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Tocharian B Manuscripts in the Berezovsky Collection (2): Five More Fragments

Abstract: This article is a full edition of five Tocharian B manuscripts kept in the Berezovsky sub-collection of the Serindia Collection of the IOM, RAS: two Sanskrit-Tocharian B Bilingual Udānavarga fragments (Uv. 1.26b–1.34a, Uv. 4.23b–4.34c); a Sanskrit-Tocharian B Bilingual Karmavācanā (Upasampadā) fragment, one fragment of a jātaka and one fragment of a stotra previously erroneously identified as Udānastotra. The article contains a transliteration, transcription, tentative translation as well as a commentary on the text of the fragments.
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In a previous article, I have made a start with publishing fragments from the Berezovsky collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IOM, RAS). This article continues publication of the Tocharian B manuscripts from this collection, presenting five more manuscripts: two Tocharian B – Sanskrit bilingual fragments of the Udānavarga; one fragment of the Tocharian B – Sanskrit Karmavācanā; one fragment of a jātaka; and one fragment previously erroneously identified as belonging to the Udānastotra.
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3 For details on the publication of the Udānavarga, cf. PEYROT 2008a, PEYROT 2016a. For details on the publication of the Udānavarga from the Serindian collection of the IOM, RAS, cf. OGIHARA 2016. Two more fragments were recently published by OGIHARA 2018, LUNDYSHEVA 2019.
Karmavācanā fragment, Upasampadā

SI 2922/2 (Old number: B/3 (14–2)
Findspot: Kuča, On-baš⁵ Miŋ-Öy
Bilingual Tocharian B/Sanskrit
fig. 1
fig. 2

SI 2922/2 fragment gives a text which is nearly identical to one of the Berlin version of the Karmavācanā (Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz), THT 1102–1125, which belongs to the Sarvāstivādin school. To be precise, the text corresponds to leaf No. 16 of the Berlin manuscript (= THT 1108)⁶, lines a2–b3.

⁴ When a Fremdzeichen consonant is following under a Non-Fremdzeichen consonant in virāma position a virama with dot is used as well.

⁵ Mikhail Berezovsky registered all the find spots of the manuscripts. He labelled this find spot “Onbašskii Minui”. However, the place is presently difficult to identify. All we know about it with certainty is that it was situated near Kucha and it was a complex of cave temples = Miŋ-Öy (“thousand caves”) or “Minui” in Berezovsky’s spelling.

⁶ The text was read, restored and translated by Klaus T. Schmidt in a book which was submitted as Habilitationsschrift to Saarbrücken University in 1986. For a long time it remained unavailable in printed form. The edition (2012) given on the CEToM website (https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian) is based on Schmidt’s edition and provides photographs of the manuscript. The edition is now available in print: SCHMIDT 2018.
1. Material description

Size (h x w, maximal): 3.7×4.7 cm. Fragment of the middle of a leaf. It is likely that the lower edge is visible on the recto side and the upper edge on the verso side. It is possible that the leaf had only four lines on each side.

2. Transliteration

\[\begin{align*}
a1 & \quad (\cdot p\cdot) \text{ntra} \cdot \text{ly} \quad \\\\\\,
\text{a2} & \quad (\cdot r\cdot c\cdot) \cdot \text{tesa} \text{\text{ś}aul} \cdot \text{ś} \cdot \\
\text{a3} & \quad \text{skasgalle} \text{star-cš} \text{mā św} \quad \\
\text{a4} & \quad \text{te ka spā} \cdot \text{ñake palsko} \cdot \text{e} \quad \\
\text{b1} & \quad \text{täkoym} \quad \text{krentauwnat} \cdot \text{p} \cdot \text{ru}^{10} \quad \\
\text{b2} & \quad \text{te ēemtsa tā pāträi} \cdot \text{ru}^{11} \\
\text{b3} & \quad \text{ma} \cdot \text{saman} \cdot \text{ă} \\
\text{b4} & \quad \text{e} \text{van} \cdot \text{dr} \cdot \text{i} \cdot \text{ru} \quad \\
\end{align*}\]

\text{The rest of the akṣara before the lacuna is rather compatible with <ma> or <pa>.}

\text{The rest of the akṣara is compatible with <rc> of line a3.}

\text{There is no trace of any virāma stroke, even though spā looks closely attached to the preceding letter. But it is for sure not written somewhat below the line.}

\text{Judging from the level of the loop belonging to the presumable ligature <tra>, it seems likely that the word was written with double /tt/, as in the next line pāträi.}

\text{The rest of the akṣara is compatible with <ru> because of the tiny remnant of the loop. It is supported by the text of THT 1108.}
3. Transcription

a1 /// (war)p(a)nträ • ly ///
a2 /// (star)-c • tesa šaul š(awaślëlle) ///
a3 /// (ya)kassaślëlle star-c mä šw(ātsintse) ///
a4 /// • te ka spā ſakne palko(n)je ///
b1 /// tākoym (•)12 krentauwnats p(ātt)r(o) ///
b2 /// te ſemtsa tā pattrai • (p)ru(camňai) ///
b3 /// (maja) • saman(v)ā(hara) ///
b4 /// evam d(v)iř (api) ///

4. Tentative translation

a1. …will enjoy…
a2. …(this eating bowl) is to be (seized) by you. Thus [your] life should be lived (by you)13…
a3. …(you) should beg for it, (but you shall) not (for the sake of) food…
a4. …and, indeed, this now in [your] mind…
b1. …I wish to be, (I wish to be) a bowl of virtues…
b2. …(I, N.N.,) this excellent eating bowl…
b3. …(it is) mine. Pay heed to this…
b4. …thus the second [time]…

5. Comments

a1. Compare THT 1108 lines a 1–2 (pā)traiyne cene ompostāņ tsañkalyi wārpananträ lyeč ///.
   Note that the subjunctive of wārpā- “to enjoy” in SI 2922/2 makes perfect sense in this context, because the passage refers to the future. The Berlin text has the apparent present warpananträ with irregular a in the first syllable. Schmidt emends this to a regular 3 pl. present wārpananträ with ā in the first syllable, but in view of the reading in SI 2922/2, an emendation of the form in THT 1108 to warpananträ has now become more likely.

a2. Compare THT 1108 line a3 te p(ā)tr(o) eŋk(āṣalya) s(ta)r-(c) t(ai)sə šaul šawašle star-că.

