

Tocharian and Indo-European Studies

Founded by Jörundur Hilmarsson

Edited by

Birgit Anette Olsen (executive editor)

Michaël Peyrot · Georges-Jean Pinault

Thomas Olander (assistant editor)

VOLUME 18 · 2017

Museum Tusculanum Press

2017

Tocharian and Indo-European Studies, Vol. 18
© Museum Tusculanum Press and the authors, 2017

ISSN 1012 9286

ISBN 978 87 635 4619 5

Published with support from the Department of Nordic Studies and
Linguistics, University of Copenhagen

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Douglas Q. Adams (Moscow, Idaho)

Gerd Carling (Lund)

Olav Hackstein (Munich)

Jay Jasanoff (Harvard)

Ronald Kim (Poznań)

Frederik Kortlandt (Leiden)

Jens Peter Laut (Göttingen)

Melanie Malzahn (Vienna)

H. Craig Melchert (Los Angeles)

Donald Ringe (Pennsylvania)

Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir (Reykjavík)

Museum Tusculanum Press

Dantes Plads 1

DK 1556 Copenhagen V

www.mtp.dk

Contents

STEFAN ZIMMER

Klaus T. Schmidt (28. 4. 1932 – 7. 2. 2017) 1

DOUGLAS Q. ADAMS

The Tocharian B subjunctive and its Proto-Indo-European
antecedents 19

ILYA B. ITKIN & ANNA V. KURITSYNA

Chapter XX of the “Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka” and its hellish sufferings:
the fragment THT 1308.a 63

ILYA B. ITKIN, ANNA V. KURITSYNA & SERGEY V. MALYSHEV

Tocharian A text THT 1331 and the “Höllenskapitel”
of the “Maitrisimit nom bitig”: some more remarks 71

ILYA B. ITKIN, SERGEY V. MALYSHEV & JENS WILKENS

THT 1590: Tocharian A Hariścandrāvadāna 83

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

On the origin of grammatical gender 95

SERGEY V. MALYSHEV

The Tocharian A version of the Mahauṣadha-Jātaka 105

GEORGES-JEAN PINAULT

Current issues in Tocharian etymology and phonology 127

PETER ZIEME

Review of Jens Peter Laut & Jens Wilkens, *Alttürkische
Handschriften*, Teil 3 165

BERNHARD KOLLER

Review of Melanie Malzahn, Michaël Peyrot, Hannes Fellner
& Theresa-Susanna Illés (eds.), *Tocharian texts in context* 175

Tocharian A text THT 1331 and the “Höllenskapitel” of the “Maitrisimit nom bitig”: some more remarks¹

Ilya B. Itkin, Anna V. Kuritsyna & Sergey V. Malyshev

Although the document THT 1331 is poorly preserved, it provides very useful information for the study of the Tocharian A language and the Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka. In the present paper, we propose a new reading and analysis of both of its larger fragments, a and b.

The press mark THT 1331 contains three Tocharian A fragments: a, b and c. Fragment a, and possibly fragment c, have preserved their lower margin, while fragment b seems to have preserved the upper margin. Some of the lines are quite difficult to read, and many akṣaras are practically erased.

The fragments were discovered in Šorčuk; the expedition code of fragment a is T III Š 63, and of fragment b it is T III Š 95. The accompanying label has a note *Maitr. Sam. III* and a reference to the fragment Š 80.12. “Maitr. Sam. III” is the original designation of manuscript № 306–310 (M-δ) containing the Buddhist drama Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka, and “T III Š 80.12” is the expedition code of the largest extant fragment of this manuscript, also known as A 307. The hypothesis that the THT 1331 fragments belong to manuscript № 306–310 (M-δ), apparently proposed by Emil Sieg and Wilhelm Siegling themselves, has a solid ground with respect to the handwriting of the fragments.

Fragments THT 1331.a–c were edited in Schaefer (2013: 337, 341–342). However, this publication is preliminary and requires a number of cor-

1 We would like to thank Jens Wilkens, Hans Nugteren and Jens Peter Laut for very valuable suggestions on the text of the article.

rections and additions. While fragment c is too small, fragments a and b are very interesting both linguistically and contentwise. Below we propose our reading with a linguistic analysis and identification with the Uyghur text.

