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Osaka University
Notes on the Buddhastotra Fragment
THT3597 in Tocharian B*

Michaël PEYROT

§0. Introduction
Recently, interest in the oldest layer of Tocharian B, so-called “archaic Tocharian B”, has increased considerably (cf. for instance Malzahn 2007 with focus on the script; Peyrot 2008: 188-189 and passim; Pinault 2008: 271-277, 348-350). The problem with archaic Tocharian B is that its corpus is small and fragmentary, even for Tocharian standards. It is all the more surprising that a number of archaic texts in the Paris and Berlin collections have remained unpublished even until present, although some are much better preserved than many of the archaic fragments included in Sieg and Siegling 1953 (for the press marks, cf. Peyrot 2008: 234).

One such fragment is THT3597, identified and translated by Schmidt (1983: 272-275), which contains a Buddhastotra praising acts of self-sacrifice of the Buddha in former births. As Schmidt refrained from presenting the original text and offering a linguistic commentary, it is high time the fragment were studied anew. It goes without saying that his translation, the identification of the parallel text B239, and his notes on the content are of inestimable value for the understanding of this text.

* In July 2007, I had the opportunity to study the original manuscript, which belongs to the Depositum der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz – Orientabteilung. I would like to thank Dr. Hartmut-Ortwin Feistel and the staff members of the Orientabteilung for their kind cooperation. Images of the manuscript are available at titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de through titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/tocharic/thtframe.htm. For valuable comments on an earlier draft, I am grateful to Alexander Lubotsky, Frits Kortlandt, Tijmen Pronk and Kristin Meier (Leiden), as well as to the editors.
Below, I will first present a transliteration (§1), then a transcription with a metrical analysis (§2), followed by an English translation (§3) and notes on the content (§4) and the language (§5).

§1. Transliteration

THT3597,¹ "das Prachtstück der Neufunde", according to Schmidt (1983: 272), measures 23.5 cm in width and 10 cm in height and contains 8 lines on each side. The fragment, consisting of a number of smaller pieces skilfully put together, stretches from the string hole (the "Schnurloch", covering lines 4 and 5 of both recto and verso) to the right margin, the latter being preserved for lines a5-8 (a tiny ink rest of the last akṣara of a4 is also preserved) and b1-4. Two large indentations reach from the bottom of the recto until lines a4 (the left one) and a5 (the right one), i.e. from the top of the verso until lines b5 and b4. The upper right corner of the recto and the lower right of the verso are lost. Of the full lines, one third misses at the left, the average number of akṣaras preserved ranging from 28 to 32, and the estimated number missing being about 15-16. Accordingly, the manuscript must have had about 45 akṣaras per line, and its original width was approximately 35 cm, or 36, as Schmidt estimated (1983: 271).

THT3598 (Mainz 655, 2) contains four other little fragments that may belong to the same manuscript.

The manuscript is written in standard ductus, but in an early variant without any important late features (in terms of Sander 1968: 182, "nordturkistanische Brāhma" A, alphabet t). All diagnostics of Malzahn’s classification (2007: 258-263, tables on pp. 296-297) are not archaic: 1) <a> and <ka>² are closed; 2) <ma> is usually closed, but sometimes it has a little opening at the top right (e.g. a1, a3, a4, a7); 3) <ma> has only a horizontal bar, no cross; 4) <sa> has no space in the middle

---

¹ The old press mark is Mainz 655, 1; the expedition code is T III. MQR, i.e. found at the Min-Öy site near Qizil in the red cupola cave during the third Prussian Turfan expedition.

² Some have a slight opening at the left, but none at the right (<ykne > b5 being an exception).
(<śa> does not occur); 5) the vowel marks for e and ai are standard (not left bound);
6) the upward stroke of <o> is modest in a7, but by no means small in b1. Worthy of
notice are some <ya> characters with an opening at the top right (e.g. a2bis, a3, a4,
b4), but they are found next to others which are closed completely (e.g. a8, b4, b5,
b6). A couple of <ña> characters are open at the left bottom (e.g. a1, a3, a4, b1), some
are open also at the right (e.g. a1, b3, b5), whereas the closed variant is also frequent
(e.g. a3, a5, b5).

The state of paper and ink is good, and generally the text is easy to read,
but some scribbles between the lines are difficult to interpret. Sometimes correcting
the text, sometimes explaining it, they are all difficult to read, and they do not always
comply with the convention to give corrections below the line and mark them with a
cross above.3

\[
a1 /// sā⁴ : mā nāś tsāṅkau eṅkālpatte pūḍnāṅktāṅne nuwāṅhe tāṅ prakrem māka
\]

\[
a2⁷ /// tāṅṇana laksāntaś : ce yāmorsa kaloym nāś tom laksanta po tāko-m
\]

\[
śa ///⁸
\]

---

3 The transliteration generally follows the conventional system (e.g. Sieg and Siegling 1953),
but I use “↑” to indicate the doubling stroke (e.g. < k↑ > = < kk >) and I distinguish “-” for
visible rests of an unreadable akṣara and “(-)” for the space of an akṣara of which no traces
can be discerned.
4 It looks like we have ka pi underneath, for which I have no explanation.
5 With an accidental ink spot underneath.
6 Two or perhaps three akṣaras are lost until the right margin.
7 Probably, 18 syllables are lost in the preceding lacuna (the rest of line a1 included), the same
number as between b7 and b8 (note 28).
8 Three akṣaras are lost until the right margin.
The exact size of the preceding lacuna (including the rest of line a2) is unknown, but it must be approximately equivalent to the space of 18 syllables. If tākoḥm sā /// starts the fourth pāda of a strophe (see note 34), this must be the last strophe. Accordingly, we expect 9 more aksaras of the pāda in the lacuna, followed by " : ", the strophe number, probably a double danda, and the metre of the next section between double dandas.

