

A SADDHARMAPUṆḌARĪKASŪTRA MANUSCRIPT FROM KHOTAN

The Gift of a Pious Khotanese Family

Oskar von Hinüber

The exact location, at which this manuscript was found, is unknown. However, it is certain that it was discovered by treasure-hunters during the last decade of the 19th century in the vicinity of Khotan, split up and eventually sold to different European researchers.¹ The by far largest share of the manuscript was preserved first in the Asiatic Museum (Азиатский Музей), where it arrived in two batches, and was later transferred to the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Институт Восточных Рукописей Российской Академии Наук) in St. Petersburg, where it is kept today. The first batch of the altogether 396 folios² was acquired by Nikolaj Fedorovič Petrovskij (1837-1908), who was the Russian consul in Kashgar between 1st June 1882 (date of appointment) and August 1903.³ Consequently, the manuscript was known under the name “Kashgar Manuscript” for a long time, before Ronald Eric Emmerick (1937-2001) drew attention to the colophons, which are written in Khotanese and therefore point to a provenance from Khotan rather (see below).⁴ The date of acquisition is sometimes given as 1903⁵ probably following A. Yuyama’s important bibliography instead of the correct 1893, if not earlier. For, a note on this manuscript appeared already in the *Zapiski Vostočnogo Otdelenija Rossijskogo Archeologičeskogo Obščestva* (Записки Восточного Отделения Российского Археологического Общества) “Memoirs of the Oriental Department of the Russian Archaeological Society” no. 7 of the year 1893 by Sergej F. Ol’denburg: *Kašgarskaja pukopis’ N. F. Petrovskogo* (Кашгарская рукопись Н. Ф. Петровского) “The Kashgar Manuscript of N. F. Petrovskij” (pp. 81 foll.).⁶ A second batch of a different manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* was presented to the Asiatic Museum in St. Petersburg in 1910 by George Macartney (1867-1945), consul at Kashgar between 1890 and 1918.⁷ It is not clear, how many folios belong to each gift. Furthermore, the British Library holds 40 folios of the Khotan manuscript in the Stein Collection and 4 folios in the Hoernle Collection.⁸ Lastly, a small number of folios of the same manuscript is scattered over different libraries: 9 folios of the Trinkler Collection are kept in Staatsbibliothek, Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin. These are the “Marburg Fragments,” which were carefully studied by Heinz Bechert;⁹ 7 fragmentary folios belonging to the Otani Collection are in the Lüshun Museum (formerly Port Arthur),¹⁰ and 1 fragment in the Ellsworth Huntington Papers finally belongs to the Sterling Library of Yale University

in New Haven.¹¹

At the beginning, it was not clear that all these folios were actually parts of one split up manuscript.¹² First, the four folios of the Hoernle Collection were studied in great detail by Heinrich Lüders (1869-1943). While Lüders was working,¹³ the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra edition by Bunyiu Nanjio (1849-1927) and Henrik Kern (1833-1917) appeared between 1908 and 1912.¹⁴ H. Kern was able to use the “Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript” only after the main body of the text established by B. Nanjio was already completed, and H. Kern did so in a very erratic way.¹⁵ With more and more material becoming available, it was slowly recognized that all these separated folios belong to one and the same manuscript.

A first complete edition, or rather transcript, of the Kashgar (Khotan) manuscript was prepared by Hirofumi Toda (1936-2003) first in seven parts between 1977 and 1979 and then again in a revised edition in 1981.¹⁶ A most useful updated survey of research was provided by Klaus Wille in 2000.¹⁷ The Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript is, however, only one of a considerable number of Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra manuscripts recovered from the vicinity of Khotan, although the provenance of many manuscripts is either uncertain or even unknown due to the lack of pertinent notes left by those who acquired them, or very often because of the reluctance of the “treasure hunters,” from whom they were bought, to reveal their sources. It can be assumed that at least the following 14 manuscripts and fragments may have been copied in the Khotan area:

1. Lüshun manuscript A (Otani Collection) (likely)
2. Lüshun manuscript B (Otani Collection) (likely)¹⁸
3. Khādaliq Manuscript ed. by K. Wille 2000
4. Farhād-Bēg manuscript ed. by H. Toda: Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts, pp. 229-258
5. Kashgar (Khotan) manuscript ed. by H. Toda: Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts, pp. 3-225
6. Fragments of two (or more?) manuscripts ed. by H. Toda: Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts, pp. 271-320
7. Fragments of seven manuscripts in the St. Petersburg Collection (I. SI P10 & P12 + 13; II. SI P 11[1] & P 7; III. SI P 8; IV. SI P 9; V. SI P 11; VI. SI P 90a & 90b1; VII. SI L 1)¹⁹

The Lüshun manuscripts are by far the oldest, although a dating to the middle of the fifth century as suggested by Zhongxin Jiang (1942-2002), p. 18a, according to the

palaeography is perhaps a little early. While manuscript B may have been copied during the sixth century according to Z. Jiang, p. 18a, the other manuscripts, even those from Gilgit are younger, the Nepalese manuscripts even substantially.

Different linguistic usage does not only reflect a difference in age, but also points to two branches of the text tradition, a Central Asian one in opposition to the Gilgit-Nepalese branch. As H. Bechert emphasized the Central Asian recension is not simply an older version, but in addition split into two sub-recensions, which are distinguished by the presence or absence of the Devadattaparivarta.²⁰

As H. Lüders already recognized, when he investigated only four folios from the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript, the Central Asian version is moreover of considerable linguistic interest, because it contains some Prakrit forms, which induced him to think that the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra might have been composed in Middle Indic originally. In particular, H. Lüders points to the vocative *kulaputrāho*, folio 260b4 a form typical for Māgadhī, and found only in this Middle Indic language.²¹ An investigation by S. Karashima into the language of the Lüshun manuscripts has confirmed Lüders' assumption in the meantime.²²

Even though the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript preserves a much older and more Middle Indic text than the Gilgit-Nepalese branch, it was most likely copied more or less contemporaneous with the oldest Nepalese manuscripts, which are dated to the 11th century.²³ The Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript is not dated and written in a script that did not change over a certain period of time. This induced earlier scholars such as Nikolaj Dimitrievič Mironov (1880-1936), to date the manuscript to the 7th century.²⁴ However, the colophons, which are not written in Sanskrit, but in late Khotanese, hardly allow any date early than the 9th, probably the 10th century rather as pointed out by R. E. Emmerick because of linguistic considerations.²⁵

These colophons are of considerable interest far beyond determining the date of the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript. They were studied by R. E. Emmerick and by Harold Walter Bailey (1899-1996).

