



**HAL**  
open science

# The beginning of the Tocharian B Karmavibhaṅga

Athanaric Huard

► **To cite this version:**

Athanaric Huard. The beginning of the Tocharian B Karmavibhaṅga. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, 2019, 19, pp.27-66. hal-02306686

**HAL Id: hal-02306686**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02306686>**

Submitted on 8 Oct 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Tocharian and Indo-European Studies

Founded by Jörundur Hilmarsson

Edited by

Birgit Anette Olsen (executive editor)

Michaël Peyrot · Georges-Jean Pinault

Thomas Olander (assistant editor)

VOLUME 19 · 2019

Museum Tusulanum Press

2019

# The beginning of the Tocharian B *Karmavibhaṅga*<sup>1</sup>

Athanaric Huard

The *Karmavibhaṅga* is one of the longest extant texts preserved in Tocharian B. The following paper presents an edition of two joined fragments from the Paris collection, which contain the very beginning of the sūtra. The present work presents careful analysis of these fragments and attempts to give a restoration of the text with the help of the Sanskrit parallel. Some issues raised by this text are then addressed in the following part of the paper: the relationship of the Tocharian to the other versions of this work, the translation of Sanskrit *dāyāda*- and the meaning of TB *ścono*.

## 1 Introduction

The Paris manuscript of the *Karmavibhaṅga* was found by Paul Pelliot in the ruins of Duldur Akhur. It is the most extensive Tocharian manuscript (10 consecutive leaves and several fragments) of the Paris collection. Lévi (1932) edited the text, based on his discovery of a Sanskrit parallel version in Nepal and then translated it in Lévi (1933). This edition was reviewed by Sieg (1938), who provided many improvements, but at that time he could not see reproductions of several folios of the manuscript. G.-J. Pinault reworked these contributions during the 1980s and 1990s, and published an online edition of the *Karmavibhaṅga* for the CEToM project in

---

1 I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Georges-Jean Pinault, who let me present an earlier version of this work in his seminar of the École Pratique des Hautes Études and helped me several times in the preparation of this paper, to Michaël Peyrot for his numerous comments and emendations, and to Mathilde Houdenot for improving my English.

2012 (with the collaboration of M. Malzahn). All quotations of the Tocharian *Karmavibhaṅga* are extracted from this edition.<sup>2</sup>

The Tocharian text is not always a close translation of the Sanskrit text edited by Lévi (1932). First of all, the wording is adapted to fit a poetic framework, so that some variations are probably due to the metrical constraints which did not allow a linear rendition of the Sanskrit wording. We also have to reckon with a stylistic factor, since in several instances the author seems to vary his phrasing in the translation of the same Sanskrit word deliberately.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, there are considerable differences between the numerous known translations of this sūtra, and the Sanskrit manuscripts are rather late (1410–11, according to Lévi 1932: 1), so that the Tocharian translation may depend on an earlier version of it.<sup>4</sup> As already stated by Lévi (1932: 5–6), the closest version to Tocharian is the Chinese translation of Gautama Dharmaprajña:<sup>5</sup> the order of the chapters is practically identical, with only an offset of one in the numbering of Lévi, due to the fact that the Chinese version adds a section “ripening in the middle earth” between “birth among the gods without form” and “whole life in hells and then rebirth” (see the comparative table in Lévi 1932: 14–19). These versions (together with the 2nd Tibetan version) do not include the avadānas, as does the Sanskrit text, but only brief allusions. Lévi was in-

2 From <http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?PK%20AS%207B> until <http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?PK%20AS%207J> (retrieved: May 28, 2018). These editions date from February 2012.

3 See for example, *passim*, the translation of the interrogative *katama-* by all possible means: *k<sub>u</sub>se* (most frequently), but also *māksu*, *intsu*, *kātsi*. For the Sanskrit compound (*a*)-*kṛtapuṅya-* (Lévi 1932: 75), the Tocharian has the following translations, PK AS 7F b3: *yāmu yārpona*; b4 *yarpo ayā(mtte)* b5: *yāmu yārpo(nta)*. See also below the translation of *mahābhoga-*.

4 For an overview of the research on the *Karmavibhaṅga* since Lévi’s publication, see Kudo (2004: vii–xi). For references to all known ancient translations, see Kudo (2004: xi–xii).

5 *Fó wéishǒu jiā zhǎngzhě shuō yèbào chābié jīng* 佛爲首迦長者說業報差別經 T80, 891a17–895b21. The translation dates from 582 (Levi 1932: 5).

clined to interpret this differences as an editorial choice,<sup>6</sup> whereas scholars now more readily attribute them to a chronological development (see for example Simon 1970).

The present fragments turned out to be part of the very beginning of the text, namely its “table of contents.” Apart from the Sanskrit manuscripts, only the Chinese translation of Gautama Dharmaprajña (see Lévi 1932: 28 fn. 4) and the Tibetan version from the British Museum (Simon 1970) include a summary similar to the Sanskrit manuscripts, which confirms the close relationship between these versions of the sūtra.

## 2 Transliteration of the fragments

The two fragments from the Paris collection discussed here, namely Pelliot koutchéen Nouvelle Série 181 and 221, belong to the same folio. PK NS 181 measures 7.5 cm in width and 8 cm in height and PK NS 221 7.5 cm in width and 8.2 cm in height. PK NS 221 has to be placed on the left and PK NS 181 on the right. When joined, the two fragments measure 15 cm in width and 8–8.2 in height. They join almost perfectly in lines a2–a5 and b2–b5. In PK NS 221 a2, a tiny trace of the left stroke of the <o>, which belongs to the akṣara <po> at the beginning of PK NS 181 a2, confirms the join. In the other lines, they are separated by a blank space (a1: 1.2 cm; a5: 2.9 cm; and a6: 6.5 cm). The fragments were also damaged at the edges; there is a notch at the upper left (a1: 3cm; a2: 1.8 cm), and at the upper right (a1: 3.5 cm; a2: 3 cm). Given that PK AS 7C, a complete leaf of the same manuscript, measures 44.8 cm in width, these fragments represent one third of the central part of a leaf, the string hole being partly conserved at the left of PK NS 221 (a3–a4 and b3–b4).

6 Lévi (1932: 6): “Ici encore le poète de Koutcha s’est contenté, comme Gautama Dharmaprajña et T’ien si tsai en Chine, de reproduire le sūtra proprement dit; mais comme eux il a maintenu quelques indications qui suffisent à prouver qu’il connaissait aussi le commentaire, notamment la mention de Maitrajña [...]”.

The expedition marks are “DA Cour” (i.e. “Duldur Aqur Cour”) for both fragments. This is not particularly significant, because it was the main find spot of manuscripts in the ruins of the monastery. But, considering the material characteristics of our fragments, this new leaf can undoubtedly be assigned to the manuscript labelled “Karmavibhaṅga β” in the CEToM site (see the overview in the table below). The new fragments share the same height, the same interlinear space, the same number of lines, etc. This is also confirmed by a palaeographical examination: it is easy to recognize the typical round (“slanting”) shape of the classical script. The only difference is that the two fragments are more damaged than the other remnants of Karmavibhaṅga β, which is shown by the slightly different color of the paper, the loss of the double brown ruling (formerly red) and by the fading of the ink, which does not share the very deep black shade that is characteristic of this manuscript.

### Comparison of PK NS 181 + 221 with Karmavibhaṅga β<sup>7</sup>

Press mark	Expedition code	Size (h × w, cm)	No. of lines	Interlin. space (cm)	Ruling	Color of the paper	Typographical module (h × w, mm)	Width of the nib (mm)	Script
PK NS 181	DA Cour	8 × 7.5	6	1.2	None	Very pale brown	4 × 6.5	1.5	Classical
PK NS 221	DA cour	8.2 × 7.5	6	1.2–1.3	None	Very pale brown	3.7 × 6.5	1.3–1.4	Classical
PK AS 7B	M 500.3; DA cour	8 × 15.3+ 28.8	6	1.3	Brown	Brownish yellow	4 × 7	1.4	Classical
PK AS 7C	882; DA cour; M 500.2	8.2 × 44.8	6	1.3	Brown	Brownish yellow	4 × 7	1.4	Classical

7 This table is extracted from the catalogue of the Fonds Pelliot koutchéen of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, on which I am working as part of my doctoral research. Here I briefly give some explanations about the features that I included in addition to those of CEToM: the paper colours follow the multilingual nomenclature of Drège (1987). “Typographical module” is the average width of <na> and <ka> × the average height of <pa>, <ṣa> and <ya>. Lastly the width of the nib is actually the width of the vertical strokes. All these measures were taken with a scale magnifier, Flubacher & Co F+C 8x.

**Transliteration**<sup>8</sup>

- a1 /// [d]· [r]ś·<sup>[1]</sup> cew sū[t]rā – [ś] ñk· k[<sub>u</sub>]śiññe r[e]ki[s]· ///
- a2 /// · ś·<sup>[2]</sup> [ñ]·kt·ntse : kaṣṣintse poyśintse sūtārne śuk· k·yśk· ·c·<sup>[3]</sup> ///
- a3 /// ○ : yāmortse ailñenta śa[w]āñcañ yāmor śonaicci : yāmor·<sup>[4]</sup> ///
- a4 /// ○ k no ywarśkāññi mā aina[ki] mā no ś[p]ālmem : alyaik no śpā ///
- a5 /// [p]·rkre śaul nestsiśco sportto (– – – – –) : neṣaṃ makā teki nes·i ///
- a6 /// ·[m]· tanmaṣṣaṃ no a[l·e] (– – – – –) m[ñ]e<sup>[5]</sup> nessiśc al·e ///
- b1 /// ·[m]·ñca<sup>[6]</sup> neṣaṃ y[ām]·r· (– – – – –) sporttotrā : wro·[s]· ///
- b2 /// [mo]r·<sup>[7]</sup> neṣaṃ yāmor s[po]rtt[o]trā (– –) ·[ś·]<sup>[8]</sup> lwāsane cmetsiśc  
alle ///
- b3 /// ○ sportotrā yśā[m]na ·[m](·)[s]·ś· : yśelme[c]· [ñ]·ktenne  
[cm]e<sup>[9]</sup> ///
- b4 /// ○ yāmor sporto[t]rā nem[ce]k ·[me]tsiś· : mā n[e]mcek cmetsiśc no  
·[i/o]<sup>[10]</sup> ///
- b5 /// ·ol·e [n]·aine [c]metrā : po so[l]me ś[au]l śaśāyu pe[s]· – [l]·e – ///
- b6 /// · tār<sup>[11]</sup> ka nraine ·est i[s]·· l[ai]totā· ///

**Textual notes**

- [1] The first *akṣaras* present some reading difficulties. The first trace has the form of a loop; G.-J. Pinault suggested to read <da>, and the trace above the <ś> could be <r-> or <-e>.
- [2] The remnants can be interpreted as <ṣa> in *virāma* position, as suggested by G.-J. Pinault, leading to the restoration of a genitive plural.
- [3] The last sign of the line is a <ca> in ligature, the above sign may also be <ca> or <śa>.
- [4] A tiny stroke can be seen at the edge of the fragment, the rest of a vocalization sign, probably <-e> or <-ai>.