12 After a virama with dot a regular dot as punctuation mark was usually omitted in writing.
13 “Thus you shall earn (lit. live) [your] living” (CEToM).
Note that there is no dot after the first sentence in the Berlin text. Furthermore, SI 2922/2 supports the restoration (e)sa in the Berlin text, which is allowed by the lacuna. The restoration (ai)sa\textsuperscript{14} should be abandoned. In SI 2922/2, the gerund form ought to be restored with <lle>, as in the next line.

a3. Compare THT 1108 line a4 tā pātra(sa) y(a)ksaṣālē star-cā mā śvāṣitse pernesā ūal īylyṇe sparkāsālē star-cā.\textsuperscript{15}

a4. Compare THT 1108 line a5 te ka spā ū(ak)e p(a)(l)skone pyāmtsar.

b1. Compare THT 1108 line b1 (enka)ṣṣeṇca tākoymā krentaunats p(at)r(o tā)koymā.

b2. Compare THT 1108 line b2 (te) ūemtsa tā pātra prucamṇai enkasketmar solmiyai pātra rṣākāṃhe bhajam. This is a word by word translation of a ritual phrase which was spoken in Sanskrit. Compare the following Sanskrit text (THT 1108 line b3) ahon iṭhaṃnmanm (= te ūemtsa) idam pātraḥ (= tā pātra) pāribhogikam (= prucamṇai) adhitissām (= enkasketmar) paripūrṇam (= solmiyai) pātraḥ (= pātra) rṣībḥjanam (= rṣākāṃhe bhajam).

b3. The following part contains the part of the ritual which was spoken in Sanskrit, except the imperative poñ ‘say!’. Compare THT 1108 line b2 tavedaṃ pātraṃ poñ mama samanvāyusmāṃ.\textsuperscript{16}

Note that the parallel Berlin text has no dot after mama.

b4. Compare THT 1108 line b3 evam dvir api tr api.\textsuperscript{17}

6. Notes

This fragment belongs to a part of the ritual of ordination (upāsāmpadā-) for monks, more precisely to the episode concerning the acceptance of the alms bowl (pātra-) by the applying monk. This part follows the request and acceptance of the clothes (cīvara-) by the monk to be ordained.\textsuperscript{18}

There are some differences of punctuation and orthography between the two manuscripts THT 1108 and SI 2922/2, which adds an interesting testimony to the ritual manuscripts for the Buddhist communities using Tocharian B.

\textsuperscript{14} Schmid 2018, 24, 56.

\textsuperscript{15} “You shall beg for [it] (with) this eating bowl. But you shall not, for the sake of food, let fade away [this way of] earning [your] livelihood” (CEToM).

\textsuperscript{16} “Is this your eating bowl? Say: [Yes, it is] mine. Pay heed to this, o venerable one!” (CEToM, somewhat modified).

\textsuperscript{17} “Thus a second [and] a third time” (CEToM).

\textsuperscript{18} For the general context and background, cf. Hartel 1956, 74–76.
fig. 3: SI 2985/1 recto

fig. 4: SI 2985/1 verso
Udānavarga (Uv. 1.26b – 1.34a)\textsuperscript{19}

SI 2985/1 (Old number: B/75)

Findspot: Kuča, Tadjit\textsuperscript{20}, main temple.

Bilingual Tocharian B/Sanskrit

fig. 3

fig. 4

SI 2985/1 lines b2-b4 give a text which is nearly identical with the Udānavarga manuscript Or.15007/308, kept in London (British Library), lines a1-a3. SI 2985/1 lines a4-a7 give a text which is nearly identical with the Udānavarga manuscripts IOL Toch. 233 + IOL Toch. 368,\textsuperscript{21} kept in London (British Library), lines a1-a4. SI 2985/1 line a2 corresponds to the Udānālāṅkāra manuscript kept in Berlin (Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz) = THT 5,\textsuperscript{22} line a1; line a5 to line a8; line a6 to line b1.

1. Material description

Size (h x w, maximal): 9.0×15.5 cm. The right part of a leaf. The lower and upper edges are visible. Seven lines are still visible on both sides, which must also have been the original size of the manuscript. Line b1 is damaged: the paper has been erased, and the ink has fainted.

2. Transliteration

\begin{verbatim}
\textsuperscript{a1}/// [n]\cdot (·)m·(·)\textsuperscript{23} k· ktseñ(\textsuperscript{\textdagger})\textsuperscript{24} • t· [s]\cdot(·)v·h[ā]n· [k]\textsuperscript{\textdagger}uś·l[\text{\textdagger}]v· • [ce]\textsuperscript{a,25}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{19} The numbering of the chapters follows BERNHARD 1965.

\textsuperscript{20} Mikhail Berezovsky labelled this find spot “Tadjit – glavnyj xram” (Tadjit – main temple). It was situated near Kuča. According to Berezovsky there was in Tadjit a surface monastery as well as a complex of cave temples, a Miŋ-Oy (“thousand caves”; “Minui” in Berezovsky’s spelling).

\textsuperscript{21} Published by PÆYROT 2007.

\textsuperscript{22} Published by SIEG & SIEGLING 1983, 147 ff.

\textsuperscript{23} The Skt. absolutive prahāya corresponds to the Toch. B absolutive in -\textdagger\text{meñ.} Therefore, <r> and <\textdagger>m> should be restored.

\textsuperscript{24} A virāma with dot is supposed to be here after which a regular dot as a punctuation mark was omitted in writing. However, here one can see a regular dot as a punctuation mark and no virāma at all.

\textsuperscript{25} The akṣara traces are compatible with <ce> of line a6.
See in the comment section.

There is a tiny trace on the akṣara <la> which looks like a beginning of virāma-connection with the following <ṅka> like in IOL Toch. 702 line b1. However, in the parallel text IOL Toch. 233 + 368 line a1, one reads olaṅkā without virāma; and also here, the akṣara <ṅka> is not lowered.

In the parallel text IOL Toch. 233 + 368 line a1, one can see jīryanti.

This akṣara should be the <rā> of rājarathāḥ Uv. 1.28a.

This akṣara should be the <ti> of upaiti Uv. 1.28b.

One can suppose that in this akṣara <ā> diacritical mark is used as a virāma-connection for the following Fremdzeichen consonant <k>.

This akṣara should be the <sa> of satāṃ Uv. 1.28c.

This akṣara should be the <n> of manorāmanam Uv. 1.29c.

The akṣaras are reconstructed according to the Sanskrit text of Uv. 1.29d.

The <a> has been added under the <ile> later.

Compare Or.15007.308 line a1 aiv.

A virāma with dot is supposed to be after a non-Fremdzeichen consonant. So here one can suppose to see a virāma without dot and a dot as punctuation mark which are mixed in a unitary virāma with dot.

Compare Or.15007.308 line a2 n-(m) mā klauthk.

In Bernard 1965, 107: Uv. 1.31b vilujyamānaḥ.

Compare Or.15007.308 line a3 marane

This is the last akṣara of tathā Uv. 1.32b.

As in line a5, one can suppose that in this akṣara <ā> diacritical mark is used as a virāma-connection for the following Fremdzeichen consonant <k>. However, the is a possibility, that the word taiknesāk was spelled as taiknesākā.

