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Abstract: The article is devoted to the publication of two leaves of a manuscript in Tocharian B from the Petrovskii collection, which is kept in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences, in St. Petersburg, known under the call numbers SI P/1b (SI 1903) and SI P/2b (SI 1904). These two leaves are consecutive and almost complete. The text is being published here for the first time in its entirety, with full transliteration, transcription and translation. It is part of a Buddhastotra, a poem of praise addressed to the Buddha, the stanzas of which are parallel to several stanzas of the Varnārhatavastotra by Mātṛceṭa.
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§ 1.

The Tocharian manuscripts kept in St. Petersburg, in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences, belong to a number of different collections which are named after the scholars, explorers and civil servants who found in the Tarim basin (in present-day Xinjiang, China) manuscripts in various languages, which were eventually sent to St. Petersburg for study by Sergei Oldenburg (1863–1934), and gathered together by the Russian Academy of Sciences.¹ The manuscript which will be published in the following pages is both historically famous and nearly unknown. It consists of two consecutive leaves of large size, written in the classical Brāhmī script of the Northern Turkestan type. The exact location where they were found is unknown, but it can be surmised to have been one of the oases on the northern route, possibly in the region of Kucha. They were acquired by Nikolai Petrovskii (1837–1908), who was then Russian consul in Kashgar, near the western border of present-day Xinjiang. This discovery was reported by Oldenburg in a short article (1893), which is evidently dated as

¹ For a comprehensive survey, see Vorob’iova-Desiatovskaja 1997, 207–210.
from May 1892. That paper included in an appendix a large plate showing
the recto and the verso of the first leaf (SI P/1b).2 At that time, both the
script and the language were unknown. Some time afterwards, the two leaves
were passed on to Ernst Leumann (1859–1931) for examination. The display
of the first leaf caused a sensation at the 9th International Congress of Orientalists
held in London in September 1892. Leumann presented the second
leaf at the 12th International Congress of Orientalists held in Rome in October
1899.3 Immediately afterwards, in 1900, he published in St. Petersburg a
transcription4 and a first analysis of the content of the two leaves. Leumann
was able to identify the metrical structure (see below § 3) of the text and
several loans from Sanskrit that pointed to the Buddhist content of the poem.
This publication comprised two plates: the first gives the metrical recon-
struction of the lines of the first leaf (SI P/1b) and the second shows the recto
and the verso of the second leaf (SI P/2b).5 Leumann’s pioneering work was
quite creditable, even though he was at a loss to interpret the special akṣaras
which were used to denote specific sounds of this unknown language. In the
following years, his first endeavour was bolstered by the discovery in Serindia
called at that time “Ostturkestan”) of further manuscripts written in
northern varieties of the Brāhmī script, belonging to the so-called Gupta
type. A number of them were in Sanskrit, which aided the partial reading of
those which were written in unknown languages while presumably contain-
ing Buddhist literature. In these materials, Leumann (1907) distinguished two
groups according to the language affiliation, which he named “Sprache I”
and “Sprache II”. The second language would later be identified as Middle
Iranian, more precisely Khotanese Saka (which Leumann termed “Norda-
risch”). The first was deciphered by Sieg and Siegling in 1908, and identified
as a new Indo-European language, which they named “Tocharisch”. Fur-
thermore, they identified two varieties of this language, A and B, and they
correctly ascribed the St. Petersburg leaves published by Leumann in 1900
to Tocharian B. Sieg and Siegling had worked mostly on the manuscripts
which had been found and brought back to Berlin by German expeditions in
the Tarim basin, from 1902 onwards, but they duly mention (1908, 915–917)
Leumann’s contribution. Therefore, it is fair to say that Leumann (1900)

2 Actually, the verso was reproduced above the recto.
3 See also BALBIR 1998, XXI–XXIII.
4 A preliminary and highly chaotic transcription of the first leaf had been published pre-
viously by HOERNLE 1893, 39–40.
5 For sake of simplicity I will henceforth refer to these two leaves by the marks [abbrev-
ations?] SI P/1 and SI P/2.
paved the way for the beginnings of Tocharian studies, and the two leaves of the Petrovskii collection have remained famous ever since as the first Tocharian manuscript ever published. It is somewhat paradoxical, therefore, that in the following decades these leaves were never scientifically published in their entirety by the few scholars who could rely on the advances in Tocharian philology.

