Title	Notes on the Buddhastotra Fragment THT3597 in Tocharian B
Author(s)	Peyrot, Michaël
Citation	内陸アジア言語の研究. 2010, 25, p. 143-169
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/26139
rights	
Note	

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 It is all the more surprising that a number of archaic texts in the Paris and Berlin collections have remained unpublished even until present, although some are much better preserved than many of the archaic fragments included in Sieg and Siegling 1953 (for the press marks, cf.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.

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 Brāhmī" 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) < ṣa > 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 Miṇ-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).

(< ṣ́a > 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. a2[bis], 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 /// sā[4] **:** mā ñäś tsäṅkau e[5]ṅ*kalpatte* pūdñä*ktaññe* nuwalñe *taṅ* prakreṃ māka wi[n]· ///[6]

a2 [7]/// ·[t]· *taññana* lakṣāntasā **:** ce yāmorsa *kaloym* ñäś toṃ lakṣanta po tāko₁m *ṣa* ///[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.

a3 [9]/// – *kauna-peñyai kauṃ cmelṣu po kauñäktem ṣeṣṣirku lak̰tsowñaisa* **:** *maiyyā-preñcai vikṣnu* ///[8]

a4 [10]/// *lmaṃts yä*[11]*maisa weśeññaisa tarka*[12] *po ṣārkatai* **:** *poyśiññeṣṣe sumer ci tarnesa ñäś w· (–) –*

a5 [13]/// *mñe tai wäṣmone eṅsā·[e] (–) ·[e]ś cmela* **:** *prakṭrem ṣañ-āñm̰ klyautkatai saṃsā[r]·· (– –) klenta ka*

a6 [14]/// *ltsa mastʿ ārwāre* **:** *taṅwä – (– – –) [ta]rñ̰*[15] *ramt̰*[16] *taṅw̰ s̰asuwa*[17]*ne ṣārkate-c ka (–) – rtstse* **:** *2 empe*

a7 [18]/// *[ta]ṅw̰ marsāre s̰asuwerṣe*[19] *(– – – – –) ṣṣānte larem ṣañ śaul̰* **:** *oṅkol·a (– – –) śne ṣlemem ṣa*

---

9 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 *tāko̢m ṣä* /// starts the fourth pāda of a strophe (see note 34), this must be the last strophe. Accordingly, we expect 9 more akṣaras of the pāda in the lacuna, followed by " **:** ", the strophe number, probably a double daṇḍa, and the metre of the next section between double daṇḍas.

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

11 *ya* is added underneath with a cross above, probably clarifying the first syllable of the word *yämaisa*. It is improbable that *ya* should be added to the text, as *(oṅko)lmaṃ yats yämaisa* or *(oṅko)lmaṃts yä yamaisa* make no sense.

12 Added underneath with a cross above: *rwa*.

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

14 In the preceding lacuna 15 syllables are lost.

15 Under the *rñ*, 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*.

16 Over *ramt̰* there is a scribble reading *mo*, for which I have no explanation.

17 Over the *w* of *taṅw̰* a little akṣara *se* is added, and over the *wa* of *s̰asuwa* a little *sa*, which combines with the *wa* below to a compound akṣara *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 < s̰asu >; it may read *se* or *ye*.

18 In the preceding lacuna 12 syllables are lost.

19 A scribble *seswa* is added above (*se* over *s̰asu* and *swa* at the left over *we*; cf. also notes 17 and 21). *s̰asuwerṣe* could also be read *s̰asuwerṣ(ṣ)e*.

a8 [20]/// _tañ_ yukamā (– – – – – –) w[a][21]ne **:** 3 saṃsārantse (– – – – – –)

po śārsa ly[k]_a_

b1 [20]/// – rtate-c[a] tn[ek] s[ā] – (– – – – – –) lñesse wes_añ_ (–) ·ts· – (– –) –

lastā **:** o

b2 [20]/// p(a)lskosa **:** 4 ñäkcya – (– – – –) [n]· skwantsi nta kca carkā-c mā

karuṃ pa[l]·· (– –) ṣana weśe

b3 [20]/// kṣ·· śaiṣṣe se ñi wa senik_ (– – –) ñiś_ wast⁄ eṅku **:** rīnäṣṣitr_a_ _sakw_ ña

