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PREFACE

The first edition of *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan* arose out of notes I made as the basis for some lectures I held during a brief but memorable visit to Japan in 1979 when I had the honour to be a guest of the Reiyukai. While waiting for a typhoon to pass by Tokyo I rather laboriously produced the camera-ready copy for that volume on an electric typewriter belonging to the Reiyukai Library. The volume has proved a very useful tool during the subsequent thirteen years, and demand for it has been steady.

Taking advantage of living now in a computerised age I have for some years been making additional notes to the *Guide* in order to keep it up to date and render it even more useful. If readers wish to communicate further items for inclusion in subsequent editions, I would be grateful for their assistance. In particular I am conscious of the fact that I have been unable adequately to take account of relevant material published in China.

I am especially grateful to Mauro Maggi and Hélène Vetch for providing me with information for inclusion in this new edition. It is with great pleasure that I express here my gratitude to the International Institute for Buddhist Studies for publishing this work and for so generously distributing it to interested scholars.

Hamburg, 30 November 1992

RONALD E. EMMERICK
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A GUIDE TO THE LITERATURE OF KHOTAN

R. E. EMMERICK

(University of Hamburg)

[1] Historical background

Khotan, known by the modern Chinese name 和田 Ho-t’ien, is a city with a population of about 50,000 people in the Sinkiang Autonomous Region of China. It is an important agricultural and manufacturing centre at the southern edge of the Tarim basin in an oasis watered by the Yurung Kash (Turkish for ‘White Jade’) and Kara Kash (Turkish for ‘Black Jade’) Rivers. It has been famed for many centuries for its gold and its jade, both of which continue to be important assets. Its silk industry is of legendary antiquity.

We have four accounts of the foundation of Khotan, all of which associate it with the son and ministers of the emperor Aśoka. This would place the foundation of Khotan firmly in the third century BC. The accounts we have are found in two Chinese and in two Tibetan sources. The earliest is the account given by the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim Hsüan-tsang in his Hsi-yü-chi, which belongs to the seventh century AD. With this the account in the Tibetan text known as the Goṣrṅga-vaśkaraṇa may be contemporary. Later are the accounts in the ‘Life of Hsüan-tsang’ by his pupils Hui-li and Yen-ts’ung and in the Tibetan ‘Prophecy of the Li country’. Thus, even the earliest of these accounts can at best reflect the tradition current in Khotan in the seventh century concerning events a thousand years earlier.

---


2 The names given to Khotan have been discussed at length by P. Pelliot, Notes on Marco Polo, vol. 1, Paris 1959, 408-425.

When Hsüan-tsang was in Khotan, the city was subservient to Chinese rule as it had lately been to that of the Western Turks. Indian influence was everywhere present, and he duly noted the use in Khotan of an Indian type of script and the large number of monasteries and adherents of the Mahāyāna. It must have seemed plausible to him when he was told by the local inhabitants that the foundation of Khotan had originally been effected by a compromise reached between groups of Indians on the one hand and of Chinese on the other. Indeed, all the evidence we have would tend to support his account.

There are some indications of the early coexistence of Indians and Chinese in Khotan. Thus, from Yotqan, the ancient site of Khotan, we have a collection of coins from the first centuries AD bearing Chinese legends on the obverse and Indian Prakrit ones in Kharoṣṭhī script on the reverse. Prakrit was indeed the administrative language of the nearby kingdom of Shan-shan in the third century AD, as we know from the discovery of Kharoṣṭhī documents, mainly at Niya.

When the Iranian element of the population of Khotan became dominant we do not know. Nomadic tribes speaking languages of Iranian origin must have been wandering about Central Asia from a very early period, probably from the first half of the second millennium BC, but we do not know when they first began to settle in permanent villages.

The first solid evidence we have of the presence of Iranians in Khotan is indirect evidence provided by a Prakrit document from Endere, which has given rise to considerable discussion. It is dated in the regnal year 'of the Great King of Khotan, King of kings' (khotana maharaya rayatiraya). The king is named Vijīda Simha, which corresponds with the royal name Bijaya Simha of the Tibetan 'Prophecy of the Li country' written more than half a millennium later. The fact that the king's name is Sanskrit may indicate merely the preservation of a tradition handed down from an earlier period when the Indian colony provided the city's ruler. Hsüan-tsang states explicitly the contemporary belief that he royal power had been transmitted without interruption from the foundation of Khotan.

The king of the Endere inscription bears the title hinajha 'generalissimo', which T. Burrow was the first to explain correctly as the Iranian equivalent of the well-known

---


6 For references to the literature see *Prolegomena*, 168 n.7.

Sanskrit *senāpati*. The Khotanese word *hināyasā* is now attested in the Khotanese version of the Sumukha-sūtra, where the Tibetan version has *sde-dpon* (= Sanskrit *senāpati* in the Mahāvyutpatti 3686, 4338).⁸

Not only did this king of Khotan bear an Iranian title but the document itself is dated in his regnal year and the term used for regnal period is *ch'una*, now generally transcribed as *ksuna*.⁹ This is the Khotanese word *ksuna*-, which is used in exactly the same way.¹⁰

It is clear from the use of this terminology even in a Prakrit inscription that there must already at that time have been a long-established connection between the Iranian inhabitants of Khotan and the royal power. At a later date, in the tenth century, the language of the court was Khotanese even though the rulers continued to bear Indian names.

It is not known exactly when Buddhism was introduced into Khotan. According to the Tibetan ‘Prophecy of the Li country’¹¹ it was introduced 165 years after the origin of Khotan, that is, about 84 BC. It is generally considered that that date is rather early for Buddhism to have been established in Khotan, yet it is striking that the introduction of Buddhism is expressly attributed to a period so long after the time of Ashoka. One might well have expected that the author would have claimed high antiquity for Buddhism in Khotan and associated its introduction directly with Ashoka. The fact that he did not do so lends credibility to his account.

Khotan was a major centre of Mahāyāna studies when Fa-hsien visited it about AD 400 on his way to India, and it expanded still further in this respect when Hsüan-tsang spent some months there in the seventh century on his way back from India to China. Both pilgrims noticed the large number of monasteries in Khotan. So too the Korean pilgrim Huei-ch’ao in the eighth century. That Buddhism flourished there in the ninth and tenth centuries we know from Khotanese sources.

As Khotan was an important centre of Buddhist studies throughout the period from which all our material in the Khotanese language comes, that is from the seventh till the tenth century AD, it is not surprising that virtually all the surviving literature is Buddhist in content and that even the secular documents are usually in some way coloured by Buddhism.

---

⁸ Ch c.001 *KBT* 140.


¹⁰ Earlier etymological speculations on this word by H.W. Bailey in *BSOAS*, XII.2, 1948, 328; *Asia Major*, n.s. II.1, 1951, 5; *KT* 4.5 are superseded by his etymology in his *Dict.*, 69 s.v.

[2] Location of the Khotanese documents

The Khotanese documents were found mainly at the sites of former shrines and monasteries within the kingdom of Khotan, about 160 km to the north and east of the modern city, and in the caves of Tunhuang. For a summary and further bibliography concerning these sites see G. Gropp, *Archäologische Funde aus Khotan Chinesisch-Ostt urkistan*, Bremen 1974, 16-28.

Most of this material is now preserved in the libraries of Western Europe. The most important collections are those in:

1. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris
   (*Pelliot collection*)
2. India Office Library, London
   (*Hoernle and Stein collections*)
   (*Stein collection*)
4. Ethnographic Museum, Stockholm
   (*Hedin collection*)
5. St. Petersburg Chapter of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg
   (*Petrovsky and Malov and Oldenburg collections*)
6. Völkerkundemuseum, München
   (*Francke collection*)
   (*Crosby collection*)

---


A few fragments are located in the USA at the universities of Harvard and Yale (*Huntington collection*).

Some fragments are found in the Ryūkoku University Library in Japan (*Ōtani collection*).

A few inscriptions are found in the National Museum, New Delhi. It is not known whether the six folios of the Book of Zambasta that were formerly in Calcutta are still there or not.

A few fragments were formerly kept in the Zentralinstitut für alte Geschichte und Archäologie der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Bereich Alter Orient, East Berlin. They are now housed together with those in the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung, Berlin. One inscription is in the Überseemuseum, Bremen.


[3] Nature of the documents

The Khotanese documents are usually of one of two kinds. They are either pothi manuscripts or Chinese scrolls. The pothi manuscripts are bundles of large rectangular paper leaves (e.g. 40 × 10 cm). Each leaf has towards the left-hand side a circle, in the middle of which may be a hole through which a piece of string could be passed to keep the leaves together. The leaves have normally four to ten lines of writing on each side and each leaf is numbered in the left-hand margin. The Chinese scrolls are rolls of Chinese paper of varying width, but not usually wider than about 25 cm, and of greatly varying length up to about seven metres. They usually have on one side a Chinese text that is not related to the Khotanese text or texts on the other side.


---

15 Information kindly supplied by Hélène Vetch.
In addition to these usual kinds of Khotanese documents there are a certain number on pieces of wood and, rarely, on wall paintings. No stone inscriptions have yet been found, but one inscription has been found on a jar.


[4] The decipherment

The pioneers in the decipherment of Khotanese were Augustus Frederic Rudolf Hoernle16 (1841-1918), Sten Konow17 (1867-1948), and Ernst Leumann18 (1859-1931), all of whom published significant contributions to its interpretation before 1920. Hoernle has never been given due credit for his part in the decipherment of Khotanese. That he was the first to decipher it has not even been mentioned in any work of reference. It is mentioned neither in Grierson’s obituary nor in the listing in the Neue deutsche Biographie. However, already in 1901 Hoernle wrote:19

‘Only a few of the words or phrases have, as yet, been determined, but these seem to prove clearly that the language of the documents is an Indo-Iranian dialect, having affinities both with Persian and the Indian Vernaculars, in addition to peculiarities of its own which connect it with the dialects of the Western Highlands of Central Asia. To me it appears that it has its nearest congener in the so-called Ghachchah dialects of the Pamir, the Sariq-qoli, Shighni, Wakh, Munjani, Sangliuki.’

[5] The name of the language

The Middle Iranian language of Khotan has been variously designated since its discovery. Among the terms that have been used are: ‘Saka’, ‘Khotani’, ‘Khotani Saka’, ‘Nordarisch’, ‘Khotanese Saka’, ‘Khotan Saka’, and ‘Khotanese’. Since the speakers of the language themselves used the term hvatana- (e.g. Z 23.4), the term ‘Khotanese’ would appear to be the most straightforward designation. J. Kistle first proposed adoption of the term ‘khotanisch’ in WZKM, 26, 1912, 395.

---


18 Obituary notice by W. Schubring in ZDMG, N.F. 12 (Band 87), 1934, 69-75.

19 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Extra Number 1, 1901, 32-33.
The script

The script is usually called Central Asian Brahmi, a Central Asian development of the Indian Brahmi script (Upright Gupta). It appears in two main varieties according to whether it is formal or cursive. By formal is meant the ornamental and elaborate variety made with thick strokes using various kinds of quill. By cursive is meant the variety that can be written quickly with either a quill or a brush, although the individual akṣaras are not connected even in this variety. There are several stages between formal and cursive. On formal Central Asian Brahmi script in general see Lore Sander, Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung, Wiesbaden 1968.

