

## ON THE SOGDIAN *PRĀTIHĀRYA-SŪTRA* AND THE RELATED PROBLEMS

### ONE ASPECT OF THE BUDDHIST SOGDIAN TEXTS FROM TURFAN

YOSHIDA Yutaka \*

Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University  
Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan  
e-mail: Yutaka.Yoshida@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp

In this paper three Buddhist Sogdian texts discovered from Turfan are identified and edited. These are unique among the Buddhist Sogdian texts in that they are not translated from the Chinese prototypes, but are dependent on, if not translated from, the originals which were popular among the Buddhists resident in Kucha, Karashahr or Turfan, i.e. the area along the Northern Silk Road, whereas most Buddhist Sogdian texts are shown to have been translated from Chinese originals. The three are the Sogdian versions of (1) the *Karmavibhaṅga*, (2) the so-called *Prātihārya-sūtra* or chapter twelve of the *Divyāvadāna*, and (3) the legend of King Kāñcanasāra. The last one constitutes the fifth chapter of the *Daśakarmapathavadānamālā*, of which the Tocharian and Uighur versions have been discovered.

*Key words:* Sogdian, Silk Road, Turfan, Buddhism, *Karmavibhaṅga*, *Prātihārya-sūtra*, Kāñcanasāra legend.

### Introduction

The publication of Ch. Reck's (2016) catalogue of the Buddhist Sogdian fragments of the German Turfan collection no doubt marks the new epoch of Buddhist Sogdian studies. While almost all the texts preserved in London, Paris, St. Petersburg, and Kyoto have been made public, there still remain a large number of unpublished fragments in the Berlin collection. This catalogue gives a very clear idea as to how much is left to be done.

Since many, if not most, of the Buddhist Sogdian texts were translated from a Chinese original, the availability of the database of the Taishō Tripiṭaka has raised

\* This study has been supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C: 716180100007). I would like to thank Professor N. Sims-Williams for his valuable suggestions on this paper. Needless to say, any remaining flaws are entirely my responsibility.

the hope that even a small fragment of the German Turfan collection can be identified with its source text. This is certainly true and in searching for the Chinese originals of unpublished texts, I myself have greatly benefitted from this database. One of the latest identification aided by the database is the Sogdian version of the *Lengqieshiziji* 楞伽師資記 (Yoshida 2017). This discovery is intriguing also from the viewpoint of Sogdian Buddhism, especially since the Chinese text is one of the earliest texts of Zen 禪 or Chan 禪 Buddhism and is known to have been composed by a Chinese monk Jingjue 淨覺 in the early 8th century.<sup>1</sup> Thus it becomes clear that Sogdians were also familiar with this very Sinicised form of Buddhism as well as popular Mahāyāna texts. It also provides the *post quem* date of a Sogdian Buddhist text. I must hurry to add that I have long been arguing that some Chinese Sogdians were followers of Chan Buddhism (Yoshida 2009), but prior to this discovery this has only been an assumption or an educated guess based on the Sogdian translations of such apocryphal *sūtras* as *Dhūta*-text and *Dharmarāja sūtra*, which were repeatedly cited in Chinese Chan literatures.

Chan texts were popular in those days, but many of them were later lost, some of which have survived among the Dunhuang Chinese manuscripts. As a matter of fact, the above-mentioned *Lengqieshiziji* is one such text and is now included in Volume 85 of the *Taishō Tripitaka*, in which volume are assembled those Buddhist Chinese texts that were discovered in Dunhuang but are otherwise unknown. A considerable number of similar Chinese texts, both from Dunhuang and Turfan, have not yet been made easily accessible to non-specialists. As an example, take the Buddhist Chinese fragment So 14830 (Yoshida 2013). It cites a passage from the *Dasheng qixin lun* 大乘起信論, but the rest is not known. In other words, the entire text of So 14 830 represents a so far unknown Chinese text. It is most likely that the Chinese original of some of the so far unidentified Buddhist Sogdian fragments will eventually be discovered among such Dunhuang and Turfan materials. One should also pay attention to the so far unnoticed collections of Buddhist Chinese texts preserved in old temples in Japan that have been extensively surveyed by a team headed by Professor T. Ochiai.<sup>2</sup>

While the majority of the unpublished Turfan fragments are unidentified, there are a small number of texts of a different sort. They are somehow identifiable with certain Buddhist texts, but of which the direct prototypes or sources remain unknown. In this paper, I will discuss two such texts. One of them is a Sogdian text related to the so-called *Prātihārya-sūtra* or Chapter Twelve of the *Divyāvadāna*, and the other is the Sogdian version of the *Karmavibhaṅga*. The two texts do not seem to be dependent on any so far known Chinese prototypes, but are likely to go back to a Sanskrit or possibly Tocharian original. As a matter of fact, a few Buddhist Sogdian texts discovered in Turfan betray the influence of Tocharian Buddhism, i.e. either translated from Tocharian or indicating the connection with the texts popular among the Buddhists resident in Kucha, Karashahr or the area along the Northern Silk Road.

<sup>1</sup> Quite recently M. Mitani (2018: 675) was able to discover a small fragment of the Chinese text in the German Turfan collection (Ch 0365). For more recent studies on the Dunhuang Chinese manuscripts of the *Lengqieshiziji*, see Tanaka and Tei (2014: 31–37).

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Ochiai 1991.

For example, there is a colophon mentioning that it was translated from Kuchean, although the text itself has remained unidentified (Yoshida 2015: 175, no. 45).

This paper will be concluded with the revised edition of the legend of King Kāñcanasāra, which constitutes the fifth chapter of the *Daśakarmapathavadānamālā*, another Buddhist work popular along the Northern Silk Road.

## 1. *Karmavibhaṅga*

So 14700 (22) and So 14700 (23) are obviously two fragments from the same manuscript which must have been a scroll made out of ruled sheets of paper prepared for copying Buddhist Chinese texts.<sup>3</sup> The text is written with a variety of the Sogdian script generally referred to as formal script, formerly called *sūtra*-script. Assuming that the text of So 14700 (22) and (23) was translated from a Chinese original, I searched for the possible Chinese counterparts of a few Sogdian words in the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*. Soon I came across a passage of the so-called *Śuka-sūtra* (T01n0080: *Fo wei shoujia zhangzhe shuo yebao chabie jing* 佛爲首迦長者說業報差別經), which at first glance seems to correspond closely to So 14700 (22). The Sanskrit text corresponding to T01n0080 is called *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* by S. Lévi, who discovered a few Sanskrit manuscripts of the *sūtra* in Nepal and published a monograph (Lévi 1932) comprising the edition of the Sanskrit text as well as the closely related Chinese, Tibetan, and Tocharian versions. Subsequent scholars refer to this *sūtra* simply as *Karmavibhaṅga*. H. W. Bailey discovered some fragments of the Khotanese version, to which a few more fragments were added by R. E. Emmerick. Later M. Maggi (1995) discovered additional fragments and edited the entire Khotanese manuscripts. Recently, the Sanskrit text was revised by N. Kudo (2004), who collated the original manuscripts including the ones not known to Lévi. The revised text and its English translation of the Tocharian B version were made available by T. Tamai (2015). For yet another new Sanskrit text see footnote 7 below.

The tradition of the *Karmavibhaṅga* that relates causes and effects of actions goes back to the earliest Buddhist literature and one finds the Pali text in one of the *Nikāya* collections and a few corresponding Chinese versions. However, the texts collected and compared with each other by Lévi represent a much developed stage and comprise more than 80 karmas or actions in comparison to the earlier versions with only 14 karmas. The Sogdian text of So 14700 (22) corresponds to the 65th karma in

<sup>3</sup> Judging from the morphology of the manuscript (paper and handwriting) Reck (2016: 141–142) considers a small fragment So 13901 as belonging to the same manuscript. It indeed does look like So 14700 (22) and (23); however, while the latter two fragments bear the old signature T II Toyoq, that of So 13901 is T II D 63, thus one may be advised to be prudent in assigning So 13901 to the same manuscript as So 14700 (22) and (23). In any case it has not been possible to identify So 13901 with its original. Here follows my text of the fragment: /1/ [... c]kn'c[...] /2/ [... mr]txm'(•)[ ](•)[...](•y) /3/ [... ] (δ)[y]wyšnw ZKw ptr 'yδ L' δ'rt 'HRZY ms /4/ [...] (k)w yrβ L' kβny rty pyšt w'yrwnc /5/ [...]w wyt'rt rty 'yw /6/ [...]t 'HRZY k(w) δšt(y)[c] '[...] from which [...] a man [...] he has no contact (*lit.* mixing) with them. Again, [...] much not little. But such [...] he departs and one [...] Then, to the building(?) [...].'

the Sanskrit text and the 53rd of the Khotanese text as edited by Maggi (1995). Since the Sogdian version most likely goes back to the 8th century, the three Tibetan versions and one Chinese version (T01n0081, translated between 982–1000 CE) as possible prototypes of the Sogdian version are excluded. For that matter, the much later Sanskrit text from Nepal would also be excluded, but here I cite it with the French translation, so that one may have some idea about the wording of the Sanskrit original once existing in Central Asia and China.

Now I am giving the text and translation of So 14700(22)<sup>4</sup> and the corresponding part in the T01n0080, the Sanskrit text edited by Lévi, and the English translations of the Khotanese and the Tocharian B versions.

