



**HAL**  
open science

# The end of Mahākāśyapa and the encounter with Maitreya Two Leaves of a Maitreya-Cycle in Archaic TB

Athanaric Huard

► **To cite this version:**

Athanaric Huard. The end of Mahākāśyapa and the encounter with Maitreya Two Leaves of a Maitreya-Cycle in Archaic TB. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* , 2020, 20, pp.1-82. hal-03500015

**HAL Id: hal-03500015**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03500015v1>**

Submitted on 21 Dec 2021

**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.

**The end of Mahākāśyapa and the encounter with Maitreya**  
**Two Leaves of a Maitreya-Cycle in Archaic TB<sup>\*1</sup>**  
Athanaric Huard

*Schläft er oder denkt er nach?*  
*Man kann's nicht genau ermitteln;*  
*Doch wenn die rechte Stunde kommt,*  
*Wird er gewaltig sich rütteln.<sup>2</sup>*

## Summary

This paper provides an edition of two archaic texts written in Tocharian B: THT 1859 (completed by PK AS 15J, and relating the encounter of Maitreya and Kāśyapa) and 1860 (teaching how to encounter Maitreya). A philological analysis shows that they belong, with other fragments of the Berlin collection, to a same Maitreya cycle, dating from the 4<sup>th</sup> or the 5<sup>th</sup> centuries (§1.1). This text is close to the Sanskrit *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, yet adding the Kāśyapa episode and an appendix on good actions, in contrast to the TA *Maitreyāvadānavyākaraṇa* and *Maitreyasamitinātaka*, that represent a longer Central Asian version of the story of Maitreya (§1.2). The text of THT 1859 is then edited and commented in respect of the canonical literature (§2.1-4). In a study of the relationship of this text to the other versions of the story, it is showed that the Tocharian text belongs a Sarvāstivādin tradition (§2.5.1). This tradition, according to which the whole body of Kāśyapa is preserved, and thus is different from the scholastic account, can ultimately be sourced to the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the *Mulasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (§2.5.2). The text of THT 1859 is then edited, commented and compared to similar texts on the means that lead to a rebirth at the time of Maitreya (§3.1-5). The motif of the “sight of Maitreya” is examined in comparison to the phraseology used to evoke the encounter with Maitreya (§3.6.1). Lastly, a phrase (“to see instantly Maitreya”), which may represent another belief than the traditional one, is investigated (§3.6.2).

## 1 The TB *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*

The text now called THT 1859 is paired with 1860 in the Berlin collection since both leaves obviously belong to the same manuscript. Considering that THT 1859 relates the encounter of Mahākāśyapa and Maitreya, [3] THT 1860 describes the way to see Maitreya (*maitreyem lākā-*), both leaves must belong to the same Maitreya cycle.<sup>3</sup>

---

\* \*I would here express my sincere gratitude for Georges-Jean Pinault, who supported me and helped me many times by deciphering these difficult texts. I also thank the anonymous reviewer for valuable remarks and emendations.

1 This is the author version (before proofs) of the paper published in *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, 20, pp. 1–82. The numbers in brackets refers to the pagination of the printed version.

2 Heine, *Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen*, 14.

3 On the story of Maitreya in general, see Abegg 1928, Nattier 1989; on Maitreya and Mahākāśyapa, see Deeg 1999, Silk 2003, Tournier 2012, 2014; for textual sources: Lévi 1929, Li & Nagashima 2013, Liu 2019 (Sanskrit), Norman 2006 (Pāli); translation of the Chinese texts by Watanabe in Leumann 1919 (for the history of texts, to be corrected with Demiéville 1920 and Legittimo 2008). Other references will be adduced in the paper.

## 1.1 Philological analysis

These two leaves can further be connected to THT 273-75, three leaves from Kizil Ming Öy about Maitreya, edited in Sieg and Siegling 1953:165-68, to which one can add also the fragments of THT 1559. A note, written with pencil on a tape fixed on the glass of 1859 states “vgl. die Hs MQ 70.7-9!” ‘compare the manuscript MQ 70.7-9 [THT 273-275]’. The author of this manuscript note is probably Sieg, or Siegling, since the manuscripts are referred to with their expedition codes.

Manuscript	Height <sup>4</sup>	Width	Num. of lines	Line spacing	String-hole	Nib	<i>akṣara</i> / line	<pa>
THT 273	6	17,3	5	1,1	5,6	0,1 1	26	0,3
THT 274	5,9	17,6	5	1	5,6	0,1	27	0,23
THT 275	5,8	12,5	5	0,9	NA	0,1 1	NA	0,25
THT 1559.a	4,8	3,6	NA	0,8	NA	0,1 2	NA	0,27
THT 1559.f	5,3	5,7	5	1,1	4,9+	0,1 2	NA	0,26
THT 1859	6	15,9	6	0,9	4,4+	0,1	34,5	0,26
THT 1860	5,9	15,1	6	0,9	5,3	0,1	33	0,2

Thanks to the scales provided in the photographs of the IDP, I could take some measures to check the validity of this assumption: 1) height: all leaves have basically the same height, which is significant in respect to the (relative) rarity of archaic manuscripts; 2) width: not a single leaf is complete; 3) line spacing: the given number is an approximation. In the [4] group THT 273-75, the height is tapering downwardly, as if the scribe had not enough space; 4) the distance of the string-hole from the left margin (when available); 5) the width of the nib on vertical strokes and 6) the average of height of <pa> (merely as indication).

These data are consistent, and prove that all folios belong to the same manuscript, whose physical characteristics are: 6 × about 18,5 cm, interline spacing of 1 cm, string-hole at 5,5 cm. Other features are subject to variations: the number of lines (5 or 6) and the average number of *akṣaras*. This can be explained by the fact that archaic manuscripts are less standardized than classical ones, but one could wonder if our manuscript was not written by several hands.

Melanie Malzahn, in her paper on the archaic script, classifies both groups of fragments as “common archaic.” But for a reason which remains unclear to me, she claims that THT 275 belongs to another manuscript than 273-274, even if they were

4 All the measures are in cm.

written by the same hand (2007:264). The material characteristics recorded previously make this assumption unlikely. Concerning THT 1859-60, she notes that they have also the classical shape of <ma> (2007:66); one should add that the archaic *ductus* is also attested (see note [1] of §2.1).

At first glance, the groups 273-275 and 1859-60 differ in appearance, but caution must be exercised since the *ductus* can vary within the same leaf: in THT 1859, the <le> is classically (right-oriented) shaped in the recto whereas on the verso it has an archaic shape (left oriented), see §3.2. This also applies to the <r-e> combination (archaic: 273 b5 *rkse*, *pe*, 274 b4 *rṣṣe*, *ntse*, 275 b5 *ce*, b6 *mem*; classical: 273 a3 *rmem*, b3 *rtte*, 274 a1 *rñe*, a2 *rññe*, b3 *rññe*, b5 *rṣṣe*, 275 b5 *rñai*, 1859 a3 *rñai*),<sup>5</sup> or the vowel *ī*, see, e. g., in 273 (archaic: a5 *rī*, b1 *cī*, *ṣcī*, b4 *kī*, *sī*, b5 *kī*; classical: a5 *rrī*, b3 *rñī*, b4 *yśī*). Given that there is a considerable variety in a text written by the same hand, one could wonder if this different visual aspect could result from a different pen. In 1859-60, the nib is much sharper than in the other group, which would explain the angular shape of the *akṣaras* (see <wa> and <la>) and the differentiation of full stroke and loose strokes [5] (particularly evident in the haft of <la> which is tiny in the 1859-60 and quite thick in 273-75).

We should now try to reconstruct the whole composition. A first clue to determine its enunciative situation is given by the end of 274:

*ślek te yatka pūdñākte ḥ śāriputri (prāśānne)*<sup>6</sup> [40a]

*śkas (yā)knesa maiwa (keṃ ḥ ta)r(y) yäl(ts)e po śaiṣṣenne* [40b]

*kodyānmā{sa} sumerntā ḥ naittāre po wa(skāte)* [40c]

‘Thus the lord Buddha prescribed this (at the question) of Śāriputra. In (six) ways (the earth) trembled in the three thousand worlds, ten million Sumeru mountains collapsed and everything (trembled)’ (THT 274 b5-b6; tr. CEToM, after Pinault 2008:269-271).

From this end, we can gather that this text was considered as a *sūtra*, uttered by Śākyamuni to Śāriputra. The latter is precisely the usual addressee of the Buddha in the texts akin to the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* ‘the prophecy about Maitreya’ and this ending formula seems to correspond directly to the beginning of the story, see: *śāriputra mahāprajño dharmasenāpatir vibhuḥ, lokasya anukampārthaṃ śāstāraṃ pariṣṛcchati*. ‘Śāriputra, of great knowledge, general of the Law, the Lord, asks the Teacher out of compassion for the world’ (Li & Nagashima 2013:218, v. 1). Then, the gender of our text can be deduced from a change of meter preserved in THT 1860 a3, which is typical of *kāvya* poems: *sargā wate || (nā)no nāke sārḡga puṣṣāmpa kenene ṣāṃṣālle ||* ‘the second chapter [ends]. Then, the chapter should be now measured in the tune *puṣṣāmpa*.’ This genre fits well with Sanskrit *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, which is also written in verse. We can hence expect a close relationship of the Tocharian fragments to the other texts on Maitreya.

5 Note that in the 1859-60, the <-e> is usually written next to the <r-> not above.

6 Cf. || *śakk(r)apraśānne ś(k)ānte wāte sarg(g)ā* (IOL Toch 80 b5); *aṣanīkentse mudgulyāyani ce prāśśām pepārkoṣ* ‘the question asked by the venerable Maudgalyāyana’ (THT 588 a7).

Manuscript	Meter	Stanzas	Topic
THT 273	4×12 (4!4!4)	25-31	Stotra for Śākyamuni
THT 274	4×14 (7!7)	35-40	How to see Maitreya
[6]THT 275	(8!7, 7!8)? <sup>7</sup>	?-8	Description of the world of Maitreya
THT 1559.a		6-?	?
THT 1559.f		11	?
THT 1859	4×25 (5!5!8!7)	60-64	Kāśyapa's Nirvāṇa
THT 1860	4×14 (7!7)	1-5	How to see Maitreya

As for the content of the composition, THT 274 is a prayer addressed to Śākyamuni, in which a speaking person (“we”) laments about his disappearing and finds a consolation in the fact that Maitreya will come. It could then be an introduction or a conclusion to a *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, even if I do not know any similar text in the Maitreya literature. THT 275 describes the world at the time of Maitreya, a description we find in almost any text of the Maitreya literature at the beginning of the story.<sup>8</sup> THT 1859 relates the encounter of Kāśyapa with Śākyamuni, which occurs at the end of the story, after the enlightenment and the teaching of Maitreya (see table in Leumann 1919:20-21). Due to its content and the numbering of the stanzas (?-8), 275 is likely the beginning of the story of Maitreya. Hence, both leaves likely belong to the same chapter. THT 275 is quite fragmentary, but segments of 8!7 can be clearly identified, and with the help of the physical reconstruction of the manuscript, the meter can be congruently restored to 5!5!8!7, as in 1859. Lastly, we can certainly bring together THT 1860 and THT 274 since both deal with the acts that lead to a rebirth at the time of Maitreya and share the same meter. Accordingly, THT 1860 should be the beginning of the chapter and THT 274 the end. Since the topic “how to see Maitreya” is addressed only twice on the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, and since here Maitreya is not the speaker, this canto is an expansion of the final exhortation of Śākyamuni at the end of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* (see §3.1), as it is expanded in other parallel [7] texts (*Book of Zambasta* 24, 306-317)<sup>9</sup> in a teaching about bad and good actions (i. e., those that lead to see Maitreya and those that do not).

Nevertheless, if, according to these suppositions, 274 is the end of the chapter beginning with 1860, and 275 to be placed before 1859, 273-274 and 275 must be kept apart, whereas their writing style is similar. This can be explained either by assuming

7 Sieg and Siegling (1953:167) reconstructed a meter of 15 syllables. But according to Peyrot (2013:662, fn. 40), this reconstruction is far from assured.

8 See the parallels quoted by Peyrot 2013:633 from the *Book of Zambasta*. This description is drawn from early layers of the canon (see DN II 75, and the DĀ parallel translated in Anālayo 2014:14).

9 “Those who bear the seed of deliverance will behold the Buddha at that time. Though in Apāyas, they will be reborn. They will escape from all woes. There will be no deliverance only for those who have committed *anantariya* [...]” (Emmerick 1968:336-37, v. 306-307).

important variations of the same hand, a “moody copyist,” or a group of several scribes working simultaneously on different sections of the manuscript and taking turns in irregular intervals (as documented in Melzer 2014, see esp. 246-47).

Here is the tentative reconstitution of the content: Title: *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* (?), Sūtra about the prophecy on Maitreya, taught by Śākyamuni to Śāriputra. Gender: *kāvya*.

– 1<sup>st</sup> canto (?) (4×12, 4!4!4): A stotra to Śākyamuni (THT 273, stanzas 25-31).

– 2<sup>nd</sup> canto (4×25, 5!5!8!7): Story of Maitreya: a) Beginning: description of the marvelous world at the time of Maitreya (THT 275, stanzas 7-10);<sup>10</sup> b) ~ end: Kāśyapa episode (THT 1859, stanzas 60-64).

[8]– 3<sup>rd</sup> canto (4×14, 7!7): Teaching about the way to be reborn at the time of Maitreya: a) beginning THT 1860, stanzas 1-5; THT 1559, stanzas 6-?; b) end: THT 274, stanzas 35-40.

The script of our manuscript (“common archaic”) can be dated from the 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> centuries, since it is earlier than two manuscripts that were dated thanks to <sup>14</sup>C from the 5<sup>th</sup> century (Sander 2013:288). Our manuscript is thus chronologically earlier than the Sanskrit *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*: the manuscript of the Schøyen collection is from the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> centuries (Hartmann 2006:8); the Gilgit manuscript from the 7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> centuries (Liu 2019:193), and the translation of Yijing from 701 (Lancaster 2004: *s. u.* “K 199”). But it should be contemporaneous with the Chinese translations of the \**Ekottarika-āgama* (T 125 II 787c2–789c28 = T 453), which is from 384 (Legittimo 2008:255-6), and T 456 (from 402; cf. Lancaster 2004: *s. u.* “K 195”).

Interestingly, the first group, the “standard” Hinayana version, does not contain the story of Kāśyapa, whereas the remaining two, which display Mahayana elements, contain it. The Tocharian version should also belong this group. Besides, it provides an expanded teaching on rebirth that is also found in these texts (and also in the *Book of Zambasta*) and not in the Sanskrit version. Hence it shows common developments with them in comparison to the shorter “standard” Hinayana version. However, the mere presence of this episode does not suffice to assert their relationship: as will be shown in §2.5, the Tocharian text presents a different account of Kāśyapa’s story.

## 1.2 Comparison of the TB *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* to the TA *Maitreyāvadānavyākaraṇa* and *Maitreyasamitināṭaka*

The most well known Tocharian text about Maitreya is the *Maitreyasamitināṭaka* (MSN), a drama composed according to the Indian literary model about the life the

10 I thank Michael Peyrot for discussing the metrical reconstruction of this difficult fragment. One should also compare the fragments THT 571-573, which belong to a different manuscript, but deal with similar topics: 571 is a description of the city of Ketumatī, as pointed out by Sieg and Siegling 1953:358, and 572 may deal with conversions and discourses of Maitreya. The editor restored a meter of 4×15 (7!8 or 8!7). Thus, it would be possible to restore the same meter as in THT 1859, but it would imply a very large manuscript (about 70-80 *akṣaras* per line). Note also that no 8!7 meter (which is required to explain THT 571 a4, for example) is recorded in the metrical schemes collected by Peyrot 2013:341-2. The stanzas of 571 are numbered 32 to 41 and those of 572 are numbered 53 to 60.



Maitreya, but several fragments of [9] a work in *kāvya* style called *Maitreyāvadānavyākaraṇa* (MAV) are also preserved in TA.<sup>11</sup> One should hence investigate the relationship of these texts with the TB *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*.

As stated by Sieg & Siegling (1921:107), the content of the extant fragments of the MAV is mostly didactic, so that it is difficult to locate them in the Maitreya corpus. A large part of the texts deals with hells and the kind of *karma* that leads to such or such rebirth. This recalls the chapters 20-25 of the MSN (the so-called *Höllenskapitel*). A comparison of the preserved title of the 22<sup>nd</sup> chapter of the MAV with the titles of the hell chapters of MSN shows that they were probably structured in the same way, i. e., distinguishing the rebirth of householders from that of monks:

MAV, 22: *maitreyā(va)dānavyākaraṇaṃ āgārikanarakopapatti ṅomā wikiwepiñci pāk* ‘in the *Maitreyāvadānavyākaraṇa*, the 22<sup>nd</sup> chapter named *Āgārikanarakopapatti* [rebirth in the hell of householders] [is finished]’ (A 226 b3-b4; cf. Carling 2009:30).

MSN, 20: “[Das Zeigen] der Körper von Wesen in den Kleinhöllen, die eine Laien-[Gestalt] haben” (Geng et al. 1998:85); 21: (*maitreyasamiti)nāṭkaṃ grhastappravrajitanirayanid(arśaṃ ṅomā wikiaspint nīpāt ar)* ‘in the *Maitreyasamitināṭaka*, the 21<sup>st</sup> chapter, named *grhastappravrajita-niraya-nidarśana* [the seeing of the hells of monks and householders]’ (A 287 and 259 a1; cf. Carling 2009:189); 22 “Das Sehen der Kleinhöllen-Wesen in Monchs- und Nonnengestalt” (Geng et al. 1998:95); [10] 23: “Das Sehen von Kleinhöllen-Wesen in verschiedenster Gestalt” (Geng et al. 1998:102), etc.

Kumamoto (2002) underlined that these chapters are peculiar to the Central Asian version of the Maitreya tale and are not paralleled elsewhere. He further suggested (2002:9) that the seed of the infernal visions was preserved in a detail of the *Book of Zambasta*: just after the *parinirvāṇa* of Kāśyapa, Maitreya sends a ray of light to soothe the pain of beings who dwell in hells.<sup>12</sup> Although this is a stereotype of Buddhist literature, the assumption of Kumamoto is likely because the place of the teaching on *karma* is precisely the Samantavṛkṣa terrace on the Kukkuṭapāta mountain and we do find an allusion to the rays of light in the Uighur *Höllenskapitel*.<sup>13</sup> Since the MAV and the MSN display these elements in contrast to all other versions, they evidently belong together and could complete each other.

The MSN included the Kāśyapa episode (as assumed in Geng et al. 2004:40, fn. 47): a praise of Kāśyapa relating his early life is preserved among the fragments of the Berlin collection (Tekin 1980:245-46, table 196), and the opening of the mountain by Maitreya

11 This work is fragmentary preserved in two manuscripts from Šorčuq. Interestingly, it was shown by Itkin 2002 that both manuscripts share similar archaic linguistic features.

12 “Then the Buddha Maitreya, for the goods of those beings who are also to be rescued from woes (but) have through *karmas* gone to Apāya, will emit a ray from the big toe of his foot. It will extend over hells, over all animals, over Pretas. Their woes will cease.” (Emmerick 1968:334-35).

13 See the “stage direction” in Geng et al. 1998:76, and for the rays of light: “Der vollkommen weise Buddha Maitreya geruhte in seiner Barmherzigkeit Strahlen auszusenden. Von jenen Strahlen berührt, [erwecken die in der Hölle befindlichen] Lebewesen eine reine Gesinnung, legen dort ihren Körper ab und werden [in] der Götterwelt (oder) in einem Menschenkörper wiedergeboren.” (Geng et al. 1998:84).

is evoked in the 25<sup>th</sup> chapter.<sup>14</sup> Interestingly, Tekin translated in appendix a folio relating a story similar to that of Mahākāśyapa, where the body of [11] Pratyekabuddha <”K’DY> is brought up from the ground by Śākyamuni and exhales a sandal fragrance. The name of the Pratyekabuddha <”K’DY> was restored as Nāgadatta by Tekin, but should rather be read as *aṅade* (Geng et al 2004:40, fn. 47). The latter reading is confirmed by the Tocharian sources, since a Pratyekabuddha Aṅgata appears in the leaf A 221 of the MAV.<sup>15</sup> This story was probably construed as a pendant of that of Mahākāśyapa: we can assume from another passage of the *Maitrisimit* that this Pratyekabuddha also gave the robe of the Buddha Kāśyapa to Śākyamuni.<sup>16</sup>

The motif of the body of a Pratyekabuddha exhaling sandal fragrance calls to mind a story found in the *Binaiye* (T 1464 XXIV 897 c25-898c1; paraphrased in Bareaux 1962:264-65), and in the *Sūtrālamkāra* (T 201 IV 326 b17-327 c10; tr. Huber 1908:355-61).<sup>17</sup> The King Prasenajit went to hear the Buddha, but was disturbed by a wonderful odor. Śākyamuni extracted from the ground the skeleton of a Pratyekabuddha and then explained this miracle by the story of a merchant son, who stole flowers on the stūpa of the Buddha Kāśyapa for a courtesan. He got ulcers because of this act, [12] and his parents bought sandal as remedy. Conscious of his forfeit, he enjoined them to give the sandal to the stūpa and then got cured and remained endowed with a perpetual odor of sandal. The exhibition of the skeleton corresponds to the Uighur text, whereas the Tocharian fragments preserve the *avadāna*, see:

(*kānikā*)ñc(ā)naśśāl tām † ṣiyak wārponṭ nṣā pyāpyāñ • [63b]

omāskenāp lyalypu(ris † oko) /// [63c]

/// (trāp)p(a)ṣ † tkañk semā kātāñkāṣ<sup>18</sup> • [64a]

14 *okāk ku(kkuṭapāt ṣulis cwanke wākāṣluneyis pratiha)ri pālkāluneyo* ‘[but also] by seeing my magic power, (with which the wall of the Kukkuṭapāda-mountain was broken)’ (A 287 and 259 a6; tr. CEToM, after Geng et al. 2004:44 and 47; Uighur text:40; see also Geng et al. 1998:76).

15 This name further suggests a connection with *yinjiētuō* 因揭陀, Skt. \**Īṅgata*, the 13<sup>th</sup> of the 16 Arhats in the *Fazhuji* 法住記 (T 2030 IL 13 a15; Chavannes & Lévi 1916:9, 292-94; Chen 2018:170 and 252), since the sixteen Arhats, who made the vow to stay in this world to protect the Law, are related to the legend of Maitreya and Mahākāśyapa (Chavannes & Lévi 1916:191-202; Deeg 1999:166, fn. 75).

16 Tekin 1980:159, table 170: “Dieses Gewand ist außerordentlich gesegnet. Da zwei Pratyeka-Buddha-Mönche [i. e., the Buddha Kāśyapa und Aṅgata?] dieses Gewand angezogen haben, hat auch der vollkommenen Weise Buddha Śākyamuni dieses Gewand anzuziehen geruht. Als vierter hatte der Arhat Mahākāśyapa dieses Gewand zu vielen Zeiten angezogen.” This is the only tradition which stages Maitreya putting on the robe (which, as pointed out by Strong 2004:220, would not be possible since Maitreya is much bigger than Śākyamuni). Thus, the MSN provides a Central Asian point of comparison to Chinese traditions about the transmission of Buddha Kāśyapa’s robe to Śākyamuni (by a deity tree or Mañjuśrī, cf. Shinohara 2000:308-310, 335).