– (–) – lwāñai śconai

b4 [22]/// ṣeyyiśkane mokauśka se (– –) ·[l]y·[y]-c_ **:** sayusā ceṃ cālate tu lyakāsta

ka·u[·]ts· naitta-c _pals·o_ **:**

b5 [23]/// ynesiñ[a] mā _sp_ maukāsta **:** karuṃ palsko te-yknesā lwāññe rupne tukau

ṣai-c_ tot_ lal[a]ṃ ///[24]

b6 [25]/// [ke]ktseñ wsāstā **:** papāsausai kektsentsa śe[26] tkasta ceṃ cäk⁄ aurce śār

maiytartsa **:** keś[c]yeṃ [l·]· ///[24]

b7 [27]/// latkānte-c_ āñmālaṣka saiṃ_-wasta po kelasta **:** 7 kest_ tekisa _lakle_ – ///[24]

b8 [28]/// – wsāsta mīsa latkatsi snai keś cmela **:** stiyais⁄ oktne karuntsa _makte_

mastā ///[29]

---

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 akṣara added over <wa>. If wane belongs to a word _s_a_suwane, this gloss may be a third case of seswa, this time written seswā (the added akṣara 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 akṣaras are lost until the right margin.

25 In the preceding lacuna 12 syllables and the strophe number "6" are lost.

26 The akṣara 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 akṣaras 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] /// sā ∶ [32]

mā ñäś tsāṅkau ¦ eṅkälpatte ¦ pūdñäktäññe

nuwalñe täñ ¦ prakrem māka ¦ win·[33] //// [a2]

    one pāda is completely lost in the lacuna

/// ·t· täññana ¦ lakṣāntasā ∶

---

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 ñäś)*, if the parallel B216a3, where we can read /// *[ñ]ä[ś]*ˎ ∶ *39*, is correctly identified (see also note 34).

ce yāmorsa ¦ käloym ñäś tom ¦ lakṣanta po[34]

tāko̦m ṣä /// [a3] */// –*

kauna-peñyai kaum cmelṣu ¦ po kauñäktem ṣeṣṣirku ¦ läk$_u$tsowñaisa ꞉ [1a]

maiyyā-preñcai vikṣnu /// [a4] [1b]

///(oṅko)lmamts yämaisa ¦ weśeññaisa tärkärwa ¦ po ṣārkatai ꞉ [1c]

poyśiññeṣṣe sumer ci ¦ tärnesa ñäś w(ināskau) ¦ [1d]

[a5] */// mñe ¦ tai wāṣmone eṅsā(t)e ¦ (snai ke)ś cmela* ꞉ [2a]

prakkrem ṣäñ-āñm klyautkatai ¦ samsār(ṣṣana[35] *lä)klenta ¦ kä*[a6] *(ltsi) ////* [2b]

(arhānteṣṣai[36] *ytārine ¦ ekwalacce warkṣä)ltsa ¦ mäst↗ ārwāre* ꞉ [2c]

 B239a1 *//// nteṣṣai ytārine ekwal(a)cc(e) w(ar)kṣä(l)ts(a) ///* [8c]

täṅwä(ssonta mā)tarñ[37] *ramt ¦ täṅw s$_ä$suwane ṣārkate-c ¦ ka(rum au)rtstse* ꞉ 2

empe[a7] *(le – karāśne ¦ seyi mīsa śawāre ¦ trikoṣ kessa* ꞉ *) ///* [3a]

 B239a2 *//// karāśne seyi mīsa śawāre trikoṣ kess(a)* ꞉ [9a]

täṅw märsāre s$_ä$suwerṣe ¦ – – – – (pa)ṣṣānte ¦ larem ṣäñ śaul ꞉ [3b]

 B239a2 [continued] *taṅw ///* [9b]

---

34 Possibly, the position of the pāda end is corroborated by B216a4 (= THT1674) *///·· ñ[ä]ś (t)om lakṣānta 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 *tāko̦m* 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 *samsār(antse)* is excluded.

