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Flat mirror or well-shaped disc? Tocharian A \( tāpaki \) (B \( tāpākye \)) and \( A \) \( mukār \)*

Gerd Carling

1 Background

Professor Georges-Jean Pinault, whom we celebrate with this festschrift, is a longtime friend and collaborator. A substantial and long-standing joint project is the *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*, of which the first volume (letters A–J), which also included Professor Werner Winter as a third co-author, appeared in 2009 (Carling, Pinault, and Winter 2009). The complete dictionary, including all letters, is in its final stages of preparation (Carling and Pinault forthcoming). To compile a dictionary of a language, which also includes a thesaurus of all occurring texts, is a huge enterprise, which requires a good working collaboration between people of various backgrounds. For an extinct language such as Tocharian, expert philologists play a crucial role in the quality of the result. Professor Pinault is currently the world’s leading expert on the Tocharian A language, in particular by virtue of his contributions on the important Maitreyasamit-Nāṭaka manuscripts with parallels in Uighur (Geng, Laut, and Pinault 2004a, 2004b; Ji, Winter, and Pinault 1998; Pinault 1990, 1999, 2001, 2013), but also his work on the grammar and syntax of the language (Pinault 1987, 2008). His contribution has been fundamental in the Tocharian A dictionary project. The list of contributions by Professor Pinault in the form of books and papers, which underlie the Tocharian A dictionary, can be made almost endless. Another important resource for Tocharian, in which Professor Pinault has played a substantial role, is the database and corpus CETO-M at Vienna University. For the purpose of compiling the Tocharian A dictionary, I compiled a complete corpus and biography of Tocharian A (between 2003–6), which was made available in 2012 via the CETO-M infrastructure. Even though the philological work on this corpus is an ongoing project, the contributions by Professor Pinault on the side of Tocharian A (as well as Tocharian B) are substantial and very important.

To compile a dictionary is very frustrating work. As soon as you find something interesting and new, or you make a discovery, where you want to linger and go deeper,
you immediately have to finish and leave. Otherwise, you will never complete the project, since there are always new, tricky problems waiting ahead. Also, you cannot jump over the boring, uninteresting parts of the language, because each single word and occurrence has to be dealt with. Therefore, I want to use this opportunity to discuss and highlight a handful of interesting and connected lemmata in the dictionary that were not published in Carling, Pinault, and Winter 2009, but which are part of the complete volume (Carling and Pinault forthcoming). For these lemmata, the proposed solutions partly come from Professor Pinault, in collaboration with me, while others are my own reinterpretations of previous word meanings.

2 A tāpaki (B tapākye) and A lyāk and the interpretation of the marks of the Buddha

Tocharian A tāpaki is normally translated as ‘mirror’ (Krause and Thomas 1964:103). It is used in the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka to describe the soles of Buddha’s feet: YQ II.4 b4–5 tām māntne lyāk sīrā tāpā(ka)is ānt o ki šalpem ‘(the soles of his feet) flat all around (like the front side) of a mirror’ (Ji, Winter, and Pinault 1998:83), A 212 b6 lyāk sīrā tāpā(ka)is ānt o ki ‘flat all around like the front of a mirror’ (CEToM 2019–04–30). These passages both describe the first Laksāṇa or characteristic feature of the Buddha, which in Sanskrit is rendered as supratiṣṭhita-pāda-talaḥ, composed of supratiṣṭhita- ‘well supported, having beautiful legs’ and pāda-tala- ‘sole of the foot’ (Monier-Williams 1899:617b, 1228b). The Sanskrit original does not have a word for ‘mirror’, but the Uighur translation of the Tocharian A text includes Uighur köz-üngü ‘mirror’ (Gabain 1950:316): (MaitrHami II.5 a7) āng ilki köz-üngü tāg tüp tās adaqı ‘völlig glatt wie ein Spiegel sind seine Fußsohlen’ (Geng and Klimkeit 1988:126–7).