17 This connection came to my attention by reading Strong 2004:34-35 (with further references), who compares it to the exhibition of the skeleton of the Buddha Kāśyapa.

18 This is the discourse of the sinner (cf. *nṣā caccriku*), which explains why a present (*kātāñkāṣ*) is used here. The sentence should be more or less parallel to “Veuillez m’accorder ton appui, sauveur ! Tel l’homme qui trébuche et tombe, s’appuie sur la terre pour se relever” (Huber 1908:359). *Trāppaṣ* is the subjunctive V of the verb *trāppā-*, expected in light of TB *trāppam* (THT 325 a2). This verb was previously set as *trāpā-* in TA (Malzahn 2010:665), because of the only attested form from *trapmām* (A 79 b3), but this form was rather simplified in the cluster with *m*. According to this putative evidence, one should rather set the root as *trāppā-*. Moreover, one should read *semā* ‘through this support’ rather than *se mā* (Sieg & Siegling 1921:108), since it is an utterance of the son. *Tkañk* cannot be construed with *trāppaṣ*, because *trāppā-* is used with the perlativ (THT 88 a2, THT 325 a2), and hence is an apposition to *semā*.



*k<sub>a</sub>cam ne tām nṣā caccrīku † yārkant yalaṃ ///* [64b]

*/// -kr/ñc- tkas kākmūrāṣ • 64*

*cam śkaṃ kāmant tsalpar † cem wyāraṃ kā(tāk) ///* [65a]

“Thus, the flowers were received by me [to be] together with the girl. ([The disease is] the fruit) of [this] wrong karma ...[as someone who], when he (stu)mbls, rises [taking] support on the very ground, I have to pay homage to this in which I have sinned” ... bearing the *kr/ñc-tkas*<sup>19</sup> 64. And they brought him [and] redeemed [him]; in the sanctuary, he ar(ose)...’ (A 220 b3-b5; the remedy is mentioned in A 220 b1; the curing in A 221 a3).

[13] One could tentatively restore the order of events in the 19<sup>th</sup> chapter of the MSN and MAV as follows: Maitreya splits the mountain open; then, the body of Mahākāśyapa goes out and performs miracles (A 231, [folio 99], MAV [19] stanzas 1-8).<sup>20</sup> Since the assembly is afraid, Maitreya tells to his disciples the story of the Pratyekabuddha Aṅgada, whose body was miraculously preserved (keeping his sandalwood fragrance) from his death to the time of Śākyamuni (Tekin 1980:245-46, table 196, reversing recto and verso). This story contains episodes of Aṅgada’s previous life and concludes on a teaching about the transmission of *dharma* (A 220-21, folios 104 and 105, MAV [19], stanzas 56-78). Maitreya praises Mahākāśyapa and relates his career (Tekin 1980: 158-59, table 170). Then Maitreya goes on and gives a lengthy explanation about evil and salvation, drawing his examples from the time of Śākyamuni (Tekin 1980:160-64, table 57-59; A 222-223+224 folios [108] and 109, MAV [19] stanzas 104-124).<sup>21</sup>

From that outline, it is rather clear the TB *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* does not belong to these texts. On the one hand, we have a text of more than 21 chapters (MAV) or 27 chapters (MSN), with *avadānas* and doctrinal teaching; on the other hand, we have a text of 3 chapters, in which the tale of Maitreya should have occupied only one canto.

## 2 The *Parinirvāṇa* of Kāśyapa (THT 1859)

The simplest way to introduce the story of the sleeping sage Kāśyapa,<sup>22</sup> waiting for the future Buddha in a mountain, may be to quote Xuanzang: [14]

“When Maitreya comes to the world as a World-honored One he will preach the Dharma in three assemblies. After that there will still be numerous arrogant people who will ascend this mountain and come to the place of Kāśyapa. Maitreya will snap his fingers, and the mountain peaks will open by themselves, and, seeing Kāśyapa, the people will

19 The word is an oblique plural. According to parallel texts, it could be the sandal or the bed of the sinner. But no obvious restoration can be provided. One may suggest *kuñcītkas*, whose nominative would be *kuñcītāk\**, a borrowing from a suffixed form akin to *kuñcit* ‘sesam’ (Pinault, *p. c.*).

20 This ordering is based on the following evidences: this fragment is the beginning of a chapter (a1), stages Maitreya, includes narrative elements of Kāśyapa’s story (the three peaks, the splitting of the mountain and a wonderful odor), and shares the same meter as A 220, etc (4×14). To the chapter 19 of the MAV, one could also add A 240 (a5 *kāśyap ptāmñkte śarīrāntu*), but the meter seems to differ (4×12).

21 An edition of these fragments is planned by Pinault.

22 On the biography of Mahākāśyapa, see the synthesis in Ray 1994:105-118, and Tournier 2012 and 2014. For a study of this episode of the Maitreya tale, see Abegg 1926:157-9;190-1, and Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015:263-8 for exhaustive references to textual sources.

become all the more arrogant. At this moment Mahākāśyapa will hand over the *kaṣāya* [to Maitreya]. After making a speech and paying homage [to the new Buddha] Kāśyapa will rise into the air and manifest various divine transformations. A fire will burst forth to cremate his body and in this manner he will enter *nirvāṇa*. Having seen this sight, the people will abandon their pride and then will be awakened and realize sainthood.” (Li 1996:234)

In the Tocharian text, the magical feats described briefly by Xuanzang fill the most part of the text, so that it is sometimes difficult to follow its narrative frame. Hence, I will provide first the transcription as well as a detailed commentary, and then a study of its relationship with other accounts of this episode. As will be shown in the commentary, the text should be divided into four parts: 1) a) 60b-60c, a discourse, presumably pronounced by Maitreya, about the epoch of Śākyamuni or the following epoch (of decay); b) 60d, mass conversion of the disciples of Maitreya, who attain some degree of spiritual achievement; 2) Magical feats of Mahākāśyapa: a) 61a, introduction, Kāśyapa goes out of the mountain; b) 61b-62a, first sequence of feats, according to the Śrāvastī miracle, c) 62b-62d, second sequence, according to the *rddhi* sequence; 3) a) 63a, astonishment of the disciples; b) 63b-63d, Maitreya compels his disciples to perform a funeral pyre and praises Kāśyapa; 4) 64a, ?. [15]

## 2.1 Transliteration of the text<sup>23</sup>

THT 1859

This interesting text has been known to Tocharologists since the digitalization of the Berlin collection. It stands out for several remarkable features, among others for preserving the initial cluster in *tkem* ‘earth’ (on this matter, see the contribution of Michael Peyrot in this volume). In his dictionary of Tocharian B, Adams several times quotes whole extracts of it. Hirotoshi Ogihara (2015) provided an edition and a Japanese translation.<sup>24</sup> But the difficulties of this text have not all been explained, and more comparative analysis is needed in order to locate this text among the other versions of the tale. Philologically, the main improvement of this edition is the identification of a fragment of the Paris collection (PK AS 15J) that completes several lacunae of THT 1859 and enables a better understanding of its narrative content. After this finding in the fall 2017, I provided a new transcription of the text. This transcription was revised by Georges-Jean Pinault, who put forward new readings and a complete translation. This draft version is quoted as Pinault (2017).

Central part of a leaf, with upper and lower edges partly preserved. Since the string-hole is situated at about 5,6 cm from the preserved right edge of THT 273 and 274, one can estimate that about 1 cm of the leaf is lost at the left edge. Small parts of paper are

---

23 I follow the convention of the CEToM database. All mentions of Pinault refer to his transcription and translation in (2017) and those of Ogihara to his transcription of the text in (2015:105).

24 As I am not able to read Japanese, I rely for the interpretation of the work of Ogihara on his transcription and the English glosses provided at the end of the paper.

lost around the main fragment, so that about 2/3 of the original leaf should be preserved. Some fragments, which were detached, are fixed with adhesive tape.

The script belongs to the “common archaic” type, as stated in §1.1. The shapes of <wa> and <la> are sometimes quite angular, which is rare in the archaic script. [16]


- a1 --- [u]s̄ ts̄aṅkar[e]<sup>[11]</sup> [wn] -- s̄ · [s]p̄ · -- [al]y·[w]c·ts̄ · -- ·wn.<sup>[21]</sup> cowai  
 ta[r]kaṅantra [o]·ts̄·[c].<sup>[31]</sup> ///
- a2 --- ·n· kwipe ausa<sup>[41]</sup> snai p·rnn̄āyātaite<sup>[51]</sup> ate tot no oṅkipše te maṅt̄ kaṅsormem̄  
 mrauskantra snai keś k(·)o ///
- a3 -- [kl]·n· maṅtkantrāaṣca<sup>[61]</sup> snai-○-y eṅkaḷ 60 kukūrapādā-ṣaḷemem̄ «yā»st̄<sup>[71]</sup> laṅ  
 kentsānts wālo ramtt̄ iprerne – ///
- a4 -- [p].<sup>[81]</sup> prutkaṣṣam̄ ramtt̄ po wālam̄<sup>[91]</sup> ○ iprerā ṅākcyē śaiṣṣesa wārññai po kaśyapi  
 ka ke<sub>uc</sub> lkāntra tarkam̄ ///
- a5 -- [r]·e ksa puwar peynemem̄ lan-me naiṣṣe<sup>[101]</sup> pūwar ramtt̄ amntsnemem̄ pūwar wār  
 nno peynemem̄ tarkam̄ta<sup>[111]</sup> [k̄]r·e ///
- a6 --- 1 ly·emane ywārcco ṣ[m]ema[n]e ywarc·o k·emane ywarc [c]aṅk(·)ami·[ty]· ·r·  
 [m̄a]<sup>[121]</sup> s(·)em(·)a[nn]̄āzm̄[p]e ntā [i]· ///
- b1 --- kenne yāpaṅ wārñne ramtt̄a [t]·kam̄<sup>[131]</sup> pāk̄r· akaśne ṅano ṣe lkatra k·y·p·  
 [y]pr·(·)nn̄· p·c· [tk]· ///
- b2 -- k·śyape stāmaṅ sū tkentsa entwek ka alpam̄ ysasṣene ramtt̄ yerkwāntane  
 ṣarnnen̄ēn̄ktra kaun meño [k]· ///
- b3 -- h·rinta kaśyape aiṅ śa-○-mnants [l]katsi klutkaṣṣam̄-me akteke akṣam̄ maitreye  
 yāst̄ cvī krepents̄ ·y· ///
- b4 -- ś ce candamaṣṣana a(·)w̄.<sup>[141]</sup>○-ne se se orotse kaśyape ṅem ṣe<sub>ṛ</sub> śakyamūniñ  
 pudñākte ///
- b5 -- [au]<sup>[151]</sup> piśaka ṣukto [k]odyānm̄allokna ṣkaṣ kante tmane pikwāla k<sub>uc</sub> se cārka  
 kektseñā 63 kr̄i ///
- b6 --- cā pi klyā [p]· [e] [l]·e [ai]· e ---- [p]· [d](·)äk(·)e s̄ ·ersa kwāntsān po  
 tkentsak [w]āntam̄<sup>[161]</sup> [e] – ///

[1] Two readings are possible: Pinault has (k)lu ṣp mā (viz. ṣp mā), and Ogihara [u]s̄ ts̄a, since in our manuscript, <m̄a> has both archaic and classical shape, see below line a3, a6 and 1860 b2. But, one should prefer the reading of Ogihara because the akṣara is not as vertical as the <m̄a> of classical shape. Moreover, the present ligature is quite close to <ts̄a> in THT 273 a4, b4.

[2] Reading of Ogihara. The reading <nt> assumed by Pinault and leading to the restoration (ekñi)nta makes sense, but is improbable, see just below line the ligature <ntka> in a2. [16]

[3] The first akṣara could also be read <au>, <wa> or <la>. The next akṣara is a complex ligature: the lower part is certainly <ts>, but the upper part remains uncertain. The restoration of Pinault aultsorsa is unlikely because there is not enough space for a <la>, which should have had the same height as the <au> or <o> just before. Moreover, one can see a tiny curved stroke under it, which implies that it was a ligature. It can be <r>, <-u>, or <ca>.

[4] The vowel <au> has a rather curious shape which, to my knowledge, is not attested elsewhere. The scribe has closed the lower extremity of the *akṣara*, maybe in order to differentiate <au> from <wā>. Sander 1968 gives a great variety of forms for the gupta of the Turkestan (type q):



[5] Adams (2013:392 and 543) reads *snai parnnā yāntaite*. See the textual commentary on this interpretation.

[6] The combination of the *Fremdzeichen* and the *akṣara* <ca> without double dot is a probably spelling of final -*ṣcā* (as pointed out by the anonymous reviewer), see the allative ending spelled <ṣca> in THT 1860 b5 (§ 3.2), <ṣca> in THT 273 b3 and THT 274 b1; also, with *virāma*, <ṣc\> in THT 274 b3 and <ṣc\> in b4. Here, the syllable *ṣcā* is metrical. [18]

[7] *yā* is written under the ruling as emendation.

[8] This *akṣara* is curiously shaped, and Ogihara reads <pa>, but PK AS 15J a7 has here <pe>.

[9] *wālam* reading of Ogihara. To read <jā> (Adams 2013:451), which would yield *jālam*, a putative borrowing from Skt. *jvālana* ‘burning’, is impossible because the long vowel sign of this *akṣara* has a marked upward curve (cf. Sander 1968:table 29).

[10] Segmentation uncertain. Theoretically, we could read *nai* (particle) + *ṣṣe* ‘one’ (pronoun) with doubling of the first consonant, as Ogihara. See further in the textual commentary.

[11] One could at first sight read a double dot above <ta>, but that would be redundant and the reading *tāka* would lead nowhere. Hence one has to assume that the first dot is an anticipated *anusvara*, and the second a <r->. The scribe did probably not have had enough space because of the ligature of the preceding line.

[12] Pinault reads *mānt*, hence a classical shape of <ma> has to be assumed (see note [1]).

[13] The *akṣara* <ta>, though in most part destroyed, is reasonably sure. This invalidates the restoration *waikam*, putative subjunctive form of *wikā-* ‘to disappear’ in Adams 2013:652.

[14] It is tempting to read <ja>, as Ogihara, *aj[a]ne*. But this reading leads nowhere: *aja* would be a *hapax legomenon* and does not account for the feminine plural of *candaṃṣṣana*. The correct reading, *a(r)w(a)ne*, was proposed by Pinault. This rather angular shape of <wa> is almost identical to the <wa> in b1.

[15] Only a tiny stroke of a vowel sign can be seen <-o> or <-au>. Considering *papālau* in PK AS 15J b6, we have to read the latter.

[16] The <wa> in ligature, albeit almost lost, is quite distinct. As for the next *akṣara*, since the second <t> of the ligature is short, a reading <tts> is not possible.

## PK AS 15J

Small fragment written in classical *ductus* (an early variant of it), which is quite damaged with numerous gaps (sometimes caused by worms), folds, [19] and a brownish spot on a2, but remains perfectly readable. A tiny fragment is now detached and could be situated thanks to the adhesive tape, which formerly fixed it to the main fragment. A trace of the vowel <e> of the ligature <lye> (a3) is preserved on the tape.

The leaf measures 10,9 × 8,7 cm, with 7 lines and an interlinear space of 1,8. The height is not complete, and the manuscript had probably 8 lines.<sup>25</sup>

- a1 /// –<sup>[1]</sup> – p<sup>t</sup>a –<sup>[2]</sup> – ///  
a2 /// kāsne swāsasken-me – ///  
a3 /// · s· trā raskre māntsantrā pā ///  
a4 /// w·rñai yakni yolaiñemp/e ///  
a5 /// k<sub>u</sub>se toṃts pelkiñ[ä]<sup>[3]</sup> ālyau ///  
a6 /// m·nt karsormeṃ mrauskāntrā snai ///  
a7 /// hākāśyape · pr·[t]kaśṣaṃ ///  
b1 /// r painemeṃ laṃ-me naiṣṣ· – ///  
b2 /// ywārccā ynemane ywārc cankra ///  
b3 /// nano ṣe lkātrā kāsyaṃpe ///  
b4 /// rkwantane ṣarnen/en<sup>t</sup>ra kaun me[ñ] ///  
b5 /// [y]·s· [cp]i kraupentse pyāmtso [s]·e<sup>[4]</sup> //  
b6 /// l[p](·)[e]ccanne<sup>[5]</sup> papālau ///  
b7 /// l· ·[ṃ] ·e ///

[1] The remnant stroke could belong to <-r> or <ñā>.

[2] The remnant stroke could belong to <ra> or <ka>.

[3] The scribe seems to have forgotten the second dot of the <-ä>.

[4] The *akṣara* could be <sa>, <na>, or <ka>. [20]

[5] A trace of the vowel sign have been preserved by the tape. The *akṣara* in ligature after <l> is rather <p> than <y> because of the serif.

## 2.2 Transcription and metrical restoration

[PK AS 15J a1] /// – – p<sup>t</sup>a – – /// [a2] /// (a)kāsne swāsasken-me – /// [a3] /// · s· trā raskre māntsantrā pā(st) /// [a4] /// w(ä)rñai yakni yolaiñemp/e(ṣe) ///  
[THT 1859 a1] (ne)<sub>u</sub>ṣ tsānkare wn(olmi † k)<sub>u</sub>s(e toṃt)s p(elkiñä) † aly(e)wc(eṃ)ts(ä)<sup>26</sup> (ype)wn(a) cowai † tārkanantrā o(n)ts(o)y)c(i) [60b]  
(cai ṣāp wāsa<sub>[a2]</sub>nte † snai yse s)n(ai) kwipe † ausa snai pernn/āyāṭtaite † ate tot no onkipṣe [60c]

25 This format is peculiar and not so frequent in the Paris collection among manuscripts of this script (classical 1<sup>st</sup> period, NTBa, according to the terminology of Sander 1968). The manuscripts of this period have rather 6 lines and their line spacing inferior to 1,5. Our fragment could be compared to PK AS 15I, which shares the same features. But this fragment has a reddish ruling line whereas in PK AS 15J the ruling is gray.

26 PK AS 15J a5: /// k<sub>u</sub>se toṃts pelkiñä ālyau ///.

*te mant karsormem* † *mrauskantra snai kes*<sup>27</sup> † *ko(dyänmasa cai* <sub>[a3]</sub> *lä)kl(e)n(e) † märtkantr*  
*ašcä snaiy enkäl 60*  
*kukurapädä-* † *šalemem yäst läm* † *kentsänts wälo ramtt iprerne* † (*omšäp*  
*maha*<sub>[a4]</sub>*kāśya)p(e)* [61a]  
*prutkaššäm*<sup>28</sup> *ramtt po* † *wālam iprerä* † *ñākcyē šaiššesa wärññai po* † *kaśyapi ka ke*<sub>u</sub>*c*  
*lkāntrā* [61b]  
*tārkaṃ* (*no ślekä* † *wranta amntsнемem* <sub>[a5]</sub> † *ypä*)*r(w)e ksa puwar peynemem* † *län-me*  
*naišše pūwar ramt*<sup>29</sup> [61c]  
*amntsнемem puwar* † *wär nno peynemem* † *tārkaṃtār kār(ts)e-(yäknesa* † *šle po štwāra*  
*kä*<sub>[a6]</sub>*lymiṃne 6)l*  
*lykemanē ywārcco* † *šmemane ywarc(c)o* † *k(ly)emane ywarc caṅk(r)ami(t)*<sup>30</sup> *y(wā)r(c* †  
*ya)mäs(k)emann* *šompte ttā* [62a]  
*i(prerne ramt šle* † *snai pkānte* <sub>[b1]</sub> *katkaṃ*) † *kenne yāpām wärñne ramtā* † *t(ā)kaṃ pākri(i)*  
*akaśne* [62b] [21]  
*nāno še lkātrā* † (*kaś*)*y(a)p(e) ypr(e)rnne* † *p(o) c(e) tk(entsa nāno lkantrā* † *maka*<sub>[b2]</sub>*-yäkne)*  
*kaśyapi*<sup>31</sup> [62c]  
*stāmaṃ sū tkentsa* † *entwek ka alpam* † *ysaššene ramtt yerkwāntane* † *šārnnen* *šenktrā*  
*kaun-meñ*<sup>32</sup> 6(2)  
*(te mant wrotsana* <sub>[b3]</sub> † *prāti)h(ā)rinta* † *kaśyape aiṃ šamnants lkātsi* † *klutkaššām-mē*  
*akteke* [63a]  
*akšām maitreye* † *yäst cvī krewpentse* † *py(amsä speltke*<sup>33</sup> *sä*<sub>[b4]</sub>*lpästsi)ś ce* † *candaṃššana*  
*a(r)wane* [63b]  
*se se orotse* † *kaśyape ñem še*<sub>i</sub> † *śakyamuniñ pudnākte(ntse* † *alpeccanne pa*<sub>[b5]</sub>*pal)au*<sup>34</sup> [63c]  
*piśaka šukto* † (*k*)*oḍyänm* *šallokna* † *skäs kante tmane pikwāla* † *k<sub>u</sub>ce se cārka kektseñā 63*  
*kr<sub>i</sub>* *---* <sub>[b6]</sub> *-* † *- cāpi klyāp(a)* † *·e l-e ·ai* *-----* † (*mkte*) *p(u)d(ñā)k(t)e s(um)ersa* [64a]  
*kwāntsän po tkentsak* † *wāntam e* *-(-) ///*

## 2.3 Translation

[PK AS 15J a2] ... they will make rain them [= flowers?] in the sky ... <sub>[a3]</sub> they will be very  
 sorrowful ... <sub>[a4]</sub> the ways of [living] to begin with ..., [linked] together with the evil ...  
 [THT 1859 a1] Formerly, [there] arose human beings [such as those] who, insatiable, steal the  
 lands from each other, because of these [evil dispositions] [60b]. (And they donned) <sub>[a2]</sub>  
 clothes without (modesty) [and] without shame; [this was] without dignity, uncontrolled,  
 and so impudent! [60c] Having understood this, (they [= the disciples of Maitreya]),  
 countless, (by myriads), <sub>[a3]</sub> will be disgusted [*saṃvegam āpad-*] in their [22] suffering  
 and shave their heads [*keśāśmaśrūṇi avatī-*], passionless. 60. Out of the Kukkuṭapāda  
 ['chicken-foot'] -mountain, like the king of geese in the sky, Mahākāśyapa will

27 PK AS 15J a6: */// m-nt karsormem mrauskāntrā snai ///*.

28 PK AS 15J a7: */// hākāśyape pr(ut)kaššām ///*.

29 PK AS 15J b1: */// r painemem lam-me naišš- ///*.

30 PK AS 15J b2: */// ywārccā ynemane ywarc cankra ///*.

31 PK AS 15J b3: */// nano še lkātrā kāśyape ///*.

32 PK AS 15J b4: */// rkwantane šarnen* *šenktrā kaun me[ñ]- ///*.

33 PK AS 15J b5: */// [y]·s· [cp]i kraupentse pyāmtso [s]·e ///*.

34 PK AS 15J b6: */// l[p](·)eccanne papālau ///*.



immediately go <sup>[a4]</sup> (upwards) [*haṃsarāja iva upari vihāya samudgamya*] [61a]. He will completely fill [and] cover as it were the sky until the entire divine world; only Kāśyapa will be seen overhead [61b]. First, they will emit (water from their shoulders and <sup>[a5]</sup> at the same time) some fire will emerge from their feet like a real fire [*adhaḥ kāyaḥ prajvalati; uparimāt kāyāc chītalā vāridhārāḥ syandante*] [61c]. Then fire from their shoulders and water from their feet will be released (in a great manner;) [*uparimaḥ kāyaḥ prajvalati; adhaḥ kāyāc chītalā vāridhārāḥ syandante*] (likewise in the four directions) [61d]. <sup>[a6]</sup> [The magical Kāśyapas will be] lying in the sky, sitting in the sky, standing in the sky, making a walk in the sky [*kecid caṅkramyante, kecit tiṣṭhanti, kecin niṣīdanti, kecid chāyāṃ kalpayanti*], there (?) [62a]. (They will cross <sup>[b1]</sup> a mountain unhindered as) [through] the air; they will enter in the ground as if [it were] water [*pr̥thivyām unmajjananimajjanaṃ karoti tadyathā udake*]. They will appear in the sky [*avirbhavaṃ pratyānubhavati*] [62b]. Sometimes one Kāśyapa is seen in the sky (and on this whole earth, sometimes) <sup>[b2]</sup> multiple Kāśyapas (are seen) [*eko bhūtvā bahūdhā bhavati; bahūdhā bhūtvā eko bhavati*] [62c]. He will stand on the ground, [and] just there, stroke and take in his two hands the sun and the moon, like two golden wheels [*imaū vā punaḥ sūryācandram asau evaṃmahardhikāv evaṃmahānubhāvau pāṇinā āmārṣi parimārṣi*] 6(2). (Thus) <sup>[b2]</sup> Kāśyapa will give human beings (the great) miracles [*prātihārya*] to see and turn them in amazement [*adbhuta*]. [23] [63a]. Maitreya will at once proclaim to this gathering: “show zeal in [gathering] sandalwood [*gandhakāṣṭhais citām cit-*] to (burn) this <sup>[b4]</sup> [body] [63b]. This one was named the great Kāśyapa, praised <sup>[b5]</sup> among those of moderate wishes by the Buddha Śākyamuni [63c]. Another fifty-seven myriads [*koṭi*] of years [and] six hundred ten thousand [= 576 000 000] years [had passed], since this one relinquished [his] body. 63. If ...” <sup>[b6]</sup>... (as) a Buddha on [mount] Sumeru; [64a] firmly, on the very whole ground, they [the three peaks?] will cover [his relics?] ...”