To the left is the string hole space; 12 syllables are lost in the preceding lacuna (the rest of line a3 included).

ya is added underneath with a cross above, probably clarifying the first syllable of the word yāmaisa. It is improbable that ya should be added to the text, as (onko)lmam yats yāmaisa or (onko)lmamts yā yamaisa make no sense.

Added underneath with a cross above: rwa.

To the left is the string hole space; 10 syllables are lost in the preceding lacuna.

In the preceding lacuna 15 syllables are lost.

Under the ṛhi, which is clearly a bit below the line so that the virāma is certain, there is a scribble [t]sa, again attached with a kind of virāma stroke. Accordingly, one might read tarñats, or, if what looks like a virāma stroke is in fact a vowel e, we have just tarñ with a gloss tse.

Over ramt, there is a scribble reading mo, for which I have no explanation.

Over the w of tañw, a little aksara se is added, and over the wa of ṣaṣwa a little sa, which combines with the wa below to a compound aksara swa. Thus, the two scribbles together can be read seswa (cf. also notes 19 and 21). I do not know what to make of yet another scribble in faint ink over < ṣaṣ >; it may read se or ye.

In the preceding lacuna 12 syllables are lost.

A scribble seswa is added above (se over ṣaṣu and swa at the left over we; cf. also notes 17 and 21). ṣaṣuvers could also be read ṣaṣuvers(s)e.
20 In the preceding lacuna 14 syllables are lost.
21 In vowel position, two strokes can be seen: one looks like <Xā>, the other could be <Xe>, or the body of an aksara added over <wa>. If wane belongs to a word ṣsuwane, this gloss may be a third case of seswa, this time written seswă (the added aksara would be <sā>, combining to <swā> with the wa underneath). However, this occurrence is much more uncertain than the other two (cf. notes 17 and 19).
22 To the left is the string hole space; in the preceding lacuna 9 syllables and the strophe number “5” are lost.
23 To the left is the string hole space; in the preceding lacuna 12 syllables are lost.
24 Three aksaras are lost until the right margin.
25 In the preceding lacuna 12 syllables and the strophe number “6” are lost.
26 The aksara has a clear e-stroke, which is, however, much too far left bound.
27 In the preceding lacuna 19 syllables are lost.
28 In the preceding lacuna 18 syllables are lost.
29 Four aksaras are lost until the right margin.
§2. Transcription

As Schmidt noted (1983: 273), lines a5-b8 have a parallel in B239a1-b6, which are given under the relevant pādas for reference. Lines a3-b8 contain strophes 1-8 of a Buddhastotra in a metre of 4 pādas with 18 syllables each.30 The 18 syllable pādas are subdivided into units of 7, 7, and 4 syllables, which I have indicated with the symbol “ | ”. The units of 7 syllables are further subdivided into 4 and 3 syllables, but this I have left unmarked. The pādas are followed by their number in rectangular brackets, except for the fourth and last pāda of a strophe (pāda d) if the strophe number appears in the manuscript itself.31 The strophe numbers of B239 are higher by 6, i.e. strophe 2 of THT3597 corresponds to strophe 8 of B239 and so on; for convenience sake, in the translation (§3) and the notes on the content (§4) reference is made only to the strophe numbers of THT3597. The poem might continue with the Buddhastotra set B207, B215, B221 with the same metre, but there is no text overlap.

Schmidt suggested that lines a1-2, which belong to another section of the stotra, have a metre of 4 pādas with 12 syllables each (subdivided into 4 | 4 | 4; 1983: 273). It is disturbing that in this small piece two out of four pāda end markings would be absent, but otherwise the metre fits very well, and it is adopted here.

[a1] /// sāː.

mā ṇāś tsāṅkau ǀ enkālpate ǀ pūḍhāktāṇe
nuwalṅe tāṅ ǀ prakṛm māka ǀ win.33 /// [a2]

one pāda is completely lost in the lacuna

/// tāṅṇana ǀ laksāntasā ā.

---

30 The metre of B239 was recognised already by Sieg and Siegling (1953: 141-142), who have offered a detailed analysis of the metrical units and the lacunae in their notes.

31 The beginning of the lines in the manuscript is given in rectangular brackets in subscript.

32 sā is probably the perlative suffix.