8 As usual I follow the conventions of TochSprR(B).

- [5] The <ma>, although not complete, is clearly visible; under it there is a small loop, which can only be <ñā>; hence the frequent ligature <mñe>.
- [6] The rest of a vertical stroke points to a <ma>, <ša> or <la> in ligature.
- [7] The end of the first word is exceptionally marked by a supplementary dot above the *Fremdzeichen* <ṛa> in *virāma* position, probably because (*yā*)*mor* terminates a heading. The *virāma* dot is thus a sort of anticipated punctuation mark.
- [8] The first trace is too small to be interpreted; the next akṣara is quite clearly visible, but problematic. Two readings may be possible: either <ś> in *virāma* position with a dot above or the number <20-1>. To read the *Fremdzeichen* <ṁa> or <ṣa> is not very likely because of the curve of the upper part. For the first reading, we must admit that the stroke above the <ś> is the tip of the dot. The rather vertical orientation of the *akṣara* and the lack of the small horizontal “foot” at the bottom of its left part is quite odd. The latter defect may be due to the deterioration of the manuscript. Another solution would be to read the number <20> and <1> above. But the comparison with the other attestations in the same manuscript (PK AS 7C b5, b6) is not decisive, because the *akṣara* seems to be placed under the ruling line, and the stroke over it does not look like a <1>.
- [9] The last *akṣara* is partly lost. As argued by G.-J. Pinault, the first part looks like <t> at first sight, but the lower part is totally erased, together with most of the bottom of the ligature. Therefore, the reading <c> would fit the upper part of the ligature, as compared to other forms found in the same context.
- [10] The tiny remaining stroke could be the left part of <na>, <ka>, or <ta>, even <sa>, the vowel diacritic either <i> or <o>.
- [11] The *akṣara* is at first sight disturbing because of the swollen upper part, which looks like the “head” of <na>; but considering that the *akṣara* is closed at the left lower part, it has to be undoubtedly read <ta>.



### 3 Restitution and translation

- a1 */// (karmā)d(a)rś(o) cew sūtrā (ñi)ś ñk(e) k<sub>u</sub>śiññe reki(sa) ///*
- a2 */// (ñākteṃt)s ñ(ä)kt(e)ntse : kāṣṣintse poyśintse sūtārne śuk(eṃ) k(āl)yśk(eṃs)c(o) ///*
- a3 */// : yāmorntse ailñenta śawāñcañ yāmor-śonaicci : yāmor-(saim-wāstecci) ///*
- a4 */// (: alyai)k no ywarśkāññi mā ainaki mā no śpālmeṃ : alyai k no śpā(lmeṃ) ///*
- a5 */// (: nesām em)p(a)rkre śaul nestsiśco sportto(tār yāmor) : nesām makā-teki nes(s)i(śco sporttotār yāmor :) ///*
- a6 */// (ono)l(m)e tanmāṣṣän no al(l)e(k ikene : yākte-cāmpa)mñ(e) nessiśc al(l)e(k ikene) ///*
- b1 */// (osta-ś)m(e)ñca nesām yām(o)r (yākte-ekñiññe nessi) sporttotār : wro(t)s(tse-ekñiññe) ///*
- b2 */// (yā)mor nesām yāmor sporttotār (nraine cmetsi)ś lwāsane cmetsiśc alle(k ikene) ///*
- b3 */// sporttotrā yśāmna cme(tsi)ś : yśelmecc(eṃ) ñ(a)ktenne cme(tsiśco) ///*
- b4 */// (nesām) yāmor sporttotrā nemcek (c)metsiś : mā nemcek cmetsiśc no (sp)o(rttotār yāmor nesām :) ///*
- b5 */// (on)ol(m)e n(r)aine cmetrā : po solme śaul śasāyu pes(t tsä)l(p)e(trä) ///*
- b6 */// (cme)tār ka nraine (p)est is(tak) laitotä(r) ///*
- a1 ... Now, I [will translate] this sūtra, the explanation (of acts), in Kucheian language ...
- a2 ... In the sūtra of the Omniscient, the Teacher, the God (of gods), to the pupil Śuka ...
- a3 ... [the beings are] the eaters of the gifts of the act, [have] the act as origin, [have] the act (as support and refuge) ...
- a4 ... others then [are] of middle rank, not low, not superior; others then [are] superior ...

- a5 ... (there is an act;) it results<sup>9</sup> in living a long life; there is (an act; it results) in being with many illnesses ...
- a6 ... makes (a man) be born in another (place) ... to be (of little pow)er in another (place) ...
- b1 ... (household)er. There is an act; it results (in being of little wealth). ... of great wealth ...
- b2 ... the act. There is an act; it results (in an infernal birth). ... in a birth among beasts, in another (place) ...
- b3 ... it results in a birth among humans. ... (in a birth) among the gods [of the realm] of desire ...
- b4 ... (there is) an act; it results in a determined birth; and [on the other hand] (there is an act; it results) in an undetermined birth; ...
- b5 ... a man, being born in hell, having lived all his life, is (completely released) ...
- b6 ... (a man) being just born in hell, falls out immediately ...

To give a better understanding of the text, I here provide the parallel Sanskrit text based on the edition of Lévi (1932: 29–30), with manuscript variants from Kudo (2004, 2006). The text was adapted to fit the topic order of the Tocharian text; when this order diverges, the number of the correspondent Sanskrit chapters (in Lévi’s edition) is added after an equal sign (see also the comparative table in Lévi 1932: 14–19).

*tatra bhagavāñ chukaṃ māṇavakaṃ taudeyaputram idam avocat. karmavibhaṅgaṃ te māṇavaka dharmaparyāyaṃ deśayiṣyāmi.<sup>10</sup> tenahi śṛṇu sādhu suṣṭhu ca manasi kuru. bhāṣiṣye. evaṃ bhagavann iti śuko māṇavakas taudeyaputro bhagavataḥ pratyaśrauṣīt. bhagavāñ idam avocat.<sup>11</sup> karmasvakān ahaṃ māṇava satvān vadāmi karma-dāyādān karmayonīn karmapratiśaraṇān. karma māṇava satvān vib-*

9 The literal meaning is “turns out to”. On this translation, see below, part 4.4 “Syntax”.

10 *deśayiṣyāmi* [corr.], cf. Kudo (2004: 27); *tatra bhagavāñ ... deśayiṣyāmi* is left out in manuscript A (Lévi 1932: 29; Kudo 2004: 26).

11 *evaṃ bhagavan ... idam avocat* is left out in A, which replaces it by *vicitrakarmā suvicitrakleśā vicitracitrā śuvicitradesaṇā yathoktam bhagavatā*

*hajati. yad idaṃ hīnotkr̥ṣṭamadhyamatāyām. tadyathā. asti karma alpāyuh̥saṃvartanīyam. asti karma dīrghāyuh̥saṃvartanīyam. asti karma bahvābādhāsaṃvartanīyam. asti karma alpābādhāsaṃs°. a. k. durvarṇas°. a. k. prāsādikas°. a. k. alpeśākhyas°. a. k. maheśākhyas°. a. k. nīcākulopapattis°. a. k. uccakulopapattis°. a. k. alpbhogas°. a. k. mahābhogas°. a. k. duṣprajnas°. a. k. mahāprajñas°. a. k. narakopapattis°. a. k. tiryagyonyupapattis°. a. k. pretalokopapattis°. a. k. asuralokopapattis°. a. k. manuṣyalokopapattis°. a. k. kāmāvacaradevopapattis°. a. k. rūpāvacaradevopapattis°. a. k. ārūpyāvacaradevopapattis°. a. k. niyatopapattis°. a. k. aniyatopapattis°. a. k. deśāntaravipakṣam. a. k. yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo narakeṣūpapannaḥ paripūrṇaṃ nairayikam āyuh̥ kṣapayitvā cyavati.<sup>12</sup> a. k. yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo narakeṣūpapannaḥ sārđhanairayikam āyuh̥ kṣapayitvā cyavati. a. k. y. s. p. narakeṣūpapannamātra eva cyavati.<sup>13</sup>*

Here, the Blessed One said this to the Śūka, the student, the son of Taudeya. “I will teach you, o student, the classification of acts, which is a religious discourse. Then listen well and be very attentive. I will speak.” “Yes, o Blessed One,” answered Śūka, the student, the son of Taudeya to the Blessed One. And the Blessed One said this: “I say, o student, that the beings are owners of their acts, heirs of their acts, have their acts as origin, have their acts as refuge. It is the act, o student, that distinguishes beings between inferior, superior, and intermediate.”

There is an act resulting in a long life [1]; there is an act resulting in a short life [2]; there is an act resulting in [people] being healthy [3]; there is an act resulting in [people] being sickly [4]; there is an act resulting in [people] being ugly [5]; there is an act resulting in [people] being beautiful [6]; [...] being great personages [7]; [...] being

*śukasya māṇavasya todeyaputrasyāśvalāpanasya* (Lévi 1932: 30 fn. 1; Kudo 2004: 26).

12 Reading of manuscript A; B and E have *narakeṣu āyuh̥ kṣapayitvā narakeṣu upapadyate* (Lévi 1932: 30 fn. 12; Kudo 2004: 28–29; Kudo 2006: 57).

13 Reading of A; B is damaged, but according to E, could be restored to *narakeṣūpapannamātra evam uktāḥ* (Kudo 2006: 57).

insignificant [8]; [...] being high-born [9]; [...] being low-born [10]; [...] being poor [11]; [...] being wealthy [12]; [...] being stupid [13]; [...] being wise [14]; there is an act resulting in a birth in hell [15]; [...] in a birth in the class of animals [16]; [...] in a birth in the world of Pretas [17]; [...] in a birth in the world of Asuras [18]; [...] in a birth in the world of humans [19]; [...] in a birth as a god of the realm of desire [20]; [...] in a birth as a god of the realm of form [21]; [...] in a birth as a god of the formless realm [22]; [...] in a determined birth [23=30]; [...] in an undetermined birth [24=31]; there is an act, which has its fruition in a foreign country [25=32]; there is an act, according to which a human, being born in hells, having spent a whole infernal life, moves [to another existence] [26=27]; there is an act, according to which a human, being born in hells, having spent one half of an infernal life moves [to another existence] [27=28]; there is an act, according to which a human, as soon as he is born in hells, moves [to another existence] [28=29].

## 4 General remarks

### 4.1 The pupil named Śuka

Śuka is the auditor of the sūtra. His complete name is *śuka māṇava taudeyaputra* in Sanskrit and *subha* (= Skt. *śubha* ‘beautiful’) *manava todeyaputta* in Pāli, both forms relying according to Lévi (1932: 21) on “ardhamāghadhī” \**sua*. The Tocharian renders it by *śuka kālyške*, choosing to translate *māṇava(ka)*- which actually means ‘young man, boy’, especially ‘brahman youth’ (BHSD: 428a).<sup>14</sup> Some modern translators translate it as a proper name, cf. Lévi (1932: 107, etc. “Śuka Māṇava”). The Sanskrit text includes the introductory *avadāna* that explains in which circumstances the sūtra was spoken by the Buddha. It may well be that

---

14 As a matter of fact, TB *kālyške* (variant *kālske*) is the standard word matching the Skt. term *māṇavaka*-, cf. Pinault (1994: 202, 205–207, with further references).

our text included this introductory *avadāna* because *ñke* (in a1) implies an opposition to a preceding text unit. Interestingly, the name of Śuka is also attested in IOL Toch 144 b6, a poem about actions and rebirths, staging a dialogue between Śakyamuni and Śuka.<sup>15</sup> It may be an indication that other versions of this sūtra circulated in the Tarim Basin, although Subha is the listener of the Buddha in other discourses of Pāli canon (DN 10, MN 99). Since this fragment contains the name of Maitreya, we may also connect PK NS 49B to this parallel version, as already stated by Lévi, who compares a Chinese translation.<sup>16</sup>

#### 4.2 The Tocharian translator

The first person pronoun *ñiś* undoubtedly refers to the Tocharian translator of the text because of *k<sub>u</sub>śiññe reki* ‘Kuchean language’. Thus we can ascribe to him the other statements in the first person that we find in the body of the sūtra. This was to be expected, because one of these speeches is akin to a colophon.

