



KHOTAN V. KHOTANESE LITERATURE

Khotanese literature is the body of writings contained in a large number of manuscripts and manuscript folios and fragments written from the 5th to the 10th century in the Khotanese language, the Eastern Middle Iranian language of the Buddhist Saka kingdom of Khotan on the southern branch of the Silk Route (in the present-day Xinjiang-Uygur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China). The manuscripts were recovered from the Khotan area and the [Caves of the Thousand Buddhas](#) near [Dunhuang](#) (Gansu Province) chiefly by expeditions from the West and Japan between the end of the 19th and the first decades of the 20th century. Khotanese collections are now housed in libraries and museums in Paris, London, Munich, Berlin, Bremen, Stockholm, St. Petersburg, Urumqi, Peking, Lüshun, New Delhi, Kyoto, Washington D.C., Cambridge, Mass., and New Haven. Most Khotanese texts were edited or re-edited by H. W. Bailey (q.v.) in his *Khotanese Texts* (KT I-V) and *Khotanese Buddhist Texts* (KBT). The St. Petersburg collection was published in facsimile and transcription with translation by R. E. Emmerick and M. I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja in *Saka Documents* (SD) VII and *Saka Documents Text Volume* (SDTV) III except for ms. SI P 6 (the main manuscript of the [Book of Zambasta](#), ms. SI P 49 (*Dharmaśarīrasūtra*, q.v.), and a few Chinese-Khotanese documents (see below). The London collection was catalogued and re-edited with translation by P. O. Skjærvø in SDTV VI. The other main facsimile editions are Bailey, 1938; Vorob'ëv-Desjatovskij and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, 1965; and the six portfolios of *Saka Documents* edited



by Bailey (*SD* I-IV, accompanied by the edition in *SDTV* I, with translation and notes) and Emmerick (*SD* V-VI). Detailed information on Khotanese literature may be found in Emmerick, 1992b; Skjærvø, 1999; and Maggi, forthcoming.

The older manuscripts were produced in the region of Khotan from the mid-5th (see below) to the early 9th century, while the younger, partly dated, Dunhuang manuscripts date largely from the 10th century, though some may go back to the late 9th century. Of the manuscripts from Khotan, only part of the documents are dated, usually according to the regnal years of the local Viśa' kings, whose chronology is still imperfectly known. On the other hand, for virtually all the literary manuscripts only an approximate dating on paleographic grounds is possible, with the exception of a manuscript of the *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra*, whose colophon gives evidence for the second half of the 8th century (see Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, p. 20). The texts are written in a variety of linguistic stages usually grouped under the labels of Old Khotanese—in a sense the sacred language of Khotanese Buddhism—and Late Khotanese. The absence of Old Khotanese texts from Dunhuang and the greater freedom of the Dunhuang translations of Buddhist texts suggest that the writing and copying of Old Khotanese texts ceased because of a break in the tradition of Buddhist learning during the social and political turmoil under Tibetan rule from after 790 to the mid-9th century (Kumamoto, 1999, pp. 359-60).

Apart from a number of documents on wood (Bailey, *KT* IV, pp. 41-50 and 144-72; Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. 557-75) and a few inscriptions on paintings (Bailey, *KT* III, p. 148, and V, pp. 255, 262; Emmerick, 1968c and 1974a; Dudbridge and Emmerick, 1978; Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. 583-85; Filigenzi and Maggi, forthcoming) and on a jar (Bailey, *KT* V, p. 383; Maggi, 2001, pp. 537-38; Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, p. 584), Khotanese texts are written on paper. The manuscripts are either books of the *pustaka* type (oblong loose leaves imitating the Indian palm leaf manuscripts) or Chinese rolls (from one to several folios joined to form rolls up to several meters in length). For some information on the paper and the manuscripts production see Duan, 1992, pp. 18-21, and Sander, 1988. For the larger and the dated literary manuscripts see [BUDDHISM iii](#).

For writing Khotanese, formal and cursive varieties of a Central Asian development of the Indian Brāhmī script were used. Formal varieties were used for literary, chiefly religious, texts, while cursive varieties were employed for both literary texts and everyday writing. The formal varieties can be grouped in four stages of development: (1) Early Turkestan Brāhmī,



type *b*, 5th-6th centuries; (2) Early South Turkestan Brāhmī, 6th-7th centuries; (3) South Turkestan Brāhmī, 7th-9th centuries; (4) Late South Turkestan Brāhmī, 10th century (see Sander, 1984, 1986, and 1989, esp. pp. 112-18 for the dating, and cf. Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, pp. lxxi-lxxii).

A large part of Khotanese literature is in verse. Khotanese metrics was studied by E. Leumann, S. Konow, M. J. Dresden, and R. E. Emmerick but is still imperfectly understood. It is unknown whether Old Khotanese metrics, known chiefly from the *Book of Zambasta* is a derivation from as yet unidentified Indian models or is an indigenous system. In several works published between 1908 and 1924, E. Leumann developed the view that Old Khotanese metrics is of Indo-European descent with connections to Greek and other metrical systems and is exclusively quantitative (see the sketch in Leumann, 1933-36, pp. xxii-xxxv, and the bibliography in Emmerick, 1973a, pp. 138-39). His theory was criticized because of the many variants he admitted for the basic metrical patterns and because he emended the texts to fit them in with the postulated patterns, and its comparative part was generally rejected and was also abandoned by his son, M. Leumann (Leumann, 1971, p. 458). Konow hesitated between a quantitative model with Indian antecedents and an accentual model with possible parallels in other Iranian poetic traditions (see the bibliography in Dresden, 1962, esp. p. 43, n. 9, where an attempt is made, though without significant results, to compare Old and Late Khotanese metrics with that of other Middle Iranian poems). Emmerick considered that Old Khotanese metrics, originally quantitative and presumably derived from Indian meters, is at a stage of transition towards an accentual type that becomes exclusive in Late Khotanese poetry. He overestimated the role of the accent, however, in that he thought that a light syllable (i.e., a syllable with a short vowel followed by one or no consonant) could be counted as heavy if stressed and vice versa, and underestimated the role of quantity, which he admitted only in the cadences (Emmerick, 1968a, pp. 437-40; 1968b; 1973a; and 1973b).