H. W. Bailey provided a transcript and a translation of the colophon at the end of the text for the first facsimile edition published by Lokesh Chandra.²⁶ Unfortunately, the last folio of the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript is damaged with only the right part being extant, which may preserve about half the text of the colophon at the end of *parivarta* XXVIII Anuparīndanā-Parivarta (folio 459b1-9):

] 800: || ttū namo saddharmapu[
]meri jsa hambrīhyā u pyarāna cu parilo tsuāṃdā u kṣādai jala/2/[puñina jsa

haṃbrīhyā u ... jsa haṃbrīhyā u tti ru] puña pharṣaja+(na) haṃbrīhyā u jaraukulina cu pari/3/[lo tsue u ...] jsa u tti ru puña hīvī brātarā braṃgalaina cu parilo tsue u ha[m]/4/[...] u tti ru puña haṃtsa hvārakā saṃduṣṭi jsa haṃbrīhyā cu pa/5/[rilo tsue ...] haṃbrīhyā u dvīrā jalottamā jsa u dvīrā śikṣamāññā cu parilo /6/ [tsue ...] budasaṃgāna u haṃtsa vinayā jsa u <haṃ>tsa pūrā nerā jalārrjunāññā jsa /7/ [... brā](ta)rā dattakāna u haṃtsa brātarā vikramna u hvārakā dhammakā jsa u hvā/8/ [rakā ... u tti ru puña biśyau hayū]nyau jsa u biśyau busvāryau jsa haṃbrīhyā u biśyau ysanyau jsa.

The reading of the colophon follows H. W. Bailey and H. Toda with the exception of the end of line 1, where both read erroneously *dala*[, instead of a clearly visible *jala*[.²⁷

The extant part of the colophon in formal script begins with a figure read by H. Toda as “800,” who however does not give the reasons for his interpretation. Higher numbers are difficult to interpret, because they occur hardly ever in manuscripts, which rarely end with a number of pages as high as or even higher than 500. One such exception is the Mūlasarvāstivādinaya found at Gilgit, where numbers up to 500 are found.²⁸ Here it can be seen clearly, that numbers “200, 300” etc. are derived from the number “100” which in many scripts is similar to the *akṣara* “a” by subscribing the numbers “2, 3” etc. When comparing the pagination of the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript, which uses numerical signs not exactly matching the script found in the manuscript itself, it is at any rate clear that the second part of the numerical sign is indeed “8.” However, the first part hardly is a form of the sign for “100,” because it looks quite different from the one found in the pagination, and, more important still, it is derived from the *akṣara* “kha” and not from “a” as expected. Therefore, a higher number such as 8000 seems to be more likely.²⁹

Next, it is difficult to find out, what this number might refer to. A date seems to be very unlikely, even if “800” is read, because there does not seem to be any only remotely matching era, and a round figure like “800” is suspicious anyway. Sometimes the length of the text is mentioned in the colophon, e.g., in the Mahāvastu *granthapramāṇam śloka 25000* “the book extends to 25,000 *ślokas*,” which corresponds to 800,000 *akṣaras*. A rough calculation shows that the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript comprises 458 folios with 916 pages with seven lines of writing and with about 30 *akṣaras* in each line, which amounts to 210 *akṣaras* per page or about 420 per folio. Therefore, the sum of *akṣaras* of the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript is 192,360 or 6,011 *ślokas*. Neither figure matches the number “800” or “8000” not even approximately.

The matter is further complicated by the colophon to *parivarta* V, which states on folio 140 *prathamacaturbhāgaḥ samāptaḥ* “the first quarter has come to an end” and again by the end of *parivarta* XIX on folio 360 *trītyaś caturbhāgaḥ samāpta* “the third quarter has come to an end” (see below). Therefore, it cannot be ruled out that the figure “8000” might refer to the length of the last quarter of the text only. However, the length of the last quarter is 97 folios with 40,740 *akṣaras* or 1,273 *ślokas*. Lastly, the price for copying the manuscript might have been mentioned here as it is rarely done in much later Pāli manuscripts from Northern Thailand.³⁰ *Non liquet*.

After a double *daṇḍa* the colophon in formal script breaks off with “homage to the Saddharmapu[.]” This is the beginning of a text in Khotanese. The transition to the longer colophon in cursive non-formal script is lost. The extant parts translate as follows according to H. W. Bailey:

“...] with the mother I share [the merit] and with the father, who have gone to the other world, and with the husband Jala[puña I share and ... with ... I share and then] I share the merit with Pharṣaja + and Jaraukulina, who [has gone] to the other [world and ...] with and then the merit with my own brother Braṃgalaka, who has gone to the other world, and I sha[re ...] and then I share the merit together with sister Saṃduṣṭā (Sanskrit Santuṣṭā), who has gone to the other [world ...] I share and with daughter Jalottamā and daughter Śikṣamāñī, who [has gone] to the other world [...] Buddhasaṃgha and with Vinaya and together with the son’s wife Jalārjuñānī [... bro]ther Dattaka and together with the brother Vikrama and the sister Dharmakā and sis[ter ... and then] I share [the merit with all frie]nds and together with all members of the household and with all relatives.”

The translation does not pose serious problems. Only *pharṣaja+na* is obscure. H. W. Bailey takes this complex to mean “judge Ja+” which, however, results in an unusually brief and therefore rather unlikely personal name. Therefore, it is perhaps better to interpret Pharṣaja+ as one word and as a name.³¹

The overall context is clear not the least due to the repetitiveness of the colophon formula. The end of the colophon seems to follow an Indian model, if inscriptional evidence is compared. The inscription of the *vinayadhara* Dhammasena says *evaṃ ca savehi nāti-mita-baṃdhavehi* and an inscription from Taxila has *ñatimitra-salohidaṇa*.³² This corresponds to *hayūna* “friend” (*mitra*, cf. Saṃghāṭasūtra § 246,4 *ha[yūna]* = *sakhāyā*)³³, *bisvāra* / *busvāra* “kinsman” (probably *bāndhava*) and *ysani* “kinsman” (*ñāti*, cf. Saṃghāṭasūtra § 243 verse 30 *ysāne* = *jñātayaḥ*; *ysani* also translates

bandhujana).³⁴

A number of deceased persons is mentioned in the beginning after the principal donor, an anonymous lady, which follows from the fact that a husband occurs among the persons enumerated to share the merit. The names of altogether 26 persons are preserved in the extant fragment. Moreover, at least 7 names can be inferred as missing out of an uncertain number of names actually lost. It is impossible to calculate the number of persons probably exceeding 50 exactly.

For, as a complete folio measures 57 cm by 18 cm, while the extant right part of the colophon folio measures only 21 cm by 13 cm, approximately only half the text of the colophon is extant. The space at the bottom of the fragment shows that the last line is preserved. Therefore, on the top about 5 cm are lost. This missing part of the fragment contained two lines (ca. 60 *akṣaras*) in formal script with the end of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* and at least a brief colophon. In front of the extant part of the colophon in formal script about 14 *akṣaras* are lost, if the text was distributed symmetrically on both sides of the rosette. The text of line 3 breaks off with *saddharmapu[ṇḍarīkasūtra]* or *saddharmapu[ṇḍarī]* with 6 *akṣaras* or 7 cm missing at the end.

As the radius of the rosette, which adorns the last folio, is 7 cm, the distance from the outer circle to the margin measures 17 cm, which results in the length of half a folio of 24 cm or 48 cm of a complete one. As a folio is 57 cm long, about 4.5 cm are missing on both ends of the fragment. The shorter lines of the Khotanese colophon have about 20 extant *akṣaras* with about 4 *akṣaras* (~ 4 cm) broken off. Therefore, the five lines interrupted by the rosette would have had 48 *akṣaras* when complete, and the last three lines below the rosette had even approximately 60 *akṣaras*. Consequently, quite a substantial part of the text is lost with altogether approximately $120 + 90 = 210$ out of 420 *akṣaras* of the complete colophon missing. This makes it impossible to estimate the number of persons involved in the donation.