## 2.4 Commentary

The story of the encounter of Maitreya and Kāśyapa has recently attracted much attention from scholars (Deeg 1999; Silk 2003; Tournier 2012, 2014). The story combines two narrative lines. According to Tournier (2012:400), the basic features of the tale (in the Sarvāstivādin literature) are: 1) the disciple appears before Maitreya and his followers; 2) the physical appearance of Kāśyapa, especially his smallness, arouses astonishment and contempt among the disciples of Maitreya; 3) Maitreya praises the virtues of Kāśyapa; 4) the followers of Maitreya attain Arhatship. There is also an additional motif: Kāśyapa produces wonders that counteract the contempt of the disciples of Maitreya. This motif could be placed either before the astonishment of the disciples of Maitreya, or after (Tournier 2012:400, fn. 132).

This framework has to be combined with the narrative line of the transmission of the robe, which embodies the continuity of teaching between the Buddhas: 1) Śākyamuni entrusts to Kāśyapa his cloth, the emblem of the true Law; 2) Kāśyapa dwells with it in the mountain; 3) gives the robe to Maitreya; 4) and enters *parinirvāṇa* (Deeg 1999, esp. 159; Silk 2003).

Our leaf remains difficult to interpret within the outlined frameworks, since the magical feats of Kāśyapa fill the most part of the text and [24] important motifs such as the transmission of the garb or the showing of Kāśyapa's skeleton are not mentioned. Moreover, the narrative is somewhat confusing because the conversion seems to take place before Kāśyapa goes out of the mountain. Besides, in the sequence of the supernatural feats, the multiplication of Kāśyapa seems to take place twice (in 61b and 62c). As will be shown, this oddity can be explained by assuming that the text sets two different sequences of supernatural feats drawn from canonical literature: Kāśyapa multiplies first within the so-called *prātihārya*-sequence, and secondly within the so-called *ṛddhi*-sequence.

#### 2.4.1 Description of the decay at the time of Śākyamuni and the conversion of the disciples of Maitreya (60b-c)

The first two clauses are rather difficult to interpret. As suggested by Pinault 2017, they seem to refer to the state of affair at the time of Śākyamuni, or at any rate a state of decay compared to the golden age in which Maitreya appears. The main idea would be that, although it was difficult to maintain the right course of actions in such a time, Kāśyapa (or the disciples of Śākyamuni) attained Arhatship.

The first sentence (60b) explicitly mentions the sin of theft. In Buddhist cosmology, this motif plays an important role in the decadence of the *kalpa*. In *the Discourse on the Practice of the Noble Wheel-turning King*, theft comes just after poverty as sign of decadence: “Then the people of the country in turn became quite impoverished. Consequently, they took from one another by force and theft increased greatly” (Anālayo 2014:9; for parallels, see comparative table: 17ff.).

The second sentence (60c) is partly lost and more difficult to interpret. I take it as referring to the absence of shame of people or to disappearance of the (correct) monastic garment in a state of decadence. I have not found direct parallels to this sentence, but the garments play a part in the description of decadence according to the already quoted sūtra: “At that time one no longer hears in the world the names of ghee, rock honey, dark rock honey, or of any sweet delicacies. Rice seeds and rice seedlings turn into grass and weeds. Silk, silken cloth, brocade, cotton, white wool, [25] what now in the world is called a ‘garment’, are at that time not seen at all. Fabrics woven from coarse hair will be the best kind of clothing” (Anālayo 2014:10).

Similarly in the verse of the *thera* Phussa (Th 1949-80), the taking of wrong cloth (red, white, etc.) will be in the future a sign of decline of the right practice, see for example: *agāravo ca kāsāve tadā tesam bhavissati; paṭisaṅkhā ca kāsāve, bhikkhūnaṃ na bhavissati* ‘At that time, they will have no respect for the ocher robe. The monks will not take in consideration the ocher robe’ (Th 966). In commentarial accounts of the decline of Dharma, this is described as decline of *liṅga*. The monks bear cloths cut in the wrong manner, dyed in the wrong color, and then abandon their frocks: *gacchante kāle nānāvidhāni kammāni karontā papañco esa, kiṃ iminā amhākantī kāsāvakhaṇḍaṃ*

*chinditvā araññe khipanti* ‘Over time, they will do various occupations, [and think]: “this is an impediment, what use have we of this?”; cutting in pieces their yellow robes, they throw it in the forest’ (Mp I 90).

**60 b** Pinault 2017 proposed the following reading and restitution: *mānkare wn(olmeṃts k<sub>u</sub>se tontsā pelkiñ aly(e)wc(e)nts(≠ekñi)nta cowai tārkanantrā au(l)ts(orsa)* ‘À cause de ces choses qui manquèrent aux êtres vivants, ils se voleront mutuellement les possessions, pour résumer’. Yet some readings are improbable, see the palographical analysis. A difficulty of the sentence is to interpret the difference between *mānkare* (preterit) and *tārkanantrā* (present). I chose to give to the present a generic value. The *·wn· akṣara* is likely the archaic realization of words with plural in *-auna* (Peyrot 2008:43), among which only *ypauna* ‘lands’ would fit the meter. For the meaning, see: *ṣṅār ekñentasa soysī lāñco mā campe(ṃ • co)wai tārkan(aṃ ypauna) k<sub>u</sub>(s)aino alyenkāts •* ‘With each of their own possessions kings cannot satiate [themselves], [so] they rob the (lands) [and] villages of others.’ (THT 22 a3-a4; tr. after Fellner in CEToM).

**60c ausa** is a quasi *hapax legomenon* so that it is difficult to assert the meaning of the sentence (problem left open in Ogihara 2015:124).

1) Pinault interprets this word as an archaic form of *auntsāte*, the preterit of the verb *aun-* ‘to begin’, which is matched formally by the TA [26] preterit *os*, without trace of the nasal infix, which spread in TB from the present (Malzahn 2010:340).

2) It can be brought together with *ausa* in THT 1105 b3, which was interpreted as ‘Kleidung, Gewand’ by Schmidt in his edition of the *Karmavacanā*: *(tet)emu ṣaiytā • makā-yākne ausa aṣitaṃ pār pītsamonta wasātai [sic] tu yparwe onolmeṃt(s) /// (ṣtwā)r(a) dv(i)p(anmane) ///* ‘(Als) du (unter den Tieren) [wieder]geboren worden warst, trugst du auf vielerlei Weise [als] Gewand Fell (?), Gefieder (?), [und] Schuppen (?) [und] (wurdest) deswegen (von den) Wesen (auf den vier) Kontinenten (verfolgt?)’ (2018:51; 67). According the commentary (Schmidt 2018:98), this is the oblique of a verbal noun (nominative *auso\** or *ausa\**), belonging to the root *wās-* ‘to don’, maybe with an *en-* prefix (as suggested by the anonymous reviewer).

Besides, the association of shame with clothing is likely, see: *(yase)-kw(i)peṣṣe wastsy āstren ausu peñyacce* ‘garbed in the pure, shining garment of shame and modesty’ (SI P 1 b2); *(kalpauca) ṣpā māske(t)rā po-y(kn)e(sa) krenta wāssanma • yase kwīpesa ṣek māskētār su kekenu wnoṣme* ‘and he becomes (the obtainer) of nice clothes of every kind. This being is always provided with shame [and] decency’ (PK AS 7J a4; tr. Pinault in CEToM). Therefore, one could assume that this noun was, as in the *Karmavacanā*, used in a kind of *figura etymologica*, which leads to the restoration of *wāsante*. For sake of completeness, I have added *snai yse*, a metrical form of *snai yase*, since the binomial phrase *yase kwīpe* is quite frequent (see above, and THT 74 a2, THT 123: a1, etc.).

*snai pernn-āyāttaite* reading of Pinault and Ogihara. Adams 2013:392 and 643 differently reads *ausa snai parnnā yāntaite* ‘they [scil. the Buddha and Mahākāśyapa] exchanged clothes voluntarily’. *Yāntaite* would be a second person dual mediopassive of the causative ‘to exchange (clothes)’ of the verb *wāntā-* ‘to cover’, and *pārna\** a

“vr̥ddhied nominal derivative of *parna*.” However, 1) this causative of *wāntā-* is not attested elsewhere, and it should rather mean ‘to make don’. 2) The existence of *vr̥ddhi* in Tocharian is dubious, and the meaning of *parnā* is *ad hoc*. Moreover, a trace of a *-e* vocalism can be seen above; a reading *snai perne* [27] is far more likely. One should then interpret the *akṣara* as <ttai>, which yields *āyāttaite*, the privative adjective of *yāt-* ‘to be able’ (*Grundverb*), ‘to tame’ (causative). As shown by Hilmarsson 1991:58-59, its meaning is ‘untamed’ (rather than ‘untamable’). On formal problems raised by this form, see Hilmarsson 1991:58-61, and Malzahn 2010:71, fn. 3.

**ate tot.** The particle *ate*, which is usually translated ‘away’ (Adams 2013:10) is here included in a lexicalized chain of particles with strengthening meaning ‘so, much’ and corresponds to TA *ote tāpreṃ*; for other instances in TB, see: *pañāktaññe pelaikne ate tot empreṃtse swāre nekarṣke pällarṣke ste* ‘the law of the Omniscient is so true, sweet, pleasant and praiseworthy’ (THT 101 5), */// ate tot – ///* (IOL Toch 394 b1).

**60d** We have here a conversion scene, which normally is the reaction of the disciples after Maitreya praises Kāśyapa. In the *Dīvyāvadāna*, the disciples *saṃvegam āpatsyante* ‘will be disgusted’ (*Dīvy* 62); in the Merv *avadāna*, *anekānāṃ ca bhikṣusahasrāṇāṃ cittam vimucyeta* ‘the mind of countless thousands of monks shall be detached’ (Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015:165-66, f. 49 v5). In the *Book of Zambasta*, “many people will go forth completely, will undertake *pravrajā*” (Emmerick 1968, v. 22.303), as in our text. The phrase *snai enkāl* could refer to the obtaining of Arhatship.

**te mänt** ‘thus’ is more specifically used as a calque of the Sanskrit particle *iti*.<sup>35</sup> It could be here associated with the verb *kārsā-* ‘to understand’ and have a complementizer function, as in *totkānts aiku te mant kārsaurmeṃ* ‘since they know that he is known only by few’ (THT 31 a6; tr. Fellner in CEToM; see also THT 197 a2; a6). Hence, the status of preceding sentences is ambiguous.

**snai keś kodyanmasa** Frequent phrase (see THT 275 b3, THT 1210 a1), to be expected here in a conversion scene (see the *avadāna* of Merv, quoted above). As for the perlativ, see *tumeṃ cai enkalñentse nāki kārsormem koṭanmasa warttone lateṃ* ‘Thereupon, those, having understood [28] the defect in attachment by myriads went away into the forest’ (PK AS 16.2 a5; Pinault in CEToM).

**(lä)kl(e)n(e)** the most likely restoration (adopted by Ogihara and Pinault), to be interpreted adverbially, because in the other occurrences, the complement of the verb *mrauskā-* is either the perlativ (THT 592 b4, YQ I.9 a5, PK NS 54 b5 (?)) or the ablative (A 385 b5). Here the verb is used absolutely as in PK AS 6B b5 or PK AS 7N b3.

35 Cf. *śrone koṭiviniṣe te mant ñem* (calque of *iti nāmnā*, THT 1556 a4); *(pra)ṭitya iti ca jñeya • śārmāmemeṃ tsānkalyñe te mänt kārsānalle* (THT 148 a3).

*mārtkantr aścā* Standard phrase for conversion, see: */// (nā)ndem kri mā kri • waštāṣ lo tskāt lap mārtko ///* ‘whether willingly or not, he pulled Nānda away from the house, having shaved his head’ (A 100 a2); *puk cem wlaluneyā mroskant lap mārtkānt waštāṣ (lcār) ///* ‘they were all disgusted because of death, shove their heads [and] (wandered forth) from the house’ (A 130 b2; in TB, see THT 365 a5). These phrases are different shortenings of the Buddhist pericope *keśaśmaśrūṇy avatārya kāṣāyāṇi vastrāṇy ācchādya samyag eva śraddhayā agārād anagārikāṃ pravrajati* ‘having shaven off hair and beard, put on the yellow robe, with right faith, he wanders forth out of the house into the homeless state’ (SBV II 232, etc.; Vin III 12-13, etc.).

## 2.4.2 The miracle sequence (61a-62d)

This passage is a condensation of two fixed sequences of the canonical literature: the *prātihārya* sequence, which was performed by the Buddha at Śrāvastī, and the sequence of *ṛddhis*, which, according to the sūtras, can be performed by successful yogins. Since both narratives include self-multiplication, this explains why Kāśyapa seems to multiply twice in our text.

### 61a-62a The *prātihārya* sequence

The Śrāvastī sequence is itself based on a canonical sequence of miracles, which is enhanced by the self-multiplication of the Buddha. To understand the wording of the Tocharian text, one should hence first study this sequence, called *ṛddhiprātihārya*, the first of the three *prātihārya* (the [29] others being mind-reading and teaching). I give here the translation Rotman 2008:277-78 at Divy 161, adding an analysis of the structure:

1) Then the Blessed One entered a state of meditative concentration such that when his mind was concentrated, he disappeared from his seat, rose up high in the sky in the eastern direction, and appeared in the four bodily postures—that is to say, walking, standing, sitting, and lying down. 2) Then he entered into the state of mastery over the element of fire. When the Lord Buddha had entered into the state of mastery over the element of fire, a) different kinds of light emerged from his body—they were blue, yellow, red, white, crimson, and the color of crystal. b) He displayed many other miracles as well. He made his lower body blaze in flames, and then a shower of cold water rained down from his upper body. c) What he displayed in the east, he then displayed in the south, and likewise in all four directions. 3) After making use of his magical powers and displaying these four miracles in the four directions, he withdrew those magical powers that he had activated and sat down in the seat that had been specially prepared for him.<sup>36</sup> [30]

36 The wording is exactly the same as in CPS 26.1 and SBV I 230 (and SBV I 155-7, I 195-96, etc.); see SBV I 230: *atha bhagavāṃs tadrūpaṃ samādhiṃ samāpanno yathā samāhite cūte svasminn āsane 'ntarhitāḥ pūrvasyān diśy upari vihāyasam abhyudgamyā caturvidham īryāpathaṃ kalpayati caṃkramati tiṣṭhati niṣṭdati śayyāṃ kalpayati; tejjodhātuṃ api samāpadyate; tejjodhātuṃ samāpannasya buddhasya bhagavato vividhāny arcīṃṣi kāyān niścāranti nīlāni pītāni lohītāny avadātāni māṃjiṣṭhāni spaṭīkavarṇāni; yamakāni ca prātihāryāni vidarśayati; adhaḥ kāyah prajvalati; uparimāt kāyāc chītalā*



Fortunately, a Tocharian text has preserved an adaptation of it, inserted in the story of Kāśyapa brethren' conversion. I follow here the translation of Pinault 2008:166, 168:<sup>37</sup>  
*asānmem tetkāk ḥ ṣ (n)ek(s)ate kālymiṃ ḥ lākāsyem cey kom pirkomem ḥ ipprerne ka ṣ  
 lyakār-ne •*

*iryāpathānta ḥ śwāra yāmṣate ḥ lyama śama mas/orkāntai ḥ lek yamaṣṣa lyśalyñeṣṣe •  
 carka kektseñmem ḥ swañcaiñ (ykne-w)äs(t)o ḥ wranta ca(r)k(a pwār/amtṣne)mem<sup>38</sup> ḥ  
 paryarinta paiynemem •*

*śwāra kālymiṃ po ḥ prautkar nermi(t)em ḥ (p)oyśintasa carka prayok ḥ asānne ka ṣ  
 lyakār-ne • I ||*

‘And he disappeared suddenly from his seat. They [the disciples of the three Kāśyapas] were looking [in all] the directions and, in the sky, they saw him precisely in the east (litt. in the sunrise). [1a] He adopted the four bodily positions: he sat, he stood, he went here and there and adopted the gesture of lying. [1b] He sent rays of light from [his] body. [As] wonders he doubly sent (flames) [and] waters from his (two shoulders) and from his two feet. [1c] The four directions were entirely full of fictive [*nirmīta*] Omniscient Ones. He left [this] process, and exactly on his seat, they saw him. 1’ (THT 108 b4-b6). [31]

Compared to the canonical pericope, the Tocharian text presents two kinds of differences: 1) due to the constraint of meter, the content is heavily condensed; 2) as Pinault (2008:175) noticed, the text is expanded by the motif of multiplication of Buddhas, which is borrowed from the Śrāvastī miracle.

This narrative enjoyed great popularity (Fiordalis 2014:2), and it is no surprise to see its influence on other texts. This episode relates a series of magical feats culminating in a great miracle (*prātihārya*) displayed by the Buddha in order to prove his superiority over his rivals (*tīrthikas*). The text is preserved in the *Divyāvadāna*.<sup>39</sup> Here the Buddha, seated on a lotus created by the Nāgas Nanda and Upananda, creates magical replicas of himself (*nirmīta*) seated on lotus leaves up to the Akaniṣṭha heaven:

*evaṃ bhagavatā buddha-piṇḍī nirmītā yāvad akaniṣṭha-bhavanam upādāya buddhā  
 bhagavanto parṣan nirmītam.<sup>40</sup> kecid buddha-nirmāṇās caṃkramyante, kecit tiṣṭhanti,  
 kecin niṣīdanti, kecin chāyāṃ kalpayanti, tejo-dhātum api samāpadyante, jvalana-  
 tapana-varṣaṇa-vidyotana-prātihāryāṇi kurvanti; [...]*

---

*vāridhārāḥ syandante; uparimaḥ kāyaḥ prajvalati; adhaḥ kāyāc chītalā vāridhārāḥ syandante; evaṃ  
 dakṣiṇasyāṃ paścimsyāṃ uttarasyān diśy; atha caturdiśaṃ caturvidhaṃ vividhaṃ rddhiprātihāryaṃ  
 vidarśayitvā tān rddhyabhisamṣkārān pratiprasrabhya purastād bhikṣusamghasya prajñapta evāsane  
 nyaśīdat.*

37 For the parallel text, see the commentary, 175-76. For earlier scholarship, see Pinault 2008:164.

38 Pinault restores *swañcaiñ (piś wä)s(t)o wranta ca(r)k(a pwār mrac)mem* ‘Il fit partir de son corps des rayons lumineux, cinq fois (i. e., de cinq couleurs); doublement, (il fit jaillir) des prodiges, des eaux [et] (une flamme) du sommet (de son corps) [et] de ses deux pieds’. But in our text, the upper part of the body is referred to as *amtṣnemem*, which would better fit the meter. Moreover, as noted by Pinault, *wāsto* should be the second member of a compound. That’s why, I returned to the restoration proposed by Sieg (1953:45, fn. 14) (*yakne w)äs(t)o*, but assuming that we have here an inversion of the expected compound *wāsto-yākne* ‘doubly’ (THT 44 b4, THT 172 a2). Moreover, this restitution would explain the ending of *swañcaiñ* instead of *-m* as an assimilation to the following consonant.

39 On the available sources, see the introduction in Fiordalis 2014:1-5.

40 The text is here difficult, see the note 613 in Rotman 2008:432. The Tibetan version reads: “until a whole array of Buddhas were magically manifested all the way up to the highest heaven (*akaniṣṭha*)” (Fiordalis 2014:26).



In this way the Blessed One created an array of buddhas rising up to the abode of the gods of Akanīṣṭha (Supreme) such that there was an entire assembly of lord buddhas. Some of these magically created buddhas were walking, some were standing, some were sitting, and some were lying down. Some, as well, entered into the state of mastery over the element of fire and were performing the miraculous deeds of causing fire and heat, making rain and lightning. ...' (Divy 162; tr. Rotman 2008:279)

This account is directly paralleled by our text, which uses a binomial phrase *prutkāṣṣāṃ wālaṃ* 'he will fill and cover' to express the multiplication. That all following miracles are performed by multiple Kāśyapas, is showed by the pronoun *-me* in *länme* and the plural *kaśyapi*. [32] A difference should nevertheless be noted: for the *yamakaprātihārya*, the wonder which consists of alternatively emitting fire and water, the Tocharian text does not follow the shorter form used in the tale of the *Divyāvādāna* (which is a standard phrase, see SBV II 37, etc.), but the full version of the *pratihārya* sequence.

That a disciple could perform such a miracle is quite interesting, because these magical feats were precisely coined in order to distinguish the Buddha from other religious teachers. In the Theravādin school, only the Buddha can perform the *yamakaprātihārya*, whereas, according to the Mūlasarvāstivādin, also chief disciples could perform it (see TGVS IV 1766). However, a transposition of the self-multiplication sequence to a disciple is to my knowledge not paralleled elsewhere. But it should be recalled that Mahākāśyapa was considered as successor of the Buddha, sometimes even as a second Buddha (Silk 2003:181, fn. 17), and that transposition of motifs from Śākyamuni to him is frequent (see Tournier 2012:395, fn. 105).

**61a kentsänts** TB *kents\** was analyzed by Adams 2011:34-37 (and Adams 2013:207) with the help of an "Indian text" as referring to a mythical bird (*garuḍa*) and then connected with the European word for 'goose' *\*ġ<sup>h</sup>ans-*.<sup>41</sup> It was apparently rejected by Ogihara 2015:108 and 125, who takes *kentsänts* as a by-form of the perlativ singular of *keṃ*, which is not possible. The identification of Adams can be bolstered by considering parallel texts.

