



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

A comparison of the Tocharian A and B metrical traditions

Peyrot, M.; Hackstein, O.; Gunkel, D.

Citation

Peyrot, M. (2018). A comparison of the Tocharian A and B metrical traditions. In O. Hackstein & D. Gunkel (Eds.), *Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics* (pp. 319-345). Leiden: Brill.
doi:10.1163/9789004357778_014

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3465776>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

A Comparison of the Tocharian A and B Metrical Traditions

Michaël Peyrot

1 Tocharian A and B

As is well known, the Indo-European languages Tocharian A and B, attested through manuscripts from North-West China dating from the 2nd half of the first millennium of the Common Era, are closely related languages, and for many purposes they are treated as one. That is to say, for many types of problems it seems not to be relevant to distinguish between the two languages, and it is justified to ask questions like:

- what is the basic word order of Tocharian?
- what is the function of the genitive in Tocharian?
- which classes of loanwords can be distinguished in Tocharian?
- what is the sectarian of affiliation of Tocharian Buddhist literature?
- and also: how does Tocharian metre work?

However, for other types of questions such an approach obviously cannot be used. For instance, word order deviations in Tocharian A and B metre may be similar, but metrically determined variation in the length of words as measured according to the number of syllables is certainly language-specific: the rules for syncope and stretching, and the possibilities that these phenomena present to shorten or lengthen words are simply different in the two languages.

The problem of whether the two languages can be taken together to investigate a certain phenomenon, or have to be kept separate, is complicated by the fact that they have converged at a relatively late stage. This convergence is in my view almost completely the result of influence of Tocharian B on Tocharian A (Peyrot 2010). Although it is not generally agreed that influence of Tocharian B on A is the only explanation for convergences, it is generally accepted that this is at least the dominant direction. Especially in view of the fact

* I am grateful to Dieter Maue (Cölbe) for comments on an earlier draft. Likewise I thank the editors for useful suggestions and corrections.

that so many points can be explained in this way, the assumption of influence from Tocharian B on A in cases of convergence should always be the first option to consider.

The historical background of this situation is relatively simple: Tocharian B was at home in Kuča in the west of the northern Tarim Basin in North-West China (present-day Xīnjiāng region), and it spread to the east later, to Šorčuq/Qarašähär and Turfan. Tocharian A was only written down when Tocharian B came to Šorčuq/Qarašähär: the Tocharian B writing tradition and spelling were adopted to write Tocharian A as well. Influence of Tocharian B on A is found in the following domains: loanwords from Tocharian B to Tocharian A; palaeography and spelling conventions; and possibly in syntax. Due to the fact that Tocharian B shows an internal chronological development, both palaeographically and linguistically, a relative dating of the earliest contacts with Tocharian A is possible. According to the linguistic evidence from the loanwords from Tocharian B into Tocharian A, the contacts took place only from a later phase of the classical stage of Tocharian B onwards, and the palaeographic evidence confirms this.

Of course Tocharian A did not copy everything from Tocharian B. Striking for instance is the lack of parallel texts in Tocharian A and B. This may be due in part to chance, since only a fraction of the literature has survived. However, there were certainly differences in the literatures; witness for instance the immense popularity of the *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka* in Tocharian A, attested in 6 different manuscripts, but so far without a trace in Tocharian B.

It is against this background that we may ask the question whether there is any proof in the metrical tradition of both languages to show either that Tocharian A literature was styled entirely on Tocharian B models, or that traces may be found suggesting a Tocharian A tradition independent of Tocharian B. Metrics is an especially interesting domain, because it is known that the Tocharian metrical tradition is so different from the Sanskrit tradition that it is possible to exclude – at least to a certain extent – Sanskrit as a complicating third factor.

2 Tocharian Metrics

The basic facts of Tocharian metrics are well known and need not be recounted in detail. The most important points are noted by Sieg and Siegling (1921: x–xi; see further Pinault 2008: 397–409; Adams 2003; 2013b; Widmer 2006; see also Malzahn, this volume):

- The main principle is syllable counting: syllable weight or length plays no role and accent (stress) patterns seem to be found, but are never strict and

probably a secondary effect of words with limited lexical stress patterns that have to be fit into subcola (Malzahn 2012).

- Verse passages are subdivided into strophes, numbered at the end; strophes are subdivided into lines, called *pādas*.
- A strophe mostly consists of 4 *pādas* of equal length (rarely 5 *pādas*, in which case the 5th *pāda* is longer). *Pādas* of unequal length are also found relatively frequently in different schemes: all four *pādas* may have different lengths, or two or three *pādas* have the same length.
- A *pāda* consists of cola and subcola. The largest syllable unit is 6, the smallest 3 and they combine into many different patterns, for instance (for an overview of metrical schemes, see the appendix and Stumpf 1971: 71–72):
 - 4:3:4:3 (the whole strophe is 4×14, noted 4×7:7 in the appendix)
 - 5:4:3 (the whole strophe is 4×12, noted 4×5:7 in the appendix)
- The most frequent strophe types are:¹
 - 4×12 (4:4:4 or 5:4:3 = 5:7)
 - 4×14 (4:3:4:3 = 7:7)
 - 4×18 (4:3:4:3:4 = 7:7:4)
- Next frequent are for example:
 - 4×15 (4:3:3:5 = 7:8)²
 - 4×17 (6:6:5 or 5:4:3:5 = 5:7:5)
 - 4×25 (5:5:4:4:4:3 = 5:5:8:7)
 - 20/22/10/15 (5:5:5:5 / 4:4:4:3:4:3 / 5:5 / 4:4:4:3)
- Small mistakes in the number of syllables, mostly due to the confusion of shorter and longer variants of particular words, e.g. Tocharian B *šp* or *špä* ‘and’, are common.
- Punctuation indicates the end of a *pāda*, but it is especially in older Tocharian B very often missing (see also further below).

3 Tune Names

Interesting about Tocharian metre is the fact that the metres have names that are usually indicated at the beginning of a verse. These names almost always have the same metrical scheme, but one metrical scheme may have many different names. For instance, there are in Tocharian B at least 25 different names

1 For a detailed analysis of the subdivision of these three metrical schemes, see Bross, Gunkel and Ryan (2014).

2 For a detailed analysis of the subdivision of this metrical scheme, see Bross, Gunkel and Ryan (2014, 2015).

for the metrical scheme $4 \times 7^1 7$, although the cola subdivision is identical. This has led to the conclusion that the names probably indicate tunes (Winter 1955: 33a). For the terminology this is all a little confusing. I will call a pattern like $4 \times 7^1 7$ a “metrical scheme” (Sieg calls this “Rhythmus”), and I will use “tune” for its different names (Sieg calls this “Metrum”).

An interesting insight into the practice of recitation or performance are the indications of the metre under some of the tune names in the manuscript A212–216 by means of the number of syllables of the first pāda: “18” under A212a7 *mandodharinaṃ* with $4 \times 7^1 7^1 4$; “14” under A213b4 *daśabalaṃ* with $4 \times 7^1 7$; “12” under A214b3 *maitraṃ* with $4 \times 5^1 7$; “20” under A215a7 *samakkorrenaṃ* with 20/22/10/15. There is further evidence of the use of the first syllables of a well-known strophe to indicate the tune as an aide-mémoire: Ogihara has found such an indication before the tune name in Kz-213-ZS-Z-04, where *ike śpa*, the first syllables of the strophe that begins with *ike śpalmen*, are given also before the tune name *bahudantāk-kenene* (2013: 377). He has also discovered another instance in B298 (= Kz-203-ZS-L-01), where the tune name *kantsakarṣanne* is preceded by *arai sruka*, the first syllables of a strophe that begins with *arai sru-kalyñe* (Xinjiang Kucha Academy 2013: 350). Finally, a unique remark on the metre is found in TH1860b3: (*nä*)no ñäke sārgga puṣṣāmpa ken(e)n(e) śāṃṣälle ‘now again [this] *sarga* is to be counted in the *puṣṣāmpa* tune’ (Ogihara 2015: 115). Here in particular the use of the verb ‘count’ for the metre is noticeable.

For at least two-thirds the tune names are Sanskrit, but they can only rarely be traced back to attested Sanskrit metre names.³ It is striking that the spelling of the tune names is very regular, with hardly any variation. One of the rare cases is the Tocharian A name *mandodharinaṃ* with variants A319a3 *maṃndhottarinaṃ* and TH1670b4 (*ma*)ndottarinaṃ. This regular spelling is not typical for Sanskrit terms in general, which often occur in a variety of different spellings due to adaptation to the native sound systems. A minor type of variation is found with geminates vs. non-geminates in Tocharian A, cf. *viṣikonam* vs. *viṣikkonam*, *śinikur(am)* vs. *śiñikkuram*, *śuriṣinam* vs. *śuriṣinnam*, *samakkorenam* vs. *samakkorrenam*.

The distribution of the tune names over the texts is not random, and it is very likely that some of these were specific for certain genres, or for particular emotions in a story. Examples are the Tocharian A tune *maitraṃ*, which is especially frequent in the Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka, doubtless because of the

3 However, Melanie Malzahn has made an important breakthrough in the etymological explanation of the tune names. Her results were presented in a lecture entitled “Written and oral culture in Tocharian – The case of poetry” (paper presented at “Transmission of the Buddhist Texts in Central Asia: Tocharian Buddhism and its Role,” Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich, 4 April 2014).

link between *Maitreya* and *maitra* ‘benevolent, etc.’ (or *maitrī* ‘friendship’; see Pinault 2008: 401); and the Tocharian B tunes *pañcamne*, which is frequent in the *Supriya-Nāṭaka*;⁴ *praśantahārne*, frequent in AS12; and *vanapraveśne*, frequent in the *Mahāprabhāsa* fragments.