- 1 [ ]βnt 'p(r)[tmy xwnx 'kyty<sup>5</sup>
- 2 zrw' wnxr βyrt '(P)[ZY δβtyk xwnx 'kyty
- 3 [m](z)'yx šyrn'm'k '(P)[ZY]( 'tδtyk xwnx)[
- 4 [β]wt ZY 'βy'wn'k 'PZY ctβ'rmy xw[nx 'kyty?
- 5 ['](t)šy ZK w'xš šw'm'ntk 'PZY p[ncmy xwnx 'kyty
- 6 γnt'k ZY ZKw pts'rtk w'xš[...]
- 7 sy''kh nβ'nt ''γ'wstk[... 'PZY 'xwšmy xwnx 'kyty?
- 8 ZKw p'γ'wk wnxr L' pty[wš-?
- 9 pts'ynt'nt 'PZY 'βtmy xwn[x 'kyty
- 10 [ ](t)[ '(P)ZY 'š(t)[my xwnx 'kyty

[If the living beings donate a bell to a Buddhist temple and a *stūpa*, what] are [the ten merits for them?] The fir[st is that] one will obtain the voice of Brahman. [And the second is that one will be a man] of great fame. A[nd the third is that one] will be [...] and a prophet. And the fourth [is that one will be ...] and his word will be persuading. And the fi[fth is that ...] evil and the cold word [...] covered with a canopy [... And the sixth is that ...] will not hear(?) the =?<sup>6</sup> voice [... and people] will be pleased [with him?]. And the seventh [is that ...] and the eighth [is that ...]

Here follow the Chinese version (T01n0080\_p0894c22-28) and its English translation prepared by myself.

<sup>4</sup> In the text (parentheses) indicate uncertain readings mainly due to damage to the paper. Illegible damaged letters are indicated by parenthesised bullets: (•••). Wholly restored letters are placed in [square brackets]. An equal sign (=) indicates the blank space for a binding hole. In the translation, words not in the Sogdian text and added to improve the English are placed in (parentheses), while word(s) in [square brackets] correspond to the restored part of the text.

<sup>5</sup> Restoration of *xwnx 'kyty* is based on '*xwšmy xwnx 'kyty* 'the sixth (is) that' encountered in line 6 of So 14700 (23). Originally '*kyty* (= *ZKZY*) is a relative pronoun, but sometimes, though not commonly, it introduces a subordinate clause: e.g. '*γw xwnx ZKZY styw ZKw wrzrw w'xš w'βt rty šy nyδ'y L' pyrt* 'One (is) that, although he speaks the truth, nobody believes him' (SCE 454–455). This usage is also attested in Christian Sogdian. See Sims-Williams 2016: 100–101, s.v. <sup>2</sup>*qy* and <sup>2</sup>*qyt*.

<sup>6</sup> *p'γ'wk* is an unknown word.

若有衆生，奉施鍾鈴，得十種功德。一者得梵音聲。二者有大名聞。三者自識宿命。四者所有出言，人皆敬受。五者常有寶蓋，以自莊嚴。六者有妙瓔珞，以爲服飾。七者面貌端嚴，見者歡喜。八者具大福報。九者命終生天。十者速證涅槃。是名奉施鍾鈴得十種功德。

If there are living beings who donate bells (to a Buddhist temple and a stūpa), they will obtain ten kinds of merits. (1) One is that they get the voice of Brahman. (2) The second is that they will have great fame. (3) The third is that they will themselves understand previous lives. (4) The fourth is that when they pronounce words, people will accept them with honour. (5) The fifth is that they will always have a canopy made out of jewels and will adorn themselves. (6) The sixth is that they will have excellent necklaces and will ornament themselves with them. (7) The seventh is that their facial appearance is so pretty and dignified that those who will see them will be delighted. (8) The eighth is that they will be rewarded with great fortune. (9) The ninth is that when they die they will be born in the heaven. (10) The tenth is that they will quickly attain nirvāṇa. (11) These are the names of the ten kinds of merits that one obtains when one donates bells (to a Buddhist temple and a stūpa).

Here is the Sanskrit text (LXV) and the French translation (Levi 1932: 144):

katame daśānuśamsā ghaṇṭā-pradānasya. ucyate. (1) abhirūpo bhavati. (2) susvaro bhavati. (3) manojña-bhāṣī bhavati. (4) kalaviṅka-ruta-bhāṣī bhavati. (5) ādeya-vākya bhavati. (6) nityaṃ samprahārṣa-jato bhavati. (7) punaḥ punar ānandaṃ śabdaṃ śṛṇoti. (8) svargeṣūpapadyate. (9) mahābhogaś ca bhavati. (10) kṣipraṃ ca parinirvāti. (11) ime daśa guṇā ghaṇṭā-pradānasya.<sup>7</sup>

Quels sont les dix avantages qu'on a pour l'offrande d'une cloche ? Réponse : (1) On est beau; (2) on a un beau timbre de voix ; (3-4) on a la voix comme le chant de l'oiseau Kalaviṅka ; (5) on a la parole persuasive ; (6) on est toujours prêt au battement (?) ; (7) on entend et on entend encore des sons délicieux ; (8) on va renaître au ciel ;<sup>8</sup> (10) on atteint vite le Parinirvāṇa. (11) Tel sont les dix avantages qu'on a pour l'offrande d'une cloche.

I cite the English translation of the Khotanese text (No. 53) from Maggi (1995: 79–80):

<sup>7</sup> The corresponding text is found in a manuscript belonging to the Schøyen collection. I cite this text as reconstructed by Kudo (2018: 498): katame daśa dharmā upacitā bhavanti ghaṇṭāpradānena | (1) ratnasvaro bhavati (2) valguvaro bhavati (3) raṃjanīyasvaro bhavati u[...] (8) mahābhogo bhavati (9) svarge upapadyate (10) kṣiparam ca parinirvāyati | (11) ime daśa dharmā upacitā bhavanti ghaṇṭāpradānena.

<sup>8</sup> The French translation of section 9 is omitted inadvertently. It should have read 'on a une grande situation'.

Which are the ten advantages (for him) who fastens a bell to a stūpa?  
 (1) [The first is that] he becomes good in appearance. (2–3) The second  
 is ... pleasant those ... (4) The fourth is that ... (5) [The fifth] is that he  
 has an agreeable speech. (6) The sixth is ... (7) The seventh is that he [be-  
 comes] always [joyful]. (8) [And the eighth is that he becomes wealthy.]  
 (9) [The ninth] is that he [takes] birth among the gods. (10) [The tenth  
 is that he quickly goes out of saṃsāra.] [These] are the ten advantages  
 [(for him) who fastens a bell to a stūpa.]

The English translation of the Tocharian B version is cited from Tamai (2015: 365–366):

(There are) ten benefits (that come along) with the gift of a bell in the *caitya* of the all-knowing one; now I would explain (< say) that. You must hear ... with (your) attentive (< determined) mind! (1–2) The person is good in terms of speech, good in terms of voice. (3) And his voice is pleasing to the minds. (4–5) His speech is pretty ... to hear. (6) Regarding joy, the person also has (< is) much (of it) innately (< in his birth). (7) He hears joyful talk (and) speech forever (< always and always), surely he does not hear speech evoking the despondent. (8) He obtains many (< big) possessions (and) is born among gods. (9–10) Quickly, however, he is freed from saṃsāra (and) obtains nirvāṇa. They are the ten benefits for one who makes worship of the Buddha-god with (< of) ten powers ...

The comparison between what has remained in the Sogdian fragment and the other five versions<sup>9</sup> indicates that the Sogdian version does not strictly correspond to any of the five, although the Chinese text of T01n0080 is the closest. In the case of So 14700 (23), while *vihāra* and *stūpa* could be the key words for identification, even so it is not possible to find the corresponding passage in the completely preserved Chinese and Sanskrit texts, notwithstanding the fact that in the case of the Buddhist Sogdian texts that are more or less faithfully translated from a Chinese prototype, it is usually not very difficult to identify their original, even though the texts in question are small fragments. Below, I quote my text and translation of the fragment.

So 14700(23) T II Toyoq A 24

1	cw]pr w(γšty)?	... he rejoices at ( <i>lit.</i> on) ...
2	wy](n)t '(W)[ZY ](pt)γ'wšt rty	... [he sees or] hears. And ...
3	xwn'](x) 'kyty 'ny' ''δ'k	... is that another person ...
4	z'ry ](Z)Y šyr'k syt 'PZY	... shows [mercy] and kindness...
5	](.)m nmγwn'k wynt 'WZ(Y)šw	... sees with contempt or ... him ...
6	](t ')PZY 'xwšmy xwnx 'kyty	... And the sixth is that ...
7	'βc'n](pδy?) ZKw βrx'r 't 'stwp	... <i>vihāra</i> and <i>stūpa</i> ...

<sup>9</sup> Including the text found in the Schøyen manuscript (see note 7 above).

8	ʾβ]tmy xwnʾx ʾkyty ʾnyw	... the seventh is that another ...
9	](^kyty ZKw) šyrʾnkʾ(rʾw)	... [the eighth is] that the pious ...
10	mʾ](t) ʾB(Y)[ʾ ](s)ʾr	... to the parents ...
11	]().[ ](δ)[y]nδʾrt	... religious men ...

Seeing all these difficulties, it would be easier to suppose that the Sogdian text was translated from a so far unknown Sanskrit text. In fact, the Sogdian version of the *Śuka-sūtra* has long been known among the Dunhuang texts, and was first studied by Rosenberg (1920) and later by Ragoza (1980). Unfortunately, since what has survived is only the beginning of the text comprising a long panegyric to the Buddha and a very little part from the introductory episode of a dog barking at the Buddha, virtually nothing is known about its contents. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the name of the dog is *c ʾwšr*, and its Brahmin master is called *ptm ʾpr ʾyš*, because both are totally different from those found in the Sanskrit and Chinese versions: *Śaṅkhakuñjara* and *Śuka Mānava Taudeyaputra*. Let us compare the Sogdian and the Sanskrit versions of the very beginning of the story.

Sogdian (English translation by Yoshida 2009: 303):

(1) Thus [I heard: Once the Buddha was at] (2) Śrāvastī [...] <sup>10</sup> (34) Then the devātideva Buddha put on his clothing and took a bowl. He took up a basket(?) <sup>11</sup> and entered the great city of Śrāvastī to beg food. He began to beg for alms (from house to house) in succession. When he arrived at the door of the Brahmin Padmapresh, there was a dog named Chaushar. When it saw the devātideva Buddha, being ill-tempered, it began to bark at him. The devātideva Buddha, who was omniscient, ...

