

imitation of the older ductus—but that a more recent text would have been composed or copied in an old script seems utterly unlikely.

Much more reasonable becomes another approach to this problem. The so-called "old script" occurs only in texts found at Ming-öy Qizil. The most natural interpretation of this situation seems to be that the "old" ductus is a local variant of the Brāhmī script, possibly developed in a scriptorium in this area. The ductus labeled "gewöhnlich" by Sieg-Siegling occurs in the MQ finds in combination with linguistic material not deviating from Š. The conclusion seems possible that the "normal" ductus is the ductus used in a scriptorium in the Š area, transferred to the West together with Š texts, and used there in competition with the local ductus, maybe even gradually superseding it. No sudden change can have taken place (which means that the ductus does not provide us with a point of reference for relative chronology) because then the copying of a Š text (or a text made up after the pattern of Š texts) in the local ductus would not have been possible.

The assumption of Š texts having been copied in the MQ area will help us to understand the coming into existence of groups of texts showing strange mixtures of Š and MQ features. Texts of this type are restricted to finds of Ming-öy Qizil (for exceptions, see § 9); their local origin is further confirmed by occurrences of local script (in B 228-230 and 241, both belonging to group III b). We may venture the conjecture that all texts with a more than negligible admixture of characteristic MQ forms (some of such forms could, of course, always be due to scribal error) are most easily explained as copies of Š texts executed by scribes of an MQ background. It seems likely that also a number of texts found at Ming-öy Qizil, but written in Š ductus and containing only Š forms (that

is, in other words, texts of group I), are of local origin, but that seems almost impossible to prove unless the textual feature to be pointed out in the following section of this paper offers a useful indication.

9. In a script of Indic type the sequences -C C- (final consonant—initial consonant) and -C V- (final consonant—initial vowel) may be written in two ways: either by combining the parts of the sequence in one akṣara, or by separating them by means of a virāma. The latter is done in our Brāhmī by connecting the first words final akṣara, to be read without a vowel complement, with the preceding one; in some manuscripts (cf. *Language XXXI* (1955), 108) a special virāma sign, resembling an anusvāra, is used in addition to the connecting stroke.

Use of ligature and of virāma occur side by side in our texts. No attempt will be made, at this point, at clarifying the reasons for absence or presence of virāma. We may, however, propose the assumption that, whatever the reasons may be, in any text of some length the conditions for occurrence or absence of virāma should be roughly the same as in any other text of similar length and, perhaps, similar structure. Whatever conditions of a more special type may arise that lead to deviations from the norm employed in the particular text, should be neutralized by a greater or at least similar number of normal conditions, if only the text is sufficiently long. In the case of a shorter fragment, however, a chance skewness might be mistaken to represent a norm.

An analysis of texts containing at least 30 sequences -C C- or -C V- results in the following listing (ligatures indicated by +, virāma by —; so-called "secondary cases" not included in the count):

	Text predominantly +	Ambiguous	Text predominantly —
MQ, MQR			
19, 34-40 (III a)	+ 56 — 25		
117-131 (III b)	+ 106 — 20		
133-147 (VII)	+ 120 — 29		
149-...-168, 391-393 (III a)			+ 45 — 70
203, 205-209 (IV)			+ 18 — 33
210-214 (V)	+ 44 — 14		
220-223 (III a)		+ 31 — 25	
224-227 (VII)	+ 28 — 9		
228-230 (III b)		+ 18 — 18	
241 (III b)			+ 11 — 24
252-...-265 (III b)	+ 49 — 12		
255 (VII)	+ 28 — 8		
273 (VII)	+ 25 — 10		

