

Tocharian Fragment THT333 in the Berlin Collection*

Ogihara Hirotoši

Keywords: Tocharian B, THT333, the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins, *shisònglù*

Abstract

Among the Tocharian Buddhist literature, there are many fragments which are related to the Vinaya texts. In this paper, one Tocharian B fragment kept in the Berlin collection that has remained unidentified will be treated in comparison with the Chinese parallel texts. According to the present author's research, it can be identified with the *Karmavācanā* text of the *Upasampadā-vastu* that belongs to the Sarvāstivādins.

1. Introduction

In the Tocharian Buddhist literature, there are many fragments belonging to the Vinaya texts. Since the study of Sylvain Lévi (1912), some scholars have researched fragments of this genre, and have revealed important facts about Tocharian Vinaya texts. However, there remain many fragments of this genre which should be studied in detail. Thorough research on Tocharian Vinaya texts is needed to integrate Tocharian philology with the study of the history of Buddhism in Central Asia.

I have undertaken a study of all Tocharian Vinaya texts in comparison with Sanskrit and Pāli texts, and especially with Chinese translations of the same texts for the purpose of revealing peculiarities of Tocharian Buddhism¹. In this paper, I will discuss the identification of one Tocharian Vinaya fragment which has remained unidentified.

2. Transliteration and translation of THT333

Here I present the identification of THT333, which has never been studied in comparison with Buddhist literature in other languages. This fragment was published by Sieg and Siegling in 1953 in *TochSprR(B) II*: 216-217 as B333. Some details of the writing of this fragment have been examined recently in connection with the study of the dating of Tocharian manuscripts by several scholars². This fragment has been found in the *Kizil* sites, and the spelling of Brāhmī letters has some archaic features³. It partly shows the notation of Archaic Tocharian B language⁴. One can find the

* The main part of this paper was read at the conference held in Moscow (8.25-8.27.2008): *The Scientific Conference Dedicated To Centenary Since The Beginning Of Deciphering Of The Tocharian Texts*. Afterwards it was studied in Ogihara (2009: 143-144 and 441-444) with some corrections.

¹ On the Vinaya texts in Tocharian A and B, see Ogihara (2009, 2010, 2012, and forthc.).

² See Malzahn (2007), Peyrot (2008: 201-203), and Tamai (2011).

³ THT333 is classified to I-2 in Tamai (2011).

⁴ Cf. Peyrot (*op.cit.*: 221).

corresponding part to THT333 in the Chinese Vinaya text 十誦律 *shisònglǜ* Vol. 21, namely, in the *Upasampadā-vastu* belonging to the Sarvāstivādins. The Sanskrit fragments belonging to the *Upasampadā-vastu* of this school have been studied also recently by Jin-il Chung (2004) in comparison with the Chinese version. THT333 corresponds to the chapter XIV, 4.3.c-4.4.d of his edition (*op.cit.*: 94), which is concerned with the *Pārājika-dharma* 3 and 4 of the *Karmavācānā* text. In addition to the restorations proposed in *TochSprR(B) II*, I have also introduced some restorations on the basis of comparison with other Tocharian and Sanskrit texts.

[Transliteration]⁵

w: 13.6 cm × h: 7.6 cm. The folio number '6' is in the left margin of the verso side.

