

**Buddhist Monastic Life in Central Asia —  
A Bilingual Text in Sanskrit and Old Uyghur Relating to the  
*Pravāraṇā* Ceremony**

Jens Wilkens<sup>\*,\*\*</sup>  
(Göttingen – Germany)

**Abstract** Bilingual texts in Old Uyghur and Sanskrit in Brāhmī script are essential for the understanding of how the Indian Buddhist tradition came to be appropriated by the Uyghurs in general, but especially during the Yuan Dynasty (1279–1368 CE). Some manuscripts represent Vinaya related materials which are missing altogether in monolingual Old Uyghur texts. The article introduces a bilingual fragment (Sanskrit and Old Uyghur) in Uyghur script housed in the Turfan Collection in Berlin which belongs to the Karmavācanā literature and deals with the *pravāraṇā* ceremony. This monastic ritual was celebrated after the annual retreat of three months during the rainy season (Skt. *varṣā*). In the Sanskrit part the fragment corresponds well with the Sanskrit Karmavācanā literature from Central Asia, whereas the Uyghur instructions on the recto are quite unique.

---

\* Dr., Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Jens.Wilkens@phil.uni-goettingen.de, 0000-0002-5110-0533.

\*\* I would like to thank the following two institutions for giving me the permission to publish the fragment U 6044 (Turfan Collection, Berlin) discussed below: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften and Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung. I would like to express my thanks to Hans Nugteren, Hirotoshi Ogihara, and Peter Zieme, who have read a draft of the article, for their remarks and suggestions.

**Received:** 29.11.2020; **Accepted:** 21.12.2020; **Published:** 31.12.2020

<https://doi.org/10.46614/ijous.831321>

**Key Words:** Old Uyghur, Sanskrit, bilingual texts, Central Asian Buddhism, festivals, pravāraṇā, karmavācanā.

**Özet: Orta Asya'da Budist Manastır Hayatı - Pravāraṇā Kutlaması Üzerine Sanskritçe ve Eski Uygurca Çift Dilli bir Metin**

Brāhmī harfli Sanskritçe ve Eski Uygurca çift dilli metinler, Hint Budist geleneğinin genel olarak Uygurlarda □ fakat özellikle de Yuan Hanedanlığı döneminde (MS 1279–1368) □ nasıl sahiplenildiğinin anlaşılması için gereklidir. Bu yazmaların bazıları, tek dilli Eski Uygurca metinlerde tamamen kayıp olan Vinaya ile ilişkili materyalleri sunmaktadır. Bu çalışma, *karmavācanā* edebiyatına ait olan ve Berlin Turfan Koleksiyonu'nda korunan Uygur harfli çift dilli bir fragmanı (Sanskritçe ve Eski Uygurca) tanıtmakta ve *pravāraṇā* törenini ele almaktadır. Bu manastır töreni, yağmur mevsiminde (Skt. *varṣā*) üç ay süren yıllık geri çekilmeden sonra kutlanırdı. Ön sayfadaki Uygurca talimatlar oldukça özgünken, Sanskritçe bölümde, fragman Orta Asya'daki Sanskritçe Karmavācanā edebiyatına bir hayli uyumludur.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** Eski Uygurca, Sanskritçe, çift dilli metinler, Orta Asya'da Budizm, kutlamalar, pravāraṇā, karmavācanā.

**Introduction**

The use of the Uyghur script to record Sanskrit texts was relatively well-known among learned specialists in the late phase of Uyghur Buddhism (13th and 14th centuries).<sup>1</sup> This “back to the roots” program has to be seen as accompanying the spread of the Brāhmī script among the Uyghurs as an alphabet in its own right, in the form of glosses, and as “foreign” elements in texts in Uyghur script, which reached its peak probably around 1300 CE or during the Yuan Dynasty (1279–1368 CE) in general.<sup>2</sup> Sanskrit sources became ever more important after the Mongol conquest of Central Asia, a development which is corroborated also by the Uyghur translation of the famous Sanskrit poetic work *Śatapañcāśatka* from the same period.<sup>3</sup> The considerable amount of bilingual texts

<sup>1</sup> For a recently published example see Wilkens 2020 (in this journal).