This manuscript has long been cited with the press mark Pe (= Petersburg), especially by German scholars. Some phrases and sentences from the text have been quoted in books and articles on Tocharian linguistics. The text was studied by Walter Couvreur (1914–1996), presumably after the revised transliteration provided by Emil Sieg (1866–1951), during Couvreur’s stay in Göttingen, sometime between 1938 and 1944. Couvreur 1948, 563 and 567 gave the transcription and translation of three short passages. In the German handbook of Tocharian, there is a broad transcription of the first leaf, with several notes but no translation, in a selection of extracts from Buddhastotras, see TEB II, 58–59 (text No. XX.3). This transcription is not based on an autopsy of the manuscript and it contains erroneous restorations which stemmed from misreadings. It has been in need of revision for a long time. I had the opportunity to personally study the original manuscript in St. Petersburg three times. In February 1998, I made a survey of the collections of Tocharian and Sanskrit manuscripts kept in the IOM, RAS. I transliterated most of the Tocharian fragments, including the two leaves of the Buddhastotra in the Petrovskii collection. This transliteration was the basis of the transcription which I published later, with translation and commentary. I realized that my interpretation of some of the damaged parts close to

---

6 See for instance KRAUSE 1955, 1.
7 Cf. KRAUSE 1952, 311. The two leaves were then referred by the marks Pe 1 and Pe 2. From the indication given there, one can surmise that Sieg and Siegling made in the meantime a new transliteration of the text on the basis of the photographs that had been published in OLDENBURG 1893 and LEUMANN 1900. This reading is the source for the quotations of a few extracts, see for instance THOMAS 1957, 173–174. STUMPF 1971, 61, 158 used the mark Petr. (respectively Petr. I and Petr. II) and quoted from the same source.
8 Precisely the verses 67b, 68b (COUVREUR 1948, 563), and 72e (COUVREUR 1948, 567). On the other hand, passing mentions of Couvreur’s alternative restorations by Krause and Thomas would suggest that Couvreur collaborated at some stage with Sieg on the interpretation of the text.
9 Under the following title: “Aus der Sammlung Petrovski”, without giving the previous literature.
10 I am much obliged to Dr. Margarita Vorobyova-Desiatovskaia, supervisor of the manuscript fund, for her help on that occasion.
the lacunas in the manuscript was problematic, so that my restorations were at the least debatable, if not unsound. Fortunately, I had the opportunity to study the original leaves\textsuperscript{12} again in April 2009 and May 2015, in order to check many details.

The leaves are in relatively good condition, although the ink has been somewhat erased in places, especially at the surviving extremities. The paper has been pierced or torn in a few places. The upper and lower edges remain. There are 6 lines on each side. The space for the string hole interrupts lines 3 and 4. Size of the leaves: 38×9.1 cm; interval between the lines: around 1.3 cm. The paper has been torn off obliquely on the right, so that half of the lines are shorter by a few centimeters. The space for the string hole occupies about 5 cm. One can still see the ruling of the lines, and even traces of the vertical ruling on both sides of the spaces for the string hole. This testifies to the careful preparation of the leaves, which is borne out by the quite regular and beautiful calligraphy. The left and right edges have been lost. The width of the respective lacunas can be estimated by the number of missing syllables and the expected position of the string hole in a manuscript of such size, since the string hole is normally placed in the first third of the leaf. The meter helps us to assess the number of missing āksaras, which varies between 7 and 10 in total for SI P/1, between 5 and 9 for SI P/2. There are more āksaras missing on the left side (between three and six) than on the right (minimum one or two, maximum five). Therefore, the width of the original leaves can be estimated to have been about 48 cm, depending on the size of the left and right margins.

§ 2. Transliteration of the two leaves SI P/1 (SI 1903) and SI P/2 (SI 1904)

The conventional symbols for the transliteration of Tocharian are used: — illegible āksara; · illegible or missing part of an āksara; /// for a lacuna in the manuscript; ○ for the string hole space; [ ] (square brackets) for an uncertain reading; ( ) for restorations; = for sandhi; \ for the virāma stroke. Note that the redundant marking of virāma, with an additional dot on the right, is found only twice in SI P/2 b1, after the same word. At the end of each

\textsuperscript{12} I am very grateful to Dr. Irina Popova, head of the IOM, RAS, for the opportunity to work with the Tocharian manuscripts housed there, as well as for the possibility to publish my edition of the two leaves in this journal.
stanza, I have given its number, without any other additional mark. Except for the last pada of a stanza, the end of the pada is normally marked by a single dot, not by the double dot which is found in most metrical passages of other Toch. manuscripts. This dot has been forgotten by the scribe at the end of the padas 65a, 68c, 68d, 72a, 73b, 74b, 74d.

**SI P/1**

**Recto (pl. 1)**

a1 /// spantaisñentaše eńku wäjra akautacce • mahäkarumșe waipe pen- yacce pešpištu • taryā-ynke ymnente šmoņaše mä[ñi](·)¹ kakām[au • ///


a3 ///rs(·)syasšen astreń ńa o ktentsa wawarpau • klesanmaššen cem lämtn aśuṃents pō nākṣeņcai • pškošše cau wemacetren [šan]masšeņcia y(·)ai ///

a4 /// [sa]nmausa 65 o ńakcyem yetwentsa yaitu vājr emńku šarnene • ylaiñäktne weśa karpāsta wrocce telkine • krenč pe[l](·)///

a5 ///[so]yşasta • wismai klyautkasta brähmaññai wertsyai po șaisše • yātšeņcia ilaiñaketem² po ylaiñäktents astsa praly[u]³ yparwe s(·)a⁴///

a6 ///[nma] pelaikneššana wrohtsana • wärpormen skwanma pälkoššana⁵ tom snay⁶ äke • saiššentse wäntre ārskormen yā(−) [st m]ai [·]ā(−)²///