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

37 As far as the Tocharian text is concerned, a restoration *(pā)tarñ* 'fathers' instead of *(mā)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).

oṅkol(m)a − − − *śne*[38] ¦ *ṣlemeṃ sä*[a8] *(ñ-āñm ṣalātai* ¦ *keścyeṃts śwātsi* **:** *)* [3c]

B239a3 /// *ṣlemeṃ ṣañ āñm ṣalātai keścyeṃts śwāts(i)* **:** [9c]

/// *täñ* ¦ *yukamā(ne)* − − − − − − *wane* **:** *3*

B239a3 [continued] *ce smā(ṃ)* /// [9d]

saṃsārantse − − − ¦ *(aiśämñe ci) po śārsa* ¦ *lykä*[b1] *(śke trekte* **:** *)* [4a]

B239a4 /// *aiśamñe ci po śārsa lykaśke trekte*[39] [10a]

/// *(ṣā)rtate-c* ¦ *tnek sā* − − [4b]

− − − − − *lñeṣṣe* ¦ *wesäñ (sä*[40]*rm)ts(a rintsatai* ¦ *tnek ke)lästā* **:** [4c]

B239a5 /// *ṣse wesäñ ṣarmtsa rintsatai tnek kelasta*[39] [10c]

o [b2] /// *p(a)lskosa* **:** *4*

ñäkcya(na ramt skwänma)n(e) ¦ *skwantsi nta kca carkā-c mā* ¦ *karuṃ pal(sko)* [5a]

B239a6 /// *skwäntsi nta kca cärkā-c mā karuṃ pal(sk)o*[39] [11a]

− − *ṣana weśe(ññaiṃ)* ¦ [5b]

[b3] /// *kṣ·· śaiṣṣe se* ¦ *ñi wa senik (wärpau ste)* ¦ *ñiś wast⁀ eṅku* **:** [5c]

B239a7 /// *wa senik wärpau ste ñäś wa* /// [11c]

rīnäṣṣiträ säkw ña(kcye) ¦ − − *lwāñai* ¦ *śconai* [b4] /// [5d]

/// ¦ *ṣeyyiśkane mokauśka* ¦ *se(nik)* − *[ly]·[y]·-c* **:** [6a]

B239b1 /// *(ṣai)yiśkane mokowśka senik* ///

sayusā ceṃ cālate ¦ *tu lyakāsta ka(r)u(ṃ)ts(a)* ¦ *naitta-c päls(k)o* **:** [6b]

[b5] /// *(* ¦ *śaul käryātai tai)ynesiñ* ¦ *mā ṣp maukāsta* **:** [6c]

B239b2 /// *śaul käryātai tainaisäñ mā ṣ mauk(ā)st(a)*[39] [12c]

---

38 Following the translation of Schmidt, we could think of *oṅkol(m)a(ññai särwe)śne* 'in elephant shape'. The paradigm of *särwece* 'form of existence' is only imperfectly known: this occurrence would prove the inflexion type *kektseñe* 'body', obl. *kektseñ*. However, this restoration presupposes a development *cn > śn*, common in the classical language, but unexpected in an archaic text.

39 The " **:** " must be lost just beyond the right edge.

40 The assumption of an akṣara <ṣ̱a> instead of <ṣa> explains the relatively large distance to the following <·ts·>.

karuṃ palsko te-yknesā | lwāññe rupne tukau ṣai-c | tot lalaṃ(ṣka [b6] *6)*

/// (ne | käryortantäṃts lātkatsi) | kektseň wsāstā **:** [7a]

B239b3 /// *ne käryortantäṃts lātkatsi kektseň wsā(sta* **:** *)* [13a]

papāsausai kektsentsa | śetkasta ceṃ cäk⁓ aurce | śār maiytartsa **:** [7b]

keścyeṃ l(wāsa lyakāsta | kālpo ṣaň āňm myāyasta) /// [7c]

