

A Saddharmapūṇḍarikasūtra 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, it seems, in two batches. Later, it was handed over 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. Part of this manuscript 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 1892, 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 Branch of the Russian Archaeological Society” no. 7 of the year 1892 (published 1893) by Sergej F. Ol’denburg: *Kašgarskaja rukopis’ N. F. Petrovskogo* (Каш-

*This is a revised version of the introduction to Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (SI P/5, etc.). Facsimile Edition [Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series 13]. Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Soka Gakkai, Institute of Oriental Philosophy. St. Petersburg, Tokyo 2013, pp. CXXIII–CXL.

гарская рукопись Н. Ф. Петровского) “The Kashgar Manuscript of N. F. Petrovskij” (p. 81 foll.).⁶ A substantial number of fragments from various manuscripts, among them an unspecified number of folios of the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra, were presented to the Imperial Russian Academy 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 in the Stein Collection and 4 folios in the Hoernle Collection⁸. Lastly, a small number of folios 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 finally 1 fragment in the Ellsworth Huntington Papers 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 Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra edition by Bunyiu Nanjio (1849–1927) and Hendrik 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, which was established by B. Nanjio, had already been 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 dispersed folios belonged 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 Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra manuscripts recovered from the vicinity of Khotan, although the provenance of many Central Asian 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 acquired, to reveal their sources. It can be assumed that at least the following 13 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 & 90b; 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 Z. Jiang, 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.

Manuscripts retrieved from different find-spots can be classified in two versions, a Central Asian and a Gilgit-Nepalese branch. As H. Bechert emphasized the Central Asian recension, which is represented by the manuscripts from the Khotan area, is not only an older version, but in addition split into two sub-recensions, which are distinguished by the presence or absence of the Devadattaparivarta.²⁰ At the same time, different linguistic usage, besides reflecting a difference in age, also separates the two branches of the text tradition geographically.

As H. Lüders already recognized, when he investigated only four folios from the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript, the Central Asian version is 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 A detailed investigation into the language of the Lüshun manuscript by S. Karashima has confirmed Lüders' assumption in the meantime.²²

Even though the undated Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript preserves a much older and more Middle Indic text than the Gilgit-Nepalese branch, it is difficult to date this manuscript, because the script used in this copy did not change over a certain period of time. Earlier scholars such as Nikolaj Dimitrievič Mironov (1880–1936) tried to date the Kashgar

(Khotan) Manuscript to the 7th century.²³ In contrast, R. E. Emmerick assumed that the language of the colophons, which are not written in Sanskrit, but in late Khotanese, would hardly allow for a date earlier than the ninth, probably even the tenth century rather.²⁴ If correct, the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript would have been copied more or less at the same time as the oldest Nepalese manuscripts, which are dated to the 11th century.²⁵ However, given the uncertainty of dating “late Khotanese”, a date during the eighth or early ninth century seems to be more likely for the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript.²⁶

The Khotanese colophons, which were studied by R. E. Emmerick and by Harold Walter Bailey (1899–1996), are of considerable interest, even if they may not be very helpful when trying to determine the date of the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript.

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. Unfortunately, the last folio of the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript is damaged with the middle part of the folio being lost and only the left and right parts being extant.²⁷ These two fragments may preserve more than half the text of the colophon at the end of *parivarta* XXVIII Anuparīdanā-Parivarta (folio 459b1–9):

] 800: || ttū namo saddharmapuṇḍa[
]meri jsa haṃbrīhyā u pyarāna cu parilo tsuāmdā u kṣādai jalal2/[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 jalārrjunāmñā jsa /7/[...
 brā](ta)rā dattakāna u haṃtsa brātarā vikraṃna u hvārakā dhaṃrmakā
 jsa u hvā/8/[rakā ... u tti ru puña biśyau hayū]nyau jsa u biśyau
 busvāryau jsa haṃbrīhyā biśyau ysanyau jsa.