- a1 *oroce* [w](arne) [w](a)ṭ₁ *nataṅkaṃne* *oroce* *maswkameṃ*^[1] *waṭ*₁ *nata(ṅkaṃne*
ytāri-)
- 2 *ne* *waṭ*₁ [š] [j]ṭ[ai]^[2] *wrattsai* *lyewetar*₁rne^[3] *postāṅne* *tuk* *paṛweṣṣe* *mātri*
(kātsane)
- 3 *yaipormeṃ* *kka* *kālporme(m)* *wi* *indriñcā* *kektseñāṣṣe* *indri* *śaulaṣe* [i](nd)r[i]
(ṣ)[pa]
- 4 *om* *no* *ce*_u *kaḷalne*^[4] *ykuweṣ*₁ *kautsiśco* *speltke* *yamaṣaṃ* *su* *no* *cwi* *speltke-*
5 *sa* *srukalyñe* *yaṃṃmaṃ* *o* *su* *mā* *ṣpa* *ṣamāne* *maṣketar*₁ *mā* *lalālu* *mā* *ṣpa*
6 *śakets*^[5] *so*₁ *lalaitau* *ṣamāñemeṃ* *maṣketar*₁^[5] *ta(n)[e]* *ta(n)e* *eṣṅke*^[6] *śaula-*
7 *sa* *warñai*^[7] *mā* *yaṣalle*^[8] *maṅkte* *kca* *tane* *te* *yaknesa* *ike*^[9] – – – ₁^[10]
[m](a)yya *campa-*
- 8 *lle* *stināṣṣi* *kwri* *mā* *katkaṭ*₁ *peparku* *poñ*^[11] *‡* 3 *snai* *k[eṣ]*₁ *(klautke)sa*^[11]
ñaktai-
- 9 *kte* *pañakte* *waiyke* *welyñe* *naksate* *waiyke* *welyñemeṃ* *klautkaly[ñe]*
(eśa)[t](k)[ai] *w](a)r(w)ā-*
- 10 *te* *palāte* *postāṅne* *rano* *keriyemane* *waiyke* *weṣṣalle* *k_u(c)e* – – – ₁^[12]
- b1 *k_use* *no* *ṣamāne* *mā* *ce* *warñai* *kca* *klyomots*₁ *wāki* *yainmu* *sakwā* *takā[lyñe]*
(wṣīl)[yñ](e *pālo)-*
- 2 *tar*₁^[13] *aiykemar*₁ *waṭ*₁ *te* *maṃt*^[14] *lkāskewat*₁ *te* *maṃn*^[14] *arahamnte* [ñi](ś₁
ne)[s](e)_u *ara-*
- 3 *hamnteñe* *perneś*^[14] *waṭ*₁ *speltkessu* *anāgāme* *ñiś*₁ *nese*_u [a](nāgāmaṃ)[ñ](e)
perneś *waṭ*₁
- 4 *speltkessu* *sakṛtākāme* *ñiś*₁ *nese*_u *sakṛtākāmaṃ[ñ]e* *(perneś* *waṭ*₁ *speltke-*
5 *ssu* *srotāpaṃne* *ñiś*₁ *o* *nese*_u *srotāpataṅne* *pe(r)n[e](ś)* *waṭ*₁ [ss]p(e)ltkessu

⁵ The transliteration here is my rereading. The system of the transliteration is as follows:

[] : damaged akṣara(s)

– : lacuna of one single akṣara

() : restored akṣara(s)

- 6 *kālpowä* *ñiś*₁ *nese*_u *pgrweṣṣe* *dhyāno* *wace* *dhyāno* *trice* *dhyāno* *starce*
dhyāno
- 7 *eru* *ñiś*₁ *nese*_u *maitra* *karuno* *moditā* *upekṣā* *akāśanaṃtyāyatam*₁ *wijñā-*
8 *nanaṃtyātam*₁^[15] *ākimñcaṃnyāyatam*₁ *naiwasamññānāsamññāyatam*₁ *aś[u]*(*bh*)^[16]
[ā](nā)[p]ā-
- 9 *nasmṛti* *ñak*(*t*)*i* *ñiś*₁ *lkātis* *kṣammaskem* *nāki* *yakṣi* *preti* *kumbhāṃṇdi* – – –
– (–)^[17]

[Notes]

a1-8: These lines concern the *Pārājika-dharma* 3. Concerning the text of the Mūla-sarvāstivādins, see Banerjee (1977: 68-69).

a8-b9: These lines concern the *Pārājika-dharma* 4. Concerning the text of the Mūla-sarvāstivādins, see Banerjee (*op.cit.*: 69-71).

1: For *maskwameṃ*, abl. sg. of *māskw* ‘obstacle, hindrance’.

2: This part corresponds to 若道路遣使殺 *ruò dào lù qiǎn shǐ shā* (T.23, no. 1435, 157a29) ‘if he sends a hireling and kills (her) in the road’. On the basis of this correspondence, Toch.B *ytārine*, the locative singular of *ytārye* ‘road’ can be restored.

Sieg and Siegling proposed (1953: 216 fn. 2) to take *ṣ[p]ūt[ai]* according to their reading as a mistake for *ṣpīkai*, but the reading *[ṣṣ]ī t[ai]* is safe. Furthermore, the noun *ṣpikiye* ‘crutch’ (Adams 1999: 667) does not give any correct meaning here. These two akṣaras should be interpreted as *ṣ ṣītai*. The meaning of the latter noun can be ascertained by the match in the Chinese text quoted above 遣使殺 *qiǎn shǐ shā* ‘(he) sends a hireling and kills (her)’. This form would be the oblique singular of *ṣito*, which would mean ‘hireling, messenger’. This nominative form *ṣito* is written as *ṣīto* in the classical Tocharian B language due to the notation of the accentuation on the first syllable⁶. In my opinion, *ṣitaitse*, which is attested in B316a1 (Sieg and Siegling 1953: 203) and should be corrected as this, is the genitive singular⁷. Here I give the transliteration of IOL Toch 1094b, where we have the oblique (b1) plural and the analogical nominative plural *ṣitaiṃ* < **ṣitaiñ* (b2)⁸:

