



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

**Notes on Tocharian A o(k) ‘snake’, A oram and B
sorromp ‘down’, B oşno, B nanāmo ‘recognising’,
B pāwe, and B †səwm- ‘trickle’**

Peyrot, M.; Olsen, B.A.; Fellner, H.; Pinault, G.-J.

Citation

Peyrot, M. (2022). Notes on Tocharian A o(k) ‘snake’, A oram and B sorromp ‘down’, B oşno, B nanāmo ‘recognising’, B pāwe, and B †səwm- ‘trickle’. In B. A. Olsen, H. Fellner, & G. -J. Pinault (Eds.), *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* (Vol. 21, pp. 163-177). Museum Tusculanum Press. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3663535>

Version: Publisher's Version

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3663535>

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

Notes on Tocharian A *o(k)* ‘snake’, A *oram* and B *sorromp* ‘down’, B *oṣno*, B *nanāmo* ‘recognising’, B *pāwe*, and B †*səwm-* ‘trickle’¹

Michaël Peyrot

This article is a collection of short notes on several Tocharian words. It is suggested that the TA cognate of TB *auk* ‘snake’ is attested as *o(k)*; that TA *oram* and TB *sorromp* ‘down’ are etymologically related; that TB *oṣno* is a word, perhaps from *ot ṣ no* ‘and then’; that *kakāmau* ‘taken’ in the so-called Petrovskij Buddhastotra is rather to be read as *nanāmo* ‘recognising’; that TB *pāwe* is an adjective, perhaps meaning ‘clean’, while *ṣāwo* ‘bath’ is a ghost word; and that TB *səwm-* ‘trickle’ is a ghost word too.

In this article, I present short notes on the following Tocharian words: 1. TA *o(k)* ‘snake’, 2. TA *oram* and TB *sorromp* ‘down’, 3. TB *oṣno*, 4. TB *nanāmo* ‘recognising’, 5. TB *pāwe*, 6. TB †*səwm-* ‘trickle’.

1 TA *o(k)* ‘snake’

Sieg & Siegling (1921: 245) read line b5 of A 455 as follows:

//// lodaroraga • wār *kats*_ṣ o ////

In his personal copy (available at CETOM), Wilhelm Siegling has later noted that the <a> of *kats*_ṣ should rather be <ā>. Indeed, the correct reading is in my view:

/// lodaroraga • wār *k[ā]ts*_ṣ o ///

1 I thank Ilya Itkin (Moscow) for comments on an earlier draft. This research was supported by the European Research Council (ERC-2017-STG 758855).

With this correction, it becomes evident that Tocharian A *wär* ‘water’ translates Sanskrit *jala-*, while *kāts* ‘belly’ renders *udara-*. These equations prompt us to take *o* /// to be the translation of *uraga-* ‘snake’. No restoration of the fragmentary *o* /// would have been feasible if we had had no Tocharian B cognate. However, in view of Tocharian B *auk* ‘snake’, the obvious restoration is *o(k)*. The reading of the whole line so becomes:

/// (ja)lodaroraga · wär k[ā]t₂ o(k) ///

As pointed out to me by Sergey Malyshev (p.c.), it remains to be seen how the apparent *jalodaroraga* ‘water-bellied snake’ (?) is to be interpreted.² It is conceivable, for instance, that it is a mistake for *jalodaro rogaḥ* ‘water-belly disease’, which is attested in the Cīvaravastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādinaya (MSV 1,07, 247a). However, in A 455 b5 a reading or restoration *(ja)lodaro roga* is only possible against the manuscript: <raga> can be read without any problem. I therefore assume that if *(ja)lodaroraga* is indeed a mistake, this corruption of the text was carried over into the Tocharian A translation.

2 TA *oram* and TB *sorromp* ‘down’

The Tocharian B adverb *sorromp* ‘down’ is not frequent, but nevertheless relatively well attested, in clear contexts, and its meaning is not controversial or uncertain. I think this adverb is a cognate of the Tocharian A hapax legomenon A 79 a2 *oram*, translated by Sieg (1952: 13) as “nieder” (cf. also Carling 2009: 91b, “down”). While the semantic connection is quite obvious, the formal side needs to be commented. As for the vowels, I think that it is a good example of the correspondence B *o* : A *o* in the first syllable and of B *o* : A *a* in the second, as among many other examples