Sanskrit (French translation by Lévi 1932: 107):

C'est ainsi que j'ai entendu — une fois — le Très Saint était à Śrāvastī, au jardin d'Anāthapiṇḍada. Et alors le Très Saint au matin s'habilla, prit son bol et son froc, et il entra dans Śrāvastī pour mendier sa nourriture. Il fit sa tournée dans Śrāvastī selon l'ordre régulier, et il atteignit la maison de Śuka Mānava, le fils de Taudeya. Or, à ce moment-là dans la maison de Śuka Mānava, le fils de Taudeya, [le chien] Conque-Éléphant, couché sur une litière recouverte d'un matelas, mange une bouillie de riz et de viande dans une écuelle de cuivre posée sur une fourneau. Le Très Saint vit Conque-Éléphant couché sur une litière recouverte d'un matelas, qui mangeait dans une écuelle de cuivre posée sur un fourneau. Et Conque-Éléphant vit le Très Saint sur le seuil, et sans se déranger, il se mit à aboyer. Et le Très Saint s'adressa ainsi à Conque-Éléphant ...

This situation may induce one to assume that the Dunhuang Sogdian text was based on a very unique prototype in Sanskrit (or possibly in other languages), and if the Turfan

<sup>10</sup> Between line 3 and line 34 a summary of what the Buddha achieved is inserted as a kind of long panegyric.

<sup>11</sup> *cynr* here translated as 'basket' is another unknown word.

text was translated from the same original, section LXV would also be considerably different from the other versions. It is worth mentioning that apart from the manuscripts found in Nepal, one fragment from Central Asia (Lévi 1932: 235–236) and another from the Schøyen collection have been known (Kudo 2018 and see also note 7 above).

## 2. *Prātihārya-sūtra*

The next example is a group of fragments belonging to the former Leningrad collection. Among the 120 texts published by Ragoza (1980) one finds 10 fragments belonging to one and the same manuscript. In his review of Ragoza (1980), N. Sims-Williams (1981: 235) remarks as follows:

Another group of fragments belonging to a single MS consists of L40, 49, 50, 52, 81, and 89 (perhaps 35a and 35b). This text, which should surely be identifiable, seems to recount a disputation between the heretic Upaka ('wp'k', 40.3, 10) and the Buddha, who is several times referred to as 'Gautama the śramaṇa' (k'wδ'm śmny, 49.1, 3; 81.9) or as 'Śākyaputra' (ś'ky-zt'k, 52.16). The setting for this encounter is the city of Rājagṛha (r'ckry knδyh, 81.4) in Magadha (m'kt 'wt'kh, 89.5), whose ruler King Bimbisāra (pym's'r xwt'w, 40.14; 49.8; 81.14) also plays a part in the story.

As I stated in my article (Yoshida 1983: 147, Note 5), L36 and L55 also belong to the group. Later in 1996 Livšič published yet another fragment, which is the largest among the group and vividly describes the disputation between King Bimbisāra and the heretics. Nevertheless, the text has not yet been identified. Quite recently I noticed the personal name Pūraṇa in L81, line 4: J(p)wrn'y bykδyn'y mζ'yx mwck' ['Pūraṇa, a great teacher of a heretical religion'. Pūraṇa plays an important role in the 12th chapter of the *Divyāvadāna* entitled *Prātihārya-sūtra* ('Miracle sūtra') and the longest fragment does show parallels, and the story is most likely to correspond to an episode in the *Miracle sūtra*.

Let us first summarise the story found in the *Divyāvadāna* as translated by A. Rotman (2008: 253–287). Here I focus on the beginning of the story and omit the rest, except for the denouement of the narrative, because what is left in the Sogdian fragments corresponds to the opening part of the legend:

When the Buddha appeared, he and his community made up of his disciples were respected and supported by kings and other notables. At that time in the city of Rājagṛha there lived six heretic teachers headed by Pūraṇa, who did not know everything but claimed they did. Whatever benefits and respect the heretics had were completely destroyed because of the Buddha and his community. They then approached the king of Magadha, Bimbisāra and asked him to give them a chance to compete with the Buddha in displaying miracles. They claimed: 'If the ascetic Gautama makes use of his magical powers and displays a single miracle, we'll display two. If the ascetic Gautama displays two, we'll display four.' The king categorically refused their

request by reproaching them for committing extravagance: ‘You’ll be corpses before your magic works on the Blessed One!’ Later the heretics approached the king again, this time while he was on the road. The king rejected the request again saying, ‘If you request this of me third time, I’ll banish you from the kingdom!’ Then it occurred to the heretics that Bimbisāra being the Buddha’s supporter they should approach King Prasenajit of Kośala. After that when Bimbisāra visited the Buddha, the Buddha decided to go to Śrāvastī in Kośala to display miracles. King Prasenajit built a pavilion for the contest between the heretics and the Buddha, where the Buddha displayed twin miracles and defeated the heretics. The heretics fled and Pūraṇa committed suicide in a pool.

I give the slightly revised text and translation of Kr IV/879 once published by Livšic (1996).

### Text

1 [ (t) skwn γr'yw (β)[ ]  
 2 βryn̄h 'wy pwty p'(δ)[y? ]  
 3 kδ'm mz'yx kwtr ZY 'sty Z(Y) kt'm pδβry ZY cw š' s'rstyh 'st[y rty]  
 4 šm'xw xypδ krz wrz ZY ''k'cy šw'mnty wrcwnyh myδ xcy c'n'w ZK  
 5 syc'kk βrwzty ZY šm'x xypδ š'str ywk ywxs'mnty myδ m'n'wk  
 6 xcy c'n'w wr'γ-y wnxr cym'nty cw ny'z-'nk'w'y 'sty šm'xw kw h  
 7 βc'npδy xwyštr s'r 'nδ'yšny myδ 'yšδ' c'nw xw ''tr pr'n'k 'kw  
 8 xwyr rwxšny'k s'r 'nδ'yšny šm'xw cw mrtxm'yt 'yšδ' p'rZY ptkwn  
 9 wyn m'ny δrδ'yc ''mrz-y 'yšδ' mn' rty c'γ-w'n'k rxnt' skwn  
 10 'wy βc'npδy xwyštry prnw 'nx'wnc ptz-y'm'c kwn'y-cyk w'xš w'β'y  
 11 šwδ' šwδ' pyšt mn' s'r nw-p'šy L' βyrδ' c'n'w xw pyms'r  
 12 xwt'w mwn'w w'xš wγtw k'ry ywn'yδ wytr kw š'ykn s'r tys rty  
 13 wyšntw ptkwn-wyn'yt γmy pt'y[δy] p'r'xs'nt šyr ''z-rt<sup>a</sup> w'stnt  
 14 šβ'r(y) [ZY] c'wn xwt'w š'ykny nyz'y(n)t m'δ w'β'nt r(••)[ ]<sup>b</sup>  
 15 n' šyš'ygn ywn'k šxy 'nx'w xy[δ] δ'rnn tym 'yw prwr[ty m'x?]  
 16 sytm'n kw xwt'w s'r pr wy(n) šw'ygn rty ywn'yδ wytr'nt kw mz'yx  
 17 mry s'r pr 'nc'n w'stnt kδ'c L' šyštnt rty šn xw šmnw  
 18 xwt'w m'(k)[t] n'βcykty m'(n) '[s](t) ZY myšn tyrtyt kw šw'ynt  
 19 yγ'rty xwrt βyr'nt cyw[y]δ 'nβ'nty 'nw'štw 'skw'nt : wyδ'γty  
 20 pr 'yw zmnw xw pyms'r xwt'w c'wn r'ckr'y knδy βyk s'r nyz-ty kw βynwβn  
 21 snkr'm s'r šw' skw(n) 'wy βγ'n βxtm pwty s'r pr nm'cw ZY pr wyn  
 22 rtyšw wyš'(nt) tyrtyt (sy)tm'n r'δh p'y'nt ZY šy myδ'n r'δy  
 23 [w'š]tnt rty xw <p> ksy-sr'w-n'k β'z-'kh 'sky s'r syxwy'nt  
 24 sytm'n wnxr wn'nt m'δ w'β'nt c'β'<sup>c</sup> c'β' mz'yx xwt'w  
 25 pr kwtr ZY pr pδβry wyn'mnty sky δynd'rty L' s'št ptmy't rty  
 26 (xypδ) m'ny šm'r mz[']yxw (x)[w]t'w yw'r xw k'wδ'm šmny ZY c'wn wyny  
 27 p'r'γz β't ZY c'wn xw kwtry mz'yxw (β)'t 'sp'yncy nyz-ty pcm'ry xcy  
 28 p'š ZY škš'pt γrβ'kyh xwnx s'št ptm't w'n'w tk'wš γwt xw

29 šy'tr xcy kt'r m'x rty βγ c'n'w xw 'yw wrc'wnyh kwn't m'x 'δw  
 30 kwn'ym k'n c'n'w : xw 'δw wrc[wnyh kwn](?)t m'x ctβ'r kwn'ymk'n 'wy  
 31 s'r 'yδcw L' 'wz'ymk'n rty [ ] mnt pexw'y wyn ZY tk'wš  
 32 [ZY ptz]m'ntyh βn px'rš't m'x 'yny 'yw ''γδy 'sp'yn rty šn xw pyms'r  
 33 [xwt']w m'δ w'β 'δw prwrty β' cw mn' s'r mwn'w w'xš wγtw δ'rt<sup>d</sup> rty  
 34 'zw pt'wtδ'r'n<sup>e</sup> c'n'w cštyk y'wr w'βδ' c'wn m'k't-cyk 'wt'ky βyk s'r  
 35 βškr'mk'n tyrt(yn)'k ''m'rzy pr[z](γ'm) ZY n'y nw(?'r \*\*\*\*\*)  
 36 sxwnw ZY wγtw k'ry : ywn'yδ pym(s)[r xwt'w ]  
 37 rty nwkr wyšn tyrtyt [ ]  
 38 rty ywn'yδ kw xypδ 'n(w)[z'k(?) ]  
 39 [ ](• ZY (m'δ)[ ]

**a:** Livšic's ''z-rty is a misprint. **b:** The word looks like *rt[y]*, but after *m'δ w'β'nt* one would rather expect *kt*. Can it be an error for *kt*? However, for the usage of *rty* introducing direct speech after the verb *w'β* see note 53 below. **c:** an error for *c'β'*? **d:** Livšic *δ'rt*, on which see the note below. **e:** Livšic's *wγtw δ'r'm* is hardly possible.

