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The present chapter consists of a comprehensive study of a Khotanese inscription on a wooden tablet, which, to judge from its content, corresponds to the first few sections of the *Nandimitrāvadāna* represented by the Chinese and Tibetan versions. As a matter of fact, no such title is attested in any extant Khotanese material, although the reception of similar texts among the Khotanese-speaking Buddhists of the 5th to the 10th century is indubitable in light of the textual sources surveyed below. Hence, for the time being, it cannot be excluded that this fluid text or textual tradition was known in ancient Khotan under (a) different title(s). For the sake of convenience, I refer to the inscription in question as ‘the Khotanese (version of the) *Nandimitrāvadāna*’ in the following discussions, especially in a context where it is compared with the Chinese and Tibetan versions. But the caveat must be added that this designation is not to be taken historically.

Notwithstanding the limited space on the wooden tablet, this short inscription provides us with a piece of evidence, which may be invaluable from two perspectives. On the one hand, it is so far the only textual witness of the frame narrative of the *Nandimitrāvadāna* from Central Asia, and thus, along with a couple of other sources, produces testimony to the text at one point in its long history. Because of the tremendous popularity that the sixteen Elders enjoyed later in East Asia, most previous studies on the history of their cult have drawn on sources written in Chinese alone, paying exclusive attention to the East Asian background, against which the tradition developed. As a result, the Central Asian and Tibetan branches of the tradition are unjustifiably neglected. This regrettable result is in part due to the scarcity and inaccessibility of relevant materials, especially those in Khotanese, which are more often deciphered or interpreted by Iranian specialists rather than by Buddhist specialists.

On the other hand, textual scholars in various fields have become increasingly aware that both manuscripts and inscriptions are not only vehicles for human ideas, but also material objects produced by a society and classified within a variety of cultural frameworks.¹ In other words, such objects have a social life in their own right, which consists in the diverse ways they have been perceived and valued in different states of their existence. In order to do full justice to the historicity of those objects that are rich in cultural data, due attention should be paid to their materiality, that is, what

---

¹. For a recent volume on this topic, which brings together manuscript scholars from various areas of specialization, see Quenzer/Bondarev/Sobisch 2014. The growing awareness of the need to consider the manuscript as material object in its own right and to interpret it in a reconstructed cultural context is especially articulated in Jörg Quenzer’s introduction to this volume with a lucid outline of its presuppositions (p. 1–5).
rôle(s) they play in material culture. In his classic proposal for the so-called biographical approach to things, Igor Kopytoff recommended the following questions to be asked in a culturally informed investigation into objects:

What, sociologically, are the biographical possibilities inherent in its ‘status’ and in the period and culture, and how are these possibilities realized? Where does the thing come from and who made it? What has been its career so far, and what do people consider an ideal career for such things? What are the recognized ‘ages’ or periods in the thing’s ‘life,’ and what are the cultural markers for them? How does the thing’s use change with its age, and what happens to it when it reaches the end of its usefulness?  

Some of the questions can surely be asked of the inscribed wooden tablet in question, which had moved in and out of several conditions of identification before it ended up residing in the museum at Saint Petersburg. In all likelihood, the tablet has passed through the hands of many human subjects who commissioned, made, owned, sold, collected, or studied it. Although not every detail about the long journey leading to Saint Petersburg is clear, it would be a worthwhile scholarly endeavor to retrieve, as far as possible, historical data about every single stage of the tablet’s “life”, which should be accorded just as much, if not more, importance as are the content and language of the inscription. In some cases, such data can also be useful for our understanding of the inscription, which was not a text *tout court*, but also an artifact serving some purposes other than conveying what the 10 lines of *akṣaras* have to say. These purposes and their socio-religious significance often go too easily unnoticed when we absorbedly divert ourselves with deciphering the arcane text. In what follows, as we trace the tablet’s trajectory back in time, we move, step by step, to a reconstruction, if only partial, of the historical background against which the inscription was used and perceived by the agent(s) who had it made.

The Object

The object presented here is now preserved at the Institute for Oriental Manuscripts (IOM) of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg, where it is assigned the serial number SI 1929 (erstwhile SI P 6.1). It is an oblong tablet made of wood, ca. 39 cm long and 12 cm wide in its complete form. A string-hole, occupying the space of about one *akṣara*, is placed in the middle of the left part, ca. 11 cm from the left margin of the tablet, whence the writing on both sides starts. It is quite clear that the string-hole had been bored before the Khotanese words were inscribed, since it does not interrupt the text by erasing any *akṣara* from it. The fact that the string-hole is flanked by two *akṣaras* which are obviously to be read together is only explicable through the assumption that the tablet was already holed when it came into the hands of the scribe who thus had to separate the two *akṣaras* from each

---

2. See Kopytoff 1986: 66f.
other so as to skip the hole. As all wooden artifacts, the tablet has a unique surface texture, showing streaks of different colors. In some places, the color is so dark that the *aṅkṣaras* are hardly discernible. A wormhole is visible on the 5th line of the inside, near to the right margin of the tablet. The whole tablet is now in a damaged state, for it has been split in twain at some point with a fissure stretching from the 9th line on the left to the 7th line on the right. When I studied the original in Saint Petersburg in mid-September 2015, I had to put the two parts together manually, in order to verify the reading of some *aṅkṣaras* along the fissure. Fortunately, it has turned out that most of the *aṅkṣaras* are still more or less retrievable.

The wooden tablet, coupled with another one, came under the scrutiny of Ernst Leumann in 1909. At that time, Leumann saw them used as the covering boards of the main manuscript of the *Book of Zambasta* (i.e., the so-called “Handschrift E”), and the tablet in question was the back cover. As a sharp-sighted philologist, Leumann immediately noticed that the two covers are inscribed on both sides. Having made a draft transcription of the inscriptions, he had to return the materials to Saint Petersburg for a time. When the *Zambasta* manuscript came back to Strasbourg about one year later, it came without the covers, so he was no longer in a position to check his transcription against the original. This is the earliest record we have about the existence of the wooden tablet. Leumann explicitly mentioned the source of the materials as Saint Petersburg, where the wooden tablets, having been returned by Leumann, were probably held back for some reasons. It was not until the early 1990s that scholars outside Russia were informed of the whereabouts of the back cover again, when Ronald Emmerick, who was preparing a comprehensive edition of all the Khotanese materials preserved in Saint Petersburg, received and published facsimiles of it. Meanwhile, the front cover remained a mystery for a longer time. No facsimile of it was available to Emmerick when he wrote his introductory remarks on the back cover in 1995. But it turns out that it was found afterwards and put at Emmerick’s disposal, since a colored photograph of it is found in the latter’s bequest. Both of the covers must belong to the Petrovsky collection, which consists of manuscripts donated by Nikolai F. Petrovsky (1837–1908) in 1905 or purchased by the Russian Academy of Sciences after his death.

---


4. See Emmerick/Vorob’eva-Desjatovskaja 1995: 34; note especially: “Unfortunately it has not proved possible to find the front cover.”

5. In his (unpublished) glossary of the Khot. documents preserved in St. Petersburg, Emmerick made the following comments: “The front cover has meantime been found and is accordingly referred to as SI P 6.o.” (p. 12). Moreover, he transcribed the whole inscription anew and translated the Khot. verses into English (pp. 249ff.). Thanks to the kindness of Ms. Alla Sizova, the secretary of IOM in Saint Petersburg, we are informed that the front cover now bears the new serial number SI 1930, and that it is ca. 52 cm long and 12.5 cm wide.

Yet, where did Petrovsky acquire the wooden tablets? As is well known, Petrovsky was the Russian consul general in Kashgar during the years 1882–1903. Being an assertive contender for Russia’s supremacy in Central Asia, Petrovsky was so enthusiastic about collecting antiquities from Chinese Turkestan that he not only acquired a huge number of manuscripts and artworks but also made them available to leading Russian Orientalists of his time.\(^7\) Like his fellow European diplomats based in Kashgar, Petrovsky did not conduct any fieldwork himself, so his acquisition of antiquities was in fact carried out through the agency of some purveyors of antiquities in Khotan, among whom Badruddhin, an ex-aqsaqal of the Afghan and Indian merchants, and Keraken Moldovack, an Armenian carpet dealer, stood out as the dearest factotums to those European gentlemen.\(^8\) Therefore, the pair of wooden tablets were, in all likelihood, purchased by Petrovsky from one of the two purveyors as well. Given that they both are endowed with string-holes predating the inscriptions and were first sent to Leumann with the Zambasta manuscript sandwiched between them, it is not unlikely that they were originally used as the latter’s covers and thus discovered and sold together with it. In that case, the quest for the prehistory of the wooden tablets inevitably leads us to the question of when and where the main manuscript of the Book of Zambasta was unearthed.

This is, however, not an easy question to answer. In toto 207 folios survive of this manuscript.\(^9\) The consignment that Leumann was given for his perusal consists of 173 folios,\(^10\) which make up 90% of the total 192 folios preserved in Saint Petersburg.\(^11\) This large bundle of folios, purchased by Petrovsky in Kashgar, must have constituted the main body of the manuscript, from which separate folios were taken away at different points. First, some folios must have already been missing when the manuscript was first discovered probably at the site of Khadalik, since Ellsworth Huntington found one of these (i.e., fol. 214) in situ in 1905.\(^12\) Second, some other folios had been taken out before the manuscript fell prey to the flames, which left traces in the fire-damaged parts (i.e., fols. 146–150, 267–299). Among those leaves which escaped the flames by a hair's breadth and remain complete, 6 folios (i.e., fols. 269, 271, 334–335, 385, 389) were purchased by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

---

7. For an introduction to the items collected by Petrovsky, see Elikhina 2008: 29–37. For his contacts with the renowned Russian Orientalist S.F. Oldenburg, who was offered the chance to study some of his manuscripts in the 1890s, see Popova 2008: 148f.
8. For various sources and accounts on the lives of the two purveyors whose activity as antiquities dealers continued down into the 1930s, see Waugh/Sims-Williams 2010: 72–75.
11. For the additional folios unseen by Leumann, see Vorob'ëv-Desjatovskij 1955: 68–71. All the folios in St. Petersburg were published in facsimiles, see Vorob'ëv-Desjatovskij/Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja 1965.
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(Calcutta) around 1910, while 1 folio (i.e., fol. 270) ended up in the Museum für Asiatische Kunst (Berlin). This small bundle of folios, in all likelihood, had been in the hands of the Armenian carpet dealer Moldovack at one time. Third, the rest of the manuscript, having suffered fire damage, was split up once again and sold off to different buyers. While the vast majority of it came into the hands of Petrovsky, 1 folio (i.e., fol. 279 = IOL Khot 154/8) was sent to Rudolf Hoernle in 1903, 1 folio (i.e., fol. 270) was taken to Japan by Tachibana Zuichō in 1912, and 5 fragmentary folios (i.e., fols. 150, 296–299 = Or.9614/1–6) were purchased by Clarmont Skrine around 1922. Although neither Petrovsky nor Skrine specified from which of the two purveyors they acquired the manuscript leaves, some information about the Hoernle fragment points to a strong likelihood that they were purchased from Badruddin by different buyers at different times.

Summing up the findings to date, we may safely conclude that the wooden tablets, along with the Zambasta manuscript, were probably found at Khadalik, an archeological site about 70 miles due east of Khotan. There is no record at all as to when they came to light, since the explorers credited with this discovery were not so much professional archeologists as “treasure seekers”, who plundered the site in such a frantic manner that at least 1 folio of the same manuscript was left in situ, which has now become the only hint we have of the findspot. Along with the vast majority of the manuscript which had been split up and partly damaged by fire, the tablets came into the possession of Badruddin, who, in his turn, sold them to Petrovsky at some point before 1903, the year in which the latter retired from his office as the Russian consul in Kashgar. It was probably after Petrovsky’s death in 1908 that the tablets and the Zambasta manuscript found their way into the

---

13. Three folios thereof (i.e., fols. 269–271), which should have belonged to the fire-damaged part of the manuscript, do not in fact show any trace of damage by fire; see Waugh/Sims-Williams 2010: 92, n. 35.

14. This can be inferred from the fact that two of these folios (i.e., fols. 269 and 335) were offered for sale to the Strasbourg University Library in 1908 by “a Russian from Jerusalem”, see Leumann 1912: 11. This unnamed Russian dealer might be identified with the “Caucasian exile and Russian subject named Kara, who, in his turn, acquired them from Caucasian Jews, who had gone to Khotan as carpet dealers and bought the leaves there”, see Konow 1914: 13. As Waugh/Sims-Williams 2010: 86 point out, the ultimate source of these folios may well have been Moldovack, who must have been on close terms with those Jewish carpet dealers from the Caucasus.

15. For the Hoernle fragment, see Waugh/Sims-Williams 2010: 86. For the fragment now preserved in Japan, see Inokuchi 1961: plate 10, and Leumann 1963: 80ff. For the Skrine fragments, see Skrine 1926: 170. Most probably, they belonged with the Petrovsky fragments to the fire-damaged bundle, inasmuch as the right half of 6 out of the 7 fragments (except fol. 150) had gone up in smoke.

16. A letter dated May 1903, received by Hoernle along with the consignment of fragments, explicitly states that the fragments “were purchased from Badruddin, aqsaqal at Khotan”, see Waugh/Sims-Williams 2010: 86.
Asiatic Museum in Saint Petersburg. One year later, they were sent to Leumann for decipherment, and we well know what happened thereafter.

The Inscriptions

The covers are inscribed on both the inside and the outside. The inscriptions on the outside are written in the upper left corner, consisting of merely seven or eight akṣaras. Leumann made a tentative transcription of the akṣaras, which, to his mind, might have been the title of the work, but he failed to construe their meaning. Having access only to the back cover, Emmerick basically followed Leumann's reading, but added italics to indicate that he did not see every akṣaras which had been visible to Leumann. Furthermore, he voiced reservations about Leumann's surmise that they are the title of the work. Before a proper interpretation of these akṣaras, no plausible conclusion can be drawn with regard to the nature of the outside inscriptions which remain mysterious for the time being.

On the inside of the front cover, there are altogether 9 lines of texts in Brāhmī-Script, which seem to have been written by the same hand. The first 2 lines are so mutilated that only a couple of akṣaras were visible to Leumann, who deciphered the rest of the inscription with admirable success. According to Leumann’s reconstruction, the legible part of the inscription consists of four Khotanese verses in the meter of Type A after Emmerick's schema (ll. 3–5) and a dhāraṇī-like Sanskrit text (ll. 6–9). The Khotanese verse foregrounds the significance of compassion and forbearance, while the Sanskrit text, written in a smaller size and indented on the left by ca. 17 cm, invokes the Three Jewels and five Bodhisattvas, whose names all end in -garbha, and records several hrdaya-type incantations, one of which might be instrumental in healing eye-diseases.

The inscription on the inside of the back cover is the main object of the

18. For his transcription, cf. front cover: /// -nā-śrānta-śihi (or -hā) & back cover: prasamcīna-śāka-kṣihi [Leumann 1933–36: 359]. Some attempts at decipherment were probably made by him, but to no avail, see ibid. 357f.: “Auf den Außenseiten der beiden Bretter steht anschienend beidemal das gleiche Wort nur in verschiedener Orthographie (Lesefehler?). Man möchte darin den Titel des Werkes sehen, ... Sollte das Schlußwort śikṣā sein?”
20. Both texts are transcribed and translated in the next section. For Leumann's pioneering work on the texts, see Leumann 1933–36: 359 and 358; which is now a bit out of date. I had modified Leumann’s work independently before Emmerick's unpublished notes became accessible to me. The latter confirm a certain number of my modifications, while some of his readings seem to me better than mine. Therefore, I have incorporated some of Emmerick’s ideas in my own translation (see below).
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present study. When Leumann first saw the wooden tablet, this inscription appeared to him as “having 10 lines”.21 But eighty-odd years later, Emmerick, having examined the facsimile of the same tablet, pointed out that the inscription actually has an 11th line which consists of some strange akṣaras at the bottom of the inside. These akṣaras are so strange that even Emmerick was not able to decipher them. Hence he published an enlargement of the 11th line in the hope that someone else might be more successful.22 Be that as it may, it seems to me inconceivable that Leumann, a scholar well known for his prudence in philological matters, could have overlooked something in the original which Emmerick was able to read from the facsimile. Although the majority of the 11th line is blurred and illegible, some akṣaras, especially those belonging to the beginning part, are at least as clear as the rest of the inscription. This is especially true of the second akṣara, on which an extravagant diacritic mark is perched. This towering mark reaches to the bottom of the 10th line so that anybody who transcribed the text to that point could hardly fail to notice it. Even if Leumann could not decipher these akṣaras at once, he should have made a remark at least, as he did with the outside inscriptions mentioned above. But this was not the case. The sheer silence of Leumann on the 11th line makes me suspicious of its historicity. For the time being, it cannot be excluded that these akṣaras have come into being only after the wooden tablet was returned from Strasbourg in 1909.23 On the other hand, even if we consider the opposite scenario that the 11th line was genuine ancient writing, to which Leumann, for curious reasons, turned a blind eye, the writing must not belong with the foregoing lines to the same inscription in Khotanese, inasmuch as the conspicuous second akṣara mentioned above, if it is Brāhmī, turns out to be we, which is a so-called Fremdzeichen so far only attested in Tocharian and Tumshuqese. In either case, these faint akṣaras have nothing to do with the Khotanese inscription, with which the present study is concerned.

The 10-lined Khotanese inscription, which occupies most of the space on the inside of the back cover, was first dealt with by Leumann, whose decipherment was incredibly successful given how little was known about this language back then. First and foremost, he identified the names and dwelling places of the sixteen Elders, which he understood as “Senior-Mönche” entrusted with the Buddhist Order after the Buddha’s

22. See Emmerick/Vorob’eva-Desjatovskaja 1995: 34, 285 (plate 188[b]).
23. It might be not impossible that this was a joke made by a mischievous Russian curator who imitated some Brāhmī characters he or she saw somewhere else. Besides, it is noteworthy that the vestige of some akṣaras on the 11th line resembles the cursive pseudo-Brāhmī-Script (i.e., Type [a] after Ursula Sims-Williams’ typology) forged by Islam Akhun, a local treasure seeker notorious for counterfeiting manuscripts and blockprints. Cf. Sims-Williams 2000: 123f., esp. fig. 12. Similar forgeries, as we are informed, also found their way into the Petrovsky collection.
passing away. Following these clues, he detected the interrelationship between this inscription and the 22nd Canto of the Book of Zambasta (i.e., the 23rd after Leumann; henceforth Zambasta 22), where an almost identical list of the Elders’ names occurs. Although Leumann might have been informed about the Chinese translation, he did not identify the inscription with its Chinese counterpart. Perhaps misguided by the fact that the Khotanese text is inscribed on the back cover of the main manuscript of the Book of Zambasta, he went so far as to suggest that it is a prose supplement to the aforementioned list in Zambasta 22. That is, to be sure, an oversimplified conception of the matter, as I demonstrate below in a following section. But it remains influential, and sometimes even leads to serious misunderstandings. For instance, Shih Jen-Lang has misread Leumann’s German and thus introduced a dreadful error into his oft-quoted dissertation, in which he regards the present inscription as “a revised prose-form of the presumably ‘complete’ text in verses, which is contained in the leaves between the boards.” Fascinated by the “complete” metrical version that only exists in his imagination, Shih has announced his future plan of a comparative study with the “complete” manuscript, the access to which is claimed to be a desideratum. This ill-informed plan, in all

24. The number of the cantos of the Book of Zambasta is a complex issue. Initially, Leumann 1933–36 divided the book into 25 cantos. The fragmentary state of the final part of the 2nd Canto led him to postulate a “3rd Canto”, which is nothing but a figment of his imagination. His mistake was soon pointed out by Russian scholars and finally corrected by Emmerick, who, in his new edition, divided the book into 24 cantos. Emmerick 1968 has become the standard edition thereafter, and his division had not been questioned for a long time, until 1998, when Mauro Maggi, working on the Zambasta fragments kept in St. Petersburg, made a significant discovery that there is a short but independent section between the 21st and the 22nd in Emmerick 1968 (Maggi 1998: 287f.). Further progress has been made quite recently by the same author and Giuliana Martini (Bhikkhuṇī Dhammadinnā) in their co-authored paper, which reveals that the 18th Canto in Emmerick 1968 is no more, and that what Emmerick regarded as an independent canto should be attributed to the 17th Canto (Maggi/Martini 2014: 139–158). Therefore, despite the fact that the state of our knowledge has been drastically altered, the number of the cantos remains 24 and the canto in question remains the 22nd.

25. Probably through Lévi/Chavannes 1916 or his Japanese disciple Watanabe Kaikyoku, who had a profound knowledge of the Chinese Buddhist canon and assisted Leumann with the identification of parallels.

26. See Leumann 1920: 165 (emphasis added): “Unsere Brettaufschrift kann aufgefaßt werden als eine Ergänzung zu den Strophen E XXIII 93–95 (i.e., equivalent to 22.93–95 in Emmerick 1968: 302) ... Unsere Aufschrift berichtet nun als eine Prosa-Überlieferung. ... Die Reihenfolge der Namen ist recht verschieden von der in den genannten Strophen gegebenen; auch stimmen ein paar Namensformen nicht ganz zusammen.”

27. See Shih 2002: 17. On the same page, he goes on to remark: “In this case, the verse style of the Khotanese manuscript contained in the leaves makes it unique when compared to the Chinese and Tibetan versions, which are both in prose.” Even a cursory skim through Emmerick’s translation suffices to reveal his statement to be a far cry from the fact.

28. See Shih 2002: 29 for the phantom idea: “It is my hope to eventually have access to the
likelihood, has never been carried out. If Shih's notes on the Khotanese text are anything to go by, it is his explicit reference to the inscription as a version of the *Nandimitrāvadāna* known in both Chinese and Tibetan. This identification, however, is not his discovery. He probably owes it to the trailblazing work done in the 1920s by Jean Przyluski, who is explicitly referred to as one of his "predecessors". Przyluski's remarks on the Khotanese text seem to have found little resonance among the specialists in this field. In the brief introduction to his new edition and English translation of the inscription, Emmerick did not mention a single word about the *Nandimitrāvadāna*, let alone Przyluski's observations. Making no use of the Chinese and Tibetan parallels, he hardly made any significant improvement of Leumann's work apart from suggesting a couple of variant readings.