The corpus of Tocharian tune names is considerable. For Tocharian B I have listed so far 90 tune names and for Tocharian A 97; of these, 39 are shared (see the appendix). Many of these shared names are well known, and here I will only give some examples of matches between A and B that have only become possible recently through the edition of new texts, or matches that result from new restorations in previously edited texts:

TA	TB
<i>āryahāraṃ</i>	<i>aryahārne</i>
<i>taruṇadivākaraṃ</i>	<i>taruṇadivākarne</i>
<i>brahmaṇavākaṃ</i>	<i>brahmaṇavākne</i>
<i>mandodharinaṃ</i>	<i>mando ///</i>
<i>yaśodharavilāpaṃ</i>	<i>yaśodharavilāpne</i>
<i>śmāśānaśrāṅkāraṃ</i>	<i>śmāśānaśrāṅkārne</i>
<i>sruñcaññenaṃ</i>	<i>sruñcaññene</i>
<i>haṃsavāṅkaṃ</i>	<i>haṃsavāṅne</i>

Especially for the Sanskrit sounding names, this list could certainly be further expanded with names still to be found in the texts, and we may assume that the equivalents of many of the remaining Sanskrit names attested in only one language are lacking by chance in the other.

In both languages, also native names are attested, and many striking examples are found in Tocharian A, e.g. *yāṅkreyaṃ*, *watañinaṃ*, *tsuntaṃ*. Some of these can be etymologised in part: *watañi-lāntaṃ* contains the word for ‘king’, *wäl*, obl. *lānt*; *śackāckeyaṃ* seems to contain the word for ‘joy’, *kācke*; and *kāpñe-kanam* means ‘in the love tune’. Without doubt the most striking are two Tocharian A names compounded with *ārśi*, the word meaning ‘Tocharian A’: *ārśi-lāñcinaṃ* and *ārśi-niškramāntaṃ*. The first of these is ambiguous and could mean either ‘[tune] of *Ārśi* kings’ or ‘*Ārśi* [tune] of kings’. But the second case is very clear: the tune *niškramāntaṃ* is well known, and this is apparently the *Ārśi* variant of it.

Also in Tocharian B names with a native first part are found: *suwāññe-wātatane* ‘*wātatane* of the pig’, *śawaññe-kwamane* ‘*kwamane* of eating (?)’,

4 For this reason (among others), it is possible that also B367, in which the same tune name occurs, belongs to this text.

nauṣaṇṇe-nāṭakäṣṣene ‘former *nāṭakäṣṣene*, former *nāṭaka* [tune]’, *nauṣaṇṇe-taruṇadivākarne* ‘former *taruṇadivākarne*’. Here the last two are the most interesting, because *nauṣaṇṇe* ‘former’ suggests that e.g. the *taruṇadivākarne* had changed and *nauṣaṇṇe* clarified that the older variant was meant. However, none of these additions qualifies the tunes as especially “Tocharian B” or “Kuchean”.

Finally, some Tocharian A names are borrowed from Tocharian B names. That is to say, not borrowings from Sanskrit names in Tocharian B, but from Tocharian B native names.

- *meṇameñṇaṃ*: clearly borrowed from TB *meṇameñe*. The Tocharian B name perhaps means ‘moon-moon’ (?).
- *sruñcañṇenaṃ*: clearly borrowed from TB *sruñcañṇene*, but the etymology of the Tocharian B name remains obscure to me.

As an intermediate conclusion on the evidence from the tune names, we may say that Tocharian A has not slavishly copied these names from Tocharian B, but also adapted them and created new ones. This is so far in line with the idea that Tocharian B was the model for the Tocharian A metrical system. There is no indication of reverse influence.

4 Establishing Tocharian Metrical Schemes

I now turn to metrics proper, that is, to metrical schemes. Because metrics is an extremely important device in Tocharian philology, I would like to give an elaborated example of how metrical reconstruction works in practice. Since more than 95% of the preserved fragments are *fragments*, and not complete leaves, we hardly ever have continuous text preserved. Fortunately, many texts are metrical or contain frequent metrical interludes, which often allow to get a much better picture of what the whole leaf must have looked like and which portion of the text is missing.

The example I give here is that of *wättänt-kenene* ‘in the *wättänt* tune’, which is attested in the small fragment B514. Surprisingly, Sieg and Siegling, the editors, note that it can have consisted of at most “2 × 14 Silben (Rhythmus 7/7)” (1953: 318). This is remarkable, because strophes usually have 4 or 5 pādas, not 2. It is all the more striking if it is considered that the only sample of this tune is almost completely lost, so that one might be inclined to ask, “where on earth do they get that?”

B₅₁₄ (only two out of 9 fragmentary lines of the recto cited here)

a4 /// – sau · wättänt-kenene · ersnasa yo – ///

a5 /// gati weṣṣām · rämer rājagrine śämt ///

In this genre, the *nāṭaka*, a strophe almost always contains direct speech of one person, and the next unit of direct speech, if metrical, would be in another tune. Line a₅ starts with *gati weṣṣām*, which can be restored to (*sumā*)*gati weṣṣām* ‘Sumāgati says’, a name that occurs elsewhere in the manuscript (B_{515a4}, b₈). Thus, the total length of *wättänt-kenene* is:

- 5 syllables in a₄: *ersnasa yo* –;
- an unknown number of syllables missing at the end of line a₄;
- an unknown number of syllables missing at the beginning of line a₅;
- minus *at least* the two restored syllables (*sumā*).

But what is the width of the leaf and can we specify the “unknown number of syllables missing”? So far only one other fragment of the same manuscript has been identified: B₅₁₅. Unfortunately, this fragment is damaged in the same way as B₅₁₄, so that the width of the manuscript leaves is unknown. However, in B₅₁₅ also a tune name occurs, *niṣkramaṃ-kenene*, and the metrical scheme of this tune is well known: 4×17 (either 6'6'5 or 5'7'5).

B₅₁₅ (only three out of 7 fragmentary lines of the verso preserved cited here)

b4 /// śc sentsamai · pālka · niṣkramaṃ-kenene · mā · e ///

b5 /// ṣṣ· caññe ainake wāntre saṃsārṣṣe totte ///

b6 /// pellesa no 1 ptānwāññe śāñ śamñeṣṣe ///

Since the beginning of this *niṣkramānt* strophe is preserved as well as the end, marked with “1”, and the metrical scheme is known, the width of the leaf can be estimated. The total length of the strophe is $4 \times 17 = 68$ syllables. Line b₄ preserves 2 syllables, b₅ preserves 13, and b₆ preserves 4 syllables: in total, 19 syllables are preserved. Thus, the total number of missing syllables is 49, i.e. approximately 25 for each of the lacunae. The end of pāda b is after 34 syllables, that is, approximately at the word *wāntre* in b₅: apparently the end of pāda b is not marked by punctuation. The last unit of pāda b should be 5 syllables and the first of pāda c 6 (or perhaps 5) syllables. Probably the pāda end is after *ainake wāntre* and before *saṃsārṣṣe totte*, since this fits well with syntax and meaning: *ainake wāntre* ‘a mean thing’ and *saṃsārṣṣe totte* ‘the other side of

saṃsāra (= in the beyond)'. If this is correct, the lacuna of the end of b₄ and the beginning of b₅ together is $34 - 10 = 24$ syllables; the lacuna of the end of b₅ and the beginning of b₆ together is $34 - 9 = 25$ syllables. Less likely, but theoretically also possible is the suggestion of the editors to place the pāda end after *ainake wāntre saṃsārṣṣe* and before *totte*, in which case the lacuna of b₄ + b₅ is 21 syllables and that of b₅ + b₆ is 28 syllables.

Returning to *wättānt-kenene*, we observe that the length of the lines preserved is similar, about 13 akṣaras, so the length of the lacunae may be assumed to be approximately the same too. This gets us finally to the metrical scheme 2×14 of Sieg and Siegling: 5 syllables are preserved; the lacuna is approximately 25 syllables; minus 2 syllables for (*sumā*)*gati*. Therefore the length of *wättānt-kenene* is approximately 28 syllables. If this scheme consisted of 4 pādas, the length of each pāda was 7 syllables, which seems too short: the shortest pādas are 9 syllables long. Although the vast majority of the metrical schemes has 4 or 5 pādas, schemes with 2 pādas are actually attested (as also pointed out by Bross, Gunkel and Ryan 2015), see the appendix. Therefore, it seems best to accept Sieg and Siegling's analysis, even on the basis of such an extremely fragmentary attestation.

5 Comparing Tocharian A and Tocharian B Metrical Schemes

When comparing Tocharian A and Tocharian B metrics, it is striking that Tocharian B has a much wider variety of metrical schemes, which goes far beyond what is attested for Tocharian A. It has more different schemes with equal pādas, like 2×14 , 4×9 , 4×10 , 4×11 and 4×13 , none of which are attested for Tocharian A. It also has many more schemes with unequal pādas, like $10/11/10/11$; $11/14/11/11$; $12/16/12/16$; $14/11/11/11$ and $19/19/10/19$, which are so far not found in Tocharian A either. The problem is that it is very difficult to argue *e silentio* that these metrical schemes were never used in Tocharian A.

It is possible, for instance, that some of these variable metrical schemes were genre-specific, and this seems indeed to be the case, as many are found in the Udānālankāra and in *kāvya* manuscripts. A reason for this distribution may be that a strophe with one pāda with a different number of syllables gave the poet more freedom of composition, which was probably especially welcome in long versed texts with sometimes over a hundred strophes in one and the same metre. Indeed, such long metrical texts, to which also the Udānālankāra and many of the *kāvya* manuscripts belong, frequently have variable metrical schemes.

Another possibility is that the metrical analysis of some of the tunes in Tocharian A is simply not correct because Sieg did not yet know the wide

variety in Tocharian B when he was working on Tocharian A. However, it is striking that pādas of 9, 11 and 19 syllables are not attested at all in any of the Tocharian A schemes known so far, and it is at least a possibility to consider that the metrical schemes of Tocharian A are more uniform than those of Tocharian B.

This problem seems unsolvable; since Tocharian B is much better attested, the proportion of preserved textual material being about 4 for Tocharian B to 1 for Tocharian A, one could always argue that definite conclusions cannot be drawn. However, for some of the Tocharian B complicated metrical schemes we have tune names that are matched in Tocharian A. Should a Tocharian B tune with a complicated scheme correspond to one in Tocharian A with a simpler scheme, then we would have a better basis to argue that the Tocharian A system is simpler.