B239b4 /// *lyakāsta kālpo ṣaň āňm myāsta*[41] /// [13c]

[b7] /// *latkānte-c | āňmālaṣka saim-wasta | po kelasta* **:** *7*

B239b5 /// *13*

kest tekisa läkle(nta | śāmňe śaiṣṣe lyakāsta |) /// [8a]

B239b5 [continued] *k(e)st tekisa alāṣmoṃ śāmňe (ś)aiṣṣ(e) lya(kāsta) ///* [14a]

[b8] /// − | *wsāsta mīsa latkatsi | snai keś cmela* **:** [8b]

B239b6 /// *ṣ(a)ň kektseňmeṃ* **:** [14b]

stiyais⁓ oktne karuntsa | mäkte mästā /// [8c]

· B239b6 [continued] *stiyais⁓ okne karūnt(sa) mäkte ma ///* [14c]

B239b7 /// *aunw arañce 14*

B239b7 [continued] *kliye*[42] *·e ///* [15a]

§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)iye* (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[43] ... 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 saṃsāra; [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, *täññana* 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)lmaṃts* one more syllable needs to be restored, for which *ymai*
   (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 *mātarñ* (for *mātärñ*) 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
   täñwä(ssonta), we could also restore *täñwä(ññeṃ ra)* 'they love', but this makes the gloss
   more difficult to explain.

[those] hungry [3c]

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

[Your] wisdom (about the ...)[47] of the saṃsāra made you understand everything, little and big [4a]

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

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

the beings (?)[49] ... 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 ... [51] [5d]

(When you were a lion), a she-monkey entrusted her two offspring to you;[50] [6a]

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]

---

47 Schmidt suggests "Eigenart" (1983: 273).

48 An adjective in -ṣṣe from an abstract in -lñe can be formed from almost any verb; (kse)lñeṣṣe '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 wərpa- (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 kəlp- as in B88b2 seems excluded here). Confusingly, the verb wərpa- '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) tierischem Haß (in unzähligen Geburten)". However, that is a bit difficult to fit into the small lacunae we have. A possibility is (tärknoy-ñ) lwāñai śconai (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. (tärknoy-c) 'released towards you'.

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 ñäś)* '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 (*karuṇā*) 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 *mäkte* THT3597 could also stand for *makte* 'self', but *mäkte* B239 can only be 'as'.

(*kṣānti*). As plausibly suggested by Schmidt (1983: 273), these two motifs might be identified with the "two friends" in pāda 2a: *tai wāṣmone eṅsā(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 Miṅ-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 *Xián Yú Jīng* 賢愚經 with notes on the differences with Tibetan and Mongolian parallels.[55] In this story, king Supratiṣṭhita 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 *Xián 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 *karaśne*, the relevant Tocharian B word, is probably 'in the wilds', rather than the traditional 'in the forest' or 'in the jungle' (Carling 2009: 115).[56] 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 *kārāśäntwä*[57] *wärtäntwaṃ* MY2.8a7 and Old Uygur *öṇtä kürtükdä arïgda semäktä* MaitriHami2.9a20-21 'in a desert₂ [or] a forest₂'.

---

55 T202, p. 356a-357b. For a summary of another version from the *Zá Bǎo 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).

56 As far as I can see, the translation 'forest' was based on A70a3 *kārāśaṃ* 'in the *karāś*', which corresponds to *vanavāsa* in the Skt. Viśvāntara-Jātaka, №9 of Āryaśūra's Jātakamālā (Sieg 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 *wärt*, 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 δyštyh* (line 800), *'wy δyšth* (line 813) "dans le désert" (Benveniste 1946: 52, 53).

57 *kārāśäntwä* is a writing error for *kārāśäntu* or *kārāśäntwaṃ*, probably due to the next akṣara <wä> of the following *wärtäntwaṃ*.