In Bernard 1965, 108: Uv. 1.33a alpataram

According to the sanskrit text a genetive plural ending of a pronoun is supposed to be here. The rest of akṣara could be compared with <tsā> of mākceṃtsā line b6.
3. **Transcription**

a1 /// (reri)n(or)m(eṃ) k(e)ktseñ • t(āṃ sar)v(a)h(ā)n(īṃ k)uś(a)l(o) vid(i)tv(a) • ceₜ Uv.1.26b, c

a2 /// y 26 jīrṇaḥ ca dṛṣṭveha tathaiva roginam •⁴⁵ ktsaice śpā Uv. 1.26d; Uv. 1.27a

a3 /// (lyelyak)orme«ṃ» waipite ykuweśā palısko jaḥau sa dhīro grhabandha Uv. 1.27b, c

a4 /// (yśelm)i no śaśṣentse mā olaṅk wikāṣyī 27 jīryaṃti vai rā(jarathāḥ)

Uv. 1.27d; Uv. 1.28a

a5 /// taiknesā kektseñe rano ktsaitsāṃne yanmāssāṃ • sa Uv. 1.28b, c

a6 /// (kreñ)c n(o) ceₜ krentāme śarsāskem 28 dhik tvām astu jare grāmye • hi Uv. 1.28d; Uv. 1.29a

a7 /// (ma)noramaṃ bimbam taiknesa pālkontse wīna erepate • jara

Uv. 1.29c, d

b1 /// (so) p(i) mṛ(ty)u(pa)r(ā)y(a)ṇ(aḥ sū r(a)n(o) srūk(a)lleśc(a) (ai)w(o)l Uv. 1.30b

b2 /// (sū rano srū)kallñeścā aiwol • anu hy enam jarā haṃti • ompostāṃ ceₜ Uv. 1.30b, c

b3 /// sek yaneṃ mā klautkomane • divā ca rātrau ca vultyumānāḥ

Uv. 1.31a, b

b4 /// (pālke)m(a)ne • duḥkhena jātīmarajena yuktāḥ laklempa cme

Uv. 1.31c, d

b5 /// (ta)thā • ynemanentse klyemanentse taiknesāk • nadināṃ vā

Uv. 1.32b, c

b6 /// mākceṃsā yaṣi kaunanto kātktore • āyur alpataram bhavet

Uv. 1.33a, b

b7 /// (m)ts wīna tākoṃ 33 pariṣṭhaṃ idaṃ rūpam aikṣnar k,rav Uv. 1.33d, Uv. 1.34a

4. **Reconstruction and tentative translation**

Uv. 1.26b /// (reri)n(or)m(em) k(e)ktseñ sarve gamisyānti prahāya deham “[men] will all pass away, casting off [their] bodies.”

Uv. 1.26c ceₜ /// tāṃ sarvahānīṃ kuśalo vidītvā “the wise man [who] understands (lit. having seen) [that] the loss is complete”

⁴⁵ After a virama with dot a regular dot as a punctuation mark was omitted in writing.
Uv. 1.26d /// y
dharme sthito brahmacaryaṃ careta “should live a life of purity (life of continence and chastity) according to the Law (steadfast in the Law)”

Uv. 1.27a ktsaice spā ///
jīrṇaḥ ca dṛṣṭeṣaḥ tathaiva rogiṇaḥ “seeing an old man here (= in this world), and likewise [seeing] a sick man” THT 5 a1

Uv. 1.27b /// (lyelyak)orme«ṃ» waipte ykuweṣa palsa kṛtam ca dṛṣṭa vyaṣṭavatacetasaṃ “seeing a dead man, abandoned [by] consciousness”

Uv. 1.27d (yśelm)i no šaiṣṣentse mā olaṅk wikäslyi kāmā hi lokasya na supraheyāḥ. “however, the desires of the world [are] not easily extinguished”

Uv. 1.28b taiknesāk kektseñe rano ktsaitsāṃṇe yamnāṭṣāṃ hy atha śarīram api jarām upaiti “likewise, the body also gets old”

Uv. 1.28d (kreñ) c n(o) ce u krañtanne śarsäskeṃ santo hi taṃ satsu nivedayanti “and the virtuous men make it known among the virtuous men”

Uv. 1.29a hi(śt) /// dhik tvām astu jare grāmye “shame on you, old and vulgar”

Uv. 1.29c taiknesa pālskontse wīna erepate 368 a4

tathā manoramam bimbam. “since the form [that is so] lovely”

Uv. 1.30b (sā rano srūkālīneścā āiwal so pi mṛtyuparāyaṇaḥ “Even that one [is] prone to death” Or.15007/308 a1

Uv. 1.30c oṃpostāṃ ce ///

anu hy enaṃ jaraḥ haṃti “and thus death follows old age (lit. old age kills)”

Uv. 1.31a şek yanem mā klauskomane sadā vrajanṭi hy anivartamāṇā “perpetually they go (away) without returning (=die)”

Uv. 1.31c /// (pālke)m(a)ne matsuḥ ivāva hi tapyamāṇā “like fish exceedingly burnt”

Uv. 1.31d laṅkema cme ///
duḥkhaṇa jāṭimarāṇaṇa yuktāḥ “with the suffering of birth and death”

Or.15007/308 a3

Uv. 1.32b ynamenentse klyemenentse taiknesāk caratas tiṣṭatas tathā “of the moving [one and] as also of the staying [one]”
Uv. 1.33a mäkcentsä yaṣi kaunantsō kātkorne
yesāṃ rātridivāpāye “of [men] whose days and nights have passed”
Uv. 1.33d (ṃ)ts wiṇa tākom
kā nu teṣāṃ ratir bhavet “what pleasure should they have (=find)”
Uv. 1.34a aiksnar kārau
parifīrnam idam rūpam “this completely old form (=body)”

5. Comments

a1. Toch. B kektseñ, obl. sg., “body” corresponds to Skt. deham, acc. sg., with the same meaning.
   a1. The Skt. absolutive prahāya must be rendered in Toch. B with an absolutive in -ormem. According to the palaeographic traces, it is possible to restore (rer[i]ormem “after having abandoned” (absolutive from rin- “renounce, abandon”), which is the expected translation of prahāya.
   a1. Toch. B ce₃, obl. sg. masc., “that” corresponds to Skt. tāṃ, acc. sg. fem., with the same meaning. Evidently, the Skt. feminine sarvahānīṃ was in Toch. B rendered with a masculine or alternant noun, for instance a verbal noun in -īhe like Nashville ‘destruction’ or kṣelīhe ‘extinction’.
   a2. According to the akṣara traces, Skt. careta, 3sg. optative, is rendered in Toch. B with a 3sg. optative ending in -yř.
   a2. Toch. B spā “and” corresponds to Skt. ca with the same meaning.
   a3. The Skt. absolutive drṣṭvā must correspond to a Toch. B absolutive in -ormem, so that the omitted <ṃ> is to be added. It is possible to restore (lyelyaksiormem “after having seen” (absolutive of lāk- “see, look at”), which makes perfect sense in this context.
   a3. The Skt. compound vyapayātacetasam “[the one] whose mind has gone apart” was translated into Toch. B as a phrase: waipte ykuweṣā palsko. The Skt. participle vyapayāta “gone away” is rendered as Toch. B waipte “apart, separately” and ykuweṣā “having gone”, obl. sg. preterite participle from i- “go, travel”. Toch. B palsko, obl. sg., “mind” corresponds to Skt. cetasam, acc. sg., with the same meaning.