274-275 (VII)	+ 23 — 7		
282-283 (VI)	+ 34 — 9		
295 (V)	+ 33 — 11		
333-335 (VI)			+ 12 — 44
338-344 (VIII)		+ 34 — 26	
349-351 (III b)			+ 14 — 34
365 (VI)	+ 29 — 8		
433-489 (IX)			+ 58 — 91
552-557 (IV)		+ 16 — 19	
574-576 (III b)			+ 11 — 33
Š			
‘A’ (cf. <i>UA</i> , p. 6-7)			+ 305 — 423
‘B’			+ 184 — 449
‘C’			+ 20 — 66
71...-106		+ 224 — 240	
266-272			+ 13 — 39
521-523	+ 30 — 17		
S			
107-116			+ 40 — 213
178-184			+ 23 — 67
286-287			+ 8 — 25
324-332 (M/S)			+ 19 — 107
384-387	+ 25 — 10		
591			+ 10 — 32
M			
170-177			+ 15 — 80
197			+ 6 — 43
415-421			+ 12 — 21

The analysis performed here yields a rather well defined pattern: The MQ texts most different in other respects from Š ones show predominance of ligatures. (Only B 333-335 [VI] differs from this, but this text shows quite unusual application of virāma even in the interior of words; the high frequency of virāma is therefore not necessarily due to the same reasons as in non-MQ texts.) Strongly mixed texts of the groups III, a and b, and IV may show predominance of ligatures or of virāma. The texts of group IX, so different from any other MQ text, prefer virāma.

Š texts and texts from Murtuq and Sängim all show predominance of virāma, with two exceptions: Š 521-523 and S 384-387. It is important to notice, though, that both of these manuscripts show deviations from what is typical for Š texts, which would lead us to classify them with MQ texts, were it not for their immediate provenance: Š 521-523 can be described as = Š — 3 (*ä, a*), 9 (*ow*); S 384-387 as = Š — 3 (*ä, a*), 9 (*ew*) [but also *au*], 9 (*auw*), that is, as texts of a Š type with significant admixture of MQ forms. In accordance to what has been stated in § 2.d, they will have to be considered as transferred MQ texts of the mixed type (i.e., similar to III/IV). Their ranking with other such MQ texts as regards their treat-

ment of final consonants is, then, anything but surprising.⁴

It seems that we may add to our list of characteristics of an MQ text as found in the deviations from the Š pattern that are most clearly recognizable in classes VII and VIII, another criterion of MQ origin, that of predominance of ligatures. This criterion may occasionally be of use in the absence of other pertinent indications (B 242 (group I), e.g., shows a relation + 12 : — 3, and may therefore be considered to be of MQ origin, even if the scope of the material does not allow a definite decision), and it may, of course, serve as a corroborating element alongside other criteria.

10. Having thus determined the distinctive features of texts written in the Western part of the B area, we shall now proceed to an analysis of texts found in the East, that is at the sites of Sängim (S), Murtuq (M), Xočo (D), Toyoq (T). The texts will be taken up together and arranged again according to their degree of similarity with the formal aspects of Š texts.

⁴Two more MQ texts found at Š are B 251 and 310, but they are too short to be considered here.

I. S, M etc. = Š:

Mss.

M 170-177	M 370
S 178-184 (<i>kakāpoš</i> : <i>kau</i> -!)	M 371
M 196?	M 372
M 200 (<i>spārtüssi</i> = 12!)	S 384-387 (cf. § 9)
M 201	M 405
S 286-287 (<i>aišsi</i> = 12!)	M 412
M 299-303	S 524-526
M 355-356	D 527-540 (<i>šše</i> = 23!)
M 357-358	M 542-544
M 367	M 608

II. S, M etc. = Š — 1 (*i/a*), 6 (*aiy*), 12 (*-si*), 16 (*-ms*), 21 (*-ñe*), 23 (*C₁C₁*):

Mss.	M	1	6	12	16	21	23
M 197	+	—	±	—	±		
S 292	+	—	—	—	—		
M 369	±	—	—	—	—		
M 415-421	±	±	+	±			+
S 432	—	—	+	—			
D 541	±	—	—	—			
M 577-579	—	—	+	—			+
S 580-581	+	—	—	—			
M 592	—		±	—	—		

This group shows all the characteristics of mixed texts with predominantly Š character: deviations and Š forms tend to occur side-by-side.