IOL Toch 1094b⁹

1 */// (mahendra)s(e)n(e) walo ṣitaiṃ ///*

2 */// lateṃ ṣitaiṃ || om no [ñ](ake) ///*

The oblique plural would be attested also in B211b2 *abhiṣekṣeṃ ṣitaiṃ*, to which Sieg and

⁶ For *ṣito*, see THT1663 + THT2373.frg.c + frg.g.b1 where it corresponds to Skt. *saṃcāritra-* ‘Kuppler’ (Simson 2000: 273). This part was treated in Ogihara (2009: 39-40, 181-189). For *ṣito*, B65a1 and B516a2 can be consulted.

⁷ Toch.B *ṣitaitse* would correspond to Skt. *dūtasya* here. Adams gave the meaning ‘± having a price (?)’ to *pitaitse* (1999: 385) on the basis of the proposition given by J. W. Broomhead (1962 [II]: 179). However, this word should be rejected. The genitive form *ṣitaitse* is also attested in SI B Toch./13.1-2 (Pinault 1998: 6 and 7 fn. 6).

⁸ As to this phonetic change, see Peyrot (2008: 78-84). The oblique plural *ṣitaiṃ* appears also in IOL Toch 253a2.

⁹ This fragment could be related to IOL Toch 63 where the last word of a1 would not be *ṣiko* restored by Broomhead (1962 [I]: 144) but *ṣito*.

Siegling (1953: 126 fn. 3) proposed to be a mistake for *pitaiṃ*¹⁰. According to these forms, it is probable that *ṣīto* would belong to the class VI.2 of nouns according to the manual of Tocharian (*TEB I*: 133-134). For a clearer illustration, I give the table of declension of this word:

	Sg.	Pl.
N.	<i>ṣīto</i>	<i>ṣitaiṃ</i> < * <i>ṣitaiñ</i>
Obl.	<i>ṣītai</i> ¹¹	<i>ṣitaiṃ</i>
G.	<i>ṣitaintse</i>	

3: This form should be 3.sg.prs. of *lu-* ‘to send’.

4: Toch.B *kaläl* < Skt. *kalala-* ‘uterus, foetus’ (cf. *MW*: 260c). It would not be based on the subjunctive stem of *kāl-* ‘to bear, endure’ (Adams 1999: 147-148). This etymology could be confirmed by other Chinese parallel texts: 歌羅羅中生 *gēluóluó zhōng shēng* (T.23, no. 1439, 502a20) ‘have lived in *kalala-* (= EMC **ka la la*¹²)’.

5: For *māskētār*, 3.sg.prs. of *māsk-* ‘to be’. This phrase corresponds to Skt. *abhikṣur bhavaty aśramaṇaḥ aśākyaputrīyaḥ dhvasyate bhikṣubhāvāt* (Banerjee *op.cit.*: 67). Toch.B *lalālu* is the preterit participle of the verb *lāl-* ‘strive for’. It is a loan translation of *śramaṇa-*.

6: For *eṃške* ‘while, even, until’.

7: Toch.B *śaulāsa warñai* cooresponds to Skt. *yāvajjīvam*.

8: Read *ya(mā)ṣṣalle*, the gerundive I of *yām-* ‘to do’.

9: This phrase corresponds to Skt. *kaccid evaṃrūpaṃ sthānam*.

10: Sieg and Siegling proposed three akṣaras missing in the lacuna, but one may suppose a somewhat larger space. It would be possible to restore *mā katkat śle*.

11: Toch.B *snai keś klautkesa* corresponds to Skt. *anekaparyāyeṇa*.

12: Toch.B *postāñe rano keriyemane*, cf. *antato hāsyaprekṣiñāpi*. The akṣara <ṣṣg> of *weṣṣalle* has been added under this line. The rest of this line would be *k_v(c)e (ṣpā wentsi pāknāmo)* ‘even less so intending to tell [it]’.