### Translation

(1) [...] the body [...] in the manner of [...], to the Buddha's fo[ot(?)] ... The king said:] 'To what great clan, to what rank do you belong? (*lit.* What great clan is there? What rank?) What is your<sup>12</sup> excellence? Your marvels and miracles of going in the sky is just as (5) a sparrow flies. Your learning doctrines and teachings is very similar to the voice of a crow. What is the difference from that? (To say that) you (are) instructors for the Chief of the World (= lokajyeṣṭha) is just like (to say that) an insect of fire is an instructor to the brightness of the sun.<sup>13</sup> What kind of men are you? For <you hold><sup>14</sup> a heretical view<sup>15</sup> in your mind and you are the companions(?)<sup>16</sup> of dung. How dare you say struggle (and) dispute making words in my presence against the majesty of (10) the Chief of the World? Go away, go away! But do not lose respect (*lit.* do not find non-respect) from me.'

After saying this word, King Bimbiśāra immediately departed and entered the palace. Those heretical people were left disgraced and contemptible, and stayed very distressed (and) ashamed. They went out from

<sup>12</sup> I read *š'* for Livšic's *šn*. *š'* is a so far unattested feminine nominative singular form of the article of *iste deixis* (Yoshida forthcoming).

<sup>13</sup> Possibly an error for '*kw xwyr s'r rwxšny'k 'nd'yšny* 'one who instructs brightness to the sun'.

<sup>14</sup> I assume a copying error for *ptkwn wyn m'ny <δ'rt'> δrδ'yc ...*, where *δ'rt'* was omitted because of the following *δrδ'yc*. Alternatively, *ptkwn-wyn-m'ny* is an *aka*-stem compound meaning 'a heretic-view-minded (man)'.

<sup>15</sup> Livšic's 'with sinful look and (sinful) mind' for *ptkwn wyn m'ny* is a *lapsus calami*.

<sup>16</sup> My tentative translation 'companion' of ''*mrzy* is based on Parthian *h'mhyrz* 'attendant' mentioned in DMSB: 9a in connection with another unknown Sogdian word '*m'rzy*.

the king's palace and said [...]: **(15)** 'Let us not be scattered. Let us keep this harsh mind.<sup>17</sup> Let us once again go altogether to see the king.' Immediately they departed to the great forest and stayed (there) for rest. They were not at all scattered. The Māra king<sup>18</sup> controlled (*lit.* took) for them the mind of the people of Magadha, so that wherever they go these heretics might obtain plenty of food.<sup>19</sup> For that reason they remained gathered.

Then, **(20)** at one time King Bimbisāra went out of the city of Rājagṛha and was going to the monastery of Veṇuvana to see and pay homage to (*lit.* for homage and for seeing) Devātideva Buddha. The heretics altogether guarded the road (waiting) for him and stood in the middle<sup>20</sup> of the road. They raised their lean(?)<sup>21</sup> arms high and they altogether raised a voice and said: 'O Great King! How much<sup>22</sup> it is not fitting to despise(?)<sup>23</sup> the Brahmins (who are) superior (*lit.* high) than you **(25)** in terms of their clan, rank, and appearance. Think in your mind, o Great King!, whether<sup>24</sup> (it is) ascetic (śramaṇa) Gautama (who) would be excellent in (terms of) appearance, (whether it is) he (who) would be great in terms of his clan<sup>25</sup>, (whether) he is to be regarded<sup>26</sup> as *pravrajita* (*lit.* gone out of the dwelling)<sup>27</sup>. (His) fasting<sup>28</sup> and commandments, (and) wisdom,<sup>29</sup> it is fitting to measure those. It is necessary to examine whether it is he or we who is better, o Lord! When he produces one miracle, **(30)** we will produce two. When he produces two miracles, we

<sup>17</sup> For the meaning of 'nx'w, see DMSB: 13b–14a.

<sup>18</sup> Livšic mistakes *šmnw* 'Ahriman, Māra' for *šmny* 'Buddhist monk' and renders *rtȳ šn xw šmnw xwt'w* as 'the king of their monks'.

<sup>19</sup> Livšic: 'if they go (further) with the heretics, they would get plenty of food.' This translation is based on the unlikely assumption that the subject of *šw'ynt* and *βyr'nt* should be the inhabitants of Magadha.

<sup>20</sup> *myδ'n* here functions as a preposition, but this usage is not common, cf. DMSB: 118.

<sup>21</sup> *sr'wn'k* is an unknown word. In view of *šwn-sry* 'haunch' and *βr'wk-sry* 'eyebrow' which are derived from *šwn* 'hip' and *βr'wk* 'eyebrow', the component *-sry* seems to be connected with body parts in pair. If this assumption is correct, one may expect \**β'z'kh-sry* '(a certain part of) arm'. I wonder if *sry* is etymologically connected with the *sr-* part of *sr'wn'k*.

<sup>22</sup> Possibly a copying error for \**c'β c'β* 'how much from you'.

<sup>23</sup> *ptmy't* is a past infinitive of the so far unknown verb \**ptmy-* which in the present context seems to mean 'to despise, look down on', cf. Livšic 1996: 7. Possibly, it shares the same root as *myt'y* 'shut, closed (eyes)'.

<sup>24</sup> On the meaning 'whether' of *yw'r* ... *ZY*, see Christian Sogdian *yw'rt* 'but, rather' (Sims-Williams 2016: 234).

<sup>25</sup> *c'wn xw kwtry* seems to be an error for *c'wn kwtry* or *xw c'wn kwtry* 'he (is) in terms of clan'.

<sup>26</sup> *pcm'ry* is a future participle derived from *pcm'r* (< *ptšm'r*) with the suffix *-y*, on which see DTS: 31.

<sup>27</sup> The more common expression corresponding to Skt. *pravrajita* is *kty'ky-nyztk*, BSTBL: 167. Thus, *šp'ync* is a near synonym of *kty'k* 'house(hold)'.

<sup>28</sup> For the meaning 'fasting' of *p'š* see Sims-Williams 2016: 127.

<sup>29</sup> *yrβ'kyh* is omitted in Livšic's translation.

will produce four. We are by no means inferior(?)<sup>30</sup> to him. While you prohibit [hate/prejudice(?)]<sup>31</sup>, please see and examine (it) [so that the dis]gust (for us) might be removed from you. Please fulfill(?)<sup>32</sup> this one wish of ours'. King Bimbisāra said to them: 'It has been two times that you said<sup>33</sup> these words (*lit.* this word) to me and I shall tolerate it.<sup>34</sup> When you say (the same) for the third time, (35) I shall expel the companion of heretics completely out of the country of Magadha. And, behold, in accordance<sup>35</sup> with ...' After pronouncing the word, immediately, [King] Bim[bisāra] ... Then those heretics ... Immediately to their as[s[embly(?)] ... and [said] thus ...

If one compares the translation of Kr IV/879 with my summary of the *Prātihārya sūtra*, there is practically no doubt that the Sogdian text represents an independent recension of the same legend. It is true that in the version of the *Divyāvadāna* one misses the Indian counterpart of the colourful simile found in lines 4–8 of the Sogdian text. However, something similar is encountered in the two Chinese recensions of the same miracle story: *Pusa bensheng manlun* 菩薩本生鬘論 (T03n0160\_p0335b9-12) and *Xianyujing* 賢愚經 (T04n0202\_p0361b12-15). I translate the former passage as follows:

Now that they (heretics) understood that they will surpass him (the Buddha), they visited the king (Bimbisāra) and boasted about their miraculous power. They requested (the king) for the contest (with the Buddha) in order to see which is superior. At that time, king Bimbisāra smiled with contempt and said: 'I observe that you heretics are extremely stupid and ignorant, while the Buddha's merits are so immense and extensive that one cannot describe them properly with words. It is as if a firefly wants to compete with the sun in terms of its brightness. It is as if one compares the amount of water in a hoofprint with (that of) a gigantic ocean. It is as if one equates an ant heap with Mt. Sumeru. It is as if

<sup>30</sup> 'wz'y mk'm is yet another unknown word. The verb 'wz seems to mean 'to be inferior' in the context. This may go back to Old Iranian \*awa-jyā, of which the root \*jyā (= \*jaiH<sup>2</sup>) means 'to perish, be corrupted; to destroy' (Cheung 2007: 223–224).

<sup>31</sup> Since *mnt* is written as an independent word, it is a conjunction meaning 'while'. Thus, Livšic's 'with no obstacles' is less likely. Moreover, one would rather expect a form \**mnt-pxw'k* for the compound meaning 'without obstacles'.

<sup>32</sup> *šp'yn* 'revolt, rebel' hardly suits the context. Here one expects the 2 sg. imperative of a verb taking *m'x'y ny' yw' ydy* 'this one wish of ours' as its direct object. I follow Livšic in etymologising this word from \**us-pārnaya-* 'to fill up', for which see also Morgenstierne (1974: 74), in particular Yazgulami *s(ə)pan-t* 'to fill, replenish'.

<sup>33</sup> Livšic mistakes *δ'rt'* (2 pl.) for *δ'rt* (3 sg.) and ends up with rendering the passage as 'these words are spoken to me'.

<sup>34</sup> *pt'wiδ'r'n* 'lit. I shall have tolerated'. I cannot see why the preterite subjunctive form is employed here.