The Indian text alluded to by Adams is TGVS I 193, the only version of Mahākāśyapa's myth which compares his flight with that of a golden winged bird (*jinchiniao* 金翅鳥, T 1509 XXV 78 c15). But the comparison of the magical flight to that of a bird is very old in Buddhist literature, as shows the segment *ākāśaṃ paryamkena krāmati tadyathā pakṣī śakuniḥ* of *abhiññā* sequence (see commentary on 62b-62d). In the (Mūla)sarvāstivādin literature, the usual comparison of a monk taking off by supernatural power is precisely to the *haṃsarāja* 'the bar-headed goose', see [33]:

*sa vitatapakṣa iva haṃsarāja upari vihāya samudgamya*  
*jvalanatapanavarṣaṇavidyotanaprātihāryāṇi kartum ārabdhāḥ*  
 'Like a royal goose with outstretched wings, he flew up high into the sky and began

41 I plan to devote a specific study to *kents\** and *\*ġ<sup>h</sup>ans-*.

to perform the miraculous deeds of causing fire and heat, making rain and lightning’ (Divy 133; tr. Rotman 2008:237).<sup>42</sup>

That *kents\** is the translation of Sanskrit *haṃsa* is warranted by another text: *yaltse samāneṃm(pa) śesa ///* (*pañā*)*kte kentsantso walo • śecakeṃts walo ra ///* *eprete eṃwe • cakravārt walo ra • meñ-ñākte ra • kauṃ ñ(ākte ra)* ‘The Buddha ... together with thousand monks [is] ... [like] the king of geese, like the king of lions ... an attentive man, like a *cakravārttin* king, like the moon, like the sun ...’ (PK NS 506 a3-a4). This is the counterpart of another Buddhist pericope, which compares the Buddha, accompanied by his disciples to “kings” in the natural world:

*atha bhagavān dānto dāntaparivāraḥ śāntaḥ śāntaparivāro [...], siṃha iva daṃṣṭragaṇaparivāraḥ, haṃsarāja iva haṃsagaṇaparivṛtaḥ, suparṇa iva pakṣigaṇaparivṛtaḥ, [...], cakravartīva putrasahasraparivṛtaḥ, candra iva nakṣatragaṇaparivṛtaḥ, sūrya iva raśmisahasraparivṛtaḥ, dhṛtarāṣṭra iva gandharvagaṇaparivṛtaḥ, [...].*

Now the Blessed One was self-controlled and his followers were self-controlled, he was calm and his followers were calm... He was like a lion surrounded by a carnivorous pack, like a royal goose surrounded by a gaggle of geese, like an eagle surrounded by a flock of birds, ... like a wheel-turning king surrounded by a thousand sons, like the moon surrounded by a constellation of stars, like the sun surrounded by a thousand rays of light, like the great king Dhṛtarāṣṭra surrounded by a group of celestial musicians, ... (Divy 125-126; tr. Rotman 2008:226-228; cf. also Divy 96, 148, etc.; in Pāli: Sv I 40, Ps III 21, etc.) [34]

The metaphor of the *haṃsa* may be based on *Dhammapada* 174-175, which compare the Arhat to a goose flying in the sky. The commentary interprets this literally, providing the story of an Arhat disappearing from the earth and then soaring in the air as a *haṃsa* (Dhp-a III 177). Interestingly, the corresponding stanzas of the *Udānavarga* (Uv XVII 2) are said by the commentary preserved in Tibetan to have been uttered about the youth of Mahākāśyapa (Rockhill 1883:75).

**Mahākāśyape** Since the reading could be <pe> or <pa>, either this <pa> has for some reason not the standard shape, or THT 1859 preserved here an archaic form of the name, *mahakaśyapā*, before the restoration of the final -e (the form *kāśyap* is attested in IOL Toch 273 a3, THT 42 a2 and THT 401 a1). Since in our text the other instances of the name are clearly thematic, I have opted for the first option.

**61b wārññai** is usually translated ‘beginning with’, but since it is also the translation of Sanskrit *yāvat*, we have probably here the equivalent of *yāvad akaniṣṭhabhavanam upādāya*.

**61c naiṣṣe** The reading is confirmed by PK AS 15J, so that the hypothesis of a mistake for *nraiṣṣe puwar* is unlikely. We may here suggest two interpretations:

42 Also, Divy 133, 239, 313; as for the TGVS, Adams links the Chinese phrase to the Pāli *suvanṇahaṃsa* (Ja 207, 353). The comparison of the magical flight to that of the *haṃsa* does not appear in the Pāli canon (the phrase is only *vehāsaṃ abbhuggacchati*).

1) a) a succession of particles *nai ṣṣe pūwa/ramt* ‘like one fire indeed’, that is to say, ‘like a real fire’. TB *nai* is an asserting particle ‘indeed, truly’, and *ṣṣe* the numeral one with doubling of the initial consonant. This phenomenon is sporadically attested in TB (for *ṣṣe*, see THT 178 a3, IOL Toch 5 b3, 187 b5, THT 134 a5, etc.). This phrase would thus be an equivalent of the expanded version of the *yamakaprātihārya* formula, used in Mahāyāna texts (Mvy 223): *yathāpi nāma mahān agniskandhaḥ* ‘certainly like a great mass of fire’ (*nai ~ nāma, agniskandha ~ ṣṣe puwar*).

b) a variant of this analysis would be to interpret *naiṣṣe* as a single word, i. e., as an adjective in *-ṣṣe* directly based on the particle *nai*, whose meaning would be ‘true, real’. This provides us a preferable solution because the presence of the initial doubling of *ṣṣe* in two different [35] manuscripts seems rather unlikely. The meaning would be approximately the same, yet more straightforward, ‘like a real fire’.

2) One could also postulate a *sandhi me/naiṣṣe*, which gives us several possible interpretations. One could think of *e/āno\**, whose oblique would be *\*e/ānai*. This putative noun can be linked to two lexems of the extant Tocharian vocabulary: a) a noun *~ eno\** ‘inside’, derivative of the preposition PIE *\*en-*, Common Tocharian *\*æ(n)-*, which is attested as first member of compound and in the adv. TB *enem*, TA *ane* ‘inside, within, herein’. The meaning would be ‘as a fire [from] the inside’, i. e., produced by inner power.<sup>43</sup> But this does not account for the comparison. b) A TA action noun *an\** ‘breath, sigh’ (Pinault in Carling 2011:8; cf. TB *ān(ā)sk-* ‘to breath’) would have a TB counterpart *\*ene*, or, with a different verbal noun suffix, *-o*. The vocalism CT *\*æ* is analogous to the τóμος type, but here a vocalism *ā* may also be concealed by the *sandhi*. The meaning would then be ‘like a blasting, blustering fire’, which would offer a sound metaphor. Nevertheless, I chose the first option, because I could not find any parallel in the Buddhist literature.

Other possible occurrences of this adjective *naiṣṣe*: */// .s· sämp/ese naiṣṣe ///* (THT 1559.c a1, manuscript of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*); */// ts·śyo naiṣṣe<sup>44</sup> ce<sub>u</sub> tsärkälyets ///* (THT 1230.g a3); */// –kä .i – /naiṣṣettse ///* (IOL Toch 801 b5).

**62a ompte ttā** The reading and the segmentation are uncertain

### 62b-62d the *ṛddhi* sequence

The following part of the text resorts to an old pericope of the Buddhist canon, included in the explanation on the six *abhiññās* ‘supernatural powers’. I give here the (Mūla)sarvāstivādin wording (SBV I 116):

*so 'nekavidham ṛddhiviṣayaṃ pratyānubhavati; eko bhūtvā bahūdhā bhavati; bahūdhā bhūtvā eko bhavati; āvirbhāvati robhāvaṃ [36] jñānadarśanaṃ pratyānubhavati; tiraḥkuḍyaṃ<sup>45</sup> tiraḥśailaṃ tiraḥprakāram asaḥjamānena kāyena*

43 Cf. for the metaphor of meditation as an inner fire: *ajjhataṃ jalyami jotim* (SN I, 169); *tadākāsasamaṃ cittaṃ, ajjhataṃ susamāhitaṃ, mā pāpacitte āsādi, aggikhandhamva pakkhīmā*. (Th 1159).

44 The text can also be segmented *yonaiṣṣe* ‘pertaining to birth [*yoni*](?)’.

45 Pāli (SN V 264): *āvirbhāvaṃ tirobhāvaṃ tirokuṭṭaṃ*, etc.; Mvu III 410: *āvirbhāvaṃ tirokuḍyaṃ tirośailaṃ*. In the Sarvāstivādin literature: *(āvirbhāvati)ro(bhā)vaṃ jñānadarśanena pratyānubhavati*

*gacchati, tadyathā ākāśe; pṛthivyām unmajjananimajjanam karoti tadyathā udake; udake abhinnasroto gacchati, tadyathā pṛthivyām;*<sup>46</sup> *ākāśam paryamkena krāmati tadyathā pakṣī śakuniḥ; imaū vā punaḥ sūryācandram asau evaṃmahardhikāv evaṃmahānubhāvau pāṇinā āmārṣṭi parimārṣṭi;*<sup>47</sup> *yāvat brahmalokaṃ kāyena vaśe vartayati.*<sup>48</sup>

‘He wields the various bases of spiritual power: having been one, he becomes many; having been many, he becomes one; he wields appearance and disappearance [as] demonstration of his knowledge; he goes unhindered through a wall, through a rampart, through a mountain as if [it were] through air; he dives in and out of the earth as if [it were] water; he walks on water without breaking the waves, as if [it were] earth; seated cross-legged, he travels through the air like a bird; and, with his hand he touches and strokes the moon and sun so powerful and mighty; he exercises mastery with the body [= moves at will] as far as the Brahma world.’<sup>49</sup> [37]

It is clear that our text did not contain the entire pericope but extracted some elements of the sequence. The main purpose of these modifications is to display a dense and brilliant sequence of magical feats. For example, in 62a *takaṃ pakri akaśne* is introduced here probably by contrast to *kenne ramt* of the preceding feat. Similarly, the multiplication formula (62c) contrasts the air and the ground so that it also includes a phrase of the magical flight. This *modus operandi* is typical of *kāvya*, see the sequence of magical feats in the *Saundarananda* (III 21-24). But we observe a similar trend in canonical texts, and such synthesis leads to the constitution of the sequence of “18 supernatural feats” or “18 transformations (*shibabian* 十八變)” of the Mahāyāna sources (see TGVS I 193, fn. 2; Mvy 210-30).

**62c p(o) c(e) tk(entsa)** Restoration according to Pinault 2017.

**62d** Metrical analysis according to Pinault 2017. The segmentation of Ogihara 2015:110 implies the loss of 5 syllables between 62c and 62d and then 9 syllables between 62d and 63a, which is at odds with the dimensions of lacunae.

**alpaṃ** This occurrence definitively confirms the gloss provided by Malzahn (2010:532) ‘darüber streichen, tasten’, ‘stroke, brush’ since *alpaṃ* and *enkrā* are the translation of

---

‘He achieves appearance [and] disappearance thanks to his vision and knowledge’ (CPS, III, 432). In his edition, Waldschmidt restored (*āvīr vibhavati ti*)*robhāvam*, following the *Mahāvīyutpatti* 210-30 (see also Waldschmidt 1960:244, fn. 44). But considering the other Sanskrit parallels (SBV I 116 and references in TGVS I 193, fn. 2), one has to restore a wording closer to the Pāli text.

46 Pāli *udake abhijjamaṇo gacchati seyyathāpi ākāśe* ‘he walks on water without sinking (litt. parting, breaking [it]) as though it were earth’.

47 Pāli *parimasati parimajjati*.

48 Pāli *kāyena vaśam vatteti*. Waldschmidt 1960:218, fn. 23, on the phrase *vaśe vartati*: “D. h. sich nach Gefallen in den verschiedenen Welten bewegen.” The translation of Kumārajīva is: 乃至梵世往來自在 ‘I can come and go until the Brahmā world at will’ (T 1435 *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* [*shi song lü*], XXIII 445 a22). I thank Bai Yu who kindly found and translated this passage. See also Sv V 282.

49 SBV I 116-117 and CPS E; translation adapted from Bodhi 2000:1727 [on SN V 264]. For references to other textual sources, see TGVS I 193, fn. 2.

Sanskrit *āmārṣṭi parimārṣṭi*, Pāli *parimasati parimajjati*. As shown by the parallel text, it has to be construed directly with an oblique (*kaun-meño*), not with *tkentsa*.<sup>50</sup>

**ysaṣṣene [...]** *kaun- meño* The word order is here a bit problematic: it would be natural to connect *ysaṣṣene ramtt yerkwāntane* with *ṣārnene*, as Malzahn (*apud* Adams 2013: 547), who translates ‘he will take ... into his [two] hands [which are] like golden wheels’. But I do not see the intent of such a comparison. It cannot be an allusion to the *cakras* that ornate [38] the palms of the hands of a Buddha. Thus, it would be better to link this phrase with *kaun-meño* (asserting their interpretation as a *dvandva*). In that case, *yerkwanto\** would be the translation of Sankrit *maṇḍala* ‘circle’, since we do find in the Pāli canon compounds such as *suriyamaṇḍala* and *candamaṇḍala* (Vin V 121; AN I 283). This would be conjectural if an instance of the *ṛddhi*-sequence would not use such expanded terms:

*kumāro svayam āśrame paryamkena niṣaṇṇo candramaṇḍalaṃ ca sūryamaṇḍalaṃ ca pāṇinā parāmrṣati. yāvad brahmakāyikakāyān vaṣe varteti ugratapo ṛṣi mahābhāgo.*

The young man could, as he sat cross-legged in his hermitage, touch the orbs of the moon and sun with his hand. An austere recluse, a gifted seer, he had power over all beings, including the devas of Brahma's world (Mvu I 284; tr. Jones 1949-56:I, 236).

**63a wrotsana pratiharinta**, for the restoration, see *tarya orotstsana pratiharinta sālkatemeś* ‘he showed them the three great wonders’ (THT 108 b3-b4), *tsopatsām pratihari* ‘the great wonder’ (A 287 and 259 a8).

**akteke** Amazement is typically the intended effect of magical feats. This wonder should arouse faith in the people. It could be an inconsistency here, because the disciples were already converted. On the underlying phraseology of *akteke*, and parallels to the phrase *akteke klutk-*, see Pinault 2015a:170-171.

### 2.4.3 The burial of Kāśyapa and his eulogy (63b-63d)

The text is here elliptic, but Maitreya probably exhorts his disciples to perform a funeral pyre, since in Tocharian, as far as we know, sandalwood (*candaṃṣim or*, A 15 a6) is distinguished from sandal-paste (*candaṃṣi curm*, YQ II.14 b8) and in ancient India, sandalwood was only used for funeral pyres (and later for statues), see McHugh 2012:185-6. [39]

As is well-known, a pyre of fragrant wood (esp. sandalwood) was an honor destined to kings and adopted for the Buddha.<sup>51</sup> The Arhats were probably treated in the same way, as shown by the funerals of Mahāprajāpatī Gautāmī,<sup>52</sup> and the report of Faxian:

50 Malzahn (2010:533) translates our passage ‘then he will brush over the earth (?)’; Adams (2013:60), who assumes a meaning ‘to [of a solid] hit glancingly, barely touch, [of light] reflect’ writes “we have a reference to Mahākāśyapa who, as a fourth-grade Arhat, will walk slightly above the surface of the ground so as not to crush ants and insects.”

51 For recent contributions on this topic, see Strong 2004 and Hinüber 2009.

52 In the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* : “Then the King of Kośala, Prasenajit, his retinue of queens, princes, ministers, citizens and people of the countryside, made piles of different varieties of fragrant woods and cremated Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and the five hundred *bhikṣuṇīs*” (Dhammadinnā 2016:27; see



After his death, the king had his remains cremated in a funeral ceremony befitting an Arhat, in accordance with the rules laid down in the scriptures and *Vinaya* texts. At a spot four or five *li* east of the vihāra, five large logs were piled up to make a pyre about thirty feet square and nearly thirty feet in height. Sandalwood, aloeswood, and other aromatic woods were placed on the top (T 2085 LI 865 b16-18; tr. Li 2002:207).<sup>53</sup>

In the pericope describing this kind of funerals in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, there is a phrase *sarvagandhakāṣṭhaiś citāṃ citvā* ‘having built a funeral pyre out of all kinds of fragrant wood’ (SBV I 162; II 105; Divy 327), which could be matched by the Tocharian text.

**63b** *py(amsä speltke sälpätsi)ś ce candamṣṣana arwane* The phrase *speltke yām-* ‘to be zealous for, to pay homage’ is construed either with a perlocative (PK AS 5C a2; THT 333), with a locative (THT 581 a3, A 347 b1), or with an infinitive. Hence, it could be construed either with *arwane* or with the word in allative lost in the lacuna. In the latter alternative, the group *candamṣṣana arwane*, taken adverbially, would mean ‘in sandalwood’, which is not altogether clear. Since the body is laid down on the funeral pyre, one rather expects the perlocative, which is the appropriate [40] case for a surface contact (Carling 2000:262). The use of the locative would imply the inclusion of the body in sandalwood, which is contradicted by the description of burial rites.<sup>54</sup> Hence it is better to construct *candamṣṣana arwane* with *speltke* ‘show zeal in [gathering] sandalwood’, and to interpret the allative adverbially, as the purpose of *speltke yām-*.

As for the restoration, it should refer either to the body of Kāśyapa or its burning. The demonstrative *ce* could either adjective, if the noun to be restored means ‘body’, or a pronoun referring to the body, if an infinitive or a verbal noun is to be restored. According to the first alternative, *kektseñ* is excluded because of the gender. A borrowing *śarir* would be unlikely because it exclusively means ‘relic’ in Tocharian, and a body becomes *śarīra* only after the cremation. Hence, the second alternative, ‘to burn it’, is more appealing. Among the available TB verbs, three would not fit the meter (*tsaktsi*, *palktsi*, *tsarktsi\**). However, the verb *sälpā-* may have an infinitive *sälpätsi*, for *sälpätsi* (cf. Malzahn 2010:943). But, since this verb has an intransitive meaning (‘to glow’), we have to recur to its causative. In light of TA *sälpāṣlune*, one can expect an infinitive *sälpätsi\**, which fits both the context and the meter.

**63c (a)** *lpeccanne papalau* We expect here some kind of eulogy. In all other versions of the tale, Maitreya praises the virtues of Mahākāśyapa and lists some of his titles of glory, see, e. g.: *yo 'sau bhikṣavo varṣasatāyuṣi prajāyāṃ śākyamunir nāma śāstā loka utpannastasyāyaṃ śrāvakaḥ kāśyapo nāmnā alpecchānāṃ saṃtuṣṭānāṃ*

---

also the account of the *Upadeśa*, which specifies the use of sandalwood, translated p. 38 and in TGVS I 587–588).

53 According to the interpretation of Deeg, this description actually refers to the burial of Mahinda (2005:167-172, 567-69). The Pāli chronicles also mention the pyre of fragrant wood (Mhv XX 43; Dīp XVII 104).

54 Faxian: “Sandalwood, aloeswood, and other aromatic woods were placed on the top [*shangzhuo* 上著]” (T 2085 LI 865 b18; tr. Li 2002:207).



*dhūtaguṇavādinām agro nirdiṣṭaḥ* ‘when people lived for one hundred years, there arose in the world a teacher named Śākyamuni, who declared the disciple named Kāśyapa to be the best of those who have few desires, the best of those who are satisfied, and the best of those who profess the virtues of the purified’ (Divy 61; tr. Rotman 2008:126, modified).<sup>55</sup> [41]

As for the Tocharian text, we are here restricted by the metric constraints. The final vowel *ā* seems to imply a *-a* stem. Pinault 2017 tentatively suggested a restoration *keklye<sub>u</sub>ccanne papālau* ‘célébré entre tous les auditeurs (?)’. This restoration would fit the metrics, but since PK AS 15 belongs to the classical stage of TB, a spelling <ew> would be unlikely. Moreover, no known *a*-stem suffixes would yield a cluster *-cc-*. We have thus to assume a borrowing: Sanskrit *alpeccha* ‘having little or moderate wishes’ (MW 96a), used in the same context in the *Divyāvadāna*, would fit both the form and the meaning. Then, the *-a* could be explained as a retention of the original vowel of the Sanskrit.

**63d** If one *koṭi* equates to ten million (MW 312c), then  $(57 \times 10\,000\,000) + (600 \times 10\,000) = 570\,000\,000 + 6\,000\,000 = 576\,000\,000$ .

**allokna** The meaning of this pronominal adjective is not altogether clear. Theoretically, it could complete *koḍyänma* or *pikwāla*. According to the metrics, the former would be more likely. It should then refer to a temporal starting point, which could be the time of Śākyamuni. The underlying idea would then be “he was the great disciple of Śākyamuni, he lived 120 years (cf. Sv II 413), and then another fifty ...years passed”. That’s why I adopted the translation “another” proposed by the anonymous reviewer.

#### 2.4.4 End (64a)

**64a cāpi** if these *akṣaras* are to be taken together, it might be an archaic form of *cpi* ‘of this’, cf. *t<sub>u</sub>meṃ suk no nke yselmeṣṣe säkwä cāpi ye III* (PK AS 12 b3) and *|| cāpi ce – III* (THT 1881 b7). If they have to be separated and *-cä* (with or without *virāma*) is the end of a word, it could be *keuc(ä)*, *epiyäc(ä)*, or *läc(ä)*, with *pi* (particle).

**klyāp(a)** Interpretation and segmentation difficult. The verb *klāwā-* ‘to be called’ has a regular Prt. I *klāwa* (*Grundverb*) and a Prt IV *klyāwäṣṣa\** is expected for its causative. TB *klāpā-* ‘to touch’ has a Preterit I *klawāte* [42] (THT 5 b5). A segmentation *-k lyāpa*, with *-k* as a particle would give the preterit I of *lyuwā-* ‘to rub’, cf. *lyawā-ne* (THT 5 b5), but it seems out of place.

**•e l•e •ai – – – –** A possible restoration would be (with Pinault, *p. c.*): *(cm)el(ṣ)e (ś)ai(ṣṣene tsänkau)* ‘arisen in the world of birth’.

**(mkte) p(u)d(ñä)k(t)e s(ume)rsa** Restoration according to Pinault 2017. For the metrical variant *mkte*, see: THT 3 b7; THT 29 a3; THT 52 b7.

55 The original translation was “of those who preach [the ascetic code known as] the virtues of the purified”; the translation of Tournier 2012:390, who chose a variant reading *dhūtavādinām*, is “qui professent l’ascèse”. Other similar eulogies in Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015:264-65 (other references in fn. 480), TGVS I 185, etc. For a study of the laudatory biographies of Kāśyapa, see Tournier 2012:289-393.

**64b *kwäntsän*** The text is here difficult. Ogihara (2015:125) left the problem open. Adams (2013: 205) interprets this phrase as referring to one of the *ṛddhis* and translates *kwäntsän po tkentsa k[w]äntam* ‘[Kāśyapa] will sink completely through the firm earth’. But since Maitreya has already urged the people to perform the funeral rites, this is excluded. Adams implicitly takes *kwäntsän* as a variant of the adjective *kwants* ‘firm, heavy’. But, *kwäntsäm* cannot be an oblique, because it is hardly a feminine form. Eventually, it could be an oblique plural, but the most likely solution is to interpret it as an adverbial ending, cf. *postäm* ‘afterwards’, *äläm* ‘otherwise’ (Pinault, *p. c.*).