Three meters, called A, B, and C, were first recognized by E. Leumann. Each meter is characterized by a basically fixed number of morae, a light syllable being worth one mora, a heavy syllable being worth two morae. A stanza consists of two verses with the same structure, and each verse consists of two halves (*pāda*) separated by a caesura with the exception of meter B (see below). There is complete freedom in the sequence of light and heavy syllables in the *pāda* openings before cadences, while in the cadences, that mark the



end of the *pādas*, the distribution of light and heavy syllables is less free than elsewhere. The most common cadences consist of two feet: dactyl + trochee (- ˘ ˘ ˘ -) and trochee + iamb (- ˘ ˘ -) with an ictus on the first syllable of each foot. There is a hierarchy between internal cadences (in odd *pādas*) and final cadences (in even *pādas*): these mark the end of verses and are characterized by the coincidence of ictus and accent (cf. Emmerick, 1968b, p. 2), which is not mandatory in internal cadences. A heavy syllable may be substituted for the light ones in the dactyls, and two light syllables may be substituted for one of the heavy syllables in any single cadence (in which case, in final cadences, the coincidence of ictus and accent must always take place on the first syllable of the foot). The main metrical structures for the three meters are as follows (other more or less frequent structures exist; the number of morae preceding the cadences is sometimes one mora longer or shorter than expected): A = 5 morae + - ˘ ˘ ˘ - | 5 morae + ˘ ˘ ˘ -; B = 11 morae + ˘ ˘ ˘ -; C = ˘ ˘ ˘ - | 5 morae + - ˘ ˘ - (Maggi, 1992, pp. 46-51; cf. Emmerick and Maggi, 1991). Also in Late Khotanese metrics, which has never been studied in detail, a stanza consists of two (rarely three) verses and each verse consists of two *pādas*, but Late Khotanese metrics is based on different principles, as it is apparently regulated by the number of stresses. At least two meters exist, one with three stresses and about eight syllables per *pāda* (e.g., *Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatārasūtra*, *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, and *Book of Vimalakīrti*) and another with four stresses and about twelve syllables per *pāda* (e.g., *Bhadracaryādeśanā* and *Jātakastava*; cf. Dresden, 1962; Emmerick, 1968a, pp. 437-38; 1968b, pp. 18-20; 1973a, p. 147; 1973b, pp. 138-39).

Khotanese manuscripts contain both literary texts and documents. Very little information is available concerning the origins of Khotanese literature. We know virtually nothing about the oral literature of Iranian descent apart from faint echoes in the legends on the foundation of Khotan and in the stylistic tendency to variation rather than repetition (Skjærvø, 1998 and 1999a, p. 314). The beginnings of written literature presumably coincided with the first Buddhist works in Khotanese, whose earliest manuscripts are written in Early Turkestan Brāhmī script, type *b*, and date accordingly from the 5th-6th centuries. This applies to some folios and fragments of Old Khotanese translations of the *Ratnakūṭasūtra*, *Saṅghāṭasūtra*, and *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, and to one folio of the *Book of Zambasta*, as well as to such secular wooden documents in Early Late Khotanese as F. II.i.006. The existence of a folio of the *Book of Zambasta* in Early Turkestan Brāhmī implies that the work was composed no later than the 5th century, and the fact that it



often has the character of a translation in the widest sense and that one passage aims at defending the translation of Buddhist texts (23.2-6) suggests that the work may have been the very first written literary text in Khotanese (see Maggi, 2004).

The greater part of the extant literary texts are Buddhist works, most of which were translated from Sanskrit. The Khotanese adopted various translation techniques for rendering the terminology of their originals (see Emmerick, 1983; Degener, 1989; Skjærvø, 1999, pp. 312-29). As many Indian words (Sanskrit and Prakrit) had already entered the Khotanese vocabulary presumably before the earliest extant texts and translations, a solution at hand was to use those loanwords as well as to continue taking over Sanskrit technical terms. On the other hand, many Indian terms were rendered by genuine Khotanese words. It is noteworthy that, in the Old Khotanese *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, the name Śrī of the Indian goddess of fortune is either taken up as such or translated by the Zoroastrian name *śśandrāmatā*; compare Avestan *spəntā- armaiti*-, the 'holy right thinking' and the guardian of the earth (Emmerick, 2002, pp. 7-9 with reference to earlier literature). The Khotanese Buddhist terminology never developed, however, into a fixed system of equivalences such as was evolved by the Tibetans. So one Sanskrit term may be rendered by more than one Khotanese equivalent, and one Khotanese word may translate different Sanskrit terms. The translators also resorted, especially in Old Khotanese, to interpretative translations in line with the Buddhist exegetical tradition.