The extant persons are the following:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 0. anonymous lady, the principal donor | 13. Śikṣamānī † |
| 1. mother of Jalapuñānā † | 14. name(s) lost |
| 2. father of Jalapuñānā † | 15. Buddhasaṃgha |
| 3. husband Jalapuñā | 16. Vinaya |
| 4. name(s) lost | 17. son's wife (daughter in law) Jalārrjuñānī |
| 5. Pharṣaja+ (not clear) (†?) | 18. name(s) lost |
| 6. Jaraukulina † | 19. brother Dattaka |

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 7. name(s) lost | 20. brother Vikrama |
| 8. brother Braṃgalaka † | 21. sister Dharmakā |
| 9. name(s) lost | 22. name(s) lost |
| 10. sister Santuṣṭā † | 23. friends (<i>mitra</i>) |
| 11. name(s) lost | 24. family (<i>bāndhava</i>) |
| 12. daughter Jalottamā | 25. kinsmen (<i>jñāti</i>) |

As far as we can see from this colophon, the anonymous lady is the principal donor accompanied by her husband Jalapuṇa and her deceased parents, who are included in this act of merit making. Her brother is as stated explicitly Braṃgalaka, and her sister is most likely Santuṣṭā. Whether or not the two “daughters” Jalottamā and the deceased Śikṣamāṇī are daughters or nieces of the principal donor, is not clear here. It is equally obscure, how and if the other persons relate to the lady who donated the manuscript. Therefore, it is necessary and useful to have a close look at the colophons at the end of individual *parivartas* to clarify this matter.

The following colophons in formal script are preserved within the text of the manuscript mostly at the end of individual *parivartas*:

At the end of the introductory Stotra (4b4):

Saddharmapuṇḍarīkamahāyānasūtrarājastotraṃ kṛtir³⁵ ācārya-Rahulabhadrrasya

At the end of the introduction (6b2-4):

namaḥ sarvajñāya nama āryasamantabhadrāya bodhisatvāya mahāsatvāya. ayaṃ
deyadharmam dānapati Jalapuṇasya. siddham namaḥ sarvabuddhabodhisatvebhyaḥ.
evaṃ mayā śrutam ... (Begin of the text of the *sūtra*)

Colophons at the end of the individual *parivartas*:

I. Parivarta (36a1):

... samāptaḥ. ayaṃ deyadharmam dānapati Jalapuṇasya

II. Parivarta (64a6f.):

.... samāptaḥ 2 || miṣjei' jalapuṇāṃ na parstā pīḍi saha jalārrjunasya

III. Parivarta (101b5f.):

... samāpta 3 || deyadharmo yaṃ dānapati Suviprabhasya

IV. Parivarta (121a5):

... samāptaḥ 4 deyadharmau yaṃ jalottamasya

V. Parivarta (140a6):

... samāptaḥ 5 || *prathamacaturbhāgaḥ samāptaḥ* || - ttū namau saddharmapuṇḍarī
miṣjei' jalapuṇāna parstā pīḍi. haṃtsa pūri śparadattina

No donor is mentioned at the end of Parivarta VI (150a5, space 14 *akṣaras*); VII (189b4, space 15 *akṣaras*); VIII (203a7, space 7 *akṣaras*); IX (211a7, space 6 *akṣaras*); X (226a6, space 27 *akṣaras*); XI (246a4, no space): ...

ṣaṣṭaḥ samāptaḥ || 6 || bhūtapūrvam ... etc.

XII. Parivarta (255b7):

... samā]pta. [1]2 deya[dharmo yamḥ]

H. Toda supplies [saha duhitā jalotama]sya, which cannot be verified by the help of the facsimile. The name is lost.

XIII. Parivarta (262b7): ... trayodaśama samāptaḥ 13 || atha khalu ... (No donor is mentioned)

XIV. End of Parivarta (283a2):

... caturdaśamaḥ samāptaḥ || [de]yadharmau yaṃ suviprab(!)asya saha duhitā jalotamasya

XV. Parivarta (302a7-302b2):

... pañcadaśamaḥ samāptaḥ 15 || mijsei' jalapuñāna parstā pīḍi uysānye jsīñi paderāṣci kiḍina. haṃtsa kṣā'dai jalapuñina u pūri jalārrjāṃna dvīrā jalotamā jsa u pūrā śparadatāna u dūvakā jsa

XVI. Parivarta (311b7): (End of the *parivarta* lost)

XVII. Parivarta (331a1):

saptāda[śamaḥ kṣā'd[ai] jalapuñāna

XVIII. Parivarta (340b3):

... aṣṭādaśamaḥ samāptaḥ deyadharmā suviprabhasya saha putrā jalārrjunasya

XIX. Parivarta (360b3):

... ekonaviṃśatimas samāptaḥ 19 *trītyaś caturbhāgaḥ samāpta* || ayam deyadharmā suviprabhasya

XX. Parivarta (371b6):

The text of the colophon is lost.

XXI. Parivarta (380b2):

... samāptaḥ 21 deyadharmō yaṃ dānapati jalapuñasya saha putrā jalārrjunasya

XXII. Parivarta (387a7):

ja]lapuñasya saha suvipra[bha...]

XXIII. Parivarta (407b1):

] 23 deyadharmā suviprabhasya [atha khalu ...

Most likely, the complete colophon is extant.

XXIV. Parivarta (421a1):

caturviṃśa]timaḥ samāptaḥ 24 deyadharmō yaṃ [ca. 17 akṣaras]sya atha khalu ...

According to the length of the gap, this colophon could correspond to the one of Parivarta II.

XXV. Parivarta (432b1f.):

... pañcaviṃśatimaḥ samāpta. jalapuñasya [

XXVI. Parivarta (445a4):

]samāptaḥ deya[

XXVII. Parivarta (455b7):

... saptaviṃśatimaḥ samāptaḥ || atha khalu ... (No donor is mentioned)

XXVIII. Parivarta (459a6):

]sadevagandharvamānuṣāsuraś ca (End of the line)

(459a7): lost (ca. 30 akṣaras)

(459b1): lost (ca. 30 akṣaras)

(459b2): lost (ca. 30 akṣaras)

(459b3): + + + + + + + + + +] 800 || ttu namo saddharmapu[ṇḍarīkasūtra

(459b4): /1/]meri jsa haṃbrīhyā u pyarāna cu parilo tsuāmmḍā u kṣadai jala

(459b5): /2/ [puñina jsa haṃbrīhyā u ... jsa haṃbrīhyā u tti ru] puña

pharṣaja+(na) haṃbrīhyā u jaraukulina cu pari

(459b6): /3/ [lo tsue u ...] jsa u tti ru puña hīvī brātarā braṃgalaina cu parilo tsue
u ha[m]

(459b7): /4/ [...] u tti ru puña haṃtsa hvāarakā saṃduṣṭi jsa haṃbrīhyā cu pa

(459b8): /5/ [rilo tsue ...] haṃbrīhyā u dvīrā jalottamā jsa u dvīrā śikṣamāñña cu
parilo

(459b9): /6/ [tsue ...] budasaṃgāna u haṃtsa vinayā jsa u <haṃ>tsa pūrā nerā
jalārrjunāṃñña jsa

(459b10): /7/ [... brā](ta)rā dattakāna u haṃtsa brātarā vikrraṃna u hvāarakā
dhaṃrmakā jsa u hvā

(459b11): /8/ [rakā ... u tti ru puña biśyau hayū]nyau jsa u biśyau busvāryau jsa
haṃbrīhyā u biśyau ysanyau jsa.