13: Toch.B *sakwä tākalyñe wṣilyñe* corresponds to Skt. *sukhasaṃsparśa-vihāratā-* (cf. *BHSD*: 597a). Among other Vinaya texts, Skt. *saṃsparśa-vihāratā-* appears only in that of the Mūla-sarvāstivādins: *yaḥ punar bhikṣur anabhijānann aparijānann asantam asaṃvidyamānam anuttara- manuṣyadharmam alam āryaviśeṣādhighamaṃ jñānaṃ vā darśanaṃ sparśavihāratām vā pratijñānyād idam jānāmīdam pathyāmīti ...* ‘Whatever monk, unknowing and not understanding, should boast of having superhuman faculties, sufficient knowledge and the specific spiritual realization of the nobles, and insight and a state of comfort which are inexistent and unobtained [by him], saying, “I know this, I see this” ... ’¹³ (Banerjee *op.cit.*: 15).

¹⁰ This form was classified as the plural oblique of *pito* by Broomhead (*op.cit.*: 178) and Adams (*op.cit.*). However, this form should be also rejected.

¹¹ The accusative form *ṣītai* is attested also in PK NS 397.frg.5a4.

¹² The reconstructed forms of EMC (= Early Middle Chinese) are quoted from Pulleyblank (1991).

¹³ The English translation is quoted from Prebish (1975: 53).

14: Toch.B *perne* has been added under this line.

15: It is a scribal error for *wijñānanamntyā(ya)tamm*, cf. Skt. *vijñānānantyāyatana-* (BHSD: 486a).

16: Toch.B *aśubh* has been added under this line.

17: It would be possible to restore *rākṣatsi ñiś lkātsi kāmāskem* ‘the *Rākṣasas* come in order to see me’ on the basis of 鳩槃荼羅刹等來至我所 *jiūpánchá luóchà dēng láizhì wǒsuó* (T.23, no. 1439, 502b2) ‘the *Kumbhāṇḍas*, the *Rākṣasas* etc. come to me’.

[Translation]

- a1 or he pushes her away (in) a great (water), or from a big hindrance he pushes her down, or (on the road)
- 2 he sends a hireling against her, finally, (the foetus) having entered (into the incipient womb) of the mother first,
- 3 indeed, having obtained both elementary powers, [that is] the bodily power and the life power,
- 4 but then he makes zeal for killing this one having come to the uterus (= Skt. *kalala-*), and this one (= the foetus) through his zeal
- 5 reaches death, this (man) is no more a monk, no more an ascetic, no more
- 6 a son of the *Śākya* [clan], he remains (as) having departed from monkhood. Thereupon for the whole life through,
- 7 it should not be done. (You should not violate) any point (= fault) of this sort. Being able to
- 8 stay silent with (your) force, if you do not intend to violate (this point), having been asked, tell (it). By several ways the lord of lords,
- 9 the Buddha-lord blamed telling lie, the turning away and refraining from telling lie
- 10 forcefully he urged [and] praised. Also finally by joking (for fun) one should not tell lie, even less so (intending to tell [it]).
- b1 The monk who, having not reached yet the excellence of any noble ones, praises (falsely) his condition of dwelling with things that are pleasant to touch (= Skt. *sukhasamsparsa-vihāratā-*),
- 2 [saying] either ‘Thus I know’ or ‘Thus I see’, ‘I am an *Arhat*,
- 3 or I am zealous for the status of *Arhat*, I am an *Anāgāmin*, or I am zealous for the status of *Anāgāmin*,
- 4 I am a *Sakṛdāgāmin*, or I am zealous for (the status) of *Sakṛdāgāmin*,
- 5 I am a *Srotāpanna*, or I am zealous for the status of *Srotāpanna*;
- 6 I have obtained the first *Dhyāna*, the second *Dhyāna*, the third *Dhyāna*, the fourth *Dhyāna*;
- 7 I have produced benevolence (= Skt. *maitrī-*), compassion (= Skt. *karuṇā-*), delight (= Skt. *muditā-*), indifference (= Skt. *upekṣā-*), the stage of the infinity of space (= Skt. *ākāśānantyāyatana-*),
- 8 the stage of the infinity of consciousness (= Skt. *vijñānānantyāyatana-*), the stage of nothingness (= Skt. *ākīñcanyāyatana-*), the stage of neither consciousness nor unconsciousness

- (= Skt. *naivasamjñānāsamjñāyatana-*), the contemplation of offensive things (= Skt. *aśubhā-*),
9 the mindfulness of breathing (= Skt. *ānāpānasmṛti-*). The gods come in order to see me, the *Nāgas*, the *Yakṣas*, the *Pretas*, the *Kumbhāṇḍas*, (the *Rākṣasas* come in order to see me).