The Khotanese versions vary widely with regard to their faithfulness to the originals and range from close translations to free paraphrases and recastings. The prose translations of *sūtras*, particularly the older ones, reproduce their originals as closely as possible, because *sūtras* were regarded as the words of the Buddha, metrical renderings being obviously freer than prose translations. The Khotanese did not content themselves with mere literal renditions, but took great care not to misrepresent the meaning of their originals. The desire to provide clear renderings of the original meaning sometimes induced the translators to amplify the text and even to insert comments. The greatest freedom is reached in the edifying tales, which are recast rather than translated, as they were felt to be liable to modification, rearrangement, and improvement.

The following new transcriptions and text editions with translation of Buddhist texts have appeared after the treatment of Khotanese Buddhist



literature in BUDDHISM iii.: *Adhyardhaśatikā* (Emmerick and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, *SDTV* III, pp. 24-34), *Amṛtaprabhadhāraṇī* (Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. 370-73), *Aparimitāyuhśūtra* (Duan, 1992, with comm., Sanskrit and Tibetan parallels, and glossary), *Avalokiteśvaradhāraṇī* (*SDTV* III, pp. 239-50, with facs. on pls. 190-98), *Book of Vimalakīrti* (*SDTV* VI, pp. 489-99; ed., tr., and comm. of lines 224-66, 293-308, and 316-50 by Maggi, 2003a, 2003b, 2004a, and 2007), *Deśanā I* (*SDTV* VI, pp. 542-46), *Deśanā II* (*SDTV* VI, pp. 547-50), *Dhāraṇī* of ms. Or. 6402 b 2 (*SDTV* VI, pp. 24-25), *Homage of Hūyī Kīma-tcūna* (Duan, 1992, pp. 66-76, with glossary, and *SDTV* VI, 27-31), *Invocation of Prince Tcū-syau* (*SDTV* VI, 499-502), *Jñanolkādhāraṇī* (*SDTV* III, pp. 21-24, and *SDTV* VI, pp. 349, 355, and 451), *Karmavibhaṅga* (Maggi, 1995, with comm., Sanskrit parallel, and glossary), *Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatārasūtra* (ed. and tr. of lines 1-54 and 278-313 by Emmerick, 1997a and 1998), *Namo text* of ms. Ch. 00268.1-131 (*SDTV* VI, pp. 502-7), *Namo text* of ms. Ch. 00276 (*SDTV* VI, pp. 303-4), *Ratnadvīpa text* (*SDTV* VI, pp. 368-70), *Ratnakūṭasūtra* (Skjærvø, 2003, with Sanskrit and Tibetan parallels), *Saṅghāṭasūtra* (Canevascini, 1993, with comm., Sanskrit original, and glossary), *Sumukhasūtra* (Emmerick, 1997-98), *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* (Skjærvø, 2004, with comm., Sanskrit parallel, glossary, and indexes), *Trīśaraṇa* (*SDTV* VI, pp. 486-87), *Vajrayāna text* of ms. Ch. ii.004 (*SDTV* VI, pp. 292-96), *Vajrayāna verses* of ms. Ch. i.0021b (*SDTV* VI, pp. 550-56), *Viśākhā* and *Vipaśyin texts* (*SDTV* VI, 330-31). The editions of the St. Petersburg and London collections also include previously unpublished materials, among which there are at times substantial remains of the Buddhist texts *Anantamukhanirhāradhāraṇī* (*SDTV* III, pp. 38-40; see also Duan, 1993, for the fragment in Lüshun), *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra* (*SDTV* III, pp. 71-75, 222 and *SDTV* VI, pp. 20-24), *Book of Zambasta* (*SDTV* III, pp. 212-13), *Raśmivimalaviśuddhaprabhānāmadhāraṇī* (*SDTV* III, p. 233), *Samantabhadra text* (*SDTV* VI, pp. 144-45, 199-200, 228, and 312), *Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra* (*SDTV* VI, pp. 220, 223, 266-68, 329, 409-23), *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* (*SDTV* III, pp. 179-212, with Sanskrit original, and facs. in *SD* 7, pls. 139-51; see also Emmerick, 1995; Skjærvø, 1999b; and the index of fragments in *SDTV* VI, pp. 608-9), and *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra* (*SDTV* III, pp. 213-14). Fragments of the *Śrīmahādevīvyākaraṇa* have been identified by K. Wille (2006, p. 487) in the Crosby collection (Washington, Library of Congress; unpublished) and the Stein collection (London).

Since Khotan was a major center of Buddhist studies in the 1st millennium (cf. [BUDDHISM i.](#)), Buddhism also pervades secular documents and non-doctrinal literary texts. Even the Hindu story of Rāma and Sītā was changed into a Late



Khotanese *avadāna* in verse. The Khotanese *Rāmāyaṇa* opens by praising the long duration of the teaching of Śākyamuni Buddha as the result of his long exertion in former births, among which was his life as Rāma. The story is not merely given a Buddhist setting: the myth itself is turned into a Buddhist myth in that it is said that Rāma also defeated Ambarīṣa and Mahādeva, which amounts to saying that the Buddha defeated Śiva and Viṣṇu, the chief gods of the Hindu pantheon (Emmerick, 2000, pp. 233-34). The story is told in a concise and lively style, as is usual in Khotanese *avadānas*, and abounds in material of a fabulous nature, with monkeys, ants, ravens, and donkeys appearing in the narration (mss. P 2801 + P 2781 + P 2783: Bailey, *KT III*, pp. 65-76; ed. Bailey, 1940a; tr. Bailey, 1940b; tr. of lines 71-78, 109-18, and 168-73 by Emmerick, 1997c and 2000).