2 Sergey Malyshev also raised the valid objection that there is already a word for ‘snake’: TA *ārṣal*. This is obviously to be acknowledged, but since Tocharian B *auk* is also found next *arṣāklo* ‘snake’, there was apparently a difference in meaning between the two words. Quite likely, this difference in meaning in Tocharian A was similar to that in Tocharian B.

in B *oñkolmo* ‘elephant’ : A *oñkaläm* (Burlak & Itkin 2003). As for the consonants, the correspondence B *rr* : A *r* may simply be due to degemination in Tocharian A, while the final *-p* may have been lost in Tocharian A, as final *-mp* is rare there,³ and final *-p* is lost in the pronoun *säm*, if that is, as I believe, cognate with Tocharian B *samp*.

The obvious obstacle to the connection is the mismatch of the initial: there is no parallel whatsoever for the presence of the initial *s-* in Tocharian B and the lack of it in Tocharian A. Probably, this difference has to be explained from wrong segmentation in the phonological phrase, like in the case of E. *adder* < **nadra-*, which lost its *n-* to the preceding article. The converse happened in Dutch *nonkel* ‘uncle’. The question is whether the *s-* was lost in Tocharian A or added in Tocharian B, and which phonological context may have been the source of such resegmentation.

The only example in Tocharian A is the following:

A 79 a2

*anaprä pesä oram pä(štam)*⁴

‘Bow down in front of my feet!’ (Carling 2009: 91b)

In Tocharian B there are more examples. In all cases, *sorromp* is found together with *klaya-* ‘fall’, and in most cases it precedes the verb and is found at the beginning of a phrase:⁵

3 In fact, it seems to be found only in *kump** ‘pot’, where it may have been restored on the basis of the paradigm, e.g. the loc.sg. *kumpaṃ*, which is attested, and *kumpa-kump* ‘in crowds’, where it may have been restored in the second member on the basis of the first.

4 I find Sieg’s restoration of the following imperative verb form as *pä(štam)* questionable in view of the phraseology in Tocharian B (for which see immediately below). Also, the associated meanings ‘stand up’ and ‘stand still’ of *käl-* ‘stand’ do not fit a downward movement. However, I admit that *päklä* ‘fall!’ (if that is what the imperative looked like) is not a very likely restoration either.

5 The following fragmentary attestations may belong here too: THT 630 a1 /// (*so*)*rromp kakl(āyau)* /// ‘having fallen down’ (this reading with *rr* is the correct one, rather than the (*so*)*romp* of Sieg & Sieglings’s 1953: 401); THT 1334.c a1 /// *sorrom klayäre* /// ‘they fell down’; and perhaps THT 406 /// (*sorro*)*m*

PK AS 13F a4

/// – – – *śaumom śaumom so(r)r(o)mp klyoyomane*
 ‘... each man ... falling down ...’

PK AS 15C a5

/// *-ttsai wešeññaisa bodhisattvem kwāmane sorromp klāya taur āssa ktāte*
 ‘... calling the Bodhisattva with a ... voice, he fell down and strew dust over his head.’

THT 1285 [etc.] a2

(*ar*)*h(ā)nteś śem sorrom painene kl(āya)*
 ‘... he came to the arhat [and] fell down at [his] feet.’ (Ogihara 2012: 156)

THT 90 a4

/// *yane aruṇāvati riś sorromp ka(klāyau)*
 ‘... ... to the town Aruṇavatī. (Having) fallen down ...’

THT 1363.e b3

/// *tme tumem sorromp pā·k· ///*
 ‘... them. Thereupon ...⁶ down ...’

THT 22 a8

(*ri*)*tāte akālk sorro(mp) k(l)āya pośintse*
 ‘He cherished the wish [and] fell down before the omniscient.’

In the phrases occurring in these examples, there does not seem to be any context in which resegmentation could have possibly occurred. The best I can think of would be words like *se* ‘he’ or *tusa* ‘thus’ placed in front of an original *s*-less **orromp*, e.g. **s*∕ *orromp klāya* ‘he fell down’ or **tus*∕ *orromp klāya* ‘thus he fell down’. However, resegmentation seems

klāya. The last two examples are pointed out to me by Ilya Itkin, who also notes the very fragmentary THT 3626.b a2 /// (*so*)*rromp* /// ‘... down ...’.

6 *pā* is probably not the beginning of an imperative in view of the preceding *tumem* ‘thereupon’. One could think of *pālkāte* ‘he looked’, but the middle of this preterite is very rare.

improbable to me here since *se* and *tusa* are not in any specific way linked to *sorromp* and should therefore have remained recognisable.