As for the date of the inscriptions, it is my tentative hypothesis that they are later than the main manuscript of the *Book of Zambasta*, in light of, first and foremost, the greater wear of the manuscript relative to the wear of the covers. Since the manuscript is written in South Turkestān Brāhmaṇī which Lore Sander dates to the 7th or 8th century, the book covers may thus have been made from about the 8th century on, although, to my knowledge, no wood sample has yet been taken from the covers for radiocarbon analysis. By and large, the Khotanese language testified to by the inscriptions is no longer good Old Khotanese, but not yet Late Khotanese, as attested in 10th-century documents from Dunhuang. It may be justified to describe the language as a somewhat transitional type, which probably dates back to the 8th or 9th century.

As for the date of the inscriptions, it is my tentative hypothesis that they are later than the main manuscript of the *Book of Zambasta*, in light of, first and foremost, the greater wear of the manuscript relative to the wear of the covers. Since the manuscript is written in South Turkestān Brāhmaṇī which Lore Sander dates to the 7th or 8th century, the book covers may thus have been made from about the 8th century on, although, to my knowledge, no wood sample has yet been taken from the covers for radiocarbon analysis. By and large, the Khotanese language testified to by the inscriptions is no longer good Old Khotanese, but not yet Late Khotanese, as attested in 10th-century documents from Dunhuang. It may be justified to describe the language as a somewhat transitional type, which probably dates back to the 8th or 9th century.

---

verse manuscript collected in St. Petersburg. At that time, it will be possible for me to carry out the comparison of these three versions in a more thorough manner." He seems to have been unaware of the fact that *Zambasta 22* had been edited and translated at least thrice, i.e., Leumann 1919, 1933–36: 250–288, and Emmerick 1968: 301–341.


30. The Chinese translation by Xuanzang was not unknown to Emmerick, since Lévi/Chavannes 1916 was cited in Emmerick 1968: 303. It is not impossible that he would have regarded the connection as too well-known to bring up again. But in that case, a brief reference was at least to be expected.

31. Emmerick carefully noted every different reading by Leumann in interlinear minuscules, while using italics to indicate *aṅgas* which are not sufficiently clearly legible to guarantee Leumann's reading. See Emmerick/Vorob'eva-Desjatovskaja 1995: 34–35.

32. For the date of the manuscript on paleographic grounds, see Sander 1989: 115f. The comparatively late date of the main manuscript might have inspired the received opinion on the date of the composition of the *Book of Zambasta*, which was thought to have been composed no earlier than the 7th century (Konow 1939: 35f.; Emmerick 1992: 40) or even as late as the 8th century (Emmerick 1983a: 964; Nattier 1990: 210). This dating has been disproved by Mauro Maggi, who adduces irrefutable evidence to demonstrate that the work's composition must be earlier than the late 5th century, see Maggi 2004: 184–190.

33. Such a description might be reminiscent of 'Middle Khotanese', an idea which P.O. Skjærvø has posited for many years (see Skjærvø 1999: 265–344 and 2007: 387–402).
inscriptions also give the impression of a transitional phase between the early and late orthography, while some aksaras therein seem to be quite archaic.\textsuperscript{34} Hence it would not be impossible to assign them to a relatively early stage of the transition, probably before the Tibetan occupation of Khotan (ca. 790–840).\textsuperscript{35} In sum, even though a more systematic investigation is necessary to arrive at a more certain chronology, it may not run afoul of the truth to tentatively conclude that the inscriptions in question were written at some point in the 8th century. If the conclusion is even approximately correct, it might give us some clues about the religio-historical context, in which the wooden tablets are to be placed.

Functionality and Materiality

Some features of the inscriptions are noteworthy, and may shed some light on the functionality of this pair of wooden tablets. The four Khotanese verses\textsuperscript{36} and the Sanskrit incantations on the front cover (i.e., SI 1930; erstwhile SI P 6.0) can be read as follows:

(verse 1) If one has plenty of silver and gold, plenty of coins, jewels, pearls, many crores (koti) of immeasurable riches, and exquisite cloths of all kinds,
(verse 2) [If] he has no compassion or forbearance towards sentient beings, he is to be

However, his classification of the Khotanese language into three stages still lacks a clear definition of the category of ‘Middle Khotanese’. Therefore, I am not quite convinced by the usefulness of this new category in the historical description of the Khotanese language, and content myself with such a neutral term as ‘transitional’ in the present case.

34. After Federico Dragoni (Leiden), who has made a preliminary survey of the orthography of the present inscription. A potential merkmal would be the form of ma, which Mauro Maggi studies in his forthcoming article “A Khotanese Document on Wood from Karadong (90-YKC-040)”; for his classification of the orthographic form of ma into 13 stages, see the table on p. 16. In the present wooden tablet, ma is quite often written with a rightward tail, which is attested in some dated 8th-century manuscripts. The overall form of the aksara seems relatively archaic; Dragoni tentatively posits that it should be positioned somewhere between nos. [2] and [3] in Maggi’s table, which are evidenced by IOL Khot W5 (Rawak) and IOL Khot W8 (Farhad-Beg-Yailaki), respectively.

35. Dragoni suggests in his preliminary survey that the present inscription predates Hedin 33 and 52 (i.e., nos. [5] and [6] in Maggi’s table), both belonging to a group of secular documents with Vaśīrasamga as the central figure, who was active around 767 CE. For the date of Vaśīrasamga, see Yoshida 2006: 51. But it should be kept in mind that this conclusion is highly tentative and hypothetical and should be critically verified in a systematic investigation into Khotanese orthography in the future.

36. All the four verses are numbered. Both the first and the fourth verses bear the verse number 1, hence I denote the latter as 1’ so as to differentiate it from the former. For a previous transcription and translation of the Khot. part of the inscription, see Leumann 1933–1936: 358–359. Given that a philological treatment of the Khot. verses is not the objective of the present section, I leave out the transcription and apparatus of the Khot. part and give my new translation only.
regarded as pitiable and impoverished, all his property (artha) is void.

(verse 3) Therefore, necessary are a benevolent mind and forbearance towards sentient beings. Such a property (artha) is to be maintained. This wealth is gained by merit (punyajita).  

(verse 1) Dear are [your] own compassion and kindness. Do not be confused by [sensual] pleasures! Look on this machine (yantra) of [your] own [i.e., body] as loaded with blood and flesh!

¶ namu \* ratnatrayāya tadyathā akeṭe cikate ++++++culu culu [v\[i\]ri v\[i\][r]] b ++
+ muncta muncta phutam phutya svāhā || namau jñānagarbhā<ya>;\* namau candraagarbhāya,
+ namau manīgarbhāya, namau kṣitigarbhāya, namau āryākāśagarbhāya; eṣāṃ pāñcānāṃ avaivarthikānāṃ bodhisatvānāṃ hṛdayam
+ āvarṭaṣyāmi tadyathā: hi hi hi! āviṣa āviṣa ahi ākāśagarbhā{ya};\* rūpacaksur +
+ cakṣu + cakṣu f nirnālaṃ karaṇum. hana hana viṣūmbha caksurāṅga svāhā ||  

\* Leumann; \* nama Emmerick. b [v\[i\]ri v\[i\][r]] Leumann; ++++ Emmerick.  
\* jñānagarbha<ya> em.; jñānagarbha insc., jñānagarbha + Emmerick. d namau Leumann; nama Emmerick.  
\* akāśagarbha<ya> em.; akāśagarbha insc.  
\* rūpacaksur + cakṣu + cakṣu \* Leumann; ṛu + ++ ++ ++ + kṣu Emmerick.

Homage to the Trio of Jewels! As follows: akeṭe cikate ... culu culu viri viri ... muncta muncta phutam phutya – HAIL! Homage to Jñānagarbha! Homage to Candragarbha! Homage to Manigarcha! Homage to Kṣitigarbha! Homage to Akāśagarbha, the noble one! For these five Bodhisattvas [who are] not liable to turning back, I will recite the hṛdaya-type incantation, as follows: hi hi hi – Enter! Enter! Come [here], Akāśagarbha! The form-eye [i.e., eye as material organ] ... eye ... I make the eye unsullied. Kill! Kill! Smother! The eye-disease, HAIL!

Both the Khotanese and Sanskrit parts of the inscription seem to consist of utterances implying some kind of speech acts, which find expression in the succession of imperative forms (in both Khotanese and Sanskrit). Either the exhortation to promote compassion and forbearance, or the admonition on the perils of sensual pleasures, or the invocation of a Bodhisattva efficacious against eye-disease assumed illocutionary force if, and only if, the respective utterance was properly performed. In other words, the intention of those who commissioned the object was fulfilled if, and only if, the respective utterance was properly delivered to the addressed agency – be it an ordinary lay devotee or a mighty Bodhisattva. In order that the intended results be somehow brought about, a certain kind of performance of the speech acts, in which the tablet may well have been used, must be assumed. Furthermore, it is remarkable that the Sanskrit text seems to place the
Bodhisattva Ākāśagarbha in the foreground, for, among all the five Bodhisattvas mentioned in the inscription, only he is addressed as ‘the noble one’ (ārya-) whose entrance into a certain object seems to be a prerequisite for the healing effects of the dhāraṇī. In Khotan, the name of this Bodhisattva was connected, at least from the 8th to the 10th century, with a monastery called Satkāyaprahāṇa, which used to be located in the valley of Mt. Sa(t)kāya at the Kara-Kāsh river on the west side of the capital of the Khotan kingdom. It was a belief entrenched in Khotan that Ākāśagarbha was residing in that monastery, which must have been a breeding ground for the cult of this Bodhisattva in Khotan. 40 Although it is unknown whether the origin of the wooden tablet was related to the monastic community in Mt. Sa(t)kāya, this inscription is likely to have rung a bell with local Buddhists who readily connected it with the sacred place dedicated to Ākāśagarbha at the Kara-Kāsh river.

The inscription on the back cover (i.e., the Khotanese Nandimitrāvadāna), which is the main object studied in this chapter, is characterized by Shih Jen-Lang as “incomplete”.41 This attribute is problematic. If one claims that something is ‘incomplete’, it is normally presumed that the object used to be in a somewhat ‘complete’ state and has somehow undergone a process of deformation, in which parts of it got lost. To be sure, a comparison of the Khotanese inscription with its Chinese and Tibetan counterparts may give the impression of incompleteness, but it is anything but sure that such a ‘complete’ text as the two versions circulating later in China and Tibet ever

40. The connection between Ākāśagarbha and the monastery is well attested in Khotanese, Tibetan, and Chinese sources: [1] Pelliot chín. 2893, line 13: Ākāśagarbha ra jsān si’ baudhasatvä Sakāyagīra satva-paripākā ‘And also Ākāśagarbha, this Bodhisattva (took his dwelling) in Mt. Sakāya for the ripening of sentient beings.’ For a previous transcription and translation, see Bailey 1942: 893f. [2] Prophecy of the Ox-Horn Mountain: de bzhin du nam mkha’ ltar dpag du med par byang chub sems dpas’ nam mkha’i sryings pos byangs gtsug lag khang ’jigs tshogs spong byed ces bya ba ’byung bar ’gyur ba’t sa gzhi de mchod gnas su ’gyur bar byin gis brlabs so // [Q mdo sna tshogs, ke 231a–7] ‘Likewise also the Bodhisattva Ākāśagarbha, having power as boundless as the atmosphere (ākāśa), blessed the spot [where] there was to be a monastery called Satkāyaprahāṇa [so that] it would become a place of worship’. For a previous translation, see Thomas 1935: 15, where the name of the monastery was mistakenly reconstructed as *Saṅkāträḥana (n. 7). The names of the monastery and the mountain are otherwise attested in the Old Tibetan manuscripts of the Prophecy [of the Arhat] of the Li Country (i.e., IOL Tib J 597&598) as San ka ya pra ha na ya[sic!] and Sa ka ya gi/i ka ri, while the Chin. translation by Chos grub gives 薩迦耶般羅訶耶 *sa-kac-sa-yae-pan-la-xa-na and 哲迦耶幾耶 *sa-kac-sa-yae-kjij-na[sic!] (cf. Pelliot chinois 2139; ed. T2990, 51.996a7–9.). [3] Or. 8210/S. 2113 verso: 虛空藏井如來於 薩迦耶山寺住[...]虚空藏井於西玉河薩伽耶僧寺住 ‘The Bodhisattva Ākāśagarbha, the Tathāgata, dwelt in a monastery [in the valley of] Mt. Satkāya ... The Bodhisattva Ākāśagarbha dwelt in the monastery [called] Satkāya[prajñāna at the West Jade river (i.e., Kara-Kāsh river).’ More or less the same sentences also occur in the captions of some Dunhuang murals (in Caves 231 and 237), see Pelliot/Vandier-Nicolas/Maillard 1983: (vol. 3) 25, 29. For the location of the West Jade river, see Rong 2015: 165.
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existed in Khotan at all. As a matter of fact, there was no evidence for such a ‘complete’ text anywhere until the early 7th century, when Xuanzang and his team produced the Chinese translation. However, the list of the sixteen Elders was probably known in Khotan no later than the second half of the 5th century, as it occurs in Zambasta 22. At that time, the list was taken as a somewhat self-sufficient unit, which serves as a prelude to the Maitreya legend that is the subject matter of Zambasta 22. This may make one think of the possibility that the list of the sixteen Elders was circulating on its own and serving different purposes since a relatively early time in its history. If that was the case in Khotan, it is pointless to speak of an “incomplete” text, since there was no ‘complete’ one from the very beginning. Even if we suppose that such a ‘complete’ version did exist in Khotan, it does not follow that the Khotanese Nandimitrāvadāna is ‘incomplete’ in terms of its function. To put it another way, for those who had the wooden tablet made, the inscription was probably ‘complete’, insofar as what they wished to achieve was already fulfilled with the text being copied up to this point – no less, no more. Taking a close look at the photograph of the wooden tablet, one may not fail to notice that the inscription ends in the middle of the 10th line, the second half of which is intentionally left blank. The copyist would have not come to a halt if he had had the intention of continuing his work. On the contrary, some internal evidence seems to suggest that he was apparently at pains to shorten the text (by omitting the numbers of some Elders’ retinue etc.) so as to fit it better into the limited space on the wooden tablet. For the copyist, the problem was that the text was ‘too long’ rather than ‘too short’.

Someone might explain the discontinuation of the text through the assumption that the copyist was dissatisfied with what he had copied so far and thus gave up. In other words, what we have here is nothing but a defective copy which was done by halves. A counter-argument may be adduced against this theory. Speaking from a typological perspective, partial manuscripts, viz. manuscripts in which only the beginnings of texts are copied, are not necessarily defective copies. A similar phenomenon, for example, is observed with Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts, in which prestige literature, such as Buddhist canonical texts etc., tends to be written only on the recto and is not continued on the verso. These manuscripts, however, are not defective copies. As the reason of this curious phenomenon, Stefan Baums envisages two possible factors, i.e., a continuation of oral transmission rendering the writing of the entire text unnecessary, and some special

42 For the terminus ante quem of the composition of the Book of Zambasta, see Maggi 2004: 184–190. To be sure, the oldest fragment (i.e., T III S 16), to judge from its folio number, should have belonged to a manuscript which begins with the 7th Canto and does not necessarily contain the 22nd where the list occurs (p. 186). But, as Maggi rightly points out, the Book of Zambasta is most probably the work of a single author, and is unlikely to have been composed piecemeal (p. 184f.). Hence T III S 16 is likely to have been a selection copy of a Vorlage similar to the main manuscript.
purposes served by this type of manuscripts.⁴³ The two factors are logically independent of each other; neither of them forms a prerequisite for the other. Therefore, in a time when written transmission held sway and oral transmission withered away, an increased emphasis on ritual uses alone could also have resulted in the same phenomenon. Some peculiarities of the inscription suggest the ritual orientation of the wooden tablet. Firstly, it is an idiosyncratic feature of the Khotanese version of the Nandimitrāvadāna that the sixteen Elders are not only enumerated but also revered. At the end of the sentences dealing with the names and the dwelling places of the first and the last Elders, two almost identical additional notes are found:

[B1+C1: 4f.] ays-ūṃ namasūṃ vanūṃ
[B2+C4: 3] biśūṃ hā aysā namasūṃ vanūṃ

‘I worship and pay honor to (all of) them!’

These sentences apparently do not belong to the original text, not only because they are absent in the Chinese and Tibetan versions, but also in light of the active voice in the first person singular, which is not likely to be attributed to the secondary narrator Nandimitra. This verb usage seems to hint at a strong subjective intrusion of those who were somehow engaged with this material. For those people, the worship of the Elders and the Arhats accompanying them was to be utterly emphasized, and this interpolation in the text obviously rendered the wooden tablet more useful. Although such a sentence is not written in the case of the other fourteen Elders, it might have served as a refrain which was to be recited in addition to every single Elder’s name and dwelling place, if my reconstruction of the few akṣaras after the sentence about the second Elder is approximately correct:

[B1+C1: 6] tta tta hveñai khu paḍājsye

‘So is to be spoken as [is spoken] to the previous one (i.e. the First Elder).’

This seems to be an instruction left by the copyist about how the inscription should be used. It turns out that it was to be “spoken”, in other words, recited. To be sure, given the current state of our knowledge, not everything written on the tablet has been plausibly explained.⁴⁴ But it transpires from the

⁴³ See Baums 2014: 296.

⁴⁴ A case in point is the detail that every sentence dealing with a specific Elder ends in a high number in Brāhma-Script, which ranges from 200 to 1600. Emmerick understood these numbers as the times homages should be paid to the Elders and Arhats, thus he translated: “I worship (and) revere them 1000 (times) ... I worship (and) revere all of them 1600 (times)” (Emmerick/Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja 1995: 35). Oskar von Hinüber has come across a similar case, in which the number 800 was written at the beginning of the colophon of a Saddharmapuṇḍarika manuscript from Khotan. Various interpretations proposed before (e.g. date, length of the text, price for copying) fail to convince him. In his recent article, von Hinüber seems to have had recourse to Emmerick’s old interpretation by considering it a possible solution to take the number 800 as something similar in nature to the numbers inscribed on the wooden tablet. See von Hinüber 2015b: 219f. This is, of course, speculative. But if it is true, what the user in ancient Khotan did with the wooden tablet may well be repeating the words of veneration even a thousand times.
foregoing analyses that the inscription, along with its counterpart on the other tablet, was probably used for some kind of performance of utterances which might have taken place against a ritual backdrop.

Nothing speaks against the hypothesis that the two wooden tablets were originally used as book covers, although, in the case of the Zambasta manuscript, it is a bit strange that the back cover (ca. 39 cm) is considerably shorter than the front cover (ca. 52 cm). In other words, if the string holes of the covers and the folios are properly aligned, the back cover is placed somewhat left-of-center, leaving about 20% of the verso of the last folio exposed. The asymmetry between the two covers might be explained through the assumption that the wooden tablet now used as the back cover was taken from another manuscript, which was of a smaller size, while the original back cover, which should be identical to the front cover in size, had been lost at some point. Be that as it may, it is indubitable that the main manuscript of the Book of Zambasta, from a certain point in its history, has been preserved between this asymmetric pair of book covers up to 1909. Thus, the wooden tablets inscribed in Brāhmī Script, if a reconstruction of their functionality is possible at all, can only be historically understood in a constellation with related artifacts such as the manuscript.

This manuscript seems to have been owned or used by at least three people, who left their fingerprints, as it were. One of them was a monk (Khot. āśārī, Skt. ācārya) named Puṇyabhadra, who wrote two colophons on the 1st and the 11th Cantos, respectively. Both of these should be categorized as ownership inscriptions, which are not uncommon on Buddhist monastic implements from Gandhara and the northern rim of the Tarim Basin. Another monk named Siddhabhadra, who also laid his hands on the manuscripts, seems to have taken a special interest in the 19th Canto on women (or the Straiya-parivāra, as was titled by him), which was instrumental in “restraining his mind” from the lure of female beauty, as we learn from his colophon to that canto. Apart from these signed colophons, a Sanskrit verse and a Khotanese prose text on the seasons were written by an even more cursive and possibly later hand on the verso of fol. 290, which the copyist had left blank. This anonymous scribe, in all likelihood, made use of

45. For a new interpretation of one of the two colophons, see Maggi 2009: 158. For some Indic inscriptions on a water jar from Kara Tepe and an oil lamp from Swat which express the same kind of concern, see Falk 2000: 251–257. For some fragmentary colophons in Tocharian which prohibit manuscripts being taken away, cf. SHT 525/56 b4: cas postāk Por[v]o[cf]\([m]\) sa[n]\[krāmās \(p\)re m[ar]] /// 'This book [may not be taken] out of the Porociṃ monastery.' THT 687 (on the margin above a string hole): säs kisāsa[l] postak Porocineṃ állakāṃ simac mā prāl 'This kisāsar[?]'-book of the Porociṃ [monastery] should not be taken out to another boundary.' MIK III 4048 (also an inscription on a wooden cover): /// Mitrawarme paikante paiaktāne pernesse akālṣa nūwemne saikate ayor wsre amplākānte pārñasim mā pralle ste ‘... (and) Mitrawarma, they wrote (this) with the wish for the glory of Buddhahood and gave (it), on the new moon day, as a gift to the monastery. Without permission, it should not be taken out of the boundary’. See Ogihara 2014: 114.
unemployed space in the manuscript to jot down some annotations on the text.\textsuperscript{46} Taken together, the colophons amount to an indication of the manuscript’s status as a monastic implement, which was placed, at different times, in the custody of various monks, who not only studied the text with great care but also vigilantly protected it from being taken out of the monastic boundary.\textsuperscript{47} Yet, another significant aspect of the manuscript apart from providing monks with learning materials probably concerns the religious merit (pu\textit{n}ya) generated by its production and perpetuation. The merit was believed to have such efficacy that both the patron (i.e. Zambasta) and the tradent of this book, along with all sentient beings, would attain enlightenment and become a Buddha before long. Moreover, even the long-term stability of the Khotan kingdom was considered to be contingent on it.\textsuperscript{48} Therefore, it would come as no surprise if the manuscript, in the Buddhist monastery at Khadalik, became a physical representation of the genuine teachings of the Buddha, and thus, by way of its materiality,

---

\textsuperscript{46} For a thorough survey of these colophons added secondarily to the manuscript, see Maggi/Martini 2014: 153–157.