This is the ultimate reason for the canonical translation of ‘mirror’ in Tocharian A, as well as the translation of A lyāk as ‘flat’ (Ji, Winter, and Pinault 1998:294) rather than ‘sichtbar’ (Krause and Thomas 1964:137).

In another passage of the Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka, describing Laksāṇa 9 (Skt. sthitāvantañaiśu-pralambabāntā), A tāpaki is translated as ‘caps (of the knees)’, parallel to Uighur tilgān ‘wheel, disc’ (Gabain 1950:341): YQ II.4 b7 (MaitrHami II.5 a18) sne nmałune kapśānā āṃpi ālēnyo kanwēṃsīnās tāpākya(s) tkālune ‘(the ability) to touch with unbent body his kneecaps with both palms’ (CEToM 2019–04–30) and A 201 b4–5 (kālyṃmān kanwēṃsīnās tāpākya(s) tkālune) ‘standing (he is) able to touch the caps of his two knees’. This is understood as a metaphorical use of the basic meaning ‘mirror’.

Let us look at how a translation of ‘mirror’ or ‘caps’, based on the Uighur equivalents, fits with the other occurrences of A tāpaki. Ā 94 b1 (oblique singular) is too fragmentary, and so is A 188 b1 (locative singular). A 22 b2 (locative singular) is part of the Punyavantājātaka: (nā)kṣēyām tāpākyaṃ māṃtne arāmpātāntu puk ‘as a heavenly mirror, all forms’ (CEToM 2019–04–30). It is a possible translation, but not entirely satisfactory.
Considering these passages, I suggest a translation ‘disc, sphere, heavenly body’ instead of ‘mirror’, which fits the instances of the word A tapakī better. This means that the ‘mirror’ translation of Uighur is an addition or reinterpretation in relation to the Tocharian original. If we look at the preceding adjective A lycāk, I suggest a change to the translation which is more in line with the original translation ‘sichtbar’, namely ‘well-shaped’. This translation is closer to the original Sanskrit meaning in Lākṣaṇa (1) and fits better with the other contexts of this word (Carling and Pinault forthcoming).

Tocharian A tapakī is paralleled by B tapākye, also translated as ‘mirror’ (Adams 2013:296; Krause and Thomas 1964:196), based on the assumed meaning of the Tocharian A form. There are two occurrences of this word. One is B 73 a kaum tapakī ramt ŋ(ā)key(ai) translated as ‘the sun like a divine mirror’ by Adams (2013:296). The other occurrence is in a derived adjective, tapakisse, which occurs in IOL Toch 10 b2 ēakte nano tapakisse yerpesa translated as ‘now again he sees three stars by means of a mirror-orb’ (Adams 2013:296). In both occurrences, a translation ‘sphere, heavenly body’ fits the context better, hence B 73 a ‘the sun is like a divine sphere’ and IOL Toch 10 b1 ‘now again he sees three stars by means of a spherical disc’, likely referring to some astronomical phenomenon.

According to Adams (loc.cit.), B tapākye is a derivative of B tāpp- ‘appear’ (Peyrot 2013). Another possible origin, according to Pinault (Carling and Pinault forthcoming), is a loan from Skt. tāpaka- ‘heating, cooking-stove’, tāpikā- ‘frying pan’ (Monier-Williams 1899:442b–c), which refers to the shape of a frying pan (round and shiny). There are several problems here, first of all the form of the Tocharian word, which does not match the source so as to be a straightforward loan from Sanskrit. This can be explained by the fact that the word was borrowed via Middle Indic, which is quite common in Tocharian (Carling 2005). The other problem is the semantic change from ‘frying pan’ to ‘mirror’, which is strongly metaphorical and is not paralleled in any of the other Middle or Modern Aryan languages (Turner and Turner 1969:328b). Also, we would expect frying pans to be made of clay and iron rather than some shiny metal. The new meaning ‘sphere, disc’ fits better with ‘frying pan’ (due to the round shape), but, a more likely solution, keeping with Sanskrit tāpaka- as the source, is to use the primary meaning of this word in Sanskrit, which is ‘heating, inflaming’, paralleled by tāpana- ‘illuminating; sun’ (Monier-Williams 1899:442b–c) and take the meaning ‘heavenly body’ as primary in Tocharian, borrowed from a Middle Indic equivalent of Skt. tāpaka- or tāpana- with the meaning of ‘heavenly body, sun’.