Not all of the 28 *parivartas* are furnished with a colophon. Moreover, some colophons are partly destroyed or completely lost. Therefore, although there could have been 28, only 18 colophons are actually available. All colophons were inserted when the manuscript was copied: They are written by the same hand as the main body of the text, and there are no open spaces pointing to gaps later filled in.

All *parivartas* of the first quarter (*prathamacaturbhāga*), the *parivartas* I to V have colophons, while *parivartas* VI to XI do not. This might indicate that this part of

the text including *parivarta* XII with the first colophon after the end of the first quarter marked at the end of *parivarta* V, is the indeed second quarter (*dvitīyacaturbhāga*). It is, however, remarkable that there is space for names at the end of *parivartas* VI to X as indicated above. The length of the gap left open varies between 6 *akṣaras*, where just the genitive of a name would fit in as in, e.g., *parivarta* XXV, and 27 *akṣaras* which allows inserting a longer colophon as, e.g., at the end of *parivarta* V. The colophon to *parivarta* XII, which is mostly destroyed, should have mentioned the end of the second quarter, which was probably donated as a whole by the persons named at the end of *parivarta* XII once. If this assumption is correct, the third quarter (*trītya caturbhāga*) comprises *parivartas* XIII to XIX, and the fourth quarter (*caturthacaturbhāga*) *parivartas* XX to XXVIII. Consequently, the distribution of *parivartas* and folios within the individual quarters is uneven: 1st quarter: 5 *parivartas* (folios 7-140 = 133 folios), 2nd quarter: 7 *parivartas* (folios 141-255 = 114), 3rd quarter: 7 *parivartas* (folios 256-360 = 96 folios), 4th quarter: 9 *parivartas* (folios 361-458 = 97 folios).

Apart from dividing the text into quarters, which seems to be rare, if not unique,³⁶ there are additional names of persons with indications to their mutual relationship, which were carefully studied by R. E. Emmerick, who, however, did not have access to all colophons at the time.³⁷

The language of the colophons is a mixture of Khotanese and Sanskrit with strong formulaic features, which often neglect grammar, particularly gender, when masculine endings are attached to feminine names. This does not enhance an easy comprehension of the relationship among the persons named as donors. Following the rules of grammar blindly, it seems that there are two men, Jalapuña and Suviprabha. The husband (Khotanese *kṣā'dai*) Jalapuña has three children with lady (Khotanese *mijsei'*) Jalapuñānā, two sons (Khotanese *pūra*, Sanskrit *putra*), Jalārjuna and Śparadatta, and one daughter (Khotanese *dvīra*, Sanskrit *duhitā*) Jalottamā. Strangely, Suviprabha also seems to have a son named Jalārjuna and a daughter Jalottamā, a very unlikely coincidence indeed.

R. E. Emmerick tried to sort out this problem by assuming that the husband of Jalapuñānā had two names, Jalapuña and Suviprabha. The first name Jalapuñānā is derived from Jalapuña by help of the suffix *-āñā*, a word formation that marks an affiliation³⁸ thus corresponding to the Sanskrit suffix *-āna* / *-ānī* marking, e.g., husband and wife since Vedic times such as Indra and his wife Indrāñī. Here, the Khotanese suffix *-āñā* shows that husband Jalapuña and wife Jalapuñānā are a couple. Also according to R. E. Emmerick Jalapuña, masc. is the name of the husband, as the colophon of *parivarta* XV shows beyond doubt in *kṣā'dai Jalapuñina* “by the husband

Jalapuṅṅā” and that of his wife is in Khotanese Jalapuṅṅānā. In Sanskrit however R. E. Emmerick assumes that the name of the wife is Jalapuṅṅyā, fem. For, the colophon of *parivarta XXII ja]lapuṅṅasya saha suvipra[* interpreted by R. E. Emmerick as “Jalapuṅṅā (fem.) with Suviprabha (masc.)” shows that Jalapuṅṅā (masc.) and Suviprabha (masc.) are two names of the same person, the husband of Jalapuṅṅā. However, that one and the same person bears two names, is not only unusual, but almost impossible.

The solution is comparatively easy. It is not the husband, who is mentioned under two names, but the wife, who is called in Khotanese Jalapuṅṅānā “the one belonging to Jalapuṅṅā (as wife)” and by her name Suviprabhā (fem.) in Sanskrit. Of course her gender is concealed in the colophons at the end of *parivartas XIV and XXII* by the masculine ending of *suviprab(h)asya*. The same is true for *duhitā jalotamasya* “of the daughter Jalottamā” also in *parivarta XIV*, where a clearly feminine name again has a masculine ending. The problem is created by the rigid *deyadharmā* formula, in which the masculine case ending *-asya* is so firmly rooted that it is used irrespective of gender also with feminine nouns.³⁹

Having sorted this out, we can have another look at the colophon at the very end of the text. At the lost beginning the principal donor was named. Therefore the missing text can be assumed to have started by something like [*miṣjei' jalapuṅṅāna* (or: *suviprabha) parstā pīḍi. puṅṅa haṁtsa] meri jsa haṁbrīhyā u pyarāna cu parilo tsuāṁdā* “Lady Jalapuṅṅānā (or: Suviprabhā) had (this text) written. I share the merit with my mother and my father, who have gone to the other world ...”

The family is united in the colophon to *parivarta XV*: “Lady Jalapuṅṅānā ordered (chapter XV) to be written for sake of the maintenance of the life of herself: together with her husband Jalapuṅṅā, and her son Jalārjām, her daughter Jalotama and her son Śparadata (cf. “postscript” p. 388), and (her daughter) Duvākā” (R. E. Emmerick, p. 384). At the same time this colophon underlines the purpose of the donation.⁴⁰

Therefore the couple Jalapuṅṅyā and Jalapuṅṅyānī = Suviprabhā had two sons, Jalārjuna and Śparadata, and two daughters, who were still alive at the time of the donation, Jalottamā and Duvākī. The third already deceased daughter Śikṣamānī is mentioned only in the colophon at the end.

In the colophon at the end only the deceased anonymous parents of Suviprabhā, her husband and one living daughter, Jalottamā, are mentioned. Most likely, the names of the other members of the family were also included, but are lost. On the other hand, one more daughter named Śikṣamānī surfaces together with Suviprabhā/Jalapuṅṅyānī’s brother Braṁgalaka and her sister Santuṣṭā. All three are deceased. Therefore, they can participate in the merit created by the donation only indirectly. For this reason, they are

mentioned only in the colophon at the end, which obviously is the place, where a transfer of merit is made.⁴¹

Moreover, we learn from the colophon at the end that Suviprabhā/Jalapuṇyānī's son Jalārjuna is married, and his wife is also named after her husband Jalārjuṇānī. The relationship of the remaining seven persons, Pharsaja+(?), Jaraukulina, Buddhasaṃgha, Vinaya, Dattaka, Vikrama, and Dharmakā to the family of Jalapuṇya and Suviprabhā/Jalapuṇyānā, if any, or among themselves remains obscure.