33 We could think of win(āskau ṇāś), if the parallel B216a3, where we can read /// [h]ā[ś], is correctly identified (see also note 34).
ce yāmorsa; kāloym ūaš tom; laksanta po 34

tāko-m śā /// [a3] /// –

kauna-peñyai kaum cmelsu; po kauñāktem ṣeṣṣirku; lāk₄sowñaisa : [1a]
maiyyā-preñcai viķšnu /// [a4] [1b]

///(oikο)Inantis yāmaisa; wešeññaisa tārkārwa; po sārkatai : [1c]
poyšiñnesse sumer ci; tārnese ūaš w(ināskau) : [1d]

[a5] /// mīne; tai wāsmone eṁsā(te); (snai ke)š cmela : [2a]
prakrem sāñ-āṁ khyautkatai; samsār(ssanā 35 lā)klenta; kā, [a6] (ltx) /// [2b]
(ahrāntessai 36 yārime; ekwalace waršā)lsā; māstā ārwāre : [2c]

B239a1 /// n'tessai yārime ekwäl(a)cc(e) w(ar)ks(l)ts(a) /// [8c]
tānwā(ssonta mā)tarñ 37 ramt; tănw s₃suwane sārkate-c; ka(rum au)rtstse : 2
empe[a7] (le - karāşne; seyi mīsa šawāre; trikos kessa : ) /// [3a]
B239a2 /// karāşne seyi mīsa šawāre trikos kessa(a) : [9a]
tănw mārsāre s₃suwarse; – – – (pa)ssānte; larem sāñ saul; [3b]
B239a2 [continued] tănw /// [9b]

34 Possibly, the position of the pāda end is corroborated by B216a4 (= THT1674) /// · ūaš (t)om laksanta po / [ ] – (so to be read pace Sieg and Siegling 1953: 129). However, the remnants of the last akṣara do not look very much like <tā>, which is the akṣara that we would expect on the basis of tāko-m in THT3597a2. If B216 is parallel nevertheless and the strophe numbers are the same, this would be the end of pāda 40c (B216 would have to be turned over).

35 Because the r is the high combined akṣara variant, a restoration samsārantse is excluded.

36 In the lexicon that is known there are not many words in -nte that would qualify; a restoration to arhrāntessai yields the correct number of syllables.

37 As far as the Tocharian text is concerned, a restoration (pāj)tarñ ‘fathers’ instead of (mā)j tarñ ‘mothers’ is equally possible (see Schmidt 1983: 273). However, Prof. Yoshida kindly points out to me that a restoration to ‘mothers’ receives strong support from a parallel expression attested in Sogdian: “L’homme qui pense à la buddhatā doit aimer tous les êtres autant qu’une mère éprouve de compassion pour son fils unique” (Benveniste 1940: 7, lines 64-66).
Following the translation of Schmidt, we could think of onkol(m)a(snah särwe)šne ‘in elephant shape’. The paradigm of särwece ‘form of existence’ is only imperfectly known: this occurrence would prove the inflexion type kektšene ‘body’, obl. kektšen. However, this restoration presupposes a development cn > šn, common in the classical language, but unexpected in an archaic text.

The “:” must be lost just beyond the right edge.

The assumption of an aksara <sa> instead of <sa> explains the relatively large distance to the following <ts>.
§3. English translation

Naturally, the translation given below is in broad outline and in many details based on that of Schmidt (1983: 273-274).

«I will not arise without having achieved the Buddha [worth]!» [c]

[this] firm roaring of yours (I) honour much. [d]

one pāda is completely lost in the lacuna [a]

41 Following Sieg and Siegling (1953: 142), probably to be corrected into myāyasta.
42 The reading kl(y)īye (Sieg and Siegling 1953: 142) is also possible, but kliye is more likely because that is the classical form of the word (Peyrot 2008: 109).
... with your characteristics; [b]
may I through this deed obtain all these characteristics; [c]
may I become ... [d] 44
O sun glory, o sun of [re]birth, you have surpassed all suns with your light, [1a]
o powerful Viṣṇu, ... [1b]
the ... of the elephants you have surpassed with [your] course, and with [your]
voice all clouds: 45 [1c]
you, Sumeru of omniscience, I honour with my skull ... [1d]
..., to these two friends you have kept in countless [re]births; [2a]
you have made yourself firm (in order to bear) ... the sorrows of the samsāra; [2b]
with unremitting energy you set out, ready on the arhat road; [2c]
your deep compassion has surpassed even love like loving mothers to [their]
sons. 46 [2d]
In the terrible wilds they ate the flesh of [their own] son, confused because of
hunger: [3a]
they forgot [their] love to [their] son [and] ... (saved) their own dear life; [3b]
in the (shape) of an elephant you threw yourself from a mountain as food for

---

43 According to the metre, tāññana is preceded by one syllable. Together with this one
syllable, it could theoretically form a four syllable word, but it could also be the f. pl. of
the adj. taññe 'your'.

44 This is probably the last pāda of this part of the poem; the following pāda is the first of the
next section.

45 Literally: 'the ... of the elephants with your going, [and] with your voice the clouds you have
surpassed'. Before (oṅko)lmants one more syllable needs to be restored, for which ymaī
(obl.sg.) 'course' is a possibility.

46 The syntax of this pāda is difficult. One would expects 'love like that of mothers to [their]
sons', but a genitive plural (which would be based on the scribble ts mentioned in note
15) is excluded by the metrical structure. Probably, the word mātarī (for mātāṛṇ) is a
nominative indeed: it may be the subject of a subclause with a verb in ellipsis. Perhaps the
glossator wanted to correct it into a genitive, just like we could be tempted to do. Instead of
tāṅwā(ssonta), we could also restore tāṅwā(ṁen ra) 'they love', but this makes the gloss
more difficult to explain.