PK AS 7H a2–a3<sup>17</sup>

(- - - - -) *pūdñäktentse weweñoṣām sutarmameṃ sälkāmai*  
 : *ṣesa ṣñaṣṣemmpa po se ñy ekita yamaṣare ce postakāśc paiykatsi ñiś*  
*yātkawa (: ce kre)nt yām(orsa - - - - -) śpāl(m)eṃ källoyeṃ cai*  
*po pūdñäkti tākoṃ ṣpä : k<sub>u</sub>ce no te wñāwa yāmornts okonta temeṃ*  
*mante k<sub>u</sub>ce no weñau tu ñke pklyauṣso po āñmtsa 24*

15 IOL Toch 144 b6: *(we)ñā poysi śukem kālśkem pälkormem : tw ertar takarškñe cmetar ñäkciye śaiṣṣene* 44 ‘Buddha spoke: Having looked at the boy Śuka. ‘If you produce faith, [then] you shall be born [again] in the divine world 44.’ (Broomhead 1962: 1, 151).

16 Lévi (1933: 82) quotes the concluding part of the *dōu diào jīng* 兜調經 (\**Taudeya-sūtra*, T 78 T i 887b04, in the reference of Lévi: Tōk, XII, 8, 72b): “Le Bouddha dit: Dans le monde à venir, si un homme récite ce sūtra, s’il en écoute les sons et les accents, et que dans son cœur la pitié s’allume, que les poils de son corps se dressent, que ses larmes jaillissent, cet homme sera le disciple de Maitreya et il arrivera au salut en sortant du monde.”

17 Meter 4×25 (5/5/8/7).

‘I have extracted (this lesson?) from the sūtras spoken by the Buddha lord, [24a] together with my relatives who all have supported me for this book, I have ordered to write [it], [24b] through this good deed, ...may they obtain the excellent (*nirvāṇa*) and may they all become Buddhas! [24c] Then what I have told about the fruits of the deed and likewise what I will tell from here onwards, listen (pl.) to it now with your whole self! [24d]’ (Pinault in CEToM)

This passage is also relevant to understand the function of this narrator, who apparently endorses the role of compiler, since he employs the verb *sālk-* which often means ‘to pull/draw (out/away)’ thus figuratively ‘to extract’. But it also means in some passages ‘to produce, show’ (Adams 2013: 753f.), which could also fit the context.

Be that as it may, the statements of our translator have the rhetorical function of catching the listeners’ attention and underlining the structure of the sūtra. We find them at the beginning of each metrical section, and sometimes inside a section at the beginning of a new category of act. See for example:

PK AS 7B a4–6<sup>18</sup>

|| *arāḍentsa* || *weñau nānok yakne(ṃ) yāmorntats tū pāklyauṣso : krenta yolainamṭs etriwāitsānamṭs rano : te keklyauṣormem epastyaññe yānmacer yāmornta yāmtsi mā ṣpā triṣcer makā-ykne : 1 nesām sū yāmor nemcek cmetsiś sportotrā : k<sub>u</sub>ce te mant wñāwa tu ñke weñau anaīśai :*

‘According to the Arāḍa [tune]. I will further tell the ways of the deeds. Listen (pl.) to it! [1a] Of the deeds [which are] good, bad, [and] mixed also, [1b] after having heard this, you will obtain the skill [1c] to do deeds, and you will not err in many ways. [1d] There is such a deed [that] evolves into a specific rebirth. [2a] What I said in this [short] manner, I will now clarify [lit. say clearly]’ (Pinault in CEToM)

18 Meter 4 × 12 (5/7). Other examples, PK AS 7H a3: *k<sub>u</sub>ce no te wñāwa yāmornts/ okonta temeṃ mante k<sub>u</sub>ce no weñau tu ñke pāklyauṣso po añmṭsa*; THT 521 a5–6; PK AS 7J a5–6; inside a metrical section, PK AS 7 C b4, b6; PK AS 7 H b3.

These interventions are modelled on a Buddhist formula that we also find in the Pāli *Cūḷakammavibhaṅga-sutta*, the counterpart of the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*. After that the Buddha said “beings are owners of their actions, etc.,” Subha asks for an explanation in the following words:

MN iii, 203<sup>19</sup>

*Na kho ahaṃ imassa bhoto Gotamassa saṃkhittena bhāsitassa vitthārena atthaṃ avibhattassa vitthārena atthaṃ ājānami. Sādhū me bhavaṃ Gotamo tathā dhammaṃ desetu yathā ’haṃ imassa bhoto Gotamassa saṃkhittena bhāsitassa vitthārena atthaṃ avibhattassa vitthārena atthaṃ ājāneyyan ti. Tena hi, māṇava, suṇāhi sādhukaṃ manasikarohi, bhāsissāmīti.*

“I do not understand in detail the meaning of Master Gotama’s statement, which he spoke in brief without expounding the meaning in detail. It would be good if Master Gotama would teach me the Dhamma so that I might understand in detail the meaning of Master Gotama’s statement.” “Then, student, listen and attend closely to what I shall say.” (Ñāṇamoli & Bodhi 2009: 1053)

The translator endorses here the role traditionally ascribed to the Buddha or to his foremost disciples and gives up the *evam me suttaṃ* claim. This literary pattern could reflect the indirect transmission of a text that underwent translation. Alternatively, these statements could be interpreted as the requisites of the ornate poetry (*kāvya*), the literary genre to which our text belongs. Indeed such a composition is already known from the *Udānālankāra*, a commentary in verse on the *Udānavarga*, see TochSpr(B) 1; PK AS 6; maybe A 217–218. This text is also punctuated by similar rhetorical statements underlining the textual structure, see e. g. *te ślokanmaṃts utpatti ṅake no wāntre śārpau-me* ‘This is the origin of the

19 For other examples of the formula, see MN i, 110ff., 291; iii 228, etc. In the *Karmavibhaṅga*, we have just the exhortation to listen to the sūtra: *karmavibhaṅgaṃ te māṇavaka dharmaparyāyaṃ deśayiṣyāmi* [corr.]. *tenahi śṛṇu sādhu suṣṭhu ca manasi kuru.* ‘I will teach you, student, the classification of acts, which is a religious discourse. Then listen well and be very attentive.’ (Lévi 1932: 29–30).

stanzas; now I will explain the matter to you' (PK AS 6C a4). Our text then shows that even the canonical sūtras were adapted to such a pattern and were not directly translated into Tocharian. This is confirmed by another text from the Paris collection, PK AS 16.2–3, an adaptation of the *Aggañña-sutta*, which conforms to a prosimetric model (Pinault 1989). As argued by Pinault (2016: 173–174, 177–181), the ultimate function of these texts was probably oral recitation.

### 4.3 Meter

The only complete pāda (in a3) of the text has 14 syllables. It has to be segmented 9/5, not 7/7 as usually. In fact, the whole text could be analysed as 9/5 or 7/7. Since this manuscript has approximately 50 akṣaras per line (Sieg 1938: 16), circa 30 syllables must be supplemented between each two lines. The next preserved leaf of the manuscript, PK AS 7B, has the meter  $4 \times 13$  (5/8), numbered 74–77, and thus does not continue our text. 74–77 is a surprisingly high number since the other metrical sections end around 20. This metrical section may thus have contained all chapters from 1 to 22. This fact is of some consequence because these categories of acts form the oldest part of the sūtra, in which all the versions agree (see the table in Lévi 1932: 14). The translator changes the meter precisely when the topic order (along with Gautama Dharmaprajña and the second Tibetan translation) deviates from the Sanskrit (namely in PK AS 7B a4). The Tocharian has the order *niyata* → *naraka* → *kṛta/upacita* whereas the Sanskrit has the reverse series *kṛta/upacita* → *naraka* → *niyata* (chapters 23–32 of Lévi 1932). When after 33 the Tocharian version follows the same order of chapters as the Sanskrit, the meter changes again (in THT 521 a5). The history of the text seems thus to be reflected in the uses of the meters. One could object that these changes of meter originate from thematic differences, but the Tocharian translator might as well have separated the *kṛta/upacita* sections from the *naraka* sections.

Here I give a metrical analysis of the text; the numbering of missing syllables takes the restored text into account. In b1 a double dot was probably omitted, but it can be restored since *nesām* begins a new section. The



segmentation of b2 is difficult; if (yā)mor is the end of a pāda, the pāda beginning with *nesām* would have to end between *lwāsane* and *cmetsiśc*, which is not likely. So I have assumed that (*cmetsi*)ś was the end of the pāda and (yā)mor an enjambment.

- a1 (: *karmā*)*d(a)rs(o) cew sūtrā (ñi)ś ñk(e) | k,śiññe reki(sa :)* [21 missing syllables ?]
- a2 | (*ñäktemt*)*s ñ(ā)kt(e)ntse : käṣṣintse poyśintse sūtärne | śuk(eṃ) k(āl)yśk(eṃs)c(o :)* [28 missing syllables]
- a3 : *yāmorntse ailñenta śawāñcañ | yāmor-sonaicci : yāmor-(saim-wās-tecci)* [26 missing syllables]
- a4 (: *alyai*)*k no ywarskāññi mā | ainaki mā no śpālmeṃ : alyaik no śpā(lmeṃ)* [22 missing syllables]
- a5 (: *nesām em*)*p(a)rkre śaul nestsiśco | sportto(tär yāmor) : nesām makā teki nes(s)i(śco) |* [22 missing syllables]
- a6 (*onol*)*m(e) tanmäṣṣän | no al(l)e(k ikene : yäkte-cämpa)mñ(e) nessiśc | al(l)e(k ikene) ///* [26 missing syllables]
- b1 (*osta-ṣ*)*m(e)ñca (:)* *nesām yām(o)r (yäkte-ekñiññe | nesi) sporttotär : wro(t)s(tse-ekñiññe)* [22 missing syllables]
- b2 (: *yā*)*mor nesām yāmor | sporttotär (nraine cmetsi)ś (:)* *lwāsane cmetsiśc alle(k ikene)* [25 missing syllables]
- b3 | *sporttotrā yśāmna cme(tsi)ś : yśelmecc(eṃ) ñ(a)ktenne cme(tsiśco) |* [22 missing syllables]
- b4 (*nesām*) *yāmor | sporttotrā nemcek (c)metsiś : mā nemcek cmetsiśc no (sp)o(rttotär | yāmor nesām :)* [21 missing syllables]
- b5 (| *on*)*ol(m)e n(r)aine cmetrā : po solme śaul śaśāyu | pes(t tsä)l(p)e(trä)* [circa 30 missing syllables]
- b6 (*cme*)*tär ka nraine (p)est is(tak) laitotä(r)*

#### 4.4 Syntax

As stated in the introduction, the Tocharian translator seeks a kind of variety where the Sanskrit always uses the same construction. We find all possible permutations of word order in our text but without many

changes in vocabulary. The recurring phrase *asti karma x-saṃvartanīyam* “there is an act resulting in *x*” is translated word for word in b4 (*nesāṃ*) *yāmor sporttotrā nemcek (c)metsiś, spārttā-* being a literal translation of Sanskrit *saṃvṛt-* ‘to turn towards; to lead to’. The asyndeton is surprising at first sight; we expect a relative *k<sub>u</sub>se* between the two verbs, because in the headings of other categories, the assertion of existence and the result of the act are linked syntactically, as in:

PK AS 7E b3<sup>20</sup>

*se se yāmor ste k<sub>u</sub>cesa tne wnołmi nauṣ lāklessoñc postāṃ rano lāklessoñc  
šek mäs(kentār 8)*

‘This is the very deed through which the beings here, first full of suffering afterwards also always become full of suffering’ = *idaṃ karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalaḥ pūrvaṃ ca paścāc ca sukhito bhavati.* (Lévi 1932: 68).