**Verso (pl. 2)**

b1 /// w(·)r(·) rõne nervānṣai • orasta niśś² ywärē laklene tńak no pw āṁntsya yam šarārne po šaulanma[sa] 67 āṁmālaśłn[e][ss]² uppā[l](·)///

b2 ///[kw]²pešse wasty āstreń ausu penyacce • kwāntsāññe jat⁶ snai ykornešsa po kektseñe lalamšk=astarya poyśišñėṣṣ=aurtṣa [laj]ktsauña ńa///

b3 /// bhrangar eńku ń o kes=āstreń īte maittasše 68 pūdñäktešše tewe branmñeke spālmen snai menāk • yainnu maktauñe ///

b4 /// nermit yāmše o ńcai wnolmen otk yaknes=astareņ • nervānāṣṣai¹⁰ kentsa šaiše tarkaucai emşketteśse • tanmasšeņcai pelaikn[e] ///

b5 /// suwa koy[ntsa] auspa brāhmañņem 69 emprenmașšana (−)[d]an- ma¹¹ ñtwāra aksāsta • klainamāśł šamaškamāśł karsatsi (−)w n(·)rm ci aurt(·)e ///

b6 ///[ṣ] karute [ṣ]iryem¹² sāgari • gāń pelaikneššai kentsa cārķasta ast- taryai • po pi šaiše kalloy nāsste pelaik[n]es(·)ai (−)ńaišš³³ [lau ///
SI P/2

Recto (pl. 3)

a1 /// h(·)tu mānavemš kauñāktañ̈=āstrem mandalmeñ̈ • pākri takāsta bramńāktañ̈hāna ersasa • yakne kektents(·) [p]([·) [sārsal]stane an(·)//
a2 /// (·)su ka[l]pa tañ̈ cîne maiyyācce • yware wertsyaine plyews=ipërner meş(·)c\(^{14}\) omoŋstam tsemtsa cîne wnołmeñ̈s\(\) tañ̈ wrocce 71 waiptr [po
wno]lment\(\)s̈ k̈ şa///
a3 ///[ndri]nta palsko o ntamš\(\) ymain po ysoño yámornəa kešanma • ykenta prešcqiyam̈ tsałnašes̈sana upąnyta • ysoño ai///
a4 /// alálttte • o ańmålaške tań̈wań̈neñça kranîka tkev nest auspa pontamts šaš̈ ŋamo 72 po pelaiknenta[m///
a5 ///[sə]m ektatsn̈e okonta cmelam̈s putkaln̈e pkantem=opąnyta waip̈tar̈tsañ̈n̈e ñesñen̈a • ymwa yâm[ll]ona šaš̈ šän i(·)[e///
a6 ///[jhę̂]e\(^{15}\) lykaše treste po karsauca plo klautkentsa po trai prekenne 73 ṭu ŋynes=anaišai po pelaiknenta şaɾs̈sta • šals(·)e///

Verso (pl. 4)

b1 /// [s]p(·)rotarc\(\) snai skeyem ka twe po krentauna ynes̈ yämšenca • ritaln̈e yarm ka [po] ne wātkaltsn̈e sportotarc\(\) • etan̈katte ka s(·)//
b2 /// nts[e] ra ymiye akâšñe 74 ollypots=enestai wāntre ynes̈ ka tañ̈ sportora • šatkai ra luanke attsaik ispe tañ̈ somotkn̈e • [kai]\(^{16}\)//
b3 /// p[o] tañ̈ ola o ŋ tu • snai keş ra tapre attsaik ette tañ̈ masketra • karsanlyem wântarwane snai prayo[k k]a sporto[tr]\(\)\(·\)\(^{17}\) ///
b4 /// [o]rkmo ra wântre o kaum̈ ra tañ̈ laktsetstse • skloksa yawușmauş ra şek wātkaltsań̈e tañ̈ omte • snai ptsa katkre ra t[pa]rškemn̈ [t]pa]rske ///
b5 /// [ai]şmornts\(\) cem̈s̈ aśamn̈eş̈e câmpamn̈e • om tañ̈ šatkau po karsa(− −) [n̈]\(^{18}\) akâše po saṃsärne şek etan̈katte 76 tāk̈=aurt[s]e\(^{19}\) [lk̈]lne
pełai///
b6 ///[•] prutkoytr akâše tañ̈ krentaunasa yke postam • ykāk tañ̈ krentauna placyem snai yārm keş saim wâsta • mant\(\) snai [ka]ls(·)ā[lyn̈]e [snai]
yā[rm̈] ke (·)[ai///

Textual notes:

1. The paper is torn at the end of the line, but the reading of mā is safe. In any case, the remnants of the next aḵšara exclude the restoration (pekwe), as per TEB II, 58, n. 6. The reading kakāmo for the next word is not warranted.
This form shows the expected final diphthong. After it, one can even see a
trace of the expected dot at the end of the pāda.