The formal script used for writing Khotanese has been carefully described and illustrated by M. Leumann, Sakische Handschriftproben, Zürich 1934. The cursive script has not yet been the subject of study although syllabaries in the cursive script were studied by A.F.R. Hoernle in JRAS, 1911, 447-477. Detailed research on the formal script was carried out by Lore Sander under a research project financed by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. She reported on this project in her article ‘Zu dem Projekt »Paläographie khotan-sakischer Handschriften«‘ in Middle Iranian Studies, pp. 159-186. According to her research the formal script can be classified into four varieties: 1. Early Turkestan Brahmi; 2. Early South Turkestan Brahmi; 3. South Turkestan Brahmi; and 4. Late South Turkestan Brahmi. Most of the extant manuscripts in formal script are written in South Turkestan Brahmi. See Lore Sander, ‘Brahmi scripts on the eastern silk roads’, StII, 11/12, 1986, 159-192; ‘Remarks on the formal brāhmī of Gilgit, Bāmiyān, and Khotan’, pp. 107-130 + plates 196-215 in Antiquities of Northern Pakistan, Reports and Studies, vol. 1, Rock inscriptions in the Indus Valley, ed. K. Jettmar, Mainz 1989.

A characteristic feature of the script is the use of two dots above an akṣara to represent a vowel sound that was not indicated by the Indian script. This vowel sound was probably originally [e], as it arose as a result of the palatalisation of old Iranian [a]: Khotanese māsta- ‘great’ from *masita- (cf. Avestan masita-). But it is very early merged with [i]: mista- ‘great’. For other sounds not indicated by the Indian script special digraphs were used: e.g. ṣs for [z] and tc, ṣs for the affricates [ts], [dz] respectively. A distinction between voiceless and voiced consonants was made by writing the voiceless consonants double: ṅs [S] beside ś [Z]. On this pattern we find similarly ṭt [t] beside t [d], thus setting free ṭ for the fricative [S], which was not present in Indian.

Another peculiar feature of the script is the use of a subscript hook. It is often found where we know that a sound had previously been present, and it must itself represent some phonetic feature.\(^{20}\) The subscript hook is usually for convenience transcribed as here by an apostrophe ('). Thus we have in Khotanese gguva- ‘ears’ from *gūza- from

---

earlier *gauśa- (cf. Avestan gaośa-). The archaic pronunciation was still known. Thus we find \( kṣāṣa' \) beside \( kṣīta' \) for ‘six’ (cf. Avestan \( xīvaš \)). This led to the development of an alternative system of representing the voiced sibilants by a subscript hook so that the voiceless sibilants no longer needed to be marked by doubling: \( ś [s] : ś' [z] \) and \( s [s] : s' [z] \). Consonants that were lost during the development from Old Khotanese were in some cases likewise replaced by the subscript hook: \( bālṣya' \)‘Buddha’ becoming \( bāyṣa' \).

A striking feature of the Khotanese script is the occasional practice of attaching more than one vowel sign to an akṣara. Thus, \( kuī \) has the \( u \)-sign below and the \( i \)-sign above the \( k \), and \( saruai \) has \( u \) below and \( ai \) above. In the cursive script two vowel signs may both be attached to the top of the akṣara e.g. \( vāe, cyāai, nāau \). The numerous digraphs and complex akṣaras assumed in many cases alternative forms and variations are found also between different scribes.

Khotanese manuscripts and texts often begin either with \( om \) or the word \( siddham \) ‘success’. Both may be represented by a stylised symbol. See Lore Sander, ‘Om or siddham — remarks on openings of Buddhist manuscripts and inscriptions from Gilgit and Central Asia’, pp. 251-261 + table in \textit{Deyadhrama: Studies in memory of Dr. D.C. Sircar}, ed. G. Battacharyya, Delhi 1986.

[7] Bibliography

No up-to-date bibliography is available. A bibliography of early publications concerning Khotanese was published by M.J. Dresden, ‘Introductio ad linguam hватanicam’, \textit{Jaarbericht no. 9 van het vooraziatisch-egyptisch Gezelschap, Ex Oriente lux}, 1943-44, 200-206.

A comprehensive bibliography of the writings of Sten Konow (1867-1948) up till 1941 was published in \textit{Norsk Bibliografisk Bibliotek}, III.5, 1942, 92-103. Among later publications of S.Konow concerning Khotanese are:

‘Notes concerning Khotanese’, \textit{NTS}, XIII, 1945, 199-224

‘Khotanese \( āryāmata' \), \textit{AO}, XX, 1946, 77-80

‘The oldest dialect of Khotanese Saka’, \textit{NTS}, XIV, 1947, 156-190


Useful bibliographical references are to be found arranged according to the fragments concerned in M.J. Dresden, \textit{Handlist}. Some bibliographical information is contained in Bailey’s \textit{Dict.}, pp. ix-xvi.

Notices of current work on Khotanese appear in \textit{Abstracta Iranica} 1978-.
[8] Survey of Khotanese literature


[9] Transcriptions of texts and fragments


These transcriptions of fragments can be used only as a rough guide to what is available. The readings are very tentative and often misleading and no attempt has been made to join fragments together. In many cases only isolated words have been read and

no further information has been given concerning the fragment. Many fragments that have not been published in transcription can be joined to those that have. Many fragments can be identified as parts of or variants to texts that are otherwise known. Once identified, the less legible portions can often be read correctly. A further difficulty of a technical nature has been created by publishing large numbers of fragments in transcription without a detailed signature concordance. A concordance to the fragments is still an urgent desideratum. A useful concordance to Bailey's transcription of the fragments is provided by M.J. Dresden's, Handlist.

In addition to the texts published in transcription by H.W. Bailey, the following are the main texts available: Adhyardha-śatikā, Jñānolka-dhāraṇi, and The Book of Zambasta. For details concerning them see [18] below.

[10] Facsimiles

A large portion of the material has been published in facsimile form. References can be found in Dresden's Handlist. Since the appearance of Dresden's Handlist the following manuscripts have been published in facsimile: Ch c. 001 in Shûyō Takubo, Studies plates on pp. 46-118, Ch 00266, P 2022, P 2025, P 2895, P 2896, P 2956 (the Khotanese lyrical poem, for which see 19.1 below) in M.J. Dresden, 'A lyrical poem in Khotanese, Part I: Text', Beiträge zur Indienforschung, (Veröffentlichungen des Museums für indische Kunst Berlin, Band 4), 1977, plates on pp. 99-103. In addition to the above a number of articles containing facsimiles of fragments have been published. References to most of these will be found here in connection with the particular texts being discussed. In general photographs can readily be obtained of all fragments except those in Japan.


It is unlikely that the supplement to the Dict. that was announced by Bailey will appear. He published an article concerning fifteen vocabulary items in Indologica Taurinensis VIII-IX (= Sternbach volume), 1980-1981, 15-18 'in anticipation of a Supplement'. These have been considered in Studies II: see the section on Vocabulary below.

Many individual texts have been provided with glossaries, and it remains necessary for the beginner to use them, since Bailey's Dict. intentionally omits the Indian element of the vocabulary, which constitutes a large proportion of the words actually occurring in
a given text, especially in the case of Buddhist literature. The Indian element of the vocabulary is not just technical but covers a wide spectrum. The loanwords have been taken from Prakrit as well as from Sanskrit and they often occur in spellings that make them scarcely recognisable even to a trained Indologist.

Bailey's *Dict.* is largely etymological. More space is often given to a discussion of the etymology than to the rest of the treatment of a word. Caution must be exercised especially when using the *Dict.* in connection with hitherto untranslated texts as the excerpts quoted in the *Dict.* pay little regard to the context and often present a meaning based entirely on etymological speculation. The *Dict.* is particularly unreliable in the case of Late Khotanese Buddhist texts.

The older glossaries compiled by Konow and Leumann were difficult to use because they contained much information that has become outdated. It is now possible to return to those glossaries because the *Dict.* provides a means of checking the earlier statements.

[12] Vocabulary

[12.1] Lexicography

An attempt has been made to keep track of advances made with regard to Khotanese vocabulary by publishing a series of volumes in which vocabulary items are discussed in alphabetical order. Two volumes have appeared so far:


In these volumes individual articles are signed by their respective authors. The series is to be regarded as a kind of central repository for information concerning Khotanese vocabulary.

[12.2] Loanwords

Several articles have been devoted to loanwords from Indian:

- **Almuth Degener**

- **Almuth Degener**

- **R.E. Emmerick**

- **R.E. Emmerick**

**[12.3] Specialised studies**

Articles devoted to or containing contributions concerning particular vocabulary items are regularly summarised in *Studies* (see 12.1 above).


Articles appearing since *Studies II* concerning particular vocabulary items are:


- **R.E. Emmerick** ‘Khotanese *birre*, *JRAS*, 1990, 7-9 + plate.


**[12.4] Computer aids**

In *Middle Iranian Studies*, p. 134, I reported on the efforts that have been made hitherto to make available concordances prepared by computer. The first computer index to Khotanese was made in 1964 by J. Moyne. It covered *KT 1-5* and *KBT*. Shortly afterwards I initiated a project in Cambridge listed as "L 260 A concordance of Khotanese" in *Computers and the Humanities*, 3, 1969, no. 5, p. 300. As reported in *Middle Iranian Studies*, in 1982 it looked as though concordances would be available almost immediately, but no further progress seems to have been made.
As a result of the rapid development taking place in computing most of those scholars who currently work on Khotanese use microcomputers so that it can be expected that an increasing amount of material will be generally available in digitalised form. Already all published texts are now available on disk.

[13] Chrestomathies

Works containing an outline grammar, texts, and vocabulary are the following:

13.2 S. Konow, Saka Studies\textsuperscript{22} (= Oslo Etnografiske Museum Bulletin 5), Oslo 1932.
13.4 S. Konow, Khotansakische Grammatik (= Porta linguarum orientalium, XXII), Leipzig 1941.
13.5 S. Konow, Primer of Khotanese Saka, (reprinted from NTS XV), Oslo 1949.
13.7 L.G. Herzenberg, Khotanosaksckij Jazyk\textsuperscript{23} (= Jazyki Narodov Azii i Afriki), Moscow 1965.

Nos 1 and 6 provide only Late Khotanese texts, no. 3 contains only two pages of grammatical information, and no. 7 contains very little in the way of reading material.

Since the orthography of Late Khotanese is very irregular it is better to begin with Old Khotanese. When one has a grounding in Old Khotanese it is possible to detect the old forms behind the late spellings.

No single work can at present be recommended for orientation with regard to Old Khotanese. It is probably best to begin with a well-written text such as The book of Zambasta (= London Oriental Series 21), ed. R.E. Emmerick, OUP 1968, using for the vocabulary a combination of the glossary to Leumann’s edition (no. 3 above). H.W. Bailey, KT 6, and Bailey, Dict. In addition to these, the vocabulary of most of the material not found in Leumann’s edition is to be found in my articles in Asia Major, n.s. XII.2, 1966, 148-178 and XIII.1-2, 1967, 1-47. For a grammatical outline the works of Konow (nos 2, 4, and 5) can be recommended, supplemented by R.E. Emmerick, Saka grammatical studies (for which see [15] below). For Late Khotanese Dresden’s edition of

\textsuperscript{22} Reviewed by H.W. Bailey, BSOS, VII.3, 1934, 412-413; É. Benveniste, BSL, XXXIII.3, 1932, 33-34.

\textsuperscript{23} Reviewed by M. Leumann, Kratylos, 12, 1967, 94-95.
the Jākastava (no. 6) remains a standard introduction. It too can be usefully supplement-
ed by my Saka grammatical studies.

[14] Teaching aids

A course book for teaching Khotanese is being developed by R.E. Emmerick and has been found useful at several universities. It contains exercises for translation both into and from Khotanese.


On phonology see the following section.


Little has been written concerning Khotanese syntax. The most detailed treatment is by L.G. Herzenberg, Khotanosakskij Jazyk (Jazyki Narodov Azii i Afriki), Moskow 1965, 117-137. For the treatment of specific aspects of syntax see also W.L. Heston, Selected problems in fifth to tenth century Iranian syntax, (University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D., 1976), University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor—London.