The few examples where *sorromp* is not found phrase-initially seem to have marked, non-default verse word-order:

THT 22 b6

eñcwaññai kentsa (k)l(āya) sorromp läklessu

‘The sorrowful one fell down on the iron earth.’

THT 49 a7

/// s. mācer śem-neś eś lmausa 7 klāya⁷ soysa so(rromp) ///

‘... [his] blind mother came to him. She fell down before [her] son ...’

IOL Toch 251 b3

/// ·ene sorro(mp) ///

‘... down ...’

THT 2593 a1⁸

/// t. pain(e)ne so(r)r(omp) ///

‘... down at [his] feet ...’

In view of the repetitive phraseology, we may perhaps restore IOL Toch 251 b3 */// ·ene sorro(mp) ///* as *(pain)ene sorro(mp)* ‘... down at [his/her] feet ...’. It thus appears that *sorromp klaya-* ‘fall down’ may be combined with a locative in the sense ‘fall down at’, e.g. ‘fall down at someone’s feet’, or with a perrelative in the sense ‘fall down before’, e.g. ‘fall down before somebody’. The genitive THT 22 a8 *sorro(mp) k(l)āya poyśintse* ‘he fell down before the Buddha’ is in this light unexpected, but with such a small number of examples it is impossible to decide whether that is a mistake for the perrelative *poyśintsa*. Another collocation with the perrelative is obviously found in THT 22 b6 *kentsa (k)l(āya) sorromp* ‘he fell down on the earth’, where the perrelative is used as with *klaya-* if it is not accompanied with *sorromp* (Carling 2000: 79).

7 Sieg & Siegling (1949: 1, 71) printed *klāysa*, obviously a typographical error. Thomas has corrected this reading in Sieg & Siegling (1983: 86).

8 This example has been brought to my attention by Ilya Itkin.

No relevant wrong resegmentation is possible with a preceding locative, but the perlicative is actually promising. If, in Pre-Tocharian B, the perlicative had the shape **-sa*, as in the historical language, and *sorromp* had the shape **orromp*, like in Tocharian A, the sequence **-sa orromp* would have been contracted to **-s/ orromp*. At this stage, renewal of the perlicative ending would have yielded the necessary **-sa sorromp*.⁹ It is difficult to envision a scenario in which Tocharian A *oram* could have lost its initial *s-* to a preceding perlicative suffix, because the perlicative has no *s-* element in Tocharian A, and this is most probably the original, Proto-Tocharian situation.

An explanation based on the perlicative has the advantage that this is the case used in the only occurrence in Tocharian A, *pesā oram* ‘down at [my] feet’, and that there are two possible constructions with the perlicative in Tocharian B, ‘fall down on something’ and ‘fall down before somebody’. At the same time, it requires that the default order of such expressions was “perlicative complement + *sorromp* + *klaya-*”. This seems natural enough, especially for ‘fall down on something’, but it would be different from what we find in the prose example with the locative: THT 1285 [etc.] *a2 sorrom painene kl(āya)* ‘he fell down at [his] feet’.

The ultimate etymology of the so reconstructed Proto-Tocharian **orromp* eludes me, but it obviously contains *omp* ‘there’ as the second element. On the evidence of the longer *ompe* and *ompek*, this *omp* must have been shortened from *ompe* (Adams 2013: 125), while *omte* and *omtem* ‘there’ are from *omp* plus the neuter pronouns *te* and *tem*, respectively, with loss of *p* in the cluster *-mpt-* (Adams 2013: 214–215). It follows that the meaning ‘down’ is contributed by the initial element **orr-*.

It is likely that Tocharian B *ñor* ‘below, down’ contains PIE **ni-* ‘down’ followed by an element **-or*, but it is unclear to me if that should be the

9 It is conceivable, but as far as I see impossible to prove, that the mismatch between the perlicative *pesā* in Tocharian A and the locative *painene* in Tocharian B is to be explained as a case where the perlicative was not renewed. Thus, a Pre-Tocharian B **painesā orromp* would have developed into **paine sorromp*, at which stage the nom.-obl. *paine* was replaced with the locative *painene* rather than the perlicative *painesā*.

same as the **orr-* of **orromp*. One might expect an adverb **ni-* ‘down’ to be enlarged with an adverbial suffix, denoting location or motion (depending on the original meaning), but not with another element meaning ‘down’.