The reading of the colophon follows H. W. Bailey and H. Toda with the exception of the end of line 2, where both read erroneously *dala*[, instead of a clearly visible *jala*].²⁸

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 Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya found at Gilgit, where numbers up to 500 are

found.²⁹ 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, it seems to be derived from the *akṣara* “kha” and not from “a” as expected. Therefore, a higher number such as 8000 might be more likely.³⁰

Next, it is difficult to find out, what this number might refer to. A date is very unlikely, even if “800” is read, because there is no era only remotely matching this figure, and a round figure such as “800” is suspicious in a date anyway. Sometimes the length of the text is mentioned in the colophon, e.g., in the Mahāvastu *granthapramāṇaṃ śloka* 25000 “the book extends to 25,000 *ślokas*,” which corresponds to 800,000 *akṣaras*. A rough calculation shows that the complete 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 colophons to *parivarta* V, which states on folio 140 *prathamacaturbhāgaḥ samāptaḥ* “the first quarter has come to an end,” and again to *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 1273 *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.³¹ *Non liquet*.

After a double *daṇḍa* the colophon in formal script breaks off with “homage to the Saddharmapuṇḍa[.]” 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[puṇa 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 Jalārjuñāñī [... bro]ther Dattaka and together with brother Vikrama and sister Dharmakā and sis[ter ... and then] I share [the merit with all frie]nds and together with all members of the household, 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.³²

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 *ñati-mitra-salohidaṇa*.³³ This corresponds to *hayūna* “friend” (*mitra*, cf. Saṃghāṣūtra § 246,4 *ha[yūna]* = *sakhāyā*)³⁴, *bisvāra* / *busvāra* “kinsman” (probably *bāndhava*) and *ysani* “kinsman” (*ñāti*, cf. Saṃghāṣūtra § 243 verse 30 *ysāne* = *jñātayaḥ*; *ysani* also translates *bandhujana*)³⁵.

A number of deceased persons are mentioned in the beginning after the principal donor, lady Suviprabhā, whose husband is named among the persons enumerated to share the merit. The names of altogether 26 persons are preserved in this 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 (see below).

For, as a complete folio measures 57 cm by 18 cm, while the extant right part of the colophon folio measures only 13 cm by 21 cm, approximately only half the text of the colophon is extant here, which, however, can be supplemented in part by the fragment in the British Library (cf. note 27 above). The space at the bottom of the fragment shows that the last line is preserved. Therefore, about 5 cm of the topmost part of this folio are lost. This missing part of the fragment contained two lines (ca. 60 *aḥṣaras*) in formal script with the end of the

Saddharmapunḍarīkasūtra 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, measures 7 cm, the distance from the outer circle to the margin is 17 cm, which results in the length of half a folio of 24 cm or 48 cm of a complete one. As the folio is 57 cm long, about 4.5 cm are missing at the outer sides 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 contained 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. Lady Suviprabhā,
the principal donor | 13. Śikṣamāṇī † |
| 1. mother of Jalapuñānā † | 14. name(s) lost |
| 2. father of Jalapuñānā † | 15. Buddhasaṃgha |
| 3. husband Jalapuña | 16. Vinaya |
| 4. name(s) lost | 17. son's wife (daughter-in-law) Jalārrjuñānī |
| 5. Pharsaja+ (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 the colophon, lady Suviprabhā (Jalapuñānā) is the principal donor accompanied by her husband Jalapuña 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

lady Suviprabhā who donated the manuscript. Therefore, it is necessary and useful to have a close look at the colophons at the end of individual *parivartas* when trying 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 kṛtir³⁶ ācārya-

Rahulabhadrrasya

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

namaḥ sarvajñāya nama āryasamantabhadrāya bodhisatvāya mahāsatvāya. ayam **deyadharmam dānapati Jalapuñasya**. siddham namaḥ sarvabuddhabodhisatvebhyaḥ. evaṃ mayā śrutaṃ ... (Beginning of the text of the *sūtra*)

Colophons at the end of the individual *parivartas*:

I. Parivarta (36a1):

... samāptaḥ. ayam **deyadharmam dānapati Jalapuñasya**. atha khalu ...

II. Parivarta (64a6f. foll.)

... samāptaḥ 2 || miṣjei' **jalapuñāna** parstā pīḍi saha **jalārrjunasya**. atha khalu...

III. Parivarta (101b5 foll.):

... samāpta 3 || deyadharmo yaṃ dānapati **Suviprabhasya** || atha khalv ...

IV. Parivarta (121a5):

... samāptaḥ 4 deyadharmau yaṃ **jalottamasya** || atha khalv ...

V. Parivarta (140a6):

... samāptaḥ 5 || *prathamacaturbhāgaḥ samāptaḥ* ||—tū namau saddharmapuṇḍarī mijṣei' **jalapuñāna** parstā pīḍi. haṃtsa pūri **śparadattina** || atha khalv ...