One of the tunes that qualifies is Tocharian A *kantsakarṣnaṃ*, Tocharian B *kantsakarṣanne*. The Tocharian A tune is recorded as 4×12 (= 5'17; e.g. Carling 2009: 99d), while the Tocharian B variant has 12/12/13/13. Indeed, the latter scheme is not found for Tocharian A. Although the Tocharian A tune is attested only three times, and never complete, the fourth pāda is known to be definitely 12 syllables long, which would definitely set it apart from the Tocharian B scheme with a fourth pāda of 13 syllables. However, Ogihara suggested a new reading of the one relevant instance of the Tocharian B tune in B298, emending the wrong *nreyentane* 'in the hells' in pāda 1d to the regular *nreyntane*, so that the scheme becomes 12/12/13/12 (2012: 114). In addition, he found a second attestation in THT1165+1548a5, which shows a scheme 12/12/10/12 (l.c.). Although the precise scheme of the Tocharian B *kantsakarṣanne* remains to be established, it seems clear now that the scheme was 12/12/x/12 with a deviating pāda c. Unfortunately, this requires a fresh look at the analysis of the Tocharian A scheme, since the fourth pāda, d, is no longer any proof that the scheme was 4×12 .

As so often in Tocharian studies, only one of the three attestations of this tune in Tocharian A has the third pāda preserved, and not even completely.

YQ3.7 (only two of 8 lines of the recto cited)

a6 /// (ptā)ñkāt kāsṣinac trānkāṣ || kaṃtsakarṣnaṃ || caṣ ṇwaṃ wsā-yokām kanak mā-

a7 -(ccāk /// purpā)r-ñy āṣānik pkanā-ñy ākāl pusār-ñi : kārūṃ pyāmtsār ṇ_ukā : śl_o oko

I will not repeat the calculations that are necessary to be sure of the position of the pādas in the fragment (see Ji 1998: 172, 174), but the number of syllables missing at the beginning of a7 is approximately 18, and with this number everything fits perfectly:

<i>caṣ ṇwaṃ wsä-yokäm kanak mä</i> _[a7] + 4 syllables	pāda a
12 syllables	pāda b
2 syllables + (<i>purpā</i>) <i>r-ñy āṣānik pkanā-ñy ākāl pusār-ñi</i> :	pāda c
<i>kāruṃ pyāmtsār ṇ_ukā</i> : śl _o oko + 5 syllables	pāda d

For pāda c, both 10 syllables and 13 syllables can be excluded: with 10 syllables, we should have a punctuation mark before *āṣānik*, which is not there. What is more, (*purpā*)*r-ñy* is written together with *āṣānik*, which is never done across pāda ends: /// rñyā ṣā ni ḳ. Also 13 syllables can be excluded, because of the metre: 13 would be 5¹8, probably 5¹4¹4, and such a division is not possible. Thus, Ji's analysis of the passage still holds, in spite of Ogihara's discoveries in Tocharian B, and we can indeed conclude that the same tune has a different metrical scheme in Tocharian A.

Another case in point is Tocharian A *paṇḍurāṅkaṃ*, corresponding to Tocharian B *paṇḍurāṅkāññene*. This tune is also interesting because it has the metrical scheme 4×9 in Tocharian B, which is not attested in Tocharian A. However, the scheme of *paṇḍurāṅkaṃ* is unknown: there are two attestations (A400b4; A274a6 *paṇḍurā(ṅkaṃ)*), but either of these allows any metrical analysis. The only evidence that can be adduced is that of a related tune in Tocharian A: *ñikci-paṇḍurāṅkaṃ* 'divine *paṇḍurāṅkaṃ*', which has the scheme 4×5¹7. However, it is possible that the scheme of this related tune was not identical to that of the simple *paṇḍurāṅkaṃ*.

A third and more straightforward example is Tocharian B *cāpicene*, which has the metrical scheme 12/15/12/15, while the corresponding Tocharian A *capicenaṃ* has 4×5¹7. In this case, however, the metrical scheme of the Tocharian B tune does occur in Tocharian A, even though we do not know any tune name for it (see the appendix). Be that as it may, the Tocharian A metrical scheme of this particular tune is definitely simpler than its Tocharian B pendant.

A fourth possible example is formed by Tocharian A *praśantahāraṃ* and Tocharian B *praśantahārne*. Again, the Tocharian B tune has an infrequent scheme, 4×11 (5¹6), while the Tocharian A scheme is largely unclear. Of the two attestations one is relevant:

A84 (only 2 out of 6 fragmentary lines of the verso cited)

b2 /// (ṣpā)t koṃsā mā tāp mā śuk || *praśantahāraṃ* || ///

b3 /// (kā)swon_o ākālyo tārko śwātsi kāruṃ(ik) ///

Even with this very fragmentary piece, 4×11 can be excluded: since b3, with the restorations, is already 12 syllables, while no punctuation marks occur in this

line, this pāda must be longer than 11 syllables. Thus, Sieg's suggestion (1952: 22) that the scheme is 4×12 remains to be confirmed definitely, but at least a scheme 4×11 is disproved.

There are still further tune names that have different metrical schemes, like TB *chandakanivartamne* with 4×7¹7 vs. TA *chandakanivartnam* with 4×4¹4¹4; TB *maitārne* with 4×7¹7 vs. TA *maitram* with 4×5¹7; TB *yal-ylaṃškene* with 4×6¹6¹5 vs. TA *ylaṃ* with 4×7¹7¹4. However, these differences are much more difficult to evaluate, since both the Tocharian B and the Tocharian A schemes are frequent, so that it is difficult to tell which of the two is more original. These differences are probably best compared with the type of variation as found for instance in Tocharian A *pañcmaṃ*, which may have 4×7¹7 (*pañcmaṃ*¹ in the appendix) as well as 4×7¹7¹4 (*pañcmaṃ*² in the appendix).

Although the number of rarer and more complicated Tocharian B metrical schemes corresponding to more frequent and simpler schemes in Tocharian A is limited, they confirm the first impression that the variety of metrical schemes in the two languages makes. The Tocharian A tradition appears to have in part simplified and regularised the wider variety of the Tocharian B tradition. It must be born in mind that especially for the majority of the Tocharian B variable and infrequent metrical schemes no tune names are attested. It is conceivable that some of these in fact correspond to Tocharian A tunes of a frequent type like 4×4¹4¹4 or 4×5¹7.

6 Features of Archaic Tocharian B Metrics

In view of the linguistic and palaeographic developments within Tocharian B (see Peyrot 2008; Malzahn 2007; Peyrot 2014), it would not be surprising if there was also a chronological development in the metrical tradition. In the domain of the metrical schemes, I have found no indications of chronological developments, as there are hardly any tune names with different metrical schemes. A possible case is *niṣkramāntne*, which has 4×5¹7¹5 (*niṣkramāntne*¹ in the appendix) as well as 4×6¹6¹5 (*niṣkramāntne*² in the appendix). It is conceivable that the former is older than the latter, but in order to prove this, more evidence would be needed.

A marked distribution is definitely found with the rare variable metrical schemes, many of which are attested only in archaic texts. For instance, strophes with two pādas are found in the archaic fragments B133, B388 and B514, while only B594 seems to be classical; the scheme 9/11/9/11 is only attested in the archaic fragments B389 and B587; 14/11/11/14 is only attested in the archaic fragments B135 and B138; 14/20/14/20 only in the archaic fragments B256–257;

and so on. However, here the same methodological problem holds as for the comparison of Tocharian B and Tocharian A: these metrical schemes are definitely in part genre-specific (predominantly *kāvya* and “Spruchpoesie”) and thus the distribution may have been caused not by a chronological development in metrics, but possibly by a shift in the popularity of text genres that has resulted in an imbalance of the genres compared to the chronological stages of the language. Finally, many other variable metrical schemes occur in classical or even in late texts.

Nevertheless, verse in archaic Tocharian B texts has some palaeographical features that present a fairly consistent picture, so that we are in this point clearly on safer ground.

- The addition *kenene* ‘in the tune’ to the name of the tune, which was already noticed by Winter (1955: 33a) is found only in archaic texts: B514a4 *wättänt-kenene*; B514b9 /// *cce-kenene*; B515b4 *niṣkramaṇ-kenene*; Kz-213-ZS-Z-04.2 *bahudantäk-kenene* (Ogihara 2013: 377); THT1312a5 *arwa-kenene*; THT1451b. a4 *yäkwe-kene(ne)*.
- Very widespread in the archaic material is the lack of pāda-end punctuation. Of course punctuation may occasionally be lacking or wrong in other texts as well, but in archaic texts it seems to be the standard not to indicate the end of pādas at all.
- Rare, but definitely confined to archaic texts is the lack of double daṇḍas before and after the name of the tune, as in e.g. THT2381c.a3, IT150a3 and B514–515.
- Whether the element *se* in B394b7 || *se yaśo(dharavi)lāp(n)e* || is an incidental addition, a mistake, or an archaic feature is difficult to judge.
- The perlative case instead of the locative seems to be relatively frequent in archaic texts, but is certainly not confined to it: AS7Ba4 *arāḍentsa*; AS12Hb3 *gautamakapilentsā*; AS12Ia3 *arāḍ(e)nts(ā)*; AS15Da2 *devadattentsa*; AS17Ib2 *prasenajintsa*; B77a5 *riññāktesa*; IT73a4 *prasenajimtsa*; IT88b2 *prasenajintsa*; NS193a4 *prasenajintsa*; THT1312a7 *gautamakapilentsa*; THT2381c.a3 *arāḍentsa*. Even if the tune indication with the perlative is a feature of archaic Tocharian B metrics, it is clearly also determined by the name of the tune itself, as the number of different tune names is restricted.

All in all, the archaic features of Tocharian B verse suggest that the notation of the tune name and the metre was not yet completely standardised and did not yet follow the strict rules found in later texts, and especially in Tocharian A.

7 Conclusion

My conclusion is that Tocharian A has elaborated the Tocharian B metrical tradition, but Tocharian B is definitely the source. First, Tocharian A has borrowed native Tocharian B names, but not vice-versa; second, Tocharian A has marked names as specifically Tocharian A; and third, complicated Tocharian B metrical schemes corresponding to simpler schemes in Tocharian A are as the *lectio difficilior* more original.