3. Comparison with parallel texts

As noted above, the parallel text of THT333 can be found in the *Upasampadā-vastu* belonging to the Sarvāstivādins. It corresponds to the chapter XIV, 4.3.c-4.4.d of the critical edition by Jin-il Chung (2004: 94), which is concerned with the *Pārājika-dharma* 3 and 4 of the *Karmavācanā* text. Unfortunately, the Sanskrit corresponding text for this part is lost. Therefore, it is necessary to quote the German translation of the Chinese text given by Chung below in order to make the comparison understandable.

[German translation]¹⁴

(Der Tod ist besser als das Leben, wenn er in dieser Weise bei verschiedenen Gelegenheiten den Gedanken entgegenkommend jenem den Tod beibringt oder anpreist, oder wenn er einen tötet, sei es durch eine Grube, einen Falle, das Schießen mit einem Apparat, das Treten, einen *Bituoluo*, einen Halb-*Bituoluo*, oder wenn er eine Fehlgeburt verursacht, sei es durch das Drücken des Leibes,) das Stoßen [ins Feuer,] ins Wasser, von oben nach unten, oder durch das Schicken eines Beauftragten auf den Weg, oder sei es durch den Abbruch der anfänglichen Schwangerschaft versehen mit zwei *Gens*, d.h. mit dem Körperorgan und der Lebensfähigkeit, und wenn jener aus diesen Gründen stirbt, ist dieser kein *Biqiu*, kein *Shamen* und kein Schüler des *Shijia*-Sohns mehr. Das *Biqiu*-Sein geht verloren. Dies sollst du zeitlebens nicht begehen. Kannst du dies einhalten? Wenn ja, soll man es bejahen.

Der Buddha verurteilte aus verschiedenen Anlässen die unwahre Rede und lobte das Unterlassen der unwahren Rede. Noch nicht einmal aus Spaß soll man unwahre Dinge äußern, geschweige denn absichtlich. Wenn ein *Biqiu* selbst die nicht vorhandene ‘Übermenschliche Norm’ zu wissen behauptet, oder sich rühmt: Ich habe die Frucht des *Eluohan* erlangt. Ich bin einer, der sich auf dem Pfad des *Eluohan* befindet. Ich habe die Frucht des *Enahan* erlangt. Ich bin einer, der sich auf dem Pfad des *Enahan* befindet. Ich habe die Frucht des *Situohan* erlangt. Ich bin einer, der sich auf dem Pfad des *Situohan* befindet. Ich habe die Frucht des *Xutuohan* erlangt. Ich bin einer, der sich auf dem Pfad des *Xutuohan* befindet. Ich habe das erste, zweite, dritte oder vierte *Chan* erlangt. Ich bin mit Güte, Mitleid, Mitfreude und Gleichmut versehen. Ich habe das ‘Raumendlichkeits-Gebiet’ das ‘Bewußtseinsunendlichkeits-Gebiet’, das ‘Nichtsheit-Gebiet’, das ‘Gebiet der Weder-Warnehmung-Noch-Nichtnehmung’, [den Erlöschungszustand,] die Geistesentfaltung durch die Meditation über Ekelobjekte, die *Annabanna-Nian* erreicht. Die *Tians* kommenn zu mir. Die *Longs*, *Yuechas*, Gespenster wie [*Futuoluos*, *Bisheshes*,] *Jupanchas* [und

¹⁴ Toch. B text of THT333 begins after the passage put into brackets.

[Chinese text]

「佛種種因緣訶奪他命。讚歎不奪命。乃至蟻子。不應故奪命。何況人若比丘自手故奪人命。若遣人持刀殺。若教死若讚死。若作是語。咄丈夫。用惡活為。死勝生。隨心隨思。種種因緣教死讚死。若坑殺若弼殺。若機撥殺若蹈殺。若比陀羅殺。若半比陀羅殺。若斷命殺若墮人胎。若按腹墮胎。若排著火中。若排著水中。若在高上排著下殺。若道路遣使殺。乃至母腹中初得二根。身根命根。初在胎中曠欲殺。從是因緣死。非比丘非沙門非釋子。失比丘法。是中盡壽不應作。是事能持不。若能當言能。

佛種種因緣妄語。讚歎不妄語。乃至戲笑不應妄語。何況故妄語。若比丘自知空無過人法。自讚我得阿羅漢果證若向阿羅漢。我得阿那含果證若向阿那含我得斯陀含果證若向斯陀含。我得須陀洹果證若向須陀洹。我得第一禪第二第三第四禪。我得慈悲喜捨空處定識處定無所有處定非有想非無想處定滅盡定不淨觀阿那般那念。諸天來至我所。諸龍闍叉浮陀羅鬼比舍闍鬼拘盤荼鬼羅刹鬼。如是鬼輩問我。我亦問彼。彼亦答我。我亦答彼。是事空無妄語。是非比丘非沙門非釋子。失比丘法。是中盡壽不應作。是事能持不。若能當言能。」

(T.23, no. 1435, 157a21-b16)

We have another Chinese version of this part in the Chinese *Karmavācanā* text, which is the excerpt from the Chinese *Vinayavastu* (十誦羯磨比丘要用 *shísòng jiémó bīqiū yàoyòng*, T.23, no. 1439), though there are some differences between two versions.