( 152 )
[those] hungry [3c]

... this repetition ... your ... overcoming ... (love) to [their] (sons). [3d]

[Your] wisdom (about the ...)? of the samsāra made you understand everything, little and big [4a]

... your ... has compelled you to ... here; [4b]

... you have given up for our sake and you have endured [it] here: [4c]

the beings (?) with [your] mind. [4d]

The thought of compassion never let you feel happy (like) with divine (pleasures); [5a]

... voices ... [5b]

«for this ... world is entrusted to me;^50 me it has taken as [its] refuge» [5c]

[but] it gave up divine happiness and ... animal hatred ... [5d]

(When you were a lion), a she-monkey entrusted her two offspring to you;^50 a vulture carried them off; you saw that and out of compassion your mind shocked; [6b]

([and] with the blood from your flanks) you bought [back] their lives and did not let off — [6c]


48 An adjective in -še from an abstract in -īhe can be formed from almost any verb; (kse)līhesse ‘of the nirvāṇa’ is a possibility, i.e. ‘your entrance into the nirvāṇa’ or ‘your wish for the nirvāṇa’.

49 If to be restored as o(nolmi).

50 Apparently, senik woppa- (pāda 5c) is to be rendered as intransitive ‘be entrusted’, while transitive ‘entrust’ (pāda 6a) is expressed with senik and a different verb (a form of kal- as in B88b2 seems excluded here). Confusingly, the verb woppa- ‘receive’ also occurs in a construction with senik that means ‘receive in trust’ in B220a1 (see Thomas 1983: 242; Adams 1999: 699).

51 Schmidt (1983: 273) suggests: “[und] (verfolgte mich mit) tierisebern Haß (in unzählichen Geburten)”. However, that is a bit difficult to fit into the small lacunae we have. A possibility is (tārknov-ī) Ṭvāñai ścondai (cmela) ‘(released [again and again]) animal hatred (towards me [in the re]births)’. With Schmidt, the Buddha may still be speaking in pāda 5d, but it is also possible that 5d is again in the second person, i.e. (tārknov-ī) ‘released towards you’.

( 153 )
thus your compassionate mind was hidden in animal appearance, o so tender one! [6d]
(When you were a turtle), you gave [your] body away to the merchants to be stripped, [7a]
[and] with your body skinned you let them cross over the wide river by your love: [7b]
you have seen hungry (animals) and put yourself [a whole] kalpa to damage (in order to feed them); [7c]
... they cut off your (flesh) – o, pitying help and stay, you endured all! [7d]
You have seen the sorrows through hunger and illness (of the people) ... 52 [8a]
you have given ([your] own body) away ... to let the flesh be stripped in countless rebirths; 53 [8b]
as 54 out of compassion you set out with calm in the eight ... [8c]
... the heart [was] hit. [8d]
A woman ... [9a]

§4. On the content
Our text contains two different poems, or at least two different sections of a poem, as shown by the change of metre between lines a2 and a3 and the strophe number “2” in a6, which implies that strophe 1 starts in line a3. Although the first section is too short for a reliable interpretation, it is likely to be a stotra, especially in view of the plausible restoration *win(āskau ṇāś) ‘I honour’* in a1. Of the second section a much larger part is preserved: it contains remains of a stotra that highlights some of the Buddha’s acts of self-sacrifice in former births, illustrating his compassion (karunā) and patience

52 Thus THT3597. B239 has ‘you have seen the people [and] the world, sick because of hunger and illness ...’.
53 Thus THT3597. B239 has preserved only the end, which goes ‘... from [your] own body’.
54 *mākte* THT3597 could also stand for *makte* ‘self’, but *mākte* B239 can only be ‘as’.
As plausibly suggested by Schmidt (1983: 273), these two motifs might be identified with the “two friends” in pāda 2a: tai wāsmone eṁsā(t)e ‘to these two friends you have kept’.

The allusion to birth stories in our stotra reminds of the Khotanese Jātakastava (Dresden 1955) and the Jātakastava of Jñānayaśas (Shackleton Bailey 1954). However, an important difference is that the composition of the Tocharian poem is not as systematic as the two Jātakastava’s just mentioned, with 2 to 4 strophes for a jātaka in the former and exactly one in the latter: some of the Tocharian strophes contain references to more than one story, while others are of a more general content, not referring to any story in particular.

Interestingly, the birth stories of the stotra can be compared with the wall paintings of the grottoes of the Min-Öy monastery complex near Qizil, that is, the same complex where the manuscript leaf was found. In these wall paintings, the frequent depiction of key scenes from birth stories testifies their immense popularity at the time. In the study of birth stories, history of art and philology may complement each other: on the one hand, the wide variety of jātaka scenes represented often serves as a heuristic device for the identification of manuscript fragments; on the other, the greater detail of the written version may narrow down the possibilities of interpretation of the murals.

Below, the content of strophes 3, 6 and 7, which contain references to birth stories, is discussed.

**Strophe 3**

The Tocharian text of pādas 3a and 3b contains the following concrete clues: people who are out in the desert consume the flesh of their son which has something to do with their own lives, while they have forgotten their love towards their son. The only logical interpretation is that a mother and a father eat the flesh of their own son in
order to survive, which fits very well to the Sujāta-Avadāna, as plausibly suggested by Dieter Schlingloff (apud Schmidt 1983: 274). This avadāna, first translated from Mongolian by Schmidt (1843: i, xxv-xxxi), has been the subject of a study of Baruch (1955), who gives a translation from the Chinese Xiàn Yú Jīng 賢愚經 with notes on the differences with Tibetan and Mongolian parallels.\(^5\) In this story, king Supratisthita is forced by the revolt of a minister to flee with his wife and Sujāta, their only child. In his hurry, the king fails to bring enough food along, and, moreover, he accidentally takes a longer road than needed. Soon tormented by unbearable hunger he wants to kill his wife to eat her flesh with his son, but Sujāta saves his mother through self-sacrifice: piece by piece, his parents eat his flesh.