The beginnings of two further *avadānas* are extant: the *Kaniṣkāvadāna* in prose (appended to the *Panegyric on King Viśa' Saṃgrāma*; see below) with the episodes of King Kaniṣka having a monument and a monastery built and of Kaniṣka's spiritual adviser Āsvaghoṣa casting a lump of clay on the newly built monument with the subsequent appearance of an image of the Buddha (ms. P 2787.155-95: Bailey, *KT II*, pp. 107-8; ed. Bailey, 1942, with tr. and comm.; tr. Bailey, 1965, 107-8); the so-called *Love story* about the love of a householder's son and the daughter of one of King Prasenajit's ministers (P 2928.4-41: Bailey, *KT III*, pp. 105-6; ed. Maggi, 1997, with tr., comm., glossary, and facs.).

A few magic texts such as amulets and omen texts give expression to the most extreme form of "folk" Buddhism. The apotropaic power of amulets (*rakṣā*) may reside in a drawing (ms. Kha. i.50: ed. Emmerick, 1968c, p. 142, with tr. and facs. on pl. II; Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, p. 585, with tr.), in a sacred formula (*dhāraṇī* as in ms. Kha. i.89a: Bailey, *KT V*, p. 137; Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, p. 203, with tr.; and in the newly found amulet from Dandan Öilik [see [DANDĀN ÖILIQ](#)]: Skjærvø, 2007), in a text (ms. Kha. i.53: Bailey, *KT V*, p. 131; Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, p. 193, with tr.; ms. Kha. i.310: Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, p. 477, with tr.; ms. Reuter 2: ed. Bailey *KT V*, p. 395), and in a text combined with drawings, as in the case of the three folios which depict six of fifteen demons causing children's diseases and contain the relevant Late Khotanese excerpt, with a Chinese parallel text, from the *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī*, a collection of sacred formulas against demons (ms. Ch. 00217 c, a, b: Bailey, *KT III*, p. 135; ed. Maggi, 1996, with tr., facs., and comm.; Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, p. 583, with tr.). Omen texts are contained in mss. Hedin 17, which foretells the consequences of aches in various part of the body, and 22.6-7 (ed. Bailey, *KT IV*, pp. 31-32 and 35, with tr.



and comm. on pp. 109-17, 127, and 129), Hardinge 078.2 (Bailey, *KT V*, p. 283; Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, pp. 126-27, with tr.), Kha. vi.4.1 (predicting the outcome of twitching in various parts of the body: Bailey, *KT III*, p. 130, and *IV*, pp. 113-14, with tr.; ed. Leumann, 1963, pp. 83-86, with tr.; Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, pp. 260-61, with tr.), and Or. 11252.1 (forecasting men's fate on the basis of the year of the duodecimal animal cycle in which they are born: Bailey, *KT III*, pp. 13-15; ed. Bailey, 1937, pp. 924-30, with tr. and comm.; Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, pp. 82-85, with tr.).

Besides the great bulk of Buddhist texts, literary works also include a number of both indigenous and translated non-doctrinal texts in Late Khotanese: lyric poetry, epistolary poetry, burlesque poetry, panegyrics, a geographical text, medical texts, and a few bilinguals. Their interpretation is at times difficult because our knowledge of the vocabulary rests mainly on religious texts.

Lyric poetry is devoted to the magnification of love. Some of the verses are quite beautiful, and it is a great pity that not more of them are extant. Nine lyrical verses on love are found at the end of the Staël-Holstein miscellaneous roll (see below). The main collection of lyrical verses is the so-called *Lyrical poem*, a difficult text known from six partly overlapping manuscripts from Dunhuang and dealing with “the coming of spring, various flowers and birds, songs of the bards (*māgadha*), and homage to the amorous sports of young lovers” (Bailey, 1964a). The tradition of the text is not homogeneous: the *Lyrical poem* proper consists of thirty verses and is preserved virtually entirely in three manuscripts, two of which agree closely, while the third differs (mss. Ch. 00266.1-42, P 2025.7-79, and P 2956); three shorter manuscripts (P 2022, P 2896.49-55, P 2985) contain verses from the *Lyrical poem* but in a different order (Bailey, *KT III*, pp. 34-48; synoptical ed. in Dresden, 1977, with facs.). Though the lyrical stanzas make up about two thirds of the poem, this closes with the admonition not to follow worldly pleasures (ed. of verses 22-29 by Kumamoto, 2000, with tr. and comm.).

Epistolary poetry is represented by a comparatively large number of letters in verse that are contained in several Dunhuang manuscripts. Though the verses, which mostly appear as unfinished drafts, are in the form of letters written by travelers during their journeys and addressed to their families, teachers, and friends in the homeland, they are not drafts of letters that were actually intended to be sent but elaborate literary works of an at times lofty poetic mode developing the theme of separation from the homeland (see Kumamoto, 1991a, 1993, and 1996b, pp. 93-94).



The only specimen of burlesque poetry is a ten-line fragment from Dunhuang containing a humorous poem. It was written by one Kīma-śanā, who is possibly to be identified with the contemporaneous Zhang Jinshan (*cā kīmā-śqnā*) mentioned in the colophon of the *Jātakastava* and other Late Khotanese religious texts (ms. P 2745: Bailey, *KT II*, pp. 92-93; ed. Kumamoto, 1995, pp. 243-45, with tr. and comm.).