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), e.g.: ... ṣaṣṭaḥ samāptaḥ || 6 || (14 *akṣaras*) bhūtapūrvam ... etc.

XII. Parivarta (255b7):

... samā]pta. [1]2 deya[dharmo yaṃ dānapati suviprabhasya] (saha) duhitā (dūvaka)sya (end of folio 255b; beginning of folio 256a1) atha khalu ...

H. Toda supplies [*saha duhitā jalotama*]sya, which contradicts the evidence found in the (new) facsimile edition, where it is clear that the name of the daughter consists of only three, not four *akṣaras*. Moreover, the shape of the slightly blurred *akṣaras* clearly points to *dūvakasya*,

again a feminine name with a masculine ending, cf. note 43 below. The gap following *deya* is tentatively filled by supplying text from the colophon to *parivarta* III, etc.

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

XIV. Parivarta (283a2):
... caturdaśamaḥ samāptaḥ || [de]yadharmau yaṃ **suviṣṭabha**(!)**asya** saha duhitā **jalotamasya** atha khalv anyā[...]

XV. Parivarta (302a7–302b2):
... pañcadaśamaḥ samāptaḥ 15 || mijṣei' **jalapuñāna** parstā piḍi uysānye jsiñi paderāṣci kiḍina. haṃtsa kṣā'dai **jalapuñina** u pūri **jalārrjāmna** dvirā **jalotamā** jsa u pūrā **śparadatāna** u **dūvakā** jsa. atha khalu ...

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

XVII. Parivarta (331a1):
saptādaśamaḥ (gap) kṣā'd[ai] **jalapuñāna**. atha khalu ...

XVIII. Parivarta (340b3):
... aṣṭādaśamaḥ samāptaḥ deyadharmā **suviṣṭabhasya** saha putrā **jalārrjunasya**. atha khalu ...

XIX. Parivarta (360b3):
... ekonaviṃśatimas samāptaḥ 19 *trītyaś caturbhāgah samāpta* || ayam deyadharmā **suviṣṭabhasya** : atha khalu ...

XX. Parivarta (371b6):
The text of the colophon is lost.

XXI. Parivarta (380b2):
... samāptaḥ 21 deyadharmo yaṃ dānapati **jalapuñasya** saha putrā **jalārrjunasya**. atha khalu ...

XXII. Parivarta (387a7):
ja]lapuñasya saha **suviṣṭa[bha...]**

XXIII. Parivarta (407b1):
] 23 deyadharmā **suviṣṭabhasya** [atha khalu ...
Most likely, the complete colophon is extant.

XXIV. Parivarta (421a1):
caturviṃśa]timaḥ samāptaḥ 24 deyadharmo 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** [(gap)

XXVI. Parivarta (445a4):
samāptaḥ deya [(gap)

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 saddharma-
pu[ṇḍarīkasūtra

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

(459b5): /2/]puñina jsa haṃbrīhyā u ... jsa haṃbrīhyā u tti ru] puña phar
ṣaja+(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 hvārakā saṃduṣṭi jsa haṃbrīhyā
cu pa

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

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

(459b10): /7/ [... brā](ta)rā dattakāna u haṃtsa brātarā vikramna u
hvārakā 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 spaces pointing to gaps that were filled in later.

All *parivartas* of the first quarter (*prathamacaturbhāga*), the *parivartas* I to V, have colophons, while *parivartas* VI to XI do not. As can be seen in the manuscript donated by Intula³⁷ the second quarter (*dviṭīyacaturbhāga*) ends with *parivarta* X thus comprising *parivartas* VI–X. It is remarkable that there is space for names at the end of *parivartas* VI to X as indicated above. The length of the gaps left open varies between 6 *akṣaras*, where just the genitive of a name would fit in as actually found in, e.g., *parivarta* XXV, and 27 *akṣaras* a gap that allows inserting a longer colophon as at the end of *parivarta* X, where in addition to the name of a donor also *dviṭīyaścaturbhāgaḥ* 2 would have

to be filled in. Consequently, the third quarter (*trīyacaturbhāga*) comprises *parivartas* XI to XIX, and the fourth quarter (*caturthacaturbhāga*) *parivartas* XX to XXVIII. Thus, the distribution of *parivartas* and folios within the individual quarters is 5 + 5 *parivartas* in the first, and 9 + 9 *parivartas* in the second part of the text with twice approximately 135 + 90 folios: 1st quarter: 5 *parivartas* (folios 7–140 = 133 folios), 2nd quarter: 5 *parivartas* (folios 141–226a = 85), 3rd quarter: 9 *parivartas* (folios 226b–360 = 134 folios), 4th quarter: 9 *parivartas* (folios 361–458 = 97 folios).³⁸