3 TB *oṣno*

In THT 591 b7 there is a difficult passage that was transliterated by Sieg & Siegling (1953: 377) as follows: : *oṣ no [m]i – n ma arañc^ä [k](ā)t(k)astār^ä*. They proposed to restore and correct to : *op no mi(t wā)t mā arañc k(ā)t(k)astār*. No image of the fragment is currently available, but clearly the large number of emendations does not inspire confidence. Accepting Sieg & Siegling’s correction to *op*, Adams (2013: 122) connects this *op* with the allative *opis* in THT 433 a17, apparently a foodstuff, and he suggests that it means ‘fat’. According to him, the passage in THT 591 b7 would mean ‘however neither *op* nor honey gladdens the heart’.

In THT 1554 + 3112 b3, Oghara (2012: 182) reads /// (*bodhi*)[*s*](*a*)*tve weṣṣam k_uce [pā]knāṣṣītar^ä [y]āmtsi cai [s]· (·)[ṣ]· ñ^ä om no*. The first part is to be translated as: ‘The bodhisattva says: “What did you [pl.] intend to do? ...’. It is the last part of the line that is difficult. Although I have no proposal to make for the difficult part [*s*]· (·)[*ṣ*]· ñ^ä, obviously the correct reading of the last akṣaras is *oṣno* rather than *om no*.

The clear reading of *oṣno* in THT 1554 + 3112 b3 makes an emendation to *op no* in THT 591 b7 inadvisable. However, at present, I cannot interpret either passage and the meaning of *oṣno* cannot be established at this point. If it is a noun, it would have a remarkable, but not an impossible structure. However, the positioning in the beginning of the verse in THT 591 b7 suggests to me that it is a sentence adverbial. Without being able to prove it, I would therefore suggest that it is shortened from *ot ṣp no*, and I would guess that the meaning is ‘and then’. If this interpretation is correct, it could also be written *oṣ no* in two words.

4 TB *nanāmo* ‘recognising’

The end of the first line of the famous Petrovskij Buddhastotra, SI 1903 a1 (formerly P1), is read by Pinault (2016a: 7, 14) as *tāryā-ykne ymentse śmoñāṣṣe mā[ñ](·) kakām[au ·]* ‘having taken on the serv(ant) of the establishment of the threefold consciousness’. In my view, the reading of the last word¹⁰ is problematic: the third akṣara is quite clearly <mo>, not <mau>, and the preceding two syllables do not look like <kakā>, but rather like <nanā>. I think we should read this sequence as *nanāmo*, which is in fact the reading already proposed by Leumann (1900: 16). In my view, *nanāmo* needs no correction, as it can simply be the nom.sg.m. of the verbal adjective of *nana-* ‘recognise, appear’. As pointed out to me by Ilya Itkin (p.c.), the obl.sg.f. of the same verbal adjective is attested in THT 1398.b a3 /// *nanāmñai* ///.

Unfortunately, I have no suggestion to make for the object of SI 1903 a1 *nanāmo*, i.e. for the two akṣaras transliterated as *mā[ñ](·)* and interpreted as *māñ(ye)* ‘servant’ by Pinault. The relevant passage is too damaged in the current state of the fragment. In my view, Pinault is right that Thomas’ restoration of these two akṣaras as (*pekwe*) ‘ring’ (1964: 58) is excluded as the consonant of the first akṣara can be read as [*m*]. However, rather than Pinault’s reading *mā*, I would opt for *m[au]*. Nevertheless, I am not able to offer a suitable restoration of the word, which should be disyllabic according to the metre. With this caveat, my translation is: *tāryā-ykne ymentse śmoñāṣṣe mau – nanāmo [·]* ‘recognising the *mau* – of the basis of the threefold consciousness’.

Verbal adjectives in *-mo* are regularly derived from the present stem. However, *nana-* ‘recognise’ forms a ^{ssə}/_{ske}-present |naná^{ssə}/_{ske}-| of class 9, and thus *nanāmo* is apparently instead derived from the subjunctive stem |naná-|. As in other cases like *weñmo* and *pāknāmo* (Winter 1977: 147; Malzahn 2010: 343–344), the reason obviously is that |naná-| was in origin a present, not a subjunctive stem. This is further confirmed by the second-syllable accent of |naná-|, instead of the typical first-syllable

10 On this word, see also Pinault (2016b: 225).

accent of regular subjunctives, and by the Tocharian A cognate nasal present [knānā-], which both clearly point to a Proto-Tocharian present **knana-* (Peyrot 2013: 762).