Panegyric literature comprehends three eulogies that extol the figures and deeds of three kings of the Khotanese Viśa' dynasty. Though they refer to historical persons and events contemporary with their composition and can be regarded as documents, they are characterized by an elevated rhetorical mode and a very elaborate style that recall that of Sanskrit inscrip-tional eulogies (*praśasti*). The metrical *Panegyric on King Viśa' Kīrtta* (r. from 791 CE; see Kumamoto, 1996a, p. 42), which is preserved by a manuscript from the region of Khotan, celebrates the King's funding, in his 16th regnal year (806), of religious activity for the sake of welfare in his reign (ms. M.T. b.ii.0065: Bailey, *KT II*, p. 72; *SDTV I*, pp. 90-91, with tr., and facs. in *SD III*, pl. lxvi; ed. Konow, 1939, with tr.; Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, p. 285, with tr.). The other panegyrics are known from two Dunhuang manuscripts. The metrical *Panegyric on King Viśa' Dharma* (r. from 978; see Pulleyblank, 1954, p. 94), which opens with a lengthy Vajrayānist invocation mentioning the Buddha Vairocana, was written on the occasion of an embassy the King sent to Dunhuang in his 5th regnal year (982) to ask the hand of a Chinese princess (ms. Ch. i.0021a.a: Bailey, *KT II*, pp. 53-55; ed. *SDTV I*, pp. 68-70, with tr., and facs. in *SD III*, pls. xlix-li; Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, pp. 522-24, with tr.). The long *Panegyric on King Viśa' Saṃgrāma* (r. 9th century? see Kumamoto, 1986, pp. 235-39, and Skjærvø, 1991, p. 269), which is followed by way of comparison by the *Kaṇiṣkāvadāna*, praises the King, on the occasion of the ceremony performed by monks at the end of the rainy season, for his religious merits imparting spiritual and material well-being to the land of Khotan and for erecting a monastery (ms. P 2787.1-154: Bailey, *KT II*, pp. 101-7; tr. and comm. by Bailey, 1965). Another eulogy of King Viśa' Saṃgrāma is found at the beginning of a verse letter (ms. Or. 8212.162.14-36: Bailey, *KT II*, pp. 1-3; *SDTV I*, pp. 19-20, 25, and 29-30, with tr. and comm., and facs. in *SD I*, pls. ix-x; Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, pp. 45-47, with tr.).

Apart from a long list of cities of Eastern Central Asia in the Staël-Holstein roll (see below), the only known geographical text is the so-called *Itinerary*, a description of a southward journey through Gilgit and Chilās to Kashmir, at that time under the rule of King Abhimanyugupta (r. 958-72), who is



mentioned in the text (ms. Ch. i.0021a.b: Bailey, *KT* II, pp. 55-57; ed. Bailey, 1936, with tr. and comm.; Bailey, *SDTV* I, pp. 70-73, with tr. and comm., and facs. in *SD* II, pls. lii-lvi; Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. 524-26, with tr.; cf. Morgenstierne, 1942, pp. 269-71).

Medical texts belong to the Indian Āyurvedic tradition, which spread in Central Asia along with Buddhism. In fact, the *Vyadhiprasāmanaparivarta* (Chapter on healing illness) of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* refers to principles similar to those of Āyurvedic medicine (Nobel, 1951). Fragments of medical texts and substantial portions of prose translations of two Sanskrit metrical treatises are extant: the *Siddhasāra* of Ravigupta and the *Jivakapustaka*. For the fragments see Emmerick, 1992b, p. 45; the St. Petersburg fragments SI P 45.1-3 and SI P 102 b4-15 are now published in Emmerick and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, *SD* VII, pls. 23-25 and 105, and *SDTV* III, pp. 36-37 and 134-35; four unpublished fragments from a single medical text in the Crosby collection are reported by Emmerick, 1992a, p. 673, and 1993, p. 59); an unidentified text on poultices is contained in mss. P 2893.32-267 + Ch. 00265, that once formed one single manuscript (see Maggi, 2008).

The Late Khotanese *Jivakapustaka* is known from an incomplete Sanskrit-Khotanese bilingual manuscript of 71 folios, presumably from the 10th century (ms. Ch. ii.003: Bailey, *KT* I, pp. 136-95; ed. Konow, 1941, with tr. and glossary). The work is an otherwise unknown compilation of prescriptions taken from various sources (see Emmerick, 1979, pp. 235-37) and organized by type of preparation in four complementary chapters introduced by the Sanskrit auspicious formula *siddham* 'success' and devoted respectively to an antidote, to drugs mixed with ghee, to drugs mixed with sesame oil, and to powders. The Khotanese version is based on the corrupt Sanskrit, which the translator could not fully understand (Emmerick, 1979, p. 243).