Apart from the division into quarters, which seems to be rare, if not unique,³⁹ found in these colophons within the text, there are additional names of persons. Moreover, there are clues to their mutual relationship, which were carefully studied by R. E. Emmerick, who, however, had access only to the colophons of *parivartas* II, V, XV at the time.⁴⁰

The language of the colophons is a mixture of Khotanese and Sanskrit in a stereotyped wording. Consequently, grammar is often neglected in these formulas, particularly gender, when masculine endings are attached to feminine names. This is, obviously, an obstacle to the comprehension of the relationship among the persons named as donors. Following the rules of grammar blindly, it seems that there are two men, Jalapuṇa and Suviprabha. The husband (Khotanese *kṣā'dai*) Jalapuṇa has three children with lady (Khotanese *mijsei'*) Jalapuṇānā, 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 Jalapuṇānā had two names, Jalapuṇa and Suviprabha. The first name Jalapuṇānā is derived from Jalapuṇa by help of the suffix *-ānā*, a word formation that marks an affiliation⁴¹ thus corresponding to the Sanskrit suffix *-ānī* indicating a wife since Vedic times such as Indra and his wife *Indrānī*.⁴² Here, the Khotanese suffix *-ānā* shows that husband Jalapuṇa and wife Jalapuṇānā are a couple. Also according to R. E. Emmerick Jalapuṇa (masc.) is the name of the husband, as the colophon of *parivarta* XV shows beyond doubt in *kṣā'dai Jalapuṇina* “by the husband Jalapuṇa” and that of his wife is in Khotanese Jalapuṇānā. In Sanskrit however R. E. Emmerick assumes that the name of the wife is Jalapuṇyā, fem. For, the colophon of *parivarta* XXII *ja]lapuṇasya. saha suvipra[* interpreted by R. E. Emmerick as “Jalapuṇā (fem.) with Suviprabha (masc.)” If so, Jalapuṇa (masc., *parivarta* XV) and Suviprabha (masc., *parivarta* XXII) should be two names of the

same person, the husband of Jalapuñā. 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 Jalapuñānā “the one belonging to Jalapuña (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 dūvakasya* “of the daughter Dūvakā” and *duhitā jalotamasya* “of the daughter Jalottamā” in the colophons to *parivartas* XII and XIV respectively, which are clearly feminine names again with 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.⁴³

Having sorted this out, we can have another look at the colophon at the very end of the text. At the beginning the principal donor was named. Therefore the missing text can be assumed to have started by something like:⁴⁴]*miṣjei’ su[viprabha parstā pīḍi. puña haṃtsa] meri jsa haṃbrīhyā u pyarāna cu parilo tsuāṃdā* “Lady 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 Jalapuñānā ordered (chapter 15) to be written for the sake of the maintenance of the life of herself: together with her husband Jalapuña, and her son Jalārjām, her daughter Jalotama and her son Śparadatta (cf. R. E. Emmerick, “postscript” p. 388), and (her daughter) Dūvakā” (R. E. Emmerick, p. 384 and on the name p. 386). At the same time this colophon underlines the purpose of the donation.⁴⁵

With the exception of the Iranian names Śparadatta and Dūvakā, the others can be normalized in Sanskrit: The couple Jalapuṇya and Jalapuṇyānī = Suviprabhā had two sons, Jalārjuna and Śparadatta, and two daughters, who were still alive at the time of the donation, Jalottamā and Dūvakī. The third already deceased daughter Śikṣamāṇī 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 Śikṣamāṇī surfaces together with Suviprabhā/Jalapuṇyānī’s brother Braṃgalaka 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.⁴⁶

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 Jalārjunyānī. The relationship of the remaining seven persons, Pharsaja+(?), Jaraukulina, Buddhasaṃgha, Vinaya, Dattaka, Vikrama, and Dharmakā to the family of Jalapuṇya and Suviprabhā/Jalapuṇyānī, if any, or among themselves remains obscure.