46 ADAMS 2013, 202.
47 ADAMS 2013, 581.
48 ADAMS 2013, 263.
49 ADAMS 2013, 596.
50 ADAMS 2013, 65.
a4. For Skt. kāmā, nom. pl., “desires, sexual pleasures” it is possible to restore Toch. B yšelmi, nom. pl., “(sexual) pleasure” from yšelme.  

a4. Toch. B no “but, however” corresponds to Skt. hi with the same meaning.

a4. Toch. B šaiṣṣentse, gen. sg., “world” corresponds to Skt. lokasya, gen. sg., with the same meaning.

a4. Toch. B mā “no, not” corresponds to Skt. na with the same meaning.

a4. The Skt. nom. pl. gerund supraheyāḥ “± perfectly dispatched” was translated into Toch. B as a phrase with olaṅk “enough, easy” and the nom. pl. gerund wikāślyi from wik- “decrease and disappear”.

a5. Skt. <hy> is normally not translated. Rather, pada-initial <hy> is often left out in the Skt. parts of the bilinguals.

a5. Toch. B taiknesāk “thus, just so” corresponds to Skt. atho “likewise”. a5. Toch. B kektseñe, nom. sg., “body” corresponds to Skt. vāroram, nom. sg., with the same meaning.

a5. Toch. B rano “also” corresponds to Skt. api “also, moreover, surely”.

a5. Toch. B ktsaitsāmñe, obl. sg., “old age” corresponds to Skt. jarām, acc. sg., with the same meaning.

a5. Toch. B yamnāṃśāṃ, 3sg. active present from yāṃ- “achieve, obtain; reach” corresponds to Skt. upaiti, 3sg. present, “reach, obtain, to get into any state or condition”.

a6. Compare the beginning of the Toch. B part with THT 5 b1: kreñc no c- – krentämne sarsāskemne eñ(we)stst(e).

a6. Toch. B kreñc, nom. pl. masc., “good” corresponds to Skt. santah, nom. pl. masc., “good, real, true; a good or wise man”.

a6. Toch. B no “but, however” corresponds to Skt. hi with the same meaning.

a6. Toch. B rano “also” corresponds to Skt. api “also, moreover, surely”.

---

51 ADAMS 2013, 565.
52 ADAMS 2013, 696.
53 ADAMS 2013, 652.
54 ADAMS 2013, 325.
56 The correct form is ktsaitsānhe (ADAMS 2013, 263). However, in the parallel text IOL Toch. 233 + 368 line a2, one can see ktsaitsānhe as well.
57 The correct form is yāmmāṣāṃ. One can see it in the parallel text IOL Toch. 233 + 368 line a2.
58 ADAMS 2013, 538.

a6. Toch. B krentâme, loc. pl. masc., “good” corresponds to Skt. satsu, loc. pl. masc., “good” etc.

a6. Toch. B šərsāskem, 3pl. active present from šərs- “to make known”, corresponds to Skt. nivedayanti, 3pl. present, with the same meaning.

a6. The Toch. B part starts with hi. One can suppose hišit “pfui, pooh” to be reconstructed as a rendering of the Sanskrit interjection dhik, or otherwise hiš as in the parallel text IOL Toch. 233 + 368 a3. This assumption is supported by THT 5 b8: hišt (w)je tākoyt (kts)aitśāññe.

a7. Toch. B talknesa “thus” corresponds to Skt. tathā “thus, in that manner”.

a7. The Skt. adjective + noun phrase manoramaṃ bimbam “charming, beautiful image” was translated by a Toch. B complex phrase with an element of composita pālskontse (gen. sg.) wīna (nom. pl.) erepate (nom. sg.) “form [which is] a pleasure for the mind”.

b1. Toch. B sū, nom. sg. masc., “he, this one” corresponds to Skt. saḥ, nom. sg., with the same meaning. Toch. B rano “also” corresponds to Skt. api “also, moreover, surely”. The Skt. compound mṛtyuparāyaṇaḥ “[the one who is] an aim of death” was translated into Toch. B as a phrase with srūkalleścā, all. sg., “death” and aiwol “towards, directed to”.

b2. It looks like that the beginning of the line is a repetition of Uv. 1.30b from the line b1, at least in Toch. B. However, for some reason the word srūkalleścā in the repetition was corrected by the subscription of <ñ> to the ligature <lle>. It seems strange because there are two derivatives from sruk- “die”: srūkalle as a noun and srukalñe as a verbal abstract. The combination of <llñ> with double /ll/ before /ñ/ would be irregular. So this seems to be a scribal mistake.

b2. Toch. B ompostāṃ “afterwards” corresponds to Skt. anu “after, afterwards, thereupon”. Skt. hy is not translated. Toch. B ceₜₐ, obl. sg. masc., “that” corresponds to Skt. enaṃ, acc. sg. masc., with the same meaning.

---

60 Adams 2013, 797.
61 Here hiš is written together with the following tve. So the last <t> of hišt could be omitted.
62 As the original manuscript was lost one cannot be sure about the omittance or presence of the final <t> in the ligature.
63 wīna is a pluralia tantum (Adams 2013, 654).
64 Adams 2013, 792.
65 Adams 2013, 111.
66 Adams 2013, 791–792.
67 Adams 2013, 126.
b3. Toch. B Conexion “continually, perpetually” corresponds to Skt. sadā with the same meaning.

b3. Toch. B yanem, 3pl. active present from i- “go, travel” corresponds to Skt. vrajanti, 3pl. present, “go, work, proceed”.

b3. Skt. hy is not translated.

b3. The Toch. B present participle klautkomane from klautk- “to turn, return, become”\(^{68}\) with negation mā corresponds to Skt. anivartamānā, nom. pl., “not returning to life, without return”.

b4. The Skt. pl. participle tapyanānā corresponds normally to a Toch. B present participle in -mane, so that <ma> would seem to be the best option for the restoration of the preserved traces at the beginning of the line. The whole form may be pālkemane, as the Toch. B root corresponding to Skt. tap- “to make hot, to suffer pain, to torment oneself” is often pālk- “to burn; (caus.) torture”.\(^{69}\) However, the rest of akṣara does not look like <m·> but more like <y·>. If it is indeed <m·>, the lower right part must have been lost completely through abrasion. This is certainly a possibility, because there is a tear in the fragment at exactly that place.

b4. Toch. B ḫaklempe, com. sg., “suffering”\(^{70}\) corresponds to Skt. duḥkhena, ins. sg., with the same meaning.

b4. Toch. B <cme> should be the beginning of a derivative of the word camel “birth, rebirth”\(^{71}\) cme, or the word cmelle/cmelñe “birth, rebirth” nom./obl. sg. gerund from tām- “to be born”,\(^{72}\) corresponding to Skt. jātī with the same meaning.

b4. The Skt. compound jātīmaraṇa may have been translated into Toch. B as cmelle srūkalle as in Udānavarga manuscript PK AS 1A b1. The Skt. instrumental is rendered the with Toch. B comitative here so that one can restore cmelle srūkallempa.

b5. Toch. B ynemanentse, gen. sg. present participle from i- “to go”, corresponds to the Skt. present participle caratas, gen. sg., “moving”.

b5. Toch. B klyemanentse, gen. sg. present participle from kāly- “to stand”, corresponds to Skt. present participle tiṣṭatas, gen. sg., “standing”.

b5. Toch. B taiknesāk “thus, just so” corresponds to Skt. tathā “thus, in that manner”.

---

\(^{68}\) ADAMS 2013, 248.

\(^{69}\) ADAMS 2013, 404.

\(^{70}\) ADAMS 2013, 589.

\(^{71}\) ADAMS 2013, 269.