\textsuperscript{47} To be sure, the fact that the action was proscribed does not mean that people refrained from it, but rather points to the possibility that those objects quite often faced the threat of being taken away, of which their monastic custodians were apparently aware.

\textsuperscript{48} ‘Merit’ (Skt. pu\textit{n}ya-, Khot. pu\textit{ñ}a-) is a recurrent theme in statements in the first person singular and two real colophons in rhythmic prose contained in the \textit{Book of Zambasta}: 1. 190: \textit{cu ha\=de va mar\=a pu\=ñ\=a n\=\=a\=t\=a\=m\=\=a} av\=a\=s\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=\=}
symbolized a presence of the sacred which was deemed not only beneficial for the worshippers but also protective of the whole kingdom. It is thus in this connection that the use of the book covers could be somehow surmised.

In the cult of the Buddhist book in present-day Nepal, the use of book covers made of wood is well documented. On the outside of the covers, which are, in most cases, later than the 10th century, heavy accumulations of sandalwood paste, vermilion powder, and saffron are found, bearing witness to their enduring presence in some ritual environment, while the inside of the covers are more often than not painted and decorated with an iconographic program. In a ritual worship of a 12th-century manuscript in 2004, Jinah Kim observed the following remarkable maneuver: “Once the book was ritually imbued with [the] presence [of the goddess Prajñāpāramitā], the book was divided into ten equal stacks and distributed to each Vajrācārya. The book covers were returned to the book’s seat in front of which the main Vajrācārya continued to perform more dhāraṇī rituals before he could join the recitation.” In this context, the book covers were treated as a special part of the manuscript, which served as indispensable paraphernalia in auxiliary dhāraṇī rituals. To be sure, the ritual recitation, in its present form, and with its present organization, may not predate the 19th century, and very meager, if any, evidence for a Buddhist cult of the book in India during the first millennium has come to light. For the time being, it would be foolhardy to assume that a full-fledged ritual of worshipping a book similar to that in later Nepal was already practiced in 8th-century Khotan. Be that as it may, it may be argued that not every element witnessed by modern anthropologists is later innovation—for instance, the particular significance attached to the inside of book covers.

As is the case with the later Nepalese manuscripts, some manuscripts from Gilgit were also found between book covers, on the inside of which Buddhas and/or Bodhisattvas were depicted in company with kneeling donor figures. None of the painted book covers can be unequivocally dated. According to the stylistic analyses by Klimburg-Salter, two out of the three pairs of covers, the inside of which are painted vertically, probably fall into the period when the Gilgit region was under the hegemony of the Palola Śāhis, i.e. from the 7th

---

50. See Kim 2013: 273.
52. See Hartmann 2009: 104, where the reader is also alerted to the potential danger of taking seriously some Mahāyānasūtras’ normative statements promising enormous merit, which could also be a way of promoting those texts in a highly competitive environment.
53. For the most up-to-date discussion of the three pairs of book covers, see Klimburg-Salter 2016: 396–400. For the first report on the discovery, see Kaul Shastri 1939: 2–12, esp. p. 3 and 6; see plates 1424A, 1433, 1436 for old photos of the covers and some folios. For colored photos of three book covers, see Klimburg-Salter 2016: 266–270, figs. 3–10; and Pal 2008: figs. 8 and 9 (https://www.asianart.com/articles/kashmir/index.html#9).
Figure 1 A pair of book covers with vertical iconographic depiction on the inside, Gilgit (ca. 7th or 8th century). Adapted from Pal 2008: fig. 9.
to the 8th century; while the third one, which shows a horizontal compositional pattern, represents an innovation and is thus of a later date.\footnote{See Klimburg-Salter 2016: 399–402, with further references to previous studies. In his recent book review, von Hinüber argues that “these book covers can be dated safely to the early 7th century”, see von Hinüber 2016: 374, n. 4. But the references given in that footnote do not seem to lend any support to this bold claim. Actually, this argument might go back to von Hinüber 1983: 49f., where some stylistic similarities are pointed out between the painting on one of the book covers and some rock paintings from the upper Indus valley, which Jettmar dated to the early 7th century (p. 49, n. 10).} Be that as it may, these earliest surviving examples of painted book covers demonstrate that at least the custom of painting book covers can be unequivocally traced back to the first millennium. Two commonalities between these covers have special relevance to the Khotanese case in question: First and foremost, the paintings show no necessary connection with the texts copied in the manuscript. The same holds mutatis mutandis true for the Khotanese inscriptions discussed above, none of which have direct bearing on the content of the \textit{Book of Zambasta}. What is more, it is noteworthy that only the inside of the Gilgit covers show an iconographic design, while the outside, though embellished with the running vine motif, performs no more than a decorative function. This feature hints at a strong likelihood that the inside paintings, which are invisible to those who would see but not open the books, served some other purposes than decoration. In a comparative study of the inside paintings, Klimburg-Salter draws our attention to a number of wooden plaques from Kucha and Khotan, which are, as the two older covers, painted vertically, and were probably used as votive offerings. On the basis of similarities in size, style, and composition, Klimburg-Salter proposes that the two covers showing vertical compositions might have been the result of a functional convergence of the painted wooden plaques as votive objects and the wooden boards as book covers.\footnote{See Klimburg-Salter 1990: 815–830.} If that is true, a not insignificant phenomenon transpires: When the book covers were also used as votive objects, it was on the inside, not the outside, that cult images were painted. At least some of the factors that contribute to this remarkable phenomenon are to be found in the materiality of book covers: The inside, compared with the outside, is harder to become the worse for wear, and, perhaps more importantly, is more closely tied up with, or even incorporated into, the manuscript carrying the sacred words of the Buddha. Hence, it is conceivable that the manuscript, which was considered the source of enormous merit, invests the inside of its covers with efficacy. For this scenario, the cult of the book is not a necessary presupposition.\footnote{Kim also takes note of the dynamics between inside and outside as a book’s cultic potential, which she interprets through a paradoxical interplay between the visibility and the invisibility, see Kim 2013: 40f. This is an intriguing theory per se, but her proposal of “a ritual turning of folios of a manuscript that accompanied a continuous recitation of the text” (p. 64f.) is based on some misinterpretations of epigraphic sources, as is rightly criticized by von Hinüber 2016: 372f.}
Figure 2 A wooden plaque (F.II.iii.002) with vertical iconographic depiction, Farhad-Beg-Yailaki, Khotan. © British Museum. Photograph courtesy of International Dunhuang Project.
Although very little, if anything, about the Buddhist cult in Gilgit has been known so far, the cultic use of book covers with special emphasis on their inside could be assumed for this milieu with some certainty.

The strong political, religious, and cultural ties between Gilgit and Khotan are well attested during the 7th and 8th centuries. It should therefore come as no surprise that a more or less identical manuscript culture was also shared between the two regions. In Khotan, wooden plaques with paintings akin to those painted on the aforementioned covers are discovered at several sites (e.g. 1907 11-11 67 [D IV 4] from Dandan-Oilik, and F II iii. 002 from Farhad-Beg-Yailaki) and attributed by various scholars to either the 6th or the 8th century. In other words, they are more or less contemporaneous with, if not slightly prior to, the book covers from Gilgit. Should the functional convergence proposed by Klimburg-Salter not be considered as something exclusive to Gilgit, but as a shared innovation in the Gilgit-Khotanese manuscript culture, it may well be hypothesized that at least some of the book covers from Khotan (such as the present pair) were probably also considered as votive offerings. If this hypothesis is not quite wide of the mark, it may have paved the way for my speculation that the inscriptions on the inside of the book covers, despite the difference between writings and artworks, may well belong to the same functional typology as the paintings from Gilgit. That is to say, the book covers might have been offered or consecrated on certain ritual occasions, when the utterances inscribed on their inside were somehow performed (possibly through recitation).

Without further evidence, the details of the presumed ritual have to remain nebulous for the moment. Be that as it may, there are good reasons to believe that the religious background against which the ritual took place was somehow related to the monastery Satkāyaprahāna at the Kara-Kāsh river, at least in the collective memory of Khotanese Buddhists from the 8th to the 10th century. This relationship is not only borne out, as discussed above, by the prominence given to the Bodhisattva Ākāśagarbha by the inscription on the front cover, but also evinced in the apprehensions about the decline of the Buddha’s teachings (dharma) and the cult of the sixteen Elders, two themes which form part and parcel of the inscription on the back cover. In the Prophecy [of the Arhat] of the Li Country composed in the late 8th or

57. See Schopen 1977 for some pioneering discussions on this issue.
58. For the Saka orthographic features attested in Gilgit manuscripts and Khotanese elements in names and titles of some donors, see von Hinüber 1981: 121–127, 1983: 58f. For artistic evidence of communications between both regions, see Klimburg-Salter 1982: 89. For the popularity that the Samghāta-sūtra and the Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra enjoyed among Buddhists in both regions, see von Hinüber 1983: 52; Emmerick 1992: 22f. and 29f.
59. For different scholarly opinions with regard to the date of the plaques, see Klimburg-Salter 1990: 825f. For more iconographically similar plaques from the Khotan region, see Williams 1973: 119 and 125, figs. 14–22 and 23–26. A colored photo of the plaque from Dandan Oilik at actual size is found in Whitfield 1985: (vol. III) plate 71.
early 9th century,\textsuperscript{60} the entire narrative was put in the mouth of Saṅghavardhana, an Arhat residing in the valley of Mt. Sa(t)kāya, where the aforementioned monastery was also located. The text consists of an account of the evanescence of Buddhism in Chinese Turkestan echoing the Candragarbhāsūtra, which is referred to at the end of the Dunhuang manuscripts as an authoritative source of information. Although both the story and timetable of the decline probably draw inspiration from the Candragarbhāsūtra, the prophecy seems to be introduced by a frame narrative which may ring a bell:

From the origin of the Li country [i.e. Khotan] there passed six generations of kings. During the time of the king of the seventh generation, by name Vijaṭa Kirti, there resided in a (mountain) valley, named [Mt. Sakāya], near to the monastery [Satkāyaprapāna], an Arhat named Saṅghavardhana. A disciple, a certain monk who under the venerable man had studied the Vinaya, having seen the sūtra of the prophecy made to the Bodhisattva Candragarbha, inquired of his ācārya, the Arhat: ‘In [Khotan, Kashgar, and Kucha], these three, after how long from the nirvāṇa of Buddha will [the semblance of the true teachings (saddharmapratirūpaka)] and the stūpas which have been erected perish? By whom [will they be] destroyed? At the last how will it be?’ The Arhat, commending him, said: ... \textsuperscript{61}

The indebtedness of the frame narrative to the Nandimitrāvadāna is quite straightforward: In both texts, the narrated time is anchored to a historic point in the past (the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa or the origin of the country), and the story is set in the reign of a specific king (Vajrasena or Vijaṭa Kirti) at the site of a specific monastery (Kukkuṭārāma or Satkāyaprapāna). Most importantly, both texts have the account of the decline narrated by an Arhat (Nandimitra or Saṅghavardhana) on the occasion of a question of doubt raised by his disciple(s). To sum up, whoever composed the Prophecy [of the Arhat] of the Li Country must have known and emulated the Nandimitrāvadāna, which was probably well-received in a religious milieu where similar prophecies were produced in the 8th and the 9th centuries. For people in that milieu, the monastery Satkāyaprapāna, in which, as mentioned above, the Bodhisattva Akāśagarbha dwelt, must have been a sacred place; hence it was blended into the backdrop, against which the Arhat related the prophecy. To be sure, it would be a bit contrived to claim that the book covers found at Khadalik stemmed from the renowned valley at Kara-Kāś river, given the scarcity of historical information which renders the monastery mysterious.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{60} The text is extant in three Old Tibetan manuscripts from Dunhuang (i.e., IOL Tib J597, 598, 601.2), where it was translated by Chos grub (aka Facheng 仏成; ca. 780–859/60 CE) into Chinese (cf. Pelliot chin. 2139). For the date and a tentative chronicle of Chos grub, see Wu 1984: 398–410. The Tibetan text was translated into English by Thomas 1935: 77–87 and edited by Cannata 1992: 43–79. The text makes reference to historical events which took place in the first half of the 8th century (Nattier 1991: 191f., n. 113 and 117), so the mid-8th century is the terminus post quem of its composition.

\textsuperscript{61} The translation is based on Thomas 1935: 77f. (with certain emendations). For the translation of the term saddharmapratirūpaka, see Nattier 1991: 86–89.

\textsuperscript{62} It is curious that almost all the sources concerning the monastery Satkāyaprapāna are
But it may not be far-fetched to argue that they were probably made and used in the same milieu, for which both the Bodhisattva Akāśagarbha and the Nandimitrāvadāna were of special importance.

**A Recasting Before the Late 5th Century**

As is mentioned above, the list of the sixteen Elders also occurs in *Zambasta* 22, and the latter was misunderstood by Shih Jen-Lang, perhaps misled by Ernst Leumann, as the ‘complete’ metrical version, of which the inscription on the back cover is but a revision in prose. While the statement made by Shih ought to be dismissed, the question arises what kind of relationship the *Zambasta* verses have to the inscription. My provisional answer would be that what *Zambasta* 22 contains is a recasting of a forebear of the inscription (i.e. the Khotanese *Nandimitrāvadāna*). In what follows, some evidence is adduced to buttress this claim.

The *Zambasta* verses amount to a recasting, insofar as the focalization of the narrative is changed. In this point, the ways in which the Elders’ names are enumerated may serve as a good example. In all three versions of the *Nandimitrāvadāna*, the focalization is external; in other words, both the Buddha’s nominations of the Elders and the list of their names are narrated from the perspective of Nandimitra, who, at the request of his disciples, gives a distanced account of what happened 800 years ago. However, the version in *Zambasta* 22 is characterized by a vision within; that is to say, the narrator enumerates the Elders’ names by having them addressed by the Buddha, whose commandments are quoted verbatim in first-person voice, as if they are given in the presence of the narrator. Although the first eight folios of *Zambasta* 22 are missing and there is no way to know how the narrative starts, it is unlikely that it contains the frame narrative attested in all the other versions of the *Nandimitrāvadāna*, since the internal focalization throughout the rest of the narrative excludes the possibility of identifying the narrator with Nandimitra. The absence of such a frame narrative is also indicated by the fact that the majority of this canto (i.e. v. 113–333), namely the prophecy of the advent of Maitreya, is put into the mouth of the Buddha, found in Dunhuang, while it is not mentioned in any pre-9th century documents from the Khotan region. Neither was the monastery visited by any pilgrim monks who visited Khotan and left records. Thus, it is not to be excluded that it was not a historical site but an *imaginair* which only existed in the collective memory. See Zhang/Rong 1993: 291.

---

63. See above p. 40, fn. 26 and 27 in the present section.
64. Cf. Emmerick 1968: 303 (v. 93–95): “Afterwards, the Buddha addressed the Elder Bharadvāja at that time, Bakula, Īṅgana, Vanavāsa, Aśoka, the Elder Gopaka, Bhadra, Kāda, Kanakavatsa, Kanaka-Bharadvāja, Panthaka, Rāhula, Nāgasena, the Elder Čudāpanthaka. He addressed [Abhedya], [Vajrīputra] then with their pupils: ‘I leave the [teachings] entrusted in your hand ...’.”
the end of whose speech rounds off the whole canto.65 Therefore, the traddent credited with the composition of this Canto probably drew upon (parts of) a
text similar in content to the Nandimitravadaṇa, in which the frame
narrative centered on Nandimitra is not unequivocally attested.

The affinity of the source text used by the traddent with the inscription in
question is, first and foremost, confirmed by a common error among the
Elders’ names. The different order in which the Elders’ names are
enumerated in Zambasta 22 is probably due to a rearrangement metri causa,
and thus not to be taken as a genuine variation.66 In three cases, there is a
discrepancy between the two sources, which can easily be explained through
either omission or scribal errors.67 The only genealogically significant
evidence is betrayed by the name of the fifteenth Elder, which both sources
give as Aśoka, while all the other versions of the list unanimously attest Ajita
(Chin. *a-dzye-ta 阿氏多; Tib. mi pham pa). To the best of my knowledge,
there is no Elder who had such a name and survived the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa.68
This name, peculiar to the two Khotanese sources, can thus only be regarded
as an error which had somehow crept into the tradition before the 5th
century.69 This error, despite its status as testis unicus, lends weight to the
postulate of a forebear of the presumably 8th-century inscription, which was
probably transmitted to Khotan by the 5th century.

Given that the inscription comes to a halt after the list of the Elders’ names
and dwelling places, and that Zambasta 22 does not contain the frame
narrative, only a tiny fraction of the forebear can be reconstructed from the

65. For the beginning and the end of the lengthy prophecy, see Emmerick 1968: 305 (v. 113):
“Afterwards the Buddha spoke thus to Ānanda: ...”, and 341 (v. 334): “The Buddha
concluded this speech. Beings became very contented”.

66. Ernst Leumann seems to have taken the different orders too seriously: “Die Reihenfolge der Namen ist recht verschieden von der in den genannten Strophen
gegebenen” (Leumann 1920: 165). Since the Zambasta verses do not attach a cardinal
number to each of the sixteen Elders, it should not be taken for granted that the way in
which the Elders are arranged here necessarily reflects their order.

67. For the name of the first Elder, only Bharadvāja (cf. baradvāju [v. 93b], baradvājī [v.
104a]) is attested in Zambasta 22. This is likely to be attributed to a secondary shortening
by the traddent who omitted Pniḍola. For the name of the fourteenth Elder, the inscription
gives sānāvāśā (as opposed to vanavāṣyu [v. 93c]), probably due to a confusion with
Śāṇakvāsin, see below p. 85, fn. 22. For the name of the thirteenth Elder, the Khotanese
sources differ from one another (cf. inγaŋu [v. 93c] and anγalā 8/[B2+C3: 4]), while the
tradition seems to have been contaminated from the very beginning. There is no
conclusive evidence for the original name of the Elder.

68. For the only possible candidate, the Aśoka of Nāṭikā, acknowledged by the Buddha as
an Arhat who had attained Nirvāṇa (SN I 358), see DPPN (vol. 1), s.v. 7. Asoka. But he died
before the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa and thus could not be appointed as one of the executors of
the latter’s will.

69. It is not impossible that the fusion of both names took place in Gândhāra under certain
circumstances, see below p. 86, fn. 24. This is by no means a common error which could be
committed by multiple scribes independently.
extant Khotanese sources. However, it is theoretically probable that what Zambasta 22 has in common with the Chinese and the Tibetan versions of the Nandimitrāvadāna also goes back to the forebear, as long as the shared content is no commonplace formula which is ubiquitous in Buddhist literature. A case in point is the three assemblies of Maitreya, which are associated with the wholesome potentialities with respect to the Buddha, the teachings (dharma), the community (saṅgha), respectively.\textsuperscript{70} Such an association is, to the best of my knowledge, only attested in the two texts, and thus can be traced back to the forebear which may well be genealogically related to the three versions of the Nandimitrāvadāna that have come down to us. In what follows, the verses in Zambasta 22, which deal with the creation of wholesome potentialities with respect to each of the Three Jewels, are compared to their respective parallel in the Tibetan Nandimitrāvadāna, with special focus on the difference between them:

\textbf{Khot. 22.221–222: ce ttā ce pratābīṃbā hatāro śśākyamuni balṣāyau yūḍāṇdā lakṣaṇyaṇau 
āysāta vāyṣāka mamā vīrā harbāṣā [āta], vasatū brūṭāre putyaṇau jṣa saṃ kho sarbaṃṇdi 
urmsyaṇye vaśārāmo ttarandaru byodāndi parrāta biṣyaṇu du[khyaau j]s[a]}

“Whoever once made images of the Buddha Śākyamuni equipped with the marks [of a great man] (lakṣaṇa) have now all come to me. Because of their merits, they shine purely like the rising sun. They have obtained a body [like adamant] (vajra). They have escaped from all woes.” (tr. Emmerick 1968: 321, 323)

\textbf{Tib. [F1.1]: [They] have humbly set up images or stūpas [made] from [things which are] made of gold, silver, beryl, crystal, jewel, brass, bell-metal, pearls, iron, copper, sandalwood, aloes wood, conch shells, horn, ivory, earth, paintings, and bones; [they] have created wholesome potentialities by humbly setting up [such] images or stūpas even [of the size] of just a finger (āngulimātra).\textsuperscript{71}

Both texts agree that one way of engendering wholesome potentialities with respect to the Buddha is making his images, while the Tibetan text also mentions erecting stūpas. However, there are discrepancies in both the cause and the effect of the meritorious act. The Khotanese verses emphasize the ‘formal’ cause, to wit, the shape of the images, which should faithfully represent the marks of a great man (mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇa). But for the

\textsuperscript{70} Cf. Emmerick 1968: 321 (v. 219–223, emphasis added): “Thus will the Buddha Maitreya preach to them [i.e., disciples in his three assemblies]: ‘[Under the instruction] (śāsana) of the Buddha Śākyamuni you [engendered] these [wholesome potentialities] (kuśalamāla). You gave various gifts to the Buddha, the [teachings] (dharma), the [monastic community] (bhikṣusāṅgha). Therefore have all births been removed for you, all karmas with afflictions (kleśa).’” Emmerick’s translation is here modified in light of the Tib. parallel (see below p. 181, fn. 55).

\textsuperscript{71} For the not substantially different Chin. version, see Lévi/Chavannes 1916: 15f.: “s’il emploient les sept joyaux, l’or, l’argent, les perles, le jade précieux, le bois odorant, le laiton, le cuivre, le fer, le bois, la pierre, l’argile (la laque, éd. de Corée), ou s’ils emploient des étoffes de soie ou de fil ou des peintures sur soie pour faire des images de Bouddhas et de stūpas, grandes ou petites, et même d’une petitesse extrême jusqu’à la dimension d’un doigt ...”.

55
INTRODUCTION (Khot.)

The sense noble, rays. He accomplished all the great acts, he obtains members like marks of a great man, gleaming, covered with the secondary tokens ("The perfection in forbearance" (Adamant)."