But here *k<sub>u</sub>cesa* is a translation of *yena*. In the categories translated in our text, the Sanskrit resorts to a gerundive, which is rendered by an active form. One can interpret this as an ellipsis or as a paratactic construction. To decide between the two alternatives, we have to look at the same formulas in the body of the sūtra:

PK AS 7B a5<sup>21</sup>

*nesāṃ sū yāmor nemcek cmetsiś sportotrā*

‘There is such a deed [that] evolves into a specific rebirth.’ (Pinault in CEToM)

PK AS 7B b1<sup>22</sup>

*intsu no yāmor mā nemcek tñmaṣṣeñca*

‘But which [is] the deed, [by which] one does not [become someone who is] reborn specifically?’ (Pinault in CEToM)

20 Meter 4 × 25 (5/5/8/7).

21 Meter 4 × 12 (5/7).

22 Id.

In the first case, the ellipsis is indicated by the demonstrative, which forecasts a relative pronoun that was restored in the translation by Pinault. The second example presents the same ellipsis of a relative pronoun, and a verb of existence must be implied to understand *tänmaṣṣeñca*. These ellipses may be explained as poetic licenses or more simply be due to the repetitive nature of formulas.<sup>23</sup> Be that as it may, these examples are different from our text in which we find neither demonstrative nor agent noun; therefore I have preserved the paratactic construction in the translation.<sup>24</sup>

23 These examples are different from the author's massive use of conjunctionless conditional subordinates in the rest of the text, see e.g.: *kuse no sū yāmor alyek i«ke»ne yāmtrā : alyek i(ke)ne pkelñe tuntse yänmāṣṣām* 'But what deed [is] it, [if] one does [it] in a different place, [5a] [and] from which one obtains the ripening at a different place' (PK AS 7B b2, Pinault in CEToM).

24 The explanation of this oddity may be that the gerundive I of *spārttā-* was used in (perhaps restricted to) another meaning. In its two attested occurrences, it means 'to practice' and appears only in vinaya texts, cf. THT 549 b3–b4 *maithunaṃ saṃyog sutārsa warñai samāññe parā(kä)ṣṣeñcaṃ sutarṣeṃ spārttalyñentane sporttolle* 'One shall practice [litt. turn in] the behaviours (*vṛtti-*) of the sūtras that make prosper the monkhood, beginning with the sūtra of the bond of sexuality [= Methunasutta (AN iv 55–56)]; THT 1106 a2: *eneṣle pañikte käṣṣintamts yaknene watk(ä)ṣālyñene spo(rto)le star-c* 'Therefore you shall now behave according to the way [and] precept of the Buddha-teachers' (Fellner in CEToM). It is thus a calque of Sanskrit *vartitavya-* 'it should be abided or remained in (loc)' hence 'it should be proceeded or behaved towards or dealt in any way with any one (loc. gen., or instr. with *saha*)' (MW: 925,3). In the Pāli vinaya texts, the corresponding gerundive *vattitabba-* also takes a complement in the locative, just as in the Tocharian examples; see e.g. *yathāpaññattesu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vattitabbaṃ* (V iii 231) 'One should undertake and practice the training rules as they are pointed out'.

5 Commentary<sup>25</sup>

a1

(*karmā*)*d(a)rs(o)* The first akṣaras of the fragments probably contain the Tocharian title of the work. The Sanskrit title *karmavibhaṅga-sūtra* (Lévi 1932: 105) might be rendered into Tocharian B by *pāke yamalñe* (cf. THT 251 b5). This is incompatible with the manuscript, which could be either <še>, <rś.>, maybe <śam>. G.-J. Pinault proposed to restore (*ā*)*d(a)rs(o)*, with a so-called mobile *o*. *ādarśa-* ‘commentary’ is attested in titles of Sanskrit works such as the well-known *kāvyaadarśa*, a treaty of poetics written by Daṇḍin (MW: 280b).<sup>26</sup> We could also consider *deśanā-* ‘discourse, teaching’ which would be adapted as *deśam\**, but the reading <ṃ> is less likely. This word is attested before the overview in a variant reading of Sanskrit manuscript A, as a denomination of the summary.<sup>27</sup>

*k<sub>u</sub>śiññe r(e)ki(sa)* The text gives a new attestation of the adjective *k<sub>u</sub>śiññe* ‘Kuchean’. Usually *reki* is translated as ‘word, speech’ (Adams 2013: 585) but we could also understand it as ‘language’. A very similar phrase is attested at the end of the *Udānastotra*, but the subsequent portion of the text was lost there, so that it does not help for the restoration of our text.<sup>28</sup> In view of one of the rare preserved metapoetic statements in Tocharian,

25 Unless noted otherwise, all quoted Tocharian words are TB. The Sanskrit words are distinguished by a final hyphen.

26 See also *ācārādarśa* (MW: 131c), *dhāturūpādarśa-* (514a), *śrāddhādarśa-* (1098a), etc.

27 See above and Lévi (1932: 30, fn. 1); Kudo (2004: 26). In the sūtra itself, the overview is named *uddeśaḥ karmavibhaṅgasya dharmaparyāyasya* ‘Exposition of the classification of act, which is a religious discourse’ (Lévi 1932: 32). This could fit with the reading, but the inanimate nouns borrowed from Sanskrit normally lost their final vowel, so we expect <śā> in *virāma* position.

28 M 500.1 b2: *rṣākeṃts lānte kreñcepi tsānkā-ñ palsko klāwāssi lālyi wrotsai* : *k<sub>u</sub>śiñ-pele rekisa* (lacuna of 11 syllables) ‘My spirit arose in order to proclaim the great striving of the good king of Rīṣis. Through a speech in Kuchean manner, ...’ (Pinault in CEToM).

we have to supply a form of the causative of *ritt-* ‘to be attached, bound to’, which means ‘to connect, arrange’, hence ‘to translate’, or ‘to compose’.<sup>29</sup>

A 229 b7–230 a1<sup>30</sup>

*t[am] yārmaṃ taṃ ṅi caṃ kāvviṣi ret(w)e(yaṃ :) ime pältsäk yeṣ ārsi-kāntwā ritwāssi kanaśäl (: šok-yo nu mā)sk(i) tāk paṃ kāvviṣi re(twe :)*  
 ‘Accordingly, my spirit and thought concerning this *kāvya* opus were directed toward the composition in Ārsi language in poetic form. Very difficult was such a *kāvya* composition’ (Carling 2009: 62)

**a2**

(*ñāktent*)s *ñ(ā)kt(e)ntse* This restoration, proposed by G.-J. Pinault, is based on a well-attested epithet of the Buddha, which renders *devātideva*.<sup>31</sup> Such an epithet does not appear in the Sanskrit version of our text and may be an expansion of the Tocharian translator.

*k(āl)yśk(eś)c(o)* Possible restorations are *-sco*, allative ending, *cce* demonstrative with initial doubling or adjectival ending, or the adverb *ecce* ‘hither’. According to the meter, just one syllable is required to complete the *pāda*. The latter option is less likely, because of the required sandhi. The formation of an adjective on *kālyśke* (*kalyśkatstse*\*) could be interpreted as a calque of *māṇavaka-* which sometimes occurs in Lévi (1932: 29, 30), or as an adjective relating to *sūtārne*.<sup>32</sup> But in both cases, the syntax would be difficult to understand. Consequently, I have chosen the allative form dependent on *sūtārne* or on an implied participle such as *weweñoṣ* ‘said’.

29 See Pinault (2016: 183f.) for the poetic implications and an interpretation of the cited text.

30 Verse 52a–c; meter 12 × 15 × 12 × 15 (a,c: 5/7; b,d: 7/8).

31 Cf. THT 295 b2 *te māṃ weñña sūtārne ñākteṃnts ñakte pūdñakte* ‘Thus said in [his] *sūtra* the Buddha, the god of gods’; also THT 5 b3, THT 167 b2, etc.

32 Cf. THT 542 a2 *māṇavagaṇaparivṛta · kālśkaṣṣe kraupesa wawārpau* ‘surrounded by a group of boys’.

## a3

Here the Tocharian translates a recurrent formula of the canonical scripture about the untransferable nature of actions and their unavoidable consequences with several compounds.

**yāmorn̄tse ailñenta śawāñcañ** Sanskrit *karmadāyāda-* ‘heir of the act’<sup>33</sup> is here translated as ‘eaters of the gifts of the act’. Surprising as it is, such a curious translation was already known to Tocharologists, although it did not draw much attention until Hackstein (2015).

THT 21 a1–2 (*Udānālankāra*)<sup>34</sup>

(weña ślo)k ce pudñākte : yolome(ṃ) āltsis krentauna (rittāssis :) ///  
(yolo wa)t cwik śawāñc/ailñe /// (5o ce ślok a)kṣā-me k<sub>u</sub>ce tne wnołmi  
yamantār krent yo(laiṃ yāmor) /// ailñe śūwaṃ cmelane

‘... this (stro)phe the Buddha (spoke), to keep [the beings] from evil [and] (to tie) [them] (to) the virtues. [50b] ... or (evil), of just this [he is] consuming the [inherited] part [50d] (This strophe) he proclaimed to them. What the beings will do here, good [and] evil deed ... the [inherited] part [of it] they will consume in the births.’ (Fellner in CEToM)

This is the translation of Uv. 9, 8 with explanation:

*yat karoti naraḥ karma kalyāṇam atha pāpakam,  
tasya tasyaiva dāyādo na hi karma praṇaśyati.*

‘Welche Tat ein Mensch begeht, sei sie böse oder gut, die wird ihm zur Erblast, denn keine Tat geht je verloren.’ (Hahn 2007: 40)

Based on Dunkel (1987), Hackstein (2015: 393–394) postulates a PIE formula ‘eating away at the inherited/entrusted’, then ‘eat the property of others’, ‘usurpate the booty taken of a defeated enemy’, ‘behave antisocially’, which would be attested in a fossilised form in Lat. *hērēs*, *-ēdis* ‘heir’ and Gr. *χῆρωσταί* ‘distant heirs’. These forms are interpreted as reflexes of PIE *\*ǵ<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>ro-* + *\*h<sub>1</sub>ed-* ‘to eat inheritance’. Although it has a different first

33 SWTF: ii 28a translates ‘Erbe der (eigenen) Taten.’

34 Meter 4×12 (5/4/3).

member, Sanskrit *dāyāda-* would also be based on this phrase. Hackstein then quotes some passages from Homer and the Rīgveda to illustrate this collocation, and suggests to interpret the Tocharian phrase as: “the inherited meaning of (a) ‘abusing property, usurpating alien property, being untrustworthy, behaving antisocially’ is expanded within the Buddhist framework to mean (b) ‘suffering the bad consequences of bad deeds.’” (2015: 397). Since the quotation of the Udānavarga is illustrated in the Tocharian text by an avadāna, Hackstein explains this semantic shift on the basis of this story, which stages Ajātaśatru, the son who killed his father and stole his kingdom.