Some very Buddhist names mentioned in the colophon are remarkable: Śikṣamāñī⁴², Buddhasaṃgha, Vinaya and Dharmakā. They recall the names of two ladies mentioned in the inscription of the *vinayadhara* Dhammasena, Bodhā and Buddhā.⁴³ Names of this type seem to have enjoyed a certain popularity, although they do not seem to occur in Buddhist literature, which, of course, does not necessarily reflect Buddhist personal names as used in real daily life.

As the principal donors Jalapuṇya and Suviprabhā/Jalapuṇyānī stand out by the epithet *dānapati* attached only to their names, three times in the extant colophons to Jalapuṇya in the very beginning of the text and at the end of *parivartas* I and XXI, and once to that of his wife in *parivarta* III. Still Suviprabhā/Jalapuṇyānī seems to have been the principal donor, because her name is presupposed at the very beginning of the long colophon at the end of the text.

Jalapuṇya is mentioned again together with the title Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra on two folios which are at present detached from the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript, to which they belong as noted by R. E. Emmerick.⁴⁴ As the text begins with *siddham*, it is likely that these two folios without pagination extant originally stood at the very beginning of the text. Here, Jalapuṇya expresses his wish to be reborn together with his parents and his wife (whose name is not given in this text) at a time, when the future Buddha Maitreya will appear on earth. Moreover, he praises the Buddha and his various selfless deeds done for all beings, among others: “He tore off the flesh of his own skin. He made (his) bone a document. He gave a pen ... wrote with (it) one verse (*śloka*)” (R. E. Emmerick). This is a close parallel to the Book of Zambasta XXIII 1645, where the well-known and also often quoted example of self-sacrifice by writing a Buddhist verse with one's own blood is referred to. Consequently, the gap should be filled by *hūñi jsa* “with blood” and the translation adjusted accordingly: “He gave a pen. He wrote with (his) blood one verse.”⁴⁶

The overall number of persons — perhaps as many as 50 — participating in this donation by a large and obviously at least well off family — copying manuscripts was fairly expensive⁴⁷ — demonstrates that the Sanskrit version of the

Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra was held in high esteem in Khotan⁴⁸ as do the numerous manuscripts of this text found there and referred to above. This is also underlined by three paintings found in a manuscript donated by the Khotanese donor Intula and preserved in the St. Petersburg collection. The end of *parivarta* V Auśadhiparivarta on folio 240a (or 206a), *parivarta* VI Śrāvakavyākaraṇaparivarta on folio [2]46b (plate 968), and at the end of *parivarta* VII Pūrvayogaparivarta (folio number lost) is marked by a miniature painting in manuscript SI P 11-1 (plate 963) with the fragment SI P 7 (plate 804) of the same manuscript.⁴⁹ The name of the Khotanese donor is mentioned at the end of the *parivartas*, as is interestingly also the division of the text into quarters:

... pañcamaḥ samāptaḥ || 5 || prathamaś caturbhāgaḥ || intulasya || atha khalu ...

Moreover, there are colophons in small cursive, and sometimes difficult to read,

characters at the bottom of page 240a (or 206a): *ttū parivartā intulā parste pīḍā*

“Intula had this *parivarta* written,” of page [2]46b: *ttū [parivartā] i[ntu]lā par[stā]*

(p)ī(d)ā || + + + + + + (stene) ca paraloke [ca] “Intula had this *parivarta*

written. ... and in the yonder world,” and at the bottom of fragment SI P 7: *intulā*

parstā pīḍā.

Interestingly, the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript is perhaps also shaped in such a way that it is prepared for miniature paintings. For, on folio 6b, where the text of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra begins, and at all subsequent extant ends of *parivartas* there are empty circles which could have been filled by a painting. If this is correct, it is difficult to guess why the paintings were not executed, if they were planned, in spite of the fact that the donation as such was brought to an end as shown by the colophon at the end of the text, which was probably added as the last step concluding the act of merit making. One might assume that manuscripts could be prepared to incorporate miniatures as a precautionary measure, as it were, just in case the donors would decide to have pictures painted (and were willing to pay for them). If not, the circles still could serve as clear markers of the end of a chapter.

More puzzling are the empty spaces at the end of the five *parivartas* VI to X, which could accommodate colophons of different length varying from only a simple name such as *intulasya* just quoted above to a longer text. As stated above, all colophons within the text seem to have been written by the scribe of the manuscript in the same formal script without any indication that they were added only after the copy was completed. Consequently, certain parts of the text must have been attributed to the respective donors from the very beginning, when the donation was planned and before the scribe began his work. If so, these gaps and particularly their varying length make

little sense and are difficult to understand. Was there the hope to win additional donors to join (and share the merit as well as the expenses) during the act of copying only who, however, were not found or declined? This, we shall never know.

Lastly, in spite of the indubitable popularity of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* in Khotan, it was not translated into Khotanese, in contrast to other texts such as the very popular *Samghāṭasūtra* or the equally popular *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*. Only a very brief summary of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* in Khotanese exists, but that in rather many manuscripts, which again underlines the popularity of the text.⁵⁰ Besides this summary there is one single verse translated from Sanskrit into Khotanese and quoted in the *Book of Zambasta*.⁵¹ It is not likely that this verse is the only trace left by a once complete, but lost translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* into Khotanese. Rather, it seems to be a spontaneous translation by the author of the *Book of Zambasta* who wanted to quote this verse in his enumeration of individual verses from different *sūtra* texts.⁵²

With the *Samghāṭasūtra*, which was obviously widely read in Khotan and in Gilgit in the same way as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* was, the situation is exactly the opposite. While G. Canevascini was able to identify traces of no less than 29 Khotanese manuscripts of the *Samghāṭasūtra*, not a single Sanskrit manuscript can be traced back to Khotan. As far as the origin of the Sanskrit manuscripts is known or can be inferred, they were either copied in Gilgit or in the northwest of the Indian subcontinent.

The *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* is represented by about 20 manuscripts in Khotanese and by a considerable number of Sanskrit fragments also from the vicinity of Khotan.⁵³ This *sūtra* thus holds an intermediate position between the exclusively Sanskrit tradition of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* and the equally exclusively Khotanese tradition of the *Samghāṭasūtra* in Khotan.

Given the total number of all fragments and manuscripts recovered from the Khotan area, it does not seem likely, though it is of course not impossible, that this situation is due to the accidental complete loss of all Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Samghāṭasūtra* or all Khotanese traces of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* at Khotan. It is, however, much more likely that the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* was among the texts which were never translated into Khotanese,⁵⁴ perhaps because, as it is said in the *Book of Zambasta* VI.4, “the Khotanese do not value the Law at all in Khotanese” (M. Maggi).⁵⁵ If the author of the *Book of Zambasta* can be taken at his word, this reluctance to translate the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* again would mark the highest appreciation for this text.

Notes

1. Thus this Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra shares the fate of many other manuscripts among them the famous Khotan (ex Gāndhārī) Dharmapada, cf. John Brough: *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada* edited with an introduction and commentary. London Oriental Series, Volume 7. London 1962, p. 2.