The Khotanese verse makes remarkable reference to a body like adamant, which the donors have obtained by dint of the merit accumulated through the commission of making the images. The idea of the adamant-like body, well attested in Chinese translations of Buddhist scriptures before the 5th century, was, at the outset, conceived in reference to a Buddha's body, which excels in purity, strength, and imperviousness to sickness. Nevertheless, there are also cases in which such bodies are said to be also available to Bodhisattvas or even to beings in another Buddha-field. This is probably also the case with the Book of Zambasta where the adamant-like body is allegedly obtained by a Bodhisattva or, as in the

72. A similar motif also occurs in the Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra (a unique verse in Dharmakṣema's version), the Maitreyasīṃhanāḍa-sūtra, etc.; see below p. 182, fn. 62.

73. It is to be noted that such bodies should not be confused with those made of adamant (vajracāya) known from later contexts. The latter idea emerged in Chin. translations of Buddhist texts dating back to the decades around 400 CE; see Radich 2012: 256–270. It is unlikely that the Khot. verse dealing with beings reborn in the first assembly of Maitreya would require the connotation of a body made of adamant, which is associated with docetic Buddhology. Therefore, Emmerick's rendering of vaśārāma as "a body made of vajra" (Emmerick 1968: 323) is probably erroneous. Bailey collected occurrences of this lexeme without explaining its form, see Prolexis: 323, s.v. vaśārāma. To my mind, the lexeme vaś(ā)rāma-, attested only twice in Khot., could be formally explained through a Khot. suffix -aa attached to a loanword from the MInd. counterpart of Skt. vajropama- (~ Gāndh. *vajyoro[v]ama- > *vaśīr[v]ama-; for y > s [ʔiʔ/ Gāndh.] and the alternation ā : o [esp. in Gāndh.], see von Hinüber 2001: 125f. §121, and 174 §213).

74. For a preliminary survey of the relevant textual sources, see Radich 2012: 249–256.

75. Cf. Akṣayamatinirdesā V: sangs rgyas kyi sky sky rdo rje ltar mi shigs shing sra ba dang sred med kyi bu ltar mkhrregs pa(ST mthu po che mkhrang ba) thob(T 'thob) par bya ba'i phyir byang chub sems dpa' 'rman kyi rus pa dang rkhang sbyin pa'o [ed. Braarvig 1993: (vol. 1) 31] “bones and marrow are the Bodhisattvas' gift so as to attain the body of a Buddha, unbreakable and firm as adamantine, strong as that of Nārāyana." tr. Braarvig 1993: (vol. 2) 121. Larger Sukhāvītvyūha (Kang Sengkai's version): 設我得佛，國中菩薩不得金剛那羅延身者，不取正覺。[T363, 12.268b23f.] ‘If, after I have attained the Buddhahood, any Bodhisattva in [my] realm could not obtain a body so adamantine [as that of] Nārāyana, I may not awaken to perfect awakening!’ (cf. Gomez 1996: 169). Wuyan tongzi jing: 若其有人生彼世界，身如金剛，皆亦堅固不可破壞，是故諸土名曰住於堅固金剛之根。[T401, 13.532b20f.] ‘If there are people reborn in that world [i.e., the Buddha-field of the Tathāgata “Holder of Wisdom–Luminary” 執慧曜], their bodies are like adamant, wholly firm and indestructible. Therefore, the realm is called “Abiding at the Root of Firm Adamant.”

76. See Zambasta 10.25–26: lakṣāṇanyu aśātsa amṛga vyāṃjyangu tcaṛṣva viḍa. utāra indriya ba'īy kṣāṇḍipārāmata yindā, bīsā kāre dāśāte māsta vaśārāmā byehēte amṛga “The [perfection in forbearance] (kṣāntipāramitā) makes his members adorned with the [marks of a great man], gleaming, covered with the [secondary tokens] ([anu]vyāṃjana), his sense noble, rays. He accomplished all the great acts, he obtains members like
present verse, by disciples in the first assembly of Maitreya.

[2] with respect to the teachings (dharma)

Khot. 22.223–227: ce tcohôrā ātama siyândi tā dyânyou jsa ramîndá. bissînya bvâré samâdhâna [...] vinu siyândâ hvatândâ pûṣṭândâ harbisîâ vâsnyâ vâyamprabhâ maṃ vâte âtâ [...]. kyvâvâvidhamu vîbhâsyo siyândi [...]. abhîhuvo daśta karha pratâsambate bvâré tcohora. ce mahâyânasîtra sîye kyvâ pûṣtâyâ pîde bissîu rraśṭô dâtu paysândândi kho balsâsiśte padamgya balsâsiśtu bvâré ne dårū.

“Those who have studied the four Āgamas find pleasure in meditations (dhyâna). They understand all kinds of [concentration] (samâdhi) ... they have studied, have preached, have read the Vinaya, they have all now come to me with a fathom-high halo (vyâmprabha) ... Those who have studied the Abhidharma, the Vîbhasa, ... [they,] skilful in extraordinary faculties (abhijñâ) [and] energetic, will realize the four [kinds of special knowledge] (pratisamvidâ). One who has studied [the scriptures of the Great Vehicle] (mahâyânasîtra), who has written them in a book, [and those who] have rightly recognized [all the teachings] as the description of the enlightenment (bodhi) will realize the enlightenment before long.” (tr. Emmerick 1968: 323)

Tib. [F.2.1 + F.2.2 + F.2.3.1]: [They] have copied, have made [others] copy, have recited, have made [others] recite ... scriptures of the Great Vehicle (mahâyânasîtra) ... caskets of the disciples (srâvakâpîtaka) [consisting of the Abhidharma, the Vinaya, and the five Āgamas] ... [as well as] the Jâtakamâlâ, the Avadânamâlâ, and the Pratyekabuddhamâlâ ... [There are] those [who] have read [them], have held [them], have copied [them] into books – even if only a verse of four lines which is taught, have made offerings to preachers of the teachings (dharmaabhânaka), ... have covered and wrapped variegated clothes around the books, have made the best wooden covers, have tied up the books with variegated strings. They have thus created wholesome potentialities.77

Both texts attest, by and large, an identical division of the teachings of the Buddha (dharma) into the three caskets of Mainstream schools (i.e. the Āgamas, the Vinaya, the Abhidharma) and the scriptures peculiar to the Great Vehicle. The third category, under which texts such as the Jâtakamâlâ are subsumed, is not mentioned in the Khotanese verses, and thus cannot be unequivocally postulated for the forebear. The compact style of the Book of Zambasta makes it impossible to provide further information on the

---

77. For the slightly different Chin. version, see Lévi/Chavannes 1916: 16 and 19f.: “[s’ils] ont pu pratiquer le culte de la Loi et planter pour eux-mêmes des racines excellentes ou enseigner à d’autres à en planter de la manière que voici: A l’égard des ouvrages du Grand Véhicule ... Derechef il y a les trois recueils des auditeurs (srâvakâpîtaka) [i.e. les cinq Āgamas, le Vinaya, l’Abhidharma] ... En outre, il y a l’Éloge en guirlande des Naissances antérieures (jâtakamâlâ) et l’Éloge en guirlande des Individuellement-illuminés (pratyekabuddhamâlâ) ... Pour une stance de quatre membres, si on peut soi-même la réciter, ou si on enseigne à d’autres à la réciter, si on la lit soi-même ou si on la fait lire à d’autres, si on la retient ou si on enseigne à d’autres à la retenir, si on l’explique soi-même ou si on enseigne à d’autres à l’expliquer, si aux maîtres de la Loi on présente avec respect les offrandes, si aux exemplaires des livres sacrés on présente avec respect des offrandes, ... si aux exemplaires des livres sacrés on offre en ornement des étuis en soies variées, des bandes, et des ceintures de fil, ..."
subdivision of each category, not to mention the titles of individual texts. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the number of the Āgamas is explicitly mentioned as “four” rather than “five”, as opposed to the Tibetan and Chinese versions of the Nandimitravadāna. It is well known that the canonical status of the fifth Āgama (i.e. the so-called Kṣudraka-Āgama) is not fixed. Whereas the classification with a fifth Āgama or Nikāya was adopted by some schools, as in the Pāli tradition, to accommodate some texts which were considered to fall hardly within the canonical quartet, some other schools, notably the Sarvāstivādins, never had more than four Āgamas, quoting those para-canonical minor texts under the designation kṣudraka ‘small, minute’. Given that both the Chinese and the Tibetan versions attest the five Āgamas, this minor variation seems to suggest that the Khotanese tradent recast this paragraph in a Sarvāstivāda-Vaibhāṣika garb, which might also be manifested in the addition of the Vihbāṣā to the Abhidharma. 

[3] with respect to the community (saṅgha)

Khot. 97f. + 228 ci śandāssajyo yaniyyā jāggarau khāysu bilsaṃgi o panyavassī mālihāru nimamadhanno yaniyyā, samkhāramu yande cāttāsālu amggāśālu bilsaṃgi, haṃtssa ātāṃduyavau vara āna varāsāre handāro […] kye bhikṣusamṣaṅgga yājāndā puṭṭa kuśalamūla vicīra māṣṭā bise tsate paśaṃḍi māma virā nāndā pravaço […]

Whoever would prepare food for the monastic community (bhikṣusamṣaṅgga) during vigils [on one of] the six [monthly days of] communal sitting [in meditation] (saṃnīṣadyā),

78. If Jan Nattier’s theory that the list of the Mahāyāna scriptures was a late interpolation in the Nandimitravadāna (Nattier 1988: 45f., n. 54) holds water, there may have been no such list in the forebear on which the Zambasta verses are based.

79. For a classic discussion of the order in which the Āgamas are arranged and the possible connection of this text with the Dharmaguptakas, see Lévi/Chavannes 1916: 31ff.

80. See Lamotte 1958: 166f. Other schools such as the Mahāsāṃghikas, the Haimavatas, the Mahāsāsakas, and the Dharmaguptakas did not have a Kṣudraka-Āgama, but all had a fifth collection in their Sūtrapiṭaka. See Lamotte 1958: 174ff. and Hirakawa 1990: 128.

81. Khot. śandāssajya- should go back to Skt. saṃnīṣadyā rather than saṃnīṣadyā (pace Leumann 1933–36: 252) in light of its reflexive initial, cf. Khot. -sandāvāta- ~ Skt. saṃnipāta. With its first component being identified with ‘six’, the compound should be understood in reference to the six monthly days (i.e., the 8th, 14th, and 15th lunar days of each fortnight), on which the Buddhist teachings are preached for the laypeople who undertake the eightfold discipline. For the canonical sources concerning the six monthly days of several Mainstream schools, see Lamotte 1949: (vol. 2) 832f., n. 270, 274. For a Skt. fragment from Sāngim (Turfan) containing an anuṣṭubh-verse about this matter, cf. SHT V 161, (recto 1, 2 + verso 4): catu(r) (t)(aśim pa)īcadasim (pa)(kṣa)ṣyehāstāmin [ta]thā | prāti|hār(a)(k)[pa]k[s]ām [ca] po[sa] + + − − + ||. A similar verse of six lines also occurs in the Maitreyavayakarana 77: caturāśim paṇcadasim paṇkṣyanghaṭāmin tathā | prāthārakapakaśa ca aśtāngasamāhitam | upavāsaṃ upoṣyeha hy āgata mama śāsane || [ed. Liu 2005: 64] ‘For, having observed the fast well endowed with the eightfold discipline on the 14th, 15th, and also on the 8th [lunar day] of a fortnight, and during the fortnight of special abstinence (prāthāraka), [they] have come here under my instruction.’ For this interpretation of the recondite term Skt. prāthāraka- or Pāli pāṭihāriya-, see Dietz 1997: 63–70 (with extensive references to the parallels of this verse). In some schools, the number of the monthly days is four; see Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 9. On these days, the laypeople have the possibility to visit the monastery or invite the monks to preach, whom
or would make a quinquennial feast (pañcavārṣika), a garland-building (mālavihāra), an invitation (nimantrāṇa) [of the monastic community], 82 or endows a monastery (saṅghārāma), a building with four halls (caturaṅsāla), and a fire hall (agnisāla) for the monastic community – sitting there with guests (āgantuka), they [i.e. the monks] enjoy the sustenance. 83 ...

Those who have engendered various merits (punya) and wholesome potentialities (kuśalamāla) with respect to the monastic community, have left great, wealthy houses, and undertaken ordination (pravrajyā) under me [i.e. Maitreya].

Tib. [3.1–2] [They] have uttered a bidding, have led [others] to what is wholesome, have made a feast [on] the eighth lunar day (aśtamīka), have made a feast [on] the fasting day (posadha), have made an invitation (upanīmantrāṇa), have humbly given a festive meal to the community, have invited [monks] to a meal, have incidentally invited [monks] to a meal, have made a monthly feast (māsika), have constantly offered food (nātyaka), have invited preachers (dharmakathika) to a meal, have made a quinquennial feast (pañcavārṣika), have endowed a temple, have spread couchs and seats (sāvyāsana), have offered religious clothes, have made a rite of consecrating the gong, have offered medical herbs, have offered [a monk’s] standard belongings (parīṣkāra). [In doing so, they] have created wholesome potentialities … With pure faith, [they] will abandon the household life in the third assembly [of Maitreya] ...

they also provide with food. The first line of the verse thus corresponds to the sentences dealing with aśtamīka and posadha in the Tib. text. For the communal sitting (nīṣadyā) on the six days, cf. Shisong lū / Sarvastivādavinaya: 僧上座會坐法者。月六齋 所謂八日、十四日、十五日、二十三日、二十九日、三十日，於是日，無病比丘應和合一處說法 T1435, 23.420c13–15 'The regulation (dharma) for the communal sitting (nīṣadyā) of the Elders of a community: On the six monthly days for fasting, i.e., the 8th, 14th, 15th, 23rd, 29th, 30th lunar days, all the monks that are not sick should assemble at one place [for the purpose of] preaching ...' For the concept of nīṣadyā in the Vinaya of other schools, see Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 297, n. 3, and Karashima 2012: (vol. 3) 327. In most cases, the communal sitting takes place at night, thus, a series of regulations are made to prevent the monks from nodding off with an Elder appointed as the superintendent of meditation (prāhānapratijāgrakā); see Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 276ff. For this reason, I interpret Khot. jāggrara- (adj. ~ Skt. jāgara- 'waking' as an attribute of śṣandāṣṣajā-, which is used here as accusative of extent in the temporal sense (Emmerick 1965: 26).

82. I do not interpret the pronoun cī as interrogative as did Emmerick 1968: 303 ("Who would perform a samniṣadyā, a jāgari,ā, would give food to the Bhikṣususāṅgha or would give an invitation at the pañcavārṣika to a mālavihāra?") Khot. paṃjāvāṣṣī should not be construed as locative (pace Emmerick: "at the pañcavārṣika") but rather as accusative, given that the Tib. text explicitly mentions “made a quinquennial feast”. For the so-called garland building constructed at a place where relics of the Buddha are kept, see Prolexis s.v. mālīhāra and BHSD s.v. mālā-vihāra. The curious form Khot. mālīhāra- may presuppose *mālīhāra- (< MInd. mālēhāra-; for -āvīr -e- see von Hinüber 2001: 136f. §146.), cf. Khot. sthāra- ~ Skt. sthāvīra-.

83. For Khot. amggiśśala-, cf. Gândh. agiśśa- (~ Olnd. agniśāla- [AV] 'the hall west of the mahāvedi where the three sacrificial fires are kept'), see Bailey 1946: 769. For Khot. hammāḍāra- 'sustenance', see Skjærvø 2004: (vol. 2) 86f. ad 9.10.

84. For the more elaborate Chin. version, see Lévi/Chavannes 1916: 21f.: "A l’égard des bhikṣu et des bhikṣūṁi, ou bien on les invite successivement, ou bien on les invite à quelque occasion, ou bien le premier jour du mois, ou bien le huitième jour, ou bien le quinzième jour, ou bien on expose un banquet d’abstinence (posadha) pour le leur présenter en offrande; ou bien on va dans les temples; soit qu’on fasse des offrandes pour un seul, soit qu’on fasse des offrandes pour la Communauté, ou bien on fait [personellement] le don et
Despite the diversity of the activities deemed as conducive to wholesome potentialities with respect to the community, a tripartite classification seems to be shared between both texts: the offering of food on festive occasions, the construction of monastic infrastructure, and the supply of provisions for the monks. The Khotanese verses record the various types of buildings with a considerable degree of detail, but only brush over the third category by mentioning in passing the sustenance enjoyed by the monks. As regards the festive occasions, what the Tibetan text refers to as two separate feasts (i.e. āstamika and poṣadha) falls in the Khotanese verses under the rubric of the communal sitting (niṣadyā), which, according to the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins, takes place six times a month. The mention of the quinquennial feast (pañcavārṣika), common to both texts, also merits attention, insofar as it implies, more often than not, royal patronage of the Buddhist clergy and manifests, in some cases, in the form of a ‘universal feast’ offered to all the people present on that occasion.85 Tracing this term back to the forebear in question may well have paved the way for the hypothesis that the idea of merging the Aśokan ideal of Buddhist kingship with the cult of Maitreya, as attested in the present paragraph, had already come into being before the second half of the 5th century, when the earliest extant fragment of the Book of Zambasta was probably copied.86

To sum up, the comparisons presented above may suffice to demonstrate that, apart from the list of the sixteen Elders, the verses dealing with the three assemblies of Maitreya in Zambasta 22 may also be derived from the forebear, the content of which is not substantially different from that of the Chinese and the Tibetan versions. In addition, the Khotanese tradent, who recast those paragraphs with a metrical flourish, may well have had recourse to some sources related to the Sarvāstivāda-Vaibhāṣika school, which left traces in some changes made to the text. Nonetheless, it does not necessarily provide evidence for the religious affiliation of the tradent, whose tastes in

---

85. See Chen 2006: 69. The openness of the quinquennial feast is also manifested in one of its Chin. renderings, i.e., wuzech 無遮 ‘without hindrance or obstacle’, hence ‘unlimited (feast)’. Lévi/Chavannes 1916: 22 considered it to be a transcription of Skt. mokṣā. However, Funayama Tōru has pointed out that its Skt. counterpart may well be nirargāla- or -argaḍa- (cf. Pāli niraggalā-) ‘unimpeded; a specific unrestrained form of the aśvamedha’ (BHSD s.v. nirargaḍa); see Funayama 2002: 318, n. 132.

86. See above p. 45, fn. 42 in the present section.
Mainstream Buddhist literature seem to be quite catholic. In the final part of this section, two pieces of evidence are adduced to shed some light on the amplitude of the literary learning of such *poetae docti* in ancient Khotan.

The first case occurs when the Buddha preaches about the path leading to the city of Nirvāṇa, which is said to co-exist with the following stanza:

\[ \text{anice harbiśsā skoṅgye, anātme harbiśsā skauṅgye. dukhiṅgye harbiśsā skoṅgye. tsāṣṭa nārvāṇi nāsaundhi.} \]  
[ed. Emmerick 1968: 302; v. 101]

“Impermanent are all the [conditioned states] (anityāh sarvasamskārāh). Without Self are all the [conditioned states] (anātmānāh sarvasamskārāh). Woe-afflicted are all the [conditioned states] (dukkhāh sarvasamskārāh). Calm, quiet is Nirvāṇa (sāntam nirvāṇam).” tr. Emmerick 1968: 303.

These are the ‘seals of the teachings’ (dharmanādrā), which constitute the fundamental dogmata characteristic of what the Buddha taught and are ubiquitous in Buddhist scriptures. The number of these ‘seals’ ranges from two to ten, while the first two propositions are common to all traditions. The most idiosyncratic part of the Khotanese version translated above is the second proposition, which deals with the selflessness or non-substantiality of all the conditioned states (samskāra) rather than of all the phenomena (dharma), a reading attested in the vast majority of the occurrences. As far as I am aware, the only text siding with the Khotanese verse is the Chinese *Ekottarika-Āgama*, in which the same dogmatic quartet is enumerated as the beginning and end of the teachings’ (法本末):

今有四法本末，如來之所說。云何為四? 一切諸行無常。是謂初法本末，如來之所說。一切諸行無常。是謂第二法本末，如來之所說。一切諸行無常。是謂第三法本末，如來之所說。涅槃為永寂。是謂第四法本末，如來之所說。[T125, 2.640b13-18]

Now, there are four [propositions which form] the beginning and end of the teachings, preached by the Tathāgata. What are the four? All the conditioned states are impermanent (sarvasamskārā anityāh). This is the first [proposition which forms] the beginning and end of the teachings, preached by the Tathāgata. All the conditioned states are woe-afflicted (sarvasamskārā dukkhāh). This is the second [proposition which forms] the beginning and end of the teachings, preached by the Tathāgata. All the conditioned states are without Self (sarvasamskārā anātmānāh). This is the third [proposition which forms] the beginning and end of the teachings, preached by the Tathāgata. Nirvāṇa is eternally tranquil (sāntam nirvāṇam). This is the fourth [proposition which forms] the beginning and end of the teachings, preached by the Tathāgata.

This reading is so rare that Étienne Lamotte considered it an error which

---

87. For a recent treatment of the imagery of the city of Nirvāṇa in Skt., Chin., and Toch. sources, see Habata 2015: 61–84. A comprehensive study taking the Khot. sources also into account is still a desideratum.

88. For an informative list of textual sources, in which the *dharmanādrās* occur with different numbers, see Lamotte 1970: (vol. 3) 1368ff., n. 1. See also Fujita 1975: 105–123.

89. Cf. also T125, 2.639a4–10.
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crept into this well-attested formula. However, taking into account that it occurs twice in the same Chinese text and is buttressed by the Khotanese parallel, a more plausible theory might be to regard it as evidence for a variant version of this proposition transmitted in the Mahāsāṃghika or Dharmaguptaka school, to which the Chinese Ekottarika-Āgama is traditionally attributed. Thus, it may not be far-fetched to argue that the Khotanese trident, who rendered the same variant into Khotanese, had access to some sources belonging to the same school.