<sup>35</sup> Livšic's 'provacative (to)' for *nw'rt* is based on Manichaean Sogdian *nw'rt* 'inclination, tendency'. In Buddhist Sogdian *pyšm ~ nw'rt(y)* denotes 'in accordance with', cf. BSTBL: 84–85, where MacKenzie's *zw'rt* is to be read *nw'rt* (Sims-Williams 1978: 259).

a fox with its meagre body compares itself with a lion. One is small while the other is large, and the inherent difference is more than obvious.’

However, this Chinese text is very different not only from the Sanskrit text, but also from the Sogdian version and represents an independent recension.<sup>36</sup> The remaining fragments are badly damaged and are difficult to place them in the story. However, what is left in L49 is translated as follows, and is most likely to come just after Kr IV/879:

(1) ‘... King [Bim̐bisāra] ... by the ascetic Gautama ... Therefore he did not listen to my word ... [In] Magadha country, they are (?)<sup>37</sup> with the ascetic Gautama ... we [will ...]. When he goes out from this, then ... (5) he will arrive at [Košāla] country, there we will have a dispute. For him ... he will not make it visible.’ Then, when ... they [depar]ted and [entered into] their residence ... King Bim̐bisāra [went] to [the monastery of] Veṇuvana and with great honour [brought] homage to the Chief of the World. ... (10) he extensively explained [with ...] the word and for him ... ‘Remain patient-minded, o king! ... [if ...] would be ..., I shall ... with ...’ ... [said] to the devātideva Buddha: ‘... is with great ...’

Judging from what has survived in the remaining larger fragments, L81 in which Pūraṇa is mentioned may belong to the beginning of the story, while L52<sup>38</sup> and L89 are likely to follow L81 and to be placed before Kr IV/879. Accordingly, one may conclude that the group of the Sogdian fragments so far discussed contains a unique Sogdian recension of the *Miracle sūtra*. Nevertheless, in view of the above-mentioned historical context of the Buddhist Sogdian texts discovered in Turfan, the text in question is likely to have been based on the original, either in Sanskrit or Tocharian, popular along the Northern Silk Road. Although the *Miracle sūtra* itself has not yet been discovered among the Sanskrit or Tocharian texts unearthed in the Northern Silk Road, one finds a few illustrations of the story among the mural paintings of Qizil grottoes<sup>39</sup> and it is obvious that the story was known in Kucha.

<sup>36</sup> For that matter, all the known versions of the *Miracle sūtra*, for which see Nakagawa (1982), differ from the Sogdian so much that none of them can be the latter’s prototype. Nakagawa’s list comprises seven texts: (A) *Sarabhami jātaḥ*; (B) *Dharmapada-Aṭṭhakathā*; (C) *Sifenlü* 四分律, Vol. 51 (T22n1428\_p0947b-950b); (D) *Xianyuḥjing*, Vol. 2 (T04n0202\_p0360c-0364b); (E) *Pusa bensheng manlun* (T03n0160\_p0334c-0336c); (F) *Divyāvādāna*, Chapter 12; (G) *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayaśūdrakavastu* (Chinese *Genben shuoyiqie youbu pinaiye zashi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事, T24n1451\_p0329a-333c and Tibetan). According to Nakagawa (1982), (E) is dependent on (D).

<sup>37</sup> *wyck* is another unknown word. Ragoza’s (1980: 38, 111) ‘волнение, возбуждение (< *wyc* ‘to tremble’)’ does not seem to suit the context.

<sup>38</sup> I would like to take this opportunity to mention that *pβ’n* found in line 9 of L52 is a loanword from Sanskrit *bhavana* ‘dwelling’ possibly via Tocharian B *bhavam* ‘id.’. Its original Sogdian homonym is *škw’m’k* found in L49, 7.

<sup>39</sup> I owe this information to Dr. Hiyama S., who refers to a mural painting of Qizil grotto No. 80 studied by Zhao Li (2006). According to Zhao, the mural is based on the story found in the *Xianyuḥjing*.

There remains one important question: How does the fragment L40, in which 'wp'k' (Upaka) appears, fit into the *Miracle sūtra*, where Upaka does not play any role in any version? In my translation L40 reads as follows:

(1) ... **at the head I was wanting to pull out** ... thirst at the throat upside down ... Said **Upaka**: 'Our Tathāgata ... first from/because of the bad action ... (5) **I blame**, (but) I praise the good action ... this four kinds of dharma ... You say: "Whoever ... other one ... he himself will be regarded as **blamed** ... two kinds of evil dharma. It itself ..."' (10) **Upaka** said: 'I have understood ... (if one?) **blames** ... it is fitting for praiseworthy people to ... I did not know (and) I erred' ... thrown away from the monastery of Veṇuvana ... to the place. When king Bimbisāra ... (15) to devātideva Buddha ... it became morning and for him ...

Among the Pali *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, the English translation of *sūtra* 188 begins as follows:<sup>40</sup>

On a certain occasion the Exalted One was staying near Rājagaha on the Vultures' Peak Hill. **Upaka, son of Maṇḍika**, came to visit the Exalted One, and on coming to him saluted him and sat down at one side. So seated, **Upaka, son of Maṇḍika**, said this to the Exalted One: 'As for me, sir, I say this, I hold this view: Whosoever starts **abusive talk** about another and carries it on, but cannot in every way make good his case, in failing to do so should be held **blameworthy** and guilty of offence.' 'Yes, **Upaka**, if he does so he is to be held **blameworthy** and guilty of offence. You yourself also, **Upaka**, start abusive talk about another and carry it on. So doing and failing to make good your case, you are to be held **blameworthy** and guilty of offence.' 'There, sir! Just like a man catching (his prey) with a big noose as soon as it puts its head out, even so I am caught by the Exalted One with the big noose of words as soon as I open my mouth (*lit.* just as **I pop my head up**<sup>41</sup>)!'

Although details are different, what is left in L40, in particular the bold-faced parts, corresponds very well to the Pali text, and it is almost certain that the narrative found in L40 is identified with the motif of the Pali text.<sup>42</sup> Nevertheless, this Āgama text on Upaka-Maṇḍikaputta has no counterpart in Chinese, and the story about him does not seem to be attested in the Sanskrit or Tocharian texts so far studied either.<sup>43</sup> I have no idea how to reconcile all these problems; however, one thing is clear: there once existed a Sanskrit or Tocharian text along the Northern Silk Road that served as the pro-

<sup>40</sup> Cited from Woodward 1933: 189–190.

<sup>41</sup> According to the footnote, this expression is used of a fish in water.

<sup>42</sup> Since one finds mention of Bimbisāra at the end, L40 may have preceded the *Miracle story*. In the Pali text, after leaving the Buddha, Upaka met King Ajātasattu, who had killed his father, King Bimbisāra.

<sup>43</sup> I owe this valuable information to Professor F. Enomoto (Osaka University).

totype of our Sogdian text, which seems to have comprised several stories about the Buddha, such as the *Miracle sūtra* and the dialogue between the Buddha and Upaka Maṇḍikaputta.

### 3. The Kāñcanasāra Legend Revisited

Finally let us see the Sogdian text expounding the legend of King Kāñcanasāra, once studied by W. Sundermann (2006). It is yet another text betraying the Northern Silk Road origin, because the story is found in the fifth chapter of the large book called *Daśakarmapathavadānamālā* ('Crown of legends concerning the ten deeds'), which is known not only from the extensive Uighur version, but is also attested in Tocharian A and B (see Wilkens 2015: 245);<sup>44</sup> since the marginal title of the Sogdian text indicates that it is also from the fifth chapter of the book referred to as *δs'šyr'krtyh* 'ten good deeds', it is certain that the Sogdian text once belonged to the very same work. In 1949, Henning (1949: 160, Note 2) announced the existence of the Sogdian version of the book of *Daśakarmapathavadānamālā* referring to a fragment in the Berlin collection bearing the signature T I α. It was Sundermann who joined the fragment with So 10132, the joined manuscript forming an almost complete short-lined *pothi* folio. When I saw the joined text in October 1992, I was able to identify one part of it with a short passage in an Uighur text published by Müller (1920: 31) in his *Uigurica III*, and I mentioned my discovery in the course of my discussion of the relationship between Sogdian and Uighur Buddhism; I concluded that the two versions represent two independent translations, possibly based on the same prototype (Yoshida 2002: 197, cf. also Yoshida 2009: 308–309).<sup>45</sup> In my mind, this recognition is important in showing that the so-called Sogdian hypothesis, which argues the Sogdian origin of the early Buddhist Uighur texts, can hardly be supported by such a text.

Recently, a fresh and extensive edition of the Uighur manuscripts of the *Daśakarmapathavadānamālā* housed in Berlin has been published by Wilkens (2016). In the text newly edited by him there is one passage corresponding to yet another part of the Sogdian text and he published an independent article comparing the Uighur text sentence by sentence with the corresponding Sogdian as edited and translated by Sundermann (Wilkens 2015); on the prototypes of the Sogdian and Uighur texts he reached the same conclusion as me.<sup>46</sup> Here I would like to edit the Sogdian text afresh,

<sup>44</sup> On the Uighur colophon mentioning the text in the Twry language as its direct prototype, which in turn was translated from the version in the language of Kūsān or Kucha, see Yoshida 2018.

<sup>45</sup> Sundermann prefers the Tocharian version as the original of the Sogdian text, because the Sanskrit name of king Kāñcanasāra appears *knens'r* in Sogdian, which differs from the former in the quantity of the first vowel. In the meantime Tocharian B form of the name *kañcansāre* has been discovered (Wilkens 2015: 246, Note 1). However, Sundermann's argument still remains somewhat hypothetical, because the Uighur counterpart *kancanasare* shows the ending *-e* characteristic of the Tocharian form, while the Sogdian form lacks it.

<sup>46</sup> When Sundermann edited the Sogdian version, he anticipated Wilkens's work and already referred to the newly discovered second parallel as well. According to Sundermann, P. Zieme had also recognised the second parallel independently and had imparted his discovery to Sundermann.

because my readings differ from Sundermann's in a considerable number of places, though some differences are admittedly just marginal.