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.[58] It is further represented in e.g. №8 (*Kèzīĕr shíkū* I, plate 37 lower right corner; Grünwedel 1912: 53, *e*) and №114 (*Kèzīĕr shíkū* III, 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 *(Kèzīĕr shíkū* I, plate 36[59]) or №17 (*Kèzīĕr shíkū* I, plate 71; *Bìhuà quánjí* II: 23; Grünwedel 1912: 60, R12).

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

Strophe 6

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

---

58 We now have only his drawing left: the original was chiseled out during the 4th Prussian expedition (von Le Coq 1928: 67-70), see the recent photo in *Kèzīĕr shíkū* I, plate 115 (upper right corner).

59 Apparently omitted by Grünwedel between *e* and *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 Siṃha-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[60]).

Thanks to the identification of the strophe with the Siṃha-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 *caraṇābhyām 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.[61] 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 Děng Dà Jí 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 *jiù* 鷲 in both stories, in principle 'vulture' (Skt. *gṛdhra*). Also in the Khotanese text, the bird is a vulture (Khot. *aysgaṃ* [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 Siṃha-Jātaka is well represented among the Qizil wall paintings, for example in grotto №17 (*Kèzīĕr shíkū* ı, plate 60 in the lower right corner; Reza 2002: 157; Grünwedel 1912: 59, L8), №38 (*Kèzīĕr shíkū* ı, plate 135; Grünwedel 1912: 74, L29), №114 (*Bìhuà quánjí* ı, 147; Grünwedel 1912: 115, B18), №118 (*Kèzīĕr shíkū* 2, plate 153; Grünwedel 1912: 106, Fig. 240), and №14 (*Kèzīĕr shíkū* ı, 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, R40[62]), №17 (*Kèzīĕr shíkū* ı, plate 66, left above the centre; Grünwedel 1912: 60, R26), and №114 (*Kèzīĕr shíkū* ıı, plate 135; Grünwedel 1912: 116, *b*27). 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 *Kèzīĕr shíkū* ı, 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. Khoroche 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 Zhì Dù Lùn* 大智度論 (Lamotte 1944-80: 1651-1652[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 Zhì Dù Lùn* variant is found. Whereas in the other versions a gazelle young is the last to be saved, the *Dà Zhì 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 (*Kèzīěr shíkū* I, plate 65; Grünwedel 1912: 59, L13), №38 (*Kèzīěr shíkū* I, plate 124 at the right; Grünwedel 1912: 68, R35), and №114 (*Kèzīěr shíkū* III, plate 197, mid left; Grünwedel 1912: 115, B21 = MIK III 9103). The deer carrying the hare is depicted in e.g. №38 (*Kèzīěr shíkū* I, plate 117 top; Grünwedel 1912: 68, R42) and №114 (*Kèzīěr shíkū* II, plate 136; Grünwedel 1912: 116, *b*7).

---

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 /ə/ display all features of the language of the first archaic stage, but further archaic characteristics, like /ew/ and *ṣc* (Peyrot 2008: 41 and 72, respectively), are not found, while *ñiś*, 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, *lakṣāntasā* a2, *(ke)lästā* b1, *sayusā* b4, *te-yknesā* b5, *wsāstā* b6, *mästā* b8. Although pāda end position is slightly overrepresented, *sayusā*, *te-yknesā* and *mästā* are verse-internal, and of these only *te-yknesā* is found before a caesura. *āñmālaṣka* b7 is the only word with a certain "archaic" <ā> in another position, as the initial *ā* of *ārwāre* 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)lästā* b1 vs *kelasta* b7, *wsāstā* b6 vs *wsāsta* b8, or short perlatives like *yāmorsa* a2, *yämaisa* a4, *weśeññaisa* a4, *tärnesa* a4 etc vs the long ones cited above. *ṣäñ-āñm* a5, usually /ṣəñ-añm/, may owe its <ā> to the simplex *āñm*. If *yukamā(ne)* a8 is correctly restored, it shows inversion of the classical spelling *yukāmane*. There are only three more cases of <a> for /á/: *lakṣanta* a2 (next to *lakṣāntasā* in the same line), *latkatsi* /látkatˢəy/ b8, *naitta-c* b4.