\(^{72}\) ADAMS 2013, 308.
b6. The Toch. B gen. pl. reflexive pronoun mäkceṃtsä corresponds to Skt. yeṣāṃ, gen. pl., “which”.

b6. The Skt. compound rātridivāpāye, loc. sg., “passing of nights(s) and days(s)” was translated into Toch. B as a phrase with gen. pl. yasi kaunantsa⁷³ “night(s) and days” and kätkorne, loc. sg. of the r-abstract from the preterite participle from kätk- “proceed, pass on, pass [of time]”.

b7. Toch. B wīna, nom. pl. (tantum), “pleasure” corresponds to Skt. ratiḥ, nom. sg., with the same meaning.

b7. Toch. B tākoṃ, 3pl. active optative from nes- “be, exist, become”⁷⁴ corresponds to Skt. bhavet, 3sg. optative, “be, exist, become”.

b7. Skt. pariṣṭīnaṃ, nom. sg., “old, decayed” is translated into Toch. B by a phrase with aiksnar “(al)together, completely” and krāu, nom. sg. preterite participle of kwār- “to age, grow old”.⁷⁵

6. Notes

This fragment belongs to the first Udānavarga⁷⁶ chapter named Anit-yavarga.

There are some differences between orthography and verbal forms of the two texts of IOL Toch. 233+368 and SI 2985/1. The translation from Sanskrit is done word by word. However, sanskrit compositas are usually translated by Toch. B phrases. Toch. B is not as rich in synonyms as Sanskrit is used to be. Some Skt. phrases get an additional elaboration as in line a7. All these instances helped not only to keep the translation close to the original but also make it clearer for the audience and omit excess stylistic effort.

Udānavarga (Uv. 4.23b – 4.34c)

SI 2994/9 (Old number: SI B/114)
Find spot: Kuča, On-baš Miṅ-Öy
Bilingual Tocharian B/Sanskrit
fig. 5
fig. 6

⁷³ In yasi kaunantsa, yasi is in the singular and kaunantsa is in the plural. We probably have to take it as a compound, even though no accent effect in yasi is seen.
⁷⁴ ADAMS 2013, 366.
⁷⁵ ADAMS 2013, 254.
⁷⁶ For the general context, cf. ĀNANDAJOTI BHikkhu, 2007.
1. Material description

Size (h x w, maximal): 8.2×5.3 cm. Fragment of the middle of a leaf. It is likely that the lower and upper edges are both visible. On the fragment, seven lines are still visible on both sides. One can assume that each side had seven lines. The fragment is heavily damaged. All the lines have losses of text.

2. Transliteration

a1 /// [y]āmi • rāgaṃ ca d[oṣ:] ///
a2 /// masketra 20-[3] a[p:] ///
a3 /// [rñe]79 sa ylaṁāktāññ[ē] ///
a4 /// ta80 ṣek yama[y]ñent- ///

77 These akṣaras should be the <doṣa> of dōsaṃ Uv. 4.23c.
78 This akṣara should be the <pra> of apramādam Uv. 4.24a.
79 The akṣara is compatible with <rñe> of a7 line.
80 Compare BERNGARD 1965, 134: Uv. 4.25b pāṇḍitāth.
a5 /// [ai]śaumye 20-5 dr[ṣṭ] ///
a6 /// karsaṁhemen [ai]-[au] ///
a7 /// rñe[ne] [p]-os-ai [l] ///
b1 /// [dhun]n[āt]’ [-] p[k] ///
b2 /// [ha] /// nn agnir iva ga[cch] ///
b3 /// n[au]talyñe • 30 prati ///
b4 /// hānā[ya] ///
b5 /// • dṛḍham śikṣata ///
b6 ///ltk æwlā[wat]taññ[e] ///
b7 /// [m]tu iṣe wr̥ntsai [p] ///

3. Transcription

a1 /// yāmi • rāgaṃ ca do(ṣam) /// Uv. 4.23b, c
a2 /// māsketrā 23 ap(ramādaṃ) /// Uv. 4.23d; Uv. 4.24a
a3 /// (snai yko)rñesa ylaiṅktaññe (•) /// Uv. 4.24c
a4 /// (panditah sek yamāδyñent(ane aiśaumye •) /// Uv. 4.25b
a5 /// aiśaumye 25 drṣṭ(adhārmika) /// Uv. 4.25d; Uv. 4.26a
a6 /// kārsalñemen aiśau(mye) /// Uv. 4.26c
a7 /// (yko)rñene p(r)os(k)ai l(kāskemane •) /// Uv. 4.27b
b1 /// (•) dhunāti pājp(a)k(āṃ) /// Uv. 4.28c
b2 /// (da)hann agnir iva gacch(ati) /// Uv. 4.29d
b3 /// nautilyñe • 30 prati(vidhyate) /// Uv. 4.30d
b4 /// (pari)hānāya – mā cā /// Uv. 4.32c
b5 /// • dṛḍhaṃ śikṣata /// Uv. 4.33b
b6 /// (snai spe)ltk(e) æwlāwattaññe /// Uv. 4.33d
b7 /// (pratibudhyadhva)m tu iṣe wr̥ntsai p(karsas) /// Uv. 4.34c

---

81 This akṣara should be the <ṣṭa> of drṣṭadhārmika Uv. 4.26a.
82 These akṣaras should be <dhun>ṅ<ti><p>ा<p>ा<kamm> of dhunāti pāpakāṃ dharmām Uv. 4.28c.
83 This akṣara should be the <ha> of dahann Uv. 4.29d.
84 This akṣara should be the <ccha> of gacchati Uv. 4.29d.
85 This akṣara should be the <vi> of pratividhyate Uv. 4.31c.
86 There is a folio abruption at this place. It is not clear enough if an akṣara was eliminated by it. On the one hand, the traces of ink on the left and on the right sides of the abruption doesn’t merge into one akṣara because the first one is looking more like <p> or <ṣ> and the second one is obviously <m>. On the other hand, from the semantical point of view there is no need of any additional akṣara.
87 This akṣara should be the <m> in virāma position of pratibudhyadhva Uv. 4.34c.
88 The rest of akṣara could be either of <p> or <k>.
4. Restoration and tentative translation

Uv. 4.23b /// yāmi
dharmasya bhavati hy anudharmacārī “...of the law, fulfills his duties (walks in the path of the Law)”

Uv. 4.23d /// māsketrā
prahāya bhāgī śrāmanyārthasya bhavati “shares the benefit derived from the monastic life”

Uv. 4.24c (snai yko)rñesa ylaiñäktāññe
apramādēna maghavān “through heedfulness of Maghavan (= Indra)”

Uv. 4.25b ̄sek yamālyhent(ane aĩaumye)
sadā kṛțyesu panditāh “a wise one permanently about [his] doings…”

Uv. 4.25d /// aĩaumye
atigrhnāti panditāh “a wise one surpasses”

Uv. 4.26c /// kārsalhēmen ai(ş)au(mye)
arthābhīsamayād dhīraḥ “having clear understanding of things, a wise man”

Uv. 4.27b (yko)rñēne p(r)os(k)ai l(kāskemane)
pramāde bhayadarśakaḥ. “[the one, who is] looking with fear at negli-
gence…”

Uv. 4.30d /// nautalyñe
sarvasamyojanakṣayam “elimination of all that binds to the world”

Uv. 4.32c mā cā ///
abhavyaḥ parihāṇa “[the one who is] improper for a decrease”

Uv. 4.33d (snai spe)ltk(e) awlāwattañe
anuṭhānam asanyamaḥ “with a lack of endeavour and with uncontrolled [senses]”

Uv. 4.34c tu iše wrāntsai p(karsas)
tad aṅgaṁ pratibudhyantadhvam “O you! Recognize this!”