<sup>2</sup> The use of this alphabet by Uyghur Buddhists dates back to an earlier period.

<sup>3</sup> Edited in Zieme 2019.

in Sanskrit and Old Uyghur in Brāhmī script is also a clear indication of this approach.<sup>4</sup> The reasons for producing these bilingual texts can be considered as being probably manifold. In terms of the appropriation of Sanskrit literature, it is clearly highly relevant that Vinaya (“monastic discipline”) related materials<sup>5</sup> have been so far identified only in bilingual texts in Brāhmī script.<sup>6</sup> The piece edited below is the only exception that has come to light so far. It can be surmised that it was actually used as a formulary in Buddhist ritual performance.<sup>7</sup> The fragment belongs to the Karmavācanā literature<sup>8</sup> and deals with the *pravāraṇā* (“invitation”) ceremony. This monastic ceremony concludes ritually the end of the annual retreat during the three months of the rainy season (Skt. *varṣā*). In India, the ceremony had to be performed by at least five monks after preparatory purifications etc. on the full moon of the month *āśvayuja* or *kārttika* respectively.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The most important presentation of these rich materials is found in the two catalogue volumes by Dieter Maue (1996, 1–173; 2015, 1–330).

<sup>5</sup> On the complex structure of the different Vinayas see Clarke 2015.

<sup>6</sup> Maue 1996, 1–64; 2015, 1–31. By contrast, fragmentary monolingual Sogdian Vinaya materials are known since several years (Yoshida 2008, 329–332, 340). Despite close historical connections, Sogdian and Uyghur Buddhism differ in this respect.

<sup>7</sup> The same is true for other manuscripts in Uyghur script containing either monolingual Sanskrit texts as in the confession text U 6170 (Hartmann / Wille / Zieme 1996, 204–207), the *mantravinyāsa* of the *Mañjuśrī-nāmasaṃgīti* (Wilkens 2020), or in the snake charm edited in Zieme 1984, 429–430 (text A) or Sanskrit-Old Uyghur bilingual texts such as in text B (Zieme 1984, 433–434), also a snake charm in which the Old Uyghur parts translate the Sanskrit phrases.

<sup>8</sup> Chung (1998, 30–32) argues against the contention of some scholars that *karma* means “decision” and *karmavācanā* “decision-making”. He says that a decision is the outcome of a *karma* but not the *karma* itself. For *karmavācanā* he prefers the translation “formula” (Chung 1998, 19). For *karma*, Shōno (2019, 57) gives the translation “‘legal’ act”. Sanskrit Karmavācanā fragments were not only found in Central Asia but also in Gilgit. A recent re-edition of several folios from Gilgit with a comprehensive overview on scholarship dealing with these materials is Shōno 2019.

<sup>9</sup> Chung 1998, 39. With different climatic conditions in the Tarim Basin one might speculate that the Central Asian Buddhist traditions had specific regulations concerning the monastic retreat. Nothing is known, however, about any adaptations to a different environment. In her discussion of the

One or more supervisors (Skt. *prāvaraka*) were elected to oversee the correct performance of the ritual.<sup>10</sup> Fragments of the Sanskrit version of the text prescribing the process and rituals acts were discovered in Central Asia. The most important Old Uyghur text related to this ceremony is the composite *Insadi-sūtra*, one part of which consists of a version of the *Pravāraṇāsūtra*.<sup>11</sup> Additionally, there are fragmentary texts in Uyghur script containing “Brāhmī elements” which deal with the *pravāraṇā*. Peter Zieme was the first scholar to describe some of these fragments and to assign them to the correct religious context.<sup>12</sup> More recently, Yukiyo Kasai (in collaboration with Hirotoshi Ogihara) edited these pieces with new remarks together with a hitherto unknown text which mentions the *Pravāraṇāsūtra*.<sup>13</sup> The latter has not been identified so far. None of the pieces with Brāhmī elements contains formulae of the ceremony itself.