5 TB *pāwe* (†*ṣāwo* ‘bath’)

Hesitantly, Adams (2013: 715) posits a noun *-ṣāwo* ‘bath’, occurring only in the compound *sārwāna-ṣawo* in Or.6402A/1.1 (W 13) a6 *sārwāna-ṣawo masketar* ‘... becomes a face-bath’. There are two obvious problems. On the one hand, Adams supposes that *ṣawo* is the unaccented compound variant of *ṣāwo**, while there is evidently no compound accent effect in the alleged first member *sārwāna*, for which in a compound *sārwānā** may be expected. At the same time, the first syllable of *ṣawo* cannot be accented, since it would then have to be /ṣāwo/, which would rather be written ***ṣuwo*. On the other hand, there seems to be no basis for the supposed meaning ‘bath’ in the context.

However, more serious are problems with the reading. The reading given by Adams is from Filliozat (1948: 69), who, using “()” and “[]” for currently common “[]” and “()” respectively, reads the line as

× (*ṣarwāna ṣa*)wo [mask]etar̄ e × tene *suṃaṣṣalle eṣa* ×

I think the correct reading is rather:

– – *rwāna* [p]awo[n]a *ma*[sk]ent̄ar̄ e[s]anene s[t]amaṣṣalle eṣa ·e

The second part can without further problems be interpreted as *eṣanene stamaṣṣalle*¹¹ *eṣa(n)e* ‘It is to be placed on the eyes. The eyes ...’. For the first part, the restoration of (*sā*)*rwāna* ‘face’ is likely, but the reading *ṣawo* is excluded because there is a further akṣara, which is probably [n]a, while the first akṣara rather looks like [p]a. The resulting [p]awo[n]a is obviously the f.pl. of an adjective, and a word *pāwe* is indeed attested.¹² Since

11 For *stam*-*caus.* ‘place’ vs. *sawm*- ‘trickle’, see below (§4).

12 The paper is damaged exactly where the horizontal closure of the akṣara should have been if it had been <ṣa> rather than <pa>. A reading [ṣ]awo[n]a

on account of THT 405 b3 *kaklaiksauwa sārwana* ‘a dry face’, *sārwanā* is a plurale tantum (Hilmarsson 1989: 85), (*sā*)*rwāna pawona māskenrā* can be translated as ‘the face becomes *pāwe*’. The entry *-šāwo* in Adams’ dictionary is thus to be deleted: no such word exists.

The idea that *pāwe* is a noun meaning ‘powder’ goes back to Sieg (1955: 74). Sieg has not included *[p]awo[n]a* in his discussion. As it turns out, *pawona* is not compatible with a noun *pāwe*, as there is no such noun class, but, as pointed out above, formally *pawona* looks like the feminine plural of an adjective *pāwe*. The following, difficult attestations of *pāwe* are known to me:

W 8 a3

[p]āwe ā(r)[kw](i)
‘... *pāwe* [and] white’

Or.6402A/1.6 (W 18) a3

lak_ṛ pāwe yamaṣam [e]śanene
‘... makes it *pāwe*. On the eyes ...’

W 30 a5

ṣarwāna • paścane kātso • po kektseñā_[ṅ] • ārkwi pāwe yama(ṣṣam)
‘... the face, the breasts, the belly, the whole body it makes white [and] *pāwe*’ (Sieg 1955: 74: “Puder (macht) [es] weiß”)

W 6 b2

pāwesa or *pāwe sa*, too fragmentary to translate

Or.6402A/1.5 (W 17) b2

nastukārm_ṅ eśanene kartse pāwesa ṣpa nestsi¹³
‘a nasal medicament in the eyes in order to be good and *pāwe*’ (?)
(Sieg 1955: 74: “als Klistier für die Augen gut, auch [gut], als Puder (?)
(zu dienen)”)

is therefore not completely excluded, but since no adjective *ṣāwe* is attested otherwise, *[p]awo[n]a* is clearly preferable.

13 The word *nestsi* has been omitted by Filliozat (1948: 71). Sieg (1955: 74) proposes to restore it, but it is in fact clearly readable.