This approach has several flaws: (a) the different glosses provided by Hackstein cover a wide range of meanings. The idea of “heir” is quite different from the suitors of the Odyssey. If we summarise the semantic shift postulated from PIE to Tocharian, we would have a strange circular evolution ‘heritage-eater’ → ‘usurper’ → ‘wrong-doer’ → ‘heir (fig.)’, i.e. “intertwining of bad deeds with unfavorable consequences” (2015: 399). (b) Hackstein seems to assume that this phrase was chosen because the Ajātaśatru’s story had some common elements with the presupposed cultural background of this formula.<sup>35</sup> However, our fragment shows that the phrase was a kind of standard translation for *dāyāda-*. (c) As stated by Hackstein in the beginning of his paper, the phrase *tasya karmadāyāda* is relevant to all kinds of actions and means that one has to bear the consequences of one’s own actions whether good or bad (*kalyāṇam atha pāpakam*). This is confirmed by looking into some commentaries of this formula.<sup>36</sup> The proposed semantic evolution would just account for half

35 Hackstein (2015: 399): “In general, it denotes the Buddhist intertwining of bad deeds with unfavorable consequences. But in the narrative framework of the Ajātaśatru-legend, it also refers to the king Ajātaśatru who illegally appropriates/devours the property of his father Bimbisāra.”

36 *Abhidh-s* 60: *kathaṃ karmadāyādāḥ | tasyāṃ svayaṃkṛtavipākapratīsaṃvedanāyāṃ kuśalākuśalānāṃ karmaṇāṃ anyonyadāyādātām upādāya* ‘Comment les êtres deviennent-ils les héritiers de leurs actions ? Parce qu’en éprouvant les résultats des actions faites par eux, ils obtiennent les actions favorables et défavorables (*kuśalākuśalakarma*) comme héritage réciproque’ (Rahula 1971: 96–97).

of the meaning. (d) The translations of the *Udānavarga* are better known for their word-to-word renditions than for their cultural innovations. Here the Tocharian obviously calques the Sanskrit by choosing *ailñe*, which, as far I know, always refers to a '(pious) gift' = Sanskrit *dāna-*, not to 'inheritance' or 'part' (Adams 2013: 106; Carling 2009: 75–76).

Hence it would be better to interpret this translation within the culture which produced it, and I think that we have enough possibilities to explain it and to refrain from turning to a PIE phrase. Here are the four factors that could account for the Tocharian translation: (a) wrong segmentation of the compound as \**dāya-ada-*; (b) content of the doctrine of *karman*; (c) influence of the Buddhist phraseology; (d) contrastive choice of Tocharian vocabulary.

(a) The natural solution would be that the Tocharian translator segmented \**dāya-ada-* in *dāya* 'gift' and the root *ad-* 'eat' after other compounds such as Sanskrit *puruṣāda-* 'cannibal' (MW: 637b), *mānuṣamānsāda-* 'eating man's flesh' (MW: 810b), or in Pāli, *kiṭṭhāda-* 'eating corn', *vantāda-* 'eating vomit' (PED: 25).<sup>37</sup> But it should be noted that these compounds are rather semantically limited. Moreover, in the commentaries I could not find any gloss of *dāyāda-* referring to this root, so that the Tocharian would be unique in this interpretation. The second part is always interpreted as coming from *ā-dā-* 'to take'. See for example:<sup>38</sup>

37 The verbal governing compounds with second member °-*ad-* 'eating' are discussed in Debrunner (1954: 27) and their thematised form °-*ad-a-*, p. 90. Concerning the Buddhist sources, CPD, s. v. '*ada*' has "*kiṭṭhā°*, *kuṇapā°*, *gūthā°* (f. *~ī*), *purisā°*, *porisā°*, *rasā°*, *vantā°*, *vighāsā°*, *visā°*".

38 See also AN-a iii 260: ***tassa dāyādo bhavissāmīti tassa kammaṣṣa dāyādo tena dinnaphalapaṭiggāhako bhavissāmīti attho***. 'Heir of this act [means] "I will be the receiver of the fruit given by this one [= the act]"'; MN-t VRI 2,156 ***kammadāyādā, attanā katūpacitakammaphalabhāgīti attho***. 'receiving the fruit of the act done and accumulated by oneself'; see also Th-a ii 22. ***tassa tasseva dāyādoti tassa tasseva kammaphalassa gaṇhanato tena tena kammaṇa dātabbavipākassa bhāgī hotīti attho***. In the grammatical literature: SKD: 2,704: *dāyādaḥ* †, *puṣi*, (*ādatte iti* . *ā* + *dā* + "ātaścopasarge" 3. 1. 136 . *iti kaḥ* . *dāyasya ādaḥ grāhakaḥ*.



AN-a v 40

*kammena dātabbaṃ phalaṃ dāyaṃ, kammaṣṣa dāyaṃ kammadāyaṃ, taṃ ādiyāmiti kammadāyādo*

‘the gift [is] the fruit that has to be given by the act, the act’s gift [is] the gift of the act, heir of the act [means] “I take it”.’

This traditional interpretation is also favoured by the majority of modern scholars. Debrunner (1954: 77) analyses *dāya+āda-* ‘das Erbe an sich nehmend’, the first member being Vedic *dāyá-* ‘share, inheritance’ (diff. from Epic *dāya-* ‘gift, present’).<sup>39</sup>

(b) In their successive reincarnations, the beings eat several kinds of food according to their previous deeds. This is well known about the Pretas who often expiate their wrong actions by eating disgusting food; in a Tocharian text related to the *Karmavibhaṅga* we find:

THT 552 a3

*wemts weṣṣiye añkaiṃ y(āmor)<sup>40</sup> šuwaṃ prete(ne)*

‘They will eat excrement, filth [and] vomit among the pretas.’

It may be no coincidence that most of the compounds in *-ada-* are often epithets of Pretas, as Pāli *vantāda-* ‘eater of vomit’ or *gūthāda-* ‘eater of manure’. But eating is not limited to penance, and another Tocharian text, together with the punishments of Pretas, evokes the heavenly foods:

39 See also KEWA: i 69; ii 3. SWTF: ii 434b just glosses the word by ‘Erbe’ and mentions the passage of the *Udānavarga*.

40 Although the phrase *añkaiṃ yām-* ‘to vomit’ is well established from medical texts (PK AS 3 A b5–6; IOL Toch 205 b4), it could also stand for ‘wrong deed’, since *añkaiṃ* means ‘wrong’, as well as its TA counterpart *keṃ*, esp. in the compound *keṃ-pālkune\** ~ *añkaiṃ-pilko\** ‘false view (of heretics)’, translation of Sanskrit *mithyādrṣṭi-* (Adams 2013: 7; Carling 2009: 159). Thus it could be the equivalent of Pāli *micchākammanta-* as well as *añkain placsa* (THT 282 a4) = *micchāvācā-*, *añkaiṃ šaul šailñe* (IOL Toch 255 a2) or *añkaiṃ spārtalñe* (IOL Toch 402 a2) = *micchājīva-* (for the enumeration, see PED: 532).

THT 1107 b2–3

*ente yñakteṃ tetemu (ṣaiyt) ñikciyan(a y)s(ā)ṣ(a)na vairuḍiṣana  
ñkāñcana mastarkalāṣana bha(janta) /// śpālmeṃ śwatsanma  
śa(wā)sta nano nrāiyṇ(e) eñcuwañeṃ palkoṣā(ṃ) krepastaṃ śawāsta  
mloṣā pilke*

‘When you (were) born among the gods, (from) divine golden, beryl, silver [and] crystal vessels (heavenly(?)) food you were eating. In hell, then, you were eating red-hot iron balls, [and] molten copper (you were drinking).’ (Fellner in CEToM)

(c) The verb *bhuñjati* ‘to eat (in general), to enjoy, to make use of, to take advantage of, to use’ (PED: 506, MW: 759b) along with concrete meanings was used in Buddhist literature to mean ‘to enjoy a heritage’ or ‘to enjoy a gift’. For the first meaning, see for example *kacci te petā ñātisālohitā taṃ dānaṃ paribhuñjanti* ‘Can our departed relatives and family members actually partake of our gift?’ (AN v 269; Bodhi 2012: 1523).<sup>41</sup> Closer to our topic, in the Pāli commentaries we find the compound *dayajja-paribhoga-* ‘enjoyment of the inheritance’. In a different context, i.e. the relationship between the monks and the Buddha, the compound is thus explained by Buddhagosa:

V-a iii 694

*Sattannaṃ sekkhānaṃ dāyajjaparibhogo paccayaparibhogo nāma. Te  
hi bhagavato puttā, tasmā pitusantakānaṃ paccayānaṃ dāyādā hutvā  
te paccaye paribhuñjanti.*

‘The enjoyment of inheritance is the enjoyment of the [four] supports<sup>42</sup> for the seven kinds of trainees. These ones are the children

41 Other examples that I have found are: the refrain *saddhādeyyāni bhojanāni bhuñjitvā* in DN i 6, etc.; *Abhidh-k-vy* 356: *na hy atra dātṛṇāṃ dāyāḥ paribhujyante*; 419 *śraddhādeyaṃ paribhujya* ; AN-a i 70 *asammāvattantānañca janassa saddhādeyyaṃ paribhuñjituṃ ayuttan”ti gihibhāvaṃ saṅkamanṭīti*.

42 *Paticca*: “Usually with ref. to the 4 necessities of the bhikkhu’s daily life, viz. *cīvara*, *piṇḍapāta*, *senāsana* (*gilānapaccaya* -- ) *bhesajja*, i.e. clothing, food as alms a dwelling-place, medicine” (PED: 384).

of the Blessed One; therefore, becoming the heirs of the supports, of their father's possessions, they enjoy the supports.'

The verb *śuwā-* precisely used to translate *bhuj-*, as we could gather from a bilingual folio from the *Abhidharmakośa*, dealing with the “transitional being” (*gandharva-*) in the intermediary existence (*antarabhāva-*): *ñāṣṣeñca · gan(dha)rvaś ca · were śawāñca* ‘... desiring; and the gandharva [Sanskrit]; smell-eater’ (THT 176 b5). The text is the linear translation of *kārikā* 3, 40c,<sup>43</sup> but is based on *gandhabhuk* ‘smell-eater’ (3, 14d), an etymological gloss of *gandharva-*.<sup>44</sup> Thus, the polysemy of the Indian verb and the Buddhist phraseology may have influenced the Tocharian translation of *dāyāda-*.

(d) The usual way to say in Tocharian ‘to feel the fruits of one's acts’ is to use the verb *wārpā-*, as in *yolaina yāmorntamts o(k)o wārpanatrā* ‘he feels the fruit of evil deeds’ (IOL Toch 43 b2).<sup>45</sup> In the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula,<sup>46</sup> *warpalñe* translates *vedanā-* ‘sensation’ (THT 156 a4–b4, PK NS 53 b1.6); in PS Bl 18.4 *sak yāso wa(r)pauca ṣāp* is a gloss from *sukha(samrā)gapratisamvedī* ‘experiencing happiness and passion’ (Peyrot 2015: 118). This latter correspondence confirms that the range of the

43 *Abhidh-k-bh* 153: *manomayaḥ saṃbhavaīṣī gandharvaścāntarābhavaḥ* || 3.40 || *saṃbhavaīṣaṇaśilatvāt saṃbhavaīṣī | gandharvañāt gandharvaḥ |* “Il est nommé *saṃbhavaīṣin*, parce que, de sa nature, il va au lieu de l'existence-naissance (*upapattibhava*). Il est nommé Gandharva parce qu'il mange l'odeur.” (La Vallée Poussin 1923–31: iii, 122).