### Text

**marginal title:** (δs) šyr'ktyh pn(cmy)k (prwrt X)[ ptr]  
**(recto)** /1/ 'wy mrcy pr(β)'γtk rty šnn t(γ)[w]<sup>a</sup> /2/ zyn'y<sup>b</sup> pcyštδ'ry  
 cywyδ [py](δ)[r] /3/ 'kδry L' pr'y p'rwt[ 'st'yx?] /4/ 'wšt rty pt'w  
 'wn'w βz'y[ p'rZY] /5/ 'δ'k nwšy nyst xyδ (s'c)tk'm<sup>c</sup> /6/ mwrt[ rty  
 mrtxm'k xypδ '(krty)'<sup>d</sup> /7/ (š)[m'r ](rty) 'M == 'krtyh pr'w /8/  
 [pr](δwk)<sup>e</sup> 'nyt[y<sup>f</sup>====] L' ('kr)[t']<sup>g</sup> /9/ wnty rty βy 'k(w)[ ]y cw (•) [ ]  
 /10/ mn' δrzy'wr' rty pwt[('k) pr(n) /11/ ptβr'w rty ms wx'ršt<sup>h</sup> wny h  
 /12/ w'tδ' rty cnn βzy' p(r'y)[myδ?] /13/ xwm'r δty' rty pr γrβ zm[nw]  
 /14/ tm[ h swγtyš rty ms nyδ[cw] /15/ nyw'nt βrw L' βyrtδ'ry r(ty m)[s]  
 /16/ βn'yšt'k xrt[ yš rty mwn'[w] /17/ δ'm zynyh pcyštδ'ry r(t)[y] /18/  
 (pr)[zγ](c')m<sup>i</sup> βr'wcky L' wn' [rty] /19/ kδ' 'kδry tγw pr'y'y rty (š)[yrw?]  
 /20/ L' wn'y pw 'nwt prxs'nt<sup>l</sup> k'(m) /21/ [mwn]w 'z'wn w'tδ'rt rty  
 nw(k)[r] /22/ [cn]n xwβw xypδ šyr'kk m'n[ pyδ'r]<sup>k</sup> /23/ [z'y]h βr'γ'z  
 wxwšw znk'ny [šn't]<sup>l</sup> /24/ [ZY]Y<sup>m</sup> wyc't βr'γ'z (β)γ'nyk β(wδ)[ ZY] /25/  
 'sp'rym'k<sup>n</sup> w'r't rty cnn (x)[ypδ] /26/ pry'w'k n'k'nxwt'wt cnn [γr'n]<sup>o</sup>  
 /27/ 'ntwxc βr'γ'z twnt[ r šk(')[βt] /28/ rty 'kw sntwš'yt βγ'y[st'n] /29/  
 s't βγ'yšt prβrtδst c'[wn] /30/ 'ws(w)[γ](t')p'z'n kw kncons'(r)[ xwt'w]<sup>p</sup>  
 /31/ tk'wš'ynt<sup>d</sup> skwn rty ms [ZKh] /32/ (')yncth ZKw 'sp'rym(')[k'] /33/  
 š'š(')ynt skwn rty n(wk)[r kw] /34/ kw[mp](c')yr<sup>s</sup> y(k)šy s'r w(')[nw  
 w'β?]<sup>l</sup> **(verso)** /1/ (rty<sup>l</sup>) βγ' tk'wš 'wnw mrtx-/2/m'k-myn'k rtny<sup>u</sup> ZKw  
 kns(n)s'r /3/ [xwβw] rty šy tym ZKw kβny kp'wtk /4/ [ ]'ptz'nm skwn  
 rty šy cnn /5/ [xypδ] ]<sup>w</sup>(γ)r'ywy y'tk c'δr s'r h /6/ 'k'(w)γtk' swkty<sup>y</sup>  
 skwn rty tym /7/ 'wyn'z'nt'k pr'mn 'np'r (nys)t /8/ pr xwt'w βz'y rty  
 ykšy w'n'w /9/ [w'β] pr[y'tr?] == (•••)[ ] /10/ [ ](prz)<sup>aa</sup> xw  
 p'rZ(Y)==== šy w'βyzt /11/ xwy(c) c'nw 'wyn 'sty rty tym /12/ (')wyn  
 pr'mn pynms'r z'm p'δy /13/ ['skw]ty skwn rty šy tym cnn h /14/  
 (šy)r'k cšmy s'r tk'wšt skwn /15/ [r](t)y ms xypδ γr'ywy xwm'r w'βt /16/  
 [s]kwn rty pt'w mwn'w βz'y p'rZY /17/ [pw](t)y δrm pty'wš'(ym)k'm<sup>bb</sup>  
 rtyšy /18/ (kn)cons'r xwt'w 'wyh 'yncty /19/ [ZY x]wt'mty ZKw  
 'xš'(ywn) wn(xr) /20/ [pty](γ)wš rty ms z'ry wyδβ[z'ynt]<sup>cc</sup> /21/ [rty]  
 nwkr w'nw w'β rty cnn h /22/ [pw](t)y δrm pyδ'r xypδ γr'y[w] /23/  
 ['wxr](c')m<sup>dd</sup> skwn 'PZY mγ'wn š[m-]<sup>ee</sup> /24/ ['x xw]t'mt pyδ'r rty ms  
 mn' /25/ [ywn]k<sup>ff</sup> z'wn (L') wyš'k [h?] /26/ [p'rZY?](m)y 'yw m'n'k  
 ZY s'ct cnn /27/ [δβty](c')<sup>gg</sup> yw'r βymk'm rty ms /28/ [δy](w)myn'k<sup>hh</sup>  
 s'n pw 'nc'n šh<sup>ii</sup> /29/ [r'm](nt)y<sup>jj</sup> šwtskwn rty ms L' /30/ ['tōr](m)nw<sup>kk</sup>  
 s't ptpt'yn škrty /31/ [skwn ](rt)y my kδ' ZK mrew h /32/ [ ] rty my  
 L' wx'rš'(t)<sup>ll</sup> wnty /33/ [ZK mz](c')yxw<sup>mmm</sup> xwt'wy' ZY h /34/  
 [xwt'm](t)<sup>nn</sup> L' xw m'th L' /35/ [xw ptry<sup>oo</sup> L](c') z'ty δwγth L'

### Notes on the Readings

**a:** WS *t(m')*. **b:** WS *nyz'y*. **c:** WS (*s*)*'ytk'm*. **d:** WS *'(krty'k)*. **e:** WS [*'*](*δyk*). But *-w-* is almost certain. **f:** WS *'n(xyz)*. **g:** Thus according to WS. **h:** WS *wy'ršt*. **i:** WS (*pr*)[*δ*](*'*)*m*. **j:** WS *prys'nt*. **k:** WS [*x'*]. **l:** WS [*1–2*]. **m:** WS [*1–2*](*y*). **n:** WS *'sprym'k*. **o:** WS [*---*] (i.e. a line filler). **p:** Or [*xwβw*]. WS restores no word. **q:** WS *tkwš'ynt*. **r:** WS *'sp'ym(')*[*k*]. **s:** WS *kw [2–3](.)yr*. My restoration is based on WS's footnote mentioning Wilkens's suggestion. **t:** WS *w(')[n'kw] / [w'β](nt)*. **u:** WS *rty*. However, a small trace of *-n-* is clearly visible. **v:** WS [*r'β*], which is meant for [*'r'β*] 'flame'. **w:** WS [*ZKn*]. **x:** WS *'k'(β)tk* 'incision'. **y:** WS *snkty* 'cuts'. **z:** WS (*...y*)*n*. **aa:** WS (*wrz*). **bb:** WS *pty'wš(nt)k'm*. *t* looks less likely. **cc:** WS *wyδβ[y'](t)* 'he spread'. **dd:** WS [*βrny*]'*m* 'I sacrifice'. **ee:** WS *š(m)[x]*. However, hardly any space for [*x*] at the end of line 23. **ff:** WS [*2–3*]'*k*. **gg:** WS [*2–3*](*.*). The last letter is certainly *-'*. **hh:** WS [*dwš*] *my'n'k<sup>sic</sup>* with a query. **ii:** A line-filler. WS *---*. **jj:** WS [*3–4*](*..*)*y*. **kk:** WS [*2–3 š*](*m*)*nw*. **ll:** WS *wy'ršt*. The slightly large space between *š* and *t* seems to contain (*'*). **mm:** WS [*cnn tr*](*'*)*yγw* 'from its heavy' with a query. **nn:** WS [*4–5*](*.*). The final *-(t)* is almost certain. **oo:** WS [*ptry*].

### Translation

**marginal title:** Ten good deeds. Fifth chapter. (Leaf) 10 [+ x].

**(recto)** ... **(1)** (what is) given at death. Yo[u] received them as a deposit. There[fore], now, do not feel pain, but stand [upright] and endure that evil, **(5)** [for] nobody is eternal and accordingly<sup>47</sup> will have to die. [Think of] a man's action. And together with (his) action he is not able to make (himself) competent (in) the world [beyond].<sup>48</sup> Where [is ...] for you? (And) why [do you ...]? **(10)** O my mind! Remember the Buddha-rank. And you are also able to redeem the living beings from evil by [this?] comfort and consolation. For a long time you burnt in the hell, **(15)** yet you obtained no fruit from that. [Also] you went astray.<sup>49</sup> You have received this living world as a deposit. Do not forget (it) at [all]. [And] now, if you feel pain and **(20)** do not act [well?], [the]se living beings will remain without hope.<sup>50</sup> And now [because] of the king's good mind, [the ear]th began [to quake] and tremble in the six ways. The divine scent

<sup>47</sup> On the adverbial use of *xyδ* 'then, therefore, etc.', see its Chinese equivalent *ji* 即 'immediately, accordingly, then' frequently encountered in Buddhist Sogdian texts translated from Chinese.