A Late Khotanese version of Ravigupta's *Siddhasāra* (about 650 CE; Emmerick, 1975-76) is contained in 64 of the 65 folios of manuscript Ch. ii.002, whose fol. 100 contains a different medical text (Bailey, *KT* I, pp. 1-104; facs. in Bailey, 1938, pp. 1-67; cf. Emmerick, 1980-82). Ms. P 2892 is a variant of fols. 5-14 (Bailey, *KT* V, pp. 315-24). Of the original thirty-one chapters, the still extant ones are those on the theoretical foundations (1), drugs (2), food (up to 3.26.12), piles and genital fistulae (from 13.27), yellow disease (14), hiccoughs and uncomfortable breathing (15.1 and 15.15-23), swollen testicles (18.53), dry excrement and heart diseases (19), madness and epilepsy (20), diseases due to wind (one of the three humors of Indian medicine together with bile and



phlegm) and rheumatism (21), liquor disease (22), erysipelas (23), swellings (24), healing wounds (25), and diseases of the eyes, ears, nose, tongue, teeth, and throat (26.0-68 and 26.75-90). The Khotanese version, presumably from the 10th century CE, contains an introduction in verse (ed. Emmerick, 1983, 19-21, with tr.), from which we know that the work was translated from Tibetan—though the translator also consulted the Sanskrit original and corrected mistakes in the Tibetan version (Emmerick, 1971)—in order to improve medical knowledge and public health in the country.

No grammatical work is known. Among the texts from Dunhuang, however, there are a word list and a few bilingual texts that originated presumably from the need felt by members of the Khotanese community in Dunhuang (on which see Kumamoto, 1996b) to acquire some knowledge of foreign languages for practical purposes. The word list is a Turkish-Khotanese bilingual, which arranges systematically, and partially glosses in Khotanese, Old Turkish words for parts of the body and technical terms concerned with archery and horse equipment, presumably to be used in military instruction (ms. P 2892.166-85: Bailey, *KT* III, pp. 81-82; ed. Emmerick and Róna-Tas, 1992, with tr., comm., indexes, facs., and ref. to earlier literature). The most extensive bilingual text is a veritable conversation manual and contains Sanskrit words and sentences followed by a Khotanese rendering (ms. P 5538b.9-87: Bailey, *KT* III, pp. 121-24; ed. Kumamoto, 1988, with tr., comm., and glossaries). The other bilingual texts are short collections of sentences and a few single words in Chinese, in Brāhmī script with Khotanese translation (mss. Ch. 00271.2-5, Or. 8212.162.1-12, P 2927.4-25 and S 5212a: Bailey, *KT* II, pp. 1 and 49, and *KT* III, pp. 103 and 136; see also Bailey, *SD* I, pl. ix, and *SDTV* I, pp. 17-19; Takata, 1988, pp. 197, 203-7, 217-27, and 435-37; and Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. 44-45 and 515; and cf. Kumamoto, 1996b, pp. 94-96).

While literary texts provide us with information on the culture and religious beliefs of the Khotanese, a considerable number of secular documents, which are written on paper and, more rarely, on wood, refer to contemporary persons and events, and thus give us glimpses into the society, daily life, and the political situation in Khotan, mainly in the 8th-10th centuries. Unlike many literary texts, the documents are particularly difficult to interpret because, apart from a few bilingual documents, they are not translations of texts known to us in other languages. Furthermore, practically all of them are written in Late Khotanese, a common feature of which is the dropping of syllables, especially the final ones, with the consequent shortening of the inflectional



endings; and they contain some words and a great many names and titles from Chinese, Old Turkish, and Tibetan that are hard to recognize when adapted to Khotanese phonology and spelling conventions. Khotanese documents are mostly kept in London (Hoernle and Stein collections: ed. Bailey, *KT* II and V, partly *SDTV* I, with tr. and comm.; and Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, with tr.), Paris (Pelliot collection: ed. Bailey, *KT* II, partly *SDTV* I, with tr. and comm.), Stockholm (Hedin collection: ed. Bailey, *KT* IV, with tr. and comm., partly *SDTV* I, with tr. and comm.), and St. Petersburg (Petrovskii, Oldenburg, Malov, and Strelkov collections: ed. Emmerick and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, *SDTV* III, with tr.). New documents have also come to light in recent years (see Emmerick, 1984; Duan Qing and Wang Binghua, 1997). On the documents in general, see Kumamoto, 1982, pp. 2-36; Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, 1992a, pp. 44-75; and Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. lxxv-lxxviii, lxxiv-lxxviii. The documents can be divided into two chronological groups: the ones found in the Khotan area (on which see Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, 1992b; Kumamoto, 1996a; Yoshida, 2006 and 2007), which probably go from the 5th to the beginning of the 9th century but belong mostly to the 8th century, and the ones discovered at Dunhuang, which are often much lengthier and date to the 10th and perhaps in part to the 9th century. Among the extant documents there are originals and copies or drafts. Miscellaneous manuscripts may contain one or more document copies or drafts and even literary texts. Thus, the Staël-Holstein miscellaneous roll, which is said to come from Dunhuang and whose present whereabouts is unknown, contains, besides two versions of a Tibetan document, three Khotanese documents dated 925 CE and nine lyrical verses in Khotanese (Bailey, *KT* II, pp. 72-76; ed. Thomas and Konow, 1929, with tr., comm., and facs.; Bailey, 1951, with tr. and comm.; cf. Pulleyblank, 1954; Hamilton, 1958, with ref. to earlier literature; and Hamilton 1977, pp. 515-21). The colophons and the rarer introductions that are found in a number of literary manuscripts, including the Khotanese colophons of the Kashgar manuscript of the Sanskrit *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* (see Emmerick, 1974b, and Bailey in Lokesh Chandra, 1976, pp. 1-2 and 430) are also of historical interest and comparable to documents, as they are sometimes dated according to the regnal years of the Khotanese kings and contribute to our knowledge of Khotanese prosopography (see Bailey, 1944; Dresden, 1955, pp. 403-4 with n. 21; and Sander, 1988).