III. S, M etc. = Š — 1 (*i/a*), 6 (*aiy*), 10 (*omN*), 11 (*o..o*), 12 (*-si*), 13 (*-s*), 14 (*-m*), 15 (*-k*), 16 (*-ms*, *-s*), 17 (*-ś*), 18 (*-ś*), 20 (*-ym*), 21 (*-ñe*), 22 (*C₂*), 23 (*C₁C₁*), 24 (*-w*), 25 (*św*):

Mss.	1	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	20	21	22	23	24	25
S 107-116	±	±	±	±	±	+			+	+	+		±		+	±	+
M 185-188													±			—	+
M 189-191	+														+		
M 193	+	—			+			+	—				—				+
M 195		±		(+)				+					+		+		
M 198	±	—			+									+			
M 199	±	—						+	+								+
M 202		—							—				—	+			(Dat. pl. -iś!)
S 288-289		—	—										±				
D 296	+	—	+	+	+	+			+				—	+			
T 297	+	±	+	+	+			+				+	—				—
M 324-325 } S 326-332 }	±	±	+	+	±	+		+	+	+	+	±	±	+	+	+	+
											(-mś)						
M 345-348	+	—	+		±		+	—	—				±				
M 361	+	—		+	+			—		+			—		+	—	
M 375-378	+	—	+	+	—	+	+			—			—		+	±	+
M 379	+					+				+							
S 400-401	±	—	+	?	+			+	+					+	+		
M 422-427	±	—	—						±	—							
M 428	+	—						+						+	+	+	
S 429	+								+							+	+
M 430	+	+							+	+			+		+		
S 511-513	+	—											—		+	+	
S 548																+	
S 550	±		+													—	
M 551					+												
M 580-581	+	—			—												
M 582 583	+	±	+												+		
S 586	+		+	+	+			—					+				
S 591	+	—	+		±	+		+	+	—			±	+	+		
M 598	+	—															
M 599	+		—						+								

The degree of admixture of forms of the type Š varies: normally the figures are very low. An exception is M 422-427 where one would almost prefer a grouping with II.

A classification according to ductus is, unfortunately, not possible. As long as the originals cannot be consulted and one has to rely on Sieg-Sieg-

ling's remarks about the script, there is very little hope for interpreting the situation in a satisfactory way: A number of manuscripts have been labeled "badly written," "careless writing," "late script," or "not allowing a safe distance between *n* and *t*," while others are said to be in "normal" script. But these terms are too vague or, as far as

aesthetic evaluations are involved, too inadequate for our purposes to permit us to draw any far-reaching conclusions. The accumulation of remarks on lack of distinction between *n* and *t* in case of S, M etc. texts seems to point to some special ductus employed in the East; it is, however, to be mentioned that Sieg-Siegling note the same thing with regard to a Š manuscript, the so-called Aranemi fragments, B 71-...106.

As pointed out above (§ 9), no difference can be observed between S, M etc. and Š texts with regard to the frequency of *virāma* vs. ligatures.

11. Before we can evaluate the data thus received, we have to consider one last question:

Do we find non-Š forms in otherwise strictly Š texts?

We do indeed. I have been able to collect the following material:

Mss. Š

‘B’: *yikne*, *amācinta*, *mokociš* (= 1); *klyaussi*, *rittāssi*, *wikāssi*, *tsārūssi š*, *pāssi*, *wassi*, *wiśsi sa* (= 12); *alyenkāms* (16).

‘C’: *kaum* (10); *wassi*, *wikāssi* (12).

77-...106: *wassi* (12); *ok pokai* (15); *koš cec-calor sa* (17).⁵

274-275: *arañcim* (1).