5. Comments

a1. Toch. B yāmi “doer”, agent noun from yām-. 89 corresponds to the last element of the Skt. compound anudharmacārī “[the one who] acts according dharma”.

a2. Toch. B māsketrā, 3sg. middle present from māsk- “to be, become”, 90 corresponds to Skt. bhavati, 3sg. present, “to be, become”.

89 ADAMS 2013, 532.
90 ADAMS 2013, 491.
a3. Toch. B *snai ykorñesa*, perl. sg., “without negligence; diligence”\(^{91}\) corresponds to Skt. *apramādena*, ins. sg., with the same meaning.


a4. Toch. B *şek* “continually, perpetually” corresponds to Skt. *sadā* with the same meaning.


a4. The Toch. B correspondence to Skt. *paṇḍitaḥ*, nom. sg., “a wise one” should be restored as *aiśaumye* as in line a5.

a5. Toch. B *aiśaumye*, nom. sg., “a wise one” corresponds to Skt. *paṇḍitaḥ* with the same meaning.

a6. The Skt. compound *arthābhisamayād*, abl. sg., “clear understanding of artha” was translated into Toch. B as a phrase with *kārsalñemēnt*,\(^{94}\) abl. sg., “knowledge” as the last component. The first component could be restored as *arthantse / ārth*\(^{95}\). Toch. B *aiśaumye*\(^{96}\) “a wise one” corresponds to Skt. *dhīraḥ* with the same meaning.

a7. Toch. B *ykorñene*, loc. sg., “negligence”\(^{97}\) corresponds to Skt. *pramāde*, loc. sg., with the same meaning.

a7. One can safely restor\(^{98}\) the Toch. B phrase *proskai lkāskemane* “seeing fear” corresponding to the Skt. compound *bhayadarśakaḥ*, nom. sg., “[the one who is] looking with fear”.

b1. Only Sanskrit text Uv. 4.28c.

b2. Only Sanskrit text Uv. 4.29d.

b3. Toch. B *nautalyñe*, obl. sg., “disappearance”\(^{100}\) corresponds to the last component of Skt. composita *sarvasamyojanaṅkṣayam* “the destruction of all bounds [to saṁsāra]” acc. sg.

\(^{91}\) ADAMS 2013, 559.

\(^{92}\) ADAMS 2013, 563.

\(^{93}\) ADAMS 2013, 529.

\(^{94}\) *yamālyñe* “doing” would match much better to gerund, fem. from this root *kṛyā* with meaning “act, doing”. However, the loc. pl. of *kṛyā* is *kṛyāṣu*.

\(^{95}\) The correct form would be *kārsalñemen* with *a* in the first syllable (ADAMS 2013, 177).

\(^{96}\) Cf. ADAMS 2013, 56: *ārth* (n.[m.sg.]) “meaning, sense” [ārth, arthantse, ārth//, -, ar-thamma] *arthantse karsak* “knowledge of the meaning”

\(^{97}\) Cf. ADAMS 2013, 113.

\(^{98}\) Compare IOL Toch. 48 line a2: *proskai lkāskesn*.

\(^{99}\) ADAMS 2013, 559.

\(^{100}\) ADAMS 2013, 371.
b4. Sanskrit (Uv. 4.32c): *abhavyaḥ parihāṇāya*. Lit. “[the one who is] improper for a decrease”. One can suppose that in Toch. B it was translated as “[the one who is] not able to die or decrease” by a form of the verb *cämp*—to be able to*. May be the agent noun *cämpfe* was used.

b5. Only Sanskrit text Uv. 4.33b.


b7. Toch. B *iše*, a particle implying attention, corresponds to Skt. *aṅgāṃ* with the same meaning.

b7. Toch. B postposition *wrāntsai* “against, opposite” and a 2pl, imperative, possibly *pkarsas* from *kārs-* “to know, understand, recognize”, correspond to the Skt. *pratibudhyantadhvam* “to be aware of” 2pl, imperative.

6. Notes

This fragment belongs to the fourth *Udānavarga* chapter named *Apramādavarga*.

Translation from Sanskrit is mostly a word by word one; however, there are some exceptions. Padas 4.28a-b, 29a-b, 30a-b, 31a-b, 32a-b are omitted as they are a mere repetition of padas 4.27a-b.

A stotra fragment

**SI 2921/7** (Old number: SI B/3-6)

Find spot: Kuča, On-baš Miŋ-Ōy

Tocharian B

fig. 7

fig. 8

---

101 For the meaning of *cämpfe* cf. VYZHLAKOV 2020.
102 ADAMS 2013, 788.
103 ADAMS 2013, 32.
104 ADAMS 2013, 176.
105 For the general context, cf. ĀNANDAJOTI BHikkhu, 2007.
1. **Material description**

Size (h x w, maximal): 3.7×10.5 cm. The right part of a leaf, preserving the lower right corner on the recto, and the upper right corner on the verso. On the fragment, three lines are still visible on both sides. One can assume that originally each side had at least 4 or 5 lines.

On the verso side, one can see two vertical lines of ornament made of doubled slanting strokes going up to the end of the page. This drawing is the usual device for marking the final leaf of a manuscript, following a colophon. This assumption fits the content of the line b2, which mentions the end of the copy of a text. Line b3 is very damaged: the paper has been erased, and the ink has fainted, so that one can see only the top of some akṣaras.

2. **Metre**

The metrical character of the text is made sure by the double dots and by the instances of alternative word order. The complete metrical segments (āñmalāṣlñe porttar ŋīś : ketara kartseś; yārpontasa ŋīnṇana : ce cemetsa warṇai, pūṇākttāṇne akālko : ot spā snai lyēpūr) lead to the assumption that

---

106 About Tocharian metre cf. PEYROT 2018.
the metre was 4 x 12 syllables, rhythm 5/7 (precisely 5/4+3). But the sentence to be found in line b2 was not metrical: it contained the title of the work, and probably the mention of the author of the text and the scribe.

3. Transliteration

a1 /// [m]· – [p]· [c]ā[r]f· ] p·y·ā·nts· c· [y]n·
a2 /// [n]u-[ā]n·a ān·m·āl·ā·ś·l·-nē port·tār ņiśd· · : ket·ar·a kart·se[ś]·
a3 /// o yērp·ont·-a-sa ņi-hēna : ce cm·el·tsa wa·r·nai w·iko
b1 /// [d]ē-k[tā]-nē akālko ot · spā sn· ly·[p]g·r[ · j [w]· ///
b2 /// [n]idhānastotṛā āra paikatsi
b3 /// – ē ē l· ē

4. Transcription

a1 /// (śpāl)m(em) (u)p(a)cār p(o)yś(i)nts(e) c(e) yn(eś)
a2 (yāmtsi : – – – – – – – – – – – : – – – mu-[ā]n·a ān·m·āl·ā·ś·l·-nē port·tār ņiś :
kēt·ar·a kart·seś
a3 (yāmtsi : – – – – – – – – – – – : – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – : – – – – – (pū)dīn(ā)k[tā]-nē akālko : ot spā sn(ai) ly(f)pār w·
b1 (yentrā – – : ) – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – : – – – – (pū)dīn(ā)k[tā]-nē
b2 /// (pra)ṇidhānastotṛā āra paikatsi
b3 /// no restoration possible

5. Tentative translation

a1 …in order to make manifest the excellent practice of the omniscient.
a2 …(please bestow) compassion, acknowledge me for the good of everyone
a3 (as making all efforts. May I enjoy the fruit) by my own meritorious acts. From this [present] existence onwards, may (the afflictions) disappear.
b1 (May my) wish of [attaining] Buddhahood (come true), and then entirely (the refuge?) …b2 …the writing [of this] Pranidhānastotra has come to the end.