Appendix

It seemed useful to me to present full lists of the Tocharian tune names and metrical schemes. Even though a lot will have to be revised when further texts are edited or when the metrics of already published texts are studied more closely, I hope that these lists will prove helpful for the further study of Tocharian metrics and the analysis of metrical passages during the edition of Tocharian texts.

In order to compile the lists given below, I have made extensive use of the texts on CEToM. Naturally, I have also used Adams (2013a), Carling (2009) and Poucha (1955). For AS12, which has no pāda punctuation so that the metrical analysis is often difficult, I have drawn from collaborative work on this manuscript with Georges-Jean Pinault.

For both languages, first the tune names are given in the order of the (Tocharian variant of the) Indic alphabet with cross-references to the other language, an indication of the metrical scheme, and attestations (spelling variants and restorations are indicated for each attestation separately). The names are given in the form in which they actually occur in the texts, mostly in the locative case, since it is often not clear what the nominative would be.

Then lists of metrical schemes are given. These are divided into four categories: 2 equal pādas; 4 equal pādas; 4 unequal pādas; 5 pādas. Within these categories, the schemes are sorted according to the number of syllables of the first pāda. Metrical schemes for which no name is so far attested are included, as well as additional text attestations for rare metrical schemes. Especially in Tocharian B, the analysis of many of the rare schemes has to cope with a considerable range of uncertainty due to the mostly very fragmentary state of these texts.

Also a list of Tumšūqese tune names has been added, since these are taken over from Tocharian B. For the Tumšūqese corpus in general, see Maue (2009). For tune names in particular, see Maue (2007; 2015).

Tocharian A Tune Names

- a* /// 4×5!7?: YQ1.4b6
apratitulyenaṃ [TB *apratitulyeṃne*] 4×5!5!8!7: A20a6; A33a6; A145a3 *apratitulnaṃ*;
 A253a8; A403b4; THT1382b.b2 *apratitulye(naṃ)*; YQ1.4a3 *apratitu(hyenaṃ)*
aptsaradarśnaṃ [TB *aptsaradarśaṃne*] 4×7!7: A6b1 (*ap*)*tsaradarśnaṃ*; A149a4;
 YQ3.1b2; A274b8 *aptsaradarśaṃ*; A289a2 *aptsaradarśaṃ*
asitakiritaṃ 4×7!7!4: A58a3 (*a*)*sitakiritaṃ*;⁵ cf. THT1418i.a2 *asi* ///
asitavāṅkaṃ?: A102a3 *asitavāṅkāṃ*; cf. THT1418i.a2 *asi* ///
ānāndarśnaṃ [TB /// *anandārśne*] 20/22/10/15: A95a5 *ānā(nda)rśnaṃ*; A313b4
ānāndārśnaṃ
ārdhal(·)ā – ///?: YQN4b6
āryahāraṃ [TB *aryahārne*] 4×7!7!4: A117a3
ārśi-niṣkramāntaṃ 4×6!6!5: A90a2 *ārśi-niṣkramā(ntaṃ)*; A299a5 *ārśi-niṣkramānta(ṃ)*;
 YQ2.11a8 *ārśi-niṣkramān(t)aṃ*
ārśi-lāñcinaṃ 4×5!5!8!7:⁶ A63a3
uttarenaṃ 4×7!7: A264b8
etwaṃ 4×5!7: A19b1; YQ1.1b3
kaṃtsakarṣnaṃ [TB *kantsakarṣanne*] 4×5!7: A304a8; YQ3.6a6 *kantsakarṣnaṃ*; YQ3.7a6
karuṇapralāpaṃ [TB *karuṇapralāpne*]?: A116a6 *kar(u)ṇa(pralāpaṃ)*; A401b6
karuṇapralā(paṃ)
kāpñe-kanam 4×7!7: A355b2 (text corrupt, metre confirmed by A372a3)
kuma – – – 4×7!7: A2b1
kuryartānaṃ [TB *karyortannene*] 4×5!7: A118b5
kuswaṃ 4×4!4!4: A4b1 *ku(swaṃ)*; A9b3
kutsmātaṃ 4×5!7: A54a5; A254a5; A256b2
keśikaṃ [TB *keśikne*] 4×6!6!5: A144a1
keśik-nandavilāpaṃ 4×7!8?: A158b3 (*ke*)*śik-nandavilāpaṃ*
keśik-sva ///?: THT1322d.a2
kokāliknaṃ (possibly 4×5!5!8!7): A58b6; A80a3
koṃswaṃ 4×4!4!4: A118b2
klumpāryaṃ [TB *klampāryaine*] 4×7!7!4: A278b1 = YQ2.7b7 *klumpä(ryaṃ)*
*gautamakapilaṃ*¹ [TB *gautamakapilne*] 4×7!7: YQ1.2a1; cf. A93b6 (*gautamaka*)*p(i)laṃ*
 and A293a3 *gau(tama)kapilaṃ*
*gautamakapilaṃ*² [TB *gautamakapilne*] 4×7!7!4: A268b3 *gaut(a)m(a)k(a)pi(laṃ)*; cf.
 A93b6 (*gautamaka*)*p(i)laṃ* and A293a3 *gau(tama)kapilaṃ*
capiccenam [TB *capicene*] 4×5!7: YQ3.4a7
cācikkinaṃ 4×4!4!4: A313a7 *cācākkinaṃ*; A106b4 *cācikki(naṃ)*

5 Sieg and Siegling (1921: 33) read (*a*)*sitakirinam*. This reading follows Carling (2009: 20a).

6 Not with Carling (2009: 49a) 4×7!7. See Sieg and Siegling (1921: 36).

citraśokaṃ 4×6!6!5: A256a1; A318b6
*c-w-ttenaṃ*⁷ 4×7!7!4: A64b1
chandakanivartnaṃ [TB *chandakanivartamne*] 4×4!4!4: A20a1–2; *channakanivartnaṃ*
 A258a7
jinakkenaṃ 4×7!7: A148a5 (*j*)(*na*)*kkenaṃ*; A276a5 (*jina*)*kkenaṃ*; YQ1.3b2
ñiki-paṇḍurāṅkaṃ 4×5!7: A12a4 *ñiki-paṇḍurā(ṅkaṃ)*
taruṇadivākaraṃ [TB *taruṇadivākarna*]?: A400a2 *taruṇadivāk(araṃ)*
*tuṣitabhavnaṃ*¹ 4×7!7: A16b3; A68b2
*tuṣitabhavnaṃ*² 4×7!7!4: A257b3
daśabalaṃ 4×7!7:⁸ A25b1; A213b4 (*daśa*)*balam*; A321b5;⁹ A339a7 *daśaba(laṃ)*;
 THT1648b.b3 (*da*)*śabalam*; YQ2.5a8
devadattenam [TB *devadattene*] 20/22/10/15: A29a6 (*devada*)*ttenam*?; A48a4; A65b1;
 A74b2 *devada(ttenam)*; A75a2; A282b4 *devadettenam*; A433a5 *devadatt(e)n(am)*;
 THT1646e.a4 *devada(ttenam)*; YQ1.8a6
nandavilāpaṃ [TB *nandavilāpne*] 4×7!8: A75b4; A91a5; A109b3; A115b1 *nandavilāpa(m)*;
 YQ2.8a6 (*nandavi*)*lāpaṃ*
niṣkramāntaṃ [TB *niṣkramāmtne*] 4×6!6!5: A11a3; A13b1 *niṣkramā(ntaṃ)*; A42a2
 (*niṣkra*)*māntaṃ*; A260b8; A265a3; A273b4; A307b1; A320a6 (*ni*)*ṣkramāntaṃ*;
 THT1151a3; THT1606f.b1 (*ni*)*ṣkramāntaṃ*; THT2383f.b2 *niṣk(r)amāntaṃ*; THT2449b2
 (*ni*)*skr(a)māntaṃ*; YQ2.11b7
pañcagatinam [TB *pañcagatine*] 21/21/18/13:¹⁰ A31b5 *pañcagati(nam)*; A100b1
 (*pa*)*ñcagatinam*; A194b3 *pañcaga(tinam)*; A300a4; THT1134a2; THT2108a2
pañcagati(nam); YQ1.10a6 (*pañca*)*gatinam*; YQ2.3b5
pañcagatiye 21/21/18/13?: A116a2
pañcapātraṃ 4×7!7: A76+83a4; A305b3 (*pa*)*ñcapātraṃ*; THT1139b4 (*pa*)*ñcapāttārnam*
*pañcmaṃ*¹ [TB *pañcamne*] 4×7!7: A261a7 (= YQ2.12b3); A279b7; YQ2.3a7; cf. A298b8,
 A339b4 and THT1331a.a6
*pañcmaṃ*² [TB *pañcamne*] 4×7!7!4: A255b3; cf. A298b8, A339b4 and THT1331a.a6
paṇḍurāṅkaṃ [TB *paṇḍurāṅkāññene*]?: A274a6 *paṇḍurā(ṅkaṃ)*; A400b4
*pariyacintākaṃ*¹ [TB *bharyacintākne*] 4×4!4!4: A147b3–4 (*pa*)*ryacintākaṃ*
*pariyacintākaṃ*² [TB *bharyacintākne*] 4×5!7: A394a4
praśantahāraṃ [TB *praśantahārne*] 4×5!7: A84b2; *praśānta(hāraṃ)* A399b6; YQ1.2a7
 (*praśantahā*)*raṃ*
prahāspa /// (mistake for *prahāsyā*?)?: A195a6
phullenam 4×7!7: A134b3; A186b4; A295b7; A332a4; A342a4 *phull(enam)*