<sup>48</sup> Lines 6–8 are badly damaged and are incomprehensible to me. Sundermann (2006: 721) renders them as follows: 'And bear in mind the sin of man, and with one's sin nobody can [ ] raise up (*'δyk' nxyz L' 'krt' wnty*)'. His [*'*](*δyk*) is unlikely because the indefinite pronoun he thinks of is an *aka*-stem and is spelled *'δ'k* or *'yδ'k*. In the photograph [*Jδwk*] is almost certain, hence my restoration [*pr*]*δwk* (< Skt. *paraloka*) 'the other world'.

<sup>49</sup> For this translation (instead of Sundermann's 'and you were smashed'), see Yoshida 2009: 308, and Wilkens 2015: 249.

<sup>50</sup> On *nwt* not meaning 'support' but 'hope', see DMSB: 13a.

[and] **(25)** flowers began to rain. Because of [his] love the king<sup>51</sup> of Nāgas began to cra[sh] thunder out of the [great] grief. In the Santuṣita heaven all the gods were observing<sup>52</sup> the king Kāncanasāra with their arms crossed and **(30)** with [pure] mind. [The] women were also scattering flowers. Then he [said to] the Yakṣa [Kumbh]īra. **(verso)** ‘O lord!’<sup>53</sup> Look at that jewel looking like a human being,<sup>54</sup> (i.e.) the [King] Kāncanasāra. I recognise a little blue [...] on him and (a piece of) flesh is hanging downward **(5)** from his body.<sup>55</sup> But still the evil Brahmin is not satisfied with the king’s suffering. The Yakṣa [sp]oke thus: ‘[He] is [to suffer more ...] **(10)** because for him so much terrible pain as he suffers (now is not enough).’<sup>56</sup> Still he (= the king) [remain]s standing respectfully<sup>57</sup> before the Brahmin and looked at him with gentle eyes. **(15)** And he is also telling consolation to himself: ‘Endure this suffering because we shall hear the [Buddha]’s law.’ King Kāncanasāra **(20)** [he]ard the women’s and relatives’ weeping voice. They also cri[ed out] miserably.<sup>58</sup> Then he said thus: ‘Because of the [Buddha]’s law I am [abandon]ing<sup>59</sup> myself and (it is also) for all y[ou relati]ves. Also **(25)** [th]is life of mine is not respectful [for] it is single-mindedly<sup>60</sup> necessary for me to be separated from [each other?]<sup>61</sup>. Moreover, [demon]-like enemy is

<sup>51</sup> As Sundermann assumes, *n’k’nxwt’wt* is a copying error for *\*n’k’nxwt’w*.

<sup>52</sup> As Sundermann remarks, *tk’wš’ynt* as well as *š’š’ynt* is the optative imperfect.

<sup>53</sup> Strangely, the direct quotation is introduced by *rty* in the language of this manuscript, cf. [*rty*] *nwkr w’nw w’β rty cnn [pw](t)y δrm pyδ’r xypδ yr’y[w ’wxr](‘)m skwn* ‘Then he said thus: “Because of the [Buddha]’s law I am [abandon]ing myself” (verso 21–23).

<sup>54</sup> *mrtxm’k-myn’k rtny* ‘lit. a jewel looking like a human being’. On this expression, see also Tocharian B *śāmīe naumye araṇemi walo* ‘a King Araṇemi (who was) a human jewel’ (Tamai 2018: 364–365). A *bahuvrīhi* compound ending with *-myn’k* ‘looking like’, see also [*dyw*]*myn’k* ‘looking like a demon (verso 28)’. Sundermann reads *rty* instead of *rtny* and translates the passage as ‘Look at that hope (*myn’k*) of man’.

<sup>55</sup> On this strange alternation of perspective between the 1st person singular narrator and the narration in the 3rd person, see Wilkens (forthcoming).

<sup>56</sup> Line 9 is badly damaged and the context of lines 9–11 is not clear to me, nor to Sundermann, who renders the passage as follows: ‘And the Yakṣa spoke thus: “[ ] it is a miracle. For extremely cruel is the pain as it is his ...”’. I assume a copying error, because one certainly expects the predicate verb of the clause beginning with *p’rZY* of line 10 to follow *šty* of line 11.

<sup>57</sup> Sundermann translates *z’m p’δy* as ‘pretty upright’. However, *z’m* also means ‘humbly, humble, respectful(ly)’.

<sup>58</sup> Sundermann’s ‘he spread mercy (*z’ry wyδβ[’y](t)*)’ is impossible. For the Uighur parallel, cf. Wilkens 2015: 248 with Note 10. On *wyδβz* ‘to cry’, see DMSB: 208b.

<sup>59</sup> Sundermann’s [*βrny*]’*m* ‘I sacrifice’ looks also possible, but the exact meaning of *βrny* is as yet to be known.

<sup>60</sup> This literal translation of *yw-m’n’k* is preferred to Sundermann’s ‘decidedly’, because its exact meaning in this particular sentence escapes me who cannot understand the context. Possibly its semantic range comprises ‘single-mindedly ~ decidedly ~ unambiguously ~ certainly’. According to Wilkens (2015: 249–250), it corresponds to Uighur *ođgurak* ‘gewiss’.

<sup>61</sup> Restoration of [*zw’j(n)*] is impossible, because the final -’ (alif) in this manuscript differs from the final -*n* in that the latter assumes a vertical tail, while the former is provided with a horizontal tail.

going ceaselessly and [alwa]ys, and also (together) with(?)<sup>62</sup> (30) [Mār]ja<sup>63</sup> it is pursuing all (of us) separately. If death [befalls] on me, [gr]eat kingship<sup>64</sup> cannot save me, [nor relatives,] nor mother, nor [father, n]or son (or) daughter, nor ...

When I first read the manuscript, I took Sundermann's recto for verso, because '(what is) given at death' (recto 1) makes perfect sense in the context: 'If death [befalls] on me, great kingship cannot save me, [not relatives,] not mother, not [father, n]ot son (or) daughter, not (what is) given at the death.' Obviously, Sundermann based his assignment of recto and verso on the position of the marginal title; according to him, in Buddhist Sogdian manuscripts marginal titles and page numbers are always placed on the recto (Sundermann 2006: 717). However, this is not always the case, as Reck (2017: 388) correctly remarks. There are cases, though not common, where marginal titles and/or page numbers are written on the verso side, e.g. Pelliot sogdien 3. Thus, a marginal title cannot always be the indicator of the recto side, and one must decide recto or verso on an independent basis. It is also to be noted that Sundermann's reading of the first word of verso line 1, [w'β](nt), is simply impossible, because there is no space for restoring [w'β]. In my opinion, even if one exchanges recto and verso, the text makes good sense as a whole. The present assignment of recto and verso is based on the Uighur parallel found in U974, which certainly follows Mainz 62 in terms of its content. Nevertheless, the correspondence between the Sogdian text of the verso and its Uighur counterpart in U978 as edited by Wilkens is looser than that between Sogdian's recto and Mainz 62, and the two texts sometimes differ so much that I suspect that my original assignment of recto and verso is still worth considering.

#### 4. Conclusion

In this paper I discussed three Buddhist Sogdian texts unearthed from Turfan, which seem to have been produced in the cultural context of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādin school, once flourishing along the Northern Silk Road. A so far known representative case is the Sogdian text of the *Araṇemi Jātaka*, of which the Tumshuqese, Tocharian A,

<sup>62</sup> I suppose that *L'* is an error for *ḍnn*. In any case *L'* makes little sense in this context, which also puzzled Sundermann (2006: 723, Note 61).

<sup>63</sup> I restore the same word as Sundermann, but with a variant spelling *ḍrmmw*, which will fill the gap perfectly well.

<sup>64</sup> Sundermann translates *xwt'wy'* 'rule' and renders the passage as follows: 'then there<sup>sic</sup> cannot save me from its heavy rule'. In the Buddhist teachings *xwt'wy'* 'kingship' (cf. also Reck's 'lordship' *apud* Wilkens 2015: 249, Note 12) is to be renounced. See the following passage cited from the *Samghāṭa-sūtra* lines 72–74, cited from TITUS with slight modification (<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/iran/miran/sogd/sogdnswc/sogdn.htm>, last access: 22 Dec 2018): 'zw 'P[ZY] prw γrβ 'z'wn xwt'w wm'ym rty 'kḍry c'wn xwt'w[y'kh 'zw] šyr ptzm'n 'krt'ym rty mn' 'xw xwt'wy' L'γwt 'I have been a king for many lives. And now I have become much disgusted from the kingship and I do not want the kingship.'

Tocharian B, and Uighur versions have been attested (Yoshida 2009: 309).<sup>65</sup> In this connection it is worth mentioning that a very small fragment containing the Sogdian version of the *Divyāvadāna* written in Brāhmī script has been identified (Sims-Williams 1996). Two long-lined *poṭhi* fragments (So 18240, 18242) mentioning *mx'kp'yn MLK* 'King Mahākappina' and *prsn'y[cw]* 'Prasenajit' are also likely to belong to the same genre. Manuscripts of the *Araṇemi Jātaka* are illustrated with miniatures in full colour. Another illustrated *poṭhi* fragment (MIK III 4932) is also known (Reck 2016: 339–340, no. 943), and the non-Chinese style of this miniature also induces one to assume the Northern Silk Road origin of the Sogdian text. In this connection, a unique Vinaya text found in So 10921, 19530a, 19530b, and Mainz 155 (Reck 2016: nos. 579, 853, 920) is of particular importance and will be discussed on the next occasion.