Some very Buddhist names mentioned in the colophon are remarkable: Śikṣamānī,⁴⁷ Buddhasaṃgha, Vinaya and Dharmakā. They recall the names of two ladies mentioned in the inscription of the *vinayadhara* Dhammasena: Bodhā and Buddhā.⁴⁸ Names of this type obviously have enjoyed certain popularity, although they do not seem to occur in Buddhist literature, which, of course, does not at 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 found at the very beginning of the long colophon at the end of the text.

Jalapuṇya is mentioned again together with the title Saddharma-puṇarīkasūtra on two folios which are at present detached from the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript, to which they belong as noted by R. E. Emmerick.⁴⁹ 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 16⁵⁰, 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 might be filled by *hūñi jsa* “with blood” and the translation adjusted accordingly: “He gave a pen. He wrote with (his) blood one verse.⁵¹”

The overall number of persons—perhaps as many as 50—participat-

ing in this donation by a large and obviously at least well off family—copying manuscripts was fairly expensive⁵²—demonstrates that the Sanskrit version of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra was held in high esteem in Khotan⁵³ as do the numerous manuscripts of this text found there and referred to above. This is further underlined by four miniature paintings found in a manuscript donated by the Khotanese donor Intula and preserved in the St. Petersburg collection.⁵⁴

Interestingly, the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript was perhaps also prepared in such a way that there is room 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 ever 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 of the second quarter of the text, which could accommodate colophons of different length varying from only a simple name such as *intulasya* (quoted above in note 37 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 copying 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 Saṃghāṣasūtra or the equally popular Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra. 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.⁵⁵ Besides this summary there is one single verse translated from Sanskrit

into Khotanese and quoted in the Book of Zambasta.⁵⁶ It is not likely that this verse is the only trace left of 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 cited from different *sūtra* texts.⁵⁷

With the Saṃghāṭasūtra, 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 Saṃghāṭasūtra, not a single Sanskrit manuscript can be traced back to Khotan. As far as the origin of the 11 Sanskrit manuscripts is known or can be inferred, they were either copied in Gilgit or in the northwest of the Indian subcontinent with the only exception being manuscript “L” written in “Proto-Bengali” script.⁵⁸

The Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra is represented by about 20 manuscripts in Khotanese and by a considerable number of Sanskrit fragments also from the vicinity of Khotan.⁵⁹ This *sūtra* thus holds an intermediate position between the exclusively Sanskrit tradition of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra and the equally exclusively Khotanese tradition of the Saṃghāṭasūtra 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 an accidental complete loss of all Sanskrit manuscripts of the Saṃghāṭasūtra 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,⁶⁰ 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).⁶¹ If the author of the Book of Zambasta can be taken at his word, this reluctance to translate the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra again would stress 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 Text, 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. According to Bongard-Levin & Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja: *Pamjatniki*, as note 19 below, p. 85 the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript comprises 291 complete folios and 108 larger fragments.

³ An obituary by Sergej Fedorovič Ol'denburg (1863–1934): *Pamjati Nikolaja Theodoroviča 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 is 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 and Bongard-Levin & Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja: *Pamjatniki*, as note 19 below, p. 17 mentioning only the year 1903.

⁴ 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 Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002. VI. 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, p. 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-Desjatovskaja 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 and Irina Fedorovna Popova: *Foreword to*

Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences, as note * above, p. XXVII.—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 and Bongard-Levin & Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja: *Pamjatniki*, as note 19 below, p. 17 with note 23, whereas the statement *ibidem* p. 78 “This manuscript was received by the Academy of Sciences as a gift from the English consul at Kashgar, G. Macartney in 1910” referring to manuscript SI P/5 (Kashgar [Khotan] Manuscript) is an obvious error, and thus the exact details of the acquisition of the Kashgar (Khotan) manuscript preserved in St Petersburg remain obscure due to partly contradictory comments by G. M. Bongard-Levin and M. I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja.—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*. London 1973, repr. Hong Kong and Oxford 1987 and Lady (Catherine Borland) *Macartney: An English Lady in Chinese Turkestan*. Hong Kong and Oxford 1985.

⁸ 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 Saddharmapunḍarikasūtra*. *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: *Saddharmapunḍarikasūtra*. *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 *Saddharmapunḍarikasūtra* 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-Punḍarika*, 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 *Saddharmapunḍarikasūtra* 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 *Saddharmapunḍarika* ed. by Hendrik 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 Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra. Leiden 1938 [rev.: Jean Filliozat, Journal Asiatique 238, 1938, p. 346 foll.], pp. 7–12.