7 Carling, Pinault and Malzahn (CEToM) propose *c(i)w(a)ntenam* (Skt. *jīvanta*).

8 Not with Poucha (1955: 137, 446) 8×14.

9 Not with Sieg (1944: 29) A320b5.

10 Not with Poucha (1955: 446) 4×5!5!8!7.

- bahudantākam* [TB *bahudantākne*] 4×5¹5¹8¹7: A259b2; A312b4; A335a2 *bahudant(ākam)*; NS4a4; YQ2.10a7
- bahuprahāram* [TB *bahuprahārne*] 4×5¹5¹8¹7: A60a5; A61a2
- bahuśiṣyakam*¹¹ 4×7¹7: A302b1 *bahuśi(ṣyakam)*; A309b4 (*ba*)*huśiṣyakam*
- brahmaṇavākam* [TB *brahmaṇavākne*] ?: A95a1 *brahmaṇavā(kam)*
- madanabhāratam* [TB *madanabhāratne*] 4×4¹4¹4: A75a5; A109a1; THT2522 (*madana*)-*bhāratam*
- mandodharinam* [TB *mando ///*] 4×7¹7¹4: A167a5 *man(d)odhari(nam)*; A212a7; A335b9 (*ma*)*ndodharinam* = A319a3 *maṇndhottarinam*; THT1670b4 (*ma*)*ndottarinam*; YQ2.1a5; YQ2.4a6; YQ2.6a3
- meñameññam* [TB *meñameñne*] 4×7¹7¹4: A37b4 *meñā(meññam)*; A275a1
- meneklinam* 4×5¹7: A56a1
- maitram* [TB *maitārne*] 4×5¹7: A23a4; A154b3; A214b3; A297b3; A300b2; A301b7; A309a1; A429b4; YQ2.2b3; YQ2.7a5; YQ2.8b6; YQ2.13a2; YQ3.10a8
- yarāssinam* 4×7¹7¹4: A23b4; A64b6; A117b3; A155b2; A171b5 *yarā(ssinam)*; A336b9; THT1377e.b1; YQ2.6b1
- yaśodharavilāpam* [TB *yaśodharavilāpne*] 4×7¹7¹2: A286+260a3 *yaśodharavilām*; A83+76b5 *yaśo(dha)ravilāpam*; YQ1.6a4
- yāṅkreyam* 4×7¹7: A65a4
- ylam* [TB *yal-ylamśke*] 4×7¹7¹4: A7b4; A13a2
- yṣimnukunam* ?: A189b4
- ratisāyakam* [TB *ratisāyakne*] 4×7¹7: A15b6; A272b4 *ratisāya(ka)m*
- ratisupam* 4×7¹7¹4: A 207b3; YQ3.5a8
- lakṣaṇa ///* 4×7¹7¹4: A301b3
- vaṃśavātram* [TB *vaṃśavāttārne*] 4×5¹7¹5: A148b2; A187a3 (*vaṃ*)*śavātram*; YQ1.5b6 *vaṃśa(vātram)*
- vanapraveśam* [TB *vanapraveśne*] 4×7¹7: A300a8; A301a1 *vana(praveśam)*; YQ3.11a8
- vilumpagatinam* [TB *vilumpagatiṃne*] 4×7¹7¹4: A69a1; YQ2.2a6
- viśikkonam* 4×7¹7¹4: A35b2 *viśikko(nam)*; A56a5 *vi(śikkonam)*; A76+83a1; A152b5 *viśikonam*; A355a2 *viśikonam*; YQ1.9b1
- watañinam* 4×7¹7: A71b3; A260b2 *watañ(i)nam*; THT1464b2 *watañin(am)*
- watañi-lāntam* 4×5¹5¹8¹7: A24b5 *w(a)tañi-lāntam*; A163b2 (*watañi*)-*lāntam*
- wārṣāmpēknam* 4×5¹7: A63b3; THT2389b1 *wārṣā(m)p(e)knam*
- wārṣinnam* 4×7¹7¹?:¹³ A57b3
- śakkariñcenam* ?: A175a6
- śāntawantākam* 4×7¹7: A66a1; A71a1

11 Readings after CEToM.

12 Not with Sieg (1952: 21) 4×7¹7¹4.

13 4×7¹8 as per Carling, Pinault and Malzahn (CEToM) would also be possible.

śiñkuraṃ ? : A141b5; A403a5 *śinikur(aṃ)*
śurišinnaṃ 4×7!7: A3a2 *śurišinaṃ*; A8b5 *śuri(šinaṃ)*; A61b2; A265b7; A331a7 *śurišinaṃ*
śmāsānaśrāṅkāraṃ [TB *śmāsānaśrāṅkāre*] 4×7!7!4: YQ2.9b6 (the second strophe
 number 1 is wrong for 2)
śaḍap-devadattenāṃ 20/22/10/15: A8a4
śāckāckeyāṃ 4×7!7!4: A64a3; A101b1 (*śāckācke*)*yāṃ* ?
śāmnernaṃ 4×5!7: A1b6; A5b2; A265a8 *śā(mn)er(na)ṃ*
śeraśi-niškramāntaṃ 4×5!5!8!7: A22a2; A43+52a2; A111a3 *śeraśi-ni(škramāntaṃ)*;
 A254b4; A290b3 *śera(śi-niškramāntaṃ)*
samakkorrenaṃ 20/22/10/15: A71a6; A215a7 (= YQ1.6b7); A355a2; YQ1.5a8 *samakkorenaṃ*
*siddham-ratisupaṃ*¹⁴ 4×7!7!4: A251b1 = A252b1
sundaravāṅkaṃ 4×6!6!5?: A299b8; YQN.5b2
subhādrenaṃ [TB *subhādrenne*] 20/22/10/15: A22b2; A77a5; A86a1; A116b4; A143b5
subhādre(naṃ); A275b6; A311a1; A373a1 (*su*)*bhādrenaṃ*; A382a1 (*su*)*bhādrenaṃ*;
 A395b5 *sūbhādrenaṃ*; YQ2.3a2
soktaṃ 4×7!7: A5b6
saundar ///?: A171a4
sruñcañṇenaṃ [TB *sruñcañṇene*] 4×5!7: A68a3; A103a1; THT1418e.b1
svapnadarśnaṃ ? : A171a6 *svapnada(rśnaṃ)*; THT1464a4
svarṇapuṣpenaṃ 4×7!7!4: A58a6
haṃsavāṅkaṃ [TB *haṃsavaṇne*] 4×5!8 + 8!8!5: A299b2 *haṃsavāṅk(aṃ)*
hariṇaplutaṃ [TB *hariṇaplutne*] 4×5!7: A17a5 *hariṇaplunaṃ*; A256a3
hetuphalaṃ [TB *hetuphalne*] 4×7!7!4: A14a6; A18b1; A271b6 (*he*)*tuphalaṃ*; A276b4;
 YQ1.8b8
tsappraṃ 4×7!7!4: A355b1
tsuntaṃ 4×7!7:¹⁵ A253a2; YQ1.3b5
 /// *cyenaṃ* 20/22/10/15:¹⁶ A60b3
 /// *twāṃ* 4×7!7!4: A102b2¹⁷

Tocharian A Metrical Schemes

METRICAL SCHEMES WITH 4 EQUAL PĀDAS

4×4!4!4

*kuswaṃ, koṃswaṃ, cācikkinaṃ, chandakanivartnaṃ, paryacintākāṃ*¹, *madana-bhāratāṃ*

- 14 It is not fully certain that *siddham* really belongs to the tune name: *ratisupaṃ* would also be a possible reading.
- 15 Metre established on the basis of A253a2 (pace Ji 1998: 34).
- 16 As per Carling, Pinault and Malzahn (CEToM). Instead of *cy*, *vy* would also be a possible reading.
- 17 A restoration to (e)*twāṃ* is excluded. Perhaps to be read [w]·*ntwāṃ*.

4×5'7 (5'4'3)

*a ///, etwaṃ, kaṃtsakarṣṇaṃ, kuryartānaṃ, kutsmātaṃ, capiccenāṃ, ṇīkci-
paṇḍurāṇkaṃ, paryacintākaṃ², praśantahāraṃ, meneklināṃ, maitraṃ,
wārṣāṃpekaṃ, śāmnernaṃ, sruñcaññaṃ, harināplutaṃ*

4×7'7 (4'3'4'3)

*aptsaradarśnaṃ, uttarenaṃ, kāpñe-kaṇaṃ, kuma – – –, gautamakapilaṃ¹,
jinakkenaṃ, tuṣitabhavnaṃ¹, daśabalaṃ, pañcapātraṃ, pañcmaṃ¹, phullenāṃ,
bahuśiṣyakaṃ, yaśodharavilāpaṃ, yānkreyaṃ, ratisāyakaṃ, vanapraveśaṃ,
watañinaṃ, śāntawantākaṃ, śuriṣinnaṃ, soktaṃ, tsuntaṃ*

4×7'8 (4'3'3'5)

keśik-nandavilāpaṃ, nandavilāpaṃ

4×5'7'5 (5'4'3'5)

vaṃśavātraṃ

4×6'6'5

ārśi-niṣkramāntaṃ, keśikaṃ, citraśokaṃ, niṣkramāntaṃ, sundaravāṇkaṃ

4×7'7'4 (4'3'4'3'4)

*asitakiritaṃ, āryahāraṃ, klumpāryaṃ, gautamakapilaṃ², c-w-ttenaṃ,
tuṣitabhavnaṃ², pañcmaṃ², mandodharinaṃ, meṇameññaṃ, yarāssinaṃ,
ylaṃ, ratisupaṃ, lakṣaṇa ///, vilumpagatinaṃ, viśikkonaṃ, śmāsānaśrāṇkāraṃ,
ṣāckāckeyaṃ, siddham-ratisupaṃ, svarṇapūṣpenaṃ, hetuphalaṃ, tsappraṃ, ///
twaṃ*

4×5'5'8'7 (5'5'4'4'4'3)

*apratitulyenaṃ, ārśi-lāñcinaṃ, bahudantākaṃ, bahuprakāraṃ, watañi-lāntaṃ,
ṣeraśi-niṣkramāntaṃ*

METRICAL SCHEMES WITH 4 UNEQUAL PĀDAS

12/15/12/15 (5'4'3 / 15¹⁸ / 5'4'3 / 15)

this metre: A226, A 227/8, A229, A230

20/22/10/15 (5'5'5'5 / 4'4'4'3'4'3 / 5'5 / 4'4'4'3)

*ānandarśnaṃ, devadattenaṃ, ṣaḍap-devadattenaṃ, samakkorrenaṃ, subhādrenaṃ,
/// cyenaṃ*