2. The present distribution of this manuscript over various libraries is described by Hirofumi Toda: *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts. Romanized Texts, Edited With an Introduction, Tables and Indices*. Tokushima 1981 (reprinted 1983) [rev.: O. v. Hinüber, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 28. 1985, pp. 137-139]. The number of folios preserved at different places is given in the introduction, p. XII.

3. An obituary by Sergej Fedorovič Ol'denburg (1863-1934): *Pamjati Nikolaja Thedoroviča Petrovskago 1837-1908* appeared in *Zapiski Vostočnogo Otdelenija Rossijskogo Archeologičeskogo Obščestva* 20. 1910, pp. 1-8. where, most unfortunately, except for some bibliographical references no detailed information on antiquities collected by N. F. Petrovskij are given, nor is the end of his tenure at Kashgar mentioned; for the date cf. Skrine and Nightingale, *Macartney at Kashgar*, as below note 7, p. 134.

4. Actually, already August Friedrich Rudolf Hoernle (1841-1918): *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*. Oxford 1916 (reprinted Amsterdam 1970 [rev.: Jan Willem de Jong, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 14. 1972, p. 265], p. 139 suspected that the manuscript came from Khādaliq. This remark was obviously often overlooked with the exception of H. Toda: *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts*, as note 2 above, p. XI or Seishi Karashima: *A Trilingual Edition of the Lotus Sutra — New edition of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese versions*. Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002. 6. 2003, pp. 85-182, particularly p. 86.

5. The year 1903 is mentioned in Akira Yuyama: *Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. Canberra 1970 [rev.: Jan Willem de Jong, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 15. 1973, pp. 140-144; F. Weller, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 70. 1975, pp. 180 foll.; Boris L. Oguibénine, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1974, pp. 76-78], p. 21, and, probably following A. Yuyama, in H. Bechert: *Über die Marburger Fragmente des Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, I. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1972, Nr. 1* [rev.: C. Vogel, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 125. 1975, pp. 445-448; Jacques May, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 17. 1975, pp. 270-273], p. 11. — An English summary is given by H. Bechert: *Remarks on the textual history of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. *Indo-Asian Art and Culture (Acharya Raghu Vira Commemoration Volume)* 2. 1973, pp. 21-27.

6. Unfortunately, this note is not accessible to me; quoted after Margarita Iosifovna Vorob'ëva-Dešjatovskaja in: *The Caves of One Thousand Buddhas. Russian Expeditions on the Silk Route, on the Occasion of 190 Years of the Asiatic Museum. Exhibition Catalogue*. St. Petersburg 2008, p. 104. — Yurij Ašotovič Petrosyan: *The Collection of Oriental Manuscripts in the St. Petersburg Branch*

of the Institute of Oriental Studies and Its Investigation. *Manuscripta Orientalia* Vol. 2, no. 3, 1996, pp. 27-37 contains only a very general survey without any helpful details.

7. After M. I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja as preceding note; cf. on Sir George Macartney: Clarmont Percival Skrine and Pamela Nightingale: *Macartney at Kashgar. New Light on British, Chinese, and Russian Activities in Sinkiang, 1890-1918.* Hong Kong and Oxford 1987 and *Lady (Catherine Borland) Macartney: An English Lady in Chinese Turkestan.* Hong Kong and Oxford 1985.

8. Cf. Jens-Uwe Hartmann & Klaus Wille: *Die nordturkestanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften der Sammlung Hoernle (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften II)*, in: *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen II*, bearbeitet von Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Klaus Wille, Claus Vogel, Günter Grönbold. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, Beiheft 4. Göttingen 1992, pp. 9-63.

9. H. Bechert: *Marburger Fragmente*, as note 5 above.

10. These fragments were considered as lost for some time, cf. H. Bechert, *Marburger Fragmente*, as note 5 above, p. 12.

11. Akira Yuyama & Hirofumi Toda: *The Huntington Fragment F of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.* *Studia Philologica Buddhica. Occasional Paper Series II.* Tokyo 1977.

12. The history of research is traced by Bechert: *Marburger Fragmente*, as note 5 above, pp. 17-23; according to H. Toda: *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts*, as note 2 above, p. XII these six fragments are preserved at Peking. This needs correction. In fact, there are not six, but seven very fragmentary folios in the Lüshun Museum Collection. They are edited together with the remaining *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* manuscripts from the materials collected by Kozui Otani (1876-1948) by JIANG Zhongxin: *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection. Facsimile Edition and Romanized Text.* Lüshun and Tokyo 1997, facsimiles ("manuscript D") pp. 174-187.

13. H. Lüders: *Miscellaneous Fragments I. Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka*, in: A. F. R. Hoernle: *Manuscript Remains*, as note 4 above, pp. 139-162, cf. Hoernle's note p. 143. Lüders' article also contains an edition of the Nepalese manuscript tradition corresponding to pp. 261,14-265,13 and pp. 269,7-271,3 in Kern-Nanjio. The relevant information was given to H. Lüders by H. Kern before the latter's edition appeared. — On Lüders' work on the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* cf. also Ursula Sims-Williams: *The papers of the Central Asian scholar and Sanskritist Rudolf Hoernle*, in: Seishi Karashima & Klaus Wille: *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia. The British Library Sanskrit Fragments Volume I.* Tokyo 2006 [rev: R. Salomon, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128. 2008, p. 809], pp. 1-26, particularly p. 4.

14. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* ed. by Henrik Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio. St. Petersburg 1908-1912 (*Bibliotheca Buddhica X*) (reprinted Osnabrück 1970).

15. On the well-known shortcomings of this edition: Willy Baruch: *Beiträge zum Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.* Leiden 1938 [rev.: Jean Filliozat, *Journal Asiatique* 238, 1938, pp. 346 foll.], pp. 7-12.

16. H. Toda: *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. Central Asian Manuscripts, as note 2 above.
17. Klaus Wille: Fragments of a Manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* from Khādaliq. Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series 3. Tokyo 2000, pp. 159-183 chapter 4.5 giving a concordance of all known Central Asian fragments with the Kashgar Manuscript. Cf. now also M. I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja & Noriyuki Kudo: A Newly Identified Fragment of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* kept in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies. ARIRIAB 10. 2007, pp. 57-66.
18. The origin of Lüshun manuscript C is unknown, manuscript D is the Kashgar (Khotan) manuscript, cf. Z. Jiang, *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection*, as note 10 above, p. 23 foll.
19. According to Grigorij Maksimovič Bongard-Levin & M. I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja: *Pamjatniki indijskoj pis'mennosti iz Central'noj Azii. Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie i kommentarij. Vypusk 1. Pamjatniki pis'mennosti Vostoka LXXIII,1 = Bibliotheca Buddhica XXXIII. Moscow 1985 [rev.: J. W. de Jong, Indo-Iranian Journal 30. 1987, pp. 215-221; D. Seyfort Rugg, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 51. 1988, pp. 576-578; L. Sander, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 84. 1989, pp. 92-97], p. 87.*
20. H. Bechert: *Marburger Fragmente*, as note 5 above, p. 15.
21. H. Lüders: *Miscellaneous Fragments I. Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka*, as note 13 above, p. 161 foll.; there are more examples of this particular vocative plural form which are listed by H. Toda: *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. Central Asian Manuscripts, as note 2 above, p. XXIII § 18, cf. also O. v. Hinüber: *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 467. Band. Wien 2001, § 322.*
22. Seishi Karashima: *Some Features of the Language of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. Indo-Iranian Journal 44. 2001, pp. 207-230.
23. Claus Vogel: *The Dated Nepalese Manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, I. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1974, Nr. 5: nos. (3) AD 1039, (4) AD 1064 and (6) AD 1065 etc. Another old Nepalese manuscript not accessible to C. Vogel and dated to N.S. 202 (Caitra) = AD 1082 is edited by Jiang Zhongxin: *A Sanskrit Manuscript of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Kept in the Library of the Cultural Palace of the Nationalities, Beijing. Peking 1988.*
24. N. D. Mironov: *Buddhist Miscellanea: I. Avalokiteśvara - Kuan-Yin; II. Central Asian Recensions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 1927, pp. 241-252 and pp. 252-279.
25. R. E. Emmerick in H. Toda: *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. Central Asian Manuscripts, as note 2 above, p. XII.
26. *Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka-Sūtra*. Kashgar Manuscript (foreword by Heinz Bechert). Tokyo 1977, p. 1 foll.