2. Sic! The spelling ilai° instead of ylai° can be accounted for by the
metrical constraint which requires a word of 4 syllables here in order to com-
plete the first 8-syllable segment of the pāda. There is no trace of the double
dot on the top of the aksara ṇa of ṇakteṁ. Compare the correct writing of the
genitive pl. of the same word shortly afterwards.

3. The reading pralya, as per TEB II, 58 is excluded; the reading pralyu
was confirmed by Couvreur, (cf. TEB I, 103, n. 1). This is the expected form
of the vocative sg. masc. of the gerundive pralye, (cf. TEB I, 103, § 123.1).

4. On the top of this aksara, the vocalization °au is excluded. The resto-
ration s(tmaucai), as per TEB II, 58, n. 12 is impossible.

5. Sic! This word is not written with a Fremdzeichen for the first aksara,
as is usual. Compare further occurrences of pālsko in 1a3 and 2a3.

6. Sic! For snai, a sandhi form before the vowel which does not change
the prosody.

7. The paper is torn, so the reading remains tentative as well as the resto-
ration. Nonetheless, my previous reading has to be revised.

8. Sic! Virāma stroke after the plain sign, not a Fremdzeichen.

9. Virāma sign, but the meter proves that this word should be read with
two syllables, as jatā.

10. According to the meter, this word should be read with 3 syllables:
nervānṣai. The ṇāḷ is written without a Fremdzeichen, which is not so re-
markable.

11. For the second aksara of this word, the reading <ra> is excluded. The
reading and restoration (ve)danma by Couvreur were correct, pace TEB II,
59, n. 5, see also THOMAS 1957, 173.

12. Despite the poor condition of the paper, the reading [ʂ]i is much pre-
ferable to [p]i for the first aksara of this word, pace TEB II, 59.

13. Virāma stroke after the plain sign, not the Fremdzeichen, see above
n. 8. As for the beginning of the word, the damaged paper and the size of the
break allow us to assume a large and complex ligature.

14. The hole in the paper allows the restoration ms(ā) for the preceding
aksara.

15. The reading of the ligature right after the break has puzzled me for a
long time. After repeated checks, it appears that some options are not war-
ranted: [pr]e, [pʰ]e, [ṣ]e, [sk]e. As the most likely reading one should retain
[jhə]e, which implies a loan from Skt. sarvajña- or dharmaṣa- with hyper-
sanskritism and adaptation to the Tocharian morphology. This can be sup-
ported by the parallel Sanskrit text, which contains *sarvadharmaññah* (VAV 3.15c). The Tocharian text paraphrases or translates several stanzas of the chapter 2 (*Sarvajñatāsiddhi*) of VAV, see below § 5. The restoration (*sarva)*jñ̄hē (Skt. *sarvajñā-*) can be reckoned redundant, because it would be translated later by *po kārsauca*. Therefore, I have tentatively preferred to restore (*dharma)*jñ̄hē, provided that the first two akṣaras were sufficiently close to the Sanskrit original.

16. Only the lower left part of a single sign, not a ligature, is visible before the break. My previous tentative reading is best forgotten.

17. The ligature entails the sandhi of *ōtrā* before the vowel or diphthong of the next word.

18. My previous reading and restoration *karsa[l]ṅ(e)* have to be drastically revised, first of all because this gives the wrong meter. In addition the place of the akṣara *ṅa* does not correspond to a ligature; it is actually marked by a virāma stroke, which is almost completely erased. The new reading allows a syntactical construction which is not very different from my former assumption, except that *po kārsati* should be taken as the nominalization of the phrase *po kārs-* ‘to know everything’ (cf. *po kārsauca* in 73e), translating the Skt. *sarvajñatā-* ‘omniscience’.

19. This sequence ought to be interpreted as the sandhi of *tākoy*, optative 3rd sg. act. of the verb ‘to be’, with the initial diphthong of the following word. This optative is in parallel to the optative *prutkoytār* of the next sentence.

§ 3. Transcription and metrical restitution of the text

The poem follows a relatively rare metrical pattern: each stanza has five pādas, the first four pādas having 13 syllables (rhythm 5/8) and the fifth pāda having 21 syllables (rhythm 8/8/5). Accordingly, the text shows a number of metrical variants of the standard Tocharian B language, as well as many sandhi forms. Otherwise, the language belongs to the classical stage, according to Peyrot’s periodization. I would assume the first half of the 7th c. CE for the composition of the text, but it may have been copied in the second half of the same century. In the following I have tried to give a continuous text in most instances. Some of the restitutions given below are, of

---

13 TEB II, 52, n. 4; STUMPF 1971, 72.
course, open to discussion. The manuscript covers verses 64 to 77d of the poem. There is still a long lacuna which I have not yet been able to fill plausibly: in the pāda 69b, where 8 syllables are missing. In the following, ordinary brackets correspond to the restorations, whereas square brackets denote additions that are required to make the text more readable. The expected dots that occur in lacunas have been restored, but missing dots have not been added in disregard of the manuscript.