The fragment U 6044<sup>14</sup> from the Turfan Collection in Berlin edited below for the first time comprises parts of the formulae pronounced during the ceremony in Sanskrit as well as instructions in Old Uyghur. Already Härtel (1956, 114 sub § 76) stated with respect to the ritual for nuns: “Eine Besonderheit liegt darin, daß das Formular zweisprachig ist: die Anweisungen sind in *Tocharisch A*, die Ausführungen in *Sanskrit* gegeben.” He refers to the Tocharian A fragment THT 1048 from Sengim which contains part of the formulary intended for the *poṣatha-pravāraṇā* ceremony.<sup>15</sup> A small fragment (THT 1051) from Kocho represents part of the bilingual (Sanskrit and Tocharian A) formulary for the *poṣatha-pravāraṇā* ceremony for monks.<sup>16</sup> It overlaps in parts with

---

names of cereals in Tocharian B, Ching (2016) informs also about climatic conditions in the Tarim Basin, harvesting of crops, calendrical issues, etc.

<sup>10</sup> Chung 1998, 39.

<sup>11</sup> Note that this text is not based on a Sanskrit model but on a Chinese one.

<sup>12</sup> Zieme 1988.

<sup>13</sup> Kasai 2017, 89–109.

<sup>14</sup> An expedition code is not found on the fragment.

<sup>15</sup> It was first published with a correct identification already in Sieg / Siegling 1921, 229 (No. 414) and re-edited in Tamai 2014, 391–393. See also Ogihara 2013, 326.

<sup>16</sup> Sieg / Siegling 1921, 230 (No. 417). See Ogihara 2013, 326.

the bilingual text edited in this article. The Sanskrit text of the side here assigned as the verso, which we can reconstruct on the basis of the Uyghur script, is in many respects identical to the one published by Härtel,<sup>17</sup> although there are a few exceptions. In parts we find also correspondences between the Old Uyghur text and the edition by Chung.<sup>18</sup> Helpful is also the Sanskrit-Tocharian B bilingual text PK NS 10 from Duldur-Akhur edited online on the website of CEToM (A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts).<sup>19</sup> The first Sanskrit-Old Uyghur fragment in Brāhmī script belonging to the Karmavācanā literature ever published is very similar in structure because it also has formulae in Sanskrit and instructions in Old Uyghur.<sup>20</sup> The direction *sözlägü ol* is found

---

<sup>17</sup> Härtel 1956, 122–123 (§ 84).

<sup>18</sup> Chung 1998, 149 (section 2.3.3.3).

<sup>19</sup> URL: <https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/>. The piece is mentioned in Couvreur 1957, 315–316. See also Schmidt 2018, 45. A list of Tocharian Karmavācanā fragments referring to the *poṣatha-pravāraṇā*—some of them unpublished—is given by Ogihara (2013, 326). THT 1015 (= Sieg / Siegling 1921, 211 [No. 381]) contains only text in Tocharian A, whereas IOL Toch 139 is in classical Tocharian B (cf. CEToM). The same applies for IOL Toch 141 (ed. Broomhead 1962, 1, 86; I owe this reference and to Couvreur 1957 to Hirotoshi Ogihara). PK NS 16 and PK NS 333 are bilingual texts in Sanskrit and Tocharian B (see CEToM; Couvreur 1957, 316). An edition of the small fragment IOL Toch 1197 related to this ceremony is provided in Ogihara 2011a, 128. The text as it is preserved today is in Sanskrit. This is also true for PK NS 124 (Couvreur 1957, 316; Ogihara 2013, 326). The Sanskrit-Tocharian B bilingual pieces IOL San 400 and IOL San 404 were edited by La Vallée Poussin (1913, 846). The Sanskrit-Tocharian B pieces IOL Toch 785 and IOL Toch 1269 are published online on the websites of the International Dunhuang Project (IDP) and TITUS (for members only) respectively. The very small Sanskrit-Tocharian B bilingual fragment Or. 15003/121 was edited by Tamai (2006, 268). On Tocharian Vinaya texts in general see the overview by Pan (2017). See also the edition of fragments from a bilingual text in Sanskrit and Tocharian A with parallels in the *Cīvaravastu* in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivāda by Malyshev (2019). As shown by Malyshev (2019, 74), “[t]he composer went through the original text, picked selectively some word or a phrase and translated it and then went on.” Thus the text is neither a complete translation nor a specimen of the alternating type in which both languages are used depending on the context.