27. Missing text is put into brackets [], damaged *akṣaras* into parentheses (), while < > marks an *akṣara* forgotten by the scribe, and + stands for gap of one *akṣara*.

28. The numbers from this manuscript are conveniently collected by Klaus Wille: Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland. Supplementband 30. Stuttgart 1990, table p. 20.

29. By coincidence the only numerical sign beyond “1000” noted by Georg Bühler in his palaeography is “8000” quoted from the Chammak Plates of Pravarasena II published in Vasudev Vishnu Mirashi: Inscriptions of the Vākātakas. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum V. Ootacamund 1963, pp. 22-27, line 19. The interpretation is certain because of the text *sahasrair aṣṭābhiḥ 8000*. High numbers noted by Louis Renou & Jean Filliozat: L’Inde classique. Manuel des études indiennes. Tome II, Hanoï 1953, pp. 705-707 look quite different. It seems that the numerical signs for “1000” etc. were created independently in different scripts.

30. Cf. O. v. Hinüber: Die Pāli Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin. Wiesbaden 2013, p. XLVIII foll., cf. note 46 below.

31. On *pharṣa* “judge” cf. Ela Filippone: Is the Judge a Questioning Man? Notes in the Margin of Khotanese *pharṣavata*-, in: Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan. Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume ed. by Maria Macuch, Mauro Maggi & Werner Sundermann. Iranica Band 13, Wiesbaden 2007, pp. 75-86 with older literature, but without reference to the colophon.

32. O. v. Hinüber: A Second Inscription from Phanigiri (Andhrapradesh): Dhammasena’s Donation. ARIRIAB 15. 2012, pp. 2-10, particularly p. 4, line 7 foll. An improved edition of this inscription, particularly of lines 14-17, appeared in ARIRIAB 16. 2013, pp. 3-12. — Sten Konow: Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions with the exception of those of Aśoka. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum II,1. Calcutta 1929, no. XXXV,2, p. 91.

33. Giotto Canevascini: The Khotanese Saṃghāṣūtra. A critical edition. Beiträge zur Iranistik Band 14. Wiesbaden 1993.

34. Cf. H. W. Bailey: Dictionary of Khotanese Saka. Cambridge 1979 s.v. *ysani*. The colophon of the Jñānolkadhāraṇī has a similar wording *harbiṣyau ysanyau u busvāryau jsa haṃ tsa biṣyau sarvastvyau uysnauryau jsa* “zusammen mit den gesamten Geschlechtsangehörigen [= Blutsverwandten] und Verschwägerten, zusammen mit allen (Sak.) allen (Sanskrit.) Wesen (Sanskrit.) Wesen (Sak.)” after Ernst Leumann: Buddhistische Literatur Nordarisch und Deutsch. I. Teil: Nebenstücke. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XV.2. Leipzig 1920 (repr. Nendeln 1966), p. 164.

35. The name of an author is given in a corresponding way in *ḥkṛtir bhikṣor ācārya Dharmatrāta[sya]*, in: Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil 9: Die Katalognummern 2000-3199 beschrieben von K. Wille, herausgegeben von H. Bechert. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band X, 9. Stuttgart 2004 [rev.: O. v. Hinüber, Indo-Iranian Journal 48. 2005, pp. 299-312], Kat.-Nr. 2026, p. 53, (provenance unknown); Gilgit Manuscript no. 8 Viśvantarāvādāna, p. 157 = no.

1347:]*śamāptam kṛtir ācārya-Śūrasya* ||, in: O. v. Hinüber: The Gilgit Manuscripts. An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research (in press). The same formula also occurs in epigraphy, e.g.: *kṛti buddhabala* at the end of the Shigar inscription, cf. O. v. Hinüber: Die Palola Śāhis. Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber. Materialien zur Geschichte von Gilgit und Chilas. Antiquities of Northern Pakistan Vol. 5. Mainz 2004, p. 69.

36. There is no example for this kind of text division in Louis Renou: Les divisions dans les textes sanskrits. Indo-Iranian Journal 1. 1957, pp. 1-32. It does occur once again, however, in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra manuscript donated by Intula (see below).

37. R. E. Emmerick: Some Khotanese Donors, in: Mémorial Jean de Menasce éd, par Ph. Gignoux et A. Tafazzoli. Leuven 1974, pp. 383-388, 3 plates. Only the colophons of the Parivartas II, V, XV are discussed here.

38. Almuth Degener: Khotanische Suffixe. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 39. Stuttgart 1979 [rev.: P. O. Skjærø, Kratylos 35. 1990, pp. 99-102; B. Tikkanen, Studia Orientalia, Helsinki 67. 1991, pp. 213-215; D. Weber, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 143. 1993, pp. 421-425; O. v. Hinüber, Indo-Iranian Journal 36. 1993, pp. 372 foll.], pp.71-73 § 7.B.11-7.B.19.

39. Examples for the mechanical use of various case endings are collected in O. v. Hinüber: Die Palola Śāhis, as note above note 35, p. 145; O. v. Hinüber: Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des Oberen Indus, in: Antiquities of Northern Pakistan Vol. I: Rock Inscriptions in the Indus Valley. Mainz 1989, pp. 73-106, particularly p. 85: *bhāgīnyā pravāsubena, raktaśāntenasya bhikṣoḥ, āyusmāṃ raktaśāntenas;* O. v. Hinüber: The Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra at Gilgit: Manuscripts, Worshipers, and Artists. The Journal of Oriental Studies 22. 2012, pp. 52-67, particularly p. 54: *pevothīyena*, fem.; further: *siṅhoṭesya*, Chilās 20:2 (*siṅhoṭena x siṅhoṭasya*), in: Ditte Bandini-König: Die Felsbildstation Thalpan I, Kataloge Chilas-Brücke und Thalpan (Steine 1-30). Materialien zur Archäologie der Nordgebiete Pakistans Band 6. Mainz 2009, correspondingly *ṣerīyesya*, Thalpan 516:1, *virudhaena*, Thalpan 509:37, both in: Ditte Bandini-König: Die Felsbildstation Thalpan IV, Katalog Thalpan (Steine 451-811). MANP Band 9. Mainz 2009 and *adharmāṇa*, Saṃghāṭasūtra manuscript F § 103.3, cf. G. Canevascini, as note 33 above, p. 49.