Khotanese accentuation has been treated by M. Maggi in a doctoral dissertation presented to the Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli entitled: Studi sul sistema accentuale del cotanese, Napoli 1992. According to Maggi in polysyllables the Old Khotanese stress accent fell on the first heavy syllable from the end of the word but never on the word final syllable. A word containing only light syllables was stressed on the initial syllable.
Note the following discussions of particular items of syntax: conditional sentences (P.O. Skjærvø, *BSOAS*, XLIV.3, 1981, 461-463); compound tenses (P.O. Skjærvø, *Studies* *I*, 32); construction with dāsś- (R.E. Emmerick, *Studies* *I*, 97).

Some articles dealing with particular features of the language are the following:

G. Canevascini  

Almuth Degener  

Almuth Degener  

R.E. Emmerick  
‘Syntax of the cases in Khotanese’, *BSOAS*, XXVIII.1, 1965, 24-33.

R.E. Emmerick  

R.E. Emmerick  

R.E. Emmerick  

R.E. Emmerick  

R.E. Emmerick  

R.E. Emmerick  

O. Hansen  

D.A. Hitch  

D.A. Hitch  

E. Leumann  

E. Leumann  

M. Maggi  

N. Sims-Williams  

D. Weber  
[16] Phonology


A useful collection of source material for the study of Khotanese phonology is provided by Tokio Takata in A historical study of the Chinese language based on Dunhuang materials (= Oriental Studies Library No. 33), Sobunsha, Tokyo 1988.

For a detailed study of Ch 00120, which contains a Brahmi transcription of part of the Chinese text of the Vajracchedikā and of some introductory prayers, see R.E. Emmerick and E.G. Pulleyblank, A Chinese text in Central Asian Brahmi script: new evidence for the pronunciation of Late Middle Chinese and Khotanese (= Serie orientale Roma LXIX), Rome 1993. In R.E. Emmerick, 'The Dunhuang MS Ch 00120: its importance for reconstructing the phonological system of Khotanese', Turfan and Tun-huang: the texts (= Orientalia venetiana IV), ed. A. Cadonna, Firenze 1992, 145-170, some additional remarks are made concerning the aspirates and retroflexives in Khotanese, and the possibility is discussed that the so-called 'script hook' may have indicated a prosodic feature.

[16.1] Vowel phonemes

According to my 1979 article Old Khotanese had the following vowel phonemes: /i i e e a ø o u ü ø/. These were reduced in Late Khotanese to: /e a ø ø/. It is possible to describe them as /i a u ø/. In R.E. Emmerick and M. Maggi, 'Thoughts on Khotanese e and ø', pp. 67-73 in: Corolla Iranica, 1991, Old Khotanese was shown to have had two additional vowel phonemes since there were phonemic distinctions between e and e on the one hand and between ø and ø on the other hand.

[16.2] Consonant phonemes

In Acta Iranica, 21, 1981, 185-209 I proposed the following consonant phoneme inventory for Khotanese: /p t d k g ι d l l t s t s' t s' ι s z z s' ι z m n n' f f' ι ι ι s h ι ι ι w j ι r/. Peripheral phonemes are: /b η γ/. To these must be added a phoneme whose phonetic form remains unclear. In Khotanese orthography it is represented by a subscript hook.
Emmerick and Pulleyblank have shown that the Khotanese phonemic system corresponds quite closely to that underlying the Brahmi script. This would mean that the Khotanese not only borrowed vocabulary freely from Prakrit and Sanskrit but were also influenced by the Indian phonemic system. In particular, they took over from Indian the retroflex phonemes. As is well known these spread north into an Iranian language such as Pashto and are largely responsible for its non-Persian appearance. Moreover, under Indian influence the Iranian fricatives [tʃ] [θ] [x] reverted to the corresponding aspirate stops [pʰ] [tʰ] [kʰ] as in Balochi.

The relatively rare phonemes represented by ts and ch in Khotanese orthography are to be interpreted as [tsʰ] and [tʃʰ] respectively and not as [tsʰ] and [tʃʰ] as thought previously.


[17] Translation technique


[18] Buddhist texts

The texts range from the earliest Mahayanist texts such as the Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra, the Ṣūraṅga-samādhī-sūtra, and the Sukhavatī-yūha to tenth century Tantric texts such as the Vajrayāna verses. The language varies from the oldest Old Khotanese in archaic orthography written in the old ornamental script (Ṣūraṅgama-samādhī-sūtra) to the latest Late Khotanese written in late orthography in cursive script (Mañjuśrī-nairatmyāvatāra-sūtra). They include close translations from the Sanskrit (Ṣaṅghāṭa-sūtra, Suvarṇabhūṣottama-sūtra), paraphrases of Buddhist tales (Jātaka-stava, Nanda), and original Buddhist doctrinal texts (Karmāṇi Deśana, Mañj).

Since most of the Khotanese translations were made directly from Sanskrit originals they also provide evidence for early forms of the Sanskrit texts themselves, which is important not only for texts that are no longer extant but also for extant Sanskrit texts as the oldest Sanskrit manuscripts are often much later than those of the Khotanese translations.

Although it is known that Khotan played an important role in the transmission of Buddhism during the period represented by the extant material, no attempt has yet been made by Buddhologists to assess its importance. The Khotanese texts have hitherto been dealt with exclusively by philologists, who have concerned themselves primarily with the question of decipherment.

(a) Texts with known titles

Since the Khotanese translations were almost exclusively made from Sanskrit originals, reference is made here to Chinese, Tibetan, or other versions only if there is some special reason such as the loss of the original Sanskrit. Fragments of some of these texts are also found in Sogdian. For information concerning the Sogdian fragments see D.A. Utz, A survey of Buddhist Sogdian studies, (Bibliographia philologica buddhica, Series Minor III), Tokyo 1978.

[18.1] Adhyāyndha-śatikā [Adhś]

The Khotanese version of Adhś was one of the first Khotanese texts to be studied intensively. The Khotanese text was edited by E. Leumann in his Zur nordarischen Sprache und Literatur.24 (Schriften der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg 10. Heft), Straßburg 1912, 92-99. Text, translation, and glossary were published by E. Leumann in the Wogihara festschrift, Taishō Daigaku Gakuhō, Tokyo 1930, 47-87. No facsimile has yet been published, but the main manuscript (SI P 4) is kept in the manuscript department of the Institute of Oriental Studies in St. Petersburg.


[18.2] Ananta-mukha-nirhāri-dhāraṇi [Ananta]

Of this Tantric text only one Sanskrit fragment survives. It was edited by F.W. Thomas in MR, 86-87.

Three folios of a Khotanese version of Ananta were identified by Watanabe for E. Leumann, who edited and translated them in N, 151-155. They were retranscribed by H.W. Bailey in KT 5.102-104. The main spell (dhāraṇi) of the text is known also from a Tunhuang manuscript published in transcription by H.W. Bailey in KT 3.77-78. The text is known also in a Chinese version: Ananta-mukha-[sādhaka]-dhāraṇi, translated by Chih-yen in AD 721 (T.I. 1018).

Additional folios or fragments of folios, containing partly overlapping text and apparently belonging to four different manuscripts, have been identified by Skjærvø. These include folios or fragments belonging to the manuscript known to Leumann and published in transcription by H.W. Bailey (Kha 1.119 fol. 29 KT 3.127-128; H 142 NS 73

KT 5.30; H 143 NS 27 KT 5.37; Dumaqu 0127 KT 5.265) as well as one unpublished fragment in the India Office Library. Four others were also published in transcription by H.W. Bailey (H 143 NS 103 KT 5.43 + Kha 1.303a1 KT 5.171; Kha 1.119 fol. 33 KT 5.145; Kha ii.31 KT 5.176; Balawaste 0206 KT 5.234) but not identified by him.


This text is known from two Late Khotanese manuscripts: Ch xlvi and S 2471. The Khotanese text of Ch xlvi was edited along with the parallel Sanskrit and Tibetan texts by S. Konow in MR, 289-356. Konow also translated the Khotanese text and provided a glossary to it. A facsimile reproduction of Ch xlvi is provided by plates XIV-XVII in MR. H.W. Bailey transcribed S 2471 in KBT 94-100 and published a transcription of the variant Ch xlvi in KT 5.243-8. Lines 252-276 of S 2471 were translated by H.W. Bailey in BSOAS, X.4, 1942, 891 and 893. For a summary of the text and further bibliography see R. Handurukande in Encycl. Buddh., II.1, 18-19. A detailed study of the Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese versions was provided by M. Walleser, Aparimitāyurjñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtram, Heidelberg 1916. A Tibetan version of the ApS was translated into French by J. Eracle in ‘Le Sūtra du Buddha Aparimitāyus’, Samādhi, 5, 1971, 52-67.

There has been some confusion with regard to the signatures of the manuscripts used by Konow. The main manuscript bears the India Office Library signature Ch xlvi.0015 while a variant to folio 7 of the main manuscript referred to by Konow as variant ‘B’ bears the signature Ch xlvi.0013b, which unfortunately appears in the heading of his edition without mention of Ch xlvi.0015, although the plates carry the correct signature. Bailey added to the confusion by publishing his revised transcription of Ch xlvi.0015 in KT 5.243-248 under the signature Ch xlvi.0012a, which is one of the signatures of the Vajracchedikā, as explained by Konow in MR p. 214 n.1. In his Handlist p. 35 Dresden followed Bailey by listing the ApS under Ch xlvi.0012a. In the second edition of KT 5 Bailey has ‘corrected’ Ch xlvi.0012a to Ch xlvi.0015a.


[18.4] Aśokāvadāna [Aśoka]


[18.5] Bhadracaryā-deśanā [Bcd]


Bcd has been widely recited among Mahāyānists ever since the fourth century A.D. It is a devotional work stressing the merits of good conduct (Sanskrit bhadracaryā) and containing a confession (Sanskrit deśanā) of sin. It is known by several other names in Buddhist literature, but the title Bhadracaryādeśanā is usual in Iranian studies because it is given by the colophon of the Khotanese version, which is known from a single manuscript belonging to the Pelliot collection preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale (P 3513). The Khotanese version consists in 68 stanzas — stanza 55 was numbered incorrectly in the manuscript as 56 — written in Late Khotanese verse. It corresponds fairly closely to the extant Sanskrit version: see the edition of the Khotanese and Sanskrit with accompanying translation by Asmussen. Editions of the Sanskrit, the Tibetan version, and three Chinese versions are provided by Sushama Devi, Samantabhadracaryā-pranidhānārāja, New Delhi 1958. On the Sanskrit text of Bcd 51 see G. Schopen, JIABS, 12.1, 1989, 149-157.


[18.6] Bhadrakalpika-sūtra [Bk]

Due to an error introduced by S. Konow this work has usually been incorrectly called "Bhadra kalpikāsūtra" in Khotanese studies. It is a sacred text (Sanskrit sūtra) concerning the names of the Buddhas to appear in the good aeon (Sanskrit bhadra-kalpa). Originally, the good aeon was considered to be one in which five Buddhas will appear, the fourth being the historical Buddha Śākyamuni and the fifth the future Buddha Maitreya, but according to another tradition 1000 Buddhas will appear in it. The Khotanese
version of this text has apparently combined both traditions since the introduction speaks of 1005 names and the rewards that will come to those who learn or recite them etc. However, the only extant Khotanese manuscript that contains the names lists only 998 names and several of those are duplicated.