The second case concerns three verses (henceforth verses α, β, γ) allegedly preached by the Buddha Maitreya to sentient beings:

α: aksūta vaysṇa narinde / haspāsta śāśiṇa balysā /
maranimju hatcañta hīno / kho ju hastā damānu ggaysingyo (= verse α)
abatanda byātāra śilā / hastamāna hāmīru /
hutashē kāmate keīta / tti hīv aymsū paīya (= verse β)
ce mara tye śāśiṇa balysā / abitandi māñīta vaysṇa /
jinda pu.ss ho harbiśi śaṃthka / dukhānu pāskalu yanda (= verse γ)


“(verse α:) Begin now to go out! Strive in the Buddha’s instruction (śāṣāṇa). Break up the army of death as an elephant a hut of reeds. (verse β:) May you be free from doubt, mindful, of excellent conduct. Think well-thought thoughts. Guard this your own mind. (verse γ:) One who now remains here in the instruction of this Buddha free from doubt will remove completely all births, will make an end of woes.” tr. Emmerick 1968: 331.

In fact, these verses are already well known under the preaching of the Buddha Śākyamuni, in light of their numerous occurrences in (para-)canonical literature in many classical languages of Buddhism.

90. See Lamotte 1970: (vol. 3) 136f. “Cette formule est apparentem fautive car ce ne sont pas seulement les saṃskāra, mais tous les dharma qui sont anātman.”

91. The school affiliation of the Chin. Ekottarika-Āgama is still open to dispute. Most scholars agree that its Indic Vorlage does not belong to the (Mula)saṃvātīvādins. In Japan, the attribution of this text to the Mahāsāṃghika has been proposed since the Tokugawa period, while some modern scholars also asserted a Dharmaguptaka origin. For an overview of various scholarly opinions, see Mayeda 1985: 127f. However, as Lamotte 1967: 106 correctly pointed out, there is no conclusive proof for any of these theories.

92. For different combinations of (two of) the three verses in various textual sources, see:


However, it is only in the Gāndhāra Dhammapada unearthed in Khotan that these verses occur in exactly the same order:

arahadha nikhamadha / yujatha budhaśaśaṇe /
dhuṇatha mucuno sena / naḍakara ba kuṇara (= verse α)
apramata svadimada / susīla bhodu bhikṣavi /
susamahida-sagapa / sacita anuraksadha (= verse β)
yo imasma dhama-vaṇa/i / apramatu vihašidi /
praha’i jadi-satsara / dukhusada kariṣadi (= verse γ)


(verse α:) Exert yourselves and go forth! Devote yourselves to the Buddha’s instruction (śāsana)! Destroy the army of death as an elephant a hut of reeds. (verse β:) Be vigilant, monks, mindful, of good conduct! With well-concentrated thought, guard [your] own mind! (verse γ:) One who will remain vigilant in this religious system (dhammavinaya), abandoning the transmigration in births, will put an end to woes.

Aside from some minor differences which can be explained away in one way or another,93 there is no significant discrepancy between both versions.

93. Verses α: [1] Gāndh. arabh- (Skt. ārabh-) was interpreted as ‘to exert oneself’ by Norman 1969: (vol. 1) 30, who probably followed the commentarial tradition (cf. Spk I 222 ad SN I 156: ārabhatha ārambha-viriyam karotha “Put forth!” means “make an effort!”). But the common verb of this verb is of course ‘to start, initiate’. This is also how the Khot. and Toch. translators understood it; cf. Khot. āksuva- ‘to begin’ (impv. pl. nd. āksūta), TochA o-n- mid. ‘to begin’ (impv. mid. pl. posāc). [2] Gāndh. nikhamadha (Skt. nīkhamadha) is rendered as Khot. infinitive narinde ‘to go out’, which could easily be triggered by the fact that the root arabh- is frequently used with infinitive forms.

Verses β: [1] Khot. abatanda-, originally ‘free from doubt, unperplexed’ (derived from the root bitam- ‘to doubt, be perplexed’), also means ‘without lassitude, vigilant’ in the translation idiom, and thus often translates Skt. atandrita-, apramatta- ‘id.; see Suffixe: 260. [2] Khot. byāta(ga)raa- ‘mindful’, consisting of byāta- ‘memory’ and garaa- ‘maker’, forms a perfect match for Gāndh. svadimad- (Skt. smṛtimaṇḍ- ‘id.; therefore, the first pada of verses β is a verbatim rendering of v. 124α (not v. 126c) in the Khotan Dhammapada, pace Maggi 2017: 278. [3] Gāndh. bhodu is probably a variant for *bhotta (impv. pl. 2nd; cf. Pāli hotha) which has undergone an Umlaut caused by the preceding syllable, cf. bhikhu du (for
addition, the order in which the three verses are arranged in Zambasta 22 dovetails with the Khotan Dharmapada. If this commonality is not to be dismissed as fortuitous, it might be a plausible hypothesis that the Khotanese tradent also had at his disposal a copy of the Dharmapada very similar to, if not identical with, the one edited by John Brough, which is believed to have diffused to Khotan at the beginning of the Common Era. For the school affiliation of the Khotan Dharmapada, Brough excluded the (Mūla)sarvāstivāda, the Mahāsāṃghika, and the Theravāda, whose versions of this text are otherwise known; and considered the Dharmaguptaka and the Kāśyapīya, two schools which were active in Gandhara at that time, as the most likely candidates for the cradle of the Khotan Dharmapada. If that is true, texts transmitted by the same school could have been available to the Khotanese tradent who composed the Book of Zambasta.

The prestige of Khotan as “the stronghold and hearth of the Mahāyāna movement” puts the Śrāvakayāna substrate of Khotanese Buddhism in the shade. Nonetheless, both the Mahāsāṃghika and the Sarvāstivāda are mentioned in the Prophecy of the Li Country as Indian Mainstream schools which found patronage in ancient Khotan. Even though the legendary
di < iti, twice in the Khotan Dharmapada; see Brough 1962: 83, §25); for the interchange between the aspirated and unaspirated stops (including -d/-t : -dh/-th-) in the Khotan Dharmapada, see Brough 1962: 100f., §49.
94. For the date of the Khotan Dharmapada, Brough proposed the 2nd century CE on paleographic grounds, while admitting that more research is needed to provide reasons for possible revision; see Brough 1962: 55f. Gérard Fussman, with more caution, dated the Khotan Dharmapada to the time period between the late 1st century and the mid-3rd century AD in his reappraisal of Brough’s conclusion; see Fussman 1989: 436–439.
95. See Brough 1962: 44f. But more versions of Gândhāri Dharmapada have recently come to light. Hence, Harry Falk reminds us of the possibility that there might have been no fixed version of the text within a certain sectarian tradition; see Falk 2015: 24–26.
96. See Lamotte 1954: 392 (emphasis added): “C’est donc bien au Khotan et dans les régions immédiatement avoisinantes qu’il faut chercher, sinon le berceau, du moins la forteresse et le foyer du mouvement mahāyānistc.”
98. For the Sarvāstivādins in Khotan, cf. Li yul lung bstan pa: thog ma sputn ma mjal te / bzod pa gsol ba’i sar mjal mo ka ka ro nga zhes bgyi ba’i gtsug laq khang zhig btsigs nas / thog ma li yul du sarbatibād kyi sde theg pa chung ngu pa yang mkhan po ’phags pa samanta-siddhi las byung [ed. Emmerick 1967: 44] “On the spot where, not at first meeting, the brothers [i.e., king Viśa’ Dharma and his elder brother] asked for pardon, a [temple] called mjal-mo-ka-ro-ngag was built. Thus, through the abbot Ārya-Samantasiddhi, the Hinayānist sect of the Sarvāstivāda first appeared in the Li country.” tr. Emmerick 1967: 45.
account in the prophecy cannot be taken historically, the existence of monasteries affiliated with these schools in the Khotan region was probably not a figment of the story-teller's imagination. Thus, it is quite conceivable, as the evidence adduced above demonstrates, that some texts of these schools, along with the forebear of the *Nandimitrāvadāna*, circulated on the southern rim of the Tarim Basin before the late 5th century, and also found reception among Mahāyāna-minded Khotanese Buddhists, an audience such a patchwork as *Zambasta 22* might have targeted.

**A Separate Tradition in Dunhuang**

Some of the sixteen Elders are also mentioned in three Khotanese documents from Dunhuang, in which their names are embedded in the formula: namau N.N. sthirā namasū(m) 'I do homage to the venerable Elder N.N.' The three documents, namely Or. 8210/S. 2471 (henceforth doc. α), IOL Khot 83+84 (henceforth doc. β), IOL Khot S. 46 (henceforth doc. γ), contain idiosyncratic lists of the Elders. A synoptic comparison of these lists with that of the Khotanese *Nandimitrāvadāna* (SI 1929) yields the following table:

---

98. The two schools are said to have been introduced into Khotan during the reign of a certain Viśa’ Dharma, whose floruit is unknown. For a tentative genealogy of the kings mentioned in the *Li yul lung bstan pa*, see Emmerick 1967: 76f.

99. The monastery ‘Dro-tir or Drūttira seems to have existed until the demise of the Buddhist kingdom, since some monks from this monastery are mentioned in at least four documents from Dunhuang and Mazar Tagh (cf. Or. 8212/162, ll. 125, 160; Or. 12637/14.2, l. 2; IOL Khot S. 13, l. 43; and Pelliot chinois 2958, ll. 213, 225); see Kumamoto 1982: 148 and Skjærvø 2002: 52, 53, 124, 509. Though nothing bearing on the Mahāsāṃghika affiliation is mentioned in these documents, the monastery seems to have enjoyed royal favor until the late 10th century. In addition, the renowned pilgrim monk Xuanzang, according to his bio-hagiography, was accommodated in a temple of the Sarvāstivādins, when he arrived at Khotan in the early 7th century (cf. T2053, 50.251b12). Whether this temple is to be identified with the one mentioned in the *Li yul lung bstan pa* is questionable.

100. Some birch-bark fragments of the *Saṃyukta-Āgama* written in the Gilgit/Bamiyan type I (ca. 6th century; after Sander 1968: 134) were discovered in Khadalik by M.A. Stein; see la Vallée Poussin 1913: 569–580. See also Wille 2006: 49, §176 for a further fragment from the same manuscript. Viewed from the structure of the sūtras, these fragments do not seem to belong to the same school as the two Chin. versions of *Saṃyukta-Āgama*, which are hypothetically attributed to the Mūlasarvāstivāda and the Dhammaguptaka, respectively (Mayeda 1985: 99–101; Chung 2008: 11–25). But a certain affinity between the sūtras contained in these fragments and the *Khandha-Saṃyutta* of the *Saṃyutta-Nikāya* is discernible; see Chung 2008: 30–32.

101. Khot. namau (Skt. *nāma*) is not followed by a dative, as one would expect, but is used as a kind of honorific marker like ‘venerable’. A similar usage is also found with Bactr. ναμάω attested in two Buddhist documents; see Sims-Williams 2007: 174–177. Maggi considers it unnecessary to postulate a use of Khot. namau as an adjective but as a parenthesis ‘Homage!’; see Maggi 1997: 40.

102. For transcriptions and translations of the sources on which the table is based, see...
While docs. β and γ, despite minor variations here and there, seem to be not quite far removed from what we know from the extant versions of the *Nandimitrāvadāna*, the tradent of doc. α, who probably only remembered seven out of the sixteen Elders by name, made up more than half of the list by padding it with some other names well known in Buddhist literature. This is a good example of how fluid such a text as the *Nandimitrāvadāna* could have been, especially when it was (partially) adapted for a variety of religious

---


103. This is, of course, not 100% sure, since one folio with about five Elders' names is missing in doc. β, which also attests the hypercorrection of (A)bhedya to Bhaisajya. But in overall terms, the remaining part of this list seems to be quite in accord with the extant versions of the *Nandimitrāvadāna*. On the other hand, doc. γ, albeit complete, drops Bhadra from the list and adds Aniruddha instead.
practices. This fluid tradition, to which the three lists in Dunhuang might ultimately go back, was at the outset separate from that discussed in the preceding sections, insofar as it does not share the significant variant ‘Āśoka’, which is replaced by ‘Ajita’ in docs. β and γ.

None of the three Khotanese documents testifies to an independent cult of the Elders. In their specific context, homage is rendered to a Buddhist pantheon consisting of crores (koṭi) of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and Elders. It may be not insignificant that both doc. β (poṭhi-folios) and doc. γ (scroll), despite their different formats, are carefully written in formal script and adorned with artistic designs. The former, the colophon of which is unfortunately not preserved, looks unostentatious, blazoned with back-and-white flowers between the lines on the verso or miniature drawings of Buddhas on the left margin. But the latter, which is by far the longest among the Dunhuang manuscripts,\footnote{This long scroll (over 21 meters) is a composite manuscript which consists of five parts: \[1\] the *Buddhoṇiṣṇavijaya* and *Sitātapatrapa* (ll. 1–198), two *dhāraṇīs* in Skt.; \[2\] the *Bhadraṇīkāṣṭhā* (ll. 198–754) in Khot.; \[3\] the first *Deśāṇa* (ll. 755–831), a Khot. confession text doing homage to Buddhas; \[4\] the *Sumukhadhāraṇī* (ll. 832–1061) in Khot.; and \[5\] the second *Deśāṇa* (ll. 1062–1101), in Khot., homage to Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and Elders. The names of the Elders occur towards the end of the final part. High-quality photos of the lengthy manuscript are found in Takubo 1975: 46–118.} boasts such an opulent embellishment that a delicate silk painting was originally glued to the back of the scroll. The painting depicts a pair of confronted birds standing on flowers and holding budding branches in their beaks. The lavishness of doc. γ seems to hint at the status of the patron, whose name is mentioned in four colophons dated at different points in the same year. One of the colophons is written two lines below the hommage to the Elders and reads as follows:

\[
\text{tī kulyām bhaddrikālpau jastām ba'yāsam u baudhasatvām u arahamāmām sthirām hiye nāme śām khīnā Hvām}: \text{Saṃgākā pastī pide ba'yysye jsūnā prīyayā udiśāyī, jsūnnaī huṣyīye pīla akālamaraṇanai vyacchānde. nauda: sahaici salya dasamye māśīt 8 haḍai pūrvabhadrīva nākaṭṭārīva vi sācū āṇna dāse nauda: | : tī sām puṇa māṛa-pyārām jsa harmbrīhe. cu parya iṁde tīyām ga-viśeṣā' hamāte, cu jāmādā sāmānde tīyām jsīnna huṣyīye. tī sām puṇa hāyī naysādī hvārākyām bṛrārām jsa harmbrīhum. hambīstā stāmnaṃ ām ba'ysūśī pariṇāmām nauda: [ed. Skjærvø 2002: 549f., l. 1101–1106]}
\]

The superior chamberlain (Khot. śām-kiṇā, Chin. *shangqing* 上卿), Hvām Saṃgāka [by name], ordered the names of the crores of Buddhas of the auspicious eon (*bhadrakalpika*), Bodhisattvas, and Elders [who are] Arhats to be written, for the sake of the enjoyment of a long life. May his life be prolonged, and calamities and untimely death (*akālamaraṇa*) will vanish! Homage! In the Year of the Hare, on the 8th day of the 10th month under the lunar mansion (*nakṣatra*) Pūrvabhadrapada, it was completed in Sācū [i.e. Dunhuang; Chin. *shazhou* 沙州]. Homage!

In the same manner, I share the merits with my parents. Those who have passed away, may they have an excellent rebirth (*gati-viśeṣa*); those who are alive, may their life be prolonged. In the same manner, I share the merits with sisters and brothers near and far. Having shared [the merits], I develop myself towards the enlightenment. Homage!

The patron of doc. γ named Hvāṃ (i.e. Wang 王)\footnote{For the adoption of Chin. surnames by Khot. people who indigenously did not use} Saṃgāka was, in all
Figure 3 The long paper scroll (IOL Khot S 46) commissioned by Hvaṃ Sangaka, embellished with a painting of a pair of confronted birds, Dunhuang (mid-10th century). Photograph by M.A. Stein in *Serindia* (Oxford, 1921), vol. 4, pl. CXLVI.
likelihood, a high-ranking official at the court of Khotan, who seems to have been enthusiastic about commissioning such artifacts, as is evident also from a Dunhuang painting of Vaiśravaṇa (Pelliot tibétain o821) made at his behest. All the artifacts related to him are dated in a certain ‘Year of the Hare’, which James Hamilton identified with 943 CE. According to the colophons, Samgaka probably spent the most part of that year in Dunhuang, whither he was probably sent as an envoy of the king Viśa’ Sambhava (aka Li Shengtian 李聖天; r. 912–966). As the colophon translated above demonstrates, what lay closest to Samgaka’s heart was his own longevity and the well-being of his parents and siblings, whether departed or alive. The pantheon, of which the sixteen Elders form an indispensable part, was believed to be instrumental in delivering on his wishes, as long as these Buddhist deities were propitiated with their names recited or copied. More or less the same use can be postulated for doc. 5, which was, nevertheless, commissioned by a donor with a relatively modest budget.

The case of doc. α appears to be a bit different. In this scroll, the Khotanese texts are written on the back of a Chinese scripture, which is meticulously copied in neat handwriting. By contrast, the Khotanese texts, which are likely to postdate the Chinese by centuries, give the impression of a sloppy hand. Having compared one of these texts with its parallel version, Duan Qing has detected numerous scribal errors, and occasionally lapsus calami, which go so far as to leave out an entire sentence. The seeming slackness of the copyist

surnames, see Wen 2016: 73–98. Interestingly, some 12th-century descendants of the Khotanese royal house, who survived the Karakhanid conquest and served the Jurchen dynasty, chose Wang as their surname (p. 93). It is not impossible that the Samgaka in question may also have stemmed from the royal family in Khotan.

106. See Dudbridge/Emmerick 1978: 283–285. In addition to a Khot. colophon, the painting of Vaiśravaṇa is inscribed with two syntactically awkward Chin. colophons, cf. 王上卿天王一心供養 ‘The superior chamberlain Wang, [to] the heavenly king, wholeheartedly offered.’ and 一心供養張儒者 ‘wholeheartedly offered the confucianist Zhang’. In the first colophon, we probably have the Chin. counterpart of Hvāṃ śām-khūṭā attested.

107. See Hamilton 1979: 53f. on the basis of Roger Billard’s examination of the lunar mansions (nakṣatra) mentioned in three colophons of doc. γ.

108. The Khot. inscription on the painting of Vaiśravaṇa is dated in the 3rd month of 943, and the four colophons of doc. γ in the 5th, 9th, and 10th month, respectively.

109. To be exact, the 487th fascicle of the Da banruo boluomiduo jing 大般若波羅蜜多經 / *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra translated by Xuanzang (cf. T220, 7, 472b9–477c14), the rightmost portion of the scroll is cut off, while a piece of this portion is found in Pelliot chinois 5536. To the left of the end of the Chin. text, there are two lines of a Khot. inscription (Skjærvø 2002: 27, b1–2), which turns out to be the opening formula of the Aparimitāyūḥsūtra, one of the Khot. texts copied on the back.

110. See Duan 1992: 23 (emphasis added): “Von diesem Teil des Manuskripts kann wirklich nicht behauptet werden, daß es von einem gewissenhaften Schreiber stammt. Viele Fehler sind ihm unterlaufen, und manchmal wird ein ganzer Satz vermißt ... S 2471 scheint eher eine gedankenlose Abschrift zu sein; es hat mehr absurde Schreibfehler, durch die ein Satz völlig unverständlich wird ...” This observation is mainly based on the second part of this composite manuscript (ll. 92–228), i.e., a copy of the Khot. Aparimitāyūḥsūtra, which is
INTRODUCTION (Khot.)

leads her to surmise that, when the Khotanese side of the scroll was written, its orthography and content were no longer considered a critical factor in accruing the merit, and what mattered for the copyist was to copy as many texts as possible within the stipulated time.iii This may be possible, but the formal difference between doc. α and doc. γ, in spite of their partly overlapping content, may also be accounted for through the disparity in rank between their donors. The donor of doc. α, Hüyi Kima-tcūna by name, was likely to be an official on the prefecture levelii who was subordinate to Saṃgaka, the patron of doc. γ. What the official wished to achieve by having the second-rate copy made finds its expression in the following colophon separated from the mutated list of Elders by a dhāraṇī:

\[ ttu \text{ sûtra } u \text{ baudasatva } hōye \text{ nāmi } k{\alpha} \text{ beysā } hōye \text{ nāme } Hüyi Kima tcūna pasta pi\text{đe beysu\text{ś}ta } brīye \text{ jsinai } hūṣi \text{ pilai } vyechide \text{ tta } štau \text{ pū\text{ṇ}a } kūsalamū{l}(a) \text{ mistye } rraispūrā fimana habrihū \text{ ga-vaṣeṣa } \text{ hamāve} || || \text{ [ed. Skjærvø 2002: 31, ll. 88–91 = Duan 1992: 76, III§71f.]} \]

Hüyi Kima-tcūna ordered the sûtra, the names of the Bodhisattvas, and the names of the Buddhas to be written for the love of the enlightenment. May his life be prolonged, and calamities will vanish! In the same manner, I share the merits and wholesome potentialities with the great prince Jina, may there be an excellent rebirth [for him]!

This formula is quite similar to that in doc. γ. We may safely infer from the final sentence that a prince named Jina had just passed away when the copy was made. The prince Jina is otherwise unknown in the Khotanese sources that have come down to us, hence it remains uncertain to which of the four 10th-century Khotanese kings he was born, not to mention when and where he died. He could have been one of the Khotanese princes sojourning in Dunhuang, where his untimely death occurred and was lamented by the envoy Kima-tcūna. But it is also possible that the message of the prince’s death in Khotan had reached Dunhuang, where Kima-tcūna, due to his diplomatic mission, could not go back to attend the funeral and thus dedicated part of the merit accrued from copying the names of the Buddhas etc. to the deceased. However, as in the case of Saṃgaka, Kima-tcūna wished, more than anything else, for his own longevity. It is also in this connection understandable that Kima-tcūna chose the Aparimitāyūhsūtra, a dhāraṇī-text which was invested with the power to prolong the human lifespan, as the second text to be copied in this scroll. In order to fulfill his hopes, Kima-tcūna took refuge in a Buddhist pantheon similar to that of

flanked by two homage texts (ll. 2–91 and 229–284), in which not only Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, Elders, but also miscellaneous deities and spirits are invoked.