Khotanese documents, a few of which are Chinese-Khotanese bilinguals (see Kumamoto, 2001 and 2007, for the St. Petersburg ones), are typologically quite varied (see Kumamoto, 1996a, and Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. lxxiv-lxxv). Besides



several private letters (*pīḍaka-*; e.g., ms. M.T. a.i.0033 addressed by a man to his wife: Bailey, *KT* II, p. 71; facs. Stein, 1921, pl. cli; ed., tr., and comm. Bailey, *SDTV* I, pp. 73-74, with facs. in *SD* III, pls. lv, lxix; ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. 270-71), numerous official letters are preserved, which include messages from superior to subordinate officials (*parau-* “order,” e.g., ms. Hedin 3: ed., tr., and comm. Bailey, *KT* IV, pp. 22, 67-71), messages between peers (*parmācā-*, lit. “exchange,” e.g., ms. D. v.4: Bailey *KT* V, p. 259; ed., tr., and comm. Bailey, *SDTV* I, pp. 42-43, with facs. in *SD* I, pls. xix-xx; ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, p. 560; see Yoshida, 2007, pp. 465-67), messages from inferior to superior officials (*haṣḍi-* “report, petition,” e.g., ms. Hedin 2.1-7 addressed to a ṣṣau official and followed by the ṣṣau’s order as a reply to it: ed., tr., and comm. Bailey, *KT* IV, pp. 21-22, 61-67) and messages to religious superiors (*viñṅatti-* “report,” ultimately from Skt. *viñṅapti-*, or *haṣḍi-*, e.g., ms. Hedin 7 and 7v respectively: ed., tr., and comm. Bailey, *KT* IV, pp. 25-26, 82-92). Among the messages to subordinate persons there is a highly formal letter of the king of Khotan (ms. P 5538a: Bailey, *KT* II, pp. 125-29; tr. and comm. Bailey, 1964b, pp. 17-26; ed. and tr. Bailey, *SDTV* I, pp. 58-61, with facs. in *SD* II, pls. xxx-xxxviii). Many orders and petitions are about administrative matters, but a number of petitions to and orders by various officials deal with legal cases and disputes (*gvāra-*). Legal documents (*pīḍaka-*, *pāḍā-*) include purchase contracts (*gārya-vāḍā-*, e.g., ms. Or. 6397/1 = Hoernle 7: Bailey, *KT* II, p. 66; facs. Hoernle, 1897, pl. v; ed. and tr. Bailey, *SDTV* I, p. 54, with facs. in *SD* II, pl. xxviii; ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, p. 9), promissory notes (*pāra-vastua-* (*pīḍaka-*), e.g., ms. Or. 6397/2: Bailey, *KT* V, pp. 5-6; ed. and tr. Bailey, *SDTV* I, p. 55, with facs. in *SD* II, pl. xxviii; ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. 9-10), adoption contracts (*perm(y)a-vāḍa-*, e.g. ms. Or. 9268B: Bailey, *KT* II, p. 14; ed., tr., and comm. Bailey, *SDTV* I, pp. 6-9, with facs. in *SD* I, pls. iv-v; ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. 68-69; see Skjærvø, forthcoming and other contracts. Economic documents comprise vouchers (*kṣau-*, from Chinese *chao* [Mathews, nos. 255 and 258], e.g. ms. Or. 6396/1: Bailey, *KT* V, p. 4; ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. 7-8; see Bailey, *KT* IV, p. 55), receipts for goods (e.g., mss. Or. 9611/a-i and Or. 9612: ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, pp. 77-78) or money (e.g. ms. Hardinge 073 I.1: Bailey, *KT* V, p. 272; ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV* VI, p. 123), and account books (e.g. ms. P 2024, a commercial document recording expenses and incomes in terms of rolls of cloth used as a monetary unit: see Kumamoto, 1995, pp. 230-38), including a monastic account book (ms. SI P 103.52: ed. and tr. Emmerick and Vorob’eva-Desjatovskaja, *SDTV* III, pp. 157-59, with facs. in *SD* VII, pl. 126; see Emmerick, 1996). Administrative documents include records and registers regarding water rights (e.g., ms. Kha. ix.61, 62, 62a: Bailey, *KT* V, p. 187; ed. and tr.



Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, p. 564), recipients of grain, etc. (e.g., ms. M.T. 094: ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, pp. 60-61), debtors (e.g., ms. Har. 060: ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, p. 41), taxpayers (e.g., ms. Har. 057: ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, p. 41), tax collectors (e.g., ms. Kha. ii.3: Bailey, *KT V*, p. 174; ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, pp. 571-72), lists of names of people eligible for guard service and other corvée work (e.g., ms. Or. 11344/1: Bailey, *KT II*, pp. 30-31; ed. and tr. Skjærvø, *SDTV VI*, pp. 104-6), and more.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

H. W. Bailey, “An Itinerary in Khotanese Saka,” *Acta Orientalia* 14, 1936, pp. 258-67.

Idem, “Hvatanica,” *BSOS* 8, 1937, pp. 923-36.

Idem, *Codices Khotanenses: India Office Library Ch. ii 002, Ch. ii 003, Ch. 00274 reproduced in facsimile with an introduction*, Copenhagen, 1938.

Idem, “Rāma,” *BSOS* 10, 1940a, pp. 365-76.