The Khotanese text is one of a group of texts contained in the India Office Library manuscript Ch c.001, which has been dated to A.D. 943. It was studied by S. Konow in a monograph entitled Saka versions of the Bhadrakalpikasūtra, (Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akadem i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse. 1929, no.1), Oslo 1929 and again by Shūyo Takubo, Tonkō Shutsudo Uteno Himitsu Kyōtenshū no Kenkyū [ = Studies on the Khotanese ‘Collection of the esoteric sūtras’ found in Tunhuang], Tokyo 1975. The latter work contains an excellent facsimile of the whole manuscript. A transcription of the whole text is contained in Takubo’s work and also in H.W. Bailey, Khotanese Buddhist texts, London 1951 (ed. 2 Cambridge 1981), pp. 76-90. A manuscript in the Bibliothèque nationale (P 2949) contains part of the introduction only. For a transcription of it see Bailey, KBT 75.

Manuscript Ch c.001 also contains another long list of Buddha names in two copies. They are transcribed by Bailey in KT 5.249-255. This list represents a tradition according to which there were billions of Buddhas in countless good aeons. Other versions of this tradition are found in Ch 00268 KBT 100-104, P 2742 KT 3.55-57, P 3513, 1-12 KT 3.112-116, S 2471 KBT 91-93. Some of these manuscripts also include a second list of Buddhas that incorporates local Khotanese Buddha names not known to Indian tradition: Ch 00268 and S 2471 (variant P 2742). Manuscript Ch 00268 prefaces to such a list an allusion to the 1005 Buddhas of the good aeon (lines 98-99 in Bailey’s edition, KBT 103).

The Khotanese Bhadrakalpikasūtra does not correspond to the text bearing the same title in the Tibetan Kanjur nor to the Chinese Bhadrakalpikasūtra translated by Dharmarakṣa (3rd-4th century A.D.) although it belongs to the same tradition. On the various lists and their relation to the Bhadrakalpikasūtra contained in the Kanjur see F. Weller, Tausend Buddhanamen des Bhadrakalpa nach einer fünfzehnten Polyglotte herausgegeben, Leipzig 1928.

Bk is one of the six texts contained on the India Office Library roll Ch c.001. All these texts have been transcribed, translated, provided with Chinese and Tibetan parallel texts where available and with a glossary, and published in facsimile by Shūyo Takubo, Studies (rev. R.E. Emmerick, III, 20.3/4, 1978, 253-256). The six texts of Ch c.001 are:

1. Buddhaśrīśa-vijaya-dhāraṇī  KT 5.368 lines 1-11
2. Sītātapatra-dhāraṇī       KT 5.368-376 lines 12-198
3. Bhadrakalpika-sūtra        KBT 76-90
4. Deśānā I                   KT 5.249-252
5. Sumukha-sūtra [Sum]        KBT 135-143

Of these the first two are in Sanskrit, although the second is provided with a Khotanese colophon (KT 5.376 lines 195-8). The second text is found also in another manuscript (S 2529) transcribed by H.W. Bailey in KT 5.359-367. Here only the last two words are Khotanese. On text no. 5 [Sum] see 17.22 below. These six texts, a mixture of Mahāyāna
and Tantra, are said by Shūyo Takubo to constitute a unified collection of esoteric sūtras in conformity with Buddhist ritual practise. The central text is the Sumukha-sūtra. The first three texts are invocational, inviting those who are invoked to take part in the ritual, while the Deśanā texts are intonation texts.

There are four colophons in this manuscript: at the end of the Sitātapatra (KT 5.376), of Deśanā I (KT 5.252), of the Sumukha-sūtra (KBT 143), and of Deśanā II (KT 5.255). Except in the case of Deśanā I the year is specified as the hare year (sahāicā sālaya). I have given reasons for considering this hare year to be AD 943, 955, or 967 (Studia iranica, 7.2, 1978, 285). As a result of an independent examination of these colophons taking into account the mention of asterisms (nakṣatras). J. Hamilton25 was able to restrict the hare year in question to AD 883 or 943 and decided in favour of AD 943. In view of this remarkable agreement I give up my preference for AD 967 (III, 20.3/4, 254 n.2).


Bhaiṣ is one of the earliest Mahayanist texts, dating perhaps from the third century AD. It may have originated in Central Asia, but only fragments of versions in Central Asian languages are extant. The work has four main themes: the twelve vows of Bhaiṣajyaguru, the Buddha of healing; the blessings obtained by those who hear or recite etc. the Buddha’s name; the way to worship Bhaiṣajyaguru; the twelve Yakṣa generals.


The Khotanese fragments do not appear to represent a close rendering of any known version and may represent an independent Central Asian tradition.

Two fragments of Sogdian versions of Bhaiṣ are extant. The published fragment transcribed and translated by É. Benveniste in his Textes sogdiens, Paris, 1940, pp. 82-92

25 Règnes, 53-54.

26 The signature FM 25,1 (probably = Fonds manuscrits) is now PK FM 25,1, whereby PK represents Pelliot khotanais.
was shown by him to correspond closely to the Chinese translation of Hsüan-tsang (AD 650). According to D. Utz, A survey of Buddhist Sogdian studies, Tokyo, 1978, p. 13 an unpublished fragment with the signature Tioc = 10402 may be a rendering of a Chinese version differing from any of the four extant ones.


There are four Chinese versions of Bhaiś, concerning which details are given by P. Pelliot, 'Le Bhaiṣajyaguru', BEFEO, 1903, 33-7. Hsüan-tsang's version (AD 650) was translated into English by W. Liebenthal, The Sūtra of the Lord of healing, (Buddhist Scriptures Series 1), Peiping 1936.


[18.8] Dharma-śarīra-sūtra [DhŚ]

Two folios of a Khotanese version were published in facsimile, transcription, and translation by G.M. Bongard-Levin and E. Tjomkin, 'Otryvok sakskoj versii Dharmaśarīra-sūtry (Dharmaśarīra-sūtra), Istoriko-filologičeskie issledovanija, Moskow 1967, 247-252; in transcription and translation with glossary by the same authors in 'Fragment of the Saka version of the Dharmaśarīra-sūtra from the E.N. Petrovsky collection', IIJ, XI, 1969, 269-280 (reprinted in G.M. Bongard-Levin, Studies in Ancient India and Central Asia, (Soviet Indology Series 7), Calcutta 1971, 257-272). Folio 7 recto of the Khotanese text and one side of a folio of a hitherto unpublished Sanskrit text of the DhŚ were published by the same authors in New Buddhist texts from Central Asia, (XXVII International Congress of Orientalists, papers presented by the USSR delegation), Moskow 1967, 13. See also my remarks in Asia Major, XVI, 1, 1971, 68. For the Sanskrit fragments see now G.M. Bongard-Levin and M.I. Vorob'eva-Desiatovskaja, Pamjatniki indijskoj pis'mennosti iz central'noj Azii, part 1, Moskva 1985, 65-76.
[18.9] Hṛdayasūtra

The Khotanese text of the Hṛdayasūtra was published in transcription by H.W. Bailey in KT 3.110-112. It was identified as being a translation of the Hṛdayasūtra by P.O. Skjærvø, who has prepared an edition with translation, commentary, and glossary. A Khotanese commentary on the Hṛdayasūtra is also extant: see on Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra below.


[18.10] Jātaka-stava [JS]


This text seems not to be a translation but a Khotanese composition containing succinct summaries of fifty-one jātaka stories, of which all but about nine have been traced in other sources. Bibliographical references to parallel stories can be found in Jampa Losang Panglung, Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Versionen, (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series III), Tokyo 1981.

The JS was written during the reign of king Śri Viśa' Śūrrā (AD 967-978).


Eight folios from three manuscripts of Jñ were identified as such by E. Leumann and published in transcription and translation in N, 157-164. The three manuscripts he designated Jñ¹, Jñ², and Jñ³. Of Jñ¹ the folios 2-6 are extant, of Jñ² folios 3 and 4, of Jñ³ folio 20, the last folio. Two folios transcribed by H.W.Bailey, KT 5.105 under the signatures H. 142 NS 81 and H. 142 NS 82 represent variants to the text published by Leumann in N, 158. One folio from yet another manuscript — Jñ⁴ if we continue Leumann's system — was published in transcription by Bailey, KT 5.36-7 under the signature H. 143 MBL 22. It was identified as Jñ by Bailey. It overlaps with folio 2 and the missing folio 1 of Jñ¹.

Yet another folio of Jñ is extant in Japan. It has been published in facsimile in Shin Sei-iki-ki in 1937 (on a plate without pagination in volume 2) and again in Sei-iki kōko
zuftu (reprinted 1972). It was transcribed by H.W. Bailey under the signature Otani 1-2, but he appears not to have recognised it as belonging to the Jñ since he reverses recto and verso. It overlaps with the manuscripts transcribed by Leumann in N p. 158. It may conveniently be referred to as Jñ.

Two further folios (143 S.A. 12 and 143 S.C. 185) found in Berlin but apparently belonging originally to the Hoernle collection remain unpublished.

Chinese versions of Jñ are T.I. 1397 and 1398. The correspondence is said by Leumann not to be close. The same applies to the Tibetan version found in the Kanjur.


Several fragments contain references to the kalpa-rāja (Khot. (IO) 17.1b4 KT 5.309; Or 6402b2 10r5 KT 5.14; PK 1311 a4, b8 KT 5.14) or the kalpa-rāja-sūtra (Ch 00275.1a3 KT 3.19; Kha 1.223a7 b3 KT 5.168). The text has not so far been traced elsewhere.


A number of fragments have been termed 'Karma text' by H.W. Bailey, who refers (KT 5.296 n.1) to their similarity to the Mahākarmavibhaṅga, ed. S. Lévi, Paris 1932. They are characterized by the phrase aṣṭa karma tcamāna hve' ... 'there is an act by which a man ...' (= Sanskrit aṣṭi karma ... -sam-vartaniyam). Their direct source has not been traced.

To KV belong texts 647-660 transcribed by Bailey in KT 5.296-302; text 638 KT 5.292; and text 62 KT 3.132. In addition a number of unpublished fragments from the Francke collection belong to the same text: FK 210.19 Do. 31, FK 210.20 Do. 32, FK 210.21 Do. 33, FK 210.22 Do. 34, FK 210.23 Do. 35, FK 211.2 Do. 55, FK 211.4 Do. 57, FK 211.5 Do. 58, and (probably) FK 210.18 Do. 30. M. Maggi has discovered that the following fragments from the Francke and India Office Library collections form almost complete folios. He lists the items provisionally as follows: (1) Khot. (IO) 2; (2) Khot. (IO) 18.2; (3) Macartney b (left half) + Khot. (IO) 3 (right half); (4) Macartney c (left half) + FK 210.19 Do. 31 (right half); (5) Khot. (IO) 5 (left portion) + Macartney e (middle portion); (6) Macartney d (left half) + FK 210.20 Do. 32 (right half); (7) Macartney a (middle portion) + FK 210.21 Do. 33 (right portion); (8) FK 211.4 Do. 57 (left half) and FK 210.22 Do. 34 (right half); (9) FK 211.5 Do. 58 (left half) + Khot. (IO) 4 (right half); (10) FK 210.23 Do. 35; (11) Khot. (IO) 3; (12) Khot. (IO) 18.1; (13) Khot. (IO) 18.4; (14) Farhad Beg 05; (15) Harvard 3.4; (16) Dumaqu 0021; (17) Dumaqu 0121; (18) FK 211.2 Do. 55; (19) FK 210.18 Do. 30.


MPPS is a commentary on the Hṛdayasūtra, on which see above.

---

27 This information was supplied by Hiroshi Kumamoto.


Mañj is contained on P 4099 (445 lines), published in transcription by H.W. Bailey, KBT 113-135. The colophon (lines 435-445) was published separately in transcription by Bailey, KT 2.123-4.