/ə/

/ə/ is regularly spelled <ä>, cf. with <ä> under the accent: *eṅkälpatte* a1, *(ke)lästā* b1, *cäk⌄* b6, *täṅw* a5, a7, *täñ* a1, a8, *tärkärwa* a4, *tärnesa* a4, *päls(k)o* b4, *mäst⌄* a6, *mästā* b8, *yämaisa* a4, *rīnässiträ* b3, *lykä(śke)* a7, *ṣäñ* a7, *ṣäñ-āñm* a5, *ṣä(ñ-āñm)* a7, *(ṣärm)ts(a)* b1, *säkw* b3. The number of accented /ə/ written <a> is modest: *kelasta* b7, *ramt* a6, *lalaṃ(ṣka)* b5, *wast* b3, *skwantsi* b2.[64] The fact that the two occurrences of <a> for unaccented /ə/ are found after /c/ and /w/, characters without Fremdzeichen counterpart, conforms to the pattern observed earlier (Peyrot 2008: 35): *carkā-c* b2, *saim-wasta* b7.

w-diphthongs

Most *w*-diphthongs in the text represent old /aw/ and they are written <au>: *kauṃ* a3, *kauna* a3, *kauñäktem* a3, *klyautkatai* a5, *tukau* b5, *papāsausai* b6, *maukāsta* b5, *śaul* a7, *tsāṅkau* a1 (on *mokauśka* b4 see below). One word with certain old /ew/ is nevertheless spelled with <au>: *aurce* b6. In addition, we find <ow> in *läkᵤtsowñaisa* a3, a word that is elsewhere rather attested with <ew, eᵤ> (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 *läkᵤtsowñaisa* 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 *läkᵤtsauwñaisa*) remain possible, but ad hoc solutions.

käloym a2

käloym '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 *skwäntsi* 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 <Xä> in the manuscript.

type of spelling is only found in colloquial material. On the contrary, the gemination of *k* before *r* in *prakkrem* a5 (vs classical *prakrem* a1) belongs to a pattern not otherwise attested on this leaf, but with parallels in the archaic material.

seswa gloss to a6, a7

For the word *seswa* 'sons', gloss to $s_{\ddot{a}}su\dot{w}ane$ a6 and $s_{\ddot{a}}suwerṣe$ a7, cf. Peyrot (2008: 114). I have now hesitantly added a third attestation *(se)[s]wā*, gloss to $(s_{\ddot{a}}su)wane$ a8.

ñiś b3

Next to three times *ñäś* 'I' in a1, a2, a4, we once find *ñiś* 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 *ñiś* had already come about.

ṣeyyiśkane b4

This dual obviously belongs to the same word as the plural *ṣaiyyiśkaṃ* B352a3 (so to be read), as argued by Schmidt (1980: 407), who posited the meaning as "Tierjunges". Later he added *ṣaiyi[s](ka)* B84b1 "[mein] Kind(chen)" (2001: 313[65]), evidently with a slight adaptation of the meaning, since it is applied to a human rather than an animal.[66] Apparently the word does not mean 'young', but perhaps something close to 'offspring, sprig'. The spelling *eyy*[67] instead of *aiy* or *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 *(tai)ynesiñ* b5

---

65 The author's reading *ṣaiyyi[s](ka)* with double *yy* in note 60 (p. 313) must be a typographical error.

66 With hindsight, 'young' was quite unlikely for B352a3, too: *lareñ $s_{\ddot{a}}$sūśkaṃ ṣaiyyiśkaṃ ///* 'dear children and young (??)'.

67 *ṣai* is excluded; cf. *ṣai-c* b5.