Preliminary transliteration of fragment THT 1331.a

a1–2: lost

a3 /// – ///

a4 /// – *m̐sar y[ä]rt[t]r̐a* : – || *an[tuṣ]* \ ///

a5 /// *[w]ri[nā]ñ_ā lwā [ś](w)[eñ]c[ä]m̐ [ts]ra[m̐] utkraṃ* – ///

a6 /// – \ *[śwā]lāṣi tkaṃ pā* (– –) *[s]k(a)tr̐a* || *pañcmaṃ* || ///

b1 /// *[ś]weñcām̐ tsp[o]k[i]ñc[ä]m̐ mā* (–) *[k](·)[ā] y. yk[o](m̐) oṣeṃ* : –
///

b2 /// – · *tsoptsām̐ empe[ly](ā)m̐ [klo]pasutsām̐ ka[p](ś)i* ///

b3 /// – *[śa]m̐* : *śo[lym](e)yis mā* – ///

b4 /// – *ta* ///

b5–6: lost

Comments on the Tocharian text

The document THT 1331 has been attributed to the “Höllenskapitel” of the Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka by Schaefer (2013: 337). This identification is based on the mention of ‘water animals’ (*[w]ri[nā]ñ_ā lwā*) in THT 1331.a a5, which has a parallel in the Uyghur translation, the “Maitrisimit nom bitig”, cf. MaitrHami, Chap. 25, leaf 10, recto 18. The two versions differ in the number of afflicted being(s) (sg. in Tocharian and pl. in Uyghur), so that Schaefer hesitates to make final conclusions, although she points out a great resemblance of the Tocharian and the Uyghur text (ibid.). As will be demonstrated below, all six legible lines of fragment a find a parallel in the Uyghur text, and therefore this identification can be regarded as certain.

- a4 *msär y[ä]rt[t]rā* ≈ MaitrHami, leaf 10, recto 14–17 ‘mit Mühe und [Not] befreit ...’²

The verb *yärt-* means ‘to drag’ and not ‘become free’. Therefore, if our identification is correct, the Uyghur translation is not literal here (which is often the case with the Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka). Besides, we might expect an adverb meaning ‘out, out of’ somewhere in the lost part of the Tocharian sentence, most likely *pre* ‘± out’, in which case its meaning would be ‘... is dragging himself out with difficulty ...’

- a5 *[w]ri[nā]ñ lwā [ś](w)[eñ]c=[ä]m [ts]ra[m] utkra[m] [ś](āwam klopant wärpnātär)* = MaitrHami, leaf 10, recto 17–21 ‘... fressen zahllose zehntausende von Wasser-Lebewesen (die Höllenwesen), saugen sie aus und stechen sie. Sie erleiden schwere, große Qual.’

The evidence of other Toch. A texts makes one suggest that *wrināñ lwā* simply means ‘fish’, cf.:

tmäṣ tom wrināñ lwā śākant sukrānāśśi śwātsi eṣār • (A 154 a4) ‘There-upon these water animals (= fish?) were pulled out [and] gave (scil. themselves?) to the kites (?) as food’ (the translation is ours; the translation on CETOM differs slightly).

saltās wrinās lwākiss elant eṣā (A 394 a1–2) ‘(He) gave alms to flying and water animals (= birds and fish?).’

A similar case can be observed with the designation of birds: in Toch. A birds are called *saltāñ lwā** (see the example above), and in Toch. B, *lwāsa ṣlyamñana* (see B 29 b8), both of which literally mean ‘flying animals’.

It is possible that the Uyghur translator interpreted the phrase *wrināñ lwā* as a designation of some hellish beings and therefore translated it literally as *suvdaki tınlaglar* ‘Wasser-Lebewesen’. As far as we know, this phrase is not found anywhere else in the “Maitrisimit nom bitig”.

2 The German translation of the “Höllenskapitel” is quoted as per Geng, Klimkeit & Laut (1998).

The last preserved akṣara of line a5 is reasonably read by Schaefer (2013: 337) as [ś]. Her restoration [ś](āwaṃ klopant) ‘great suffering’ also seems plausible. Another possible conjecture is [ś](urāmāntu) ‘calamities’, cf. (śu)rāmāntu in A 354 a1.

