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Georges-Jean Pinault

The Buddhastotra
of the Petrovskii Collection

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 *Varṇāravvarastotra* by Mātrceṇa.

Key words: Tocharian, Sanskrit, poetry, Buddhist literature, Buddhastotra, Mātrceṇa

§ 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. 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
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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 transcription\(^4\) 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 reconstruction 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 “Osttürkistan”) 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 containing 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 “Nordarisch”). The first was deciphered by Sieg and Siegling in 1908, and identified as a new Indo-European language, which they named “Tocharisch”. Furthermore, 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 B{	extsc{albir}} 1998, XXI–XXIII.

\(^4\) A preliminary and highly chaotic transcription of the first leaf had been published previously by H{	extsc{øernle}} 1893, 39–40.

\(^5\) For sake of simplicity I will henceforth refer to these two leaves by the marks [abbreviations?] 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.\(^6\) 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.\(^7\) 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.\(^8\) 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).\(^9\) 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.\(^10\) 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.\(^11\) 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 aksaras, which varies between 7 and 10 in total for SI P/1, between 5 and 9 for SI P/2. There are more aksaras 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 of the size of the left and right margins.

\textsection 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 aksara; · illegible or missing part of an aksara; /// 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 pāda of a stanza, the end of the pāda 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 pādas 65a, 68c, 68d, 72a, 73b, 74b, 74d.

SI P/1

Recto (pl. 1)

a1 /// spantaitsñentaše enku wājra akautacce • mahākarumse waipe peñ-yacce pespiuntu • taryā-ykne ymentse smoñaše mā[ñ][·] kakām[au •]///
a2 /// lyp[o] yaitu stmau šna-nvalññessëpi sumerntse mācne 64 poy-si[ñ][ñ][·] tew ylaiñakte next yalts=saintsa lāññess=ānaiśai [p][·] prēs-cyaše [kr][·]///
a3 /// r[·]yaṣṣēm āstrem ĭa o kentsa wawārpau • kleśanmassēm cêm lāmnt asūremts po nākṣeñcai • pālkoṣṣe cau wemaciterem šan[maññessai] y[·]ai ///
a4 /// [s]āññaüsai 65 ñ nākkeyem yetwemtsa yaitu vājr emñku şa[rînne •]

Verso (pl. 2)

b1 /// w[·]rś[·] riñe nervānsai • orasta ŋiš[·] ywārce lāklen ṭiñk no pw āṁmtsa yam šārāmne po šualama[sa] 67 āṁmāś[·]nne[ss][·] uppā[li]///
b2 ///[kw][·] peṣṣa wastes āstrem ausu peñ-yacce • kwāntsaṁne īat[·] snai ykorhise po kekṣeñe lālamsk=astarya poyśiññess=aurtṣa [la] ktsauña şa ///
b3 /// bhraŋgār enku śū o kes=āstrem īte maittarsē 68 pūdññekteṣe tew bramñākte ṣāmplen snai menāk[·] yainmu maktāunu ///
b4 /// nermi yǎmse o .plus wnomen okt yaknes=astarem • nervānnessai[k] kentsa ṣaiṣṣe tarkauca emṃketṣe • tanmaññessai pelaikn[e] ///
b5 /// sguwa coy[ntsa] auspā brāhmaṃeṃ 69 emprenmañsa[na] (−)[d]a[ñ]-

b6 ///[s] karute [ṣ]iyrem[12] sāgari • gāṅ pelaikn̄ssai kentsa cārkāsta ast-

b7 /// [la]u –///
SI P/2

**Recto** (pl. 3)

a1 // h(·)tu mānavemš kauñäktanāñ=āstrem mañdālmem • pākri takāsta bramñäktanāñana ersonasa • yakśe kektents(·) [p][c] [śārsa]stane an(·)//

a2 // (·)su ka[l]pa tañ cīne māiyāccee • ywārc wertsyaine pleyews=ipremne ms(·)c14 oppostam tsemtsa cīne wnolmēṃṣ[ ] tañ wrocce 71 waiptār [po wno]lmēṃṣ[ ] kṣa//

a3 // [ndritis]nta palsko ○ ntaṃs[ ] ymain po ysomno yāmornnta klesanma • ykenta preściyam tsalpaslesṣana upāynta • ysomno a[///]

a4 // alālte • o āṁnālske tañwaññeñca krātanike tweek nest auspa pontams sañ saumo 72 po pelaiknenta[m]///

a5 // [sa][rm ektētsñe okonta cmelamts putkalife pkantenm=opāynta waip-tārtṣaṅṇenta setśhenta • yāmwa yām[ll]ona sañ sañ īñ(·)[e]///

a6 // [jhā]e15 lykaśke trekte po karsauca po klautkentsa po trai prekenne 73 tu yknes=anaisai po pelaiknenta ċarsāṣta • ċals(·)e///