3 A mukär* and A lycāk and the problematic context of A 375

According to a suggestion by Pinault (Carling and Pinault forthcoming), there may be another word for mirror in Tocharian A, *mukār, which is borrowed from Skt. mukara-, mukara- ‘mirror’ (Monier-Williams 1899:819b). The word is a hapax in the fragmentary and highly problematic passage A 375 a2, which contains several un-
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known words: /// späm lycäk mukram : akappiyo yvic kal’m – lakan triśkam pātruk. The passage is part of a Buddhastotra text which contains reference to a cemetery, including words such as A leps* ‘carnivore, jackal’, sukṛam ‘vulture’, and arkāmnā* (n.pl.) ‘cemetery’ (B erkenma). In the same passage we have a phrase akappiyo yvic ‘completely with impurity’, an unknown lakan as well as an adjective triśkam, together with pātruk ‘skull’ (Malzahn 2014). Tocharian A triśkam also occurs in A 365 b2, which seems to be a part of the Arāṇemi-Jātaka, in the phrase triśkas kāntvasyo ‘with a triśkam tongue’. In the Nachlass of Werner Thomas (Carling and Pinault forthcoming), a translation ‘blutunterlaufen’, i.e., ‘blood-filled’ is suggested for triśkam, which is difficult to imagine in combination with A pātruk ‘skull’ as well as A kāntu ‘tongue’. An alternative interpretation is ‘glowing’ or ‘burning’, which suits both contexts better. If 365 b2 is part of the Arāṇemi-Jātaka (the context is unclear), we witness the passage where the Brahmins torture the prince and tear the tongue out of his mouth, which then would be painful.

Immediately preceding the locative mukram in A 375 a2, we have an adjective lycäk, which recurs in the Garbhāṣṭra text A 150 b4 /// lycäk māskatār śalyās po, which can be translated as ‘(it) becomes lycäk on the left side’. Pinault (Carling and Pinault forthcoming) suggests ‘flat, smooth’, which would fit with ‘mirror’ for *mukār. This translation is paralleled by the translation ‘flat’ of A lyāk in combination with A tāpaki ‘mirror’ in the previous passage. The problem here is that A 150 b4, which is a Garbhāṣṭra text, likely refers to something changing, developing or emerging inside the body of a fetus, and it is hard to imagine something inside a body becoming ‘flat’ like a mirror. The meaning is likely something else.

Alternatively, we may assume that mukār* (via Middle Indic, cf. A suk for Skt. sukha-) is a loan from Skt. mukbara- ‘crow’ (BHSD 433b), and lycäk then designates a completely different property, such as the color or shape of this bird, for instance ‘black’, ‘dark’, or ‘grey’. This suits the context of the Garbhāṣṭra better than ‘flat’. However, this demands further philological work to be fully solved.

4 Conclusion

I have proposed a reinterpretation of several words in Tocharian A. For A tāpaki (B tapākye) I suggested a translation ‘disc, sphere, heavenly body’ instead of the previously proposed ‘mirror’. The word is borrowed via Middle Indic from Sanskrit tāpaka- or tāpana- with a meaning of ‘heavenly body, sun’. I further suggested that A lyāk changes meaning from ‘flat’ to ‘well-shaped’, which is more similar to the proposal by Krause and Thomas, ‘sichtbar’ and more in line with the original Sanskrit text. Finally, for A mukār* I tentatively suggested a meaning ‘crow, raven’, borrowed from Sanskrit mukbara- ‘crow’, and for the preceding adjective lycäk I tentatively suggest a color adjective, e.g. ‘dark, black, grey’. 
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