Although in the Xiàn Yú Jīng version it is not explicitly mentioned where the scene of self-sacrifice takes place, it is clearly in an uninhabited area where no food is available. Following Schmidt, the best rendering of karāśne, the relevant Tocharian B word, is probably ‘in the wilds’, rather than the traditional ‘in the forest’ or ‘in the jungle’ (Carling 2009: 115).\(^5\) On the one hand, this interpretation strengthens the plot of the story, where the lack of food is so important; on the other, it can be supported by the match between Tocharian A kārāśāntwā\(^5\) wārtāntwam MY2.8a7 and Old Uyghur öntä kūrtūkdä arigela semäktä MaitriHami2.9a20-21 ‘in a desert\(^2\) [or] a forest\(^2\).

---

\(^5\) T202, p. 356a-357b. For a summary of another version from the Zā Bāo Zàng Jīng 雜寶藏經 (T203, 2, p. 447c), see Chavannes (1910-34: iii, 2; see further iv: 201) and Baruch (1955: p. 344).

\(^5\) As far as I can see, the translation ‘forest’ was based on A70a3 kārāśam ‘in the kārāś’, which corresponds to vanavāsa in the Skt. Viśvāntara-Jātaka, No9 of Ārāyaśūra’s Jātakamālā (Steg 1952: 43; Hanisch 2005: i, 82, line 9). Probably, vanavāsa was taken as a more general ‘living in the wilds’ rather than ‘living in the forest’; \((-\)vana is otherwise translated with wārt, for instance directly before in a2 (l.c. line 5) and directly after in a4 (l.c. line 13). As Prof. Yoshida points out to me, this interpretation may be supported by the Sogdian parallel of the Viśvāntara-Jātaka, which has ‘\(Wy\ \ddot{\text{y}sh\dot{h}\) (line 800), ‘\(Wy\ \ddot{y}sh\dot{h}\) (line 813) “dans le désert” (Benveniste 1946: 52, 53).

\(^5\) kārāśāntwā is a writing error for kārāśāntu or kārāśāntwom, probably due to the next akṣara \(<\ddot{\text{w}}\>\) of the following wārtāntwam.
Grünwedel identified the Sujāta-Avadāna in Qizil grotto №38 (1912: 70, R52), where the king is about to kill his wife with his sword, which the prince, sitting on his mother’s shoulder, begs him not to do.\textsuperscript{58} It is further represented in e.g. №8 \textit{(Kēzīēr shikū 1, plate 37 lower right corner; Grünwedel 1912: 53, e)} and №114 \textit{(Kēzīēr shikū 111, plate 197 in the centre; Grünwedel 1912: 115, B20 = MIK III 9103)}. Although trees are by no means rare in the jātaka murals, in none of these a tree is depicted, which further corroborates that karāś need not denote a wilderness with trees.

Evidently, pāda 3c refers to a different story, since the Bodhisattva appears as an elephant that throws itself from a mountain to feed people who are hungry. This motif is well attested, for instance in the Hasti-Jātaka (Āryaśūra’s Jātakamālā №30), where an elephant saves in exactly this way seven hundred people who are lost in a desert, suffering hunger, thirst, and fatigue. The Hasti-Jātaka is easily identified in the murals: somebody is cutting flesh from an elephant that is lying on its back, e.g. grotto №8 \textit{(Kēzīēr shikū 1, plate 36\textsuperscript{59})} or №17 \textit{(Kēzīēr shikū 1, plate 71; Bihuā quānji ii: 23; Grünwedel 1912: 60, R12)}.

Pāda 3d is too fragmentary to allow a successful interpretation. Possibly, \textit{ce smā(m)} ‘this repetition’ takes up the two food donations directly preceding; \textit{yukāmane} ‘overcoming’ may refer to the Bodhisattva’s triumph over the body. If \textit{w-ne} is to be completed as \textit{(sₘₚ)w(a)ne}, it probably refers to the Sujāta-Avadāna of pādas 3a-b, but the reading is very uncertain.

\textbf{Strophe 6}

In strophe 6, we are on safe ground as far as the identification of the story is concerned:

\textsuperscript{58} We now have only his drawing left: the original was chiseled out during the 4\textsuperscript{th} Prussian expedition (von Le Coq 1928: 67-70), see the recent photo in \textit{Kēzīēr shikū 1, plate 115} (upper right corner).

\textsuperscript{59} Apparently omitted by Grünwedel between \textit{e} and \textit{f}(1912: 53).
the Buddha has bought back the lives of the two young ones of a she-monkey. As shown by Schmidt (1983: 275), this refers to the Simha-Jātaka. In this jātaka, a she-monkey entrusts her two young ones to the Bodhisattva who has the shape of a lion, but while the lion is asleep, a vulture catches the two little monkeys. In order to get them safely back, the lion offers his own blood as food to the vulture. The same story is found as №32 in the Khotanese Jātakastava (Dresden 1955: 436), as №32 in the Jātakamālā of Haribhaṭṭa (Hahn 2007: 137-150), and in the Dà Zhì Dù Lùn 大智度論 (Lamotte 1944-80: 2297-2298).