21/21/18/13 (5'3'4'3'6 / 5'3'4'3'6 / 4'5'4'5 / 4'3'6)

pañcagatinaṃ, pañcagatiye

METRICAL SCHEMES WITH 5 PĀDAS

4×5'8 + 8'8'5 (4×5'5'3 + 4'4'4'4'5)

haṃsavāṇkaṃ

18 Subdivision unclear.

METRICAL SCHEME UNKNOWN

*asitavāṇkaṃ, karuṇapralāpaṃ, keśik-sva ///, taruṇadivākaraṃ, paṇḍurāṇkaṃ,
 prahāspa ///, brahmaṇavākaraṃ, yṣiṃnukunaṃ, śakkariñcenaṃ, śiṇikkuraṃ,
 saundar ///, svapnadarśnaṃ*

Tocharian B Tune Names

apratitulyeṃne [TA *apratitulyenaṃ*] ? : AS13Bb7 (*apra*)titulyeṃne; B379b1
apratitu(lyeṃne); B380a4 *appra*(titulyeṃne)
aptsaradarśaṃne [TA *aptsaradarśnaṃ*] 4×7!7: AS13Ia5 (*a*)ptsaradarśaṃne; IT68b2
 (*apta*)radarśanne; IT150a3 *aptsara*(*da*)r(*śa*)ṃ(n)e; IT405b.b3 *aptsa*(*radarśanne*);
 NS36+20b3 *aptsara*(*darśaṃne*); NS79.1b4 *a*(*p*)tsarad(*a*)rśaṃ(ne) = IT69a5
a(*ptsaradarśaṃne*); THT1314b5 *aptsaradarśanne*
arāḍeṃne 4×5!7: AS7Ba4 *arāḍentsa*; AS12Ia3 *arāḍ*(e)nts(*ā*); AS16.3b1; THT2381c.a3
arāḍentsa
aryahārne [TA *āryahāraṃ*] 4×7!7!4: AS17Ca2
āryavāṇśāṣṣene ? : THT1420h.a3 *āryavāṇśāṣṣe*(ne)
*ārwane*¹ 4×5!7: AS12Ca1 *a*(r)wan(e); THT1312a5 *arwa-kenene*; cf. also B283a.b7 (*a*)rwane;
 IT23b1 *ā*(r)w(ane); IT759a2 *ārwane*
*ārwane*² 4×7!7: AS17Ha1 *a*(r)w(a)n(e); cf. also B283a.b7 (*a*)rwane; IT23b1 *ā*(r)w(ane);
 IT759a2 *ārwane*
indraiśṇene ? : B582b4
o[*l*].[*k*].[*sa*] ? : THT1314a6
katarosine 4×7!7: AS16.2a3
*kantsakarṣanne*¹ [TA *kaṃtsakarṣnaṃ*] 12/12/10/12: THT1165+1548b.a5 *kaṃtsakarṣaṃne*
*kantsakarṣanne*² [TA *kaṃtsakarṣnaṃ*] 12/12/13/12: B298¹⁹
karuṇapralāpne [TA *karuṇapralāpaṃ*] 4×5!7:²⁰ B82a3; B263a1 *karu*(ṇa)pra(lāpne);
 B264b3 *karuṇapral*(ā)pn(e)
kāryortaṇṇene [TA *kuryartānaṃ*] 4×5!7: AS17Ia5 *kāryortaṇṇen*(e); B350b3; IT887a2
kāryortaṇṇen(e); NS31+294b5; NS36Aa1 *kāry*(o)rtt(a)ṇṇ(e)n(e); THT3110b2 (*kā*)ryor-
 taṇṇene (Ogihara 2012: 192)
kintarikne 4×6!6!5?: AS13H1b1 *kintarikh*(e); B91b6
keśik-anandārśne ? : THT1576b.b2 (*ke*)śik-anandārśne
keśikne [TA *keśikaṃ*] 4×6!6!5: B400a3 *k*(e)śikne
koś-kṇene 4×7!7: AS17Da1 *koś. kṇ*(e)n(e)
klampāryaine [TA *klumpāryaṃ*] 4×7!7!4?: B359b2
kwamane 4×7!7: NS29a4; NS29b3
*gautamakapilne*¹ [TA *gautamakapilaṃ*] 4×7!7: IT1a2; cf. also THT1312a7 *gautamakapilentsa*

19 Probably so to be read for 12/12/13/13 with an emendation of *nreyentane* in 1d to *nreyntane* (cf. Ogihara 2012: 114).

20 Metre based on B82 (Sieg and Siegling 1953: 20), but 1d would then have *no* after a caesura.

*gautamakapilne*² [TA *gautamakapilaṃ*] 4×7¹8: AS12Hb3 *gautamakapilentsā*; cf. also
 THT1312a7 *gautamakapilentsa*
cañcamaniyaine 4×7¹7?: IT55a7 *c(a)ñc(a)m(an)iyaine*; IT173b3; NS79.1a4 (*cañcama*)*n(i)-*
yaine; THT2626b2 (*cañcamani*)*yaine*
capicene [TA *capiccenam*] 12/15/12/15: AS12Da3 *cāpīcene*; THT1281b7
chandakanivartaṃne [TA *chandakanivartnam*] 4×7¹7: B86b4 (*chan*)*d(a)kanivartaṃne*;
 IT78b2 *channakanivarttanne*; THT1533d.a2 [= B602.3a2] (*chanda*)*kanivarttanne*²¹
taruṇadivākarne [TA *taruṇadivākaram*] 19/19/10/19: B85a5 *taruṇadi(vākarne)*; B100b1
ta(ruṇa)d(i)vāka(rne); IT36b2 /// (*taru*)*ṇadivākarne*; IT78a1 *taruṇadi(vākarne)*;
 NS83b2 *taruṇ(ādivākarne)*; IT573a1 *taruṇa(d)i(vākarne)*
ti – ri-ne 4×7¹7: AS17Da4 *ti – ri-n(e)*
tutuṃtarhāññene?: B115b4
tesakaccāṃne 4×7¹7¹4: B107a7
devadattene [TA *devadattenam*] 20/22/10/15: AS15Da2 *devadattentsa*; B93a6; NS36+20a3
devadatte(ne)
nandavilāpne [TA *nandavilāpaṃ*] 4×7¹8: AS12Aa5 *nandivilāpne*; B28a4 *nandavilā(pne)*;
 IT76b2 *nandi(vilāpne)*; NS80.2a1 *n(a)nd(āvilāpne)*; NS83b7 *nandavilāpn(e)*;
 THT1312b3 *na(n)d(a)vīlapne*; THT1468b2
nandine 4×7¹7: AS17Ab2
*niṣkramāntne*¹ [TA *niṣkramāntam*] 4×5¹7¹5: AS7Ja5 *niṣkramā(tne)*; AS7Kb2 (*ni*)*ṣ(kr)amatne*
 = AS7Na5 *niṣkramatne*; cf. also B515b4 *niṣkramaṃ-kenene*; B610a5 *niṣkramā(tne)*;
 IT217a1 (*niṣkra*)*mātne*
*niṣkramāntne*² [TA *niṣkramāntam*] 4×6¹6¹5: B81a2 *niṣkramāṃne*; B347a3 *n(i)ṣ-*
kramāntne; cf. also B515b4 *niṣkramaṃ-kenene*; B610a5 *niṣkramā(tne)*; IT217a1
 (*niṣkra*)*mātne*
nauṣaṇṇe-taruṇadivākarne?: IT3a3 *nauṣaṇṇe-taruṇadi(vākarne)*
nauṣaṇṇe-nāṭakāṣṣene 4×7¹7 IT3a5; IT36a5 (*nau*)*ṣaṇṇe-nāṭakāṣṣene*; IT217a7 (*nauṣaṇṇe-*
nāṭa)*kāṣṣene*
pañcagatine [TA *pañcagatinam*] 21/21/18/13: B88a5; B577a4
pañcamne [TA *pañcmaṃ*] 4×7¹7: AS17Ba2; AS17Fa4; AS17Jb6 *pañca(mn)e*; B367a6;
 B523a2; IT1145b2; Kz-213-ZS-Z-10 (Ogihara 2013: 378); NS80.2b3; THT2992b1 *pañc(a)-*
m(ne); AS12Cb3 *pañcāṃne*
paṇḍurāṇkāññene [TA *paṇḍurāṇkaṃ*] 4×4¹5: AS16.2a1 (*paṇḍurāṇ*)*kāññene*; B99b5
paṇḍurāṇkāññene; B397 *paṇḍurā(ṇkā)ññ(e)n(e)*; IT91a6 *paṇḍurāññene*; IT91b6
 (*paṇḍurā*)*ññene*; IT239a3 (*pa*)*n(ḍu)rāññene*
putropatne 4×7¹7: AS17Aa4
putrovātne 4×5¹7: AS12Bb2
puṣṇāvatiṃne 14/11/11/11: B108a8; B419b4 *puṣ(ṇāvatiṃne)*
prayasvatine?: G-Su36.1