「佛種種因緣呵責殺生。讚歎不殺生。乃至蟻子尚不應殺。何況於人。若比丘自手奪人命。若持刀與。若教死讚死。作是言。咄人用惡活為死勝生。隨彼心樂死。種種因緣教死讚死。若作憂多殺。若頭多殺。若作弼作網作撥。若作毘陀羅殺。若似毘陀羅殺。若斷氣殺。若墮胎殺。若按腹殺。若推著火中水中。若從高推下。若遣使道中死。乃至母腹中初得二根。身根命根歌羅羅中生。惡心方便令奪其命。從是因緣死者。是非比丘。非沙門非釋子。失滅比丘法。是事盡壽不應犯。汝能持不(答能)。

佛種種因緣呵責妄語。讚歎不妄語。是中乃至戲笑尚不應妄語。何況故妄語。若比丘不知不見空無過人法。自言我如是知如是見。我得須陀洹果乃至阿羅漢果。我得初禪二禪三禪四禪。我得慈悲喜捨無量空處識處無所有處非想非非想處定。我得不淨觀阿那般那念。諸天來至我所。諸天龍夜叉薛荔毘舍闍鳩槃荼羅刹等來至我所。彼問我答我問彼答。若比丘如是妄語者。是非比丘。非沙門非釋子。失滅比丘法。是事盡壽不應犯。汝能持不(答能)。」

(T.23, no. 1439, 502a12-b02)

It is remarkable that THT333 accords well with the *Karmavācanā* text quoted in the Chinese *Upasampadā-vastu*. However, this fact does not mean that THT333 would belong to the fragment of the *Upasampadā-vastu* of the Sarvāstivādins, for we have the pagination '6' in THT333, and on the

other hand, this part belongs to the final part of the Chinese *Upasampadā-vastu*. This implies that THT333 would belong to the *Karmavācanā* text compiled in Tocharian Buddhism¹⁵. It is important to state that the corresponding part to THT333 is found in the Chinese the *Upasampadā-vastu*. Because it is said that this Vinaya text had been translated from Sanskrit into Chinese by *Kumārajīva* at the beginning of the 5th century, it could be said that the *Karmavācanā* text of this type had been already compiled in the Sarvāstivādins and it had been transmitted into China through Central Asia. THT333 would confirm that the *Karmavācanā* text of this type had been also known to the monastery of the *Kucha* region, the center of Tocharian Buddhism. It can shed light on the activity of the Sarvāstivādin monks in Central Asia.

In this connection, the bilingual (Toch. B/Sanskrit) *Karmavācanā* text in the Berlin collection edited and translated by Dr. K.T. Schmidt in 1986 should be mentioned. According to his work, this bilingual *Karmavācanā* text can be divided into two parts, namely, the text for ‘*pravrajyā*’, and that for ‘*upasampadā*’. We have the corresponding part to the former text in the chapter V of this edition (2004: 49-50) of the *Upasampadā-vastu* of the Sarvāstivādins. The Sanskrit texts in the latter part are pointed out by Jin-il Chung in the chapter XIII of his edition (2004: 83-86). Some passages written in Tocharian B are also attested here. However, the wording of ritual formulae written in Tocharian B is quite different from the text of the *Upasampadā-vastu* of the Sarvāstivādins.¹⁶ This text could show the actual use of the *Karmavācanā* text in the Tocharian Buddhist community.

On the other hand, in the prescription of the *Pārājika-dharma* 4 in Tocharian version, we have **sakwā tākalyñe wšlyñe*, which could be compared with Skt. *sukhasaṃsparśa-vihāratā*-. In the Vinaya texts, this word can be attested only in the version of the Mūla-sarvāstivādins. Although the text of THT333 accords well with that of the Sarvāstivādins, we have a phraseology that can be found only in the Vinaya text of the Mūla-sarvāstivādins in the prescription itself. In my opinion, this could be explained as follows: there would have existed some traditions with slight differences in the Sarvāstivādins, one of which would have been the so-called Mūla-sarvāstivādin, and the Tocharian Vinaya texts would reflect this complexity inside the Sarvāstivādins. In his articles, Prof. Enomoto (1998 and 2004) assumes that basically the Sarvāstivādins and the Mūla-sarvāstivādins would have been the same school, and there would have existed two, or more than two different Vinaya texts in the Sarvāstivādins.¹⁷ Tocharian Vinaya texts could confirm this theory.¹⁸

¹⁵ THT334, whose pagination is ‘8’, should belong to the same manuscript as THT333 on the basis of its formal peculiarities and its content, though we do not have the corresponding part in the Chinese *Upasampadā-vastu*.