506-509: *cimpamñecci* (1).

521-523: cf. § 9.

558-562: *pañikte* (1).

585: *///ntamš, ste* (16).

These cases are found alongside normal Š forms. If we dismiss the possibility that some of these forms may be mistakes, we come to the following conclusions:

Some texts of the Š type show characteristics otherwise found only in S, M, etc. texts. Quite

⁵ While this text, found at Šorčūq, is a Š text linguistically, it still shows some strange deviations from the normal Š pattern: We find, e.g., not infrequently an *a* where Š forms regularly have an *ā* (cf. *palskontse* B 102.5). It seems that the condition for this deviation is that the form in question has to be part of a system in which regular *a* occurs (as in nom. obl. sg. *palsko*); hence, these deviations would appear to be analogical. Similar observations can be made for *a* : *ā*, cf. B 73b6 *kātsāšše* (beside *kātsāšše* in another manuscript, B 75b3) in analogy to obl. sg. *kātsa*. Whether these features are more than scribal habits, is an open question since only this one manuscript seems to show them.

contrary to the situation in these texts, however, the forms appear only in a small percentage of all possible occurrences. There seems to be a drift toward some of the developments found in Eastern texts, but in no way has the same stage of development been reached. We find *i* for */ā/* after palatal consonant, as in S, M, etc., but only occasionally; we notice simplification of consonant sequences as in *alyenkāms* or *ok pokai*, but only in exceptional cases. (Only the simplification of *-stsi* > *-ssi* in the ending of the ‘causative’ infinitive seems to be the rule.) Certain especially significant forms of S, M, etc. do not occur in Š: I have found no evidence for the characteristics 20, 21, 22, 24, 25. As for 10 (*omN*), the most peculiar development in Eastern texts, only *kaum* in B 5b3 (Š ‘C’) can be cited. Any interpretation of this isolated form will have to take into consideration that *kaum* is used here in close combination with *pārkaw-o*, so that to me the assumption of an assimilation (prior to the separation by a word like *šai*, as conjectured by Sieg-Siegling) seems most likely.

As for S, M etc. forms in MQ texts, the following is to be said: In B 19b6 (MQ III a) we find an entirely isolated *komt* ‘on the day’ that can be explained only as an Eastern form, *komt* < **kaun-t*. We know nothing about the history of this word, but it is perhaps significant that the only other occurrences I know of are in B 459 (*co komtak, cau kaumtak* ‘on the very same day’), an MQ text of the group IX.

This group IX is, as we have seen, in no way patterning with any other MQ group, but it goes perfectly well with the texts of group S, M etc. III. We seem to have no choice but to consider the texts of MQ IX as being of non-Western origin, and there is indeed some evidence to this point beyond linguistic data. A precious little fragment, B 486, is to be read as follows:

///<pi>š kšun tsa kemārcune <<oroccepi> lānte>///

‘in the year of realm (5?, 15?, etc.) of (the (great?) king) Kšemārjuna...’ (*š* instead of *ś* (in *piś*), and *e* instead of *i* (in *kemārcune*) are attested in the Eastern texts B 296 and 297, from Xočo and Toyoq, respectively.) Lévi (*Fragments* p. 23) has given two more instances (in a letter kept at Leningrad) where the name of this king occurs, interestingly enough again in a text where *e* and *i* are confused and the initial cluster *kš* appears simplified as *k-*. The name of this king

seems to be that of a member of the Arjuna dynasty which Lüders (*SPAW* 1930, pp. 28-31 = *Philologica Indica* 618-622) has shown to be the rulers of the kingdom of Agni (Qārašahr). Whether the title of Kṣemārjuna was 'great king,' as suggested by Lüders' Sanskrit document, or rather 'king' as in Lévi's letter, cannot be decided at this moment.