6. Comments

a1. The words of this line should probably be restored as follows.
 upacār – noun, obl. sg., a loan from Skt. upacāra- “practice, behavior, method”.

---

70
poyšintse – gen. sg., “the all-knowing one, omniscient”, epithet and title of the Buddha, calque of Skt. sarvajña- “omniscient”.

cē – obl. sg. masc., of the demonstrative pronoun se of near deixis.

ynēś – adverb, “really, obviously”; one could restore it as a part of the phrase yneś yāmtsi, infinitive, from the phrase yneś yām- “to make clear, manifest”.

Accordingly, these would make a complete pāda: śpālmem upacār poyšintse cē yneś yāmtsi “in order to make manifest the excellent practice of the omniscient”; in other words, “to follow his example”.

a2. The first word of the line remains conjectural. The ligature ends with <-mu>, but the upper part remains problematic: it may be <-s>, or a more complex ligature. The reading of <-nna> is perfectly safe, and it would be arbitrary to suppose a mistake. Otherwise, this text does not show any spelling error. The nom. sg. -nna, if it were the feminine of an adjective in -nne, does not fit with ānmalāṣsālne, which is masculine. Alternatively, an abstract in -nna, (obl. sg. -nna), does not fit in this context. The remaining option would be a verb form, the direct object of which would be “compassion”. This would be a 2sg. active of an imperative (V) based on a subjunctive stem in -n̄ (class XII), maybe from a denominative verb.

a2. ānmalāṣlihe is a verse form of ānmalāṣsālne, nom./obl. sg., “compassion”.

a2. porttar – 2sg. middle imperative from ārttā- “to approve of, love, praise”. A new form and obviously correct. For this variant of the imperative prefix p(ā)- compare pokse from āks- “to announce, proclaim”. ¹⁰⁷

a2. niś – oblique of the 1sg. person personal pronoun. The nominative form is identical but does not fit in the present context. This form cannot be simply the direct object of the preceding verb, because one would expect the suffixed pronoun (-n) of the 1st person. Therefore, this pronoun ought to be constructed with a participial clause, which was made complete with the next segment. See the possible reconstruction of the text: ¹⁰⁸ porttar niś : ketara kartséš (yamasšeñcai po skeye) “acknowledge me, (as making all efforts), for the good of everyone”, where yamasšeñcái, obl. sg.

¹⁰⁷ Adams 2013, 41.

¹⁰⁸ However, it is important to mention that as there normally should be a syntactic break after the punctuation mark (double dots), this reconstruction supposes a misfit between metre and syntax. Otherwise the translation ought to be as follows:

a2 …acknowledge me [with respect to?] compassion; for the good of everyone, ...

a3 …(May I enjoy the fruit) by my own meritorious acts.
nt-participle from yām- “doing”; po “all, every, each, complete”; skeye, obl. sg., “effort”.

a3. The first word of the line ought to be restored as (ok)o, obl. sg., “fruit, result”. As this text clearly contains a series of wishes, oko would be the complement of a verb meaning “to obtain, reach” or “to enjoy” in the optative, possibly wärp-. This would make a complete pāda: (warpoymar ok)o yārpontasa ̃niññana.

a3. yārpontasa, perl. pl., “good deed, merit” (an equivalent of Skt. puṇya-) and ̃niññana, obl. fem. pl., “pertaining to me, my own” were put in a metric order109 to impose the rhythm 4+3 in the segment of 7 syllables.

a3. The last word of the line ought to be completed most probably as an optative form of wik- “drive off, disappear” either 3sg. middle wikoytär or 3pl. middle wikoy(e)ntär.110 The term kleś, (oblique, pl. klešanma), loan from Skt. kleśa- “affliction, impurity, depravity, defilement” is commonplace111 as the direct object of the causative (transitive) of the verb wik-. So the complete pāda can then be restored as follows: ce cmeltsa warñai wiko(yenträ klešanma).

b1. akālk – nom./obl., sg. “wish”. The form of the text is akālko with so-called mobile -o, which is attested in other metrical texts. This vowel alternates with -ä and with zero at the end of the word. A final -k should have been written <k>. However, according to the requirements of metre, the -o has been written here. The wish in question pertains to becoming a Buddha in the next life, based on the merits.

b1. snai lyipär – current phrase (as an equivalent of Skt. puṇya-) used as an adverb “without any rest; entirely, completely”.112

b1. The last word of the line remains conjectural. One could restore wa(ste) “protection, refuge”.113 This would refer to a commonplace notion, the threefold protection given by the Buddha, the Dharma and the Saṅgha.

7. Notes

This fragment has been used by Lévi for his edition of the Udānastotra,114 with the following comment:

---

109 The normal (prose) order would be: ̃niññana yārpontasa.
110 ADAMS 2013, 652.
111 For example, THT 1126 line a4 klešanma wikāṣṣāṃ.
112 ADAMS 2013, 602.
113 ADAMS 2013, 634.
114 Lévi 1933, 66.
“Un fragment à Pétrograd semble appartenir au colophon:
1  tanhā akālk : oṣ ūspa snai lyipar
2  tānastottā āra paikatsī”

Lévi attributes this fragment to the Udānastotra. However, the connection
with the Udānastotra seems to be wrong. Lévi assumes that for the d of
udāna the scribe wrote <u> (uāna), but with the alternative <ta>, namely the
Fremdzeichen, transliterated currently as <ta>. But the Fremdzeichen <ta> is
never found together with the diacritic mark of long vowel <ā>. Therefore,
one should read <dhā>. The next decisive point is the reading of the preced-
ing akṣara: this sign could be <ñi>, <ṇi>, or perhaps <śi>. One should quite
definitely restore (pra)ṇidhānastottrā, a transposition of Skt. Pranidhān-
astotra.

In any case, the preceding text shows no common phrase with the conclu-
sion of the Udānastotra.

Since the notion of pranidhāna-, alternatively pranidhi- “solemn resolu-
tion, wish, vow” is quite important in the Buddhist doctrine, a work with
such a title is not unexpected. But an exact identification seems to be out
of reach at this point.