¹⁶ In addition, THT333 belongs to the latter half of the text for ‘*upasampadā*’, though we do not have this part in the bilingual *Karmavācanā* text.

¹⁷ This has been already pointed out on the basis of the Sanskrit fragments discovered in Central Asia, cf. Simson (2000: 2-13). See also Sasaki (2000) and Clarke (2001).

¹⁸ On the basis of my research on the Tocharian Vinaya texts, it is possible to connect them with tradition of the (Mūla-)sarvāstivādins, cf. Oghara (2009: 498-508). In fact, there are other fragments that show the Mūla-sarvāstivādin affiliation in the Tocharian *Karmavācanā* texts (= IOL Toch 139 and IOL Toch 1148), see Oghara (2011: 124 fn. 21 and 128-130). Although the former fragment has been classified as the *Mahāvvyūtpatti* since the study of the first editor (Broomhead 1962 [I]: xi, 137-140), it should be classified as the *Karmavācanā* text on the basis of its content. On the other hand, Tocharian B *sthūlāncana*, the plural form of **sthūlānce* which is the same as

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I discussed the identification of THT333 with the *Karmavācanā* text quoted in the Chinese *Upasampadā-vastu* and the importance of this fragment for the study of the transmission of the Vinaya texts of the (Mūla-)sarvāstivādins from India to China. The study of Tocharian literature can shed light on the history of the Buddhism in Central Asia. However, the task of interpreting Tocharian texts, which contains lots of difficulties, should be dealt with from the point of view of the history of the (Mūla-)sarvāstivādins.

References

- Adams, Douglas Q. (1999) *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Banerjee, Anukul Chandra (1977) *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit: Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya*. Calcutta: The World Press Private Limited.
- BHSD = Edgerton, Franklin (1953) *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary. Vol. II: Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Broomhead, J. W. (1962) *A Textual Edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kuchean Manuscripts. With Transliteration, Translation, Grammatical Commentary and Vocabulary*, by J. W. Broomhead, Ph.D.Diss. Trinity College, Cambridge, 2 vols.
- Clarke, Shayne (2001) The Mūla-sarvāstivāda Vinaya Muktata. *Buddhist Studies* 30: 81-107.
- Enomoto Fumio (1998) Mūlasarvāstivādin and Sarvāstivādin. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, 47-1, 111-119 (in Japanese).
- Enomoto Fumio (2004) Emergence of 'Mūla-Sarvāstivādin. In: *Studies on Indian Philosophy and Buddhist Thoughts. Volume in Honor of Professor Esho Mikogami*. Kyoto: Nagata-bunsho-do, 651-677 (in Japanese).
- Lévi, Sylvain (1912) Un fragment tokharien du Vinaya des Sarvāstivādins (Collection Hoernle N^o 149.4). *Journal Asiatique*, 10^e série, tome 19: 101-111.
- Malzahn, Melanie (2007) The Most Archaic Manuscripts of Tocharian B and the Varieties of the Tocharian B Language. In: Melanie Malzahn (ed.), *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Heidelberg: Winter, 255-297.
- MW = Monier-Williams, Monier (1899) *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ogihara Hirotoishi (2009) *Researches about Vinaya-texts in Tocharian A and B*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, EPHE.
- Ogihara Hirotoishi (2011) Notes on some Tocharian Vinaya fragments in the London and Paris collections. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12: 111-144.

the original form *(s)thūlāñca reconstructed on the basis of 偷蘭遮 *tōu lán zhē* (= EMC*^haw lan teia), is attested in IOL Toch 139a7. However, the term 偷蘭遮 is used in the *Vinayavibhāṅga* belonging to the Sarvāstivādins. Unfortunately, the provenance of these fragments is unknown. It has been studied in Ogihara (2009: 158 and 465-467). On IOL Toch 1148b3, see Ogihara (2011: 128-130).