<sup>20</sup> Maue / Röhrborn 1976.

in both texts. The Tocharian literary tradition seems to be the model for the Old Uyghur Karmavācanā bilingual texts.<sup>21</sup>

The placement of the side assigned here as the recto presents a problem. It is quite possible that *yuldurga* “thistle(s)” mentioned in lines r. 01 and r. 08 is the equivalent of Tibetan *'dab-ma-dag* “straw” or “leaves” for the seats of the participants found in Härtel’s § 82.<sup>22</sup> In Härtel’s edition follows the “distribution”, by which we have to understand the distribution of the straw.<sup>23</sup> This would tally with lines r. 01–02 of the Uyghur text that the thistles should be distributed. The Sanskrit formula on the recto is, however, so far not found in any of the parallel versions in other languages.<sup>24</sup> It is also quite possible that the thistles were put to a ritual rather than a practical use during the ceremony.

### Spelling characteristics<sup>25</sup>

As the manuscript is one of the few specimens in Uyghur script containing Sanskrit formulae, spelling peculiarities should be described briefly. Confusion of dentals is common in this text, because it occurs in Sanskrit (r. 05: *suṣṭu*; v. 05: *ṣuruteṇa*; v. 06: *avavada-t[u]*; v. 08: *apa{n}ṭin*; v. 09: *yaṭa-d(a)rman*; v. 10: *ḍivir*) as well as in Uyghur words (r. 01: *anṭa*, r. 06: *kaṭa*).<sup>26</sup> It is remarkable that the connected spelling *sözläğüol* is met with twice in the manuscript (r. 06, r. 10). The erroneous form *apa{n}ṭin* in v. 08 can be explained by an original cluster <tt> in a Brāhmī manuscript which was misunderstood by the Uyghur Buddhist as representing the sequence of the letters <nt>. An inserted vowel – mostly *i* and only once *u* – between two consonants in the

<sup>21</sup> Hirotoshi Ogihara (personal communication) informs me that in Tocharian B there are archaic monolingual Karmavācanā fragments. These represent the oldest stratum of this kind of literature in Tocharian.

<sup>22</sup> Härtel 1956, 120.

<sup>23</sup> Härtel 1956, 121.

<sup>24</sup> For a possible correspondence see below.

<sup>25</sup> In the transcription, letters in () denote defective spellings, {} letters to be deleted and [] lost letters. In the translation, letters in [] are restored, text in () was added as an explication for a better understanding. *d* stands for etymologically correct *d* spelled *t* in the manuscript, whereas *t* represents etymologically correct *t* spelled *d* in the manuscript.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. also the loan word *pirav(a)r(a)ke* in r. 07.

rendering of the Sanskrit text is found in v. 05 (*piravarayami*), v. 09–10 (*pirakariṣiyami*), v. 10 (*divir*), v. 11 (*tirir*), v. 05 (*śuruṭena*). The compound *saṅghasthavira* (‘abbot’) is treated as two words in Old Uyghur (r. 03–04: *saṅga-iṣṭavire*), with a typical initial vowel in order to avoid an initial consonant cluster. Due to the difficulties of writing a Sanskrit text in Uyghur script the scribe made sometimes use of the diacritic dot next to the letter n: šwrwɔdyñ’ (*śuruṭena*) in v. 05, ’ñw k’mp’n (*anu-kampan*) in v. 07, č’ñ’ñ (*čanan*) in v. 08, the already mentioned spelling error ’p’ñdyn (*apanṭin*) in v. 08, ’yv’ñ (*evan*) in v. 10, pyr’v’r’ñ’ (*piravarana*) in r. 04. To represent /š/ in Sanskrit words two diacritical dots are added: r. 05 swšdw (*suštu*), in the fragmentary word in the first line on the verso, v. 02 p[ ]šw (*bikšu*), v. 08 p’šy’n (*pašyan*), v. 11 v’ršy (*varše*). Sanskrit *m* and *ṃ* are represented by <ñ> and <n> in Uyghur script. In Uyghur words the voiced back velar is represented by the letter q with two diacritical dots, which is characteristic for manuscripts from the Yuan period (cf. *yuldurga* in r. 01 and *yumgu* in r. 02). The style of writing and the spellings point to the Mongol period as the time of origin of this manuscript. All in all, the spellings are very similar to the manuscript U 6170 (Turfan Collection, Berlin) edited by Hartmann, Wille, and Zieme (1998, 204). In terms of palaeography, both pieces are quite similar. Thus, one can surmise that the manuscripts were produced in the same period.