SI P/1a1 (5 syllables missing) spāntaitsṅentaśe eṅku wājrā akautacce •
mahākarumṣe waipe peñyacce peśpīntu •
tāryā-ynke ymentse śmōṇaśe māṅ(ye) kakāmau •
(tā[a2]ryāka-wi yetwemts=ɔ)yypo yaitu stmau śña-nwalneśeṣepi sumbernts me mracne 64
poyśīṇ(ɛ)ṣse tve ylaiṅākte nest yalts=esaintsa
Ikāṣeṇc=ānaiṣai p(o)-preścyṭaṣṣe kr(ṃ)[a3](t pelaikne •
(stvarā-we)r(t)syaṅṣeṃ āstreṃ āktentsa wawārpau •
kleśanmaṣṣeṃ cem lāmint asūremts po nāṅṣeṇcai •
pālskoṣe cau wemacir sneṃāṅṣeṇcai y(l)ai(nā[a4]kentse prākṛṃ)
śanmausa 65
ṅākcyem yetwemtsa yaitu vājr emṅku śarnene •
ylaiṅāktṇe weṣṣa karpāsta wrocce telkine •
kremt pel(aikneṣe [a5] śūkṣa śāṃma) sosṣasta •
wismai klyautkasta brāhmanaṅṇai wertsyai po sāisṣe •
yātāsṛṣeṇcai ilaiṅakt̥em po ylaiṅāktnents āṣt̥a pralyu yparwe s(t)a(mās-
lu) (66)
[a6] (toms stwar=empre)ṃna pelaikneṣṣaṇa wroṭstsana •
wāpormem skwanma pālskoṣṣana toṃ snay āke •
śaiṣṣentse wāntre ārskormem yā(tā)st mai(yy)ā(cceṃ •
(katknat [b1] śaulṣana po) w(a)rś(ain) riṇe nervāṇṣai •
orasta niś ywārc laklne tṇak no pw āṁtsa yam śarāṃne po śaulammasa 67
āṁmāślāṅṣeṣe uppāl(ne ʃemast=ara[b2]ṇcāṣṣu •
yase)-kw(i)peṣṣe wastyṣ āstreṃ ausu peñyacce •
kwaṁtsaṅṇe jat(ā) snai-ykorniṣṣa po kekteṇe
lālṃṣk=astarya poyśīṇeṣṣ=aurtsa lāktsauṇa
ṣa(rṣa ṅākcyē) [b3] (karunāṣṣe) bhṛṅgāṅg eṅku śūkes=āstreṃ īte maityar-
ṣe 68
pūṁṅakteṣe tve bramāṅkte śpālmeṃ snai menāk •
yainmu māktauṇe ———-[b4] ————(-•)
nermī yāṁṣeṇcai wnomlen okt-yaknes=astareṃ •
nervänāssai kentsa šaišše tärkaucai emšketstse •
tanmāsšeccai pelaikn(ešš)e [b5] (bramñäktentse) šuwa koyns ta auspa
brāhmānem 69

ta emprenumassana (ve)danma stwāra aksāsta •
klainamts šaṃaškaṃs karsatsi (sak)w n(a)rm ci aurt(s)e (•)
(ceṃ [b6]wamer kālpo)š karute-širyeṃ sāgari •
gāi pelaiknešśai kentsa cārkāsta astaryai •
po pī šaišše kalloy nāstsi pelaiknes(s)ai (wšem)nāiš lau(ke) [SI P/2a1]
(astareṃ warne 70)

h(e)tu mānavemš kauṇaktānē=āstṛem māṇḍālmer •
pākri takāsta bramṇāktaṇñana ersnasas •
yakne kektents(e) p(o) šārsasta-ne an(aišai) [a2] (•)
(šaumo spelkes)šu kalpa tañ cine maiyyācce •
ywārc wertsyainę plyews=iprems ṃ(a)-c ompostām tsemtsa cine wno-
lems ts tañ wrocce 71

waiptār po wnolemnts kša(lamū[a3]lānta i)ndrinta
pālskontamts ymain po ysomo yāmorna klešanma •
ykenta preściyaṃ ṭsalpāsleshana upāynta •
ysomo aišeṃca) [a4] (snai olypo kāśṣi) aláltte •
añmālaške tānwaññeṣca krātanike tewk nest auspa pōntamts sañ šaumo 72
po pelaikntenam (ts nesalñenta [a5] cāmpalñenta •)
šarm ekātatsne okonta cmelaṃts putkalñe
pāntenme=opāynta waiptārsānñenta šetsñenta •
yēmwa yāmlonna sañ sañ ñ(k)e(ne wānta[a6]rwa •)
(twe dharma)jhiñe lykaške trekte po kārsauca po klautkentsa po trai pre-
kenne 73