21 Not with Sieg and Siegling (1953: 385) and (Adams 2013a: 582) /// [ri]nivartta[m]ne.

- praśantahārne* [TA *praśantahāraṃ*] 4×5!6: AS12Cb1 *pr(a)ś(a)ntahā(r)n(e)*; AS12Ha4; AS12Ib2; IT43b3
- prasenajinta*²² 4×7!7: AS17Ib2; IT73a4 *prasenajim̐tsa*; IT88b2; NS193a4
- bahudantākne* [TA *bahudantākam̐*] 4×5!5!8!7: AS13Ea3 (*bahudantā*)*kne*; B521a2; Kz-213-ZS-Z-04.2 *bahudantāk-kenene*;²³ NS32b1 (*bahu*)*dantākne*; THT1526b.b3 *bahudantā(kne)*; THT1537e.a3 *bahu(dant)ā(kne)*
- bahupayikne* 4×7!7!4: AS16.5b6 *bahupāyikne*; AS17Ja6; B312b5 *bahup(a)y(ikne)*; G-Qm1.1; NS399a1 *bahupa(yi)kne*; S1a2 *bahup(ayikne)*
- bahuprahārne* [TA *bahuprakāraṃ*] 4×5!5!8!7: B108a3
- brahmaṇavākne* [TA *brahmaṇavākam̐*] 4×5!8 + 8!8!5?: IT178a4; IT40a2 *brāhma(ṇavākne)*
- bhadrajiññ(ene)*?: IT65a3
- bharyacintākne* [TA *paryacintākam̐*] 4×4!4!4: B89a6 *bharyacin(tākne)*; NS31+294a1 *bharyacitākne*; NS406a5 *bharya(cintākne)*
- madanabhāratne* [TA *madanabhāratam̐*] 4×4!4!4: IT266b4 (*ma*)*danabhāratne*; NS32b4
- mando* /// [TA *mandodharinam̐*] 4×7!7!4?: THT370b3
- meñameñne* [TA *meñameññam̐*] 4×7!7!4: AS13Da6; AS17Ba4; AS17Eb5; THT1468a1 *meñameñ(ne)*
- maitārne* [TA *maitram̐*] 4×7!7:²⁴ AS17Cb3 *maittārne*; B158a6 *maitarne*; B589a6 *maittārne*
- yakwene* 4×5!7: AS13Db2; AS17Ia3; B87b.a4 *ya(kw)e(ne)?*; THT1451b.a4 *yākwe-kene(ne)*; THT1580l.a3 *yak(wene)*; THT1622d.b2
- yatikaşşene* 4×5!5!8!7: B108b4
- yal-ylaṃşkene* [A *ylaṃ*] 4×6!6!5: AS16.3b3
- yaśodharavilāpne* [TA *yaśodharavilāpam̐*] 4×7!7: AS12Ja4 (*yaś*)*o(dharav)ilāpne*; AS15Ca6 *yaśodhara(v)ilāpne*;²⁵ IT18a2 (*yaśodha*)*ravilāpne*; B394b7 *se yaśo(dhara-vi)lāp(n)e*²⁶
- ratik-mne* 4×7!7!4: AS17Ea6
- ratisāyakne* [TA *ratisāyakam̐*] 4×7!7: AS16.8a3 (*rati*)*sāyakne*; B575a4–5
- riññāktene* 10/11/10/11: AS13Da1 *rīñākte(ne)*; B77a5 *riññāktesa*; B516a3 (*r*)*ūññāktene*; THT1533e.a2 [= B602.3c1] *rīñ-ñākte(ne)*
- rşap-devadattemne* 20/22/10/15: B375a2

22 The unexpected form of this tune name is probably to be explained from an obl.sg. *prasenajim̐* to a nom.sg. *prasenaji* (cf. IT178b8 *prasenaji walo* ‘king Prasenajit’). The *t* is epenthetic and not related to the *t* of Skt. *prasenajit*.

23 The metre seems to fit a little better if instead of *ike śpalmen̐-yurvāşkā[s]inā* [l[e](m)n[e] *krantā(nā)* [s]pelkesoñco [wi]naññ[e]ntr̥a one should tentatively read (and understand) something like *ike śpalmenā*! *yurvāşkāşene*! *lenā krentā spelkesoñco*! *winaññentrā* ‘in this excellent place of Yurpāško the zealous enjoy the good monastic cell ...’

24 Not with Sieg and Siegling (1953: 87, 373) 4×5!7. In B589a6 the reading seems to be not *lwāsa ka* – – [:] *kā* but *lwāsa ka* – – [s]· *kā*.

25 Here the last unit appears to be 4 instead of the expected 3 syllables in a7.

26 Not with Sieg and Siegling (1953: 263) and Adams (2013a: 524) *yaśo(dharapra)lāp(n)e*.

rṣap-pañcagatine 4×7¹8?: B577a4 (*rṣa*)*p-pañcagatine*
rṣap-ṣalye-malkwerne 4×7¹7¹4: B108b1–2 *rṣap-ṣalywe-malkwerne*
vaṃśavāttārne [TA *vaṃśavātraṃ*] 4×5¹7¹5: B517a6; THT1126b2 *vaṃśa(vāttārne)*²⁷
vanapraveśne [TA *vanapraveśaṃ*] 4×7¹7: AS17Hb2 *vanapprav(e)śn(e)*; B615a1 (*vanapra*)-
veśne; NS34a4 *va(napraveśne)*; NS398b3 (*vanapra*)*veśne*; THT1533f.b2 [= B602.3b1]
vana(p)r(aveśne)
vilumpagatine [TA *vilumpagatinam*] 4×7¹7¹4: AS4Ba1; B585a3 *vilumpagatiṃne*
vemacitreṃne 4×7¹7¹4: B375b3
wāttānt-kenene 2×7¹7?: B514a4
śawaññe-kwamane 4×7¹7: AS16.2a6 *śawaññe-kwamane*; B582b1
śuddhodaññene 10/11/10/11:²⁸ B350b5; B611a4 *śuddho(da)ṃ(ñene)*; B613b3
śuddhodaṃñene; B619a2 (*śuddho*)*daṃñene*; B624b4 (*śuddho*)*dāṇṃñene*?;
IT132a1; IT504b1 *śuddhodaññen(e)*
śmāśānaśrāṅkārne [TA *śmāśānaśrāṅkāraṃ*] 4×7¹7¹4: B78b5 (*śmā*)*śānaśrāṅkārne*;
NS55a3 (*śmāśānaśrā*)*ṅkārne*; SHT290.10a3 *śmāśā(naśrāṅkārne)*
ṣaḍapne 4×5¹7: B372b1
ṣaḍap-ṣalye-malkwerne 4×7¹7¹4: B107a1–2 *ṣaḍap-ṣalywe-malkwerne*
ṣartanīkaine 10/10/10/11?: B78a4
ṣarmirśkeṃne 4×5¹7: B107a10
ṣṭakkumaine 4×4¹4¹4: B107b7
sādhariḱ-anandārśne?: B583a5
subhādrenne [TA *subhadrenaṃ*] 20/22/10/15: B33a2
sumāṃśkaine 4×7¹7?: B346a3
sumāline 4×5¹7: AS17Kb3
suwāññe-wātatane 4×7¹8?: B108b9
s(·)emiyene 4×7¹7?: AS17Fb4
skampaumaśśaṃskaine 4×4¹4¹4: B107b4
strivighātne 11/14/11/11: AS12Kb5 *strivighātne*; B282a6 *strivighā(tne)*; IT1b4; THT1537f.a2
strivighātne; THT1314b7 *strivigh(ātne)*
snai-trāṅkone 4×7¹7: AS12Lb2
spālñene 4×7¹7: AS16.5b3
sruñcaññene [TA *sruñcaññenaṃ*]?: THT1522b.a7
haṃsavañne [TA *haṃsavāṇkaṃ*] 4×5¹8 + 8¹8¹5?: NS83a5; THT1926a5 *haṃsavā(ñne)*
hariṇaplutne [TA *hariṇaplutaṃ*] 4×5¹7: B520b5 (*ha*)*riṇ(ap)lutn(e)*²⁹
haridāsñene 4×7¹7: B589b7; NS83a3 *haridāsa(ñene)*

27 Pace Ogihara (2012: 186), who reads *v(ai)ś(āli)*.

28 Apparently mostly 10/11/10/11. Only in AS12Db4–5 certainly 4×11 (cf. Sieg and Siegling 1953: 229).

29 The subdivision is not regular: 1a has 5¹3¹4 and 1d has *ra* after a caesura.

hetuphalne [TA *hetuphalam*] 4×7¹7¹4: AS17Cb1 *h(e)tuph(al)n(e)*
 /// *anandārśne* [TA *ānāndarśnam*]?: THT1499a3
 /// *cce-kenene*?: B514b9 (cf. *capicene*)
 /// *wānne*?: IT165a2³⁰
 /// *ṣṣaine* 4×7¹7: B522b6

Tocharian B Metrical Schemes

METRICAL SCHEMES WITH 2 EQUAL PĀDAS

2×7¹7 (4¹3¹4¹3)
wättānt-kenene; this metre also B133, B388
 2×7¹8 (4¹3¹3¹5)
 this metre B594

METRICAL SCHEMES WITH 4 EQUAL PĀDAS

4×4¹5
paṇḍurāṅkāññene; this metre also B135a1–b3, B261a4–b5
 4×5¹5
 this metre: B296b3–5
 4×5¹6
praśantahārne; this metre also: B64, B82b5–6, B126, B262
 4×4¹4¹4
bharyacintākne, madanabhāratne, ṣṭakkumaine, skampaumaśśaṃškaine
 4×5¹7 (5¹4¹3)
*arādeṇne, rwane*¹, *karuṇapralāpne, kāryorttaññene, putrovātne, yakwene, ṣaḍapne, ṣarmirśkeṇne, sumāline, hariṇaplutne*
 4×5¹8 (5¹5¹3)
 this metre: AS12Gb2–3, B44, B84b4–6, B258–260
 4×7¹7 (4¹3¹4¹3)
*aptsaradarśaṇne, ārwane*², *katarosine, koś-kñene, kwamane, gautamakapilne*¹,
cañcamaniyaine, chandakanivartaṇne, ti – ri-ne, nandine, nauṣaṇñe-nāṭakāṣṣene,
pañcamne, putropatne, prasenajintsa, maitārne, yaśodharavilāpne, ratisāyakne,
vanapraveśne, śawaññe-kwamane, sumāṃškaine, s(·)emiylene, snai-trāṅkone,
spālñene, haridāsñene, /// ṣṣaine
 4×7¹8 (4¹3¹3¹5)
*gautamakapilne*², *nandavilāpne, rṣap-pañcagatine, suwāññe-_uwātatane*

30 Uncertain. It is unclear to me what Broomhead's reading *kawānne* (1962 i: 62; see also Adams 2013a: 156) is based on. Perhaps this restoration goes back to a suggestion of Couvreur to read the word as a 3pl.sbj.-3sg.suff. 'they will pour it', 'they will pour it for him', etc.