***wäntam*** The segmentation *tkentsak wäntam* proposed by Pinault (*p. c.*) keeps us from assuming a new root *kwäntā-*, as does Adams, assuming a meaning ‘to sink’. TB *wäntam* can easily be interpreted as the subjunctive V of the verb *wäntā-* ‘to cover’, which is expected alongside the present VI *wäntanam*. Since this class have usually *Ablaut* (as pointed out by the reviewer), it should be the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural, but it could also be a 3<sup>rd</sup> singular. In the latter alternative, it could refer to the *maitrī* with which Maitreya suffuses the world (Pinault, *p. c.*), or in the former, to the closing of the mountain after Kāśyapa’s death.

## 2.5 The Tocharian text compared to the other versions of the tale

It is not an easy task to situate our text among the different versions of the meeting of Mahākāśyapa and Maitreya, because it remains fragmentary and some details, as we have seen, remain unclear. Building on the [43] division outlined by Tournier 2014:15, the most important question to solve is when Mahākāśyapa entered *parinirvāṇa*, namely if it is sometimes after the death of Śākyamuni or after his encounter with Maitreya. In the latter case, Mahākāśyapa would have preserved his live thanks to meditation (as in T 456, the *\*Ekottarika-āgama*, and the *Book of Zambasta*); in the former case, only his skeleton would have been preserved (as in the (Mūla)sarvāstivādin tradition, e. g., in the *Divyāvadāna*). Here, Mahākāśyapa seems at first sight to be alive: he is not referred to as a skeleton, but with his name, and he performs miracles. But nothing can be concluded from this fact, since even as a skeleton, he could perform miracles as mentioned in the *Upadeśa* (T 1509 XXV 79 a17; translated in TGVS I 195).

### 2.5.1 The Sarvāstivādin tradition and the date of the advent of Maitreya

Since Tocharian Buddhism belongs to Sarvāstivāda, one could expect that this text follows its account of the story. One should hence compare the Tocharian text with other text with a clear Sarvāstivādin affiliation, namely the *Mahāvibhāṣā* (T 1545 XVII 698 b9-29; translated in TGVS I 191, fn. 1) and the Merv *avadāna* (Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015:260-9). But, since these texts are themselves based on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and since several Tocharian accounts of the life of the Buddha are close to this *Vinaya* (Pinault 2008:159-162, 169-177), one should rather first examine this text in further detail (see also Tournier 2014:8-16).

The story of Kāśyapa's encounter with Maitreya is evoked twice in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. According to the tale included in the *Kṣudrakavastu*, Mahākāśyapa decides to enter *parinirvāṇa* and wants to visit Ajātaśatru but cannot achieve it because the king is sleeping. He then goes to the Kukkuṭapāda mountain, makes the vow with his *adhiṣṭhāna* 'controlling power' that his body, with his robe (*saṃghāṭī*) and stock, will be preserved until the time of Maitreya and lastly enters *parinirvāṇa*. Ajātaśatru, coming too late, is informed by Ānanda of the future of Kāśyapa (T 1451 XXIV 408 c13-409 c11; translated in Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015:263-67 and Przulski 1914:522-528). [44] The second tradition, placed in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, tells that Maitreya will come to the Kukkuṭapāda mountain with his disciples, take the skeleton (*asthisamghāta*) of Kāśyapa with his hands, and answer to the contempt of his disciples by praising him (T 1448 XXIV 25 a25-b8; tr. Lévi 1929:43; extracted in Divy 61; tr. Rotman 2008:126-127). These two accounts are not necessarily congruent: the motif of the transmission of Śākyamuni's robe is absent from the second tale.<sup>56</sup> The first text does not explicitly state in which state the body of the disciple should be preserved, whereas in the second, he is displayed as a skeleton.

The *Mahāvibhāṣā* relies on the first story, as well as the Merv *avadāna*, which nevertheless includes the detail of Maitreya holding the skeleton in his own hand. The scholastic tradition represented by Vasubandhu adds that the power of preservation (*adhiṣṭhāna*) used by Kāśyapa only applies to what is hard, which explains why only the skeleton of the disciple was preserved until the time of Maitreya (Tournier 2014:8-12). Since a fragment of the relevant passage of the *Abhidharmakośa* is provided with TB glosses (SHT 1743, X, 165-166, see translation and commentary in Tournier 2014:10-11), it is expected that our text follows this account.

The answer to this problem is to be found in the sentence *piśaka sukto (k)odḍyānm/allokna skās kānte tmane pikwāla k<sub>u</sub>ce se cārka kektseñā*, lit. 'fifty-seven myriads [*koṭī*] of years and other six hundred ten thousand years that he relinquished [his] body'. Two clues can be extracted from this sentence: first that our text assumes that Mahākāśyapa entered *parinirvāṇa* at the time of Śākyamuni, and secondly, that it should be affiliated to the Sārvāstivādin literature, since it faithfully reproduces the duration given in these sources for the advent of Maitreya.

The phrase *kektseñ tārkā-* occurs elsewhere (IOL Toch 743 a2, without context) and should be a fixed euphemism for 'to die', as in the Sanskrit compound *dehatyāga* 'relinquishing of the body, death' (MW 496c), or the Chinese phrases *wangshen* 亡身, *yishen* 遺身 'to relinquish or [45] abandon the body, to die', even if in the present context, it could also specifically refer to 'the releasing the body' under the mountain. Then, this sentence was translated by Adams (2013:410) as '[it had been] six hundred years [*sic*] since he released [his] body', and by Pinault (2017) '57 myriades d'autres années et 6×100×10.000 (ont passé) jusqu'à ce que celui-ci abandonne son corps.' We are facing two alternatives: in the former case, Kāśyapa would have died shortly after

<sup>56</sup> According to Lévi (1929:43-44), this story may rest on a confusion between *saṃghāta* and *saṃghāṭī*. Silk (2003:200) on the other hand argues that the physical connection represented by Kāśyapa between the two Buddhas suffices as a symbol of continuity.

Śākyamuni; according the latter translation, he would have remained alive until the time of Maitreya. To determine which is the correct interpretation, we should scrutinize the meaning of *k<sub>u</sub>ce*.

Although *k<sub>u</sub>ce*, as the most widespread conjunction (= Skt. *yad*), has a great range of uses, one can hardly ascribe a meaning ‘until’ to it.<sup>57</sup> As conjunction it most frequently means ‘since’ causally or temporally, the causal meaning being far more frequent.<sup>58</sup> In all these occurrences, the subordinate clause is placed in front of the main clause. Postponed *k<sub>u</sub>ce* are rarer and have a completive meaning ‘that’. Among them, one case is very close to our text: *štwar-tmām pāñ-wälts puklā ci kuc ne puttišparšinās wlesant wleštār* ‘You have [at your disposal] 45.000 years in which to exercise Buddhahood’ (A 255 b3; tr. after Pinault et al in CEToM, cf. Pinault 2008:100-1), which is equivalent to *štwarāk pāñ pi puklā puttišparām wleštāt* ‘For 45 years he exercised Buddhahood’ (A 255 b2). According to Pinault (2008:101), the TA conjunction *kuc ne* can be accounted for as an accusative of temporal extension (“...des ans, [46] pendant lesquels...”), since the relinquishing of the body is a momentaneous action, *k<sub>u</sub>ce* cannot refer to a duration here, and we should hence understand: ‘it has been ..., that ...’. We can thus conclude that our text follows the “orthodox” Sarvāstivādin version, according to which Kāśyapa died at the time of Śākyamuni and only his body was preserved in the mountain.

Secondly, our text also conforms to the duration given in the Sarvāstivādin sources for the advent of Maitreya. According to Nattier (1991:26, fn. 31), this event “is placed at approximately 5.6 billion years from now (variant: 560 million years) by Buddhist commentators,” and, in Nattier (1988: 30, fn. 31), at “5.670.000.000 years from now.”<sup>59</sup> This question was studied by Zieme 2016, who identified two time spans in Chinese sources: *wushiliuyi qi qianwan sui* 五十六億七千萬歲 ‘fifty-six *yi* and seven ten million years’ (e. g., in T 384 XII 1025 c15), that is ‘5.670 million years’ if one *yi* = 100 millions and *wushi qiyi liubaiwan sui* 五十七億六百萬歲 ‘fifty-seven *yi* and six million years’ (e. g., in T 1552 XXVIII 887 c3), that is 5.706 million years, if one *yi* = 100 millions, or 576 million years, if one *yi* = 10 millions. Zieme showed that only the latter tradition is attested in Uighur literature, viz. *älig yeti kolti altı yüz tımän yıl* ‘fünfzig sieben koṭis von [rather und] sechshundert zehntausend Jahren’ (Zieme 2016:2, fn. 9 for the reference of the translation).<sup>60</sup>

57 As conjunction, it is glossed in Carling 2009:147 ‘that, since’ and in Adams 2013:192 ‘because; (so) that; since’. Actually, it is difficult to find a conjunction ‘until’ in Tocharian. In TB, it should be expressed with *eṃške* or *(e)tswai* (eventually *tänktsi* + verbal noun), but as conjunction their meaning is rather ‘whereas.’ Only few examples ‘until’ can be found: */// tswai kka kätkowwa pikwäla tom epinte mäkte kaśya(pe) ///* ‘Up until these passed years indeed as Kāśyapa...’ (THT 338 b3; tr. Malzahn in CEToM; maybe also in IOL Toch 179 a3 and PK NS 31 and 294 b6).

58 (*klyom*) *ñ(i) se kuc ne nāṣ puttišparām kälpo nasam puk praṣṭam nā ///* ‘My (noble) son! Ever since I attained the rank of Buddha, during all [this] time...’ (YQ II.14 a3; tr. CEToM; MaitrHami 2, 15-16). Yet this *kuc ne* could also be explained as an expansion of *praṣṭam*.

59 The first number may come from T 452 XIV 420 a7, the second one from T 384 XII 1025 c15.

60 Zieme has “56.070.000 Jahre” for the first number and “57.060.000 Jahre” for the second one, probably assuming that one *koṭi* = 1 million; but this does not fit the duration given by Nattier and the usual value ascribed to a *koṭi* (namely ‘ten millions’, cf. MW 312c). In the former case, one has to ascribe 100 millions to a *yi* because of *qianwan* ‘10 millions’. In the translation of the Uighur text reproduced by Zieme, *mal* is added after *fünfzig* and *sechshundert*, but would be difficult to understand in light of the other languages. As Zieme points out, the *von* is disturbing and one would rather expect

Zieme called the second number a “variant” of the first, because it less often attested in the Chinese canon. Actually, it should rather be [47] the original number given in Sarvāstivādin literature since T 1552 is a Sarvāstivādin Abhidharma manual (\**Samyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*) and this duration is also attested in the *Mahāvibhāṣā*, precisely in the story of Mahākāśyapa: “Je souhaite que mon corps avec mes guenilles (*pāṃśukūla*), mon bol (*pātra*) et mon bâton (*danḍa*), demeure longtemps sans pourrir, durant 57 koṭis et 60 cents milliers d’années [*wushiqijuzhi liushibaiqian sui* 五十七俱胝六十百千歲, i. e., 576 million years, if one *koṭi* = ten millions]” (T 1545 XVII 698 b14-16; tr. TGVS I 191, fn. 1). Then, it comes as no surprise that the same number should also be restored in the MSN:

(*pñāk spā*)*tpi koris* † *ṣāk-kānt (tmām puklā* † *kupre)ne kātkeñc kātka(ṣ sām)* †  
*ārkiśoṣṣaṃ pättāñkāt*  
*śmantrā cem wrasañ* † *tām praṣṭāśśāl (ṣyak* †) *///*

‘(When 57.6 million years pass and (he) (= Maitreya) arises as Buddha on the earth, [then] the beings will come (together) with this time’ (A 288 a4).<sup>61</sup>

According to this evidence, we can be sure that our text complies with the account of the orthodox tradition, according to which Kāśyapa does not stay alive until the advent of Maitreya. Nevertheless, he is not explicitly staged as a skeleton, as expected, and the state of his body should be inferred from the exhortation of Maitreya to his disciples.

## 2.5.2 “Burnt in sandalwood” or the miraculous preservation of the body of Kāśyapa

The mention of the pyre of sandal-wood is a unique narrative element in respect of other accounts of the story and is of great interest for our study. It raises two problems: why was this detail added to the story? What does it tell about Kāśyapa’s body condition? [48]

Two explanations of this narrative element can be provided. Firstly, the funeral pyre can have been “mechanically” added because it is an expected motif after the death of a saint, as the motif of gathering the bones and erecting a stūpa, which is attested in other accounts of the tale. The intent could also be to extol the virtue of Kāśyapa by such a sumptuous burial, making him equal to the Buddha. We already saw this tendency in the miracle sequence.

But this motif can also be related to the account of Kāśyapa’s death in the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In this narrative, Ajātaśatru, when he understood that Mahākāśyapa was dead, “started gathering firewood to burn the body. Ānanda stopped him, saying: ‘Kāśyapa will keep his body as it is through the power of meditation until Bodhisattva Maitreya is reborn on Earth [...]. It cannot be burnt because of the power of meditation. You can build a *stūpa* upon it.’” (Karashima & Vorobyova-

---

*und*, which yields the same number as the Chinese sources. I am indebted to the anonymous reviewer for bringing these problems to my attention.

61 As for the metrical restoration, I follow Peyrot 2013:637: 4× 5 † 5 † 8 † 7 (for a different restoration, see the edition in CEToM). Peyrot quotes the Uighur parallel, according to which *kātkaṣ* is to be interpreted as a second protasis. The number given by the Uighur text is faulty here.



Desyatovskaya 2015:267, fn. 174; translation of the Tibetan version in Tournier 2012:397). The first version of the *Aśokāvadāna*, which is based on this *Vinaya*, specifies that Ajātaśatru started to gather sandal-wood (T 2042 L 115 a19; Przyłuski 1923:333). Since the story of Ajātaśatru and Kāśyapa was probably known to the Tocharian redactor, he might interpret the discourse of Ānanda as an injunction to postpone the funeral.<sup>62</sup> In like manner, all versions of the tale that specify the disposal of the body provide narrative elements of funeral (offerings, gathering of the bones, erection of a stūpa).

But, compared to the texts that describe the very end of Kāśyapa, Maitreya's exhortation is here somewhat surprising since, after the magical performance, the body of Kāśyapa usually miraculously burns or annihilates itself without external intervention. The distribution between these two alternatives is rather clear: if Mahākāśyapa is considered as alive, or at least his body intact, there is a mention of auto-cremation. In T 456, according to which Kāśyapa preserved his body thanks to meditation until the coming of Maitreya, his end is related in the following [49] manner: "Fire will go out of the upper part of his body [and] he will enter *parinirvāna*. They will gather the relics of his body and raise a *stūpa* on the mountain top".<sup>63</sup> This account is congruent with that of Xuanzang: "A fire will burst forth to cremate his body and, in this manner, he will enter *nirvāna*" (T 2087 LI 919 c21; tr. Li 1996:233). The *Book of Zambasta* and the Pāli *Sāvakanibbāna* follow the same line.<sup>64</sup> However, if the body is preserved as a skeleton, the texts refer to mere destruction. In the Merv *avadāna*, Kāśyapa ends his vow by *me śarīraṃ vikīrye* 'may my body disintegrate'.<sup>65</sup> Likewise, according to the *Upadeśa*, the body, which was referred to as *gushen* 骨身 'skeleton', is "destroyed" [*mie* 滅].<sup>66</sup>

We can infer from this distribution that in the Tocharian text, the body of Kāśyapa was considered as wholly preserved, even though he entered *parinirvāna* long ago, as stated in the sentence studied in the previous part. Hence, we have to assume a third version of the story between the two alternatives already laid out. This narrative line was already seen by Tournier when commenting the inscription of Silao, which refers to the body as *deha*, which points to a living body, even if Kāśyapa is said to be *nivṛtaḥ* (2012:396-7). He sourced this account to the *Kṣudrakavastu* of [50] the

62 According to Tournier (2012:387), the discourse of Ānanda means that the power of *adhiṣṭhāna* suffices to transform the preserved of body of Mahākāśyapa into a relic without need of a funeral pyre.

63 上出火，入般涅槃。收身舍利，山頂起塔 "Indem er oben am Körper Feuer herauskommen läßt, tritt er in das *parinirvāna* ein. Die Gebeine sammelnd stiftet man (für ihn) auf der Bergspitze ein Reliquiendenkmal" (T 456 434 a1-2; tr. Watanabe in Leumann 1919:278).

64 "At once he will become *parinivṛta*. He will emit fire from his body. The gods will gather his relics together. They will do them great honour" (Emmerick 1968:334-35, v. 297); for the Pāli *Sāvakanibbāna*, see the quotation below.

65 Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015:264-65, F 49 V4. I follow the interpretation of Tournier 2014:16, fn. 57; the editors translate differently '[Maitreya shall] crush my *śarīra*'.

66 即於空中滅身而般涅槃 'Enfin dans l'espace (*ākāśa*), il détruira son corps (*nirodhayati*) et entrera dans le *Parinirvāna*' (T 1509 XXV 79 a17; tr. TGVS I 195). The mention of *gushen* is at a16. The text reports twice the *parinirvāna* of Kāśyapa. In T 453, where Kāśyapa did not enter *parinirvāna* (T 453 XIV 422 b19), his body is merely destroyed: 葉身體奄然星散 'the body of Kāśyapa will suddenly be scattered [*xingsan* 星散]', "Zu jener Zeit wird der Körper des Kāśyapa plötzlich verschwinden" (c4-5; tr. Watanabe in Leumann 1919:251).



*Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, which was probably ambiguous and was interpreted as referring to whole preservation of the body of Kāśyapa.

In the Chinese translation of Yijing, the first vow seems to allude to a full preservation of the body, but is not very specific: “I should wrap myself with the coarse hempen refuse-rags which the Lord gave me and keep my body as it is until Maitreya is reborn to become a Buddha-lord [令身乃至慈氏下生]” (T 1451 XXIV 409 a16-18; tr. Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015:263, fn. 161).<sup>67</sup> But, after his vow, we find a phrase *buhuai* 不壞 ‘unbroken’, which seems to refer to the body of Kāśyapa: 即便入定, 三峯覆身, 猶如密室, 不壞而住 ‘As he entered into meditation, the three peaks covered his body as a sealed room, so that it will not *be* broken and stay [until Maitreya]’.<sup>68</sup> Later the body is said “to be protected by the power of meditation” [*yiding shouchi* 以定守持] (T 1451 XXIV 409 b25). Similar phrases to *buhuai* are used as epithets of the body of Kāśyapa in other Chinese accounts relying on this *Vinaya*, in the vow itself: ‘Je souhaite que mon corps avec mes guenilles (*pāṃśukūla*), mon bol (*pātra*) et mon bâton (*daṇḍa*), demeure longtemps sans pourrir [*buhuai* 不壞], durant 57 koṭis et 60 cents milliers d’années’ (T 1545 XVII 698 b14-16; tr. TGVS i 191, fn. 1). In the *Aśoka-avadānas*, we find in the corresponding sentence *buxiuhuai* 不朽壞 ‘ne tombent point en pourriture’ (T 2042 L 114 c20; tr. Przyluski 1923:331-332) and *bushihuai* 不失壞 ‘without being lost or injured’ (T 2043 L 153 c19; tr. Li 1993:112). The different translations show that these terms may be ambiguous, but seem rather to refer to the mere idea of destruction: for the word *huai* ‘to be destroyed, broken’, Hirakawa (1997:308) provides the glosses *naś-*, *bhid-*, *pralaya*, *jṛṇa*, *pūti*, etc.; for *xiuhuai* 朽壞, *bhagna*, *vināśa*, *pralugna* [51] ‘broken, destroyed, ruined’ (1997:654); and for *shihuai* 失壞, *naś-*, *bhramś-*, etc. (1997:337).

This ambiguity can be cleared up by considering a medieval Pāli text collecting deaths of saints, the *Sāvakanibbāna*. This account of the legend of Kāśyapa is also based on the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition, more precisely on the *Kṣudrakavastu*.<sup>69</sup> After the king honored the body of the great disciple, the text ends with the following prediction:<sup>70</sup>

67 “Il faut maintenant que je couvre mon corps avec l’habit *pāṃśukūla* que le Bhagavat m’a donné, pour que ce corps dure jusqu’à l’arrivée de Maitreya sur la terre” (Przyluski 1914:524).

68 Cf. T 1451 XXIV409 a19. I thank Bai Yu for verifying the translation. The passage was translated differently: ‘As he entered meditation, the three peaks of the mountain closed together and covered him like a sealed room’ (Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015:263, fn. 161); ‘Alors il entra dans l’extase et les trois pics se fermèrent pour recouvrir son corps de même qu’une demeure secrète et indestructible’ (Przyluski 1914:525).

69 See an account of the extant sources in Thailand in Lagirarde 2006:81-84. For a comparison of the structure of the tale, see Lagirarde 2006:84-90. Besides, in the Thai text translated by Lagirarde (2006:97), Mahākāśyapa performs the *yamakaprātihāryas* before his *parinirvāṇa*, which would not be possible Theravādin context. A way of transmission for legends on Mahākāśyapa to Laṅkā is proposed by Tournier 2014:26.

70 I follow the text of Padchasee 2004:124-25 with added corrections in brackets. The main text had the readings: *metteyyaṃ*, *vikirāyati*, *patibhāvam*, *upajpajjivā*, *jhapessati*. Padchasee quotes in fn. 135 another text which is apparently drawn Lagirarde’s transcription of the Paris manuscript “Pāli 295 (3)” (cf. 2004:116, fn. 1). This text offers quite different readings: *therassa śarīraṃ yāvajjatanā pi yāva metteyyo sammāsambuddho loke upajjati • tavā therassa śarīraṃ na vi[na]ssati na kiriyati na putibhāvam āpajjati • anāgate ariyametteyyo sammāsambuddho loke upajjamāno hatthatale therassa sarīrato aggijālā uṭṭhahitvā dāyissati metteyyo sammāsambuddho pana tasmim̐-y-eva ṭhane therassa dhātuthūpaṃ lokehi pūjitaṃ karapessati*. In this version the body of Kāśyapa seems to burn from itself: ‘In the future, when the noble Metteyya will be born, in the palm of [his] hand, a flame, having arisen from [his] body will burn [it]’. For the Thai version of the text, see the translation of Lagirarde

*therassa sarīraṃ yāvajjatanā pi tatheva atthi yāva metteyy[o] sammāsambuddho loke uppajjissati na tāva vinassati na vikir[ī]yati na p[ū]tibhāvam āpajjati anāgate ariyametteyyasammāsambuddho loke upa[p]ajjī[t]vā attane hatthatale-y-eva sayam therassa sarīraṃ jh[ā]pessati • metteyalokanātho pana tasmim-y-eva thane therassa dhātuthūpaṃ lokehi pūjītabbaṃ karissatī-ti.*

‘The body of the Elder is still the same until now. Until Metteyya, the completely enlightened one, will arise in the world, it will not be destroyed, it will not be scattered, it will not show putrefaction. In the [52] future, the noble Metteyya, the completely enlightened one, arisen in the world, will himself burn the body of the Elder in the palm of his own hand. Then, the lord of the world Metteyya will in this very place make a stūpa for the relics of the Elder to be honored by the people.’