Thanks to the identification of the strophe with the Simha-Jātaka, the content of the lacunae is reasonably clear. Following Schmidt (1983: 274), the beginning of 6a probably introduces the Bodhisattva in the shape of a lion, while the end must contain a verb that together with senik means ‘entrust’ (see note 50). Pāda 6b is preserved completely, but the word (or words) sayusā is unknown and its interpretation uncertain. As far as the content is concerned, it is likely that sayusā is the word for ‘vulture’ in the nom.sg., but formally it could also be sa yusā or even sayu sā ‘the vulture’. Pace Schmidt (l.c.), sayusā is unlikely to be the perl.sg. of a word for ‘beak’, because the vulture probably needed to be introduced explicitly. Moreover, an interpretation as ‘with its beak’ is contradicted by Haribhaṭṭa’s caranābhyaṃ ādāya ‘taking away with [its] feet’ (Hahn 2007: 141, line 5) and by the murals in Qizil №17 and №118, which show the bird flying around with a monkey in its claws. The lacuna at the beginning of 6c must explain how the Bodhisattva buys the freedom of the monkeys; according

60  T1509, p. 307c. In another version from the Dà Fāng Dēng Dà Jì Jīng 大方等大集經 (T397, p. 70a-b; Lamotte l.c., who mentions two more versions on p. 2298) the lion gets the monkeys back after threatening to throw himself from a precipice, which is at variance with the Qizil iconography (see below). Confusingly, Dresden calls the bird an “eagle” in his summary of the Chinese versions (1955: 450; cf. also Schmidt 1983: 274), whereas it is a jìju 豪 in both stories, in principle ‘vulture’ (Skt. grāhrīṛa). Also in the Khotanese text, the bird is a vulture (Khot. aysgam [nom.sg.]; see Dresden 1955: 436).

61  A word sayu could only be singular, so that we can exclude ‘claw’, which would certainly need a plural.
to the parallels, he does this with the blood that comes out when he tears apart his own skin.

The Simha-Jātaka is well represented among the Qizil wall paintings, for example in grotto №17 (Kēziēr shikū 1, plate 60 in the lower right corner; Reza 2002: 157; Grünwedel 1912: 59, L8), №38 (Kēziēr shikū 1, plate 135; Grünwedel 1912: 74, L29), №114 (Bihuā quānjī 1, 147; Grünwedel 1912: 115, B18), №118 (Kēziēr shikū 2, plate 153; Grünwedel 1912: 106, Fig. 240), and №14 (Kēziēr shikū 1, plate 49). Although neither of these allows to identify the bird in any precise way, the image in №38 seems to emphasise the large claws of the animal, while the lion clearly tears the skin off its left shoulder with its right forepaw.

Strophe 7

Whereas pādas 7c and 7d are of general stotra content, 7a and 7b most probably refer to two different stories: in 7a, the Buddha lets his body be stripped off the flesh by merchants, and in 7b he lends his skinned body to let beings cross a wide river.

The problem with pāda 7a is that it offers few concrete clues. Schmidt (1983: 275) suggests that it is the Kacchapa-Avadāna, in which a turtle saves five-hundred merchants from shipwreck, after which they eat its flesh (e.g. Khotanese Jātakastava №42, Dresden 1955: 440). However, merchants appear very frequently in birth stories, and the motif of giving away one’s body occurs even more often. In short, Schmidt’s suggestion is a good possibility, but the identification can hardly be considered certain.

The Kacchapa-Avadāna is attested e.g. in grotto №38 (Grünwedel 1912: 68, R4062), №17 (Kēziēr shikū 1, plate 66, left above the centre; Grünwedel 1912: 60, R26), and №114 (Kēziēr shikū 11, plate 135; Grünwedel 1912: 116, b27). However, these paintings show the turtle saving the merchants, not the merchants eating its flesh, which makes the identification of pāda 7a with the Kacchapa-Avadāna even more uncertain.

62 Now chiseled out, see Kēziēr shikū 1, plate 115, centre.
Conversely, the theme of the story referred to in pāda 7b is very clear and there are two similar stories that fit very well. In both, the Bodhisattva is the king of an animal herd that has to flee but gets stuck before a river that they are unable to cross. In order to save the lives of his herd, the Bodhisattva lets them cross over his own body. In one story, attested for instance in the Mahākapi-Jātaka, №27 of Āryaśūra’s Jātakamālā, the Bodhisattva is a monkey that stretches its body from bank to bank over the river; in the other, contained for example in the Subhadra-Avadāna, №40 of the Avadānaśataka, he is a gazelle that stands in the middle of the river, offering its back as an additional support for the gazelles to jump over the river. In the Tocharian text no animal name occurs, but papāsausai kektsentsa ‘with skinned body’ can perhaps be used to identify the story. Although it is mentioned in the Mahākapi-Jātaka that the monkey king’s body is hurt (e.g. Khoroch 1989: 189), physical pain plays a much more important role in the gazelle story, see e.g. the Khotanese Jātakastava №5 (Dresden 1955: 425), the Avadānaśataka (Feer 1891: 157), Rockhill (1884: 139), and the Dà Zhi Dù Lùn 大智度論 (Lamotte 1944-80: 1651-1652\textsuperscript{63}). Because of this detail, it is more plausible that pāda 7b refers to the gazelle story.