tū yknæs=anaisai po pelaikntena šārsasta •
šals(k)e(mane yarm i[b1]mesa ka po) sp(o)rtotar-c
snai skeyern ka tew po krentauna yneś yāmšeṣca •
ṛitelñe yarm ka pone wātktālsne sportotār-c
etaṅkātte ka s(nai åke tañ ka[b2]rsalne yente)ntse ra ymīye akāśne 74
olypotsts=enestai wāntre yneś ka tañ sportotra •
štakai ra lauke atsaik ispe tañ somotknē •
kā(tkre ra [b3] āparške māsketār) po tañ olāñ tu •
snai keś ra tapre atsai ete tañ māsketār •
kārsanāleyṃ wāntarwane snai prayok ka sportotr (aišai yama[b4]lñe po
(ci) (75)

(štakai) orkmo ra wāntre kauṃ ra tañ lāktsetstse •
skloksa yaušmanuṣ ra şek wātktālsānñe tañ omte •
snai pta kātkre ra tārṣēkemēn tārṣē (māske [b5] tār •)
(ente po) aiśmōnts cēmēr aiśmēnēsē cāmpammē •
om tān sātkau po kārsas (tsi ṣa) tān akāšē po sāmsārēne ŋēk ētāṅkātē 76
tāk = aurṭsē Ikāṅñe pelai(kṇenta) [b6] (po sāiśṣēne) •
prutkoyt akāšē tān kṛentaunasa yēk postām •
yāk tān kṛentauna placyēn snai yārē keš sain-wāstā •
mant snai-kāls[n]ālyēn snai yārē ke(ś s)ai(m-wāstē ka nest •)

§ 4. Translation of the text

[b] …having seized the unsplittable thunderbolt [vajra-] of trustworthiness,
[c] trusting in the splendid banner of great compassion [mahā-karunā-],
[d] having taken on the serv(ant) of the establishment of the threefold con-
sciousness,15 [e] very well adorned (with the thirty-two ornaments), standing
on the summit of the Sumeru characterized by self-roaring, /64/

[a] you, you are the god Indra of all-knowingness [sārvajñātā-], with a
thousand eyes [b] looking attentively at the good Law [sad-dharma-] appro-
priate to every time, [c] [you are] surrounded by the pure gods belonging to
the four companies,16 [d] o you who destroy totally those Asura-kings [asura-
rāj-] of the passions [kleśa-], o you who tied up this Vemacitra of thinking17
with the firm fetter of the god Indra! /65/

[a] Adorned with the divine ornaments, having seized the thunderbolt [va-
jra-] in both hands, [b] in the guise of god Indra, you descended to the great
sacrifice, [c] you made (humans) satiated (with the nectar) of the good L(aw).
[d] You have struck with amazement the company of brahmins [and] the whole
world, [e] o you who have tamed the Indra-gods, o you who ought to be
carried on the head of all Indra-gods, o you who have to be placed first! /66/

[a] (Those) great (four) truths belonging to the Law, [b] after having re-
ceived [them], and those delights of thinking without end, [c] after having
renounced the condition of the world [loka-dharma-], you tame18 the power-

15 This phrase transposes the notion of the three applications of awareness pertaining to a
Buddha: Skt. smṛty-upasthāna-; Pāli satipatthāna- (cf. BHSD, 614b).
16 This refer to the Cāturmāhājikas, comprising the four Mahārājas ‘Great kings’, posted
at the four cardinal points, and the groups of deities which they control: the Gandharvas, the
Kumbhāndas, the Nāgas, the Yakṣas (cf. KIRFEL 1959, 25).
17 Vemacitra, alternatively Vemacitrin (cf. Pāli Vepacitti) is a prince of the Asuras (see
BHSD, 509a). His defeat at the hands of the god Indra is a topos of Buddhist literature.
18 The verb (yātāst, 2 sg. act. of the present of the verb yāt- ‘to tame’), if correctly restored,
is in the present, while the other finite verbs nearby are in the past tense. Nonetheless, there
are some other verbs in the present in the passage, and this may be the case for the verb in the
ful ones, [d] (you pass through all) the bushes (of life) towards the city of Nirvāṇa [nirvāṇa-nagara-]. [e] You have abandoned me in the midst of suffering, but only in your protection [śaraṇa-] will I go with all my person through all the lives. /67/

[a] (You stood up) on the lotus of sympathy, (o you dear to the heart!). [b] Having put on the pure [and] splendid garment of (shame and) modesty, [c] the top-knot [jaṭā-]¹⁹ [is] firmness, the whole body [is] without negligence; [d] soft, pure, large [is] the brilliance of all-knowingness [sarvajñatā-]. [e] Having seized with the hand the (divine) pitcher [bhṛṅgāra-]²⁰ (of compassion), full of the nectar of friendship [maitrī-rasa], /68/