The three synonyms used to express the alteration of the body corresponds to the Chinese texts: *na vinassati* ~ *buhuai*, whereas *na pūtibhāvam āpajjati* would confirm the translation ‘without rotting’. Moreover, it provides the only strict parallel to our text since it alludes to the cremation of Kāśyapa’s body by Maitreya (*sarīraṃ jhāpessati*). Similarly, in another medieval Pāli text, called *Mahāsampīṇḍanidāna*, akin to the same tradition, Kāśyapa takes three resolutions (*adhiṣṭhāna*), beginning with: “May my dead body remain without decay in between the three peaks of the mountain Kukkuṭasampāta” (Saddhatissa 1975:45).<sup>71</sup> The Tocharian text, which is from the 4<sup>th</sup> or the 5<sup>th</sup> centuries (cf. §1.1), is thus the earliest unambiguous testimony of this version of the tale, preceding the Chinese versions of the *Aśoka-avadāna* (T 2042, 2043, 2058), which date from the 6<sup>th</sup> century (Maspero 1911).

This motif of the miraculous body is perfectly coherent with the emphasis laid in the Tocharian text on the supernatural feats of Mahākāśyapa, since the preservation of the body is itself an *abhiññā*, and both wonders were results of ascetic practices and meditation. In several accounts, the taking of vow (*adhiṣṭhāna*) is preceded by a meditative state, and in the other versions, Kāśyapa preserved his life in a deep meditative state (references in Tournier 2014:15). This version of the story is in line with a turn in conception of the body in Buddhism, switching from insight in impermanence to the exaltation of the virtuous, miraculous bodies of the saints, as manifestation of spiritual excellence.<sup>72</sup> This miraculous [53] preservation of the body of Kāśyapa evidently bears some connections with the “flesh-bodies” (*roushen*), preserved body-relics of saints, as was previously assumed.<sup>73</sup>

---

2006:107.

71 This motif of three “vows” (*adhiṣṭhāna*) recurs in the *A yu wang jing* (T 2043 L 153 c18; tr. Li 1993:111), where they are called *sanmei* 三昧 [*samādhi*], even if their content is slightly different. The original Pāli text remains for the time being inaccessible (Lagiarde 2006:80-83; Tournier 2014:16).

72 The same conception is reflected in the wonder of the non-aged bodies of Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and the 500 nuns, which is described by Dhammadinnā in the following manner: “These are bodies that are at once ‘prodigious’, if not miraculous, super-natural and un-natural. It seems to me that this praise of the corpses as eternally youthful presumes an aesthetic of ‘physiomorals’ that pervades the cultural and religious dimensions of body discourse across many communities of Middle-Period Buddhism in India” (2016:56).

73 Since this matter would be too long to investigate here, it shall be the object of another study. This was also pointed out by Tournier 2012:398.

### 3 “How to see Maitreya”

#### 3.1 Introduction

The second leaf to be edited belongs to a specific type of texts that enumerates good actions leading to a rebirth at the time of Maitreya. This kind of text is always made of an enumeration of sentences divided between a protasis “those who do this or that” and an apodosis “they will encounter Maitreya/myself.” Such enumerations occur at two points in the narrative framework of the Maitreya tales: 1) After the mass conversions that follow his first teaching, Maitreya states that his disciples are reborn in his lifetime because of good actions done under the time of Śākyamuni. 2) After the end of the carrier of Maitreya, Śākyamuni ends his discourse by a final exhortation to do good actions in order to be reborn at the time of Maitreya.

I provide here the corresponding passages from the Sanskrit *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* for purpose of comparison with the Tocharian text:<sup>74</sup> [54]

*tataḥ kārūṇikaḥ śāstā maitreyo dvīpadottamaḥ  
samitiṃ vyavalokyātha idam arthaṃ pravakṣyati ||69||  
sarve te śākyamuninā munīśreṣṭhena tāyinā  
arthato lokanāthena dr̥ṣṭāḥ saddharmadhātunā  
ropitā mokṣamārgaṇe [ni]kṣiptā mama śāsane ||70||  
chattradhvajapatākābhīr gandhamālyānulepanaiḥ  
kṛtvā śākyamuneḥ pūjāṃ hy āgatā mama śāsane ||71||  
kuṅkumodakarāsena candanenānulepanam  
dattvā śākyamuneḥ stūpe hy āgatā mama śāsane ||72||  
buddhaṃ dharmam ca saṅgham ca gatvā tu śaraṇam sadā  
kṛtvā tu kuśalam karma āgatā mama śāsane ||73||  
śīkṣāpadāni samādāya śākya[simhasya] śāsane  
pratipālya yathābhūtam hy āgatā mama śāsane ||74||  
dattvā saṅghe ca dānāni cīvarapānabhojanam  
vicitraṃ glānabhaiṣajyaṃ hy āgatā mama śāsane ||75||  
caturdaśiṃ pañcadaśiṃ pakṣasyehāṣṭamīṃ tathā  
prātihārapakṣam ca aṣṭāṅgam susamāhitam  
upavāsam upoṣitvā hy āgatā mama śāsane ||76||*

‘Alors le compatissant, le Maître, Maitreya, le meilleur des bipèdes, ayant considéré l’assemblée, proclamera ceci [69] : Vous tous, Śākyamuni vous a eus sous les yeux, lui le premier des sages, le sauveur, le vrai protecteur du monde en qui repose la Loi ; il vous a plantés sur le chemin de la délivrance, mais vous avez dû attendre mon enseignement [70]. C’est pour avoir rendu hommage à Śākyamuni avec des parasols, des bannières, des étendards, des parfums, des guirlandes, des onguents que vous êtes venus à mon enseignement [71]. C’est pour avoir donné aux stūpas de

74 The *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* still requires a critical edition; for practical reason, I give here the manuscript edited by Lévi 1932 (with some emendations according to the other manuscripts; the original readings were: *vikṣiptā*, v. 70d, and *śākyamuniśāsane*, v. 74b). Li & Nagashima 2013:227 give variant readings of all previously edited manuscripts, but the testimony of the Gilgit manuscript has to be thoroughly revised according to the new transcription of Liu 2019:199.

Śākyamuni du safran mêlé à de l'eau ou en poudre, ou bien du santal, en guise de revêtement, que vous êtes venus à mon enseignement [72]. [55] C'est pour avoir toujours pris refuge dans le Bouddha, et la Loi, et la Communauté, c'est pour avoir fait des actes de bien que vous êtes venus à mon enseignement [73]. C'est pour avoir promis de suivre les préceptes dans l'enseignement [du Lion des Śākya], pour les avoir gardés exactement que vous êtes venus à mon enseignement [74]. C'est pour avoir donné à la Communauté des dons, de quoi se vêtir, boire, manger, et aussi des remèdes contre la maladie que vous êtes venus à mon enseignement [75]. C'est pour avoir jeûné le jeûne sabbatique, le quatorze, le quinze, le huit de la quinzaine, et aussi à la quinzaine miraculeuse,<sup>75</sup> pour avoir jeûné parfaitement, en état de recueillement, que vous êtes venus à mon enseignement [76].<sup>76</sup> (Tr. Lévi 1932:395).<sup>76</sup> Similar discourses can be found in the other versions of the Maitreya tale, which basically rely on the same content.<sup>77</sup>

The second passage reads:

*prasādayiṣyatha cittāni tasmim śākyamunau jine |  
tato drakṣyatha maitreyaṃ sambuddhaṃ dvipadottamam ||100||*

'Donc ayez un esprit de piété pour Śākyamuni, ce Vainqueur! et alors vous verrez Maitreya le parfait Bouddha, le meilleur des bipèdes'<sup>78</sup> (Lévi 1932:397).<sup>78</sup>

The Gilgit manuscript (Liu 2019:202, v. 105-106) adds: *tasmād buddhe ca dharme ca saṃghe cāpi gaṇottame | prasādayata cittāni bhaviṣyati mahārthikam || taṃ tādrśaṃ kāruṇikaṃ Maitreyaṃ dvipadottamam | ārādhayitvā kālena tato nirvāṇam eṣyatha ||* 'Hence you shall be trustful [56] in the Buddha, the Law and the Community, the best of the congregations; you will have great benefit. Having pleased to this so compassionate Maitreya, the best of the two-footed, then you will go in proper time to *nirvāṇa*.<sup>79</sup> In parallels texts, this section is generally expanded to other kinds of good actions and could be much broader.<sup>80</sup>

Since in THT 1860, Maitreya is referred to in the third person, it should belong to the second passage. Moreover, although its content sounds familiar, THT 1860 does not share any direct parallels with the quoted texts, or other similar discourses embedded in Maitreya tales, which fits well with the fact that the second discourse is more freely shaped than the former. An additional evidence based on the phraseology will be adduced after the commentary of the text (§3.6.1).

75 On this term, see the footnote of Lévi 1932:301.

76 Chinese translation at T 455 XIV 427c4-15 (tr. Watanabe in Leumann 1919:242).

77 Cf. T 456 XIV 431 c25ff. (tr. Watanabe in Leumann 1919:269ff.); in the *Book of Zambasta*, Emmerick 1968:320-25, v. 22.219-245; in Tocharian A 302 (MSN, act IV), A 286 + 260 (MSN, act XVI).

78 Lévi 1932:398. Variant readings in Li & Nagashima 2013:231.

79 The first stanza is also preserved in the Tibetan translation: "Donc ayant rendu une pensée votre pensée à l'égard du Bouddha, de la Loi et de l'excellente Communauté, vous atteindrez le grand objet" (Lévi 1932:402). The Chinese translation of Yijing follows the other manuscripts (T 455 XIV 428 b4; tr. Watanabe in Leumann 1919:243).

80 *Anāgatavamsa*, v. 138-140 (Norman 2006:17-18 and 31-32), expanded in prose in manuscript B of the edition of Minayeff 1886:37; see also T 456 XIV 434 a16 (tr. Watanabe in Leumann 1919:279); *Zambasta* in Emmerick 1968:336-341, v. 22.312-335. Several translations can be found in Nattier 1988:38, fn. 12. The formulas preserved in the MAV (A 227-228 b2-b7) may also belong to this part.

### 3.2 Transcription

THT 1860

Even if the overall layout of the leaf is preserved, with parts of the right, upper and lower edges, the gaps are so numerous that only about the half of the leaf should be extant. The paper is locally torn and spotted with brown, but perfectly readable. Some fragments, which were detached, are fixed with adhesive tape.

The script belongs to the “common archaic” type, as stated in §1.1, with a curious particularity: on the verso, the vowel <-e> above the <l> are [57] archaically shaped, i. e., left oriented (b1 *lai*, b3 *ltke*, b4 *llye*, *lme*), whereas on the recto they are right oriented (a5 *ltke*, a6 *kle*).

The recto preserves an indication of new chapter, which is a rare case in an archaic manuscript. This metrical indication is framed between two double *danḍa*. The first one is lengthened at both ends by right-angled short strokes. Between them, there is a curious drawing: two parallel strokes, lengthened at both ends by acute-angled very short strokes (like the *danḍa* described before, except that the drawing is bigger, the angle acute, and the short strokes overlap each-other). These double vertical strokes are as if surrounded by a spiral of three coils, whose shading suggests volume. The whole picture looks like a pillar wrapped by a garland of cloth. One could wonder if this curious drawing is not an archaic version of the interlacing decoration that marks the end of a chapter or of a text.

The remarks on the readings of Ogihara pertain to his transcription of the leaf, to be found in 2015:115-117.

- a1 – [k]ly·wṣastā kantwasa mā to – – – – – ṣḡ – – ///
- a2 naṭ krent preke śle maittreyeṃ ñä[kt] – – – – – ts – [m] pāklyew[ṣ a]<sup>[11]</sup> – – – – – ttr·  
– ///
- a3 sarggä wate || ○ || – no ñäke sārgga puṣṣampa ken[e]n[e] ṣamṣalle || k<sub>u</sub>s· · ///
- a4 – moṣ k-akecce ompalsko ○ – ññe-ṣmeñcañ ṣek ṣañ palsko yātaṣṣeñc«añ»<sup>[2]</sup> ṣek mamrau[s] · ///
- a5 – – – tsi-ñäktents ·äk-eṃn maitt-eyeṃ cai yäst lka ·e<sup>[3]</sup> – [m]ñ·ksā<sup>[4]</sup> I k<sub>u</sub>se cai  
[s]peltkes ≠ orocce ///
- a6 – – ·[ām](·)as(·)a [b](·)[o]<sup>[5]</sup> – – yär[k]en·se pelkiñä tsälp·s·sa saṃsārmem kleṣanma  
sā ///
- b1 – – – – ñ· – – – yeṃ [k<sub>u</sub>se] ak[ṣa]s[k]eṃ pelaik-e aknatsantsä karsattsi yätaske ///
- b2 – – – l·tsi ramṭ p[o] aiskeṃ s·[m]sa·ṣṣ-na nākānma yne – – mt n·rvva stamaskem cai  
lakam ce<sub>u</sub> mai[t-re] ///
- b3 – – [y]·rk·ne ṣek laḷaskem ○ reki palsko kektentsa yä[n]k·n<sup>[6]</sup> kastwer speltkesä ñwona  
neṣmye [ṣḡ]<sup>[7]</sup> /// [58]
- b4 [ñ]ws· m·kṣantse ka pelkiñä cai ○ [m](·)ärtt«ī»keṃ<sup>[8]</sup> maittreyeṃ 4 k<sub>u</sub>se allyeñkḡ·  
onolments ṣek ñāske ///
- b5 yäkneṣca<sup>[9]</sup> upāsākāññeṣc wato [a] – – [t]·[i an]aikte<sup>[10]</sup> epe – [i] – – – – – aine [p]e  
///
- b6 ·[ai]ne 5 ke[t ś]äk ≠ renta wāntarwa – – – – – ·ai ///



[1] Ogihara reads [s] *pāklyew[ṣ]* and restores it to *(ye)s pāklyewṣ(a)*, and then to *pāklyewṣ(aso)* (2015:116; 125). He analyzes the latter form as 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. pl. imperative of *klyausā-*, but the usual form is *pāklyausso*, which is incompatible. The reading <ṣa> is indeed excluded. Hence, one should assume a *sandhi* (Pinault, *p. c.*), rather than to adduce a problematic form to a complicated file (Malzahn 2010:511). Besides, before the verbal form, the reading <s> is not very likely, if compared to the <sa> just below, which leads to another restoration.

[3] The ligature <stlka> extends until the line below. The next *akṣara* must have been a complex ligature. Since a reading <n> for the first element is probable, the restoration *lka(sk)[e](ṃ)* of Ogihara is unlikely.

[4] The reading <mñ> is likely, but one could consider also <ṣñ> or <pñ>. There are some strokes under the <ñ>. It cannot be the remnants of the vowel sign of the next line (namely *[si]*, as read by Ogihara), because it is clearly linked to <ñ>.

[5] One would at first read <mi>, as per Ogihara, but the lower stroke does not have a right oriented curve. Since the *akṣara* consists of two strokes that are almost parallel, a better option is to read <ba>. As for the vocalism, it could be <-o> or <-i>.

[6] The *akṣara* <ña> is quite visible, but problematic. One sees two parallel vertical strokes but reading <ṣa> or <pa> would preclude from reading the phrase *yñkaum kāstwer*, which is certain here. One could assume a scribal error or an archaic-oriented shape of <ñ> with a vertical left stroke (see the letter <ña> in THT 275 a3, THT 274 a5).

[59] In the Gupta script, the <ña> was shaped as square without right side (Sander 1968:table 9, type g and i; table 29, type q).

[7] It is also possible to read [y]; but due to the very curved shape of the upper stroke, it would be less likely.

[8] The first *akṣara* is partly lost. The left part, slightly slanted, forming a right-angled corner strongly suggests a reading <ma>. Ogihara tentatively reads <ṣa>. As for [ttī], the scribe first wrote <-e> and then added a right oriented horizontal stroke to draw a <-ī>.

[9] On this spelling, see §2.1, fn. [6].

[10] The interpretation of the remnant strokes is difficult: the tiny right-oriented stroke looks like a long vowel after <ta>. It cannot belong to a <sa>, because in this manuscript, that *akṣara* is written with a small dot on the right stroke. As proposed by Pinault (*p. c.*), I read here <a->, assuming that the tiny right-oriented stroke is the loose end of the vertical stroke.

THT 1559.a

I provide here the transliteration of this fragment, belonging to the following leaf, since it has a stanza numbered 6, and uses the recurring formula *nāktents ñakte [devātideva]*, as in THT 274 a3 and 1860.

Small fragment of the central part of a leaf, torn in the middle and repaired with an adhesive tape. The text is perfectly readable. The script is similar to the preceding leaf, except the shape of the <-e> sign, which is sometimes elegantly waved.



- a1 /// [s]·[u]s·[r]·y·rtā(·) ///  
a2 /// śaiṣṣeṣe yse<sup>[1]</sup> yäst u ///  
a3 /// – pesto wastameṃ 6 ·o ///  
a4 /// – [n]ār[k]ātār weṣṣe – ///  
b1 /// ·t··ñ··ṣ· ///  
b2 /// ·ṣṣ[e] k<sub>u</sub>se papālau yāmw ā[ñc]· ///  
b3 /// ntsä nāktā k<sub>u</sub>ce ce<sub>u</sub> nāktentsä ñ· ///  
b4 /// ·e – – r(·)āl(·)ye nās [ṣ]e[k] ///  
b5 /// – /// [60]

[1] I assume a vowel sign archaically shaped.

### 3.3 Transliteration and metrical restoration

Before the new chapter, the meter is unknown; the text is then written in tune *puṣṣāmpa* (4×14, 7!7). Due to the small size of 1559.a, the metrical reconstruction is left out.

[a1] – kly(e)wṣastā kāntwasa mā to(t)– – – – – ṣṣa – – /// [about 10 missing syllables]  
(kārsä)<sub>[a2]</sub>nat krent preke śle maitreyeṃ nākt(eṃ ya)ts(i ta)m päklyewṣ (aṣanikeṃ  
kāṣṣim mai)ttr(eyeṃ lkatsi) /// [about 10 missing syllables] [a3] sarggä wate  
|| (nä)no nāke sārgga puṣṣāmpa kenene ṣāṃṣälle ||  
k<sub>u</sub>s(e onolmi wārūṣlñe † yneś ṣek [a4] yā)moṣ k(r)akecce [1a]  
ompälskoññe-ṣmeñcañ ṣek † ṣāñ pälsko yātāṣṣeñcañ [1b]  
ṣek mamraus(kāṣ saṃsarmeṃ † añme takam [a5] kwri lka)tsi [1c]  
nāktents (ñ)äk(t)eṃn maitt(r)eyeṃ † cai yäst lka(n-n)e (ne)mñ(ce)ksā 1  
k<sub>u</sub>se cai speltkes/orocce † (ṣek laläskem ynañmñesa)[2a]  
(śpal[a6]meṃ nākteṃ ś)ām(n)asa † bo(dhisatveṃts) yärken(t)se [2b]  
pelkiñä tsälp(at)s(i)sa † saṃsärmeṃ kleśänmasā [2c]  
(trikalñemeṃ cai [b1] läkam † nāktents) ñ(äkteṃ maitre)yeṃ (2)  
k<sub>u</sub>se aksäskem pelaik(n)e † aknatsantsä kärsattsä [3a]  
yātāske(ntär yetwesa † krentaunaṣṣe alyeñ[b2]käm̄ts) [3b]  
(yneś) l(ka)tsi ramt po aiskem † s(a)ṃsa(r)ṣṣ(a)na nākänma [3c]  
yne(ś ra)mt n(e)rvva{ṃ} stämäskem † cai läkam ce<sub>u</sub> mait(t)re(yeṃ 3)  
(k<sub>u</sub>se pudñäkteṃ kä[b3]ṣṣintse) † y(ä)rk(e)ne ṣek laläskem [4a]  
reki pälsko kektsentsa † yänk(au)n kästwer speltkesā [4b]  
ñwona neṣmye-śä(lna ra † ṣek wikäskem po [b4] tä)ñws(a) [4c]  
m(o)kṣāntse ka pelkiñä † cai märttikeṃ maitreyeṃ 4  
k<sub>u</sub>se allyeñkānts onolments † ṣek nāske(ntär kārts/attsaik) [5a]  
(ṣa[b5]maññeṣṣe)-yäkneṣcä † upāsākāññeṣc wato [5b]  
a(kalk yam)t(s)i anaikte † epe (pakr)i (ritantär) [5c] [61]  
(wertsy)aine pe(st tsälpantär † maitreyentse pre[b6]ścy)aine 5  
ket śäk/renta wāntärwa † (yamwa takam) – – – [6a]  
– ai /// [6b]

[THT 1559.a a1] */// s·(k)<sub>is</sub>(e) r(a) y(ä)rtā(m) ///* */// śaiṣṣeṣe yse yäst u ///* */// (lantsi)*  
*pesto wastāmeṃ 6 ·o ///* */// –nārkātār weṣṣe(ñca) ///* */// t·ñ·ṣ· ///* */// ṣṣe k<sub>is</sub>se*  
*papālau yām<sub>w</sub> āñc(alī) ///* */// (ñakte)ntsā ñāktā k<sub>is</sub>ce ce<sub>u</sub> ñāktentsā ñ(ākteṃ) ///*  
*/// ·e – – r(·)āl(l)ye ñās ṣek ///* */// – ///*

### 3.4 Translation

[Śāriputra, out of compassion for the world, asked the Buddha about the means to encounter Maitreya. Śākyamuni probably speaks to his disciple personally.]

[THT 1860 a1] ... you [sg.] heard [the story of Maitreya?] ... with the tongue ... not so much ... [a2] ... [Now,] you [sg.] (know) the good time to go with the Lord Maitreya; hear [sg.] that, [how] (to see the Venerable) Maitreya, (the teacher) ... [a3] the second chapter [*sarga*] [is finished] || Now, the chapter should be counted in the tune *puṣṣāmpa* ‘with a flower’ ||

[Those] (beings) who (always realize [a4] the [spiritual] exercise) of the disgusting [*aśubha*], [1a] [who] always practice meditation, master their own mind, [1b] are always disgusted (of the *saṃsāra*), [a5] (if they wish) to see Maitreya, [1c] the Lord of lords [*devātideva*], they will quickly see him, assuredly 1. Those who, with great zeal, (always strive with reverence) [2a] [a6] in order to pay homage to the bo(dhisattvas, the most excellent ones among gods and hum)ans, [2b] so as to free [themselves] from *saṃsāra* [and] (the confusion) of *kleśas*, [2c] [62] [b1] (they will see the Lord Maitre)ya (2). Those who teach the Law to the ignorant ones, [so that they can] understand [it] [3a], [who] ornate [it] (with the jewel of virtues) [3b], [b2] [who] give others the faults of *saṃsāra* to see, as it were, (with one's own eyes), [3c] [who] fix the *nirvāṇa* with one's own eyes, as it were, those will see this Maitreya 3. (Those who) [b3] always strive to [pay] homage (to the Buddha, the master), [4a] by body, speech and mind, with fervor, day and night, [4b] (who[ever] always avoid) new slander and stri(ves) [b4]with (all) [their] kindness, [4c] only for the sake of liberation [*mokṣa*], those [will see] the mighty Maitreya 4. [Those] who (assuredly) always seek (the benefit) of other beings [5a], [b5] ([if] they want to mak)e a w(ish) for the way (of monk [*śramāna*]) or lay-people [*upāsaka*] [5b], [be it] unnoticed or (public, [b6] (they will be redeemed in the *saṃgha*, at the) ti(me of Maitreya) 5. Those by whom the ten good things [*dasākuśaladharmāṇi*] (are done) ... [6a]

[THT 1559.a a1] ... [those] who drag ... [a2] ... the shame of the world, quickly ... [a3] ... (to go) out of the house 6. ... [a4] ... he will be restrained, saying ... [b2] ...who has praised ..., made the *añjali* ... [b3] ... o Lord of lords ... which Lord of lords ... [b4] ...I, always ...