40. Devaśīrikā, the donatrix of manuscript D of the Saṃghāṭasūtra expresses a similar wish: *sve śarīre āyurvalavarṇavṛddhi*, O. v. Hinüber: Palola Śāhis, as note 35 above, no. 10 (Saṃghāṭasūtra).

41. Another example for deceased persons being included in the act of merit making is the colophon to the Gilgit manuscript “D” of the Saṃghāṭasūtra, cf. preceding note.

42. The existence of this name does not necessarily point to the actual existence of the status of a *śikṣamāṇā* in the career of a Buddhist nun in ancient Khotan. On the absence of *śikṣamāṇās* cf. Ann Heirman: Where is the Probationer in the Chinese Buddhist Nunneries? Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 158. 2008, pp. 105-137 and O. v. Hinüber: The Foundation of the Bhikkhunīsaṃgha. A Contribution to the Earliest History of Buddhism. ARIRIAB 11. 2008, pp. 3-29,

particularly p. 19.

43. O. v. Hinüber: A Second Inscription from Phanagiri, as note 32 above; Pavajitikā is not a personal name, as assumed erroneously, cf. ARIRIAB 13. 2013, p. 3 foll.

44. These folios are published as facsimile in R. E. Emmerick & M. I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja: Saka Documents VII: the St. Petersburg Collections. Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum Part II Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia. Vol. V. Saka. London 1993 [rev.: A. Degener, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 3rd Series 5. 1995, pp. 119 foll.; H. Kumamoto, Indo-Iranian Journal 38. 1995, pp. 371-376 (also on the text volume); G. Canevascini, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 59. 1996, pp. 163 foll.; M. Maggi, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 92. 1997, pp. 589 foll.; R. Schmitt, Kratylos 42. 1997, pp. 175-177], plates 49, 50 and in transcription by R. E. Emmerick & M. I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja: Saka Documents Text Volume III: the St. Petersburg Collections. Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum Part II Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia. Vol. V. Saka. London 1995 [rev.: A. Degener, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 3rd Series 6. 1996, pp. 439 foll.; M. Maggi, Indo-Iranian Journal 41. 1998, pp. 282-288; Y. Yoshida, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 60. 1997, pp. 567-569; H. Kumamoto, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 92. 1997, pp. 239-245], pp. 68 foll.

45. The Book of Zambasta. A Khotanese poem on Buddhism, edited and translated by R. E. Emmerick. London Oriental Series Volume 21. London 1968.

46. This suggestion is not without problems, because the traces of *akṣaras*, particularly the beginning of line 3 with *jsa* do not really seem to match. — A corresponding Sanskrit text is, e.g., *madīyena śoṇitena massiṃ kuryyāc carmmam utpātya bhūrjjaṃ kuryyād asthi bhaktvā ca kalamam kuryyāt*, Adeleid Mette: Die Gilgitfragmente des Kāraṇḍavyūha. Indica et Tibetica 29. Swisttal-Odendorf 1997 [rev.: H. V. Guenther, Journal of the American Oriental Society 120. 2000, p. 153], p. 143, 9-11 = P. L. Vaidya: Mahāyānasūtrasaṃgraha, Volume I. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 17. Darbhanga 1961, p. 293, 22 foll.; Mātṛceṭa writes his Prañidhānasaptati with his own blood: Jens-Uwe Hartmann: Das Varṇārhavarnastotra des Mātṛceṭa herausgegeben und übersetzt. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge Nr. 160. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden XII. Göttingen 1987 [rev.: J. W. de Jong, Indo-Iranian Journal 32. 1989, pp. 243-248; M. Hara, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 86. 1991, pp. 313-318; O. v. Hinüber, Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 39. 1995, p. 248 foll.], p. 20 etc.

47. On the prices of Pāli manuscripts copied much later in 16th century Northern Thailand cf. note 30 above.

48. On the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra in Khotan: Mauro Maggi, in: R. E. Emmerick & Maria Macuch (edd.): The Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran. Companion Volume I to A History of Persian Literature. A History of Persian Literature Vol. XVII. London 2009, p. 324 foll.

49. Both miniatures are reproduced in black and white in G. M. Bongard-Levin & M. I.

Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja: Pamjatniki, as note 19 above, pp. 250 and 253. The miniature on folio 240a is reproduced in colour in the exhibition catalogue *The Lotus Sutra and Its World. Buddhist Manuscripts of the Great Silk Road. Manuscripts and blockprints from the collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies. St. Petersburg & Tokyo 1998, plate 2 = Buddhistische Manuskripte der Seidenstraße. Das Lotussutra und seine Welt. Wien und Wolfenbüttel 2000, plate 2.*

50. R. E. Emmerick: *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan. Second Edition, Thoroughly Revised and Enlarged. Studia Philologica Buddhica. Occasional Paper Series III. Tokyo 1992, pp. 27-29; H. W. Bailey: Sad-dharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra. The Summary in Khotan Saka. The Australian National University. Faculty of Asian Studies. Occasional Paper 10. Canberra 1971 [rev.: M. J. Dresden, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93. 1973, pp. 599 foll.]; H. W. Bailey: *The Khotanese Summary of the Sad-dharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*, in: *Taisho Daigaku Kenkyukiyo. Memoirs of the Taisho University, The Department of Literature and Buddhism. 57. 1972, pp. 530-526.**

51. *Book of Zambasta*, as note 45 above, VI 3. The verse was identified already by Ernst Leumann (1859-1931).

52. Cf. M. Maggi, as note 48 above, pp. 338 foll.

53. Prods Oktor Skjærvø: *The Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras. The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra. Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 60, 61. Central Asian Sources V, VI. Cambridge/Mass. 2004, 2 Volumes. On the Sanskrit manuscripts Vol. I, pp. XXXIII foll.; on the Khotanese manuscripts pp. LXII-LXXI.*

54. Thus also M. Maggi, as note 48 above, p. 375. — It is remarkable that no Khotanese Vinaya text seems to exist with the only exception of the Tumšūqese Karmavācanā containing the vows of an *upāsaka* (or an *upāsikā*?): R. E. Emmerick: *The Tumshuqese Karmavācanā Text. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse. Jahrgang 1985, Nr. 2* [rev.: V. H. Mair, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 106. 1986, pp. 879 foll.; H. Kumamoto, *Kratylos* 32. 1987, pp. 176 foll.; P. O. Skjærvø, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1987, pp. 77-90; O. v. Hinüber, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 83. 1988, pp. 619 foll.] with corrections by Klaus Totila Schmidt: *Ein Beitrag des Tocharischen zur Entzifferung des Tumšūqsakischen. Altorientalische Forschungen* 15. 1988, pp. 306-314.

55. This would not shed a very favourable light on the Saṃghāṭasūtra in Khotenese, unless, perhaps, both texts simply appealed to different readers and users, the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra to the educated or learned and the (to our taste at least) rather unassuming Saṃghāṭasūtra to the common monk or layman(?).