- a6 [śwā]lāṣi tkaṃ pā(kār mā)[s]k(a)trā ≈ MaitrHami, leaf 10, recto 21–23 ‘erscheinen sie <...> (mit Körpern) wie Fleischklumpen, die so groß wie Berge sind.’

The form [śwā]lāṣi, with an ā before the suffix, is unexpected: elsewhere we only encounter śwālṣi (A 30 b6) and śwālāṣi (THT 2463 b3). In the middle of the line a restoration pā(kār mā)[s]k(a)trā ‘becomes visible’ seems highly probable (see the Uyghur translation), cf. an exact parallel in A 184 a3: tkaṃ pākār māskatār.

- b1 [ś]weñc=ām tsp[o]k[i]ñc=[ām] ≈ MaitrHami, leaf 10, recto 23–25 + MaitrSānim, leaf 11, recto (Taf. 85, recto 5–10) ‘... und zerstückeln (diese Körper), indem sie sie mit den Schnäbeln und mit den Krallen in Stücke reißen.’

The verb *tspok-* is attested at least two more times in Tocharian A texts, in similar fragmentary contexts:

/// ñ lw[ā] tspokiñcām ś[w]eñcām ysār śwāl kapsiññās klopasuntāp : (152 b6) ‘... animals *tspokiñc* and eat blood and flesh from the body of the afflicted (being).’

/// [ñ] lwā tspoki /// (THT 1136 a1) ‘... animals *tspokiñc* ...’

The precise meaning of this verb is unknown (see the commentary of Michaël Peyrot for THT 1136 on CETOM). The Uyghur parallel for line THT 1331.a b1 makes one suggest a conjecture (*saltā*)ñ lwā ‘birds’ for both of those contexts, and for the verb *tspok-* the meaning ‘± to peck’.

For the middle of this line a restoration mā(k pu)[k](l)[ā]y(o) ‘for many years’ seems highly probable.

- b2 *tsoptsām empe[ly](ā)m [klo]pasutsām ka[p](ś)i(ñño) ///* ≈ MaitrSānim, leaf 11, recto (Taf. 85, recto 5–10) ‘[<...> werden sie] danach nun [in der] qualvollen Preta-[Existenz wiedergeboren], in der sie riesige Körper haben.’

b3 *śo[lym](e)yis ma[l](aññ oki)* = MaitrHami, leaf 10, verso 3–5 ‘Thre Kehlen sind wie [dünne Bäume(?)]’.

The meaning of the word *śolyme** is considered unknown, but the context in A 295 a3 = YQ-36[N.3] a7 (*sälpmām añcwāṣṣāñ pāñ kānt śolymeñ* ‘500 blazing iron *śolymes*’ in a description of hellish torments) suggests the meaning ‘needle’.

This phrase undoubtedly corresponds to the MaitrHami, leaf 10, verso 3–5 *kısl tąg [ken alkıg] karnı bolur .. [örtükın]čä bogzı bolur* ‘Their bellies are wide as an abyss, their throats are like *örtük*’. In Geng, Klimkeit & Laut (1998: 124) the word *örtükınčä* is translated as ‘wie [(dünne) Bäume(?))]’. But as Jens Wilkens has pointed out to us (p.c.), a similar phrase can also be found in chapter 15 of the “Maitrisimit nom bitig”: [*ignä*] *örtükınčä yinčä boyuz[lari]* (leaf 4, recto 2–3) ‘dünne Kehle[n] wie ein [Nadel]öhr’, see Geng, Klimkeit & Laut (1993: 203). Therefore, in the opinion of Jens Wilkens, in the lines MaitrHami, leaf 10, verso 3–5, before [*örtükın]čä*, we are to restore *ignä* ‘needle’ as well. The word *örtük*, as Jens Wilkens and Hans Nugteren suggest (p.c.), is the diminutive of a noun *ört** ‘eye of a needle’, derived from the verb *ör-* ‘to weave’. It should be noted that in the *Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk* of Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī a word *urt* ‘eye of a needle’ is found, which may be a misspelling or a variant of *ört**.