Apart from the form *[p]awo[n]a*, I see the following arguments to take *pāwe* to be an adjective:

- In Or.6402A/1.6 (W 18) a3, *pāwe* is not in the right position of the sentence to be the subject of the verb *yamaṣām* ‘does, makes’. At the same time, for semantic reasons it can hardly be a noun ‘powder’, because what would be the subject in that case? The easiest here is to take it as an object complement, i.e. ‘it makes it *pāwe*’. Obviously, *pāwe* is then best analysed as an adjective.
- In W 30 a5, the same holds true. Sieg translates “Puder (macht) [es] weiß”, but this requires the supposed object complement *ārkwī* to come before the supposed subject *pāwe*. Much more straightforward is to take *ārkwī* and *pāwe* as coordinated object complements.
- In W 30 a5 *ārkwī pāwe*, in Or.6402A/1.5 (W 17) b 2 *kartse pāwesa ṣpā* and possibly in W 8 a3 *[p]āwe ā(r)[kw](i)*, the word *pāwe* is found next to another adjective. In Or.6402A/1.5 (W 17) b 2 *kartse pāwesa ṣpā*, the two are even explicitly coordinated with the conjunction *ṣpā*. The occurrence of the perlativ *pāwesa* in Or.6402A/1.5 (W 17) b2 and possibly in W 6 b2 is not in favour of *pāwe* being an adjective, but the construction in Or.6402A/1.5 (W 17) b2 is difficult, and not any easier if *pāwesa* is taken to be a noun. In particular, *kartse* ‘good’ could in that case not modify it, because it is nom.sg.m.

It seems to me that *pāwe* has a positive meaning: it appears to describe good results of medical treatment, for instance on the face. It is further coordinated with ‘white’ and with ‘good’. A possible meaning may be ‘clean’, ‘clear’ or ‘bright’. In all three cases, there would be a similar term, like *astare* ‘clean’, *takarṣke* ‘clear’, *lak_utse* ‘bright’, etc., and since it is confined to medical texts, it is apparently a more specific term.

If the proposed meaning is approximately correct, it is suggestive to think of a connection with Lat. *pūrus* ‘clean’, Ved. *pāvate* ‘becomes clean’, etc. (cf. e.g. de Vaan 2008: 500–501). In that case, the most straightforward reconstruction for Tocharian would be **ph₂uo-*. If the formation was thematicised later, **peh₂u-* would also be possible. It is theoretically

conceivable that a *w* was lost after *p*, i.e. *pāwe* < **pwawe* < **puH-uo-*,¹⁴ but there is no parallel in Indo-European or Tocharian for this peculiar formation.

6 TB †*səwm-* ‘trickle’¹⁵

A verb *səwm-* ‘trickle’ is posited by Adams (2013: 761–762, his notation is “*sum-*”; likewise Malzahn 2010: 950 and Peyrot 2013: 835) on the basis of these two occurrences:¹⁶

Or.6402A/1.1 (W 13) a6

eśane sumäṣṣälle

‘[it is] to be trickled in the eyes’

W 42 b1

/// *slānkälyā satkentampa sumäṣälyā*

‘it is to be pulled out and together with medicines [it is] to be trickled’

The meaning ‘trickle’ and the addition of the second occurrence are due to Krause (1952: 300), who changed Filliozat’s reading *sukäṣälyā* (1948: 79) into *sumäṣälyā*. Both the meaning and the change of Filliozat’s reading must have been based on a draft of Sieg’s posthumously published 1955 article (see Sieg 1955: 74, 78).

Above (§3), I have presented my revised reading of the first occurrence: *e[s]anene s[t]amaṣṣälle* ‘is to be placed on the eyes’. Thus, the existence of the verbal root *səwm-* now depends on the second occurrence. As it turns out, Krause’s correction of Filliozat’s reading is not warranted. I am hesitant to propose a reading myself, but Filliozat’s reading is obvi-

14 A parallel for this reduction is offered by *maścītse* ‘mouse’, which probably derives from **mwas-* < **muHs-* (Beekes 2010: 985).

15 My attention to this verb has been drawn by Federico Dragoni in the context of his study of the word *sumo* ‘libation’ in his PhD thesis (2022: 216–217).

16 I keep Adams’ translations and readings, except for the confusing *sumäṣṣalle*, *slānkälyā* and *sumäṣälyā*, which I have corrected to *sumäṣṣälle*, *slānkälyā* and *sumäṣälyā*, respectively.

ously better than that of Krause, as the second akṣara is rather *kā*, and in any case not *ṃā*. However, the reading of the first akṣara is difficult too. Perhaps the word should be read [*ṣ*]u[*kā*]*ṣalya* (cf. the quite similar akṣara *pu* in line b3, with the same relatively low upper left knob), but this is not certain and does not immediately yield a comprehensible translation: ‘is to be dangled’ (?).