[a] you, (you are) the excellent, without comparison, Brahmā-god of Buddha, [b] having reached the destination, (...) [c] o you who fashion living beings according to the eightfold pure way, [d] o you who release forever the world on the ground of Nirvāṇa [nirvāṇa-bhūmi-], [e] o you who generate verily brahmins through your mouth, sons of the Brahmā-god of the Law. /69/

[a] You have taught the four Vedas consisting in the [four] truths, [b] [it is] widely a delight [and] amusement that you are understood by women [and] children, [c] [you] (who have obtained) that gem of Sāgara having the cup in his hand [karotā-pani-].²¹ [d] You released the pure Gaṅgā [river] of the Law on the earth. [e] May the whole world manage to swim fa(r away) towards the domain of the Law, (in the pure water). /70/

[a] For humans in huge number,²² from the pure circle of the sun [sūrya-maṇḍala-], [b] you became visible with your figure appropriate to a Brahmā-god. [c] You have understood wholly [and] accurately the way of the body. [d] The (zeal)ous (human being) has gained a powerful love for you. [e] In the midst of the company he has leapt into the sky [and] he has set off following you; he caused to grow the great love of living beings towards you. /71/

[a] Individually, the roots of virtue [kuśala-mūla-] of all living beings, the faculties of sense [indriyā-], [b] the ways of the thoughts, entirely [and] alto-

---

¹⁹ This refers to the twisted hair on the top of the head of ascetics (cf. MW, 409a).
²⁰ This refers to a luxurious pitcher or vase used to pour water, especially for kings (cf. MW, 765c). This is one of the vessels belonging to the insignia of royalty in ancient India (cf. Wezler 1987).
²¹ This attribute is found with Nāgas and Yakṣas. The cup in question is made of the skull or cranium: Skt. karotā- or karoti- (cf. MW, 255c; BHSD, 169b). Skt. Sāgara- is the name of a king of Nāgas (cf. BHSD, 589a), who possessed the cintāmani gem, through which all wishes come true.
²² This is a special meaning of Skt. hett- (cf. BHSD, 621b).
gether, the acts, the passions, [c] the places, the moments, the means pertaining to salvation [d] [you] know them altogether, (an unrivalled teacher), indefatigable, [e] merciful, loving, grateful, you alone are certainly the ally of all [people]. /72/

[a] Of all the conditions of being [dharma-], (the existences, the abilities,) [b] [their] cause, [their] support, [their] fruits, [their] repartition among the births, [c] [their] obstacles [and their] means of success, [their] differentiations [and their] singularities, [d] the (things) that have been done [and] the (things) that have to be done, each one it its own place, [e] you as knower of the dharmas [dharma-jña-], [you are] who knows all, the fine [and] the great, under all turns [and] in all three times. /73/

[a] In that way you have understood accurately all the conditions of being [dharma-]. [b] Only by the idea being thrown off, (everything) just happens to you. [c] Just without efforts, you, [you] reveal all the virtues. [d] Only the requiring just turns to be for you the decisiveness in every matter. [e] (Your capacity for understanding) [is] just impossible to hinder, without end, like the course of the wind in an open space. /74/

[a] A very secret matter just turns out to be obvious for you, [b] even what is extremely distant [turns out to be] nearby [and] similar for you indeed. [c] (Even) the deep becomes shallow, all that [is] easy for you. [d] Even the high beyond counting becomes low indeed for you. [e] In the things which ought to be understood (the perception) happens (wholly for you), even without practicing [prayoga-]. /75/

[a] Even an (extremely) obscure thing [is] for you bright like the sun. [b] Even in front of the hesitation, your decisiveness [remains] always there. [c] Even the bottomless deep (becomes for you) the shallowest of the shallow. [d] (Where) the ability to wisdom of (all) the wise ones is stopped, [e] there has spread out the space [of] your (own) understanding of everything, always impossible to hinder in the whole Saṃśāra. /76/

[a] The vision of all the conditions in the whole world) may be large, [b] the space may be filled up with your virtues step by step, [c] still your virtues would overflow with neither number nor measure, o refuge [and] protection! [d] Thus (you are indeed) the absence of oppression, the refuge [and] protection) with neither number nor measure. (...) /77/

---

23 About the interpretation of the verb form placym, 3rd pl. act. of the optative of the verb plāṭkt - (see PEYROT 2013, 781, n. 505).
§ 5. Parallel texts in Sanskrit

The style of this poem indicates at first glance that it belongs to the Buddhastotra genre. The Buddha is often addressed in the vocative and he is the object of lavish praise. In addition, the text shows the author’s acquaintance with classical Sanskrit poetics and Indian erudition. It is obvious that many phrases and sentences are translated from or modeled on Sanskrit. This assertion can be very precisely substantiated through comparison with the best known stotra composed by the poet Māṭrceṭa (2nd c. CE), the so-called Varṇārhatvarṇastotra. This is no surprise because there is evidence for the wide circulation of Māṭrceṭa’s poems in Serindia, which can be judged by the large number of manuscripts in Sanskrit, as well by their translations.24