**Verso** (pl. 4)

b1 // [s]ptotarc[·] snai skeyem ka tve po krentaua yneś yāṁśeñca • rītalte yarm ka [po]ne wātkāltsñe sportotarc[·] • etanḵatte ka s(·)//

b2 // nts[e] ra ymīye akāṣe 74 olypots=esestai wāntre yneś ka tañ[ ] sportotra • saṭkai ra laue attsai ispe tañ somotkñe • [ka]16///

b3 // p[o] tañ ola ○ n tu • snai keś ra tapre attsai ette tañ masketra • karsanālyem wāntarwane snai prayo[k k]a sporto[tr](·)17 ///

b4 // [o]rkmo ra wāntre ○ kaum ra tañ[ ] laktsetstse • sklokṣa yauṣmaus ra śek wātkālṭaṅṇe tañ omte • snai ptsa kātkre ra t[pa]rskemem [tpa]rskem[·] ///

b5 // [ai]śmonst[ ] cemṣtr aśāmniṣše cāmpamni • om tañ śatka po karsa(−) [b]18 akāśe po saṃsārne śek etanḵatte 76 [tāk]=aur[s]e19 [lkā]llīfe pela[///

b6 // [·] prutkoeyt akāše tañ[ ] krentaunasa yke postam • ykāk tañ krentaua placyem snai yāṃ • keś saim wāṣta • mant\ snai [ka][ls(·)ā[lyñe][snai] yā[rmn] 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 akṣara 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 complete the first 8-syllable segment of the pāda. There is no trace of the double dot on the top of the aksara ṇa of ṇakteṃ. 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 āu is excluded. The restoration 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 restoration. 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 jātā.

10. According to the meter, this word should be read with 3 syllables: nervāṃṣai. The /nā/ is written without a Fremdzeichen, which is not so remarkable.

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 [ṣji] is much preferable to [pʃj] 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 warranted: [prʃe], [pʃe], [ʃnʃe], [ʃʃe]. As the most likely reading one should retain [ʃhʃe], which implies a loan from Skt. sarvajña- or dharmaṣṭpa- 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)jhñē (Skt. sarvaññā-) can be reckoned redundant, because it would be translated later by po kārsauca. Therefore, I have tentatively preferred to restore (dharma)jhñē, 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 °trā>°tr before the vowel or diphthong of the next word.