Fragment of a jātaka

SI 2921/24 (Old number: SI B/3-13)
Findspot: Kuča, On-baš Miŋ-Öy
Tocharian B
fig. 9
fig. 10

---

115 See the edition and restoration by Pinault 1990 and the comments by Peyrot 2016b.
116 Edgerton 1953, 360.
117 One would remember Samantabhadracaryāpranidhāna, also known as Bhadra-
carīpranidhānastotra and Ārya Bhadracarya Pranidhāna Rāja, the text which was popular in
the region. Also the Samantabhadracaryā-pranidhāna text is written in the first person, as the
text of SI 2921/7. However this text doesn not fit the Sanskrit version: http://gretil.sub.
unigoettingen.de/gretil/1_sanskr/4_rellit/buddh/bst-108u.htm.
1. Material description

Size (h x w, maximal): 3.3×5.5 cm. The right part of a leaf, preserving lower right corner of the presumed recto, and the upper right corner of the presumed verso. Based on the content, one cannot establish with safety what is the recto and the verso. On the fragment, three lines are still visible on one side, and four lines on the other side. Line b4 is much damaged so that one can see only the top of some akṣaras. One can assume that originally each side had at least five lines. The text seems to be entirely in verse, judging from the double dot in a6, and the number in b2, and from instances of verse forms.

2. Metre

The metrical character of the text is made sure by the double dots and by the instances of metrically pressed forms (ṣlyamoñ lwāsa and teky empelye) as well as several verse forms. The definition of the metre remains uncertain. However, there are several instances of sequences of 7 (4+3) syllables, and the final sequence of the pāda ought to be of 4 syllables (ṣlyamoñ lwāsa : teky empelye 10). Therefore, one may tentatively surmise that the metre was of 4 x 18 syllables, rhythm 7(4+3)/7(4+3)/4.

3. Transliteration

a1 /// [lt]s: [r]s: s: aḥm-l-ṣṣ[e]ṃñ
a2 /// [rñe] soyṣṣawa šaul • rintsamai
a6 /// y: moñ • lwāsa : paskemane
b1 /// ŋ[e]m • walo šeym • akalye pr[e] :[ś]l
4. Transcription

a1 /// (au)ltso(s)rs(a) s(e) aṁm(a)l(ā)(off)-śemnī
a2 /// (pem)rne soyṣṣawa šau lintsamai
a3 /// (śly)a(m)ōn ḍwāsa : paskemane
b1 /// ŋem walo ṣeym akalye prep(ā)l(e)
b2 /// (lyakā)wa teky empelye 10 subhāṣita(gaveṣi)
b3 /// mañye nestsi arttamai amāṃ
b4 /// — — ā ḍ e — — ra po

5. Tentative translation

a1. …in brief, this one, out of pity
a2. …I satisfied the glory, I gave up [my] life
a3. …the flying animals. Observing
b1. …was the king named … The learning (ought) to be asked for (by myself)…
b2. …(I suffered?) a dreadful disease. 10 (The king) Subhāṣitagaveṣi…
b3. …I approved to become a servant. (I abandoned) the pride…

6. Comments

a1. The words of the line one should probably restore as follows.
   aultsorsa – adverb, “in short, briefly”, based on the verbal noun from the preterit participle from wälts- “to put together, press together.
   aṁmalāṣṣemnī – causal (ending in -nī) from aṁmalāṣṣe, equivalent of aṁmalāṣṣalne, abstract, “sympathy, pity, compassion”. This form would be of the late layer of Tocharian B, featuring assimilation of a cluster of palatal consonants.
   a2. The first word of the line ought to be restored as pernerne, obl. sg., “splendor, glory”.
   a2. soyṣṣawa is a verse form with syncope for soyāṣṣawa, 1sg. active preterit from soy- “to satisfy”.
   a3. One knows already the fixed phrase ḍwāsa ḍlyamnana (THT 29 b8; to be restored in THT 343 a3), lit. “flying animals”, referring to birds. Here the
feminine plural *ṣlyamāṇa* of the agent noun *ṣlyamo* has been replaced by the masculine due to metrical requirements.

a3. *paskemane* is the *m*-participle from *pāsk-* “to protect; to observe (rules), practice, beware of”.

b1. *ñem* — nom. sg., “name”. It features here in the so-called naming construction with apposition to the proper name and the title of the person: “the king named N.N.”.

b1. *ṣeym* is a late form of *ṣaim*, 1sg. active imperfect from *nes-* “to be”.118

b1. *prekšle* is a verse form with syncope for *prekšalle*, gerund (I), expressing obligation, from *pārk-* “to ask for, beg”.

b2. The first word of the line remains conjectural. One could restore *lya-kāwa*, 1sg. active preterit from *lāk-* “to see”, hence in this context “to suffer”.

b2. *teky* is a sandhi form, metri causa, for *teki*, obl. sg., “disease, illness”. With *empelye*, obl. sg., “terrible, horrible, dreadful, awful” composes a metrically pressed form *teky empelye*.

b3. *mañye* is a verse form with syncope of *mañiye*, obl. sg., “(male) slave, servant”.

b3. *amāṃ* — nom./obl., sg., “pride, arrogance”; here probably a direct object, complement of a verb meaning “to set apart, abandon”.

7. **Notes**

The fragment belongs to a text which tells in verse stories of the past life (*jātaka*) of the Buddha in the first person, see the verbs in lines a5, b1, b3. Furthermore, the line b1 contains the typical sentence of conclusion, which gives the identification of a character of the distant past, in the 3sg. imperfect (*ñem walo ṣeym)*.119 This sentence corresponds to the so-called *samodhāna*, a finishing part of a *jātaka* in the Pāli *Jātaka* collection.

The king *Subhāṣitagaveṣin* is a well-known figure of Bodhisattva, which was the hero of a *jātaka* or *avadāna*.120

In Tocharian B, *Subhāṣitagaveṣin* is found in several texts: IOL Toch. 115 a1, IOL Toch. 278 b1, THT 95 a6, THT 99 a6. Precisely, in Berlin fragments, the story of *Subhāṣitagaveṣin* was told following the telling of the *Araṇemi-jātaka*, the story of a very generous king, see the transition in THT

---

119 Cf. THT 95 a1 (*etve säim*), A 17a2, Thomas 1957, 74–75, 162.
120 See the references in Panglung 1981, 177. See in particular Mālasarvāstivāda-Vinaya, Vinayakṣudraka (T. 1451). Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā by Kṣemendra, No. 53 (see translation and analysis by Straube 2009, 271–278); Aavadāna-sataka, No. 38.
The story itself was told in drama form, as seen in the fragments THT 99 to 101. In short, the king in question is eager to learn a saying (subhāṣita) of the Buddha. With this intention he meets a Yakṣa (who is actually Indra/Śakra in disguised form) in the forest, and learns finally from him the saying (stanza) in exchange of his own life: in this goal the king prepares a gigantic fire and throws himself into it, which however changes itself immediately into a pond. Then he obtains to hear the saying and to spread it.

There is however some uncertainty concerning the SI 2921/24 fragment, partly because the fragmentary text does not offer any common word or phrase with the fragments THT 95, 99–101. This situation can be explained by a difference of genre, since the treatment in dramatic form in THT 99–101 is quite extensive, with alternating prose and verse. It is not at all certain that the king who was named in SI 2921/24 b1 was identical to Subhāṣitagaveśin, who is named later in line b2. The phrase “I gave up my life” (line a2) may apply to many Bodhisattvas. Then, it is possible that our text contained the successive telling of several jātakas in very abridged form (a type of text which is known otherwise) and in verse. And among them it contained the jātaka of Subhāṣitagaveśin.
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