Mañj was written early in the reign of Viśa’ Śura (AD 967-978). It is a composite work borrowing freely from older Khotanese literature. Corresponding passages in the Book of Zambasta have been printed opposite the text of Mañj on pp. 440-453 of my edition of Z. Mañj 261-277 corresponds to Vajr 41a4-43b4 (see on Vajr below).


The importance of Mañj in assessing the role played by Khotan in the development of Buddhist doctrine is considerable. Thus, in Mañj 54-82 (verses 42-69) the three kleśas Moha, Rāga, Dveṣa are described as three doctrinal monsters, kings of the Rākṣasas. The parts of their bodies are identified with details of Buddhist doctrine. The twenty eyes of Moha correspond to the twenty satkāya-drṣṭi, his ten mouths to the ten aκuśala, his eight arms to the eight aksana and so on. See my article ‘Three monsters in Khotan’ in Studia Iranica, 6.1, 1977, 65-74, where the text of Mañj 54-82 (verses 42-69), translation, and commentary are found. Such a description has not so far been traced elsewhere in Buddhist sources.

[18.16] Nandāvadāna [Nanda]

The story of Nanda the merchant is contained in P 2834.6-58, transcribed by H.W. Bailey in KBT 45-7. Translation and commentary by R.E. Emmerick, ‘Nanda the mer-

Some parallel passages from the corrupt Sanskrit text of the Nandāvadāna contained in Cambridge MS Add. 1598 (Avadāna-sāra-samuccaya) were quoted in the footnotes on pp. 73-4 of my article ‘Nanda the merchant’. Four other Sanskrit manuscripts of the Nandāvadāna are found in the Tokyo University Library (references in Seiren Matusunami, *A catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library*, Tokyo 1965).


[18.17] Pradaṅśinā-sūtra [PS]


*PS* is about the advantages accruing from properly circumambulating a caitya. A similar text on the same subject is the Caiṭya-pradaṅśinā-gāthā known in a Tibetan version in the Kanjur (Peking vol.39, Mdo Šu 208a3-210bl) and in Chinese (T.I. 700). On the Tibetan version see *Encycl. Buddh.*, III.4, 565-6.

The Khotanese *PS* follows a document on the same roll (Ch 0048.1-13 *KT* 2.40-1). The document has been dated to AD 995 (?) by J. Hamilton, *JA*, 265.3/4, 1977, 369; *Règnes*, 51.


[18.18] Sad-dharma-puṇḍarika-sūtra [Sdhp]

Only one śloka is actually found in Khotanese translation: see *Z* 6.3. Several versions of a metrical summary of *Sdhp* are extant. The most complete version is P 2782, transcribed by H.W. Bailey in *KT* 3.57-63. Variants to parts of the text are provided by Or 8212.162.82-90 *KT* 2.5-6 and P 2029b 17-21 *KT* 3.55. Text, translation, commentary, and glossary are provided by H.W. Bailey, *Sad-dharma-puṇḍarika-sūtra, the summary in Khotan Saka*, (The Australian National University, Faculty of Asian Studies, Occasional Paper 10), Canberra 1971 (rev. by M.J. Dresden, *JAOS*, 93.4, 1973, 599-600). The text

---

28 Photocopies of these were kindly supplied to me in 1973 by Professor Minoru Hara, University of Tokyo.

29 Reprinted in 1973 with the addition of a list of errata on p. 58.


P 2029 was transcribed by Bailey in KT 3.54-55 as if it were two sides of a scroll, whereas in fact the manuscript is paged as pointed out by H. Vetch. Page 1 contains Bailey's lines 17-21 (Sdhp); page 2, lines 1-5; page 3, lines 6-11; and page 4, lines 12-16.


The Khotan manuscript of the Sanskrit Sdhp has a colophon written in Khotanese at the end of the manuscript and three Khotanese colophons at the end of three of the chapters of the Sanskrit text. The three chapter colophons were first studied by Ariyoshi Sanada, 'Saiiki Bonpons Hokekyō no Ich-Shahon ni tsuite' [ = On a Sanskrit Manuscript of Sdhp found in Central Asia], pp. 54-61 in Oriental Studies in honor of Junitaro Ishihama on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, Osaka 1958. They were studied in detail by R.E. Emmerick, 'Some Khotanese donors', pp. 383-8 in Mémorial Jean de
Menasse, ed. Ph. Gignoux and A. Tafazzoli, Louvain 1974, with facsimiles on plates XIX-XXI. The Khotanese colophon at the end the manuscript was transcribed and translated by H.W. Bailey in the preface to Lokesh Chandra’s facsimile edition. Note that the husband’s name is jalal not dala as in Bailey’s transcription and translation in accordance with the colophon at the end of chapter 15, which has jalapüña. Bailey has omitted the words u hva[ra]kä at the end of line 7.

As for the date of the Khotanese summary of Sdhp no certainty can at present be obtained. The fact that in both P 2782.82 and Or 8212.162.155 the Ācārya of the Gūmattirai monastery, Dharmaidrākarapüña, is mentioned may aid in determining the date.

[18.19] Saṅghāṭa-sūtra [Sgh]

The Sgh is a long text mostly dealing with the merit accruing from reciting, copying etc. the text itself, but also containing a number of interesting comparisons. The Khotanese version has claimed much of the attention of students of Khotanese partly because of its size. Many complete folios and numerous fragments are extant. The process of identifying and locating the fragments is still continuing. At present 145 fragments belonging to at least 27 manuscripts have been identified as belonging to the Saṅghāṭasūtra. Detailed investigation has shown that all the Khotanese fragments are based on a single original translation of the Sgh that evidently enjoyed great popularity in Khotan. This translation must have been made no later than the first half of the fifth century AD according to Canevascini.

As the Sgh is a large Old Khotanese text that is on the whole a faithful translation of the original Sanskrit it enables close comparison with the Sanskrit with the result that precise information can be obtained concerning the meanings and functions of Khotanese words.

The main stages in the elucidation of Sgh have been:

1. ‘Allerlei Zusammenhänge aus sechs Saṅghāṭasūtra-Handschriften’ by E. Leumann, N, 1-41. Most of these folios and fragments have been retranscribed by H.W. Bailey in KT 5.

2. S. Konow, Saka Studies, Oslo 1932, pp. 63-111 contains an edition of a large number of ‘Fragments of the Saṅghāṭasūtra with the Tibetan version and an English translation’. The edition is followed by a comprehensive (though now antiquated) vocabulary (pp. 113-198).

3. Transcriptions of the material published by Konow together with transcriptions of numerous fragments both identified were published by H.W. Bailey, KT 5 (see references in Dresden’s Handlist, p. 78).

4. L.G. Herzenberg, Jazyk khotano-saksikx buddhijskix pamjatnikov, Leningrad 1966 (unpublished dissertation to be viewed in the Lenin Library, Moskow; contents summarised in ‘Avtoreferat’ published under the same title and date) edited 17 unpublished folios of Sgh. He mentions 19 folios, but 9 and 14 and 10 and 17 are fragments of the same folio. Two folios which I transcribed in the library of the Institut Vostokovedenija in Leningrad in June 1974 were not used by Herzenberg.


[18.20] Sudhanāvadāna [Sudh]

Sudh is known from three main manuscripts, two of which (Ch 00266 and P 2025 + P 4089a) agree closely while the third (P 2957) differs significantly. In addition there are four fragments in the Bibliothèque Nationale: P 2896, P 2957, P 2784,30 and P 5536 bis (now PK 5536 bis). The material has all been transcribed by H.W. Bailey in KBT 11-39 apart from P 5536 bis, which was transcribed by him in KT 5.327 under the signature P 5536b2. On this last fragment see in detail R.E. Emmerick, ‘A Khotanese fragment: P 5536 bis’ in Monumentum H.S. Nyberg, I, (Acta Iranica 4), Leiden-Téhéran-Liège 1975, 223-236 with plates XXXV-XXXVI in Acta Iranica 6, 1976). For a translation and linguistic commentary on Sudh see H.W. Bailey, BSOAS, XXIX.3, 1966, 506-532.

A further seven-line fragment of Sudh provides yet another variant to the introduction of the text: manuscript Li (M. 3914) 73 of the Peking collection (microfilm no. 5534).31 It has been published in transcription by H. Kumamoto in Studia grammatica Iranica, Festschrift für Helmut Humbach, ed. R. Schmitt and P.O. Skjærø, München 1986, 242 n. 6.


---

30 For three lines on this manuscript that were overlooked by Bailey see R.E. Emmerick, ‘Some more Khotanese aksaras’, Bulletin of the Asia Institute, 4, 1990, 231-232.

For a comparative study of some of the motifs in the Khotanese Sudhanāvadāna see Almuth Degener, ‘Sudhanas Wanderung in khotanischer Fassung’, StII, 11-12, 1986, 21-32.

This text is written in Late Khotanese and presents many difficulties in the way of interpretation. A synoptic text enabling quick comparison of the various fragments would be of great advantage. It is not yet known whether the variation between the manuscripts is due to discrepancies in the manuscript tradition or whether it reflects the oral transmission of an epic style poem.

The Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of the Sudhana-kinnary-avadāna in the Avadānakalpa-latā have been treated by J.W. de Jong in Textcritical remarks on the Bodhisat-

[18.21] Sukhāvati-vyūha [SV]

Only one folio, bearing the number 19, has so far been found to belong to this text. It was transcribed under the signature Kha 0013c2 by H.W. Bailey, KT 5.123.


[18.22] Sumukha-sūtra [Sum]

For this text see also on Bk above. The content of Sum is trivial: the Bodhisattva Vajrapāni and a number of deities promise to protect anyone who recites, learns etc. the Sum. It contains a number of dhāranis. The entire Late Khotanese version is extant.


[18.23] Śūraṅgama-samādhi-sūtra [Śgs]

As the title of this work indicates, it is concerned with a particular meditation (Sanskrit samādhi) known as ‘Śūraṅgama’, which Lamotte renders ‘marche héroïque’.

E. Leumann identified eight fragmentary folios from the Hoernle collection as being part of a Khotanese version of the Śgs. He edited and translated them in N, 93-101 and they were retranscribed by H.W. Bailey in KT 5.83-86. Fifteen folios from Khadaliq near Khotan, also in the India Office Library, bearing the signature Kha 1.13, were identified by H.W. Bailey and published in transcription in KBT 1-7. Five small fragments bearing the signature D iii that had been published in transcription by H.W. Bailey in KT 5.256-257 were identified by myself as belonging to a single folio from a different manuscript of the Śgs from that represented by the other folios. All this material was edited, translated, commented upon, and provided with a glossary by R.E. Emmerick, The Khotanese Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra, (London Oriental Series 23), OUP 1970. This work also contains an edition of the corresponding portions of the Tibetan version and facsimiles of the Khotanese material used. Reviews known to me are the following: M.J. Dresden, JRAS, 1971, 193-5; J.W. de Jong, Asia Major, XVI.1-2, 1971, 207-210; O. von Hinüber, OLZ, 69.9/10, 1974, 491-3; M. Leumann, JAOS, 94.4, 1974, 478-9.


Kumārajiva’s Chinese translation (T.I. 642), dating to about AD 400, was translated into French by É. Lamotte, La concentration de la marche héroïque (Śūraṅgamasamādhi- sūtra), (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 13), Bruxelles 1965.

The Khotanese Śgs is distinguished by its archaic and consistent orthography (see my edition pp. xix-xxi). Its precise date cannot be determined.