18. My previous reading and restoration karsat[Ja(e)] have to be drastically revised, first of all because this gives the wrong meter. In addition the place of the akṣara ṇa 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 karsati 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). 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 64b 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) spāntaitsñenta eñku wājrā akautacce • mahākārūṃse waipe peñyacce pespiṃtu • tāryā-ykne ymentse smoñasāse māñ(ye) kakāmau • (tā[a2]ryāka-wi yetwemts=o)lypo yaitu stmau śña-nwalñeṣṣepi sumerntse mṛācne 64
poyśiñ(e)ṣṣe twee ylaïñakte nest yalts=ešaintsa
lāṣṣeñe=ānaiṣai p(o)-preścyasāse kr(em)[a3](t pelaike •)
(stwarä-we)r(t)syaṣṣem ĕstrem ŏkṣentṣa wawārpau • kleśanmasem cem lämtn asürems po näkeṣcœi • pālskoṣce cau wemacitreme śanmāṣṣeñcœi y(l)ai(ñ[a4]ktentṣ prākreṃ) śanmausa 65
nākcyem yetwemtsa yaitu vājr ēṃkù sārñe • ylaïnāktñe wessa karpāṣa wrocce telkine • kremt pel(aikneṣse [a5] śūkœa sāmna) sosṣasta • wismai klyautkasta brāḥmaññai wertsyai po śaiṣṣe • yātāsṣeñœi ilaiñakte po ylaïñaktest ĕṣṭa pralyu yparwe s(t)a(māṣ-lu) (66)
[a6] (tom stwar=eṃpre)mna pelaikneṣṣana wroṭṣtasna • wārporṃeṃ skwanma pālskoṣṣana toṃ snay ëke • sañṣentṣe wāntre ārskormem yā(t)st mai(yy)āc(ceṃ •)
(katknat [b1] sāulṣana po) w(a)rś(aim) rine nervānsai • orasta ŋiś ywāre lakenle tḥak no pw āṃtṣa yam sārāmne po śaulanmasa 67
āṃmālāṣṣeṣse uppāl(ne ścmaṣt=ara[b2]ičāssu • yase)-kw(ipesṣse wāstsy āstren ausu peñyacce • kwāntsäññe jat(ā) snai-ykorāñṣṣa po kektṣeñfe
lalaṃṣk=astarya poyśiñneṣṣ=autsā lāktṣauña
ṣa(rsa ŋākcyœ) [b3] (karunāṣṣe) bhrāṅgār enku śūkes=āstrem ḣte maittarṣ-ṣe 68
pūđāktesṣe twee brāṃṇāke śpālmem snai menāk • yainmu māktœuñe – – [b4] – – – – – (•)
nermit yāṃṣeñcœi wnolmen okt-yaknes=astareṃ •
nervānāṣai kentsa sāiṣṣe tārkaucai ēṃsketstse •
tanmāṣsefcai pelaik(ĕṣṣe) [b5] (bramṅāktentse) s₅suwa koyntsa auspa
brāhlmānem 69
emprenmaṣṣana (ve)danma ītwāra āksāsta •
klainamts śāmaśktamts karsatsi (sa)w n(ā)rm ci aurt(s)e (•)
(cem [b6]wamer kālpo)ṣ karute-sīryem sāgari •
gāṇi pelaiknesṣai kemsca cārkāsta astaryai •
po pi sāiṣṣe kalloy naṣtsti pelaiknes(s)ai (wṣem)ṇaiś lau(ke) [SI P/2a1]
(astarem warne 70)
h(e)tu mānavemś kauṅāktānā=āstrem maṇḍālmem •
pākri takāsta bramṅāktānāna ersnasa •
yakne kektsents(e) p(o) sārsasta-ne an(aiṣai) [a2] (•)
(ṣaumo spelkkkes)su kalpa taṅ cine maiyācce •
ywāṛc wertsyaine plyews=iprern ms(ā)-c omoṣtām tsemtsa cine wnom-
ments taṅ wrocce 71
waipṭār po wnomments k₅sa(lamū[a3]lānta i)ṇdrinta
pālskontamts ymain po yṣomo yāmornta keśanma •
ykenta preściyam tsaḷpālesana upāynta •
yṣomo ai(ṣeφca) [a4] (snai olypo kāṣsi) alālta •
āhmālaśke tāṅwaṅnefca krāṇākhe tvek nest auspa pontaṃts ṣaṅ ṣaumo 72
po pelaiknentam (ts nesalṇenta [a5] cāmpaṇṇenta •)
ṣaṃm ektāṣṭe okonta emelanṭs putkalṅe
pkāntenm=opāynta waipṭāṛstāṇeṇta ṣeṭsṇenta •
yāmwa yāmllona ṣaṅ ṣaṅ i(k)e(ne wānta[a6]rwa •)
(twe dharmajhṅe lykaśke trekte po kārsauca po klautkntsa po trai pre-
kenn [73]
tī yknes=anaiṣai po pelaiknenta sāṛsāsta •
ṣāls(k)e(mane yarm i[b1]mesa ka po) sp(o)ṛtōt-r-c
snai skeyem ka twee po krentauna yneś yāmṣeφca •
ṛtalṅe yarm ka poṇe wāṭkālṅśe sportot-r-c
etaṅkṅtātta ka (nai āke taṅ ka[b2]rslaṅe yente)ntse ra ymiye akāśne 74
oyloptst=enesia wāntre yneś ka taṅ sportotrā •
ṣātkai ra laukε atsai kse taṅ somoktṅe •
kā(tkre ra [b3] pāṛške māsketur) po taṅ olan tu •
snai keś ra tapre atsai ette taṅ māsketṛā •
kārsanālyem wāntarwane snai prayok ka sportotr (aiṣai yama[b4]lṅe po
ci) (75)
(ṣātkai) orkmo ra wāntre kaṁ ma taṅ lāktsetstse •
skloksa yauṃmaṣu ra ṣeṭ wāṭkālḥsāṅe taṅ omte •
§ 4. Translation of the text