44 *Abhidh-k-bh* 125: *sa gandhabhuk* || 3.14 || *ata eva gandharva ityucyate | dhātūnām anekārthatvāt | hrasvatvaṃ śakandhukarkandhuvat | alpeśākhyastu durgandhāharo mahēśakhyāḥ sugandhāhārah | ata eva gandharva ityucyate |* “Il mange l'odeur. D'où son nom de Gandharva, ‘qui mange (*arvati*) l'odeur (*gandham*)’. Le sens des racines est multiple : *arv*, si on le prend dans le sens d'aller est justifié : ‘qui va manger l'odeur’ (*arvati gacchati bhoktum*). On a *gandharva* et non *gandhārva* comme on a *śakandhu*, *karkandhu* [here the translator cites *Dhātupāṭha*, i 613 *arva hīmsāyām śakandhu*, vi 1. 94]. Le Gandharva de bas rang mange une odeur mauvaise, le Gandharva de haut rang mange une bonne odeur” (La Vallée Poussin 1923–31: iii, 47–48).

45 See also THT 268 a3, A 54 a1; A 298 a6, etc.

46 See Pinault (1988: 121), with further references.

meaning is rather ‘to experience’ than ‘to consume’ and gives the phraseological match of Tocharian *wärpā-*. Indeed, this verb is very frequently joined with TB *lakle* and *sakw*, TA *klop* and *suk*,<sup>47</sup> just as Sanskrit *duḥkha-* and *sukha-* (as well as their Pāli counterparts) are objects of (*pratisam-*)*vid-* (BHSD: 371,1, s. v. *pratisamvedin*; PED: 400, s. v. *paṭisamvedeti*). This phraseology matches the Buddhist definition of *vedanā* (namely threefold *Mvy* 1913–16: *vedanāskandhanāmāni: sukhāḥ, duḥkhāḥ, aduḥkhāsukhāḥ*).

The verb *paṭisamvedeti* is used to mean precisely ‘to experience the results of one’s own acts’ in the Pāli suttas about the doctrine of karma. See for example the refrain in the *Mahākammavibhaṅga-sutta*:

MN iii 215<sup>48</sup>

*vipākam paṭisamvedeti upapajja vā apare vā pariyaḥe.*

‘He will experience the result of that either here and now, or in his next rebirth, or in some subsequent existence.’ (Ñāṇamoli & Bodhi 2009: 1064)

Thus, in a sentence such as *okw empelye wärp{a}nantār cmelane* ‘they will experience a terrible result in their births’ (THT 17 a5), *oko wärpā-* is the counterpart of the Sanskrit phrase *vipākam (pratisam)vid-*. Although the parallelism between the two roots is not always as clear as one would wish,<sup>49</sup> the bulk of the occurrences concords with the distribution between *wärpā-* ‘to experience, to feel pleasure or pain, to enjoy or suffer’ and *śuwā-* ‘eat, consume’. The Tocharian translators then probably chose the latter solution because it was more appropriate to the concrete meaning of *ailñe*, or because they were translating *bhuj-*.

To conclude, four explanations (of course not mutually exclusive) can be provided: a “popular” etymology of the Sanskrit compound, an in-

47 See A 42 a1: *klopant wärpnāntrā*; A 46 a5: *suḥkuntu wärporāḥ*; THT 28 b1: *lakle wärpnantār*; SI P 1 a6: *wärpormeṃ skwanma*, etc.

48 See also MN iii 180; AN i 135, etc.

49 *wärpā-* also translates *anumud-* ‘rejoice’ (A 464 b4; B 543 b6), which is not a problem, but is sometimes also employed with alms as object: THT 1539.b b2: *krūi pintwātā warpa(trā)* (also A 435 a1) or with a gift: *elant wä(rp)*. (A 444.c a2).

fluence of the mythological background, an underlying gloss containing *bhuj-* as enjoyment of the inheritance, and a semantic distinction specific to Tocharian.

Lastly, it seems that our translation is paralleled by the Tibetan translation in the *Mahāvvyutpatti*: *karmadāyāda-* is glossed *las kyi bgo skal la spyod pa* in Mvy 2314, *spyod pa* being the rendition of °*āda-*. For this verb, we find the following entry in Jäschke 334: “1. To accomplish, perform [...] 2. To treat hence gen. to use, to make use of, to employ, to enjoy”. Lokesh Chandra (1976: 1492) gives, among other translations based on the root *kr-*, *spyad pa*: *anubhūyate* ‘enjoys’ and (p. 1493): *spyad par bya*: *bhokṣye* ‘I will enjoy’. In Hopkins 2032, we find the gloss ‘partake of/enjoy the share’ for *bgo skal la spyod pa*. This comparison with the *Mahāvvyutpatti* suggests that the Tocharians had at their disposal a similar kind of work; otherwise it would be difficult to explain the recurrence of this peculiar rendition of *dāyāda-* in two unrelated texts.

**yāmor-śonaicci** Here, we have the translation of the compound *karmayoni-* ‘having the act as origin’. TB *śonaicci* is an adjective derived from *ścono* ~ *śconiye*. As pointed out by M. Peyrot and the anonymous reviewer (p. c.), the simplification of the cluster *śc* to *ś* is not trivial, though other instances can be found in classical texts.<sup>50</sup> Another difficulty is that *ścono* is usually translated ‘enmity, hate’ (see Adams 2013: 701). However, G.-J. Pinault (p. c.) has drawn my attention to several occurrences of this word, as well as of its TA counterpart *śom\**, in which it should be translated as ‘(bad) birth’.<sup>51</sup> This meaning is guaranteed by a fragment of the *Vinayavibhaṅga* where *ścono* translates *yoni-*, just as in our text.<sup>52</sup> I put

50 See Peyrot (2008: 70–71): PK NS 67 b1 *śonai(ñ)* can be added to these occurrences. This simplification in initial position before vowel has parallels in the forms *śīre*, *śīrem*, etc. also in classical texts (Peyrot 2008: 71).

51 See Pinault *apud* Ogihara (2012: 168, fn. b).

52 THT 1579 b1–2 *tiryagyoniḡataṃ* is translated by *lwasāṣṣ(ai) śconaine ykuweṣ* (Ogihara 2012: 167–168).

aside the occurrences that have already been treated,<sup>53</sup> and would like to comment on two examples where the number four is adjoined to TB *ścono* / TA *śom\**, because they are closer to our text. This phrase refers to the Buddhist classification of the four ways of birth.<sup>54</sup> In an introductory sentence of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula, *ścono* is interestingly contrasted to *camel* ‘birth’:

THT 149 a4–5

(*po pre*)*ści(yaṣṣi)*<sup>55</sup> *pīś āntsi śtwāra ścon(a)nne piś cmela(ne re)skem*<sup>56</sup>  
• *saṃsār ste* •

‘The five elements [*skandha*] (belonging to all time periods flow) in the four origins [*yonī*], in the five births [*jāti*]; [this] is *saṃsāra*.’

The other attestation, in TA, also alludes to *saṃsāra*:

A 313 a7–8<sup>57</sup>

*śtwar śonāmtwaṃ pa(prutkuṣ puk) kusne wrasañ : k<sub>u</sub>prene tākiñc śom  
kṣaṇa«ṃ» tñi puk tsālpāšlye*

‘Wenn (all) die Wesen, welche in den vier Kontinenten eingeschlossen [sind, zu erlösen] wären, [so würden] sie alle von dir in einem [einzi- gen] Augenblick zu erlösen sein.’ (Sieg 1952: 33)

53 THT 3597 b3 *rīnāṣṣitrā śākw nā(kcye) – – lwāñai śconai* ‘[but] it gave up di- vine happiness and ... detestable animal state ...’ (Peyrot in CEToM); YQ II.7 b2: *caṃ śonam tatmuṣ naś* ‘you have been born in this reincarnation class’ (CEToM) = Uigh. *bu muntag körksüz ažunta* ‘in dieser so häßlichen Existenz’ (after Ogihara 2012: 168).

54 PED 559: “1. the womb. – 2. origin, way of birth, place of birth, realm of existence; nature, matrix. There are four yonis or ways of being born or generation, viz. *aṇḍaja* oviparous creation, *jalābujā* viviparous, *saṃsedaja* mois- ture-sprung, *opapātika* spontaneous.”

55 Restoration according to TochSprR(B) 2: 79, fn. 3.

56 The restitution is based on the metaphor of the flows of *saṃsāra*; for an as- sociation with the verb *śr-* ‘to flow’, and an etymological play, see: *Saṃsāre saṃsarantī haṃ kammavāyusameritā | Kāsissa rañño visaye ajāyim dāsaḡāmake* || ‘Waving in the *saṃsāra*, moved by the wind of my actions, in the realm of the king of Kāsi, I was born in a village of slaves’ (Ap 538).

57 Meter 4×12 (4/4/4).

This has to be corrected to:

‘If [all] the beings that [are] trapped in the four ways of birth were [to be redeemed], they [would] all be to be redeemed by you in one [single] moment.’

On the other hand, the word TB *ścono* is also attested as translating Sanskrit *dveṣa-* ‘hatred’ in several bilingual texts,<sup>58</sup> and even *krodha-* ‘anger’.<sup>59</sup> That is the reason why Ogihara translated ‘[bad] birth’, but in our text the word must have a neutral, generic meaning, as stated in the Pāli commentary of the *Cūḷakammavibhaṅga-sutta: kammaṃ etesaṃ yoni kāraṇanti kammayonī ‘kammayonī: ‘namely the act [is] the origin, the cause of these ones’* (MA-a v 10). This agrees with the preceding mentions of the four ways of birth, which encompass all births, not uniquely bad births. The negative connotation may come from the Buddhist context and its application to the *saṃsāra*. It is thus difficult to cover the span between these two meanings and this should be a matter of further investigations.

**yāmor-(saim-wāstecci)** Here, we expect the translation of *karma-pratiśaraṇa-* ‘having the act as refuge’. Sanskrit *śaraṇa-* is usually translated by the single terms *saim*, *waste* or by the binomial phrase *saim-wāste*. An adjective based on this compound is attested in THT 583 b1 (*śi*)*kamaiyyai*<sup>60</sup>-*saim-wāstetse*, which is also a bahuvrīhi ‘having the possessor of the ten powers [i.e. the Buddha] as support and refuge.’

58 IOL Toch 926 a2 *k<sub>u</sub>se ṣpā śco(nai)* = Uv. 32,49c *yaś ca dveṣakṣayaṃ prāptaḥ* ‘and who has attained the extinction of hatred’; PK NS 67 b1 *k<sub>u</sub>se ṣamāne tremeñ śonai(ñ)* ~ PrMoSA.8 *yaḥ punar bhikṣur duṣṭo doṣād* ‘Whichever monk, wicked and out of enmity’ (Ogihara 2009: 295); PK AS 7G b5 *śconai-yparwe duṣṣīlñesa = dveṣasamutthitena dauḥṣīlyena* ‘because of their wickedness arisen from hatred’ (Lévi 1932: 77); PK AS 6C a4 = Uv. 31,18d.