Therefore, for line b3 we may propose a restoration *śo[lym](e)yis ma[l](aññ oki)*, lit. ‘[like] the nose of a needle’. Since normally pre-tas’ throats are compared to the eye of a needle,³ the use of the word meaning ‘nose’ for designating the eye of a needle seems highly unusual. It would be easier to understand if it referred to the point of a needle, but, although such comparisons can also be found in the Buddhist literature,⁴ in that case the Uyghur translation must have been imprecise.

3 Cf. *sūcīchidropamamukhāḥ* ‘with mouths like the eye of a needle’ (Buddha-carita, 14:28). The same compound is also found in the *Divyāvadāna* (in the story of Śroṇa Koṭikarṇa).

4 We could not find examples in the Sanskrit literature. In the Chinese Tripitaka the phrase *yān rú zhēng fēng* 咽如針鋒 ‘throat like the point of a needle’ is

Final reading (with conjectures) and translation

a1-2: lost

a3 /// - ///

a4 /// - *msär y[ä]rt[t]rä : - || an[tuʃ] ///*

a5 /// *[w]ri[nā]ñ lwā [ś](w)[eñ]c=[ä]m [ts]ra[m] utkra[m] [ś]. ///*

a6 /// - - *[śwā]lāʃi tkam pā(kär mǎ)[s]k(a)trǎ || pañcma[m] || ///*

b1 /// *[ś]weñc=ām tsp[o]k[i]ñc=[ām] mā(k pu)[k](l)[ā]y(o) yk[o](m)
oʃem : - ///*

b2 /// - · *tsoptsām empe[ly](ā)m [klo]pasutsām ka[p](ś)i(ñño) ///*

b3 /// - *[sä]m : śo[lym](e)yis ma[l](aññ oki) ///*

b4 /// - *ta ///*

b5-6: lost

a4 ‘... drags himself out (?) with difficulty. || Then ...’

a5 ‘... water animals (= fish?) are devouring him. (He endures) cruel and torturous suffering ...’

a6 ‘... a land of meat becomes visible. || In the tune P. ||’

b1 ‘... are devouring and pecking (?) him for many years, day and night ...’

b2 ‘... with a big terrible suffering body ...’

b3 ‘... (like) the eye (point?) of a needle ...’

The Uyghur parallel according to the translation of Geng, Klimkeit & Laut (1998: 123–124) runs as follows:

MaitrHami, leaf 10, recto

14–17 Von diesen derartigen Leiden **mit Mühe und [Not] befreit**, erscheinen sie in einer K[leinhöllen]-Ex[is]tenz(form), die einem [100 Meilen] großen Fleischberg i[m] Ozean gleicht. **17–19** [Und] dort zerstückeln und **fressen** zahllose zehntausende von **Wasser-Lebewesen** (die Höllenwesen), saugen sie aus und stechen sie. **20–21** Sie erleiden **schwere, große Qual**. **21–23** Von dort befreit, **erscheinen** sie in einer unbewohnten

found a few times.

Schneewüste (mit Körpern) **wie Fleischklumpen**, die so groß wie Berge sind. 23–25 Und dort kommen aus den vier Richtungen Vögel und Wildtiere und **zerstückeln** (diese Körper), indem sie sie mit den Schnäbeln ...

MaitrSānim, leaf 11, recto (Taf. 85, recto 5–10)

... und mit den Krallen **in Stücke reißen**. Ohne Hoffnung, ohne Zuflucht, ohne Retter leiden [die Wesen Qual]. Aus jenem der[artigen] Leid [befreit, werden sie] danach nun [in der] qualvollen Preta-[Existenz wiedergeboren], in der sie **riesige Körper haben**.