¹⁶ H. Toda: Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts, as note 2 above.

¹⁷ Klaus Wille: Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra from Khādaliq. Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series 3. Tokyo 2000, pp. 159–183, chapter 4.5 provides a concordance of all known Central Asian fragments with the Kashgar Manuscript, cf. now also M. I. Vorob'eva-Desjatovskaja & Noriyuki Kudo: A Newly Identified Fragment of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra kept in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies. ARIRIAB X. 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 12 above, p. 23 foll.

¹⁹ According to Grigorij Maksimovič Bongard-Levin (1933–2008) & M. I. Vorob'eva-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 Ruegg, 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.—The facsimile edition “Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences” (see note * above) contains the following manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra preserved in St. Petersburg: SI P/5 (Khotan [Kashgar] Manuscript, SI 1925/1927), pp. 1–802; SI P/7 (SIS 1933, inv. 1933), pp. 803–804; SI P/8 (SIS 1934, inv. 1934), pp. 805–810; SI P/9 (SIS 1935, inv. 1935), pp. 811–850; SI P/10 (SIS 1937, inv. 1937), pp. 851–916; SI P/11 (SIS 1939, inv. 1939), pp. 917–966; SI P/12+13 (SIS 1940, inv. 1940), pp. 967–968; SI P/20, pp. 969–972; SIS 2077, inv. 2077, pp. 973–974; SI P/67,3d,v,g,a,b (SIS 2093, inv. 2093, fr. 4,5,3,N 90,N 91), pp. 975–984; SI P/67,8a,b (SIS 2098, inv. 2098, fr.1,2), pp. 985–988; SI P/68 (SIS 3013, inv. 3013), pp. 989–990; SI P/79,1,2 (SIS 3030, inv. 3030), pp. 991–994; SI P/90b1,a (SIS 3044, inv. 3044), pp. 995–998; SI L/1 (SIS 3330, inv. 3354), pp. 999–1000; SI P/151 (SI 3693, inv. 3749), pp. 1001–1002; SI P/151 (SI 3694, inv. 3750), pp. 1003–1004.

²⁰ H. Bechert: Marburger Fragmente, as note 5 above, p. 15.

²¹ H. Lüders: Miscellaneous Fragments I. Saddharma-Puṇḍarika, as note 13 above, p. 161 foll.; there are more examples of this particular vocative plural form which are listed by H. Toda: Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts, as note 2 above, pp. 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 Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra. Indo-Iranian Journal 44. 2001, pp. 207–230.

²³ N. D. Mironov: Buddhist Miscellanea: I. Avalokiteśvara - Kuan-Yin; II. Central Asian Recensions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarika. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 1927, pp. 241–252 and pp. 252–279.

²⁴ R. E. Emmerick in H. Toda: Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts, as note 2 above, p. XII.

²⁵ Claus Vogel: The Dated Nepalese Manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra.

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 Saddharmapunḍarika Kept in the Library of the Cultural Palace of the Nationalities, Beijing. Peking 1988.

²⁶ This date was suggested by Mauro Maggi in a letter to S. Karashima, who kindly shared this information with me.

²⁷ Saddharma-Punḍarika-Sūtra. Kashgar Manuscript (foreword by Heinz Bechert). Tokyo 1977, p. 1 foll.—Only the right part found in the Facsimile Edition (see note *) is discussed in the following. The missing left part could be traced on 23rd July 2013 among the Khotanese manuscripts preserved in the British Library: Prods Oktor Skjærvø: Khotanese Manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library. London 2002 [rev.: V. Hansen, Journal of the American Oriental Society 124. 2004 /2005], pp. 380–382; L. Sander, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 100. 2005, pp. 557–561; O. v. Hinüber: Ein Meilenstein in der Erforschung des zentralasiatischen Buddhismus. Zu einem neuen Katalog khotan-sakischer Handschriften. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 157. 2007, pp. 385–394; cf. also Huaiyu Chen: Newly identified Khotanese Fragments in the British Library and their Chinese Parallels. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 22. 2012, pp. 265–279], p. 354 foll., no. IOL Khot 158/3. A re-edition of both parts of the colophon together with the Intula colophons (see note 54 below) is under preparation and will appear in ARIRIAB XVIII. 2015.

²⁸ Missing text is put into brackets [], damaged *aḥṣaras* into parentheses (), while < > marks an *aḥṣara* forgotten by the scribe, and + stands for a gap of one *aḥṣara*.