59 IOL Toch 1244 b1 *k<sub>u</sub>temeñ ścono* = Uv. 20,17a *kutaḥ krodho* ‘whence the anger’.

60 Late form of the compound *śka-maiyya* (attested in THT 109 b3), which translates the epithet *daśabala-*.

## a4

(: *alyai*)*k no ywarskāññi mā ainaki mā no śpālmeṃ* : *alyaik no śpā(lmeṃ)* The Tocharian translator seems to have rendered the members of the compound *hīnotkrṣṭamadhyamatā-* as separate items. This was probably inspired by the question of Śuka, who lists the different categories of beings, coordinating them with *api* (Levi 1932: 29). In Miln 66, the same categories are enumerated by the repetition of *aññe* ‘others’, just as in our Tocharian text.

## a6

(*anol*)*m(e) tanmāṣṣān no* The causative of the verb *tām-* seems at first sight rather odd, because the translator of the *Karmavibhaṅga* only uses the forms of the *Grundverb*. Besides, this causative stem normally means ‘beget, generate’, in figurative use with objects such as TB *lakle* (THT 197 b5, THT 217 b4), TB *sak* (PK AS 17I b2, PK NS 19 a4 ), TB *sklok* ‘doubt’ (THT 15 b2), or TA *pñi* ‘merit’ (YQ III.10 a8, A 303 b7). According to bilingual manuscripts, this causative translates Sanskrit *prasavati* (A 463 b5) or *janayati* (THT 537 b2). Since objects associated with Pāli *pasavati* are *pāpaṃ* ‘bad action’, *puññaṃ* ‘merit’, *veraṃ* ‘hatred’ (PED: 446), this figurative meaning of the causative is likely to come from the Buddhist phraseology. Indeed, I have found three examples where it means ‘to beget’ concretely, but just one is relevant to our context because we need a construction such as “the act that makes someone be born as *x*”.<sup>61</sup> Unfortunately, the text is damaged:

90K-58F-01 a10

/// (*e*)*mpelya* : *tanmāṣṣāṃ nraine lw(ā)s(a) pr(e)tenne ñākcyē śām(ñ)e* ///

61 The other examples are THT 1231 a4 /// *tanmāṣṣeñca poyśīnta āwe mācer śaiṣsentse kre* /// ‘... one who begets omniscient [Buddhas]; the grandfather [and] mother of the world; ... the good ...’ (Peyrot and Burlak in CEToM); YQ III.3 a4: /// (*k<sub>u</sub>le*)*wāñ sidārtheṃ kāts kāmant k<sub>u</sub>lewāñ tatāmśānt-āṃ* ‘Women have carried Siddhārtha in their womb, women have given birth to him’ (CEToM).



‘[...] terrible [...] it makes (creatures?) born in animals and Pretas in a hell, in divine and human worlds [...]’ (Ogihara 2015, after CEToM)

Thus, the translator of the text may have chosen a construction with the causative for the sake of variation. According to the restoration of the following heading, we should have the category of *prāsādika-* ‘fair, beautiful’, which is translated further in the sūtra as a reward for good deeds by a periphrasis *takarṣkñ* / *erṣeñcañ* ‘evoking gracefulness’ (PK AS 7G b2, Pinault in CEToM).

(*yäfte-cämpa*)*mñ(e)* The extant ligature *mñ(e)* immediately suggests an abstract noun based on a *-mo* adjective, namely *cämpamñe* as pointed out to me by G.-J. Pinault. Considering the Sanskrit text, we could also think about *aiśamñe = prajñā-*, but this would be too far from the precedent heading. TB *cämpamñe* ‘capacity, ability’ is also attested later in the text, as translation, with *orotstse*, of *maheśākhyā-* ‘distinguished, exalted, great’:

PK AS 7I a3–4 (restoration based on the similar translation in a6–b1)<sup>62</sup>  
*orotse cpī māsketrā cämpamñe /// (wrocceṃ) cäm(pamñ)e(cc)e(m) k*  
*onolmempa känmastrā šesa 10*  
 ‘The power of this one [= the pious one] is great ..., he comes together with (great), p(owerful) beings for sure’ (Pinault in CEToM) = *maheśākhyo bhavati. maheśākhyaiḥ samāgamo sattvaiḥ bhavati* (Lévi 1932: 84).

This translation is of some interest because the interpretation and the etymology of this word along with its counterpart *alpeśākhyā-* ‘insignificant, petty’ are still disputed.<sup>63</sup> The Tocharian seems to be based on a popular etymology, which links these two words to the root *śak-* ‘to be powerful, to be capable (to)’. This etymology has parallels in the Buddhist literature, such as the form *mahāśākya-* (BHSD: 426,1) and several glosses in Pāli commentaries: *mahesakkhoti mahabbalo* ‘i.e. of great strength’ (Th-a ii 260), *mahesakkhoti mahānubhāvo* ‘i.e. of great power’ (Ja vi 198).

62 Meter 4×15 (7/8 or 8/7).

63 References in PED: 58, 526; CPD s. v. *appesakkha*.

For the sake of completeness, I have made a compound on the basis of *wrotse-ekñiññe* ‘of great wealth’ (see below) and substituted *yäfte* for *orotse*, thus translating the heading *alpeśākhya*, because it would allow sufficient room for the subsequent lacuna.

## b1

(*osta-ṣ*)*m(e)ñca* Considering the reconstruction of the following text, this is the translation of *uccakulopapattivartanīyaṃ*. G.-J. Pinault has suggested to restore *osta-ṣmeñca* ‘householder’. We could then imply a sentence such as *nesāṃ yāmor sporttotār nestsi kauc osta-ṣmeñca* ‘there is an act; it results in being a high[-born] householder’.<sup>64</sup>

Another possibility would be to complete (*ostne tñnmaṣ*)*ṣ(e)ñca*, which would be compatible with the remnants of *aḥṣaras* and is paralleled in the body of the *sūtra* as a translation of *ādhyeṣu kuleṣu upapadyate* ‘is born among rich families’:

PK AS 7 E a4<sup>65</sup>

*ś(a)tem o(st)ne (tā)nmaske(n)trū (e)kñiññesa kekenoṣ :*

‘they are reborn in a rich house provided with possession[s]’ (Pinault in CEToM) = *ādhyeṣu kuleṣūpapadyate mahādhanēṣu mahābhogeṣu* (Lévi 1932: 65).

But the translation of *ucca-* ‘high’ is less certain. If the compound was calqued, we would expect *kauc ost*.<sup>66</sup> This collocation is indeed attested in a poem about meritorious acts, but the text remains difficult.

64 In this kind of construction, the attribute is in the nominative, see PK AS 7E a5 *tūsa ket āñme skwassu ṣek nessi* ‘Therefore who has the wish to be happy, ...’. See also PK AS 8C b7, THT 82 b4, etc.

65 Meter 4×25 (5/5/8/7).

66 The antonym *ette* ‘low’ is used in combination with *ymiye* ‘path, way’ or *camel* ‘birth to translate *apāyeṣūpapanno* ‘reborn in evil state’ as retribution for bad actions.’ See PK AS 7G b2 *cmentār rano ette ymainne* ‘[if] they are born in low places’, b3 *ette cmelne tmaskentrā* ‘they are reborn in a low birth’, and b4, b6.

THT 257 a3<sup>67</sup>

( | - ) *tonne cmetrā kauc | kauc ka ost yaṃ | su säswāts säś(w)ā(ts :)*  
[14b]

‘ ... [If] he is born high among these, this one goes to a very high house for his successive sons (?)’

Hence, we may propose *kauc ostne tänmaṣṣeñca* ‘being born in a high house’.

**wro(t)s(tse-ekñiññe)** The reading indubitably points to a form of the adjective *wrotstse*, being an adequate translation of Sanskrit *mahā-*. According to our parallel, the two best candidates are *mahābhoga-* and *mahāprajña-*. We are rather dealing with *mahābhoga-*, because the next heading identified with certainty is *lwāsane cmetsīc / tiryagyonyupapatti* in the next line.

In the body of the text, the Tocharian translator renders *mahābhogaś ca bhavati* either by a periphrasis, *wrotsana ekñiññenta yänmāṣṣām* ‘he obtains great possessions’ (PK AS 7I a3, same translation in PK AS 7I b2–3, PK AS 7I b6–PK AS 7J a1), or by a compound, *māsketrā wrotse-ekñiññe* ‘he becomes of great wealth’ (PK AS 7J a4, same translation in PK AS 7J b3, b5). It is difficult to decide with much certainty between these two alternatives. But since a shorter form would be preferred for the “table of contents”, I have chosen the *bahuvrīhi* translation.

This being established, the preceding lacuna must contain the heading corresponding to *alpabhoga-*. As far as I know, no Tocharian translation of this word is known elsewhere, but it can be inferred from its antonym. Between the periphrasis and the calque, the meter and the size of the loss speak for the shorter form. Concerning the first member, we found three translations in bilingual texts; *yäfte* was probably chosen because it was apparently the standard form in first part of compounds:<sup>68</sup>

67 The metric is based on Sieg’s indications (TochSprR(B) 2: 157, fn. 12); according to him, the meter is  $14 \times 20 \times 14 \times 20$  (a,c: 7/7; b,d: 5/6/5/4 or 5/6/4/5).

68 See Peyrot (2008: 166–167).

*yekte-*:

IOL Toch 70 b6 (*alpaśrut*)*aś ca bhavati* • *yekte ke(klyauṣu)* ‘having listened [but] little’ (Uv. 22,9a)

*totkā-*:

THT 16 a7 *totkā-yärm* ‘of small measure’ = *alpamātro* (Uv. 8,4a)

*yäfte-*:

THT 531 a1 (*alpa*)*lakṣme* • *yäfte-pernentse* ‘of little glory’

THT 51 a7 (*yä*)*kte-yärm* ‘of small measure’ = *alpamātro* (Uv. 6,18a)

IOL Toch 152 b2 *yakte swāralñe-s(kwacci)*<sup>69</sup> ‘of little pleasure and enjoyment’ = *alpāsvādasukhāḥ* (Uv. 2,17c)

### b3

***cme(tsiśc)*** This is the straightforward restoration of the text after *ñ(a)ktenne*,<sup>70</sup> parallel to the preceding clause. The alternative reading *tne*, which is inserted in all headings of the main text, would fit the context, but is excluded by the rest of the second *akṣara* in the ligature. The alternative restoration of *tseñketär* ‘arises’, is not to be considered, since it would imply a construction that is different from the other sentences.

### b4

***nemcek cmetsiśc*** Tocharian B *nemcek* is an adverb meaning ‘certainly, surely’ (Adams 2011: 364). The phrase *nemcek cmetsiśc* translates *niyatopapatti-* ‘determined birth’, i.e. a birth in a specific location. It can be discussed if *nemcek* is an adjective or an adverb. PK AS a5 *nesām sū yāmor nemcek cmetsiś sportoträ* is translated by Sieg (1938: 7) ‘Es gibt eine Tat, die zum bestimmten Geborenwerden führt’ and by Pinault (in CEToM) ‘There is such a deed [that] evolves into a specific rebirth.’ Ad-

69 For the adjective, cf. THT 255 a5 *skwätse laute mā nesām* ‘There is no happy moment.’

70 For the restoration of the vowel *a*, see *ñaktenne* (PK AS 7B a4).

ams (2011: 364) posits an (indeclinable) adj. *nemcek* ‘certain, sure’, but the adduced example could be translated otherwise.<sup>71</sup>

**no (sp)o(rttotär yāmor nesām :)** The remnants of the last akṣara are unclear; one should only rely on the vocalisation sign, which could be <-o> or <-i>. Following the usual translation of the Sanskrit text, we could have *sporttotär* here, which is compatible with the metric requirements. Alternatively, G.-J. Pinault (p. c.) has put forward a restoration *to(tte)*, which would be the first part of a compound *totte-ypoyšē* ‘belonging to a foreign country’, matching Skt. *pāra-deśya-* or *-deśika-* (MW: 620a), and thus a translation of the heading *deśāntaravipakṣam*.