4×5'7'5 (5'4'3'5)

*niṣkramāntne*¹, *vaṃśavāttārne*

4×6'6'5

kintarikne, *keśikne*, *niṣkramāntne*², *yal-ylaṃṣkene*

4×7'7'4 (4'3'4'3'4)

aryahārne, *klampāryaine*, *tesakaccāmne*, *bahupayikne*, *mando* ///, *meṇameṇne*,
ratik-mne, *rṣap-ṣalye-malkwerne*, *vilumpagatine*, *vemacitreṇne*,
śmāsānaśrāṅkārne, *ṣaḍap-ṣalye-malkwerne*, *hetuphalne*

4×5'5'8'7 (5'5'4'4'4'3)

bahudantākne, *bahuprahārne*, *yatikaṣṣene*

METRICAL SCHEMES WITH 4 UNEQUAL PĀDAS

9/11/9/11

this metre B389, B587

10/10/10/11 (6'4 / 6'4 / 6'4 / 6'5)

ṣartanūkaine

10/11/10/11 (4'6 / 4'7 / 4'6 / 4'7)

riññāktene, *śuddhodaññene*; this metre also B282a1–6

10/19/10/19 (5'5 / 4'3'4'3'5 / 5'5 / 4'3'4'3'5)

this metre B78a1–2

11/14/11/11 (4'3'4 / 4'3'4'3 / 4'3'4 / 4'3'4)³¹

strivighātne; this metre also B279–281, B608

11/15/11/15 (4'3'4 / 4'3'3'5 / 4'3'4 / 4'3'3'5)

this metre B150

12/12/10/12 (5'4'3 / 5'4'3 / 5'5 / 5'4'3)

*kantsakarṣanne*¹

12/12/13/12 (5'4'3 / 5'4'3 / 5'4'4 / 5'4'3)

*kantsakarṣanne*²

12/13/12/13 (5'4'3 / 4'3'6 / 5'4'3 / 4'3'6)

this metre B384–385

12/12/12/15 (5'4'3 / 5'4'3 / 5'4'3 / 4'3'3'5?)

this metre B146

12/15/12/15 (5'4'3 / 4'3'5'3³² / 5'4'3 / 4'3'5'3)

capicene; this metre also THT1540a+b, THT1540f+g

12/16/12/16 (5'4'3 / 5'4'3'4 / 5'4'3 / 5'4'3'4)

B294.9–11 = B296b5–9 = B297b.b6–7

31 This metre presents many difficulties of analysis. Apparently pādas a, c and d can also be 8'3, and in b sometimes an unexpected 8'6 is found.

32 The subdivision in THT1540a+b and THT1540f+g is 5'4'3'3 (Schmidt 2007: 322, 324).

13/12/13/12 (5'5'3 / 5'4'3 / 5'5'3 / 5'4'3)

this metre B292

14/11/11/11 (7'7³³ / 5'6 / 5'6 / 5'6)

puṣṇāvatimne; this metre also B12, B41, B386

14/11/11/14

this metre B135b3–7, B138

14/20/14/20 (4'3'4'3 / 5'6'5'4 / 4'3'4'3 / 5'6'5'4)

this metre B256–257

19/19/10/19 (4'3'4'3'5 / 4'3'4'3'5 / 5'5 / 4'3'4'3'5)

taruṇadivākārne

20/22/10/15 (5'5'5'5 / 4'4'4'3'4'3 / 5'5 / 4'4'4'3)

devadattene, rṣap-devadattēne, subhādrenne

21/21/18/13 (5'3'4'3'6 / 5'3'4'3'6 / 4'5'4'5 / 4'3'6)

pañcagātine; this metre also B1, B2, B3, B45, B588a1–6

METRICAL SCHEMES WITH 5 PĀDAS

4×5'8 + 8'8'5 (4×5'5'3 + 4'4'4'4'5)

brahmaṇavākne; haṃsavañne; this metre also: B7, B220, B290, THT1573a

METRE UNKNOWN

apratitulyemne, āryavāñśāṣṣene, indraiśñene, o[l]·[k]·[sa], keśik-anandārśne, tutuṃtarhāññene, nauṣaṇñe-taruṇadivākārne, prayasvatine, bhadrarajīñ(ene), sādharik-anandārśne, sruñcaññene, /// anandārśne, /// cce-kenene, /// wāñne

Tumšugeše Metre Names

orocce naumntaiṣṇe [TB **orocce nauntaiṣṣene*] TS 1+6+21 a4

kāryortaṇe [TB *kāryorttaññene*] IOL Toch 162 a4

(*n*)*iṣkramātne* [TB *niṣkramāntne*] TS 1+6+21 b3

(*n*)*auṣaṇñe nāṭakya* [TB *nauṣaṇñe nāṭakāṣṣene*] TS 10 b2

śmaśāna(śrāñkārne) [TB *śmaśānaśrāñkārne*] TS 16 a2

References

Adams, Douglas Q. 2003. Patterns of stress and rhythm in Tocharian B prosody. In *Language in Time and Space. A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday*, ed. Brigitte L. M. Bauer and Georges-Jean Pinault, 1–11. Berlin: de Gruyter.

33 The expected subdivision of the first pāda into 4'3'4'3 is often violated.

- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013a. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Brill.
- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013b. More thoughts on Tocharian B prosody. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 14:3–30.
- Broomhead, J. W. 1962. A textual edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kuchean manuscripts. With transliteration, translation, grammatical commentary and vocabulary. 2 vols. Diss. Cambridge.
- Bross, Christoph, Dieter Gunkel, and Kevin M. Ryan. 2014. Caesurae, bridges, and the colometry of four Tocharian B meters. *Indo-European Linguistics* 2:1–23.
- Bross, Christoph, Dieter Gunkel, and Kevin M. Ryan. 2015. The colometry of Tocharian 4×15-syllable verse. In *Tocharian Texts in Context. International Conference on Tocharian Manuscripts and Silk Road Culture, Vienna, June 25–29th, 2013*, ed. Melanie Malzahn, Michaël Peyrot, Hannes Fellner and Theresa-Susanna Illés, 15–28. Bremen: Hempen.
- Carling, Gerd. 2009. *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Part 1: A–J. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CEToM = *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*. URL: www.univie.ac.at/tocharian
- Ji Xianlin. 1998. *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China*. Transliterated, translated and annotated by Ji Xianlin in collaboration with Werner Winter and Georges-Jean Pinault. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2007. The most archaic manuscripts of Tocharian B and the varieties of the Tocharian B language. In *Instrumenta Tocharica*, ed. Melanie Malzahn, 255–297. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2012. Position matters – The placement of clitics in metrical texts of Tocharian B. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13:153–162.
- Maue, Dieter. 2007. Tumschukische Miszellen I: Beobachtungen zur Metrik. In *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan. Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*, ed. Maria Macuch, Mauro Maggi and Werner Sundermann, 225–238. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Maue, Dieter. 2009. *Tumshuqese Manuscripts and Inscriptions*. URL: <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/iranica/tumshuq/transliteration.pdf>.
- Maue, Dieter. 2015. Tumschukische Miszellen II: The Haṃsasvara puzzle. In *Tocharian Texts in Context. International Conference on Tocharian Manuscripts and Silk Road Culture, Vienna, June 25–29th, 2013*, ed. Melanie Malzahn, Michaël Peyrot, Hannes Fellner and Theresa-Susanna Illés, 117–126. Bremen: Hempen.
- Ogihara Hirotooshi. 2012. Tokarago B ,Avadāna shahon' ni tsuite – The “Avadāna manuscript” in Tocharian B. *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 32:109–243.
- Ogihara Hirotooshi. 2013. Lüè lùn Qiūcí shíkū xiàncún gǔdài qī Qiūcí yǔ tǐjì – On the Kuchean archaic inscriptions surviving in the grottoes in the region of Kucha. *Dūnhuáng Tǔlǔfān Yánjiū – Journal of the Dunhuang and Turfan Studies* 13:371–386.

- Ogihara Hirotoshi. 2015. Doitsu shozō Tokarago B danpen THT1859–1860 ni tsuite – Kuchean Fragments THT1859 and THT1860 in the Berlin Collection. *Tōkyō Daigaku Gengogaku Ronshū – Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 36:103–129.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2008. *Variation and change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2010. Proto-Tocharian syntax and the status of Tocharian A. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 38:132–146.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2014. La relation entre la chronologie du tokharien B et la paléographie. In *Lecteurs et copistes dans les traditions manuscrites iraniennes, indiennes et centrasiatiques*, ed. Nalini Balbir and Maria Szuppe, 121–147 (Eurasian Studies 12). Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente Carlo Alfonso Nallino.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2008. *Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et grammaire*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Poucha, Pavel. 1955. *Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A* (Institutiones Linguae Tocharicae I). Prague: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství.
- Schmidt, Klaus T. 2007. THT 1540. In *Instrumenta Tocharica*, ed. Melanie Malzahn, 321–339. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Sieg, Emil. 1944. *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen I* (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrgang 1943, Phil.-Hist. Klasse Nr. 16). Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Sieg, Emil. 1952. *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II* (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1951 Nr. 1). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Sieg, Emil and Wilhelm Siegling. 1921. *Tocharische Sprachreste*. Vol. 1: *Die Texte. A. Transcription*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Sieg, Emil and Wilhelm Siegling. 1953. *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B, Heft 2. Fragmente Nr. 71–633*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Stumpf, Peter. 1971. *Der Gebrauch der Demonstrativ-Pronomina im Tocharischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Widmer, Paul. 2006. La métrique tokharienne: l'influence indienne et quelques développements tokhariens. In *La langue poétique indo-européenne. Actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes, Paris, 22–24 octobre 2003*, ed. Georges-Jean Pinault and Daniel Petit, 523–535. Leuven: Peeters.
- Winter, Werner. 1955. Some aspects of “Tocharian” drama: Form and techniques. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 75:26–35. [= Winter 2005: 11–20]
- Winter, Werner. 2005. *Kleine Schriften. Selected Writings. Festgabe aus Anlass des 80. Geburtstags*, ed. Olav Hackstein. 2 vols. Bremen: Hempen.
- Xinjiang Kucha Academy etc. 2013. Kèzǐěr shíkū hòushānqū xiàncún Qīcǐ yǔ jí qítā pólúomí wénzì tǐjì nèiróng jiǎnbào (1): dì 203, 219, 221, 222, 224, 227, 228, 229 kǔ – A Brief Report of the Kuchean and Other Brāhmī Inscriptions Surviving in the Back Mountain Area of the Kizil Grottoes (I): Cave no. 203, 219, 221, 222, 224, 227, 228, 229. *Dūnhuáng Tǔlǔfān Yánjiū – Journal of the Dunhuang and Turfan Studies* 13:341–369.