- Ogihara Hirotoši (2012) On the Poṣatha ceremony in the Tocharian Buddhist texts. *The Annual of Research Institute for Buddhist Culture Ryūkoku University* 35: 22-28.
- Ogihara Hirotoši (forthc.) A fragment of the Bhikṣu-prātimokṣasūtra in Tocharian B. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13.
- Peyrot, Michaël (2007) *An edition of the Tocharian fragments IOL Toch 1 - IOL Toch 822 in the India Office Library, London*. London: International Dunhuang Project. <http://idp.bl.uk>.
- Peyrot, Michaël (2008) *Variation and Change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean (1998) Economic and administrative documents in Tocharian B from the Berezovsky and Petrovsky collections. *Manuscripta Orientalia* 4 (4): 3-20.
- Prebish, S. Charles (1975) *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtra of the Mahāsāṃghika and Mūlasarvāstivādin*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (1991) *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Sasaki Shizuka (2000) Vinayas Quoted in the Vibhāṣā. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 49-1: 413-421 (in Japanese).
- Schmidt, Klaus T. (1986) *Fragmente eines buddhistischen Ordinationsrituals in westtocharischer Sprache. Aus der Schule der Sarvāstivādins. Text, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen und Indizes*. Unpublished habilitation thesis.
- Sieg, Emil and Wilhelm Siegling (1953) *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Heft 2. Fragmente Nr. 71-633*. Aus dem Nachlass hrsg. von Werner Thomas. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Simson, Georg von (2000) *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins. Teil II: Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex*. (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, XI). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- T. = *Taishō Tripiṭaka*.
- Tamai Tatsushi (2007) *An edition of the Tocharian fragments IOL Toch 855 - IOL Toch 1247 in the India Office Library, London*. London: International Dunhuang Project, <http://idp.bl.uk>.
- Tamai Tatsushi (2011) *Paläographische Untersuchungen zum B-Tocharischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- TEB I = Krause, Wolfgang and Werner Tomas (1960) *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band I: Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- TochSprR(B) = Sieg, Emil and Wilhelm Siegling (1953).

[Addendum]

I published the article entitled ‘The Avadāna manuscript in Tocharian B’ in the preceding number (vol. 32) of *TULiP*, where a verbal root *maut-* (?) ‘to dedicate (?)’ was set up on the basis of Toch.B *mautāne* (which should belong to the class I of the preterite system). After the submission of the final version, I found another attestation of this root in a wooden stick kept in the Xinjiang Kucha Academy (cf. *Comprehensive Record of Contents of Kizil Grottoes*. page X. 2000, Ürümqi: Xinjiang Meishu Sheying Chubanshe). The transliteration of this phrase is as follows:

klaina tenkeš\ ruwe mautanamane malwer\ kamānte kuntinta 7.

Here Toch.B *mautanamane* could be the present participle middle of this root, which tells us that this root should belong to the class VI of the present system. These forms make it possible to set up a verbal root *maut-* (Prs.VI, Pt. I). Although the meaning presented by me is compatible with this attestation, it needs more attestations to confirm the meaning of this root.



Plate 1: THT333 recto/verso

Depositum der BERLIN-BRANDENBURGISCHEN AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN in
der STAATSBIBLIOTHEK ZU BERLIN - Preussischer Kulturbesitz Orientabteilung

ドイツ所蔵トカラ語断片 THT333 について

荻原 裕敏

キーワード: トカラ語 B THT333 説一切有部 『十誦律』

要旨

本稿ではドイツ所蔵トカラ語断片 THT333 を扱う。本断片は古風な *Brāhmī* 文字で書写されており、また言語特徴の面からも Archaic Tocharian B として知られる特徴を留めているため、トカラ語文献中、古層に属する断片であると判断される。1953 年に *TochSprR(B) II* によってローマ字転写が出版された際、この断片は *Prātimokṣa* に属する断片として分類され、既にいくつかの研究でも言及されているが、これまでこの断片の比定には至っていなかった。漢訳仏典中の律蔵と比較した結果、筆者は説一切有部の広律である『十誦律』巻 21「受具足戒法」に収められた羯磨文中に対応部分が見出される事を発見した。しかしながら、THT333 は全ての点について『十誦律』の対応箇所一致するわけではなく、「波羅夷法之四」の条文に相当する部分に根本説一切有部律のものと一致する部分が見られた。これらの事実は、梵漢蔵文による仏典研究から提出されている、説一切有部の内部には複数の律が存在しており、所謂根本説一切有部と称される部派もその内の一つであったとする主張をトカラ語文献からも裏付けると同時に、律蔵で規定された羯磨文が実際に西域北道の仏教の中心地であった *Kucha* 地域で受容されていた事を示している。

(おぎはら・ひろとし 中国人民大学国学院)