On the Tocharian side, some fragments of bilingual (Sanskrit-Tocharian A/B) manuscripts have been identified and edited by COUVREUR 1966. A manuscript in Tocharian A in the Berlin collection, comprising eight leaves (A243–250 = THT 876–883)25 contains a metrical translation of stanzas of the chapter 2 (Mūrdhābhiṣeka “Top consecrating”) of the VAV.26 A new publication and translation of this Tocharian A text is still a desideratum.27 In the following I will quote extracts from the Sanskrit text28 of the VAV which correspond, at least in part, to several stanzas of the Tocharian B Buddhastotra in St. Petersburg.

Stanza 64, cf. VAV 8.25

mahākaruṇāyā kṣtsnam alingyeva jagat sthitah /
ahaṁ va ity anāthānāṁ sanāthyam avaghosayan //
pithitāḥ kāpathāḥ sarve [v]īparyāśāṣaṁaṁjaseḥ /
āṁṣtaikāyanaḥ śrīman ājīr[ā] /
Stanza 67, cf. VAV 8.16

brāhmaṇaḥ brahmaṇaḥ putrā aurasā mukhājā iti /
prasāto lokavādō 'yam tvayi sāphalyam āgatah //
Stanza 69, cf. VAV 7.12

mahānāgair ivā svairam api ksunāṁ kumārakaiḥ /
strījanēṇāḥ yaḥ asau dvārargulābālabbuddhinā //
Stanza 70ab, cf. VAV 8.3

aprameyaprabhāvasya sā buddhāvenikasya te /
deśanāprātiḥāryasya vyuṣṭir vyuṣṭimatāṁ vara //
Stanza 70e, cf. VAV 8.18

uddhṛtyamedhyajāṁbālāṁ saṅklesakrimisaṁkülāt /
akliṣṭaṁśaṁpanne plāvitā vimale 'mbhasi //

24 HARTMANN 1987, 22–47.
25 First edition by SIEG and SIEGLING 1921, 121–125.
26 See the identification and analysis of some stanzas by SCHMIDT 1983 and 1987, as well as the information provided by HARTMANN 1987, 88.
28 After the publication of HARTMANN 1987. That is accompanied by Hartmann’s translation into German, which I will not reproduce here.
This is not the place to comment on all correspondences between the Tocharian and the Sanskrit texts.\(^{29}\) I would rather point out some major facts. First, the Tocharian B Buddhastotra is not divided into chapters, and has its own numbering. We are unable to figure out the length of the original Tocharian poem, but it comprised maybe one hundred stanzas or so. Second, the Tocharian stanzas are translations or paraphrases of Sanskrit stanzas which belong to different chapters of the VAV, to wit chapters 3 (\textit{Sarvajña-tāsiddhi} “Accomplishment of omniscience”), 7 (\textit{Brahmānuvāda} “Explanation according to the Brahman”) and 8 (\textit{Upakārastava} “Praise of the services”) in the present state of my investigation.\(^{30}\) Third, although the correspondences with Sanskrit are more numerous for the chapter 3, the Tocharian text does not follow the order or the extent of the original Sanskrit text. The redactor of the Tocharian poem therefore selected some stanzas from the VAV, which he found representative for a given theme. On occasion a single Tocharian stanza summarizes two or three Sanskrit stanzas of similar content. One has also to consider the fact that the author of the Tocharian poem

\(^{29}\) This comparison has been made by \textsc{Pnault 2008, 305–311}, according to a different presentation.

\(^{30}\) The correspondences with stanzas in chapter 3 were already noted by Schmidt, whose findings are reported by \textsc{Hartmann 1987, 137}. But Hartmann gives no precise comments under the corresponding stanzas of the Sanskrit text.
had to fill up lengthy stanzas, longer than any Sanskrit stanzas, which are mostly of the amūṣṭubh-type (4×8 = 32 syllables). As for the stanzas for which there are no obvious parallels in the VAV, one should consider if they were not extracted from other stotras by Mātṛceta or from other collections of stanzas belonging to the same genre. One is led to conclude, at least provisionally, that the Tocharian text was a “new” Buddhastotra produced by the compilation and adaptation of stanzas from previous Buddhastotras in Sanskrit, mostly works by Mātṛceta. This manuscript adds significant evidence for understanding the local process, in the Tocharian-speaking milieu, of the composition of literary works belonging to the Buddhist tradition.

Abbreviations

BHWD: EDGERTON 1953.
MW: MONIER-WILLIAMS 1899.
THT: Tocharische Texte aus den Turfanfund.
ZVORAO: Zapisiki Vostochnogo Otdeleniia Rossiiskogo Arkheologicheskogo Obschestva [Proceedings of the Oriental Branch of the (Imperial) Russian Archaeological Society].
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