Thus, Or.6402A/1.1 (W 13) a6 *sumäṣṣälle* is to be read *stamäṣṣälle* and W 42 b1 *sumäṣälyya* may have to be read *ṣukäṣälyya*. Neither of these forms can possibly be from a root *səwm-* (*sum-*), which is, therefore, a ghost.

[RECEIVED: SEPTEMBER 2021]

Leiden University Centre for Linguistics
Universiteit Leiden, Postbus 9515
2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
m.peyrot@hum.leidenuniv.nl

References

- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. *A dictionary of Tocharian B*. Second edition, revised and greatly enlarged. Amsterdam / New York: Rodopi.
- Beekes, Robert S.P. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. With the assistance of Lucien van Beek. Leiden: Brill. [2 vols]
- Burlak, Svetlana A. & Il’ja B. Itkin. 2003. “A sound change that never happened: The fate of Proto-Tocharian **o* (B *o*) in Tocharian A”. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 10: 17–35.
- Carling, Gerd. 2000. *Die Funktionen der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carling, Gerd. 2009. *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A. Part 1: A–J*. Compiled by Gerd Carling, in collaboration with Georges-Jean Pinault and Werner Winter. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CETOM = *A comprehensive edition of Tocharian manuscripts*. www.univie.ac.at/tocharian
- de Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dragoni, Federico. 2022. *Watañi lāntaṃ. Khotanese and Tumshuqese Loanwords in Tocharian*. PhD thesis Leiden.

- Filliozat, Jean. 1948. *Fragments de textes koutchéens de médecine et de magie. Texte, parallèles sanskrits et tibétains, traduction et glossaire*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur. 1989. "West Tocharian *särwāna* 'face'". *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3: 77–90.
- Krause, Wolfgang. 1952. *Westtocharische Grammatik. Band I. Das Verbum*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Leumann, Ernst. 1900. "Über eine von den unbekanntem Literatursprachen Mittelasiens". *Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg*, VIIIe série, IV/8.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2010. *The Tocharian verbal system*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Ogihara Hirotoši. 2012. "Tokarago B "Avadāna shahon" ni tsuite — The "Avadāna manuscript" in Tocharian B". *Tōkyō Daigaku Gengogaku Ronshū — Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 32: 109–243.
- Ol'denburg, S. 1893. "Kašgarskaja rukopis' N. F. Petrovskago". *Zapiski Vostočnago Otdělenija Imperatorskago Russkago Arxeologičeskago Obščestva* 7 (1892): 6–7.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2013. *The Tocharian subjunctive. A study in syntax and verbal stem formation*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2016a. "The Buddhastotra of the Petrovskii Collection". *Written Monuments of the Orient* 2016, issue 1: 3–20.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2016b. "Glossary of the Tocharian B Petrovsky Buddhastotra". *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 17: 213–247.
- Sieg, Emil. 1952. *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II*. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Werner Thomas. Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Sieg, Emil. 1955. "Die medizinischen und tantrischen Texte der Pariser Sammlung in Tocharisch B". *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 72: 63–83.
- Sieg, Emil & Wilhelm Siegling. 1921. *Tocharische Sprachreste, I. Band. Die Texte. A. Transcription*. Berlin / Leipzig: de Gruyter.
- Sieg, Emil & Wilhelm Siegling. 1949. *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B, Heft 1, Die Udānālaṅkāra-Fragmente, Texte, Übersetzung und Glossar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Sieg, Emil & Wilhelm Siegling. 1953. *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B, Heft 2. Fragmente Nr. 71–633*. Aus dem Nachlaß hg. v. Werner Thomas. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Sieg, Emil & Wilhelm Siegling. 1983. *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B, Teil I: Die Texte. Band 1: Fragmente Nr. 1–116 der Berliner Sammlung*. Neubearbeitet und mit einem Kommentar nebst Register versehen von Werner Thomas. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Thomas, Werner. 1964. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch, II. Texte und Glossar*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Winter, Werner. 1977. “Internal structure and external relationship of two verbal paradigms: Tocharian B *weñ-*, A *weñ-* ‘say’”. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 5: 133–159.