### **Edition**

U 6044

Transliteration

Recto

- 01 ’’nd’ p’s’ ywldwrq’ ’wyl’kw  
 02 ’wl qwvr’q kwyz ywmqjw  
 03 ’wl : ’čmyš t’ s’nkk’  
 04 ’ysd’vyry s’dw pyr’v’r’ñ’  
 05 swšdw pyr’v’r’ñ’ typ :  
 06 ’wyč q’d’ swyz/[ ]kw’wl  
 07 p’s’ pyr’vrk/[ ]/y/  
 08 ’ylykynd’ ywl[ ]

09 p'q yn t[ ]twnwp [ ]  
 10 swyzl'kw'wl :: q'm'q [ ]  
 11 [ ]//ws/[ ]/[ ]d[ ]  
 12 rest

## Verso

01 [ ]š.//[ ]  
 02 p[ ]šw p'd'nt' p/[ ]  
 03 s'nkk' t//py [ ]  
 04 pyr'v'r'y'my [ ]  
 05 šwrwdyñ<sup>27</sup> p/[ ]//  
 06 ''v'v'd' d[ ]'nkk'  
 07 ''ñw k'mp'n //28 'wp'd'y '  
 08 č'n'n' p'šy'n ''p'ndyn  
 09 y'd' drm'n pyr'k'ry  
 10 šyy'my 'yv'ñ tyvyr ''py  
 11 tyryr ''py k'dy v'ršy

## Transcription

Recto (Härtel 1956, 120–121 § 82)

01 anța basa yuldurga ülägü  
 02 ol <:> kuvrag köz yumgu  
 03 ol : ačmišta saᅇga-  
 04 ištavire sadu piravarana  
 05 suštu piravarana tep :  
 06 üç kața sözl[ä]güol ::  
 07 basa pirav(a)r(a)ke //y/  
 08 eligindä yul[durganıᅇ bir]  
 09 baᅇın t[u]tunup [ ]  
 10 sözlägüol :: kamag [ ]  
 11 [ ]//ws/[ ]/[ ]d[ ]  
 12 [partly preserved letters]

<sup>27</sup> The last two letters curiously shaped.

<sup>28</sup> Perhaps two deleted letters or a punctuation mark.



### Translation

(01–02) Then, the thistle(s)<sup>29</sup> are to be distributed. (02–03) The community should close their eyes. (03–06) After opening (them) again, the Saṃghasthavira<sup>30</sup> should pronounce (the formula): *sādhu pravāraṇā suṣṭhu pravāraṇā*<sup>31</sup> three times. (07–10) Then, the supervisor of the *pravāraṇā* (Skt. *prāvaraka*)<sup>32</sup> ... taking in his hand [one] bundle [of] thistles ... he should pronounce: (10–12) “All ...”