Scenes of both jātakas are attested in the murals, although of the gazelle story only the Dà Zhi Dù Lùn variant is found. Whereas in the other versions a gazelle young is the last to be saved, the Dà Zhi Dù Lùn tells how a deer stretches itself from bank to bank, succumbing only after having saved a last hare. Illustrations to the Mahākapi-Jātaka can be found in e.g. grotto №17 (Kèziēr shikū ₁, plate 65; Grünwedel 1912: 59, L13), №38 (Kèziēr shikū ₁, plate 124 at the right; Grünwedel 1912: 68, R35), and №114 (Kèziēr shikū ₃, plate 197, mid left; Grünwedel 1912: 115, B21 = MIK III 9103). The deer carrying the hare is depicted in e.g. №38 (Kèziēr shikū ₁, plate 117 top; Grünwedel 1912: 68, R42) and №114 (Kèziēr shikū ₃, plate 136; Grünwedel 1912: 116, b7).

\textsuperscript{63} T1509, p. 250a.
§5. Linguistic notes

As noted in the introduction, the text is archaic. However, the language is not pure, but hybrid, which is in line with the dating of the script as “early standard” instead of archaic: the leaf was definitely copied at a later stage, when the classical language had already developed. In short, the vowels /a/ and /a/ display all features of the language of the first archaic stage, but further archaic characteristics, like /ew/ and sc (Peyrot 2008: 41 and 72, respectively), are not found, while āiš, attested once, is even a clear feature of the later classical language (on other possible later features, see below).

/a/

Although the spelling of /a/ conforms to the classical norm in the majority of cases, the number of exceptions is certainly large enough to classify the text as archaic. Long <ā> for unaccented /a/ is mostly found in final syllables: /// sā a1, laksāntasā a2, (ke)lāstā b1, sayusā b4, te-yknesā b5, wsāstā b6, māstā b8. Although pāda end position is slightly overrepresented, sayusā, te-yknesā and māstā are verse-internal, and of these only te-yknesā is found before a caesura. ānāłaska b7 is the only word with a certain “archaic” <ā> in another position, as the initial ā of ārwaře a6 could be the result of sandhi. Verse-internally, but also in final position, <a> is the normal spelling for unaccented /a/, cf. e.g. the verse ends of 1a, 2a, 6c, 7b, 7d, 8b. A distribution on the grammatical level is also difficult to find, cf. (ke)lāstā b1 vs kelasta b7, wsāstā b6 vs wsāsta b8, or short perlatives like yāmorsa a2, yāmainsa a4, weṣēñaisa a4, tārnesa a4 etc vs the long ones cited above. sān-ām a5, usually /ṣān-aṃ/, may owe its <ā> to the simplex ām. If yukamā(ne) a8 is correctly restored, it shows inversion of the classical spelling yukāmane. There are only three more cases of <a> for /ā/: laksanta a2 (next to laksāntasā in the same line), latkatsi /lātkatəy/ b8, naitta-c b4.
/ɔ/ is regularly spelled <ă>, cf. with <ǎ> under the accent: eiıkālpatte a₁, (ke)lästä b₁, cäk̃ b₆, täñw a₅, a₇, täñ a₁, a₈, tärkärwa a₄, tärnesa a₄, päls(k)o b₄, mäsṭ a₆, mästä b₈, yämaisa a₄, rīnassittrā b₃, lykā(ške) a₇, sāñ a₇, sāñ-ānm a₅, sāñ-ānm a₇, (sārm)tc(a) b₁, sākw b₃. The number of accented /ɔ/ written <a> is modest: kelasta b₇, ramt a₆, lalam(ska) b₅, wast b₃, skwantsi b₂. The fact that the two occurrences of <a> for unaccented /ɔ/ are found after /c/ and /w/, characters without Fremdzeichen counterpart, conforms to the pattern observed earlier (Peyrot 2008: 35): carkā-c b₂, sain-wasta b₇.

w-diphthongs
Most w-diphthongs in the text represent old /aw/ and they are written <au>: kaum a₃, kauna a₃, kauñäktm a₃, klyautkatai a₅, tukau b₅, papāsaua b₆, maukašta b₅, šaul a₇, tsǎnkau a₁ (on mokauška b₄ see below). One word with certain old /ew/ is nevertheless spelled with <au>: aurce b₆. In addition, we find <ow> in lākₜₜsow(324,641),(384,671), a word that is elsewhere rather attested with <ew, e>, (B135a₆, IT163b₅; see Peyrot 2008: 43). Theoretically, ow could represent a transitional phase between ew and aw, but in view of aurce with classical aw in the same text it is doubtful whether lākₜₜsow(324,641),(384,671) is reliable evidence for a development ew > ow > aw. A contamination of ew and au to ow, or a misspelling of au as o (i.e. for lākₜₜsauwŋaisa) remain possible, but ad hoc solutions.

kāloym a₂
kāloym ‘may I obtain’, with simple l for regular källoym, is probably a mistake: geminates are not generally simplified in this manuscript, and in the whole corpus, this

---

64 skwantsi B239a₆ would be a mistake for classical skwantsi in this otherwise classical manuscript, but the two dots are remarkably thin and faint, not at all resembling other <Xā> in the manuscript.
type of spelling is only found in colloquial material. On the contrary, the gemination of \(k\) before \(r\) in \textit{prakkrem} a5 (vs. classical \textit{prakrem} a1) belongs to a pattern not otherwise attested on this leaf, but with parallels in the archaic material.

\textit{seswa} gloss to a6, a7

For the word \textit{seswa} ‘sons’, gloss to \textit{s\textsubscript{a}suwane} a6 and \textit{s\textsubscript{a}suwarse} a7, cf. Peyrot (2008: 114). I have now hesitantly added a third attestation \((se)[s]\text{wā},\) gloss to \((s\textsubscript{a}su)wane\) a8.