P.O. Skjærvø established that the fragment D. x 10c, which I could not trace in Śgs (see my edition pp. xviii-xix), belongs in fact to the Saṅghāṭasūtra (22v7 ff.) and D. x 10bl (KT 5.263) is to be joined to the right of it. The striking phrase śaṃdo humphutemā is a rendering of Sanskrit pādau śirasābhivandya. The initial word read <śūraṃ> lggamā by Bailey is actually to be supplemented as [padma]ggarbhā.

Another fifteen largely preserved folios of the main manuscript as well as a number of small fragments are kept in the India Office Library. They were identified by P.O. Skjærvø: see Middle Iranian Studies, p. 15. An edition is in preparation.
[18.24] Suvarṇa-bhāsottama-sūtra [Suv]

The Suv is a composite work that was built up around the confession that forms the third chapter of the extant texts. It contains among other things also jātakas (stories of the lives of Buddhas in former births), a chapter on the doctrine of śūnyatā (emptiness), and an early medical treatise.

Progress in the study of the Khotanese Suv can be summarised as follows:

1. ‘Stücke aus dem Suvarṇaprabhāsa’, edited and translated by E. Leumann, N, 53-91. Among these pieces are nine folios made available to Leumann by Salemann. No facsimile of these folios is available, which is a serious handicap for research on the Suv material.

2. S. Konow, Zwölff Blätter einer Handschrift des Suvarṇabhāsasūtra in Khotan-Sakisch, (Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse XVIII), Berlin 1935, 426-486 contains text, translation, parallel Sanskrit, glossary. Retranscribed by H.W. Bailey, KT 5.106-119. Facsimiles of folios 33 and 34 were published on pp. 365-366 of G. Gropp, Archäologische Funde aus Khotan, Chinesisch-Osttürkistan, Bremen 1974. A facsimile of folio 32 was published by L. Sander in St11 11/12, 1986, plate 18 p. 191. It is probable that most of these folios were destroyed during World War II. Photographs of the condition they were in when Konow worked on them are in the hands of Bailey and myself. In the interest of scientific research they ought to be published.

3. A large number of folios and fragments of Suv have been published in transcription by H.W. Bailey in KT 1 and KT 5. For their identification and location see (7) and (8) below.


7. A preliminary list of the folios and fragments of Suv together with their location with regard to the Sanskrit original appeared in the first edition of R.E. Emmerick,
The Sūtra of golden light,32 pp. 105-106. This work contains also an appendix (pp. 107-8) giving a translation of the Khotanese introduction to Suv.

(8) P.O. Skjærvø, *The Khotanese Suvarnabhāsottamaśūtra*, unpublished habilitation thesis, Mainz 1983, provides a detailed edition of all fragments of the Khotanese identified before 1983 including many that were first identified by Skjærvø himself. The work also contains an English translation and a commentary.

(9) A substantial amount of new material has been identified in the Petrovsky and Malov Collections in St. Petersburg and will be published by M.I. Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja and myself.

Almost all the material is in Old Khotanese and corresponds more or less to the Sanskrit text as edited by Nobel apart from the Late Khotanese version in P 3513.59v-l75v2 KT 1.242-9, which corresponds to 1-tsing or its Tibetan rendering.

[18.25] Vajracchedikā [Vajr]

The Vajr is arranged in the form of a dialogue between Subhūti and the Buddha. It is one of a small number of sūtras summarising the philosophical teachings of the Prajñā-pāramitā literature.

An edition of the Khotanese Vajr (44 folios) with translation, parallel Sanskrit text, facsimiles, and glossary was published by S. Konow, *MR*, 239-288, 330-356 and plates V-XI. The text was retranscribed by H.W. Bailey, *KT* 3.20-29. Even in the corrected reprint Bailey’s edition still contains some lapses not found in Konow’s edition. Thus, Konow correctly printed dātā vā in 2b3 whereas Bailey prints only dātā in both editions.

The introductory verses explaining the name Vajracchedikā (2a4-2b2) were edited with translation and commentary by H.W. Bailey, *BSOAS*, XV.3, 1953, 530. The Khotanese Vajr is of some interest because of its deviations from the Sanskrit text. At times it includes commentarial additions. Most striking are the replacement of a translation of the concluding stanza of the Vajr — a literal one in Old Khotanese is found in Z 6.15 — by a commentary in 34 verses. The manuscript tradition of these verses in Ch 00272, the manuscript used by Konow, is corrupt, but progress in understanding these verses has been made possible as a result of the discovery by H.W. Bailey, *KBT* p. viii ad 11, of a second version, less corrupt, in the manuscript of Mañj 261-277. An edition of these verses based on both versions, together with a translation and commentary, were published by R.E. Emmerick, ‘The concluding verses of the Khotanese Vajracchedikā’, in *Prajñāpāramitā and related systems: Studies in the Honor of Edward Conze*, (Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 1), ed. L. Lancaster, 1977, 83-92. The obverse of the first folio of Vajr manuscript Ch 00275 contains several fragmentary statements in different hands, one of which statements consists in a date, which can be regarded as providing a terminus before which that copy of Vajr must have been written. This date is the 14th April AD 941 according to the calculation of J. Hamilton, *Règnes*, 51.

For literature concerning all versions of Vajr see E. Conze, *Literature*, 60-66.

Some general problems surrounding the Khotanese Vajr were discussed by Yuishin Itō in ‘A few problems concerning the Khotanese Vajracchedikā Prājñāpāramitā Sūtra’, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies], II.2, 1954, 207 (560)-209 (562).


[18.26] Vimala-kirti-nirdeśa-sūtra [VkN]

The VkN (‘Teaching of the (Bodhisattva) Vimalakirti’) is one of the earliest Mahāyāna sūtras. The first known translation into Chinese dates to 188 AD. The theme of the work is based around the idea that Vimalakirti pretended to be ill and took the opportunity of preaching to all who came to visit him.

The Sanskrit text of VkN is not extant apart from a few quotations in later Sanskrit works. A French translation based on the Tibetan version of the Kanjur and on Hsüan-tsang’s Chinese rendering of AD 650 (T.I. 476) is contained in É. Lamotte, *L’enseignement de Vimalakirti (Vimalakirtinirdeśa)*, (Bibliothèque du Muséon 51), Louvain 1962.


Two folios (8 and 171) of an Old Khotanese translation of VkN were identified as such by E. Leumann,33 who published a transcription and translation in N, 42-49. These were retranscribed by H.W. Bailey, KT 5.80-82 (nos 168 and 169). Two further folios (unnumbered) of an Old Khotanese translation of VkN were identified as such by H.W. Bailey, who published a transcription in KT 5.131-132 (nos 237 and 238) and a transcription of the corresponding part of the Tibetan version of VkN in KT 5.377-378. These folios are published in facsimile by Skjærø as f. 8, f. 171, f. *115, and f. *116 respectively.

Two fragmentary folios published in transcription by H.W. Bailey in KT 5.314 (nos 691 and 692) were identified by myself as belonging to VkN (see AO, XXX, 1966, 35). Of these Ōtani 3-4 corresponds to pp. 255-256 in Lamotte’s translation and Ōtani 5-6 to pp. 366-367. These were published in facsimile by Skjærø as f. *82 and f. *164 respectively.

Two further folios published in transcription by H.W. Bailey have been identified by Skjærø as belonging to VkN: Kha 040 fol.10 KT 5.121 (= Lamotte p. 108) and Kha

---

33 *ZDMG*, 62, 1908, 92.
All these folios and fragments appear to belong to the same manuscript as pointed out by Skjærvø, who has provided a detailed study in his article ‘Khotanese fragments of the Vimalakīrtinirdešasūtra’, pp. 229-260 in Kalyāṇamitrārāgaṇam, Essays in honour of Nils Simonsson, ed. E. Kahrs, Oslo 1986. His article contains transcriptions of all known fragments of the Khotanese, transcriptions of the parallel portions of the Tibetan version, an English translation, a commentary, and facsimiles of all fragments.

The Book of Vimalakīrti [Vim]

Manuscript Ch 00256 contains on lines 224-386, transcribed by H.W. Bailey in KBT 104-113, a difficult Late Khotanese text, to which Bailey has given the name ‘Book of Vimalakīrti’ because the name Vimalakīrti occurs five times (316, 328, 342, 362) in it, sometimes as speaker. It is not yet clear what relationship the ‘Book of Vimalakīrti’ bears to VKN. If it is a translation it is a translation of a version that has not yet come to light. Thus, as Lamotte points out (op. cit. p. 77), it is characteristic of VKN as an early Mahāyāna text that the bhūmiṣ are not mentioned in it. Yet several bhūmiṣ are mentioned at the beginning of the ‘Book of Vimalakīrti’. On the other hand the general tenor of the passages where the name Vimalakīrti occurs in the text do bear considerable resemblance to the text as given by Lamotte. This Khotanese work will clearly repay detailed study.

A second copy of lines 368-386 KBT 112-113 is contained in P 2026.1-22 KT 3.48-49, as pointed out in Studies II.118.

(b) Texts without known titles

For convenience of reference a title has been invented by H.W. Bailey for many of those Khotanese texts whose titles are not known. Some of these texts are the following:

[18.27] Amṛta-prabha-dhāraṇī [Amṛta]

This Late Khotanese text of fifty lines was published in transcription by H.W. Bailey, KT 5.61-64 (no.150). It was so called because the name occurs in line 30 and because it contains in lines 32-33 a dhāraṇī beginning with the word amrītta-prabhā. It refers to itself several times as a sūtra. It is unusual as containing a date (line 12) in the body of the text. The as yet untranslated text is devoted to veneration of the Buddha Amitāyus, here mentioned in the Late Khotanese form Armyāya (lines 17 and 23). Amṛta is another name for Amitāyus in esoteric Buddhism.

[18.28] Avalokiteśvara-dhāraṇī [Avdh]

Avdh consists in 19 folios written in archaising Late Khotanese, transcribed by H.W. Bailey, KT 3.1-13. The text was so called because it ends with a dhāraṇī (folio 23) that is preceded by homage to the bodhisattvas with Avalokiteśvara at the head (22r3 nama āryāvalokiteśvaraprāmprakhebhyau bauhdhisatvebhya). Avalokiteśvara is frequently addressed in the vocative. H. 143 NS 87 KT 5.42 may have some connection with this text.


[18.29] Bhavāṅga text

Ten fragmentary folios were assigned this title by H.W. Bailey and transcribed in KT 5.284-8 under the signature Hardinge 079.01. When I saw them in the British Museum on 25.2.1970 they were catalogued as Or 12637. They were presumably assigned this title by H.W. Bailey on the strength of the occurrence of the word bhavāṅgyau on folio 8v3. On bhavāṅga see Encycl. Buddh., III.1, 17-20 and R.E. Emmerick, ‘Bhavāṅga’, p. 195 in Encycl. Iranica, 4, 1990.

[18.30] Deśanā

This title was given to P 3513.76vl-84v4, transcribed by H.W. Bailey in KBT 62-6 and by him in Indological studies in honor of W.Norman Brown, (American Oriental Series 47), ed. E. Bender, New Haven 1962, 18-22. The beginning of this text (P 3513.76vl-78rl) is found as a variant also in PK 3510.9.1-10.10 KBT 53. The three lines byehide ... anatta (80vl-2) recur in Ch 1.0021b,b45-6 KBT 154. The word deśana occurs at 84r4.

The title Deśana was given by Shūyo Takubo (see on Bcd above) to Ch c.001.755-851 and 1062-1109 (texts 530 and 531 in KT 5.249-255). These texts are not deśanās in the same way as P 3513.76vl-84v4, which contains the words a diśau’ (84vl) ‘I confess’, but it is said in Ch c.001.828-9 KT 5.252 that anyone who orders the Buddha names of this text to be written or who recites them will obtain karmāṃ deśana. Two variants to Ch c. 001.755-851, 1062-1109 have been transcribed by H.W. Bailey: P 3513.1-12 KT 3.112-116 (no. 47) and Ch 00268 KBT 100-104. The text proper of S 2471 KBT 91-93 beginning with sidhamā in line 25 is also closely related to these texts. Despite considerable variation between these versions it would be useful to have a synoptic version.