111. See Duan 1992: 23.

112. Two titles of the donor are attested in doc. α, namely sau and ttūtēvā (ll. 222, 225). Wen 2008: 127–133 tentatively suggests the former to be identified with Chin. zhishi 知事 ‘administrative clerk’, with an additional remark that the functions and powers of (ś)saū are not clear at all in the case of 10th-century documents from Dunhuang. The second title is undoubtedly a transcription of Chin. dutou 都頭 ‘area commander (equivalent to general)’; see Haloun apud Bailey 1943: 600.
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Samgaka. The only difference might be that Kīma-tcūna’s pantheon was a bit more fluid, insofar as it contains names of some ‘Buddhas’ unknown in Indic sources, which are likely to be attributed to a local tradition.\(^{113}\) The same fluidity is also characteristic of the list of the sixteen Elders in doc. \(\alpha\), which, as mentioned above, has undergone considerable substitution and reshuffle. It seems that the Elders were broadly construed as a group of sixteen tutelary figures, the individual names of which were often subject to alteration and had little impact on the efficacy of the donation.

In sum, there is no evidence for an independent cult of the sixteen Elders among the Khotanese-speaking Buddhists in Dunhuang during the 10th century. Be that as it may, several lists of the Elders, which might have been derived from a tradition different from that in Khotan proper, were transmitted in a number of homage or confession texts, in which they were incorporated into a Buddhist pantheon of tutelary divinities. Those texts were produced at the behest of donors who prayed for the longevity of themselves and the well-being of the deceased in the afterlife. Those wishes, commonplace as they may sound, were especially meaningful at a time when Khotan and its neighboring regions were plunged into the maelstrom of war and the society was in turmoil. As in the auspicious images from Dunhuang which often depict the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas frequenting Khotan,\(^{114}\) we see in those Khotanese documents an ardent desire not only to make spiritual beings present but also to resort to “many sources for spiritual sustenance, hope, relief, or defense” (Carrithers 2000: 834). Such a predisposition toward polytropy\(^{115}\) was especially understandable in a social setting, in which contingency loomed so large that people were wont to rely on as many suppliers as possible for their day-to-day needs, both economic and political. Viewed from this perspective, the Elders were but one of the religious associates with whom the Khotanese-speaking Buddhists in 10th-century Dunhuang were in continued communion.

113. The peculiar local ‘Buddhas’ attested in doc. \(\alpha\) are discussed in detail by Duan 1992: 28–34. Some of the local ‘Buddhas’ are also named in IOL Khot S. 12 (Ch\textsuperscript{2}68).
114. For the illustrations of auspicious images from Dunhuang and their socio-historical background, see Soymié 1984: 77–102, and Zhang/Rong 1993: 212–279.
115. For the term ‘polytropy’ and the features that differentiate it from ‘religious tolerance’ or ‘inclusivism’, see Carrithers 2000: 831–837.
Transcription

1 ¶ tta-ṁ pyuśṭā khu jastā ba'[ys]ā mahāparinirvā[ni] samāhān[i]
   samā[va][ā]† yuḍā khvī 800 salī parrye ttu bāḍī sūrāst[rā]² kṣīra rr re yve
   [vajra]s[em] nāma yve³ vara ttiṇa kṣ[i]ra kukkan.[t].rā[m].⁴

2 nāma tye samkhāraṁ vara ttiṇa sam[kherma] naṃdāmitṛ nāma tye
   arahaṃḍi kṣa abhijñi busti tcāhaura dhyāna haṣṭa vimaṃkṣa sa gampha⁵
   haṃḍārāṁ aṣmū paysāndi⁶ audi⁷ mujakāṁ vi buri aṣmū paysāndi kā
   [ha]di⁸ tye naṃdāmitṛ arahaṃ-

3 di parinirvāṁ bāḍī himye tti + pharāka śamanā haṃgriya ttye arahaṃḍi ta
   hvādi midāṃṃi khu thu paranirvi cirvā dari baysūṃṇi śāśāṃ hamrāṣṭi ṣṭi
   arahaṃḍ-ūṁ [tta] hve brātaryau tvā rve + + śca⁹ paśya khu baysā na-ra
   parinī[rv]ye āyy tti sāṃ [śā] +¹⁰

4 kṣaṣe mahāśāvā yṣiṃṇi hauḍa u jastāṃ nātāṃ jaṃbviyāṃ rrāṃdām"⁴
   śadāṃ dāṃnāvāṁ dānāvāṁ [d]ām²¹ [tt]i bīṣṭi braṣṭāṃdi midāṃṇi pisā ni

---
1. mahāparānīrṇāṇi [sa]māḥ[ā]na samā + + Leumann; mahā + + + + + + hāna sam. + ja
   Emmerick.
2. surāst[rā] Leumann & Emmerick.
3. tye Leumann & Emmerick.
4. ku .au + rā + Leumann; ku .auṭarā + Emmerick.
5. sa + ha Leumann & Emmerick.
6. paryāmsāyī Leumann & Emmerick. The akṣara -yṣāṃ- is written in such an
   extravaganț, idiosyncratic form that both Leumann and Emmerick read it as -ryaṃsā-.  
7. odi Emmerick.
8. + sāṃgikā haḍi Leumann; + + + + + + Emmerick.
9. tvā + + kāṣca Leumann. The -v- of -rve is written with an open oval similar to -ṭ-.
10. + + Leumann & Emmerick.
11. rr[u]ṃḍaṁ Leumann.
12. śadā dān.vaṁ dānāvāṁ .ām Leumann; padāryā + + dānāvāmāṇām Emmerick. The
   akṣara that I read [d]ām appears in a triangular form, which may possibly be attributed to
   a spot at the lower right corner.
muhu ttyām sthīrā nāma bhāmaṁ ne\textsuperscript{13} diśa paysāṁnāṁ ku ā'ra\textsuperscript{14}
arahāṃd-ūṁ tta hve ays-ā[ū]m [n]āma bve\textsuperscript{15} di-

5 śa-m paysāmn[ū]m\textsuperscript{16} paḍauyāsā sthīrī pimdaul[a]\textsuperscript{17}-bharadvāji nāma
gauyāṃni āsti uspurrayau yseryau arahāṃdyayau haṃtsa śācamuni bayśā
parauna\textsuperscript{18} ays-ūṁ namasūṁ vanūṁ 1,000 śye sthīrī kanakavatsī nāma
kaśmīri āsti paṃjūm

6 tta tta hveñai khu paḍ[ā]s[ye]\textsuperscript{19} 200 didi sthīrī kānaka-bharadvāji nāma
pūrvadī āsti 300 tçūrām\textsuperscript{20} abhiji uttarū āsti 400 pūhi bakkulā nāma mara
jaṃbviya āsti 500 kṃṣemī kāXi\textsuperscript{21} nāma semkhaladvipi\textsuperscript{22} āstā

7 600 haudami bhadṛ nāma ttāmravrānṇikadvipi āstä 700 haṣṭaṁ vajraput[r]\textsuperscript{23}
nāma yamunavrānṇikadvipi āstä 800 naumā gaupāki nāma ga(ṃ)dhamāyaṁ
garā vī āsti 900 dasami rā-

8 huli ttrayastrīṁśvā āsti cv-ī vasva śakri jasti saṃkharāṁ + .[ā]\textsuperscript{24} 1,000
śūdasam(ṃ)\textsuperscript{25} pa[m]tha\textsuperscript{26} prabhaṁkaradvipa āsti 1 100 || dvāsaṁ nāgasem

\textsuperscript{13} bvā[ma]ne Leumann.
\textsuperscript{14} [p]aysāṁnmāka ār. Leumann & Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{15} ays. + + + Leumann; aysaṁ [dā] + Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{16} + aṃ paysām[ne] Leumann; .e aṃ paysām[ṇ]aṃ Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{17} pimdaul[ṇu] Leumann & Emmerick. The akṣara that I read -[a] rather than -[nu] is
written in a slightly lower position than usual so as to avoid clash with the descending
akṣara in line 4 above it.
\textsuperscript{18} paḍauna Leumann & Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{19} hve .ai thu + dā .e Leumann; hve ūnai thu paḍārye Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{20} tçūrā Leumann.
\textsuperscript{21} kānṭhi Leumann & Emmerick. Though the second akṣara resembles -nthi, the received
reading is not to be followed because consonant clusters -NC- (N = n/ṇ/ṅ) are consistently
written as -mC- in this inscription. The name of the Elder is otherwise attested in Khot. as
kāḍa-/ika-, but the shape of the akṣara does not seem to support such a reading.
\textsuperscript{22} sīṃkhaldadvipi Leumann & Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{23} vajraputta Leumann & Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{24} śivavaknāki jasti saṃkhār[amā] Leumann & Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{25} sūdasaṁ Leumann.
kailāśā gari vś āsti 1 200 || draisaṃ\textsuperscript{27} amgāł[ā]\textsuperscript{28} gṛdhakū-

9 li gari vś āsti 1 300 tcahaulasaṃ śānāvāsā uṣay[ā] gari vś āsti 1 400

pamjspūsaṃ āsauk[i] [ma](hā)pāmdari\textsuperscript{29} gari vś āsti (1 500) [ksasa]m
[cū]dāpam[th]aị\textsuperscript{30} vaidehī\textsuperscript{31} garā vś ā-

10 sti uspurryau [kṣa]sā-seyau arahaṃdyau śācamuni baysā parauya\textsuperscript{32} biṣūṃ
hā aysā nāmasūṃ vanūṃ 1 600

\textsuperscript{26}. + + Leumann; [paṃṭhi] Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{27}. drraisaṃ Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{28}. The reading of the middle syllable -gā- is uncertain, for there is a third dot above the double dot. Does it indicate the removal of the double dots, and thus *aṃgālā? 
\textsuperscript{29}. + + paḍari Leumann; (maḥā)[paḍari] Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{31}. vaideh[ā] Leumann & Emmerick.
\textsuperscript{32}. paḍauya Leumann & Emmerick.
[A1]

\[\text{tta-ṃ pyuṣṭā. khu jastā ba'ysā mahāparinirvāṇi samāhāni samāvajā yuḍā, khvī 800 sali parrye, ttu bāḍi Sūraṣṭrā kṣira rre vye, Vajrasem nāma vye. vara ttiṇa kṣira Kukk(u)ṭ(ā)rām(a) nāma 'vye saṃkhāram. vara ttiṇa saṃkherma Naṃdamiṭ nāma 'vye arahamdi. kṣa abhijñi busti, tcahaura dhyāna, haṣṭa vimaukṣa. sa gampha haṃdārām aysmū paysāṃdi, audi mujakāṃ vi buri aysmū paysāṃdi.}\]

\[\text{3. vye] em.; tye Insc. 4. vye] em.; tye Insc.}\n
\[\text{1–2 Cf. Tib. [A1: 1–2]: Thus have I heard: 800 years have elapsed since the Blessed One passed into Nirvāṇa.}\n\[\text{Cf. also Chin. [A1: ]: “Voici ce que rapporte la tradition. Dans les huit cents années qui suivirent le Parinirvāṇa du Bouddha Bhagavat ...” tr. Lévi/Chavannes 1916: 6.}\n\[\text{4–6 Cf. Tib. [A1: 4–8]: A monk by the name of Nandimitra dwelt – He was absorbed in the eight emancipations (aṣṭavimokṣadhyāyin), endowed with the six extraordinary faculties (saḍabhiṃja) ... He knew the mental behavior (cittacarita) of sentient beings – even of ants and small insects (antataḥ kuntapiṇḍikānām api) – living within a distance of many hundred thousand leagues (yojana).}\n\[\text{Cf. also Chin. [A1: ]: “il y avait un arhat nommé Nandimitra. Il avait au complet les huit Délivrances (vimukti), les trois Sciences (vidyā), les six Pénétrations (abhijñā) ... Par la force de la Connaissance du vœu, il pouvait connaître les sentiments et les actes de toute sorte de tous les êtres vivants (sattva) qui sont en ce monde.” tr. Lévi/Chavannes 1916: 6.}\n
[A2]

kā haḍi ttye Naṃdamiṭ araḥaṃdi parinirvāṃ bāḍi himye, tti (vā) pharāka ṣamana haṃgriya, ttye araḥaṃdi ta hvādi: midiṃmi, khu thu paranirvi, cirvā
dāri baysūṃní šāsāṃ hamraṣṭi ṣti? araḥaṃd-ūṃ tta hve: brātaryau, tvā rve(ñā)
(kā)ṣca paśya! khu baysā na-ra parinirvyē yā, tti jṣāṃ sā(śaṃ) kṣāse mahāṣāvā
ysiṃni hauḍa, u jastāṃ nātāṃ jaṃbviyāṃ rāṃdāṃ ṣadāṃ dāṃnavaṃ

{dānavaṃ} dāṃ.

3–6 Cf. Tib. [A2: 3–8]: He (i.e. Nandimitra) said: “Good people (bhadrāmukhāḥ), be without fear and do not lament nor wail! Why? Because when the Blessed One was about to completely pass into Nirvāṇa, he entrusted the true teachings to the hands of the sixteen Great Elders (mahāsthavīra), for the purpose of fully purifying the gifts of patrons and donors (dāyaṃkāraṃpatīnāṃ).

Cf. also Chin. [A2]: “Le Vénérable leur dit: «... Le Bouddha Bhagavat au moment de son Parinirvāṇa a confié la Loi sans supériorité à seize grands Arhat et à leur entourage, en leur ordonnant de la protéger de façon à ce qu’elle ne fût pas détruite. Il leur ordonna de faire en personne et avec les bienfaiteurs (dānapati) un véritable champ de bonheur (punyakṣetra), de façon à ce que ces bienfaiteurs obtinissent la récompense du grand fruit.»” tr. Lévi/Chavannes 1916: 8–9.

Cf. also Zambasta 22.95cd–96: umā ttā śūṣam nu yṣānyu dastu viḍi paśṣimā. tto ttā biśśā ggāṭhā yṣāṇā kye mamā śūṣāni śṣadda. ka ni trānu daksinā śūḥātu ku parśiṇdi dukhyau jṣa. [The Buddha Śākyamuni spoke to the sixteen Elders:] “I leave thisŚāsana entrusted in your hand. Thus have all these householders who are faithful in my Śāsana been entrusted to you. May you purify their gift so that they may escape from woes.” tr. Emmerick 1968: 303 (modified; for daksinā śūḥ-‘to purify the gift’ see below p. 169, fn. 13).
[B1 + C1]

tti biṣṭi braṣṭāṃdi: miḍaṃni pisā, ni muhu ttyāṃ sthīrā nāma bvāmaṃ, ne diśa paysāṃnām ku ā'ra. arahamd-ūṃ tta hve: ays-ūṃ nāma bve, diṣа-ṃ paysāṃnūṃ. paḍauysā sthīri Piṃḍaula-Bharadvāji nāma Gaṇyāṃni āsti, uspurryau yserau arahamdyau haṃtsa, Śācamuni baysā parauna. ays-ūṃ namasūṃ vanūṃ 1000. śye sthīri Kanakavatsi nāma Kaṃṣiri āsti, paṃjūṃ.

tta tta hveṇai khu paḍājsye 200.

1–2 Cf. Tib. [B1: 2–3 + C1: 2–3]: The monks said to ... Nandimitra thus: “Elder, we do not know those Elders’ names!” ... “Elder, we also do not know where those Elders dwell.”
  Cf. also Chin. [B1: + C1]: “... la grande assemblée demanda derechef: «Les seize grands Arhat dont vous avez parlé, nous ne savons pas quels sont leur noms.» ... «Nous ne savons pas en quel endroit demeuraient généralement les seize Vénérables, gardant et maintenant la vraie Loi et se rendant utiles aux êtres vivants.»” tr. Lévi/Chavannes 1916: 9, 10.
  3 For the name Piṃḍaula-Bharadvāja in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.93: pātcu vā balysā sthaviru gurṣte Baradvāju ttu kālu “Afterwards, the Buddha addressed the Elder Bharadvāja at that time.” tr. Emmerick 1968: 303; cf. also
    IOL Khot 84/1, r1: namau Piṃḍūra-Bharadvāgyq sthirā namasūṃ.
    IOL Khot S. 46, 1093: namau Piṃḍūra-Bharadvājā sthirā namasūṃ ||
  5 For the name Kanakavatsa in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.94a: Kanakavatsu; and
    IOL Khot 84/1, r2: namau Kanakavatsi sthirā namasūṃ.
    IOL Khot S. 46, 1093–4: namau Kanakavatsā sthirā namasūṃ ||
RECONSTRUCTION (Khot.)

[B1 + C2]

didi sthīri Kānaka-Bharadvāji nāma Pūrvadvī āsti 300. tcūraṃ Abhiji Uttarū āsti 400. pūhi Bakkulā nāma mara Jāmbvīya āsti 500. kṣemi ṚKāḍi nāma

3 Seṃkhaladvipī āstā 600. haudami Bhadṛ nāma Ttāmravarṇikadvipī āstā 700. haṣṭāṃ Vajrapuṭṛ nāma Yamunavarṇikadvipī āstā 800.

______________________________

2 Kāḍi] em. from kāXī (the illegible consonant [cluster] X is certainly not ḍ-).


1b For the name Abhija in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.95a: Abiju; and IOL Khot 84/1, v2: namau <A>bhai{ṣa}jā sthirā namasūṃ. IOL Khot S. 46, 1094: namau Abhijā sthirā namasum || See Skjærvø 2002: 388, 633.


[B2 + C3]

naumā Gaupākī nāma Ga(m)dhamāyāṃ garā vī āsti 900. dasami Rāhuli

Ttrayastrīṃśvā āsti cv-ī vasva Śakri jasti saṃkhāraṃ (aś)tā 1000. śūdasa(m)

3 Panṭhai ʿPrabhaṃkaradvipi āsti 1100. dvāsaṃ Nāgām Sen Kailāsā gari vī āsti 1200. draiṣaṃ Aṃgālā Gṛdhakūlā gari vī āsti 1300. tcahaulasāṃ ʿVānāvāśā Uṣayā gari vī āsti 1400.

---------------------------


1a For the name Gaupāka in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.93d: Ggaupaku; and
1b For the name Rāhula in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.94c: Rāhulu; and
IOL Khot S. 46, 1996-7: namau Rāhulā sthīrā nāmasūṃ ||
Or.8210/S.2471, v78-79: namau Rāhula sthīrā nāmasū:
3a For the name Paṃtha in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.94d: Pantho; and
3b For the name NāgaSenā in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.94d: Nāgasenu; and
4a For the name Aṃgālā in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.93c: Ḫṅaṇu; and
4b For the name Vānāvāśa in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.93c: Vānapāyasu; and
IOL Khot 84/2, ri: namau Vanāvāsā sthīrā nāmasūṃ.
IOL Khot S. 46, 1998: namau Va(na)vāśā sthīrā nāmasūṃ ||
Or.8210/S.2471, v76: namau Vanāvāsā sthīrā nāmasū:
[B2 + C4]

paṃjsusāṃ Aśauki Ma(hā)pā(m)dari gari vī āsti (1500). kṣasāṃ Cūḍapāṁthai

Vaidehi garā vī āsti, uspurryau kṣasā-seyau arahaṃdyau, Śācamuni baysā

3 parauya. biśūṃ hā aysā namasūṃ vanūṃ 1600.

---

1 For the name Aśauka in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.93d: Aśāukau; but cf.
   IOL Khot 84/2, r1–2: namau Ajittā sthīrā namasūṃ.
   IOL Khot S. 46, 1998: namau Ajittā sthīrā namasūṃ ||
2 For the name Cūḍapāṁtha in Khot., cf. Zambasta 22.94d: Cūḍapantho; and
   IOL Khot 84/2, r2–vi: namau Cūḍapathai sthīrā namasūṃ .. ||
   IOL Khot S. 46, 1999: namau Cūḍapathai sthīrā namasūṃ ||
   Or.8210/S.2471, v77: namau Cūḍāpatai sthīrā namasū :
Thus have I heard: ¹ When the Lord Buddha had attained the meditative state [called] the Great Complete Nirvāṇa (mahāparinirvāṇa),² [and] when for him 800 years elapsed. At that time, in the country of Surāṣṭra, there was a king, he was Vajrasena by name.³ In that country, there was a monastery

---

¹ For the problematics of the opening formula, see above pp. 25f.
² See also the opening paragraph of the Khot. Aśokāvadāna 1.2–5: kha 'śi 'nāmau dāśabhāla-cakravartā Śākyumunī gyastāṃ na yaśā bāyāṃna kīrā dāse yude [...] tī tūṣāni ūśihe te c'cī nirmajja ānyā yimaka-sālyām di bahyāṃ stāma mihāparinirvāma nāmma simāhām simāvāse'. khvai padausyā sāṇā sīvī parya. "When – Homage! – the emperor of the world possessing the ten powers (dāśabala-cakravartin), the Lord of Lords Siddha Śākyamuni had completed [his] works as a Buddha … Then he deigned to go right to the bank of the Nairāṇjanā river. Staying under the twin sāla trees (yamaka-sāla), he attained the [state of] concentration called ‘complete extinction’ (mahāparinirvāna), when for him the night passed beyond the first watch." [Dragoni 2014: 27, 39].

³ For the problematics of the opening formula, see above pp. 25f.

It seems to be an idiosyncrasy of the Khot. tradition that the Buddha's parinirvāna is referred to as a meditative state (Khot. samākāna < Skt. samādhi). In most of the versions of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra of the Dirgha-Āgama that have come down to us, the Buddha's parinirvāna was preceded by his successive attainment of the four stages of meditative contemplation (dhyāna) and the five states of consciousness (vijñānasthiti) of arūpa. But the attainment of the highest state of consciousness did not lead to his passing into Nirvāna; instead he traversed all the stages backwards to the first dhyāna, and attained the four dhyānas for the second time, and this time, he passed into Nirvāna from the fourth dhyāna. See Waldschmidt 1948: 250f. Despite the close connection with the attainment in meditation practice, nowhere else is the Buddha's parinirvāna, as far as I am aware, explicitly referred to as a meditative state. It is not impossible that the Khot. idiosyncrasy might have something to do with the Mahāyāna idea that the Buddha did not pass away but persisted, as attested in a number of Mahāyāna sūtras transmitted to Khotan. This idea entails an explanation of the extinction of the Buddha which is too well-known in the Mainstream canonical sources to gloss over. In that case, a possible explanation would be that the Buddha was not “dead” but absorbed in a meditative state, as is the case with Mahākāśyapa awaiting the arrival of Maitreya in Kukkuṭapāda. There are a number of texts mentioning Mahākāśyapa’s absorption in a preserving meditative state, including the 22nd chapter of the Book of Zambasta (in all likelihood, composed in Khotan), cf. 22.281–282: hamata śāndā rāṭā tu yande gharu sārbiye kādā māstā. myāhīṃ tṛṃkhānu samāhāṇa Mahākāśiye āste. hamata gharu kukuṭapādaya pakūtāte Mumrai balysā. sthavāřa yuṣṭhahāte samāhāṇa balysā po 'namastā. “The earth itself will split apart and a very large mountain will rise up. Amid its peaks, Mahākāśyapa will be sitting in meditation. The Buddha Maitreya himself will knock upon Mount Kukkuṭapāda. The Elder will rise up from meditation. He will worship at the Buddha’s feet." [Emmerick 1968: 330–333]. With regard to the question whether Mahākāśyapa was dead or absorbed in meditation, various traditions offer different answers, see Tournaire 2014: 15.