²⁹ 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.

³⁰ By coincidence the only numerical sign beyond “1000” noted by Georg Bühler in his palaeography (1896) is “8000” quoted from the Chammak Plates of Pravarasena II now 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, Hanoi 1953, pp. 705–707 look quite different. It seems that the numerical signs for “1000” etc. were created independently in different scripts.

³¹ O. v. Hinüber: Die Pali Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang in Nord-Thailand. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, Band 2. Wiesbaden 2013, p. XLIX foll., cf. note 52 below.

³² Or *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 quoting older literature, but without referring to this colophon.

³³ O. v. Hinüber: A Second Inscription from Phanigiri (Andhrapradesh): Dhammasena’s Donation. ARIRIAB 15. 2012, pp. 2–10, particularly p. 4, line 7 foll. with corrections in O. v. Hinüber: Again on the donation made by the vinayadhara Dham-

masena and on other inscriptions from Phanigiri. 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.

³⁴ Giotto Canevascini: The Khotanese Saṃghātasūtra. A critical edition. Beiträge zur Iranistik Band 14. Wiesbaden 1993.

³⁵ 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 hamtsa biṣyau sarvasatvyau uysnauryau jsa* “zusammen mit den gesamten Geschlechtsangehörigen [= Blutsverwandten] und Verschwägerten, zusammen mit allen (Sak.) allen (Sansk.) Wesen (Sansk.) 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.

³⁶ The name of an author is given in a corresponding way in *ḷkṛtir bhikṣor ācāryaDharmatrāta*[*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: *ḷsamāptam kṛtir ācārya-Ṣūrasya* ||, in: O. v. Hinüber: The Gilgit Manuscripts: An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research, in: Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Eds.: From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research. Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field, Stanford June 15–19 2009. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Denkschriften, 460. Band = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens Nr. 80. Wien 2014, pp. 79–135, particularly p. 96. The same formula also occurs in epigraphy, e.g.: *kṛti buddhabala* at the end of the Shigar inscription, cf. O. v. Hinüber: Die Palola Ṣāhis. 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.

³⁷ G. M. Bongard-Levin & M. I. Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja: Pamjatniki, as note 19 above, p. 103, ms. P/10, folio 287b2 foll.: *saddharmapuṇḍarīke mahāvaitulyasūtraratne dharmabhāṇakaparivarto nāma daśama samāptaḥ 10 dvitīyaścaturbhāgaḥ 2 deyadharmau yaṃ dānapati intulasya*, cf. also at the end of the first quarter in the same manuscript *ibidem*, p. 133, folio 206(not 240!)a3 foll.: *saddharmapuṇḍarīke mahāvaitulyasūtraratne ośadhiparivarto nāma pañcamah samāptaḥ 5 || prathamaścaturbhāgaḥ || intulasya || atha khalu bhagavān ...*

³⁸ It is conceivable that the distribution of *parivartas* and folios was quite regular in the “original” manuscript when this division into “quarters” was introduced. There are indications in the extant fragments of Intula’s donation of a Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra manuscript (SI P/10) that the scribe tried to reproduce the folios of his exemplar, if the stretching (end of folios 296, 297, facsimile edition pp. 859, 861) and compressing (end of folio 299, facsimile edition p. 865) of the script is taken into consideration.

³⁹ 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 as indicated above in note 37.

⁴⁰ 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.

⁴¹ Almuth Degener: Khotanische Suffixe. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 39. Stuttgart 1979 [rev.: P. O. Skjærvø, *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, p. 372 foll.], pp.71–73 § 7.B.11–7.B.19.

⁴² Jacob Wackernagel: *Altindische Grammatik*. Band II,2 Die Nominalsuffixe von Albert Debrunner. Göttingen 1954 [rev.: F. Edgerton, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 75. 1955, pp. 55–66; P. Thieme, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 209. 1955, pp. 182–216 = *Kleine Schriften*. ²1984, pp. 661–695; M. Mayrhofer, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 51. 1956, pp. 5–15; K. Hoffmann, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 110. 1960, pp. 175–182 = *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. 1973, pp. 130–137], p. 280 § 1164b, cf. Jeremy Rau: *The Origin of Indic and Iranian Feminines in -ānī-^a*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 127. 2007, pp. 57–66.