## b5

**po solme śaul śasāyu pes(t (tsä)l(p)e(trä)** In the body of the sūtra, this sentence is translated by a longer version:

PK AS 7B b6 – PK AS 7C a1<sup>72</sup>

*nraiṅne tetemoṣ caiṅ taiknesa onolmi : solmeṅ śaul śāyeṅ taka ntä kca tsälpenrä 9*

‘Being reborn in hell, these beings live in that manner their whole life, then somehow they are redeemed’ (Pinault in CEToM)

The restoration is based on *pestä tsälpenrä*, attested in another section as a translation of *cyavati* (PK AS 7C b3). It is interesting that here the translator has chosen a looser rendition than in b6, *tsälpā-* being usually the translation of Sanskrit *muc-*. The Tocharian does not follow the reading of Sanskrit manuscript B: *āyuh kṣapayitvā narakeṣu upapadyate* ‘having passed his life in the hells, he is reborn in the hells’ (nor does manuscript B in the body of the sūtra; Lévi 1932: 48–49; Kudo 2004: 82–85).

71 Adams cites IOL Toch 307 b4: *källoym oko nemcek ce po cmelane*, translating ‘may I achieve this certain result in all births’. Alternatively, this could be translated ‘may I achieve for sure this result in all births’. *nemcek* is elsewhere associated with *oko* in THT 206 a1: */// (tā)ko; oko nemcek wakīse akalkätse ///*; THT 365 b7: *nemcek tumēṅ wrotse oko pä(knätär) ///*.

72 Meter 4×12 (5/7).

**b6**

(*p*)*est is(tak) laitotä(r)*: Tocharian *laitā-* ‘to fall’ is a more literal translation of Sanskrit *cyu-* ‘to move to and fro, shift, to fall away, de cease’ (MW: 403b), more specifically ‘to de cease, esp. to pass from one state of existence into another’ (PED: 264). The wording combines two adverbs used further in the sūtra to express the idea of rebirth (in the Sanskrit text always *cyavati*, Lévi 1932: 48f.): *tne onolmi : cmenträ nraiynntane istak entwe laitontrā* ‘the beings here [when] they are reborn in hells fall out immediately after’ (Pinault in CEToM) and PK AS 7C b3 *cmetär ra nraiynne ramer no pestä tsälpeträ* ‘even [if] he is reborn in hell, quickly he will be redeemed completely’ (Pinault in CEToM). The Tocharian text, not surprisingly, does not agree with the family of B and E, referred to above, which have *narakeṣūpapannamātra evam uktāḥ*.<sup>73</sup>

[RECEIVED: JUNE 2018]

Athanaric Huard  
EPHE, PSL  
4-14 rue Ferrus,  
75013 Paris  
France  
athanaric.huard@ephe.psl.eu

**References**

- Abhidh-k-bh* = Pralhad Pradhan. 1967. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Abhidh-k-vy* = Unrai Wogihara. 1932–36. *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā by Yaśomitra*. Tokyo: Tokyo Publishing Association of Abhidharmakosavyakhya.
- Abhidh-s* = Pralhad Pradhan. 1950. *Abhidharma samuccaya of Asanga*. Critically edited and studied by Pralhad Pradhan. Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan.
- AN = *Aṅguttara-nikāya*, Pali Text Society, London.

---

73 Kudo (2006: 57). Again, this reading is not attested in the body of the sūtra (Lévi 1932: 48–49; Kudo 2004: 84–85; Kudo 2007: 84).

- AN-a = *Manorathapūraṇī*, Pali Text Society, London.
- Ap = *Apadāna*, Pali Text Society, London.
- BHSD = Franklin Edgerton. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit grammar and dictionary*. Vol. 2. *Dictionary*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2012. *The numerical discourses of the Buddha: a translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Broomhead, J.W. 1962. *A textual edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kucheian manuscripts. With transliteration, translation, grammatical commentary and vocabulary*. Vol. 1 = Edition. Doctoral dissertation, Trinity College, Cambridge.
- Carling, Gerd. 2009. *A dictionary and thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Vol. 1. *Letters a–j*. By Gerd Carling in collaboration with Georges-Jean Pinault and Werner Winter. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CEToM = *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*.  
<http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/> (retrieved: May 29, 2018)
- CPD = *A critical Pāli dictionary*. Begun by V. Trenckner; rev., continued and ed. by Dines Andersen, Helmer Smith and Hans Hendriksen. Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard. 1924–.  
<http://cpd.uni-koeln.de/search> (retrieved: May 28, 2018).
- DN = *Dīgha-nikāya*, Pali Text Society, London.
- Debrunner, Albert. 1954. *Altindische Grammatik*. Band 2(2). *Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Drège, Jean-Pierre. 1987. Note sur les couleurs des papiers des manuscrits de Dunhuang. *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 3. 147–150.
- Dunkel, George E. 1987. *Hērēs, χηρωσταί*: Indogermanische Richtersprache. In George Cardona and Norman H. Zide (eds.), *Festschrift for Henry Hoeningwald*, 91–100. Tübingen: Narr.
- Hahn, Michael. 2007. *Vom rechten Leben, Buddhistische Lehren aus Indien und Tibet*. Aus dem Sanskrit und aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt und herausgegeben. Frankfurt am Main & Leipzig: Verlag der Weltreligionen (im Insel Verlag).
- Hopkins = *Jeffrey Hopkins' Tibetan–Sanskrit–English dictionary*. A project of the UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies. Boonesville, Virginia.  
<http://uma-tibet.org/tib/dictionary.php> (retrieved: May 28, 2018)
- Ja = *Jātaka*, Pali Text Society, London.
- Jäschke = Heinrich August Jäschke. 1881. *A Tibetan–English dictionary*. With special reference to the prevailing dialects. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- KEWA = Manfred Mayrhofer. 1956–80. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. 4 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

- Kudo, Noriyuki. 2004. *The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and annotations of the original Sanskrit manuscripts from Nepal*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology.
- Kudo, Noriyuki. 2006. One more manuscript of the *Karmavibhaṅga* in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu: Transliteration of Manuscript E. 1. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology* 9. 43–60.
- Kudo, Noriyuki. 2007. One more manuscript of the *Karmavibhaṅga* in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu: Transliteration of Manuscript E (2)”. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology* 10. 94–116.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de (1923–31) *L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*. 6 vols. Paris & Louvain: Geuthner & Istas.
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1932. *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadésa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga)*. Éditées et traduits avec les textes parallèles en sanscrit, en pali, en tibétain, en chinois et en koutchéen par Sylvain Lévi. Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1933. *Fragments de textes koutchéens. Udānavarga, Udānastotra, Udānālankāra et Karmavibhaṅga*. Publiés et traduits avec un vocabulaire et une introduction sur le “tokharien” par M. Sylvain Lévi. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Lokesh Chandra. 1976. *Tibetan–Sanskrit dictionary*. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company.
- Miln = *Milindapañha*, Pali Text Society, London.
- MN = *Majjhima-Nikāya*, Pali Text Society, London.
- MN-t = *Majjhima-Nikāya-ṭīkā* see VRI.
- Mvy = Sakaki, Ryōzaburō. 1916. *Mahāvvyutpatti*. Tokyo: Suzuki gakujutsu zaidan.
- MW = Monier-Williams, Sir Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit–English dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press.
- Ñāṇamoli, Bikkhu & Bikkhu Bodhi. 2009. *The middle length discourses of the Buddha: a translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Original translation by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli, translation edited and revised by Bhikkhu Bodhi. 4th ed. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Ogihara, Hirotoši. 2009. *Researches about Vinaya-texts in Tocharian A and B [Recherches sur le Vinaya en tokharien A et B]*. Doctoral dissertation, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris.
- Ogihara, Hirotoši. 2012. A fragment of the *Bhikṣu-prātimokṣasūtra* in Tocharian B. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13. 159–175.



- Ogihara Hirotoši. 2015. Kucheian verses written on a wooden tablet kept at Xinjiang Kucha Academy. In Melanie Malzahn et al. (eds.), *Tocharian texts in context. International Conference on Tocharian Manuscripts and Silk Road Culture held June 26–28, 2013 in Vienna*, 149–157. Bremen: Hempen.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2008. *Variation and change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2015. Notes on Tocharian glosses and colophons in Sanskrit manuscripts II. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 16. 107–130.
- PED = T. W. Rhys Davids & William Stede. 1921–25. *The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English dictionary*. London: Luzac.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1988. Le Prāṭīyasamutpāda en koutchéen. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 2. 96–165.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1989. Une version koutchéenne de l'Aggañña-Sutta. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3. 149–220.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1994. Une nouvelle inscription koutchéenne de Qoumtoura: Légende de scènes bouddhiques de Praṇidhi. *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 11–12. 171–220.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2007. Concordance des manuscrits tokhariens du fonds Pelliot. In Melanie Malzahn (ed.), *Instrumenta Tocharica*, 163–219. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2016. Les Tokhariens, passeurs et interprètes du bouddhisme. In Michel Espagne et al. (eds.), *Asie centrale. Transferts culturels le long de la route de la soie*, 167–200. Paris: Vendémiaire.
- PraMo = Georg von Simson. 2000. *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Teil 2. *Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Rahula, Walpola. 1971. *Le Compendium de la super-doctrine (philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asaṅga*. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient: diff. A. Maisonneuve.
- Sieg, Emil. 1938. Die Kutschischen Karmavibhaṅga-Texte der Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 65. 1–54.
- Sieg, Emil. 1952. *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II*. Aus dem Nachlass hrsg. von Werner Thomas (Abhandl. d. Deutschen Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Kl. f. Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst 1951, Nr. 1). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Simon, Walter. 1970. A note on the Tibetan version of the *Karmavibhaṅga* preserved in the MS Kanjur of the British Museum. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 31. 161–166.

- SKD = Rādhākāntadeva. 1886. *Śabdakalpadrumaḥ*. Or an encyclopedic dictionary of Sanskrit words arranged in alphabetical order giving the etymological origin of the words according to Panini, etc. Kalikātā: Barada Prasad Basu and Hari Charan Basu.  
<http://www.sanskrit-lexicon.uni-koeln.de/scans/SKDSscan/2013/> (retrieved: May 28, 2018).
- SWTF = Ernst Waldschmidt et al. 1973-. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden [und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule]*. Begonnen von Ernst Waldschmidt. Im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- T = Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo.
- TEB 1 = Wolfgang Krause & Werner Thomas. 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Band 1. *Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Th-a = *Paramatthadīpanī* V, Pali Text Society, London.
- TochSprR(B) = Emil Sieg & Wilhelm Siegling. 1949–53 *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B*. Heft 1. *Die Udānālāṅkāra-Fragmente* [Übersetzung und Glossar]. Heft 2. *Fragmente Nr. 71–633*. Aus dem Nachlass hrsg. von Werner Thomas. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Uv. = Franz Bernhard. 1965. *Udānavarga*. Vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- V-a = *Samantapāsādikā*, Pali Text Society, London.
- VRI = Vipassana Research Institute *Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana Tipitaka Version 4.0 (CST4)*, based on Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana edition. Dhamma Giri.  
<http://www.tipitaka.org/cst4> (retrieved: May 28, 2018)