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

mokauśka b4

In *mokauśka* 'she-monkey', *au* alternates with *oṃ*, and in the parallel B239 we find *mokowśka*. The evidence is meagre, but it seems that especially in the word *oṃṣap* 'more' a phonetic development to *auṣap* has taken place. If the same development is responsible for the variants in this word, *mokauśka* is another later form that does not actually belong together with the archaic *a*-vowels of this manuscript (on *oṃṣap*, *mokoṃśka* and the sound change *oṃ > 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 *tainaisäñ* 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. *käryātai tainaisäñ* in B239b2. The problems are not confined to the first syllable: we find *e* for *ai* in the second, and *i* for *ä* in the third. Although the form *tainaisäñ* is rare, its classical shape is certain (cf. further B153b3, B387.3a, M3a7[68]). As have I argued elsewhere (Peyrot 2008: 120-121), the development of the genitive ending *-äñ* to *-i* (cf. *tainaisi* B547b5) went through a stage *-än* 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 *-äñ* is attested in *wesäñ* b1. If the *e* in the second syllable is linguistically real, we may compare *ṣeyyiśkane* b4 with *-e(y)* for *ai* (see above), which

---

68 The latter to be read *tainaisäñ*ᵃ‿. 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 *-äṃ* is well attested.

would point to monophthongisation; otherwise, it may have been formed analogically after the ubiquitous genitive ending *-ne*.

śetkasta b6

śetkasta 'you let cross (prt.)' is clearly a mistake; the regular form would have been *śātkasta* /śátkasta/. 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 evidenly 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 *stəynask-* 'be silent'.[70]

references

Adams, Douglas Q.

    1999   *A dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi.

Baruch, Willy

    1955   'Le cinquante-deuxième chapitre du *mJaṅs-blun* (sūtra du sage et du fou)', *Journal Asiatique* 243, 339-366.

Benveniste, Émile

    1940   *Textes Sogdiens, Édités, traduits et commentés*. Paris: Geuthner.

    1946   *Vessantara Jātaka, Texte sogdien, Édité, traduit et commenté*. Paris: Geuthner.

Bìhuà quánjí

    1992-95 *Zhōngguó Xīnjiāng bìhuà quánjí* 中國新疆壁畫全集 (6 vols.). Tiānjīn: Tiānjīn Rénmín Měishù Chūbǎnshè.

Carling, Gerd

    2009   *Dictionary and thesaurus of Tocharian A, Volume 1: A-J, In collaboration with Georges-Jean Pinault and Werner Winter*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Chavannes, Édouard

    1910-34 *Cinq cents contes et apologues, extraits du tripiṭaka chinois et traduits en français* (4 vols.). Paris: Leroux.

Dresden, Mark J.

    1955   'The Jātakastava or "praise of the Buddha's former births", Indo-Scythian (Khotanese) text, English translation, grammatical notes, and glossaries', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society,* new series 45 (part 5), 397-508.

Feer, Léon

    1891   *Avadâna-Çataka, Cent légendes bouddhiques, La centaine d'avadânas, commençant par Pûrṇa (Pûrṇamukha-Avadâna-Çataka)*. Paris: Leroux.

---

70 Interestingly, Adams (1999: 710) lists a *sticce* IOL Toch 305a2 'quiet'. Although he evidently stretched the meaning towards *stəynask-* 'be silent', the semantic link between 'without motion' and 'without sound' is easily made: cf. English *still*, and especially Gm. *still* and Dutch *stil*, the usual term for both concepts. *s[ti]y(·)·* B497a10 is too damaged and fragmentary to be taken into account. Note added in proof: In a paper held at the *Arbeitstagung Tocharologie* in Saarbrücken (Germany), 13 October 1995, Georges-Jean Pinault has argued on the basis of the otherwise unpublished Paris manuscript NS51 that the correct word division is rather *stiyai soktne*, meaning "in foul water [and] in dung". Unfortunately, a full discussion of this proposal is not possible here.

Grünwedel, Albert

1912   *Altbuddhistische Kultstätten in Chinesisch-Turkistan, Bericht über archäologische Arbeiten von 1906 bis 1907 bei Kuča, Qarašahr und in der Oase Turfan.* Berlin: Reimer.