One difficulty remains: The forms of the MQ IX texts point to a connection with texts of the East, and not of the Central region where Qārašahr is located. Whether the dating by reference to a king of Agni reflects the political status of the East at a certain time, or whether the authors of our documents owed a more personal allegiance to that king, is impossible to say at this time. In any case, the question remains also how these texts came to Ming-öy Qizil. One assumption would be that just the documents were transferred, another, that one would have to think of a monastery transplanted to the West. No decision seems possible; it may, however, be mentioned that the latter assumption would perhaps permit us to explain the otherwise entirely isolated MQ III a form *komt* as a loanword due to direct contact with Eastern speakers.

12. It is quite obvious that in making such suggestions we are already implying certain interpretations of the textual diversities discussed.

In view of the solid number of grave deviations from the type found in Š, and of the lesser deviations used consistently, we are led to the conclusion that the groups of texts discussed here belong to different dialects of B. At this point we probably cannot go beyond isolating three dialectal units:

- the Central dialect (Š),
- the Western dialect (MQ),
- the Eastern dialect (S, M, D, T).

The Leitformen for the Western dialect are 3 (*ä, a*), 5 (*a, ā*) and for pure MQ texts 7 (*oⁱ*), 8 (*e^u*), 9 (*o^u*). For the Eastern dialect we have 10 (*omN*), 1 (*i/a*), 17 (*ś*), 24 (*w*), 25 (*św*).

We have supported this classification only on the phonological level (apart from some special evidence for MQ origin of a text). Even though this aspect of the comparison of the dialects will require further study, some statements may be added now in regard to dialectal differentiations on the morphological and lexicographical levels.

W. Thomas⁶ has tried in vain to explain the difference between the collective ending of the B -l-participle in *-llona* and that in *-lyana*: his attempt to distinguish between adjectival and substantivized forms does not agree with the materials. However, if we look at the distribution of *-lyana* vs. *-llona*, we discover that forms in *-lyana* occur only in S, M etc. III texts; *-llona*, on the other hand, is found in MQ, Š, and S, M etc. I texts, but never in S, M etc. III ones. We may, therefore, list *-lyana* as one of the characteristics of the Eastern dialect; it should, perhaps, be emphasized here that the occurrence of a morphological criterion definitely eliminates the last chance for considering Eastern forms as nothing but graphic peculiarities.

(The linguistic reality of the dialectal characteristics is further underlined by the fact that they do also occur outside the tradition we are dealing with here: The deviations 10 (*omN*), 1 (*i/a*), 11 (*o...o*), 12 (*si*), 13 (*s*), 14 (*m*), 16 (*ms*), 17 (*ś*), 22 (*C₂*), are found also in Manichaean texts from Xočo and Murtuq (to be published by the Deutsche Akademie), and a Maral-baši-Saka document found at Murtuq⁷ contains B names of tunes with the characteristic deviation 10 (*aumN*).)

While *-lyana* and *-llona* clearly are in complementary distribution and the statement made can be considered reliable, in another case we can make just a suggestion. One of the nomina agentis is formed in *-uki*; it occurs only, as far as I have been able to determine, in MQ and S, M etc. texts (one of them group II) and in one Hoernle fragment of Western origin. Forms in Š texts or in MQ I and S, M etc. I texts are conspicuously absent; since Krause's (WTG I. 45) assumption of an iterative or habitual function of this suffix seems unacceptable (cf., e. g. the passages with *aksaššuki* and *šparkäššuki*), one may suggest that the occurrences found actually represent an isogloss of MQ and S, M etc. vs. Š.

13. Having established the existence of at least three dialects in B, we have to deal now with the remainder of B texts not discussed so far. In view

⁶ *Die tocharischen Verbaladjektive auf -l* (Berlin, 1952), pp. 39 and 51.

⁷ Sten Konow, *Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt*, *SPAW* 1935, pp. 772-823. The B forms are: Ms. VIII. b3 [n]iškramān ne, a4 orocce naumntai[y?] ne (so to be read, or naumttaiy ne?).

of the fact that only a fraction of the Paris and London texts is available in print, it seems better to refrain from an evaluation of these documents for the time being. As far as I have been able to see, the evidence found in these texts is in support of the analysis presented in this paper.