### Abbreviations

- BSTBL = D. N. MACKENZIE 1976. *The Buddhist Sogdian texts of the British Library*. [Acta Iranica 10.] Leiden/Tehran: Brill.
- DMSB = N. SIMS-WILLIAMS and D. DURKIN-MEISTERERENST 2012. *Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian*. [Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia, *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, Vol. III: *Texts from Central Asia and China*, Part 2.] Turnhout: Brepols.
- DTS = N. SIMS-WILLIAMS and J. HAMILTON 2015. *Turco-Sogdian documents from 9th–10th century Dunhuang*. [Trans. by N. SIMS-WILLIAMS with an appendix by Wen XIN] London: SOAS.
- Mainz = Sogdian and Uighur texts which are housed in the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin and bear Mainz numbers
- MIK = Sogdian texts preserved in the former Museum für Indische Kunst, Berlin
- SCE = D. N. MACKENZIE 1970. *The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian*. [London Oriental Studies, vol. 22.] London and New York: Oxford University Press.
- So = Sogdian texts in Sogdian script housed in the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin
- T = TAKAKUSU Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and WATANABE Kaikyoku 渡邊海旭 (eds.) 1924–1934. *Taishō Shīnshū Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai.
- WS = Werner Sundermann

### Bibliography

- CHEUNG, Johnny 2007. *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. London and Boston: Brill.
- HENNING, Walter B. 1949. 'The Name of the "Tokharian" Language.' *Asia Major* I/1: 158–162.
- KUDO, Noriyuki 2004. *The Karmavibhaṅga. Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. [Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VII] Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- KUDO Noriyuki 工藤順之 2018. "Karuma=Vibanga" Sansukuritto shahon: Sukoiën=korekushon danpen 『カルマ・ヴィバンガ』サンスクリット写本: 「スコイエン・コレクション」断片 [Newly identified Sanskrit fragments of the *Karmavibhaṅga* in the Schøyen col-

<sup>65</sup> For the fresh translation of the two Tocharian versions, see Tamai 2018.

- lection].’ *Sōkadaigaku Kokusaibukkyōgaku Kōtōkenkyūsho Nenpō. Hēsē 29 nendo* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報 平成29年度 [Annual report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the academic year 2017] 21: 491–508.
- LÉVI, Sylvain 1932. *Mahā karmavibhaṅga (La grand classification des actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā karmavibhaṅga). Textes sanscrits rapportés de Népal, édités et traduits avec les textes parallèles en sanscrit, en pali, en tibétain, en chinois et en kouchéen.* Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- LIVŠIC, Vladimir A. 1996. ‘Sogdian Buddhist Fragment Kr IV/879 No. 426 from the Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies.’ *Manuscripta Orientalia* 2/2: 3–8.
- MAGGI, Mauro 1995. *The Khotanese Karmavibhaṅga.* [Serie orientale Roma, Vol. 74.] Rome: ISIAO.
- MITANI Mazumi 三谷真澄 2018. *Ōtanitai Doitsutai shūshū kanjibutton danpen mokuroku* 大谷隊ドイツ隊収集漢字仏典断片目録 [A catalogue of Chinese Buddhist fragments collected by Otani and German Turfan expedition] Kyoto: Ryūkoku Daigaku.
- MORGENSTIERNE, Georg 1974. *Etymological Dictionary of the Shughni Group.* Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- MÜLLER, F. W. K. 1920. *Uigurica III. Uigurische Avadāna-Bruchstücke (I–VIII).* [APAW] Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- NAKAGAWA Masanori 中川正法 1982. ‘Shaējōjinpensetsuwa 舍衛城神變説話 [The Tale of the Great Miracle at Sravasti].’ *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist studies] 30/2: 657–658.
- OCHIAI Toshinori (with related remarks by MAKITA Tairyō and Antonino FORTE) 1991. *The Manuscripts of Nanatsu-dera: A Recently Discovered Treasure-House in Downtown Nagoya.* [Trans. and ed. by Silvio VITA] Kyoto: Istituto Italiano di Cultura Scuola di Studi sull’Asia Orientale.
- RAGOZA, A. N. [A. H. Рагоза] 1980. *Согдийские фрагменты центральноазиатского собрания Института востоковедения.* Москва: Наука.
- RECK, Christiane 2015. ‘The Work in Progress: The Catalogue of the Buddhist Sogdian Fragments of the Berlin Turfan Collection.’ In: A. KRASNOWOLSKA et al. (eds.) *Studies on the Iranian World I: Before Islam.* Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 59–66.
- RECK, Christiane 2016. *Mitteliranische Handschriften, Teil 2. Berliner Turfanfragmente buddhistischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift.* [VOHD XVIII, 2.] Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- RECK, Christiane 2017. ‘Abschnitt 7.2: Buddhistisch-sogdische Manuskriptologie.’ In: Ludwig PAUL (ed.) *Handbuch der Iranistik, Band 2.* Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 385–393.
- ROSENBERG, Frederic 1920. ‘Deux fragments sogdien-bouddhiques de Ts’ien-fo-tong de Touenhouang (II). Fragment d’un sūtra.’ *Bulletin de l’Académie des Sciences de Russie*, Part 1, 399–420; Part 2, 455–474, with one plate.
- ROTMAN, Andy (trans.) 2008. *Divine Stories. Divyāvadāna. Part I.* Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 1978. ‘Review of D. N. MacKenzie: *The Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library.* Téhéran and Liège/Leiden (AcIr 10).’ *Indo-Iranian Journal* 20/3-4: 256–260.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 1981. ‘The Sogdian Fragments of Leningrad.’ *BSOAS* 44: 231–240.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 1996. ‘The Sogdian Manuscripts in Brāhmī Script.’ In: R. E. EMMERICK et al. (eds.) *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang. Vorträge der Tagung “Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung,” veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.–12.12.1994).* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 307–315.

- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 2016. *A Dictionary: Christian Sogdian, Syriac and English*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- SUNDERMANN, Werner 2001. 'Eine soghdische Version der Aranemi-Legende.' In: Louis BAZIN and Peter ZIEME (eds.) *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*. Turnhout: Brepols, 339–348.
- SUNDERMANN, Werner 2006. 'A Fragment of the Buddhist Kāñcanasāra Legend in Sogdian and its Manuscript.' In: Antonio PANAINO and Andrea PIRAS (eds.) *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europaea Held in Ravenna, 6–11 October 2003*. Milan: Mimesis, 715–724.
- TAMAI, Tatsushi 2015. 'The Tocharian *Karmavibhaṅga*.' *Sōkadaigaku Kokusaibukkyōgaku Kōtōkenkyūsho Nenpō. Hēsē 26 nendo* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報 平成26年度 [Annual report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the academic year 2014] 18: 337–381.
- TAMAI, Tatsushi 2018. 'The Tocharian Aranemi-Jātaka.' *Sōkadaigaku Kokusaibukkyōgaku Kōtōkenkyūsho Nenpō. Hēsē 29 nendo* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報平成29年度 [Annual report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the academic year 2017] 21: 359–400.
- TANAKA Ryōshō 田中良昭 and TEI Sei 程正 2014. *Tonkō zenshū bunken bunrui mokuroku* 敦煌禪宗文獻分類目録 [A classified catalogue of the Chan Buddhist texts discovered in Dunhuang]. Tokyo: Daitoshuppansha.
- WILKENS, Jens 2015. 'Die altuigurische *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* und die buddhistische Literatur Zentralasiens.' *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 38: 245–270.
- WILKENS, Jens 2016. *Buddhistische Erzählungen aus dem alten Zentralasien. Edition der altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. 3 vols. Turnhout: Brepols.
- WILKENS, Jens (forthcoming) 'Performanz vs. Perspektive: Narratologische Anmerkungen zu einer altuigurischen Erzählungssammlung.'
- WOODWARD, Frank L. (trans.) 1933. *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Anguttara-Nikāya) or More-Numbered Suttas. Vol. II*. London: Pali Text Society.
- YOSHIDA, Yutaka 1983. 'Sogdian Miscellany.' *Studia Iranica* 13: 145–149.
- YOSHIDA, Yutaka 2002. 'In search of Traces of Sogdians "Phoenicians of the Silk Road".' *Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berichte und Abhandlungen* 9: 185–200.
- YOSHIDA, Yutaka 2008. 'Die buddhistischen sogdischen Texte in der Berliner Turfansammlung und die Herkunft des buddhistischen sogdischen Wortes für Bodhisattva.' [Trans. by Y. KASAI and Ch. RECK] *AOH* 61/3: 325–358.
- YOSHIDA, Yutaka 2009. 'Buddhist Literature in Sogdian.' In: Ronald E. EMMERICK and Maria MACUCH (eds.) *The Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran. Companion Volume I to A History of Persian Literature*. New York: I. B. Tauris, 288–329.
- YOSHIDA, Yutaka 2013. 'Buddhist Texts Produced by the Sogdians in China.' In: Mauro MAGGI et al. (eds.) *Buddhism among the Iranian Peoples of Central Asia*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 155–179.
- YOSHIDA, Yutaka 2015. 'A Handlist of Buddhist Sogdian Texts.' *Kyōtodaigaku Bungakubu kenkyūkiyō* 京都大学文学部研究紀要 [Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters Kyoto University] 54: 167–180.
- YOSHIDA Yutaka 吉田豊 2017. 'Sogudogo yaku Ryōgashishiki to kanrensuru mondai ni tsuite ソグド語訳『楞伽師資記』と関連する問題について [On the Sogdian version of the *Leng-ch'ieh shi-tzu-chi* and related problems].' *Tōhōgaku* 東方学 133: 31–52.

- YOSHIDA, Yutaka 2018. 'Farewell to the "Teacher of Four *Twyryst* 'n".' In: Zsuzsanna GULÁCSI (ed.) *Language, Society, and Religion in the World of Turks: Festschrift for Larry Clark at Seventy-five*. [Silk Road Studies XIX.] Turnhout: Brepols, 267–279.
- YOSHIDA, Yutaka (forthcoming) 'The Sogdian Articles from the Viewpoint of General Linguistics.'
- ZHAO Li 赵莉 2006. 'Kezi'er shiku Xiangfu liushi waidao bihua kaoxi 克孜尔石窟降伏六师外道壁画考析 [An analysis on the narrative depiction of *Mahāprātihārya* on murals of Kizil].'  
*Qiuci Wenhua Yanjiu* 龟兹文化研究 3: 422–430.