Hahn, Michael

2007   *Haribhaṭṭa in Nepal, Ten legends from his Jātakamālā and the anonymous Śākyasiṃhajātaka.* Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Hanisch, Albrecht

2005   *Āryaśūras Jātakamālā, Philologische Untersuchungen zu den legenden 1 bis 15* (2 vols.). Marburg: Indica et Tibetica.

Hilmarsson, Jörundur G.

1989   *The dual forms of nouns and pronouns in Tocharian.* Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.

Kèzīěr shikū

1989-97 *Zhōngguó shikū, Kèzīěr shikū* 中國石窟，克孜尔石窟 (3 vols.). Běijīng: Wénwù Chūbǎnshè.

Khoroche, Peter

1989   *Once the Buddha was a monkey, Ārya Śūra's Jātakamālā.* Chicago – London: University of Chicago.

Lamotte, Étienne

1944-80 *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse* (5 vols.). Leuven/ Louvain-la-Neuve: Bureaux du Muséon/ Institut orientaliste.

von Le Coq, Albert

1928   *Von Land und Leuten in Ostturkistan, Berichte und Abenteuer der 4. Deutschen Turfanexpedition.* Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Malzahn, Melanie

2007   'The most archaic manuscripts of Tocharian B and the varieties of the Tocharian B language', in: Melanie Malzahn (ed.), *Instrumenta Tocharica.* Heidelberg: Winter, 255-297.

Peyrot, Michaël

2008   *Variation and change in Tocharian B.* Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi.

Pinault, Georges-Jean

2008   *Chrestomathie tokharienne, textes et grammaire.* Leuven: Peeters.

Reza

2002   *Painted Buddhas of Xinjiang.* London: British Museum.

Rockhill, William W.

1884   *The life of the Buddha and the early history of his order.* London: Trübner.

Sander, Lore

1968   *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung.* Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Schmidt, Isaak J.

1843　'*Dzaṅs-blun oder der Weise und der Thor, Aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt und mit dem Originaltexte herausgegeben* [etc.] (2 vols.). St. Petersburg: W. Gräff's Erben.

Schmidt, Klaus T.

1980　'Zu Stand und Aufgaben der etymologischen Forschung auf dem Gebiete des Tocharischen', in: Manfred Mayrhofer, Martin Peters, and Oskar E. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie, Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, 24. - 29. September 1978*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 394-411.

1983　'Vorläufige Bemerkungen zu den in der Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin neu gefundenen tocharischen Handschriftenfragmenten', in: Fritz Steppat (ed.), *XXI. deutscher Orientalistentag, vom 24. bis 29. März 1980 in Berlin, Vorträge*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 271-279.

2001　'Die westtocharische Version des Araṇemi-Jātakas in deutscher Übersetzung', in: Louis Bazin and Peter Zieme (eds.), *De Dunhuang à Istanbul, Hommage à James Russel Hamilton*. Turnhout: Brepols, 299-327.

Shackleton Bailey, David R.

1954　'The Jātakastava of Jñānayaśas', in: Johannes Schubert and Ulrich Schneider (eds.), *Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller, Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 22-29.

Sieg, Emil

1952　*Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II, Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Werner Thomas*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1951, Nr. 1. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Sieg, Emil and Wilhelm Siegling

1953　*Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B, Heft 2, Texte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Thomas, Werner

1983　*Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B, Teil I: Die Texte, Band 1, Fragmente Nr. 1-116 der Berliner Sammlung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

abstract: The Tocharian B fragment THT3597 is in urgent need of study, despite the great achievements of Schmidt (1983). It is a precious sample of Tocharian Buddhist literature, preserving parts of a Buddhastotra with allusions to the Buddha's acts of self-sacrifice in former births. Written in non-archaic script, it is linguistically interesting because it preserves obvious archaic traits, but mixed with several later features. Glosses are evidence of a lively interest in the manuscript at the time, revealing even the unique form *seswa* 'sons'.

Michaël PEYROT

Universiteit Leiden

Vergelijkende Indo-Europese Taalwetenschap

Postbus 9515

NL-2300 RA Leiden

The Netherlands

m.peyrot@hum.leidenuniv.nl