³ Vajrasena is otherwise once attested as the name of a king ruling in Šrāvastī, see PW s.v.
called Kukkuṭārāma. There, in that monastery, there was an Arhat by the name of Nandamitra. He realized the six extraordinary faculties (abhijñā), the four states of contemplation (dhyāna), [and] eight emancipations (vimokṣa). He knew the mind of others within a distance of one hundred leagues (yojana), he knew every sentient being’s mind up to that of ants (pipilika).

[A2]
When the time came for the Arhat to pass into complete Nirvāṇa, many monks then assembled [and] said to the Arhat thus: “Gracious one! When you pass into complete Nirvāṇa, how long will the Buddha’s teachings constantly exist?” The Arhat said to them thus: “[My] brethren! Let go of this anxiety [that is] to be removed!

---

4. Kukkuṭārāma is the name of a grove near Gayā, see PW s.v. Here, the monastery was named after the celebrated hermitage in India. As Richard Salomon points out, there was a custom, especially in Gandhāra, of naming monastic institutions after sacred spots in the homeland of Buddhism, see Salomon 1999: 213; Tarzi/Salomon/Strauch 2015: 151.

5. For the three items, see Mvy 202–209 (abhijñā), 1478–1481 (dhyāna), 1511–1518 (vimokṣa); and BHSD s.v. abhijñā, dhyāna, vimokṣa.

6. For OKhot. hamdāra- see Skjærvø 2004: vol. 2, 361. The difference between hamdāra- and handara- ‘other’ is not quite clear to me. In some cases, they seem to be interchangeable. For some other occurrences of LKhot. hamdāra- used in lieu of OKhot. handara-, see DKS s.v. handāra-.

7. This sentence was neither translated by Leumann nor by Emmerick. The main difficulty that prevented them from making sense of it is the enigmatic reading sa + ha, which, in light of the Tib. parallel, should be corrected to sa gampha (~ OKhot. sate ggampha). Here the phrase is obviously used as “accusative of extent”, see Emmerick 1965: 26, §II.4.

8. For telepathy or mind-reading (ādesāna) as one of the three miracles (prāthihārya) exhibited by the Buddha, see BHSD s.v. ādesāna, prāthihārya. A similar expression is found in a passage from the Faji jing / *Dharmasangitiśūtra translated by Bodhiruci (early 5th cent.), where the main topic is about the ten kinds of sovereignty (aśvarya) to be attained by the Bodhisattva: 又得心自在。云何心自在？乃至蚊虻蜲子行知心故。[T76, 17.641a22f.] ‘Again, [the Bodhisattva] attains sovereignty over the mind (citta). Why [is his] sovereignty over the mind? Because [he] knows the mental activities (cittacarita) even of mosquitoes, gadflies, and ants.’

9. For the expression kāscā- paśś- ‘to let go of or give up anxiety’, cf. Zambasta 5.1b: puṣṣo paśśāta handare kāce “Give up utterly other anxieties.” [Emmerick 1968: 96–97]. The term
kāścā- ‘anxiety, grief’ occurs repeatedly in a context dealing with the perturbation of all sentient beings who were yearning for the Buddha when the latter was no more in Jambudvipa, cf. Zambasta 23.24–28: [ham] gargaṛṣṭa harbiśśā hayūrīne khana bāśśā panaśte. panye ttera kāśca uysnorā samu kho tye ci māta mide, jūhānā storu uysnora balsyu vāte kāścāna ysiru palisāṛṣṭa harbiśśā hva’ndā mari a’gye dvate yaksā. cu ttā thaṇa cakrama līṇ ku śa pāḍā balsyu dītāndā. ku-m tūssā balsyāna daindā bīśśā nā ysiru brūscāte kāśca. Udayanī rundi bihiya atī ysiru nuṣṭhura kāśca, atī kāde jūhāte balsyā. nai ne ysirā ēśṭātu yīndi. myaño anddvāro āste. balsyu vāte jūhāte ānī. cīi rīne śśāṣṭā yanindā kāścāi ju kari nā vaihindā. “All gatherings, pleasures, laughter, jokes had disappeared. The anxiety of every being was as great as that of one whose mother is dying. Beings were greatly yearning for the Buddha, anxious. Fiercely tormented were all men, deities residing here, Yakṣas. Because these are the places, spots for walking about, cells where formerly they saw the Buddha, when they see them without the Buddha, anxiety utterly afflicts their heart. King Udayana had extraordinary, very fiercely bitter anxiety. Very greatly does he yearn for the Buddha. His heart cannot endure it. He sits in the midst of the harem. He is yearning for the Buddha. Whatever services the queens perform for him, his anxiety does not disappear at all.” [Emmerick 1968: 346–347]. It transpires from this passage that the term has a specific connotation of mental uneasiness caused by the absence of the Buddha in Jambudvipa. Therefore, it also makes good sense in the present context where the monks’ apprehension is caused by the imminent disappearance of the Buddha’s teachings. The Khot. passage finds parallel in the Dasheng zaoxiang gongde jing 大乘造像功德經, a unique text translated by the Khotanese monk Devendraprajña (for the Skt. name of the monk, see Forte 1979: 289f.) in 691 CE, cf. 黃娛樂事一切都息，是時眾生孤獨無依，皆於如來心懷懸慕，生大憂愁，如喪父母，如箭入心。共往世尊曾所住處，園林庭宇，悉空無佛，倍加悲憤，不能自止。爾時優陀延王住在宮中，常懷悲感，渴仰於佛。夫人、妓女、諸歡樂事，皆不涉心。[T694, 793a24–29] ‘All entertainments and pleasures had ceased. At that time, sentient beings were lonely, without protector. They all were sentimentally attached to the Tathāgata and overcome with grief, as if their parents had passed away or their hearts were pierced by arrows. They went together to the groves and cloisters where the Blessed One had dwelt, but they were empty and there was no Buddha there, which filled them with even more uncontrollable sadness and longing. At that time, King Udayana dwells in his palace. Constantly feeling sorrow, he yearns for the Buddha with admiration. [Therefore,] he is totally indifferent to [the companionship of his] queens and palace ladies [and the other] enjoyable things.’ Here, the counterpart of Khot. kāścā- is rendered into Chin. by some more or less similar terms.

10. The past perfect form here presupposes a dissimilation of the consonant cluster -vy-: parinirṛye yā < “paraniirṛye vyā < OKhot. parāṇārṛvāte vāti.”

11. See SWTF s.v. Jambudvīpeṣa[ṛ]a(a), Wogihara 1968, s.v. jambudvīpeṣvara.

12. Emmerick obviously juxtaposed “gods, Nāgas …” with the sixteen Elders and considered both as those who were entrusted with the task of protecting the teachings, cf. “he entrusted [the maintenance of the Order] to the sixteen Great Hearers and to gods, Nāgas, Jambudvīpa kings (and) supporters (and) donors.” [Emmerick/Vorob’eva-Desjatovskaja 1995: 35]. This is not quite plausible in light of the Tib. and Chin. parallels which merely mention the sixteen Elders as the protectors of the teachings. What is more, the Elders were also given the responsibility of being worthy recipients of the gifts given by the
[B1 + C1]

Then the pupils asked: “Gracious teacher! Neither do we know those Elders’ names, nor are we aware of the places where they dwell.” The Arhat said to them thus: “I know their names, [and] I recognize their places [of residence].

(1) The first Elder by the name of Piṇḍola-Bharadvāja dwells in Godāna[dvīpa], together with a full thousand Arhats, by order of the Buddha Śākyamuni. I worship and pay honor to them! 1000. (2) The second Elder

householders who, in return, accrued a great amount of merits. This process is also called ‘the purification of gifts’ (Skt. daksināvīśodhana, Pāli dakkhināvisuddhi). It is probably for this reason that, in an early Khot. adaptation of the present passage in the Book of Zambasta (i.e., 22.95cd–96), not only the teachings (śāsana), but also the faithful householders (grhastha) were entrusted to the Elders, in the sense that they would deign to purify their gifts. Therefore, it is not inconceivable that “gods, Nāgas ...” in GP are not syntactically equivalent to “the sixteen Great Disciples”, but rather the possessive modifiers of the obscure final word of the sentence, i.e., dām, which is interpreted as the AS of an Indic loanword dāna- ‘gift’ and construed together with śāśam as the objects to be entrusted to the Elders. It is notable that, in this case, the loanword is homophonous with the LKhot. word for ‘grain’, i.e., dām (base *dāna-, see Dresden 1955: 458).

In the Khot. version, the range of benefactors who make offerings is extended from ‘faithful householders’ to ‘gods, Nāgas, kings of Jambudvīpa, and faithful lordly patrons’. 13. Neither Leumann nor Emmerick was able to translate the second half of the sentence due to their false division of the last few aksaras (cf. paysāmnānka ār. ‘recognizers ...’). On closer scrutiny, it turns out that ka should be corrected to ku and those aksaras can alternatively be divided as paysāmnān ku ārā (< OKhot. āre, 3P pres. mid. of āh- ‘to sit, dwell’). For the collocation dīśa- ... ku āh- ‘the place(s) where ... dwell(s)’, see Zambasta 22.28ocd hā tu dīśo jsāte ku aśīri Mahākāśvavā āste “... will go off in that [place] where the Ācārya Mahākāśyapa will [dwell].”; 23.3o b tu dīśu daity ku āstā “one sees the place where he has [dwelt].” [Emmerick 1968: 339–331, 348–349].

14. As far as the phrase “by order of the Buddha Śākyamuni” is concerned, both Leumann and Emmerick misread the word paraunna as padaunna, and thus interpreted the phrase erroneously, cf. “den Priester Śākyamuni mit dem ersten [= vor allem] –” [Leumann 1920: 167]; “Beginning with the Buddha Śākyamuni ...” [Emmerick/Vorob’eva-Desjatovskaja 1995: 35]. Their misreading resulted in a different analysis of the syntactical structure of the passage by anchoring the phrase to the following sentence (i.e., “I worship ...”). A parallel is found in the Tib. version, cf. rdzu ’phrul gyi stobs kyi tshe byin gyis brlabs te bsrings nas bom ldan ‘das kyi bkas gnas pa yin no /// [B2: 8–10] ‘Having preserved and prolonged [their] life through magical power, they [i.e., the sixteen Elders] stay put by order of the Blessed One’. In light of the Tib. parallel, the phrase should rather be anchored to the preceding sentence. For this phrase as the ‘ritual kernel’ of this text, see above pp. 29–31.
by the name of Kanakavatsa dwells in Kashmir, with five\textsuperscript{15} ... So is to be spoken as [is spoken] to the previous one.\textsuperscript{16} 200.

\[B1 + C2\]


\[B2 + C3\]

(9) The ninth [Elder] by the name of Gopaka dwells on Mount  

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} According to the Chin. and Tib. versions, the Elder Kanakavatsa has an entourage of 500 or 5,000 Arhats. Therefore, it is not impossible that \textit{pamjum}, which might have been followed by \textit{seyau} or \textit{yseryau}, is the last remnant of the number of Arhats in Kanakavatsa’s retinue, which might have been omitted for the sake of simplicity.
\item \textsuperscript{16} For \textit{hvāñ} - IA ‘to speak to/with’ see Emmerick 1965: 32, §IV.10.(d)–(f). cf. SGS: 315, §150.(ii).
\item \textsuperscript{17} With regard to the places of residence of the Elders (4) & (5), the Khot. version agrees with the Chin., as opposed to the two Tib. lists:
\item \textsuperscript{18} The toponym \textit{yamunā(varṇika)dvīpa} is otherwise only attested in the alternate list in Tibetan liturgies (see below p. 133), in which, however, the dwelling places of the Elders (6)–(8) seem to have been shuffled, as it were:
\end{itemize}

19. Neither Leumann nor Emmerick was able to read the second half of the sentence correctly, cf. Śrīvāsanakri jasti samkhāram (Tail. “in the monastery of the god Śrīvatānaka” [Leumann 1920: 167]; “in the monastery of the god Śrīvatānaka” [Emmerick/Vorob’eva-Desjatovskaja 1995: 35]. On closer scrutiny, three of the first four aksaras are to be corrected (ṣrī → cvi, saka → sva, na → śa), and the second half turns out to be a relative clause introduced by cv-i.

The relative clause unknown in any other version is apparently a Khot. addition which is meant to clarify the Skt. term trāyāstrimśa for the intended audience in Khotan. It is well known that the Thirty-three gods are governed by Śakra (Indra), who sits either under the pāircchattaka tree or in the divine hall sudharmā or in the palace vaijayanta, see Kirfel 1920: 196f. Yet, it is unknown elsewhere that their abode perched atop Mount Sumeru is also referred to as the samghārāma (Khot. samkhāram) of Śakra. This is an uncommon use of the term samghārāma, which, in a Buddhist context, usually designates monasteries or temples where Buddhist monks dwell. Viewed from the context, it may well have been the result of an interpretatio Khotanica, in other words, an attempt at reading into the text some ideas entrenched in Khotan so as to make the Skt. term somehow comprehensible to local believers, who were not quite familiar with Indian Buddhist cosmography but had an idea of the Buddha and his disciples dwelling in a communal resting-place. The same idea may well have been transferred to Śakra and his retinue abiding in the realm of the Thirty-three gods, which was also conceived of as something of a samghārāma.

20. The toponym prabhaṃkaradvipa is exclusive to the Khot. version, in which the dwelling places of the Elders (10) & (11) seem to be exchanged. All the other versions give Trayastrimśa as Panthaka’s place of residence, while accommodating Rāhula in Priyaṅgudvipa. Should it be the case, it is not impossible to derive prabhāmka-ra from Skt. priyaṅgu- through a hypothetical process of Sanskritization (e.g. Mnd. [eastern?] *pi[v]amgu > Gandh. *prav[h]a:go > prabhamkar-). For the sound changes -y- > -v- and Gandh. -bh- > -v(h)- / -ç/-, see von Hinnüber 2001: 175, §214 and 161ff, §191.

21. Otherwise only attested in the alternate list in Tibetan, where it is, however, the dwelling place of the Elder Amgāla (i.e., the counterpart of Amgāla [13] in the Khot. version). In the Chin. and the Tib. versions, Mt. Kailāsa is not mentioned, while its place is taken by Mt. Paṇḍava or Mt. Vipulapārśva.

22. It is noteworthy that the tradent obviously confused this Elder as the famous Śāna(ka)vasin (see BHSD s.v. Śānakavāsin). The latter was known as Šenevaka in the Khot. Āsokāvadāna, see Dragoni 2014: 82, s.v. šenevaka-. This error is to be corrected in light of other attestations of this Elder’s name, which unanimously point to Vanavāsa/in.

23. The Rṣi-mountain (aka Mt. Uśira) is not mentioned in the Chin. and Tib. versions, but
[B2 + C4]

(15) The fifteenth [Elder] Aśoka\(^{24}\) dwells on Mount Mahāpāṇḍara.\(^{25}\) 1 500.

(16) The sixteenth [Elder] Čudapanthaka dwells on Mount Vaideha, with full sixteen hundreds of Arhats, at the command of the Buddha Śākyamuni.\(^{26}\) I worship and pay honor to all of them! 1 600.

occurs in the alternate list in Tibetan, where it is assigned to the Elder Ajita (i.e., the counterpart of Aśoka [15] in the Khot. version) not Vanavāsa/in. In all the other versions, including the alternate list, the dwelling place of Vanavāsa/in is given as Mt. Vaihāra, to which the Cave Saptaparṇī belongs, or Mt. Vaideha(ka), which is assigned to Čudapanthaka (16) in the Khot. version. It is thus not unlikely that Rṣi-mountain here takes the place of Mt. Yugandhara, which is attested as the dwelling place of Čudapanthaka in both the Chin. and the Tib. versions.

24. Except in Khotan, the name of this Elder was only known as Ajita in China and Tibet (also among the Khotanese-speaking people in Dunhuang!). The Khot. variant must have come into being quite early, since it is already attested in the Book of Zambasta. Phonologically, a fusion of both names could have taken place in Gāndhāri, cf. Skt. ajita- > Gāndh. ayida- (sg. nom. *ayi[d]o or contracted *ayo) and Skt. aśoka- > Gāndh. aśo(ga)- (cf. Late Khot. aśū'); for Gāndh. y > š /ž/ see von Hinüber 2001: 174, §213.

25. This reading is tentative, and such a mountain is unknown elsewhere. It is possible to consider it identifiable with Mt. Pāṇḍava, which is mentioned as the dwelling place of Nāgasena (12) in the Chin. and the Tib. versions. But further evidence is lacking.

26. For the error committed by Leumann and Emmerick who misread padayaya for parauya, see the similar one pointed out above (p. 83, fn. 14). For this phrase as the ‘ritual kernel’ of the present text, see above pp. 29–31.
Glossary

The glossary contains all references to occurrences of all words in SI 1929. References are given by both line number in the transcription and section letter + line number in the reconstruction of the text.

The headings reflect, as far as possible, the Late Khotanese spellings of SI 1929. When multiple spellings are available, priority is given to the most archaic one. If a word is attested also in Old Khotanese or in a more archaic Late Khotanese spelling, counterparts are given in brackets in order to facilitate future lexicographical work. In the case of Indian loanwords and proper names, references to their counterparts in Indic and forms differently adapted into Khotanese are also given in brackets.

Critical signs are used in the glossary but occurrences containing supplements or emendations by the editor are marked with an asterisk (*). Words and aksaras removed by the editor are not taken into account. The following abbreviations of grammatical terms are used:

- A: accusative
- IA: instrumental-ablative
- N: nominative
- S: singular
- f: feminine
- L: locative
- nt: neuter
- V: vocative
- GD: gentive-dative
- m: masculine
- P: plural
- GD: genitive-dative
- m: masculine
- P: plural

a-: vya- (OKhot. a-: vāt-) vb. ‘to be’: 3S pres. mid. (as)ā 8/[B2+C3: 2]; 3Sm pf. intr. yye 1/[A1: 2], 2/[A1: 3, 4].
āṃgāla- (< Skt. ?) ‘name of an Elder’: NS āṃgālā 8/[B2+C3: 4].
abhija- (< Pkt. < Skt. abhijā-; cf. Pāli abhiṣe, Gāndh. abhēja-) ‘name of an Elder’: NS abhīji 6/[B1+C2: 1].
abhijñā- (= OKhot.) subst. 'extraordinary faculty (five or six in number)': NAP abhijñā 2/[A1: 4]. Cf. BHSD s.v. abhijñā.
aysa (OKhot. aysu) 1S pers. pron. ‘I’: GD encl. -m 1/[A1: 1]; N aysūm (-ā + -ūm) 4/[B1+C1: 2], 5/[B1+C1: 4], aysā 10/[B2+C4: 3].
arahānda- (= OKhot. < Skt. arhant/-arhat-) ‘Arhat’: NS GDS arahāndi 2/[A1: 4], 2–3/[A2: 1, 2]; 3/[A2: 2]; NS arahāndūm (-i + -ūm) 3/[A2: 3], 4/[B1+C1: 2]; IAP arahamdyau 5/[B1+C1: 4], 10/[B2+C4: 2].
asāuka- (=< Skt. aśoka-) ‘name of an Elder’: NS asāuki 9/[B2+C4: 1].
āh-: āsta- (= OKhot.) vb. ‘to sit, remain’: 3S pres. mid. āsti/āstä 5/[B1+C1: 3, 5], 6/[B1+C2: 1, 2, 3], 7/[B1+C2: 3, 4], 8/[B2+C3: 2, 3], 9/[B2+C3: 4, 5], [B2+C4: 1], 9–10/[B2+C4: 2]; 3P pres. mid. ā’ra 4/[B1+C1: 2].
u (= OKhot.) conj. ‘and’: 4/[A2: 5].
Mt. Kailash in present mountain kail 3
monas kukku ku *
that':
country Kash ka
Elder'
until'
auda/audä) prep./postp. + GD 'up to, audi
untenable.
however, never attested as a byname of
ultimately from Skt.
Sogd. |w't'nwr and MChin. 鬱單越/曰 ultimately from Skt. *Uttaravati, which is, however, never attested as a byname of Uttarakuru. This hypothesis is thus untenable. Cf. Prolexis: 26f.; De Chiara 2013: 171, 2014: 171.

uṣaya- (< Gāndh. < Skt. ṣaya-; cf. Gāndh. uṣavha- : Skt. ṣābha): 'name of a mountain in Magadha (Skt. ṣīgigiri)': GDS uṣayā 9/[B2+C3: 5].

uspurra- (= OKhot.) adj. 'complete': IAP uspurryaś 5/[B1+C1: 4], 10/[B2+C4: 2].

audi (OKhot. odi/odā, LKhōt. auda/audā) prep./postp. + GD 'up to, until': audi ... vī buri 2/[A1: 5].

kānaka- (< Skt. kanaka-) 'name of an Elder': kānaka- 6/[B1+C2: 1].

kanakavatsa- (< Skt. id.) 'name of an Elder': NS kanakavatsi 5/[B1+C1: 5].

kaśmira- (< Skt. id.; cf. OKhot. kaspāra- < Gāndh. kaspīra-): 'the country Kashmir': LS kaśmīri 5/[B1+C1: 5]. Cf. Prolexis: 44f.

kā (OKhot. ku/ku) conj. 'when, if, so that': kā 2/[A2: 1].