MaitrHami, leaf 10, verso

3–4 Ihre Kehlen sind wie [(**dünne**) Bäume(?)].⁵

Preliminary transliteration of fragment THT 1331.b

a1 /// [ā]ñmes\ : udumparši [p](yāpy o)ki mā(s)[ki] – ///

a2 /// [klo]p wārpnāntrā [t]pār nu umpar ñom\ klyu yṣam [k](·)· ///

a3 /// [l](·)· – – ṣ(·)· (...) ·(·)[o] ·(·)ā –\ ///

a4–6: lost

b1–4: lost

b5 /// (pāl)[s]k[ā]nt\ mar was [m]e(tra)kām pālkāly(e) ṣ[e]ma[s\ :] – ///

b6 /// (·) [ña]reytwam w[o]rtam\ pālkā[c] (ṣ)ā[mn]āñ ko[s] (n)e [o] ///

Comments on the Tocharian text

In Schaefer (2013: 342) fragment THT 1331.b was published without translation and any attempt of identifying it with the Uyghur text. However, the verso of this fragment finds a parallel in two virtually identical passages at the beginning of chapter 23: MaitrSānim, leaf 1 and MaitrSānim, leaf 4 (Geng, Klimkeit & Laut 1998: 96, 97). The first passage seems like a more probable candidate, since the context of leaf 4 is rather well pre-

5 To be changed to ‘wie ein [Nadelöhr]’, see above.

served, and no parallels to the recto of THT 1331.b can be found there, while leaf 1 is followed by a large, leaf-long lacuna. Moreover, the address to the readers (or listeners) in line THT 1331.b b6, *pālkā[c] (ṣ)ā[mn]āñ ko[s] (n)e [o] ///* ‘Look, monks, how ...’, can well be the continuation of leaf 1 ‘Wenn man fragt “Warum?” (so gilt) ...’

Note that, according to Pinault (1999: 204), until now no Tocharian A fragments were known to belong to act XXIII.

a1 The restoration *udumparṣi [p](yāpy o)ki mā(s)[ki]* seems certain: cf. *(udumpa)rṣi pyāpy ok[i] ptāñāktañ māski ///* (A 30 a6) ‘Buddhas are as difficult to ... as an udumbara flower’. This is a recurring metaphor in the Buddhist literature, see, e.g., an example from the Divyāvadāna (from the story of Śroṇa Koṭīkarṇa): *durlabhadarśanā hi vatsa tathāgatā arhantaḥ samyaksambuddhās tadyathaudumbarapuṣpam* ‘Because, my son, perfectly enlightened tathāgatas, arhats are as difficult to see as an udumbara flower.’

b5 *(pāl)[s]k[ā]nt mar was [m]e(tra)kāṃ pālkāly(e) ṣ[e]mā[s] = Maitr-Sāñim, leaf 1 (Taf. 70, 16–23)* ‘... denken folgendermaßen: “Wenn wir doch den vollkommen weisen Buddha Maitreya nicht sehen und seine Lehre nicht hören würden!”’

This line is the first known example of the prohibitive particle *mar* used not with a verbal form expressing present or future events (present, subjunctive or optative), but with the modal phrase “verbal adjective II + imperfect of the verb ‘to be’”. Apparently, it was used for a wish expressing that something should rather not have happened in the past.

As Jens Peter Laut and Jens Wilkens (p.c.) point out to us, the Uyghur text has an unusual phrase here, which can well be explained by a calque from Tocharian.

b6 *[ñā]reytwaṃ w[o]rta=m = MaitrSāñim, leaf 1 (Taf. 70, 24–27)* ‘... und schleudert sie in die Großhöllen.’

Final reading and translation

- a1 /// [ā]ñmes : udumparši [p](yāpy o)ki mā(s)[ki] – ///
 a2 /// [klo]p wārpnāntrā [t]pār nu umpar ñom kl[yu] yş=ām [k].. ///
 a3 /// [l](·)· – – ş(·)· – (...) ·(·)[o] ·(·)ā [-] ///
 a4–6: lost
 b1–4: lost
 b5 /// (pāl)[s]k[ā]nt mar was [m]e(tra)kāṃ pālkāly(e) ş[e]mā[s :] – ///
 b6 /// (·) [ñā]reytwam w[o]rta=m pālkā[c] (ş)ā[mn]āñ ko[s] (n)e [o] ///
- a1 ‘... oneself. Like an udumbara flower ...’
 a2 ‘... they endure suffering. Their ill fame goes up high ...’
 b5 ‘... they thought: “If only we had not seen Maitreya!” ...’
 b6 ‘... cast them down to hells. Look, monks, how ...’