See also Karmāṃ Deśana below.

[18.31] Homage of Hūyi Kima-tcūna

S 2471, transcribed by H.W. Bailey in KBT 91-3, contains the name Hūyi Kima-tcūna in lines 2 and 89. He ordered the text to be written. The text proper begins at line 25 with the word sidhamā. It is a namo text akin to those called Deśanā by Shūyo Takubo, on which see 18.6 above. The introduction (lines 1-24) bears a strong resemblance to that
to the ‘Invocation of Prince Tcû-syau’ (lines 1-14). A variant of the text, P 2742, was published in transcription by H.W. Bailey in *KT* 3.55-57.

[18.32] Invocation of Prince Tcû-syau

Ch 00267, transcribed by H.W. Bailey in *KBT* 146-148, contains the name of the ‘great prince’ Tcû-syau in lines 39, 47, and 57. Lines 2-35 were translated by H.W. Bailey in *BSOAS*, X.4, 1942, 889 and 891. See also on the preceding text. The reference in this text to the king Śri Vijatti Saṃgrauma as deceased may provide an indication of the earliest possible date of this text if this king has been rightly identified with the Sheng (AD 742-755) of the Chinese sources.

[18.33] Invocatory formulae

Three or four fragments form part of a text containing invocatory formulae for invoking gods and Bodhisattvas on behalf of a patron (Skt. dānapati). P 2023 *KT* 3.107, Khot. (IO) A *KT* 5.310-311, and P 2023 *KT* 3.45 in that order form part of a single text as discovered by H. Vetch on the basis of the Chinese text of Kumārajiva’s translation of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra on the recto. For the Chinese text of Khot. (IO) A (= C41) see the appendix by Kazuo Enoki in Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *Catalogue of the Tibetan manuscripts from Tun-huang in the India Office Library*, OUP 1962, p. 250

[18.34] Karmāṇi Deśana [KD]

This is the title given by me to a Late Khotanese text found in three variants, Ch 00268, Ch XLVI 0013a, and Ch 00277, published in transcription by H.W. Bailey in *KBT* 66-71. In my article ‘The confession of acts’ in *Varia 1976*, (Acta Iranica 12), Leiden-Téhéran-Liège 1977, 87-115, I published a critical synoptic text, translation, and glossary of this interesting text on the theory of *karma-deśanā*. This text may be an original Khotanese work. At any rate no similar text has yet been found in Buddhist literature.

[18.35] Ratna-dvipa text

This title was given by H.W. Bailey to H. 147 MBD 24a + 23a + 25a, transcribed by him in *KT* 5.64-7. The word *rāmna-dvipa* occurs in 24a 8 and 24a 12, but there seems to be no reason why this word should have been chosen as the title of the text.

[18.36] Triṣaraṇa

[18.37] Vajrayāna

Three Late Khotanese texts belong to this category as follows:

(1) ‘Vajrayāna text’ Ch ii 004 (four folios) KBT 143-6 translated by H.W. Bailey with commentary in ‘Vajrayāna texts from Gostana’ in Studies of esoteric Buddhism and Tantrism in commemoration of the 1150th anniversary of the founding of Koyasan, Koyasan 1965, 27-39. According to Bailey, loc. cit. 29, this text is contemporary with Ch 1.0021b, but he gives no reason for this opinion.

This text is a treatise on the rosary. Similar texts have been found in Tibetan manuscripts from Tunhuang: see R.A. Stein, ‘Un genre particulier d’exposés du tantrisme ancien tibétain et khotanais’, JA, 275/3-4, 1987, 265-282.

(2) ‘Vajrayāna verses’ Ch 1.0021b,a² (47 lines) KBT 149-151. Lines 43-46 were transcribed earlier in KT 2.57 (no.15). This text contains a date in lines 44-45, which corresponds according to J. Hamilton, Règnes, 51, to 10th August AD 971.

(3) ‘Vajrayāna verses of Cā Kīmā-śani’ Ch 1.0021b,b (65 lines) KBT 151-156. Lines 1-32 were translated by H.W. Bailey in ‘Vajrayāna in Gostana-deṣa’, The journal of the international association of Buddhist studies, i.1, 1978, 53-6. Details concerning Vajraghaṇṭā, Vajrāṅkuśi, Vajrapāśi, and Vajrasphota, which Bailey, loc. cit. p. 56, could not trace, are to be found s.vv. in Marie-Thérèse de Mallmann, Introduction à l'iconographie du tantrisme bouddhique, (Bibliothèque du centre de recherches sur l'Asie Centrale et la Haute Asie I), Paris 1975.

Since this text mentions in line 62 Cā Kīmā-śani, who is referred to also in Ch 1.0021b,a², it is likely to be of at least approximately the same date.

[18.38] Zambasta, The Book of [Z]

This name was suggested by H.W. Bailey for the longest extant Khotanese text, a poem on Buddhism that was written at the request of an official called Ysambasta.

207 folios of Z are extant extending from fol. 146 recto to fol. 440 recto, the verso of the last folio being blank. We do not know whether the folios preceding fol. 143, which is not extant, but whose existence can be inferred from the verse numbers on folio 159, contained earlier chapters of the same poem, as is likely, or whether they contained another text. The extant folios are arranged in chapters, of which twenty-four have hitherto been established.


For a bibliography of earlier work on Z see p. ix of my edition. Subsequent publications are as follows:
R.E. Emmerick, ‘Khotanese metrics’, *Asia Major*, n.s. XVI.1, 1968, 1-20

*Z* is composed in three different metres distributed through the poem as set out on p. xxi of my edition. It is the chief source of our knowledge of Khotanese metrics, which is a subject that has aroused considerable debate because E. Leumann believed that the Khotanese metrical system was related to the Greek hexameter and was therefore of great importance for the understanding of Indo-European metrics. In my view it is an adaptation of an Indian metrical system.

*Z* is of particular interest as an original Khotanese work concerning various aspects of Buddhism. It is based on Indian sources although it is not a direct translation. Some chapters paraphrase known Buddhist texts. One chapter, the sixth, claims to contain a verse from each sūtra. Of these only the versions from three texts have been identified, those from the Saddharma-puṇḍarika-sūtra, the Suvarṇabhūṣottama-sūtra, and the Vajracchedikā. All three were identified by E. Leumann and no further identification has since been made!

That *Z* was popular in Khotan is shown by the number of copies that are known to have existed. The main manuscript has six lines on each side of the folio. Among the seventeen variant fragments published in my edition of *Z* (pp. 424-436) are fragments with three, four, five, and eight lines on each side of the folio as well as with six. The number of variants known to exist is steadily increasing. Some additional variants are listed in my article ‘The historical importance of the Khotanese manuscripts’ in *Prolegomena*, p. 174. After writing that article I visited Leningrad (now St. Petersburg) and saw on 25.10.1976 under the signature SI P 50 a folio of *Z* corresponding to folio 240 of my edition but showing spelling variants. Thus, it has kṣame in 12.30 for kṣamātē and tītu in 12.34 for tītā. Additional material is to be found in the St. Petersburg collections and will be published jointly M.I. Vorob’eva-Desjatovskaja and myself.

Kha 1.115.3 *KT* 5.189 is a variant to *Z* 12.71-4. To it P.O. Skjærvø has joined an unpublished fragment. In addition, he has identified the following three variants: Hardinge 076.4 *KT* 5.279 = *Z* 3.117-124; unpublished fragment without signature = *Z* 8.44-50; Hardinge 076.72.6 *KT* 5.282 = *Z* 22.228-239.

The date of composition of the Book of Zambasta remains unknown. However, there is reason to believe that it should not be dated earlier than the seventh century AD (cf. S. Konow, *NTS*, XI, 1939, 35ff.). The extant ms. copies are of later date, but they too cannot be dated precisely. The language of *Z* is Old Khotanese, but the manuscripts were copied by scribes who spoke Late Khotanese (cf. R.E. Emmerick, ‘The
transition from Old to Late Khotanese', pp. 33-42 in *Transition periods in Iranian history* (= Studia Iranica. Cahier 5), Leuven 1987).


[19] Non-doctrinal literary texts

[19.1] Lyric poetry

The lyrical verses at the end of the Stael-Holstein roll (lines 52-73) were reedited by H.W. Bailey in *KT* 2.75-76 and are available in translation with commentary by Bailey in *Asia Major*, n.s. II.1, 1951, 1-45.

The longest surviving lyrical poem has not yet been presented in translation. The text was published in transcription by H.W. Bailey in *KT* 3.34-48. It is preserved fragmentarily in several manuscripts: Ch 00266, P 2896, P 2956, P 2895 (= Paris Y), P 2022, and P 2025 (the order of presentation in *KT* 3). A convenient synoptic text and facsimiles of the manuscripts have been published by M.J. Dresden, 'A lyrical poem in Khotanese, Part I: Text', *Beiträge zur Indienforschung*, (Veröffentlichungen des Museums für Indische Kunst Berlin 4). Berlin 1977, 81-103. Only a few lines have been translated in scattered articles so far. The poem presents difficulties of interpretation because most of our knowledge of the language derives from a study of religious texts.


19.2 Rāmāyaṇa

A translation of and commentary on the Khotanese Rāmāyaṇa were published by H.W. Bailey in *BSOAS*, X.3, 1940, 559-98. The text was published in transcription by Bailey in *KT* 3.65-76. Bailey's work has been made known in Japan by Kazuo Enoki in his article 'Kōtango no Rāma-ō Monogatari' [The story of King Rāma in Khotanese], in *Sirukurodo (Silkroad) no Rekishi kara* [From the history of the Silkroad], Tokyo 1979, pp. 100-112 and 205-208, in which he brings up to date his earlier articles in *Tōyō Gakuhō* [Reports of the Oriental Society], 27.3, 1940, 449 (139)-460 (150) and 28.3, 1941, 469 (143)-470 (144). Kazuo Enoki adds some remarks concerning the relationship between the Khotanese Rāma story and the other versions. A new edition of the Khotanese Rāmāyaṇa by R.E. Emmerick is in preparation.
19.3 Verse letters

In Tokyo University Linguistics Papers (TULIP), 12, 1991, 59-60, H. Kumamoto drew attention to a literary genre represented by a number of Khotanese texts containing letters in verse form. Most of them are extant only as drafts. To this class of literature belong: (1) Ch 00269.9-22 KT 2.42-43; (2) Or 8212.162.13-81 and 92-124 KT 2.1-8; (3) P 2027.1-66 KT 2.79-82; (4) P 2786.1-2 KT 2.93; (5) P 5536 bis KT 3.118 (item 50).

[20] Medical texts

There are substantial remains of two prose translations of Sanskrit metrical medical texts: the Siddhasāra of Rāvīnaga and the so-called Jivakapustaka. Facsimiles of both of these texts were published by H.W. Bailey in Codices Khotaneses. In both cases the original Sanskrit is extant so that it is possible to make close comparison between the Khotanese and the Sanskrit. Both these medical texts have played an important part in furthering our knowledge of the Khotanese vocabulary. Medical texts tend to employ a large range of vocabulary and in the case of these two texts we have the added advantage that the Sanskrit can be compared.