### 3.5 Commentary

**a3** This sentence is very important because it preserves the whole formula of introduction of a new meter, before the standardization of classical time, using verb

*ṣāms-*, which literally means ‘to count’.<sup>81</sup> The [63] occurrence of *kenene* after the name of the meter in archaic texts was already noticed by Peyrot 2018:330, e. g., *niṣkramam-kenene* vs. *niṣkramāntne*, etc. The most likely interpretation would be that the full phrase was reduced by ellipse and the locative ending was deferred to the name of the meter. Besides, one should interpret *se*, which appears in other archaic introduction formulae (as in B394b7: || *se yaśo(dharavi)lāp(n)e* ||), as referring to the new canto and as the subject of a gerundive such as *ṣāmsalle*.

*puṣṣāmpa* interpreted by Pinault (*p. c.*) as a borrowing to the Sanskrit *puṣya* ‘flower’ (MW 640b) via a Prakrit form *puṣṣa*, cf. Pāli *phussa* (PTSD, *s. u.* “*phussa*”). This would yield *puṣ(ṣ)\** and *puṣṣāmpa* should hence be interpreted as a comitative, even though it is not paralleled by another tune name (cf. Peyrot 2018:332-41). Note that Skt. *puṣpa*, in the particular meaning of ‘disease of the eye’ is borrowed as *puṣ\** in W 15a5 (Adams 2013:422).

**1a-c** Cf. (*lo*) *putkorā māskantrā plyaskenaṃ smeñc māmroskuṣ* ‘[Those who] are in seclusion, sit in meditation, [are] disgusted ... [will come to Maitreya]’ (A 302 b3).

**1a** *k<sub>s</sub>(e onolmi wārūṣlñe yneś ṣek yā)moṣ k(r)akecce*. *Krakecce* could be interpreted as a complement of *ompalskoññe* in the next verse, but this would be rather unlikely because the phrase *ompalskoññe ṣām-* is generally used absolutely (THT 192 a1, IOL Toch 76 a2, IOL Toch 247 a3, etc.). We have probably an allusion to the *aśubhabhāvanā* ‘meditation on the impure’, which is more frequently referred to in TA and TB as *aśubh*. The participle *yāmu* belongs to a phrase, such as *yneś yām-* ‘to realize’ [*sākṣāt kr-*] (with *ompalskoññe* as complement in IOL Toch 179 b2, THT 12 a4). As for *bhāvanā*, its standard translation is *warāṣṣālñe*.<sup>82</sup>

**1d** (*ne*)*mñ(ce)ksā* The restoration proposed by Pinault (*p. c.*), (*tswai*)*yñ(e)* ‘towards, up to’, is meaningful in this context. But one has to reckon with [64] the *akṣara* in ligature under the <ñ>. So, I propose to restore the adverb *nemceksa*, ‘indeed, certainly’ a combination of particles *nemcek* and *tsa*,<sup>83</sup> which fits both the context<sup>84</sup> and the paleography. This restoration has two flaws: 1) the <ca> does not fit so much with the remnants of *akṣara*, but these are so tiny that no certainty can be attained; 2) a form *nemñceksa* would be a rather late phonetic evolution, the classical form being *nemceksa* (Peyrot 2008:76). Yet, in classical texts, the instances of *nemñceksa* are as many as those of *nemceksa*: M 500.1 b3, THT 66 b8 vs. M 500.1 a1, IOL Toch 147 a1 (however the

81 Cf. *ṣkas piś ñu wat no ṣamṣtār mā po solme* ‘he counts 6, 5, or 9, but not the full [number]’ (THT 41 b1).

82 Cf. TA *wrāṣlune = bhāvanā* (A 385 a4, b2); (*ke*)*ktseñe ykāmṣe lkāṣlyā aśubh ṣek warāṣṣalle* ‘the body must be seen as disgusting (litt. loathsomeness), the [meditation on the] impure [*aśubha*] must always be practiced’ (THT 9 a3).

83 One could also assume a *sandhi nemñce>ksā*, ‘whosoever assuredly’, but this seems a bit unnatural.

84 See the use of particles in order to strengthen the prediction, e. g.: *kumnāṣ ṣakk ats metraknac* (A 302 a1, also A 229 b6, YQ II.15 b8, etc.); and the Chinese formula 得見世間燈明彌勒佛身必無疑也 ‘dann könnt ihr ohne Zweifel (dereinst) die Leuchte der Welt, den Buddha Maitreya, zu Gesicht bekommen’ (T 456 XIV 434 a16; tr. Watanabe in Leumann 1919:279).

particle *nemcek* is consistently written in this manner in classical text). Moreover, we may have an instance of this development (redundant spelling and assimilation) in our manuscript in the form *aiṃñ cai* (THT 275 b4),<sup>85</sup> see also the redundant spelling in *(ñ)äk(t)eṃn maitt(r)eyeṃ* in 2b.

**2b** For the restoration, see: *ce<sub>u</sub> tu yäknesa ñakteṃ sāmnanne śpālmeṃ onolmeṃ • śek wināṣṣi cmelše ce<sub>u</sub> samudtār totte ykuweṣo* ‘such a being like this, most excellent among gods and men, one shall at all times venerate as the one having passed across the sea of birth’ (THT 30 b3-b4; tr. Fellner in CEToM).

**2d** *bodhisattveṃts* The complement of the phrase *yarke yām-* is usually in the genitive: *(nauṣ pūdñä)kteṃts yärkenta yamalñesa* ‘by paying homage to the previous Buddhas’ (PK NS 54 a4; also G-Qa 1 3, THT 365 a6). [65]

**3a** Cf. *krant märkampal klyosāmseñc äkälsanträ pikänträ* ‘[Those who] hear who hear the good Law, teach it, write it ... [will come to Maitreya]’ (A 302 b2).

**3b** *yätäskentär* The verb *yät(ā)-* ‘to adorn, decorate’ is usually used concretely (his body, etc.), but also in metaphors, see *papāṣṣorñe yetweṃtsa yaitu ṣañ-añm yäknaikne* ‘(He) has adorned himself with the jewels of observance [*śīla*] in every way’ (THT 372 a2; also PK NS 48 and 258 a3).

**3c** Cf. *ṣän [sic] nakänma lkälyñene mikow eśne se ṣaiṣṣe* ‘the world [has] closed its eyes to the sight of its own faults’ (THT 1191 b4; tr. Adams 2013:494).

*ñwona neṣmye-śä(lna)* The form *ñwona* is the nominative or accusative plural feminine of *ñuwe* ‘new’. Adams 2013:287 translates ‘female novices/neophytes’,<sup>86</sup> Pinault (*p. c.*) suggests ‘inouï’ or ‘absurde’. I translated it literally, but the word may bear negative connotations, cf. Greek *νέος*, Latin *novus*, which often have the connotations ‘unexpected, strange, evil’ or ‘seditious’. Most likely the plural form is to be explained by the fact that *neṣmye* is the first part of a compound in plural. In TB, *neṣmye* is otherwise always used in binomial phrase with *nāki* ‘blame’ and refers to a bad speech act. Since <śä> is the most likely reading, the word *śalna* ‘quarrel’ would fit both the syntax and the context. Pace Adams (2013:680), it is probably a *plurale tantum* according to its form (suffix *-na*), and the plural *\*śalnanta*, which is based on a restoration, should be abandoned.

**4d** The verb was probably omitted, because the text always repeats the same formulae. Similarly, the prose text following the *Anāgatavaṃsa* (Minayeff 1886:37), has just *passissanti* and omits systematically *metteyyaṃ*.

85 Peyrot 2013:633, fn. 45: “It is unlikely that the *ñ* of *aiṃñ* refers to a 1sg. because there is no mention of a 1sg. in the whole text; instead, it can reflect *sandhi: ṃ\_c > ṃñc*”.

86 Probably inspired by *ñuwetstse*, which effectively means ‘novice’, but it would be out of place in the present context.

*m(o)kṣāntse ka pelkiñā*, cf. (*k<sub>u</sub>ce pat nu*) *wrasañ tsālpālune ākālyo ptāñkte mārkaṃpalaṃ wa(ṣtāṣ lāntassi)* ‘(or) the beings (who), with the wish of [66] liberation, in the teaching of the Buddha [decide] ... to leave the house’ (A 302 a4).

*mārttikem* Ogihara (2015: 115, 128) reads and restores [*ṣā[r]tt[ī]kem*] ‘one who encourages (?)’, but that is paleographically unlikely. Hence, I follow the suggestion of Pinault (*p. c.*), who proposes *mārttikem*, a borrowing to a Prakrit form (cf. TA *wyār* for *vihāra*) of *maharddhika* ‘mighty’.

**5a** *kārtse* // *ttsaik* For the restoration, see: (*ono*)*lme lāreṃts kārtse k<sub>u</sub>se nāṣtrā* ‘The being, who wishes the good for those who are dear to him’ (THT 1178a b6).

**5c** *a(kalk yam)t(s)i anaikte epe (pokr)i (ritantār)* Restoration uncertain. The adjective *anaikte*, the privative of *aik-* ‘to know’ is attested in: *anaikte alokālymi putk(au) a- - - - • // wikṣeñca • ṣañ krent ompalskoññe yne(ś yamaṣṣeñca • po ṣamā)ññ(e)ṃ yakneṃtsa ṣai kekenu* ‘Unerkannt, völlig abgesondert ... meidend, seine gute Versenkung voll(führend) war er in den mönchischen Weisen vollkommen’ (THT 12 a3-a4; Sieg & Siegling 1949:20). According to its context, it refers to meditation in a secluded place, as in (with *pavivitto ~ putkau*): *pallaṅkaṃ ābhujitvā ujum kāyaṃ pañidhāya appiccho santuṭṭho pavivitto asaṃsaṭṭho āraddhavāriyo adhiccittam anuyutto* ‘[Sāriputta] having crossed his legs, and set his body straight, with few desires, satisfied, secluded, unmingled [with people], with energy aroused, applies himself to the higher mind’ (Ud 43). Hence the gloss ‘unnoticed’ is fully justified (Malzahn 2010:544; *pace* Hilmarsson (1991:104) who makes another proposal).<sup>87</sup> Here, this quality would refer to the way of monk, and *pākri* to the way of lay supporter. The phrase *akālk yām-*, although less common than *akālk ritā-* or *nāsk-*, does exist: *sās(we)nās akālk yamaṣamai* ‘I have expressed [lit. made] the wish [67] towards the lord’ (PK AS 17J a4; tr. Pinault in CEToM; cf. also A 265 b6; A 330 b3).

**6a** *śū* // *krenta wāntārwa* is a calque of the *daśakuśaladharmā* (PK AS 7H a5 *ś(a)k krenta yāmornta*), a topos in this context. Some elements of the list are itemized in A 227-228 b6-b7.

*yamwa takam* cf. *yāmwa ket tākam kakraupauwwa ṣāp yāmornta* ‘Those by who [these] acts are done and accumulated’ (PK AS 7B a2, also PK AS 7C b3).

**THT 1559.a a1** *y(ä)rtā(m)*, subjunctive V of the verb *yārtā-* ‘to drag’, unattested, but expected in light of the preterit I *yarta\**.

87 The other occurrence is difficult: *kete āñme anaiktaiṃ anaikte ce teyknesa ikene te spārtoytrā* (THT 278 a1), translated by Hilmarsson as ‘Whose spirit, uninformed / unknowing in such a matter, would turn away from the unknown’. But *ket(e) āñme* should rather be the phrase ‘if someone has the wish’, with an infinitive lost in the lacuna, and *spārtoytrā* should belong to the apodosis. A tentative translation would be ‘who wishes [to obtain] the most unknown [the *nirvāṇa?*], should then behave in this way’.

a2 *yse* syncopated form of *yase* ‘shame’.

a4 *nārkatār* if correctly read, it would be the subjunctive V (for the time being unattested) of the verb *nārka-* ‘to restrain’, which has a causative paradigm.

b3, b4 the vocative implies that Śāriputra (?) is talking to Śākyamuni, which would explain the *ñās* ‘T’ of the next line.

### 3.6 The motif of the sight of Maitreya

#### 3.6.1 Phraseological study

The motif of the “encounter with Maitreya” is the heart of the devotion for Maitreya. How this encounter could take place has been amply studied (Nattier 1988). However, the exact phraseology used to describe this encounter was rarely scrutinized.<sup>88</sup> Here, such a phraseological study is interesting to order it among similar texts, and to investigate its underlying beliefs. [68]

When exposing the means to encounter Maitreya (*cf.* § 3.1), the Maitreya tales (*Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, *Anāgatavaṃsa*, together with the Chinese translations T 453, 455 and 456) follow a specific phraseological pattern: the phrase “to come in the domain of Maitreya”, *vel sim.*, belongs to the teaching of Maitreya to his followers, whereas the phrase “to see Maitreya” belongs to the final exhortation of Śākyamuni.

1) The Sanskrit text presents two variant readings according to the manuscripts: the Gilgit version reads *āgatā hi mamāntikam* ‘they came close to me’ (Liu 2019:199, v. 70-3), whereas the other manuscripts have *āgatā mama śāsane* ‘they came in my teaching’ (Li & Nagashima 2013:227, v. 71-77). The Gilgit manuscript can have preserved an older version, since it uses also a variant of the second formula, *macchāsanam upāgatā*, in the last sentence of the litany (Liu 2019:199, v. 75). Such a variation was likely leveled in the other manuscripts. The Chinese version of Yijing is a quasi-literal translation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> phrase: 來生我法中 ‘[that’s why] you came and were born in my *dharma*’ (T 455 XIV 427c4; tr. Watanabe in Leumann 1919:242). In the text translated by Kumārajīva, the teaching is replaced by *suo* ‘place’: 來生我所 ‘they came and were born in my place’ (T 456 XIV 431 c25; tr. Watanabe in Leumann 1919:269).<sup>89</sup>

2) As we have seen, most manuscripts of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* have the final exhortation *tato drakṣyatha maitreyaṃ sambuddhaṃ dvipadottamam* ‘hence you will see Maitreya, the thoroughly enlightened One, the best of the two-footed ones’, whereas the Gilgit manuscript has a longer version. The *Anāgatavaṃsa* reads *dakkhinti bhadrasamitiṃ tasmim kāle sa-devakā* ‘they together with the Devas will see the auspicious assembly at that time’ (Norman 2006:17-18, 32, v 140).<sup>90</sup> The prose simply states: *taṃ pana metteyyaṃ bhagavantaṃ ke na passissanti. ke passissanti.* ‘Who will not see this

88 See nevertheless Pinault 2015b:380-82, who notes the equivalence in TA between the phrases *opṣālyasāl śiyak kum-* ‘to come together with Maitreya’s *opṣāly*’ and *metraknaśāl śiyak kum-* ‘to meet (lit. to come together with) Maitreya’.

89 Same phrase in the translation of Zhu Fonian in T 453 XIV 422 c5, etc.



blessed Maitreya, who will?’ (Minayeff 1886:37). The text of Kumārajīva resorts basically to the same model: nt ‘then you can undoubtedly see the body of the Buddha [69] Maitreya, the lamp of world’ (T 456 XIV 434 a16; tr. after Watanabe in Leumann 1919:279), as well as T 453: 欲得見彌勒佛 ‘[who] wish to see the Buddha Maitreya’ (T 453 XIV 423 b5; tr. after Watanabe in Leumann 1919:254). Only Yijing resorts to another phrase in this part: 願逢慈氏尊 ‘[who] wish to encounter Maitreya’ (T 455 XIV 428b4 b6; tr. after Watanabe in Leumann 1919:243)

In the text edited in this paper, only the phrase “to see” is attested (1c, 1d, 3c, 3d). This is an additional evidence to the ordering of the third chapter of the TB *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* as an expansion of the final admonition of Śākyamuni. But in the end of the section (THT 274), the phrase “to come” is also used (“to see”: 5 occurrences; “to come”: 3 occurrences).

To understand why these variations occur, one should compare the phrases of our text with all the preserved Tocharian texts that teach the means to a rebirth at the time of Maitreya. The Tocharian corpus is formed of the following texts: A 227-228 (MAV, chapter 19), A 299 A 302, (MSN, act IV), A 286 + A 260 (MSN, act XVI), and the very fragmentary PK NS 400. The Tocharian texts basically rest upon the phraseology outlined above, but show greater variation, which can be classified in six categories:

1) “to come” or “to be”: Best represented in the Tocharian corpus are verbal forms of TB *kām-*, TA *kum-*, counterparts of the Sanskrit *āgata*. The object of the verb can directly be Maitreya (a) or a mediate noun, such as ‘epoch, place’ (b). Moreover, two constructions are possible, the allative or the comitative. The latter is far more frequent than the former.

a) The bulk of occurrences use a verb of motion with only Maitreya as complement: α) allative: (*yā*)*taṃ śāmtsi maittreyeṣc* ‘he will be able to come to Maitreya’ (THT 274 b2-b3, TB *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, also A 279 b5, A 302 a1, MSN); β) comitative (the most frequent phrase): (*āṣā*)*nikāṃ metraknaśśāl ṣiyak kumsantrā* ‘they come together with the noble Maitreya’ (A 302 a6, MSN, also A 279 b3, A 299 a1, etc.).

Both phrases could be distant translations of *mamāntikaṃ āgatā*. A literal translation of the latter phrase can be found in PK NS 400 b3 (in [70] a broken context) where *enepre ~ antikaṃ*. But phrase β) can also have a Indic model different from the attested phrases: *pūdñākteṃpā kālpāṣṣām ṣe śāmtsi bodhisātveṃpā* ‘ he succeeds in coming together with the Buddha [and] with the Bodhisattva’, which is a translation (except for the plural rendered as a singular) of *buddhair buddhaśrāvakaiś ca samāgamo bhavati*] (PK AS 7I a4, MKV 84; see Vis 614 for the use of this phrase with Maitreya).

b) Closer to *mama śāsane*, there is α) “time”: *śmantrā cem wrasañ tām praṣṭāśśāl* ‘these beings will come with this time’ (A 288 a5, MSN); β) “teaching”: this the exact translation the Sanskrit phrase of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*: *āñcaṃ lyalypūrā metrak śpālmeṃ pättāṃñkte märkamplaṃ (śmantrā)* ‘by which *karman*, (will they come) in the Law of the blessed Buddha Maitreya?’ (A 227-228 b4, MAV); γ) TA *opṣāly*, TB *ekṣālye*:

90 Cf. also v. 138 *tasmā Metteyya-buddhassa dassan’-athāya vo idha* ‘Therefore, in order to see the Buddha Metteyya here ...’.

*metrakṣinām opṣlyāśśāl ṣiyak kumseñc* ‘they come together with the *opṣāly* of Maitreya (A 302 a5, MSN), (*me*)*trakṣinām opṣlyis tām kālymaṃ* ‘(they will be) in the place of the *opṣāly* of Maitreya’ (A 230 b1, MAV, colophon). This phrase was extensively studied by Pinault 2015b:381, and other examples can be found there. For the meaning of *opṣāly*, see below §3.6.2

3) “to see”: This phrase is rarer, excepted in the TB *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* (THT 274 and 1860 *passim*), but is also found elsewhere: *po pi onolmi maitreyemtsa warñai pañākte yneśne lkātsi källoṃ* ‘May all the beings succeed to see in person a Buddha, beginning with Maitreya’ (PK NS 48 and 258 b5, ritual; tr. after Pinault in CEToM; also A 227-228 b5-b6, MAV).

4) “to be saved”: *śalpanṭār metrakṣyāp krant mārkaṃplaṃ* ‘they are delivered in the good Law of Maitreya’ (A 221 b6, MAV); *ṣakk ats ces(ma)śśāl ṣiyak kumse śalpanṭār antuṣ cem* ‘certainly they come together with them and are then delivered’ (A 229 b6, MAV also A 231 a1, MAV).

5) “rebirth”: *cmīmār tām praṣṭaṃ* ‘May I be reborn at this time (A 227-228 a1, colophon). [71]

6) “to miss”: Interestingly, the wish to be reborn at the time of Maitreya can be negatively expressed with the verb *trik-* ‘to miss’: *m(ai)trāk warñai poyś(i)ññem kau-ñāktentso pārkālñe trīśim manta* ‘May I never miss the rising of [these] Sun-gods, the omniscient ones to begin with Maitreya’ (PK AS 5C b6, colophon, completed with THT 1326 b2; see further IOL Toch 271 b2, PK AS 4B b4, A 227-228 b4).

The 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter of the TB *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* stands out within this corpus, by the use of a phrase that is much less frequent than “to come”. This confirms the significance of the phraseology for ordering our text. Then, the variations observed within the same text, in comparison to the Sanskrit model, are to be explained by the genres the quoted texts belong to (*nāṭaka* or *kāvya*). In *kāvya*, or ornate poetry, the lengthy repetitions of the sūtra are condensed or varied to prevent boredom. The same phenomenon can be observed in the *Book of Zambasta*, which fluctuates between variation and repetition. Besides, the extracts of Pāli colophons and devotional poems quoted by Saddhātissa (1975:36-43) show that the same variety would be expected by studying a larger Indian corpus.

### 3.6.2 “To see instantly Maitreya”: A Yogācāra connection?

The stress put by these texts on the motif of “encounter” or “sight” is interesting. Given the occurrences of these phrases in the Sanskrit *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, both reflect the traditional Maitreyan belief (the “here/later model, or deferred Golden Age” of Nattier 1988:26-27), according to which the devotee should accumulate merits during countless thousands of years (*cf.* §2.5.1) in order to be reborn at the time of Maitreya and to be liberated by him.<sup>91</sup> Nevertheless, this merit-oriented approach seems to be superseded by a search for personal encounter with the future Buddha, which is also

91 Cf., in the *Book of Zambasta*: *parrāta puṣṣo biśyo dukhyau jsa* ‘They have completely escaped from all woes’ (Emmerick 1968:322-323, v. 232). See below for the Tocharian parallels.

instantiated by the motif of the “sight” (note the emphasis laid on seeing body of Maitreya in the formula of [72] Kumārajīva quoted in §3.6.1. This would point to another model of the typology (the “mystical alternative” [there/now], Nattier 1988:29-30).<sup>92</sup>

This mystical bent can be further linked to the interesting words TB *ekṣalye* TA *opṣāly*. They were studied and compared to their Uighur counterpart *yañi kün* ‘ceremony’, literally ‘new day’ by Pinault (2015b), who showed that they most frequently mean ‘feast’, ‘ceremony’ or (paired with *paryāri*) ‘magical exploit’. Since this term also translates *ṛtu* ‘season’,<sup>93</sup> the encounter with Maitreya seems to have been likened to cosmic, miraculous events. This words also bears probably visual connotations, which is confirmed by its etymology.<sup>94</sup> The coming of Maitreya is hence presented [73] as “a miracle or wonderful sight, accompanied by many cosmic and divine manifestations” (Pinault 2015b:383).

Thus, the traditional belief seems to be deflected into a mysticism of the divine apparition. The antiquity of such ideas in Buddhism and their ties to the *bhakti* movement were evoked by Schopen (1997:137, fn. 9, with references). Similarly, Harrison emphasized the importance of “direct encounter of a Buddha” and the proximity of the practice of *buddhānusmṛti* with *darśana* (1992:223, with references to previous literature). That this conception is widespread in Tocharian Buddhism is shown by other sentences of ritual texts or colophons: *yneś poyśintaṃts koynamem källoy(m klyauṣtsi okta)ts(ai) klyomñai yāri* ‘May (I) get (to hear) from the mouth of the omniscients in person the (eight)fold noble path!’ (PK AS 5B b2-b3; tr. Pinault in CEToM) or *po pi onolmi maitreyemtsa warñai pañākte yneśne lkātsi källoṃ* ‘May all the beings obtain to see before one's eye a Buddha such as Maitreya’ (PK NS 48 and 258 b5, ritual; tr. after Pinault in CEToM).