\textit{niś} b3

Next to three times \textit{niś} ‘I’ in a1, a2, a4, we once find \textit{niś} in b3. The \(i\)-variant is completely unexpected next to the otherwise archaic vocalism of the text: it proves that the text was copied at a time when the later variant \textit{niś} had already come about.

\textit{seyyiśkane} b4

This dual obviously belongs to the same word as the plural \textit{saiyyiśkam} B352a3 (so to be read), as argued by Schmidt (1980: 407), who posited the meaning as “Tierjunges”. Later he added \textit{saiyi[s](ka)} B84b1 “[mein] Kind(chen)” (2001: 313\textsuperscript{65}), evidently with a slight adaptation of the meaning, since it is applied to a human rather than an animal.\textsuperscript{66} Apparently the word does not mean ‘young’, but perhaps something close to ‘offspring, sprig’. The spelling \textit{eyy}\textsuperscript{67} instead of \textit{aiy} or \textit{aiyy} is difficult to interpret, because it is rare in the whole corpus and it is hardly possible to establish a distribution. In this manuscript, however, there is a possible parallel in \((\textit{tai})\text{ynesiñ} b5

---

\textsuperscript{65} The author’s reading \textit{saiyyi[s](ka)} with double \(yy\) in note 60 (p. 313) must be a typographical error.

\textsuperscript{66} With hindsight, ‘young’ was quite unlikely for B352a3, too: \textit{lareñ s\textsubscript{a}s\textsubscript{u}śkam saiyyiśkām lli} ‘dear children and young (??)’.

\textsuperscript{67} \textit{sai} is excluded; cf. \textit{sai-c} b5.

(163)
(and a counterexample maiyyā- with a comparable phonological context in a3).

**mokauška b4**

In *mokauška* ‘she-monkey’, au alternates with *om*, and in the parallel B239 we find *mokowška*. The evidence is meagre, but it seems that especially in the word *omsap* ‘more’ a phonetic development to *ausap* has taken place. If the same development is responsible for the variants in this word, *mokauška* is another later form that does not actually belong together with the archaic *a*-vowels of this manuscript (on *omsap*, *mokomška* and the sound change *om > au*, see Peyrot 2008: 91-93).

**(tai)ynesiñ b5**

It is unfortunate that *(tai)ynesiñ* ‘of those two’ is damaged, because it displays serious irregularities. However, the parallel *tainaisān* B239b2 is clear enough, and reading and interpretation (gen.du. demonstrative) are beyond doubt. I have restored the first syllable as *tai*, but *te* is also possible; I have opted for the spelling *aiy* because it has a parallel in *maiytartsa* b6. This strange spelling might have to do with the sequence *tai tai*, i.e. kāryātai *tainaisān* in B239b2. The problems are not confined to the first syllable: we find *e* for *ai* in the second, and *i* for *ā* in the third. Although the form *tainaisān* is rare, its classical shape is certain (cf. further B153b3, B387.3a, M3a768). As have I argued elsewhere (Peyrot 2008: 120-121), the development of the genitive ending *-ān* to *-i* (cf. *tainaisi* B547b5) went through a stage *-ān* rather than *-iñ*; consequently, *-iñ* is more likely to be a contamination of the two than an intermediate form.69 Whatever be the explanation of *-iñ*, it is not a systematic phenomenon, since the regular genitive *-ān* is attested in *wesān* b1. If the *e* in the second syllable is linguistically real, we may compare *seyyiškane* b4 with *e(y)* for *ai* (see above), which

---

68 The latter to be read *tainaisaŋ*’. On this ending, which is also found with nouns, cf. Hilmarsson (1989: 61-67).

69 To my knowledge, this is the only attestation of *-iñ*, whereas *-əm* is well attested.
would point to monophthongisation; otherwise, it may have been formed analogically after the ubiquitous genitive ending -ne.

šetkasta b6

šetkasta ‘you let cross (prt.)’ is clearly a mistake; the regular form would have been šātkasta /šātkasta/. The akṣara is written in a strange way, with the e-vowel bound to the left, possibly to avoid problems with the large akṣara in the line above. However, this cannot be the explanation of the e-vocalism itself: precisely the akṣara <śā> would have fitted perfectly. We can only guess that in the original the vowel was written in a strange way.

stiyais b8

stiyai or stiyais is further only attested in B239b6, and its meaning is difficult to extract from this passage alone: Schmidt translates “in unerschütterlicher (?) Ruhe (?)” (1983: 274). Apparently he separated stiyai sokne after Sieg and Siegling (1953: 142; cf. also Adams 1999: 710), which yields two new words: stiyai ‘undisturbed’ and sok (sokt on the evidence of our manuscript) ‘calm’. A difficulty with this analysis is that stiyai can hardly be an adjective: -iyai occurs as obl.sg.f. ending, but the masculine would then have to be ste or the like (i.e. with a root st-!). In view of the t in THT3597, I prefer to separate stiyais oktne, which leaves us with one unknown word less: oktne is evidently the locative of ‘8’. Morphologically, stiyais is probably a perlative in sandhi, i.e. stiyais for stiyaisa. Schmidt’s interpretation of the passage could still hold, as it makes good sense; the word stiyo*, approximately ‘calm’,
could be related to the verb *staynask*- ‘be silent’.
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