Jivaka-pustaka is the title given by H.W. Bailey to the extracts from three unidentified medical works contained in the India Office Library MS. Ch ii 003, which is incomplete and contains no colophon. The 73 extant folios of the manuscript contain, however, Sanskrit and Khotanese alternately, so that bilingual evidence is available. The Khotanese Jivaka-pustaka was translated into English and provided with a glossary by S. Konow, A medical text in Khotanese, Oslo 1941 (reviewed by M. Leumann, OLZ, 1942, 465-467 and by H. Oertel, KZ, 67, 1942, 244). This work accordingly provides a valuable introduction to Khotanese medical literature.

The Sanskrit text corresponding to the Khotanese version of JP was printed in transcription on alternate pages in H.W. Bailey's edition in KT 1.136-195. This Sanskrit text is unreadable. It was badly copied by the original scribe and it must at some stage have been written down from dictation. Many of the prescriptions can, however, be traced in


other medical sources and their identification enables close comparison to be made. Four of the prescriptions were traced to Caraka by J. Filliozat, *JA*, 235, 1946-7, 134-5, and the corresponding passages of Caraka referred to by Filliozat have been printed by H.W. Bailey in the second edition of *KT* 1.195-196. The first passage quoted there, to which also Filliozat referred, is a different formulation of the same prescription. One of the four passages identified by Filliozat had in fact already been identified by A.F.R. Hoernle in ‘An ancient medical manuscript from Eastern Turkestan’ in Commemorative essays presented to Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, Poona 1917, 415-432. Hoernle published facsimiles of folios 44 and 64.

For a list of the prescriptions that have so far been identified in other Sanskrit medical works see p. 236 of my article ‘Contributions to the study of the *Jivaka-pustaka*’ *BSOAS*, XLII.2, 1979, 235-243. The Sanskrit text of the *JP* is of later date than that of the *Si*, which it used as a source.

A.F.R. Hoernle prepared for publication as volume 2 of *MR* an edition and translation of the *JP* as far as 72r. His edition included a lengthy introduction on the manuscript, its script, and language and contained besides his edition and translation of the Khotanese text his reconstruction of the Sanskrit text. The work was entitled *An ancient medical manuscript from Turkestan* and marked as ‘Press-Copy’. It is included in the India Office Library under Eur. D. 723. Matsuda Kazunobu in *The Eastern Buddhist*, n.s. XX.2, 1987, 113 n. 9 erroneously refers to this as the Siddhasāra.


[20.2] Siddhasāra [*Si*]

The title Siddhasāra occurs at the beginning of the text together with the name of its author Rāgūgupta. 64 folios of the Khotanese text are extant despite the occurrence of the words ‘54 pattarā seāsāra’ (= ‘54 folios Siddhasāra’) on the recto of the first folio of the main manuscript Ch ii 002. Extant are folios 1 + 1 bis, 2-20, 101-107, 109, 121-153, and 155-156. Thus, there are 64 folios excluding folio 100, which belongs to another medical text not yet identified.

A variant to folios 5-14 of Ch ii 002 is provided by P 2892, which was published in transcription by H.W. Bailey in *KT* 5.315-324 but which has not yet been published in facsimile.


---

The main manuscript of the Khotanese version of Si was transcribed by H.W. Bailey in *KT* 1.1-105 with a Tibetan translation from the Tanjur in transcription facing it. The Khotanese translation does in fact follow the Tibetan more closely than the Sanskrit and the Khotanese introduction explicitly states that the text was translated from Tibetan. The translator must however have used also the Sanskrit. The corresponding portions of the Sanskrit text were published in transcription by H.W. Bailey in *KT* 1.106-132. The text printed there is unreadable, however, because of the very large number of serious misreadings. For the principal corrections needed to the text see my articles ‘The Sanskrit text of the Siddhasāra’ in *BSOAS*, XXXIV.1, 1971, 91-112 and ‘New light on the Siddhasāra’ in *BSOAS*, XXXVII.3, 1974, 628-654. See also ‘Some emendations to the text of Rāgugupta’s Siddhasāra’, *Sanskrit and World Culture, SCHR. OR*. 18, 579-585, Berlin 1986.


Subsequent volumes to be published in the same series (VOHD) will contain editions of the Khotanese, and Uighur versions, commentary and vocabularies.

In my article on ‘Rāgugupta’s place in Indian medical tradition’ in *Indologica Taurinensia*, III-IV, 1977, 209-221 I gave evidence for dating the Sanskrit text of Si to about AD 650, shortly after Vāgbhaṭa. For the possibility that Rāgugupta may in fact have lived still earlier and been an ancestor of Vāgbhaṭa see D. Wujastyk, ‘Rāgugupta and Vāgbhaṭa’, *BSOAS*, XLVIII.1, 1985, 74-78.

A fragment of a bilingual text of the Si with alternating Uighur and Sanskrit, both in Brāhmī script, is being prepared for publication by D. Maue (Giessen).


[20.3] Other medical texts

For references to fragments of other medical texts in Khotanese see Dresden’s Handlist, s.v. Medical texts. The longest of these is P 2893.32-267. It is transcribed by H.W. Bailey in KT 3.84-93 but it has not yet been published in translation. It is probable that at least some of the prescriptions contained in P 2893 will be found in other sources, but no work has yet been undertaken in this direction. P 2893, Ch ii 002 folio 100, and Ch 00265 are all related in style and translation technique. P 2889 KT 3.78 (15 lines) contains a few badly copied notes from other medical texts. Thus, the prescription beginning with hauskyā ttrahi ‘dry radish’ is known from Ch 00265.16-18 KT 3.17-18. This is followed by a prescription found in P 2893.78-81 KT 3.85, and lines 9-13 contain an incomplete copy of Si 5.97 = JP 50r4-50vl KT i.141.

[21] Documents other than literary and medical

It is not possible to draw a sharp line between literary and non-literary texts in all cases. It is clear that recipes and lists belong to this category. Many of the brief letters containing instructions from officials resemble such lists apart from the introductory formulas. But the longer letters such as reports from envoys come closer to literary texts. They may perhaps be distinguished as pertaining to historical persons.


The documents present considerable difficulties of interpretation not least because of the occurrence of numerous loanwords, titles, etc. from Chinese, Turkish, and to a lesser extent, Tibetan. The way forward lies in collaboration with experts in these fields who specialise in Central Asian material. On the formation of such a group of scholars in Japan in 1983 see D. Jackson, ‘A group of young Tun-huang scholars in the Kyōto-Ōsaka area’, Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie, 3, 1987, 143-145.

Significant progress towards understanding the Khotanese documents is being made possible by the elucidation of contemporary Tibetan documents. In this field see the valuable survey by G. Uray, ‘The Old Tibetan sources of the history of Central Asia up to 751 A.D.: a survey’ in Prolegomena pp. 275-304. The use of Chinese and Turkish sources has also shed much light on the Khotanese documents. Important contributions have been made by J. Hamilton, ‘Nasales instabiles en turc khotanais du Xe siècle’,...

[21.1] The Staël-Holstein roll


[21.2] The Hedin documents

The best introduction to the study of Khotanese documents is provided by H.W. Bailey, KT 4. This volume contains an introduction, an edition of documents belonging to the Sven Hedin collection, translation of the documents, and an elaborate commentary.

[21.3] P 2786


[22] Chronology of the Khotanese kings

The first successful attempt to date the reigns of some of the Khotanese kings was made by E.G. Pulleyblank, ‘The date of the Staël-Holstein roll’, Asia Major, n.s. IV.1, 1954, 90-97. Subsequent articles have carried the discussion further: Taijūn Inokuchi, ‘Utengo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viša’ Vikrama</td>
<td>AD 737-747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viša’ Sihya</td>
<td>AD 763-785</td>
<td>teš-tešteš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viša’ Dharma</td>
<td>AD 785-801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viša’ Vāhām</td>
<td>AD 912-949</td>
<td>thū-khi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viša’ Kṛtta</td>
<td>AD 950-966</td>
<td>thye-thye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viša’ Sāmbhava</td>
<td>AD 967-978</td>
<td>cū-hiña</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viša’ Śūra</td>
<td>AD 978-982</td>
<td>thye-thye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viša’ Dharma</td>
<td>AD 987-999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to J.E. Hill, ‘Notes on the dating of Khotanese history’, III, 31.3, 1988, 179-190, the kings listed in the Tibetan ‘Prophecy of the Li country’ are all to be dated to the period before AD 750 and therefore all preceded those attested in the Khotanese documents.

[23] Khotanese administration


[24] Bilinguals

[24.1] Sanskrit-Khotanese

The most extensive bilingual text is P 5538b KT 3.121-4, which was edited and translated by H.W. Bailey, BSOAS, IX.3, 1938, 521-43. It was thought by Bailey to be the exercise
of a student learning Sanskrit. Each Sanskrit word or sentence is followed by a Khotanese rendering. There is no connected sense but many groups of related items occur. It looks like a school exercise.

A new edition with commentary, text, translation and glossaries is provided by Hiroshi Kumamoto, 'A Sanskrit-Khotanese conversation manual for Central Asian travelers', *Colloque franco-japonais de documents et archives provenant de l'Asie centrale, 4-8 octobre 1988, Kyoto International Conference Hall*, 29-59.

[24.2] Chinese-Khotanese

The Chinese-Khotanese bilingual Or 8212.162.1-12 KT 2.1 has been partially interpreted by H.W. Bailey in *Saka Documents Text Volume*, London 1968, 18-19. It shows similarities to S 5212a KT 3.136 and Ch 00271.2-5 KT 2.49. According to Bailey it is 'a traveller's hand-book of Chinese-Khotanese phrases'. Some portions of P 2927 KT 3.102-105 contain Chinese-Khotanese bilingual phrases. All these texts have been studied by Tokio Takata in *A historical study of the Chinese language based on Dunhuang materials* (= Oriental Studies Library No. 33), Sobunsha, Tokyo 1988: for S 5212a see pp. 203-204 and 217-220, for Or 8212.162 see pp. 204-206 and 220-224, and for P 2927 see pp. 206-207 and 224-227.

[24.3] Turkish-Khotanese

The Turkish-Khotanese bilingual P 2892.165-184 KT 3.81-2 was interpreted by H.W. Bailey in 'A Turkish-Khotanese vocabulary' in *BSOAS*, XI.2, 1944, 290-6. See further E. Hovdhaugen, 'Turkish words in Khotanese', *NTS*, XXIV, 1971, 163-209. Hovdhaugen suggested in view of the technical nature of the vocabulary that the text may have had a practical aim such as military instruction. For a facsimile and commentary see H.W. Bailey, *BSOAS*, XXXVI.2, 1973, 224. A new edition was published by G. Clauson, 'The Turkish-Khotanese vocabulary re-edited', *İslâm Tarihleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5, 1973, 37-45.

A number of the glosses were assigned to the wrong language by Bailey, who has been followed by subsequent scholars. The text has been re-edited and subjected to further examination by R.E. Emmerick and A. Róna-Tas, 'The Turkish-Khotanese wordlist revisited', *CAJ*, 36.3-4, 1992, 199-241.
ABBREVIATIONS

AO  Acta orientalia.
BEFEO Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extême-Orient.
CAJ Central Asiatic Journal.

Codices Khotaneses Codices Khotaneses: India Office Library Ch. ii 002, Ch. ii 003, Ch 00274 reproduced in facsimile with an introduction by H.W. Bailey (= Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Maioris II), Copenhagen 1938.


GGA Göttingische Gelehre Anzeigen.


IIIJ  
*Indo-Iranian Journal.*

JA  
*Journal Asiatique.*
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*Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.*
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*Journal of the European Ayurvedic Society.*

KBT  

KT 1-7  

Middle Iranian Studies  

MR  

MSS  
*Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft.*

N  

NTS  
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OLZ  
*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.*

Proceedings ... Hamburg  

Proceedings ... Turin  

Prolegomena  

Shūyo Takubo, Studies  

StII  
*Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WZKM</td>
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</tr>
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