[b] ...having seized the unsplitable thunderbolt [vajra-] of trustworthiness,
[c] trusting in the splendid banner of great compassion [mahā-karuṇā-],
[d] having taken on the serv(ant) of the establishment of the threefold consciousness,\(^{15}\) [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 [sarvajñatā-], with a thousand eyes [b] looking attentively at the good Law [sad-dharma-] appropriate 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 thinking\(^{17}\) with the firm fetter of the god Indra! /65/

[a] Adorned with the divine ornaments, having seized the thunderbolt [vajra-] 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 Law.
[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 received [them], and those delights of thinking without end, [c] after having renounced the condition of the world [loka-dharma-], you tame...\(^{18}\)

---

\(^{15}\) 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 Cāturmahārājikas, comprising the four Mahārājas ‘Great kings’, posted at the four cardinal points, and the groups of deities which they control: the Gandharvas, the Kumbhāṅgas, 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 tense, 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 [jatā-]<sup>19</sup> [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-]<sup>20</sup> (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 brahmmins 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 [karota-pāṇi-].<sup>21</sup> [d] You released the pure Gangā [river] of the Law on the earth. [e] May the whole world manage to swim far away towards the domain of the Law, (in the pure water). /70/

[a] For humans in huge number,<sup>22</sup> 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 (zealous) 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 [indriya-], [b] the ways of the thoughts, entirely [and] alto-

---

<sup>19</sup> This refers to the twisted hair on the top of the head of ascetics (cf. MW, 409a).

<sup>20</sup> 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. Wetzler 1987).

<sup>21</sup> This attribute is found with Nāgas and Yakṣas. The cup in question is made of the skull or cranium: Skt. karota- or karoti- (cf. MW, 255c; BHSD, 169b). Skt. Sāgara- is the name of a king of Nāgas (cf. BHSD, 589a), who possessed the cintāmaṇi gem, through which all wishes come true.

<sup>22</sup> This is a special meaning of Skt. hetu- (cf. BHSD, 621b).
gether, the acts, the passions, [c] the places, the moments, the means pertaining to salvation [d] [you] know 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 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, with(out 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 Samsāra. /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 overflow23 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 *placyem*, 3rd pl. act. of the optative of the verbe *plātk-* (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 Mātrceta (2nd c. CE), the so-called Varnāravarnastotra. This is no surprise because there is evidence for the wide circulation of Mātrceta’s poems in Serindia, which can be judged by the large number of manuscripts in Sanskrit, as well by their translations. 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) contains a metrical translation of stanzas of the chapter 2 (Mūrdhābhīṣeka “Top consecrating”) of the VAV. A new publication and translation of this Tocharian A text is still a desideratum. In the following I will quote extracts from the Sanskrit text 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
mahākarunayā kṛtsnam āliṅgyeva jagat sthitah //
ahaṃ va ity anāthānāṃ sānyāsyam avaghosayan //
Stanza 67, cf. VAV 8.16
pithitāḥ kāpāthāḥ sarve [v]paryāśāśāṃjasah //
amṛtañjayanah śīmān ca tar [v]jvērta aṭṭhasah //
Stanza 69, cf. VAV 7.12
brāhmaṇaḥ brahmaṇaḥ putrā aurāśā mukhaīā iti //
prasīto lokavādo ’yam tvai sāphalyam āgatah //
Stanza 70ab, cf. VAV 8.3
mahānāgair iva svairam api kṣunāḥ kumārakāḥ //
strījanenāpi yad asau dvīyaśālābalabuddhinā //
VAV 8.4
aprameyaprabhāvasya sā buddhāveṇikasya te //
dēsanāpradāhārayasya yuṣṭir yuṣṭimatāṃ vara //
Stanza 70e, cf. VAV 8.18
uddhrtyamedhyavājāmbītā śamklesakrīmimakulāt //
akliṣṭāṣṭāṅgasaṃpanne plāvīte mābhīṣi //

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. 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 (Sarvajñatāsiddhi “Accomplishment of omniscience”), 7 (Brahmānuvāda “Explanation according to the Brahman”) and 8 (Upakārastava “Praise of the services”) in the present state of my investigation. 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 PINAULT 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 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 anuṣṭubh-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 Mātrceta 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 Mātrceta. 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

BHSD: Edgerton 1953.
MW: Monier-Williams 1899.
THT: Tocharische Texte aus den Turfanfunden.
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