The Uyghur parallel according to the translation of Geng, Klimkeit & Laut (1998: 96, 97) runs as follows:

MaitrSāñim, leaf 1 (Taf. 70, 16–27)

Sie erblicken den verehrungswürdigen Buddha Maitreya, und diejenigen, die einst in einem Menschenkörper die Drei Kleinodien verabscheut haben, die grob und betrügerisch waren und die ein anvertrautes Gut verbraucht haben, denken folgendermaßen: “**Wenn wir doch den vollkommen weisen Buddha Maitreya nicht sehen** und seine Lehre nicht hören **würden!** Und wenn wir doch auch das Juwel der Mönchsgemeinde nicht sehen würden!” Nachdem sie solche Gedanken gedacht haben, trifft sie erneut der ‘Wind der schlechten Taten’ und **schleudert sie in die Großhöllen**. Wenn man fragt “Warum?” (so gilt): ...

or

MaitrSānim, leaf 4 (Taf. 71, 18–25)

... (diese) sehen [den vollkommen weisen Buddha Maitreya] und [denken folgendermaßen]: **“Wenn wir doch (bloß) den [vollkommen weisen] Buddha Maitreya nicht sehen müßten!** Und wenn doch (bloß) diese Mönchsgemeinde unsere schlechten Taten nicht erkennen würde!” Nachdem sie diese Gedanken gedacht haben, dreht sie der ‘Wind der schlechten Tat’ herum, führt sie (fort) und **schleudert sie in die Großhöllen.** Was nun diejenigen (Höllenwesen) betrifft, die ein warmes, weiches Herz haben ...

[RECEIVED: OCTOBER 2017]

Ilya B. Itkin
Marshala Koneva Street, 5-2
123060 Moscow
Russia
ilya.borisovich.itkin@gmail.com

Anna V. Kuritsyna
Abelmanovskaya Street, 6-65
109147 Moscow
Russia
linnansaari@gmail.com

Sergey V. Malyshev
Novatorov Street 34, bldg. 7, app. 6
119421 Moscow
Russia
sjerjozha@yandex.ru

Bibliography

CETOM = A comprehensive edition of Tocharian manuscripts. www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/

- Geng Shimin, Hans-Joachim Klimkeit & Jens Peter Laut. 1993. “Das Erlangen der unvergleichlichen Buddhawürde”. Das 15. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der Maitrisimit. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 20. 182–234.
- Geng Shimin, Hans-Joachim Klimkeit & Jens Peter Laut. 1998. *Eine buddhistische Apokalypse. Die Höllenkapitel (20–25) und die Schlußkapitel (26–27) der Hami-Handschrift der alttürkischen Maitrisimit. Unter Einbeziehung von Manuskriptteilen des Textes aus Sänjim und Murtuk*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1999. Restitution du Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka en tokharien A: Bilan provisoire et recherches complémentaires sur l’acte XXVI. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 8. 189–240.
- Schaefer, Christiane. 2013. Zur Katalogisierung der tocharischen Handschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung. In Yukiyo Kasai, Abdurishid Yakup & Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst (eds.), *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit*, 325–348. Turnhout: Brepols.

TOCHARIAN AND INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES (abbreviated TIES) was founded in 1987 by Jörundur Hilmarsson and appeared under his editorship in Reykjavík, Iceland, until his death in 1992. Vol. 6 appeared posthumously in 1993 under the editorial finish of Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir who also supervised the continuation of the Supplementary Series up to vol. 5 in 1997. Vols. 7 to 10 were published by C. A. Reitzel Publishers Ltd., Copenhagen. Subsequent volumes are published by Museum Tusculanum Press in Copenhagen.

Editors:

Birgit Anette Olsen (executive editor, Copenhagen)
Michaël Peyrot (Leiden)
Georges-Jean Pinault (Paris)
Thomas Olander (assistant editor, Copenhagen)

Orders and correspondence concerning distribution should be directed to:

Museum Tusculanum Press
Dantes Plads 1
DK 1556 Copenhagen V
Denmark
info@mtp.dk

Manuscripts for publication and other correspondence on editorial matters should be directed to:

Mail: Georges-Jean Pinault
École Pratique des Hautes Études. À la Sorbonne.
54 rue Saint-Jacques. CS 20525.
75005 Paris
France

Email: ties@hum.ku.dk