Verso (Sanskrit) (PK NS 10 a2–a4; Härtel 1956, 122–123 § 84; see Chung 1998, 149, section 2.3.3.3)

01 [ ]ṣ. // [ ]  
02 *b*[ik]ṣu *badanta* P/[ ]  
03 *saṅga* *tribi* [ ]  
04 *piravarayami* [darṣtena]  
05 *śruṭena pa*[riṣaṅka]ya  
06 *avavada-t*[u man s]aṅga  
07 *anu-kampan* upadaya  
08 *čanan pašyan* apa {n}ṭin  
09 *yaṭa-d(a)rman* *pirakari-*  
10 *šiyami* *evan* *ḍivir* *api*  
11 *tirir* *api* *kadi* *varše*

Reconstructed Sanskrit text:<sup>33</sup>

[*a*ham *itthaṃnāmā*<sup>34</sup>] *bhikṣu*<sup>35</sup> *bhadanta*<sup>36</sup> P//// *saṅgha*<sup>37</sup> *tribhi*  
[*sthānai*]<sup>38</sup> *pravārayāmi* [*drṣtena*] *śrutena pa*[riṣaṅka]yā *avavadat*[u

<sup>29</sup> See Clauson 1972, 924a.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. the corresponding female term *saṅkhāsteryāñce* in the text for nuns in Tocharian A (Härtel 1956, 114).

<sup>31</sup> A similar formula, but one which all monks present during the ceremony should pronounce, is found in Chung 1998, 150 (section 2.3.3.6.). The fragmentary text reads *sādhu prav[ā] ///*.

<sup>32</sup> The spelling is not very clear.

<sup>33</sup> My aim is not to reconstruct a grammatically correct Sanskrit text but rather to give an idea what kind of text the Uyghur scribe might have used as a model.

<sup>34</sup> It is possible that the actual name of the monk was originally found here. In the Tocharian A fragment PK NS 10 a2 it is *dharmavarmo* (in Sandhi; cf.

mām] saṅgha<sup>39</sup> anukampām<sup>40</sup> upādāya jānaṃ paśyann āpattiṃ  
yathādharmaṃ prakariṣyāmi<sup>41</sup> evaṃ dvir api trir api kadā (?) varṣe  
...<sup>42</sup>

### Conclusion

The fragment U 6044 is further evidence for the importance of the *pravāraṇā* ceremony in Uyghur Buddhism. It can be argued that the text was actually used during the ritual performance of the *pravāraṇā*.<sup>43</sup> This might also throw some light on the Vinaya related materials in Brāhmī script. At least those with *alternating* languages were probably used in actual Buddhist practice rather than being merely tools to better understand the underlying Sanskrit texts. The manuscripts in which Sanskrit formulae *alternate* with Uyghur instructions are not bilingual texts in the strict sense. That Tocharian Karmavācanā manuscripts in Brāhmī obviously served as a pattern for the manuscript in question is highly significant. At least spellings and structure of U 6044 point to this conclusion. The importance of Tocharian literature would thus not be restricted to a few important texts which were translated in the early phase of Uyghur Buddhism (*Maitrisimit*, *Daśakarma-*

---

Couvreur 1957, 316). In THT 1051 (= Sieg / Siegling 1921, 230 [No. 417 r. 3]) it is *dharmaraksito* (in Sandhi).

<sup>35</sup> For correct *bhikṣur*.

<sup>36</sup> In PK NS 10 a2: (*bhada*)*ntaṃ*. There is enough space for another word in Uyghur after *badanta*.

<sup>37</sup> For *saṅghaṃ*. Perhaps to be restored to *bi[kṣu]-saṅga*.

<sup>38</sup> In PK NS 10 a2: *ṭrbhi sthānai*. Cf. the correct *tribhiḥ sthānaiḥ* in Chung 1998, 149 (section 2.3.3.3.). Not in Härtel 1956, 122 (51.5). For the omission of the visarga in a Sanskrit-Tocharian A Vinaya manuscript see Malyshev 2019, 89. In the Sanskrit fragment of the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* in Uyghur script the visarga is also omitted throughout. See Wilkens 2020, 31.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. also in PK NS 10 a3: *saṃgha* (for *saṃgho*). This fragment has additionally before that word: *saṃgha a(n)uśāsatu māṃ*.

<sup>40</sup> For *'nukampām*.