⁴³ Examples for the mechanical use of various case endings are collected in O. v. Hinüber: *Die Palola Śāhis*, as above note 36, 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 pravāsusabhena, raktasāntenasya bhikṣoḥ, āyusmāṃ raktasātenas*; O. v. Hinüber: *The Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra at Gilgit: Manuscripts, Worshipers and Artists*. *The Journal of Oriental Studies* 22. 2012, pp. 52–67, particularly p. 54: *pevoḥīyena*, fem.; further: *sinhoḥesya*, *Chilās* 20:2 (*sinhoḥena* x *sinhoḥesya*), 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 *ṣeriyesya*, *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*, *Samghāṭasūtra* manuscript F § 103.3, cf. G. Canevascini, as note 34 above, p. 49.

⁴⁴ *miṣjei' su* is extant in the fragment preserved in the British Library, see note 27 above.

⁴⁵ *Devaśirikā*, the donatrix of manuscript “D” of the *Samghāṭasūtra* expresses a similar wish: *sve śarīre āyurvalavarṇavṛddhi*, O. v. Hinüber: *Palola Śāhis*, as note 36 above, no. 10 (*Samghāṭasūtra*).

⁴⁶ Another example for deceased persons being included in the act of merit making is the colophon to the Gilgit manuscript “D” of the *Samghāṭasūtra*, cf. preceding note.

⁴⁷ 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 Bhikkhunīsamgha. A Contribution to the Earliest History of Buddhism*. ARIRIAB 11. 2008, pp. 3–29, particularly p. 19.

⁴⁸ O. v. Hinüber: *A Second Inscription from Phanigiri*, as note 33 above, p. 5 with corrections in ARIRIAB 16. 2013, p. 3 foll.

⁴⁹ These folios are published as facsimile in R. E. Emmerick & M. I. Vorob'eva-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, p. 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, p. 163 foll.; M. Maggi, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 92. 1997, p. 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, p. 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], p. 68 foll.

⁵⁰ The Book of Zambasta. A Khotanese poem on Buddhism, edited and translated by R. E. Emmerick. *London Oriental Series Volume 21. London 1968.*

⁵¹ 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 śonitena massiṃ kuryyāc carmmam utpātya bhūrjjaṃ kuryyād asthi bhaktvā ca kalamam kuryyāt*, Adelheid 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: *Mahāyānasūtrasamgraha, Volume I. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts* 17. Darbhanga 1961, p. 293, 22 foll.; Mātṛceṭa writes his Prañidhānasaptati with his own blood: Jens-Uwe Hartmann: *Das Varṇārhavarṇastotra 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.

⁵² On the prices of Pāli manuscripts copied much later in 16th century Northern Thailand cf. note 31 above.

⁵³ On the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra in Khotan: Mauro Maggi, in: R. E. Emmerick & Maria Macuch (eds.): *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. 342 foll.

⁵⁴ These miniatures and the Intula colophons will be discussed in the article under preparation as mentioned in note 27.

⁵⁵ 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, p. 599 foll.]; H. W. Bailey: *The Khotanese Summary of the Sad-dharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*, in: Taisho Daigaku Kenkyūkiyo. *Memoirs of the Taisho University, The Department of Literature and Buddhism.* 57. 1972, pp. 530–526.

⁵⁶ Book of Zambasta, as note 50 above, VI 3. The verse was identified already by Ernst Leumann (1859–1931).

⁵⁷ Cf. M. Maggi, as note 53 above, p. 338 foll.

⁵⁸ O. v. Hinüber: *An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research*, as note 36 above, pp. 114, 118.

⁵⁹ Prods Oktor Skjærø: *The Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras.*

The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra. Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 60, 61. Central Asian Sources V, VI. Cambridge/Mass. 2004, 2 Volumes; on the Sanskrit manuscripts Vol. I, p. XXXIII foll., on the Khotanese manuscripts pp. LXII–LXXI

⁶⁰ Thus also M. Maggi, as note 53 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 Tumšūqese 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, p. 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, p. 619 foll.] with important corrections by Klaus Totila Schmidt: Ein Beitrag des Tocharischen zur Entzifferung des Tumšūqsakischen. Altorientalische Forschungen 15. 1988, pp. 306–314.

⁶¹ This would not shed a very favourable light on the Saṃghāṭasūtra in Khotanese, unless, perhaps, both texts simply appealed to different readers, the Saddharmapunḍarīkasūtra to the educated and the (to our taste at least) rather unassuming Saṃghāṭasūtra to the common man (?).