There is, however, a small number of localized Berlin texts that should be discussed here in the interest of completeness. We have some fragments from Qumtura (Qu), from Kučā (Ku), and from Ming-öy near Kučā (unfortunately labeled M like texts from Murtuq), that is, all from the West. The texts have the following characteristics:

M (K)	231-233: = Š — 1 (<i>i/a</i>) [beside <i>ä/a</i>], 16 (<i>ms</i>) [beside <i>-mts</i>], 17 (<i>š</i>), 22 (<i>C₁C₁</i>); virāma: 27, ligatures: 7.
	516-517: = Š — 12 (<i>si</i>) [in <i>nessi</i> , beside <i>-tsi</i>]; virāma: 6, ligatures: 6.
Ku	597: = Š; virāma: 1, ligatures: 15.
	601: = Š; virāma: 7, ligature: 1.
	602: = Š — 1 (<i>i/a</i>), 22 (<i>C₁C₁</i>); virāma: 4, ligature: 1.
Qu	352-354: = Š; virāma: 15, ligatures: 3.
	359-360: = Š — 1 (<i>i/a</i>), 16 (<i>ms</i>), 17 (<i>š</i>); virāma: 15, ligature: 1.
	368: = Š; virāma: 8, ligatures: 2.
	373: = Š — 1 (<i>i/a</i>), 22 (<i>C₁C₁</i>); virāma: 3, ligature: 0.
	374: = Š — 12 (<i>si</i>) [in <i>rittässi</i> , beside <i>lkätsi</i> , <i>aitsi</i>], 22 (<i>C₁C₁</i>); virāma: 7, ligature: 0.
	398-399: = Š — 1 (<i>i/a</i>) [beside <i>yärponta</i>]; virāma: 5, ligatures: 3.
	491: = Š; virāma: 6, ligature: 0.

There seems to be some consistency in correspondence to, and deviation from, the Š type in these texts, too. But the groups apparently resulting are too small to guarantee sufficient reliability of conclusions drawn.

14. I shall, at this time, not discuss the rather obvious implications of the establishment of at least three clearly distinct dialects within B upon our understanding of the function of this language in the Kučā-Qārašahr-Turfan region at the time when our texts were written, nor shall I dwell upon the question of the rôle of A in the Central and Eastern areas.

Rather, and in conclusion, shall I devote a few words to the respective functions of the three B dialects. The Eastern and Western dialects are both essentially confined to their areas; no evidence of extralocal use is extant. The Central dialect, on the other hand, aside from being the only form of B attested near Qārašahr, is represented all over the entire 'Tocharian' area. We have seen that Š texts were copied and imitated by local scribes. It seems evident that the Š dialect must have had a particularly high prestige, so that one might almost be tempted to call it something like 'Standard Tocharian B.' This prestige seems to be in no connection with political influence of Agni; rather does it appear as though a strong cultural and religious center would have exerted its influence. In *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* XXV, p. 16-18 has Krause collected references in B texts to a monastery Yurpa (so to be read), located probably near Šorčuq; in *Handbuch der Orientalistik* IV. 3. 7 he states again, in a context which is otherwise no longer fully acceptable, 'insbesondere scheint sich in Šorčuq . . . ein Zentrum des Schreibwesens befunden zu haben.'

Could it be that what has been labeled in this paper as Š dialect, Š texts, Š ductus, all point back to this monastery somewhere in the kingdom of Agni? And that this monastery indeed was the religious center of the whole B area, exerting a strong influence from Ming-öy Qizil in the West to the Turfan oasis in the East?

As things stand now, these will be questions hard to settle. The publication of the remaining texts and, perhaps, some day, new finds may give us the answers.