<sup>41</sup> The Old Uyghur text points to a variant *prakariṣyāmi* while the Sanskrit text edited by Härtel (also PK NS 10 a4) reads *pratikariṣyāmi*.

<sup>42</sup> Perhaps the beginning of the next *vastu*, the *varṣāvastu*.

<sup>43</sup> With regard to Tocharian Buddhism, Ogihara (2011b, 28–27) has argued that Sanskrit was used during ceremonies such as the *poṣatha*, the *pravāraṇā*, and the *śayyāsana*.

*pathāvadānamālā*, and a few others) as well as to terminology and phraseology (e.g., the syntax of metaphors). Perhaps Tocharian Vinaya texts—or to be more precise: Tocharian-Sanskrit bilingual texts with alternating language use according to the context (formulae vs. instructions)—were still actually used by the Uyghurs even after they had stopped translating Tocharian texts into their own language.<sup>44</sup> Such an assumption could explain the absence of monolingual Vinaya texts in Uyghur. One might speculate that the knowledge of Tocharian had deteriorated by the end of the 13th century or even earlier, thus precise instructions in Uyghur became a desideratum. It has to be admitted that this scenario is highly hypothetical.

### Abbreviations

CEToM: A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts

r. recto

v. verso

### Bibliography

- Broomhead, J. W. 1962: *A Textual Edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kuchean Manuscripts. With Transliteration, Translation, Grammatical Commentary and Vocabulary*. 2 volumes. PhD Diss. Trinity College, Cambridge.
- Ching Chao-jung 2016: “On the Names of Cereals in Tocharian B”. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 17, 29–64.

---

<sup>44</sup> Uyghur glosses in Brāhmī script to Vinaya texts in Sanskrit and Tocharian B are important testimonies of the meticulous use of these manuscripts by Uyghur Buddhists. See Maue 2009, 5 (no. 1 = Sanskrit), 17–26 (no. 13 = Tocharian B) and Maue 2010, 338–341 (no. 25 = Tocharian B). However, as Hirotohi Ogihara reminds me, the *Karmavācanā* text referring to the *Upasampadā* edited by Schmidt (2018, 1–159) has formulae to be recited by the candidate in Tocharian B because he should understand the content correctly. This would of course represent a problem for Uyghur Buddhists using Tocharian (and Sanskrit) materials for ritual purposes. How this problem is best addressed has perhaps to be postponed until further materials have come to light.

- Chung, Jin-Il 1998: *Die Pravāraṇā in den kanonischen Vinaya-Texten der Mūlasarvāstivādin und der Sarvāstivādin*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden; Beiheft 7).
- Clarke, Shayne 2015: “Vinaya”. In: Jonathan A. Silk (ed.), *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Vol. 1. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 60–87.
- Clauson, Sir Gerard 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Couvreur, Walter 1957: Review of Härtel 1956. In: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 1/4, 315–317.
- Härtel, Herbert 1956: *Karmavācanā: Formulare für den Gebrauch im buddhistischen Gemeindeleben aus ostturkestanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden III).
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe / Klaus Wille / Peter Zieme 1996: “Indrasenas Beichte”. In: *Berliner Indologische Studien* 9/10, 203–216.
- Kasai, Yukiyo 2017: *Die altuigurischen Fragmente mit Brāhmī-Elementen* (unter Mitarbeit von Hirotohi Ogihara). Turnhout: Brepols (Berliner Turfantexte XXXVIII).
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de 1913: “Nouveaux fragments de la Collection Stein”. In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 843–855.
- Malyshev, Sergey V. 2019: “A Sanskrit-Tocharian A Bilingual Text of the Cīvaravastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya”. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 19, 71–92.
- Maue, Dieter 1996: *Alttürkische Handschriften Teil I: Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII, 9).
- , 2009: “Uigurisches in Brāhmī in nicht-uigurischen Brāhmī-Handschriften [Teil I]”. In: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 62/1, 1–36.
- , 2010: “Uigurisches in Brāhmī in nicht-uigurischen Brāhmī-Handschriften Teil II”. In: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 63/3, 319–361.