This mystical bent seems to go a step further in our text in the phrase *maitt(r)eyem cai yäst lka(n-n)e* ‘they will instantly see Maitreya’ (1d). Actually, such a phrase is impossible within the frames of the traditional model, since Maitreya is supposed to descend upon earth in the distant future (as in the phrase *kālena tato nirvāṇam esyatha*

92 In our text, this motif is also applied on abstract ideas, as in *yneś ramt nervvaṃ stāmāskem* ‘who establish, set the *nirvāṇa* as before their eye’ (3d). The adverb *yneś* usually translates *sākṣāt* ‘before one's eyes, evidently’, ‘in person’ (cf. IOL Toch 187 a4), which, combined in a phrase with *kr-*, refers to ‘making present, the realization’ of a spiritual attainment, or ‘direct perception [of the truth]’. The Tocharian text here plays on a formulas of the sūtras *ayam eva kho, āvuso, ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo etassa nibbānassa sacchikiriyāya* ‘this is the Noble Eightfold Path [which leads] to the realization of this *nirvāṇa*’ (SN IV 252), combining it with the phrase *ime stām-* ‘to put one's attention into’ (= *smṛtim upasthā-*); but as shown by *ramt*, the adverb *yneś* here keeps its literal sense.

93 See the bilingual text THT 544 a2, edited in Couvreur 1968:278. This does not affect, in my mind, the explanation of the term by the root *\*h<sub>3</sub>ek<sup>w</sup>*- (see below).

94 Pinault linked the word to the root *\*h<sub>3</sub>ek<sup>w</sup>*- (2015b:396-99), as well as Adams 2013:81. Yet, one could offer another morphological analysis: a suffixation in TB *-iye* < to a gerund in *-le* of an inherited desiderative/iterative present *\*h<sub>3</sub>ek<sup>w</sup>-s<sup>l</sup>/o-* (cf. Greek ὄψομαι, Sanskrit *īkṣate*; alternatively a Tocharian inner formation *\*h<sub>3</sub>ek<sup>w</sup>-sk<sup>l</sup>/o-*). As parallel one can provide the nouns TB *śatkālye* TA *śāktālyi* ‘seed’ from *kātā-* ‘to strew’ (more precisely from the subjunctive V of a new root/causative *\*kātka* < *\*(s)kedh<sub>2</sub>-ské/o-*), TB *parskalyiye* ‘fear’ from *parskalle\**, ger. of *pārskā-* ‘to fear’ and maybe *akālye* ‘teaching’ (see the discussion in Malzahn 2010:521). We can thus neatly explain the meaning of ‘season’ < ‘to be seen [regularly]’. Adams (2013:81) proposed that a basic meaning ‘manifestation, phenomenon’ which could evolve in ‘season’.

‘then you will go in proper time to *nirvāṇa*’, cf. §3.1). Only who expects to be reborn in the Tuṣita heaven, or to get a vision of Maitreya in one’s lifetime (Nattier 1988:18-19) would assume such a resolution. These beliefs are normally represented among proponents of Yogācāra school or specialists of meditation (Demiéville 1951:377-387). Thus, our text could neatly correspond in wording to the last prayer of Xuanzang, the most famous bearer of this aspiration: “Homage to Maitreya Tathagata, the Fully Enlightened One! May I and all living beings be speedily present before your compassionate countenance!” (Li 1995:333). One should then examine if a connection with this belief could be assumed.

The aspiration to reborn in Tuṣita in order to meet Maitreya is best represented in the *Mile pusa shangsheng doushuaitian jing* 觀彌勒菩薩上生兜率天經 ‘Sūtra of the visualization of the rebirth of [74] bodhisattva Maitreya in the Tuṣita heaven’ (T 452), translated by Juqu Jingsheng in the first half of the 5<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>95</sup> This short sūtra belongs both to visualization sūtras (*guanjing* 觀經) and to Maitreya sūtras. It proposes to obtain a rebirth in the Tuṣita heaven by cultivating several acts of merit and, more interestingly, a visualization of Maitreya as he is now in the Tuṣita heaven. The “swift sight” would be particularly appropriate in this context. As underlined by Demiéville, the same sūtra recurs to the traditional metaphors used for the magical flight in the air, a feat which is obtained by meditation, in order to describe the swiftness of the rebirth: “Après mon *Nirvāṇa*, ceux de mes disciples qui auront cultivé avec zèle les mérites, obtiendront après leur mort de renaître au Tusita dans le temps qu’il faut à un athlète... pour plier et étendre le bras,... dans le temps d’un claquement de doigts, ... en un instant, ... avant même d’avoir levé la tête...” (T 452 XIV 42o a-b; tr. Demiéville 1951:383).<sup>96</sup> This sūtra was precisely obtained by Juqu Jingsheng in his youth (that is in the first half of the 5<sup>th</sup> century) in Turfan (Koh 2002:164, fn. 263).<sup>97</sup> Even after this period, this belief is well attested in Central Asia: during the 7-9<sup>th</sup> century, the Yogācāra school (and the Maitreya-in-Tuṣita cult) was well established in Dunhuang (Kasai 2013:83-94) and the aspiration to a rebirth in the Tuṣita heaven is attested in colophons until the end of Uighur Buddhism (Kasai 2013:70-71; Zieme 1992:86). Nevertheless, we should be careful on this claim in absence of other evidences.<sup>98</sup> [75]

#### 4. Lexical appendix

For convenience, I here give a list of the new words or forms provided by the texts, as well as the new identified meanings. For details, see the commentary:

95 This sūtra was translated in German by Koh (2002:164-199).

96 Complete translations of these passages can be found in Koh (2002:187; 190 = 420 a16-17 and a29ff).

97 For details on the life of Juqu Jincheng, see Démiéville 1951:382 and Koh 2002:12, 164 (with references).

98 This phrase could also be explained as a conflation of two phrases. In Uighur colophons, the most widespread wish is to attain buddhahood, and that wish is often enhanced by an adverb ‘quickly’ *vel sim.* (Zieme 1992:85). Unfortunately no such wish is preserved among the extant Tocharian colophons, but it would probably be expressed in the same manner, see, e. g., in a list of benefits of a good action: *ramer spā keṣṭrā* (PK AS 7N a3) or *ramer no spā saṃsārmeṃ tsälpetrā* (PK AS 7I b3) = *kṣipraṃ ca parinirvāti* (MKV 85, 103). Hence, the author of the text could have (erroneously) conveyed two different phrases ‘to see Maitreya’ and ‘to attain quickly *nirvāṇa*’ which is perfectly understandable since ‘to encounter Maitreya’ means ‘to attain liberation at the time of Maitreya’.

*ate tot* (1859 a2): intensive meaning ‘oh!’, ‘such a’ = TA *ote täpreṃ*.  
*alpaṃ* (1859 b2): 3sg.act.sub. V of *ālpā-* ‘to stroke’ = Skt. *āmrj-* ‘to stroke, to wipe’.  
*(a)lpeccanne* (PK AS 15 J b6): loc. pl. of *alpecca\**, borrowing from the Sanskrit *alpeccha-* ‘having moderate wishes’ (?).  
*kentsänts* (1859 a3): gen.pl. of *kents\** ‘goose’ = Skt. *haṃsa*.  
*kwäntsän* (1859 b6): adv. ‘firmly’ (?).  
*caṇḍaṃṣṣana* (1859 b3): obl.fem.pl. of *caṇḍaṃṣṣe* ‘made of sandal’.  
*tkentsa* (1859 b2), *tkentsa-k* (b6): perl.sg. of *keṃ* ‘earth’; on the preservation of the initial cluster, see the contribution of Peyrot in this volume.  
*nārkātār* (1559 a4): 3sg.moy.sub. V of *nārk-* ‘to restrain’.  
*naiṣṣe* (1859 a4): nom.sg.masc. adj. ‘true, real’ (?).  
*puṣṣāmpa* (1860 a3): name of a tune, probably the perlativ of *puṣ\** a borrowing via a Prakrit from Skt. *puṣya* ‘blossom, flower’.  
*mārttikem* (1860 b4): obl.sg.masc. of *mārttike\** ‘powerful’, borrowing of Skt. *maharddhika* via a Prakritic form.  
*y(ä)rtā(m)* (1559 a1): 3sg.act.sub. V of *yärtā-* ‘to drag’.  
*yerkwāntane* (1860 b4): dual of *yerkwanto\** ‘wheel’.  
*wāntaṃ* (1860 b6): 3pl.act.sub. V of *wāntā-* ‘to cover, envelop’.

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

[76]

### Abbreviations<sup>99</sup>

CEToM = *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*, URL: <http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/> [retrieved: Sept. 11, 2019].

DP = Cone, Margaret. 2001–. *A Dictionary of Pāli*. Part I (a–kh), Part II (g–n). Oxford: Pali Text Society.

CPS = Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1952. *Das Catuspariṣatsūtra: eine kanonische Lehrschrift über die Begründung der buddhistischen Gemeinde*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Divy = Cowell, Edward Byles, and Robert Alexander Neil. 1886. *The Divyāvadāna, a Collection of Early Buddhist Legends, Now First Edited from the Nepalese Sanskrit Mss. in Cambridge and Paris*. Cambridge: University Press.

Mvu = Senart, Émile. 1882–1907. *Le Mahāvastu*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.

MPS = Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1949–1950. *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Mvy = Sakaki, Ryōzaburō. 1916. *Mahāvvyutpatti = Bon zo kan wa Shiyaku Taiko*. Tokyo: Suzuki gakujutsu zaidan.

<sup>99</sup> For abbreviations of Pāli texts, see DP I x–xiv.



MKV = Lévi, Sylvain. 1932. *Mahā-karmavibhaṅga (La Grande classification des actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadésa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga)*. Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.

PTSD = Rhys Davids, Theodor W., & William Stede. 1921. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*. London: Pali Text Society.

TGVS = Lamotte, Étienne. 1944–1980. *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra)*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université de Louvain, Institut orientaliste.

SBV = Gnoli, Raniero. 1977. *The Gilgit manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu: being the 17th and last section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. 2 vol. Roma: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

SHT = Waldschmidt, Ernst, ed. 1965-. *Sanskriithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

T = *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*.

## References

Abegg, Emil. 1928. *Der Messiasglaube in Indien und Iran*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter. [77]

Adams, Douglas Q. 2011. “Three Additions to the Tocharian B Aviary.” *Tocharian and Indo-European Study* 12: 33–43.

———. 2013. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B: revised and greatly enlarged*. 2nd edition. 2 vols. Amsterdam.

Anālayo, Bhikkhu. 2014. “Maitreya and the Wheel-Turning King.” *Asian Literature and Translation* 2 (7): 1–29.

Bureau, André. 1962. “La construction et le culte des stūpa d’après les *Vinayapiṭaka*.” *Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* 50 (2): 229–274.

Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*. New York: Wisdom Publications.

Carling, Gerd. 2000. *Die Funktion der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

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

Chavannes, Edouard, & Sylvain Lévi. 1916. “Les seize Arhat protecteurs de la Loi.” *Journal Asiatique* série 11, tome 8: 5–50, 189–304.

Chen, Ruixuan. 2018. “The *Nandimitrāvādāna*: A Living Text from the Buddhist Tradition.” PhD Thesis.

Couvreur, Walter. 1968. “Zu einigen Sanskrit-Kutschischen Listen von Stichwörtern aus dem *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra*, *Daśottarasūtra* und *Nidānasamyukta*.” In *Pratidānam. Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies. Presented to F.B.J. Kuiper on His Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Johannes Cornelis Heesterman et al., 275–82. The Hague: Mouton.

Deeg, Max. 1999. “Das Ende des Dharma und die Ankunft des Maitreya.” *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 7 (2): 145–170.

———. 2005. *Das Gaoseng-Faxian-Zhuan als religionsgeschichtliche Quelle*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag.

- Demiéville, Paul. 1920. “E. Leumann: *Maitreya-Samiti, das Zukunftsideal der Buddhisten.*” *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 20 (1): 158–170.
- . 1951. “La *Yogācārabhūmi* de Saṅgharakṣa.” *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 44 (2): 339–436.
- Dhammadinnā, Bhikkhunī. 2016. “The Funeral of Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and Her Followers in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.” *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 17: 25–74.
- Emmerick, R. E. 1968. *The Book of Zambasta: A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism*. London: Oxford University Press. [78]
- Fiordalis, David. 2014. “The Buddha’s Great Miracle at Śrāvastī: A Translation from the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya.*” *Asian Literature and Translation* 2 (3): 1–33.
- Geng, Shimin, Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, & Jens Peter Laut. 1998. *Eine buddhistische Apokalypse: die Höllenskapitel (20-25) und die Schlusskapitel (26-27) der Hami-Handschrift der alttürkischen Maitrisimit; unter Einbeziehung von Manuskriptteilen des Textes aus Sängim und Murtuk*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Geng, Shimin, Jens Peter Laut, & Georges-Jean Pinault. 2004. “Neue Ergebnisse der Maitrisimit-Forschung (II): Struktur und Inhalt des 26. Kapitels.” *Nairiku Ajia Gengo No Kenkyū [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages]* 19: 29–94.
- Harrison, Paul. 1992. “Commemoration and Identification in *Buddhānusmṛti.*” In *In the Mirror of Memory: Reflections on Mindfulness and Remembrance in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism*, edited by Janet Gyatso, 215–238. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 2006. “*Maitreyavyākaraṇa*”, In *Buddhist manuscripts Band 3*, edited by Jens Braarvig, 7–9. Oslo: Hermes.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur. 1991. *The Nasal Prefixes in Tocharian: A Study in Word Formation*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun.
- Hinüber, Oskar von. 2009. “Cremated like a King: The Funeral of the Buddha within the Ancient Indian Cultural Context.” *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 13: 33–66.
- Hirakawa, Akira. 1997. *Bukkyo Kan-Bon daijiten [Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit dictionary]*. Tokyo: Reiyukai.
- Ogihara Hirotooshi. 2015. “Doitsu shozō Tokarago B danpen THT1859–1860 ni tsuite [Kuchean Fragments THT1859 and THT1860 in the Berlin Collection].” *Tōkyō Daigaku Gengogaku Ronshū [Tokyo University Linguistic Papers]* 36: 103–29.
- Huber, Edouard. 1908. *Aṣvaghōṣa Sūtrālamkāra: traduit en français sur la version chinoise de Kumārajīva*. Paris: Leroux.
- Itkin, Ilya. 2002. “The Linguistic Features of Tocharian A Manuscript *Maitreyāvadānavyākaraṇa.*” *Manuscripta Orientalia* 8 (3): 11–16.
- Jones, John James. 1949–1956. *The Mahāvastu*. 3 vol. London: Luzac.
- Karashima, Seishi, & Margarita I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya. 2015. “The Avadāna Anthology from Merv, Turkmenistan.” In *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 145–525.

- Kasai, Yukiyo. 2013. “Der Ursprung des alttürkischen Maitreya-Kults.” In *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit*, edited by Yukiyo Kasai, A Yakup, & Desmond Durkin, 67–104. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers.
- Koh, Hey Ryun. 2002. “Die Ikonographie der Maitreyafigur mit gekreuzten Füßen und des Tuṣita-Himmels, dargestellt anhand des Sutra von der Visualisierung [79] der Wiedergeburt des Bodhisattva Maitreya im himmlischen Paradies Tuṣita.” PhD Thesis, Heidelberg: Ruprecht-Karls-Universität.
- Kumamoto, Hiroshi. 2002. “The Maitreya-Samiti and Khotanese.” Paper Read at the Symposium Franco-Japonais “Interactions et Traductions Culturelles En Eurasie,” jointly held by the University of Tokyo and l’École Pratique Des Hautes Études, in Paris, December 12-13. 2002.” At [https://www.academia.edu/21129880/The\\_Maitreya-samiti-and\\_Khotanese](https://www.academia.edu/21129880/The_Maitreya-samiti-and_Khotanese) [retrieved: Sept. 11, 2019].
- Lagirdard, François. 2006. “The Nibbāna of Mahākassapa the Elder: Notes on a Buddhist Narrative Transmitted in Thai and Lao Literature.” In *Buddhist Legacies in Mainland Southeast Asia*. Paris: École française d’Extrême-Orient.
- Lancaster, Lewis R. 2004. *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*. [http://www.acmuller.net/descriptive\\_catalogue/](http://www.acmuller.net/descriptive_catalogue/) [retrieved: Sept. 11, 2019].
- Legittimo, Elsa I. 2008. “Reopening the Maitreya-Files—Two Almost Identical Early Maitreya Sūtra Translations in the Chinese Canon: Wrong Attributions and Text-Historical Entanglements.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 251–293.
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1929. “L’inscription de Mahānāman à Bodhgayā. Essai d’exégèse appliquée à l’épigraphie bouddhique.” In *Indian Studies in Honor of Charles Rockwell Lanman*, 35–47. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- . 1932. “Maitreya le Consolateur.” In *Études d’orientalisme publiées par le musée Guimet à la mémoire de Raymonde Linossier*, 355–402. Paris: E. Leroux.
- Li, Rongxi. 1993. *Biographical Scripture of King Aśoka*. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- . 1995. *A Biography of the Tripitaka Master of the Great C’ien Monastery of the Great Tang Dynasty*. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- . 1996. *Great Tang Dynasty Record of the Western Regions*. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- . 2002. “The Journey of the Eminent Monk Faxian.” In *Lives of Great Monks and Nuns*, 155–214. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- Li, Xiezhū, & Jundo Nagashima. 2013. “*Maitreyavyākaraṇa*.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 16: 217–31. [80]
- Liu, Zhen. 2019. “An Improved Critical Edition of *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* in Gilgit Manuscript.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 22: 193–207.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2007. “The Most Archaic Manuscripts of Tocharian B and the Varieties of the Tocharian B Language.” In *Instrumenta Tocharica*, edited by Melanie Malzahn, 255–297. Heidelberg: Winter.
- . 2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden: Brill.

- Maspero, Henri. 1911. “Sur la date et l’authenticité du *Fou Fa Tsang Yin Yuan Tchouan*.” In *Mélanges d’indianisme offerts par ses élèves à M. Sylvain Lévi*, 129–149. Paris: E. Leroux.
- McHugh, James. 2012. *Sandalwood and Carrion: Smell in Indian Religion and Culture*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Melzer, Gudrun. 2014. “A Palaeographic Study of a Buddhist Manuscript from the Gilgit Region: A Glimpse into a Scribes’ Workshop.” In *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field*, edited by Jan-Ulrich Sobisch, Dmitry Bondarev, and Jörg Quenzer, 227–272. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Minayeff, J. 1886. “*Anātagavaṃsa*.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 2: 33–53.
- Nattier, Jan. 1988. “The Meanings of the Maitreya Myth: A Typological Analysis.” In *Maitreya, the Future Buddha*, edited by Alan Sponberg and Helen Hardacre, 23–47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1991. *Once upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 2006. “The *Anāgatavaṃsa* Revisited.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 28: 1–38.
- Padchasee, Phramaha Yothin. 2004. “*Sāvakanibbāna*: A Critical Edition, Language and Style” [in Thai]. Master Thesis, Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2008. *Variation and Change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- . 2013. *The Tocharian Subjunctive: A Study in Syntax and Verbal Stem Formation*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2018. “A Comparison of the Tocharian A and B Metrical Traditions.” In *Language and Meter*, edited by Olav Hackstein and Dieter Gunkel, 319–345. Leiden: Brill.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2008. *Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et grammaire*. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2015a. “The Formation of Buddhist Languages.” In *Tocharian Texts in Context*. [81] *International Conference on Tocharian Manuscripts and Silk Road Culture (2013)*, 159–185. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- . 2015b. “The Tocharian Background of Old Turkic *yangi kün*.” In *Kutadgu Nom Bitig. Festschrift für Jens Peter Laut zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Elisabetta Ragagnin and Jens Wilkens, 378–405. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- . 2017. “THT 1859.” Document dated from the 5.11.2017.
- . 2018. “Colophons in Tocharian Manuscripts.” Handout of a conference held at the University of Hamburg, the 11th October 2018.
- Przyluski, Jean. 1914. “Le nord-ouest de l’Inde dans le *Vinaya* des Mūlasarvāstivādin et les textes apparentés.” *Journal Asiatique* série 11, tome 4: 493–568.
- . 1923. *La légende de l’empereur Açoka (Açoka-Avadāna) dans les textes indiens et chinois*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Ray, Reginald A. 1994. *Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rockhill, W. Woodville. 1883. *Udānavarga: a collection of verses from the Buddhist canon, compiled by Dharmatrāta*. London.

- Rotman, Andy. 2008. *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna. Part 1*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Saddhatissa, Hammalawa. 1975. *The Birth-Stories of the Ten Bodhisattas and the Dasabodhisattuppattikathā*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Sander, Lore. 1968. *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Sander, Lore. 2013. “Was kann die Paläographie zur Datierung tocharischer Handschriften beitragen?” In *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit*, edited by Yukiyo Kasai, A Yakup, & Desmond Durkin, 277–324. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers.
- Shinohara, Koichi. 2000. “The Kaṣāya Robe of the Past Buddha Kāśyapa in the Miraculous Instruction Given to the Vinaya Master Daoxuan (596-667).” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 13: 299–367.
- Schmidt, Klaus Totila. 2018. *Nachgelassene Schriften. 1. Ein westtocharisches Ordinationsritual. 2. Eine dritte tocharische Sprache: Lolanisch*. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Stefan Zimmer. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Schopen, Gregory. 1997. *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.
- Sieg, Emil, & Wilhelm Siegling. 1921. *Tocharische Sprachreste, I. Band. Die Texte. A. Transcription*. Berlin/Leipzig: de Gruyter. [82]
- Sieg, Emil, & Wilhelm Siegling. 1949. *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B, Heft 1. Die Udānālāṅkāra-Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Glossar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2003. “Dressed for Success: The Monk Kāśyapa and Strategies of Legitimation in Earlier Mahāyāna Buddhist Scriptures.” *Journal Asiatique* 291 (1–2): 173–219.
- Strong, John S. 2004. *Relics of the Buddha*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tekin, Şinasi. 1980. *Maitrisimit nom bitig: die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Tournier, Vincent. 2012. “Matériaux pour une histoire de la légende et du culte de Mahākāśyapa: une relecture d'un fragment inscrit Retrouvé à Silao (Bihār).” In *Autour de Bāmiyān. De la Bactriane hellénisée à l'Inde bouddhique*, edited by Guillaume Duceour, 375–413. Paris: De Boccard.
- . 2014. “Mahākāśyapa, His Lineage, and the Wish for Buddhahood: Reading Anew the Bodhgayā Inscriptions of Mahānāman.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 57 (1–2): 1–60.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1960. “Die Erleuchtung des Buddha.” In *Indogermanica: Festschrift für Wolfgang Krause zum 65. Geburtstag am 18. September 1960*, 214–29. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Zieme, Peter. 1992. *Religion und Gesellschaft im Uigurischen Königreich von Qočo*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- . 2016. “Die Zeitspanne von Śākyamunis Nirvāṇa bis zur Ankunft Maitreyas in der altuigurischen Tradition.” <https://www.academia.edu/25698687/-Die-Zeitspanne-von-Śākyamunis->



[Nirvāṇa bis zur Ankunft Maitreyas in der altuigurischen Tradition](#) [retrieved: Sept. 11, 2019].