*kāḍa- (< Skt. kālika-) 'name of an Elder': NS kāḍi 6/[B1+C2: 2].

kaścā- (= OKhot.) subst. 'sorrow, grief': AS kāscā 3/[A2: 4].

ku (= OKhot.) rel. pron. 'where': diśa ... ku āra 4/[B1+C1: 2].

kukkuṭārāma- (< Skt. id.) 'name of a monastery': kukk(u)(ā)rām(a) 1/[A1: 3].

kailasa- (< Skt. id.) 'name of a mountain in the Himalaya range (i.e., Mt. Kailash in present-day Tibet)': GDS kailāśā 8/[B2+C3: 3].

kṣa- (OKhot. kṣā'-/kṣāta'-) card. num. 'six': NA kṣa 2/[A1: 4].

kṣasama- (= OKhot.) ord. num. 'sixteenth': NSm kṣasamaḥ 9/[B2+C4: 1].

kṣasā-se- (= OKhot.) card. num. '16 hundred, i.e., 1,600': IAP kṣasāseyau 10/[B2+C4: 2].

kṣasu- (= OKhot.) card. num. 'sixteen': GD kṣaśe 4/[A2: 5].

kṣira- (= OKhot.) subst. 'country': LS kṣīra 1/[A1: 2, 3].

kṣema- (OKhot. kṣei'ma-) ord. num. 'sixth': NSm kṣemi 6/[B1+C2: 2].

khu (OKhot. kho) conj. 'as, when, so that': khu 1/[A1: 1], 3/[A2: 2, 4], 6/[B1+C1: 6]; khitī (-u + -i) 1/[A1: 2].

ganḍhamāya- (< Pkt. < Skt. gandhamādana-; cf. LKhōt. ganḍhamāya- [Sudh]) 'name of a mountain to the east of Meru, renowned for its fragrant forests': GDS ga(m)dhamāyaṃ 7/[B2+C3: 1].

gampha- (= OKhot.) subst. 'league', tr. Skt. yojana- = Tib. dpag tshad [Sgh, Suv]: NAP gampha 2/[A1: 5].

gara- (OKhot. gara-) subst. 'mountain': GDS garā/gari 7/[B2+C3: 1], 8/[B2+C3: 3, 9/[B2+C3: 4, 5]/[B2+C4: 1, 2].

grdhakula- (< Pkt. < Skt. grdhrukūṭa-; cf. OKhot. grdhukāṭa-, LKhōt. grṛdhakūṭa-, grṛdhakūṭa-) 'name of a mountain near Rājaṅgha': GDS grṛdhakūṭi 8–9/[B2+C3: 4]. Prob. not through Gāndh. grijaüde, Hybrid Skt. ghṛjjākūṭa- [Tarzi/Salomon/Strauch 2015: 159f.]; for Skt. kūṭa- > Khot. kūla- cf. ratnakula-.

gauṇaka- (< Skt. gopaka-) 'name of an Elder': NS gaupāki 7/[B2+C3: 1].

gauyānna- (< Pkt. < Skt. [apara]godānīya-; cf. Pāli gauyāna-)
'name of a Dvīpa in the west, one of the four Buddhist continents': LS gauvāṃni 5/[B1+C1: 3].
cirvā (OKhot. cerā vā) interrog. 'how (long), quanti', contracted with the particle vā (see below): 3/[A2: 2]. Cf.
DKS s.v. cerā: N 165.43–4 khu thu paranirvā cirvā dāri baysūṇi sāsāṃ hamsrāṇi śti 'when you have ceased (entered parinirvāna-),
how long is the Buddhaic teaching to continue?'. tr. H.W. Bailey.
cu (= OKhot.) rel./interr./indef. pron.: cvi (-u + -i) 8/[B2+C3: 2].
cudapanthaa- (< Skt. cudapanthaka-) 'name of an Elder': NS cudapanthai 9/[B2+C4: 1].
jambviya- (OKhot. jaṃbutiya- < jaṃbutiva- [Prolexis: 88] < Pkt. < Skt. jambudvīpa-; cf. Gāndh. ja[m]budiva-) 'Jambudvīpa, one of the four
Buddhist continents': LS jambviya 6/[B1+C2: 2].
jambviya- (= OKhot.; cf. LKhot. jaṃbviyā-) adj. 'belonging to
Jambudvīpa, dwelling in Jambudvīpa': GDPm jambviyām 4/[A2: 5]. Cf. Suffixe 2.B.12; for a comparison with jaṃbviyāva-
(with suffix -ia, only OKhot.) see Suffixe 14.B.12.
jaṣṭa- (OKhot. gaṣṭa-) subst. 'god, lord': NS jaṣṭā 1/[A1: 1]; GDS jaṣṭi 8/[B2+C3: 2]; GDP jaṣṭām 4/[A2: 5].
jñāṁ (OKhot. jñāna-, pres. pt. of jñā-to go') particle: 3/[A2: 4]. Cf. tīt below.
ataka adv. 'so, thus': ttaṃ ṭa (-a + -m) 1/[A1: 1]; ta 3/[A2: 2], tta 3/[A2: 3], 4/[B1+C1: 2], 6/[B1+C1: 6].
tāmavānyakadvīpa- (< Skt. tāmavānyakadvīpa-; cf. Skt. tāmapaṛṇi-, Pkt. tambapā[ṇ]a-, Gk. tāprobāne 'Sri Lanka') 'ambiguous place name, possibly the region along the
present-day Tambraparnī River in Southeast India': LS tāmavānyakadvīpi 7/[B1+C2: 3].
tī (OKhot. tīyā) conj. 'then': tī 3/[A2: 1], 4/[B1+C1: 1]; in the phrase tī jsāṁ 'and, as well as; also, likewise': 3/[A2: 4]. Cf. De Chiara 2013: 180.
tcāhaura- (= OKhot.) card. num. 'four': NA 2/[A1: 4].
tcāhulasama- (= OKhot.) ord. num. 'fourteenth': NS tcāhulasam 9/[B2+C3: 4].
tcūrama- (= OKhot.; cf. LKhot. tcūrama-) ord. num. 'fourth': NSm tcūram 6/[B1+C2: 1].
trayastrīṃśa- (< Skt. trayastrīṃśa-) 'designation of 33 Devas inhabiting the realm of desire (kāmāvacara)': LP trayastrīṃśva 8/[B2+C3: 2].
tha (OKhot., LKhot. tha, thā) 1S pers. pron. 'you': N thu 3/[A2: 2].
dasama- (= OKhot.) ord. num. 'tenth': NSm dasami 7/[B2+C3: 1].
dāna- (< Skt. dāna-) subst. 'gift': AS dām 4/[A2: 6].
ndānava- (OKhot. dānava- < Skt. dānapati-) subst. 'donor, patron': GDP dāmnavaṁ dānavaṁ 4/[A2: 6].
For Indo-Iranian (loan)words ending in -pati transferred to the a-stems in Khot., cf.
saināva- < Skt. saṁapati, spāta- <spādāpati, sthānvāva- <Skt. sthānapati, phārjavatvāa- <
dāri (OKhot. dāru) invar. '(for) long': 3/[A2: 3].
dīśa- (OKhot. < Skt. id.) subst. 'direction, place': AS dīśa 4/[B1+C1: 2], dīṣaṁ (-a + -m) 5/[B1+C1: 2].
dīda- (OKhot. dād[ḍ]a-) ord. num. 'third': NSm dīdi 6/[B1+C2: 1].
draisama- (OKhot. draisama-) ord. num. 'thirteenth': NSm draisam.
Glossary (Khot.)

8/[B2+C3: 4].
dvāsama- (= OKhot.) ord. num. ‘twelfth’: NSm dvāsam 8/[B2+C3: 3].
dhyāna- (< Skt. id.) subst. ‘meditation or contemplation (normally four in number)’: NAP dhyāna 2/[A1: 4]. Cf. BHSD s.v. dhyāna.

namdamitra- (< Skt. id.) ‘name of an Arhat’: NAS namdamitr 2/[A1: 4][A2: 1].
namas- : namasya- (OKhot. namas- : namasāta-) vb. ‘to worship’: 1S pres. act. namasūm 5/[B1+C1: 5], 1O/[B2+C4: 3].

nāgasena- (< Skt. id.) ‘name of an Elder’: NS nāgasem 8/[B2+C3: 3].
nāta- (OKhot. nāta/-nāg[g]-a-< Skt. nāga-) subst. ‘Nāga, a mythical semi-divine race’: GDP nātām 4/[A2: 5].
nāman- (= OKhot.) subst. ‘name’: NAS nāma 1/[A1: 2], 2/[A1: 3, 4], 4/[B1+C1: 1, 2], 5/[B1+C1: 3, 5], 6/[B1+C2: 1, 2], 7/[B1+C2: 3, 4][B2+C3: 1].

ni/ne (= OKhot.) neg. ‘not’: 4/[B1+C1: 1].

nauma- (= OKhot.) ord. num. ‘ninth’: NSm naumā 7/[B2+C3: 1].

paṃjśa- (= OKhot.) card. num. ‘five’: GD paṃjīm (cf. OKhot. paṃjīnu) 5/[B1+C1: 5].

paṃjśūsama- (= OKhot.) ord. num. ‘fifteenth’: NSm paṃjśūsam 9/[B2+C4: 1].

paṃthaa- (< Skt. panthaka-) ‘name of an Elder’: NS paṃthai 8/[B2+C3: 3].

paḍājsia- (OKhot. paḍāṃjsia-) adj. ‘former’: IASm paḍājsye 6/[B1+C1: 6].

paḍauysa- (= OKhot.) adj. ‘first’: NSm paḍauysā 5/[B1+C1: 3].

paysān- : paysāṃda- (= OKhot.) vb. ‘to recognize’: 3Sm pf. tr. paysāmī 2/[A1: 5, 6], 1P pres. act. paysāṃnām 4/[B1+C1: 2], 1S pres. act. paysāṃnām 5/[B1+C1: 3].

paranirv- : paranirvya- (OKhot. paranirv- : paranirvṛta-/paranirvāta-) vb. ‘to attain complete Nirvāṇa’: 2S pres. act. paranirvi 3/[A2: 2]; 3Sm past pf. tr. paranirvye yā 3/[A2: 4].

parinirvāna- (< Skt. id.) subst. ‘complete Nirvāṇa’: NS parinirvām 3/[A2: 1].


pars- : parrya- (OKhot. pars- : parrāta-) vb. ‘to pass, elapse’: 3Pm pf. intr. parrye 1/[A1: 2].

paś- : paśā- (OKhot. paśś- : paśśāta-) vb. ‘to let go, release’: 2P imper. act. paśya 3/[A2: 4].

piṃḍaula- (< Skt. piṃḍola-) ‘name of an Elder’: piṃḍaula- 5/[B1+C1: 3].

piśaa- (= OKhot.) subst. ‘teacher’: VS piśā 4/[B1+C1: 1].

puls- : braṣṭā- (= OKhot.) vb. ‘to ask’: 3Pm pf. tr. braṣṭāmī 4/[B1+C1: 1].

pūrvadvi- (OKhot. pūrvati- < Pkt. *purvade[h]a- < Skt. pūrvavideha-; cf. MChin. *pjut-ba-dej 弗婆提 < Pkt. *purvade[h]a- attesting to the loss of -vi-) ‘name of a Dvipa in the east, one of the four Buddhist continents’: LS pūrvadvi 6/[B1+C2: 1]. Compared with its OKhot. counterpart, the form has apparently undergone some kind of Sanskritization (e.g. purva- > pūrva-; -ti/-di > -dvi, perhaps in analogy to Khot. diva-: Skt. dvipa-). Cf. Prolexis: 199.

pūha- (= OKhot.) ord. num. ‘fifth’: NSm pūhi 6/[B1+C2: 2].

pyū- : pyūṣta- (= OKhot.) vb. ‘to
hear': ppp. 3Snt pyūṣṭā 1/[A1: 1].
prabhāmkaradvipa- (< Skt. id.)
‘name of a Dwīpa which is otherwise unknown; for Skt. prabhāmkara-
see BHSD s.v.’: LS prabhāmkaradvipa 8/[B2+C3: 3].
pharāka- (= OKhot.) adj. ‘much,
many’: NPrm pharāka 3/[A2: 1].
bakkula- (< Skt. bak[k]ula;- cf. Tib. ba
tu la) ‘name of an Elder’: NSm
bakkulā 6/[B1+C2: 2].
ba’ysa- (OKhot. balysa-) ‘Buddha’: NS
ba’ysā 1/[A1: 1]; baysā 3/[A2: 4]; GDS
baysā 5/[B1+C1: 4], 10/[B2+C4: 2].
baysūña- (OKhot. balysūña-) adj.
‘Buddha-, pertaining to a Buddha’:
NSm baysūmni 3/[A2: 3]. Cf. Suffixe
bāda- (= OKhot.) subst. ‘time’: NAS
bādī 1/[A1: 2], 3/[A2: 1].
bistha- (= OKhot.) subst. ‘disciple,
pupil’: NP biṣṭṛ 4/[B1+C1: 1]. Cf. Prolexis:
244; Studies II: 199f.
biśa- (OKhot. biśśa-) pron./adj. ‘all’:
GDP biśum 10/[B2+C4: 3].
bud- : busta- (= OKhot.) vb. ‘to
perceive, know’: 3Sm pf. intr. busti
2/[A1: 4]; 1P pres. mid. bvāmām
4/[B1+C1: 1]; 1S pres. mid. bve
4/[B1+C1: 2].
buri (OKhot. buro/buru, LKhot. burā)
postp. and participle of
indefiniteness: audī ... vi burī 2/[A1:
5].
brātar- (= OKhot.) subst. ‘brother’: VP
brāṭarāyau 3/[A2: 3].
bhadra- (< Skt. id.) ‘name of an Elder’:
NS bhadrī 7/[B1+C2: 3].
bharadvāja- (< Skt. id.) ‘clan name of
two Elders’: NS bharradvājī 5/[B1+C1:
3], 6/[B1+C2: 1].
mara (OKhot. mara[t]a; cf. LKhot. ma)
invar. ‘here’: 6/[B1+C2: 2].
maḥāparinirvāna- (< Skt. id.; cf. LKhot.
mihāparinirvān) subst. ‘great,
complete Nirvāṇa’: AS
mahāparinirvāṇi 1/[A1: 1].
*mahāpāṃḍara- (< Skt.
mahāpāṇḍara-) ‘name of a mountain
whose location is unclear’: GDS
mahāśāva 4/[A2: 5].
mahāśāvāa- (= OKhot. < Pkt. < Skt.
mahāśrāvaka-; cf. Gāndh. savaka-/
śava[g]-a) subst. ‘great disciple’: GDP
mahāśāvā 4/[A2: 5].
midān- (OKhot. mā[ḥ]dān-) adj.
‘bounteous, gracious’: VSm midāmni
(OKhot. māḍāna) 3/[A2: 2], 4/[B1+C1:
1]. Cf. SGS: 338f., Studies III: 124, s.v. māde,
mā(ḥ)dān-, and Dresden 1955: 409,
mujaka- (OKhot. mumjaka-) subst.
‘ant’: GDP mujakām 2/[A1: 5].
muhu (= OKhot.) 1P pers. pron. ‘we’:
N muhu 4/[B1+C1: 1].
yan- : yudha- (= OKhot.) vb. ‘to do’:
3Sm pf. tr. samāvajā yudhā 1/[A1: 1].
yamunavarṇikadvipa- (< Skt. id. ≈
yamunadvipa-) ‘ambiguous place
name, possibly the region along the
present-day Jumna River in North
India’: LS yamunavarṇikadvipī
7/[B1+C2: 4].
yśni- (OKhot. ysṇīya-/ysṇīta-; cf.
Sogd. zyni(...)h, TochAB senik, Niya-Pkt.
jeni(...)a; for Khotan-Skt. yśenikān
see Skjaervø 1991: 28ff.) adv.
‘entrusted to, under the care of
(often in the syntagm with haur-:
haudha- [see below]): yśni haudhā
4/[A2: 5].
ysāra- (= OKhot.) card. num.
‘thousand’: IA yseryau 5/[B1+C1: 4].
rrām- (OKhot. rrund-) subst. ‘king’:
NS rre 1/A1, GDP rrāmdām 4/[A2: 5].
rāhula- (< Skt.) ‘name of an Elder’: NS
rāhuli 7–8/[B2+C3: 1].
Glossary (Khot.)

vajraputra- (< Skt. id.) ‘name of an Elder’: NS vajraputrař 7/[B1+C2: 4].

vajrasena- (< Skt. id.) ‘name of a king’: NS vajrasem 1/[A1: 2].

van- : ? (= OKhot.) vb. ‘to honor’: iS pres. act. vanum 5/[B1+C1: 5], 10/[B2+C4: 3].

vara (OKhot. vara[t]a; cf. LKhot. va) adv. ‘there’: 1/[A1: 2], 2/[A1: 3].


vā (= OKhot.) particle, usually second word of a clause: tāt (vā) 3/[A2: 1].


vimaukṣa- (< Skt. vimokṣa-) subst. ‘emancipation (three or eight in number)’: NAP vimaukṣa 2/[A1: 5]. Cf. BHSD s.v. vimokṣa.


vaideha- (< Skt. vaideha[ka]-) ‘name of a mountain’: GDS vaidehi 9/[B2+C4: 2].

śakra- (< Skt. id.) ‘name of Indra’: GDS śakri 8/[B2+C3: 2].

śācamuna- (OKhot. ś[ś]ākyamuna- < Skt. sākyamuni-) ‘the Gautama Buddha’: GDS śācamuni 5, 10/.

śāsana- (OKhot. śāsana- < Pkt. < Skt. sāsana-; cf. Gandh. sāsana-<sāsana-) subst. ‘teaching’: NAS śaśaṃ 3/[A2: 3], śai̧śaṃ 3/[A2: 4].

śūdasama- (OKhot. *śūndasama-) ord. num. ‘eleventh’: NSm śūdasama(m) 8/[B2+C3: 2].

śya- (OKhot. śāta-; cf. LKhot. śa’-) ord. num. ‘second’: NSm śye 5/[B1+C1: 5].

ṣa- (= OKhot.) dem. pron. ‘this, that’: ASm tū 1/[A1: 2]; GDSm tye 2/[A2: 1], 3/[A2: 2]; LSm tīna 1/[A1: 3], 2/[A1: 3]; ASF tvā 3/[A2: 3].

ṣāda- (OKhot. ṣṭadda- < Pkt. < Skt. śraddha-; cf. Gandh. śadha-) adj. ‘faithful’: GDP ṣadām 4/[A2: 5].


ṣa’- (OKhot. śāta-) dem. pron. and adj. with near deixis: GDPm ṣṭyām 4/[B1+C1: 1].

ṣṭḥ- : stā- (OKhot. śṭh-: stā-< sthā-) vb. ‘to stand, be (verbum existentiae)’: 3S pres. mid. ṣṭi 3/[A2: 3].

sa’- (OKhot. sata-) card. num. ‘hundred’: NA sa 2/[A1: 5].

saṃkhārama- (= OKhot. < Central Asian language < Skt. saṁghārama-; cf. TochA saṅkrām, TochB saṅkrām, Sogd. snkrm) subst. ‘resting place for a company (of monks or deities)’: NS saṃkhārām 2/[A1: 3], 8/[B2+C3: 2]; LS saṃkherma 2/[A1: 3].

saṃhāana- (= OKhot. < Pkt. < Skt. samādhāna-; cf. LKhot. simāham) subst. ‘absorption, meditation’: AS saṃhāṇi 1/[A1: 1].

saṃvāj- : samāvaj- (OKhot. saṃvāj- : saṃvāj-) subst. ‘fall into any state or condition, attain to’: PPP. AS saṃvāja 1/[A1: 1].

sali- (=OKhot.) subst. ‘year’: NAP sāli 1/[A1: 2]. For the etymology < *sard-uk,-
Glossary (Khot.)

see Sims-Williams 1990: 291f.

sūrāṣṭra- (< Skt. saurāṣṭra-) adj. ‘belonging to Saúráṣṭra, a country in Northwest India (i.e., present-day Surāṣṭra)’; LSm sūrāṣṭrā 1/[A1: 2].

semkhaladvipa- (< Skt. simkhaladvipa-) ‘the island of Sri Lanka’; LS semkhaladvivi 6/[B1+C2: 3].

sthīra- (= OKhot. < Pkt. < Skt.) adj. ‘elder’; NS sthīrā 5/[B1+C1: 3, 5], 6/[B1+C2: 1]; GDP sthīrā 4/[B1+C1: 1].

haṃgrīya- (= OKhot.) vb. ‘to assemble’: 3Pm pf. intr. haṃgrīya 3/[A2: 2].

haṃtsa (= OKhot.) postp. + IA ‘together (with)’: 5/[B1+C1: 4].

haṃdāra- adj. ‘other’; GDP haṃdārām 2/[A1: 5].

haḍi (OKhot. haḍe) conj. ‘but, however’: haḍi 2/[A2: 1].

hamraṣṭi (OKhot. hamraṣṭu/hamu ṛaṣṭu; cf. LKhot. hamraṣṭa) adv. ‘always, perpetually’; 3/[A2: 3]. Cf. SGS: 243, §23.(iii) and Prolexis: 388f.

haṣṭa- (= OKhot.) card. num. ‘eight’: NA 2/[A1: 4].

haṣṭama- (= OKhot.) ord. num. ‘eighth’: NSm haṣṭam 7/[B1+C2: 4].

hā (= OKhot.) directional particle, away from the subject: biṣūṃ hā aysā ... 10/[B2+C4: 3].

him- : himya- (OKhot. hām- : hāmāta-) vb. ‘to be, become’: 3Sm pf. intr. himye 3/[A2: 1].

haudama- (= OKhot.) ord. num. ‘seventh’; NSm haudamī 7/[B1+C2: 3].

haur- : hauḍa- (= OKhot.) vb. ‘to give’, in the phrase ysini haur- ‘to entrust’ (tr. Skt. pari-ind- ‘to present, hand over’, see DKS s.v. ysinīta-): 3Sm pf. tr. hauḍa 4/[A2: 5].

hvān- : hva- (OKhot. hvān- : hvata-) vb. ‘to speak, say’: 3Sm pf. tr. hve 3/[A2: 3], 4/[B1+C1: 2]; 3Pm pf. tr. hvādi 3/[A2: 2]; NSm pt. nec. III hvēnai (= OKhot. hvēnai) 6/[B1+C1: 6] – for e : ā see Dresden 1955: 406, §2.2.(8).