- , 2015: *Alttürkische Handschriften Teil 19: Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII, 27).
- Maue, Dieter / Klaus Röhrborn 1976: “Ein zweisprachiges Fragment aus Turfan”. In: *Central Asiatic Journal* 20, 208–221.
- Ogihara, Hirotohi 2011a: “Notes on Some Tocharian Vinaya Fragments in the London and Paris Collections”. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12, 111–144.
- , 2011b: “On the Poṣatha Ceremony in the Tocharian Buddhist Texts”. In: *The Annual of Research Institute for Buddhist Culture Ryūkoku University* 35, 28–22.
- , 2013: “On the *Karmavācanā* in Tocharian”. In: Matteo de Chiara / Mauro Maggi / Giuliana Martini (eds.), *Buddhism among the Iranian Peoples of Central Asia*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Multilingualism and History of Knowledge 1; Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften philosophisch-historische Klasse 848; Iranische Onomastik 11), 311–331 (Plate II).
- Pan, Tao 2017: “A Glimpse into the Tocharian Vinaya Texts”. In: Susan Andrews / Jinhua Chen / Cuilan Liu (eds.), *Rules of Engagement: Medieval Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Regulation*. Bochum & Freiburg: Projekt Verlag (Hamburg Buddhist Studies 9), 67–92.
- Schmidt, Klaus T. 2018: *Nachgelassene Schriften*. 1. *Ein westtocharisches Ordinationsritual*. 2. *Eine dritte tocharische Sprache: Lolanisch*. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Stefan Zimmer. Bremen: Hempen (Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 24).
- Shōno, Masanori 2019: “How to Become a Buddhist Monk: A Re-edition of One of the Gilgit *Karmavācanā* Texts”. In: *Bulletin of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies* 2, 57–106.
- Sieg, E[mil] / W[ilhelm] Siegling 1921: *Tocharische Sprachreste*. I. Band. *Die Texte. A. Transcription*. Berlin & Leipzig: de Gruyter.

- Tamai, Tatsushi 2006: “The Tocharian Fragments in Or. 15003 of the Hoernle Collection”. In: Seishi Karashima / Klaus Wille (eds.), *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments*. Vol. 1. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology Soka University, 267–269.
- , 2014: “The Tocharian *Karmavācanā*”. In: *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University XVII*, 365–394.
- Tezcan, Semih 1974: *Das uigurische Insadi-Sūtra*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Berliner Turfantexte III).
- Wilkens, Jens 2020: “A Sanskrit Fragment of the *Mañjuśrī-nāmasaṃgīti* in Uyghur Script”. In: *International Journal of Old Uyghur Studies* 2/1, 27–35.
- Yoshida, Yutaka 2008: “Die buddhistischen sogdischen Texte in der Berliner Turfansammlung und die Herkunft des buddhistischen sogdischen Wortes für *bodhisattva*” (trans. Yukiyo Kasai & Christiane Reck). In: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 61/3, 325–358.
- Zieme, Peter 1984: “Indischer Schlangenzauber in uigurischer Überlieferung”. In: Louis Ligeti (ed.), *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 425–440.
- , 1988: “Das Pravāraṇā-Sūtra in alttürkischer Überlieferung”. In: *Barg-i sabz – A Green Leaf: Papers in Honour of Jes P. Asmussen*. Leiden: Brill, 445–453.
- , 2019: “A Fragment of an Old Uighur Translation of the *Śatapañcāśatka*”. In: *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University XXIII*, 333–343.



**Fig. 1: U 6044 recto**  
**Depositum der BERLIN-BRANDENBURGISCHEN**  
**AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN**  
**in der STAATSBIBLIOTHEK ZU BERLIN - Preußischer**  
**Kulturbesitz**  
**Orientabteilung**



**Fig. 2: U 6044 verso**  
**Depositum der BERLIN-BRANDENBURGISCHEN**  
**AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN**  
**in der STAATSBIBLIOTHEK ZU BERLIN - Preußischer**  
**Kulturbesitz**  
**Orientabteilung**