Idem, “Rāma, II,” *BSOAS* 10, 1940b, pp. 559-98.

Idem, “Kaṇaiska,” *JRAS* 1942, pp. 14-28.

Idem, “The Colophon of the *Jātaka-stava*,” *Journal of the Greater India Society* 11/1, 1944, pp. 10-12.

Idem, *Khotanese Texts [KT] I-VII*, Cambridge, 1945-85 (several reprs. with corrections).

Idem, *Khotanese Buddhist texts [KBT]*, London, 1951 (repr. with corrections, 1981).

Idem, “The Staël-Holstein Miscellany,” *Asia Major*, N.S. 2, 1951, pp. 1-45.

Idem, *Saka Documents [SD] I-IV*, *Corpus Inscr. Iran. II/V*, London, 1960-67.



Idem, “Lyrical Poems of the Sakas,” in *Dr. J. M. Unvala Memorial Volume*, Bombay, 1964a, pp. 1-5.

Idem, “Śrī Viśa’ Śūra and the Ta-uang,” *Asia Major*, N.S. 11, 1964b, pp. 1-26.

Idem, “Viśa Saṃgrāma,” *Asia Major*, N.S. 11, 1965, pp. 101-19.

Idem, *Saka Documents. Text Volume [SDTV I]*, Corpus Inscr. Iran. II/V, London, 1968.

G. Canevascini, *The Khotanese Saṅghāṭasūtra*, Wiesbaden, 1993.

A. Degener, “Zur Übersetzungstechnik in der khotanischen *Vajracchedikā*,” *ZDMG* 139, 1989, pp. 346-67.

Duan Qing, *Das khotanische Aparimitāyuhṣūtra*, Reinbek, [1992].

Idem, “Lüshun Bowuguan cang Yutian yu ‘Chusheng wubian men tuoluoni jing’ canpian de shidu” (Interpretation of a fragment of the Khotanese Anantamukhanirhāradhāraṇī kept in the Lüshun Museum), in Ye Yiliang, ed., *Yilang xue zai Zhongguo lunwen ji* (Collection of papers on Iranian studies in China), Beijing, 1993, pp. 9-14.

Duan Qing and Wang Binghua, “Xinjiang xin chu Yutian wen mu du wenshu yanjiu” (A newly discovered Khotanese wooden document from Xinjiang), *Dunhuang Tulufan yanjiu* 2, 1997, pp. 1-12, 2 pls..

M. J. Dresden, “Note on Khotanese Poetry,” in E. Bender, ed., *Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown*, New Haven, 1962, pp. 42-50.

Idem, “A Lyrical Poem in Khotanese. Part 1: Text,” in *Beiträge zur Indienforschung Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Berlin, 1977, pp. 81-103.

R. E. Emmerick, *The Book of Zambasta: a Khotanese Poem on Buddhism*, London, 1968a.

Idem, “Khotanese Metrics,” *Asia Major*, N.S. 14, 1968b, pp. 1-20.

Idem, “Some Khotanese Inscriptions on Objets d’Art,” *JRAS*, 1968c, pp. 140-43, 2 pls..



Idem, "On Ravigupta's *gaṇas*," *BSOAS* 34, 1971, pp. 363-75.

Idem, *Saka Documents [SD] V-VI*, Corpus Inscr. Iran. II/V, London, 1971-73.

Idem, "Commodianus and Khotanese Metrics," *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1973a, pp. 138-52.

Idem, "Khotanese Metrics Again," *Asia Major* 17, 1973b, pp. 137-53.

Idem, "Note on a Khotanese Inscription in the Bremen Überseemuseum," in G. Gropp, *Archäologische Funde aus Khotan, Chinesisch Ostturkestan*, Bremen, 1974a, pp. 362-64.

Idem, "Some Khotanese Donors," in *Mémorial Jean de Menasce*, ed. P. Gignoux and A. Tafazzoli, Louvain, 1974b, pp. 383-88, pls. xix-xxi.

Idem, "Ravigupta's Place in Indian Medical Tradition," *Indologica Taurinensia* 3-4, 1975-76, pp. 209-21.

Idem, "Contributions to the Study of the *Jīvaka-pustaka*," *BSOAS* 42, 1979, pp. 235-43.

Idem, *The Siddhasāra of Ravigupta*. Vol. 1. *The Sanskrit Text*, Wiesbaden, 1980; Vol. 2. *The Tibetan Version with Facing English Translation*, 1982.

Idem, "Some Remarks on Translation Techniques of the Khotanese," in K. Röhrborn and W. Veenker, eds., *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien: Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981*, Wiesbaden, 1983, pp. 17-26.

Idem, "A New Khotanese Document from China," *Studia Iranica* 13, 1984, pp. 193-98, pl. XIV.

Idem, "The Crosby Collection," in A. Wezler and E. Hammerschmidt, eds., *Proceedings of the XXXII International Congress for Asian and North African Studies, Hamburg, 25th-30th August 1996*, Stuttgart, 1992a, pp. 672-74.

Idem, *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan*, 2nd ed., Tokyo, 1992b.

Idem, "The Svastika Antidote," *Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society* 2, 1992c, pp. 60-81.



Idem, “Notes on the Crosby Collection,” in W. Skalmowski and A. van Tongerloo, eds., *Medioiranica: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 21st to the 23rd of May 1990*, Leuven, 1993, pp. 57-64.

Idem, “On the St. Petersburg Folios of the Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra,” in *Au carrefour des religions: Mélanges offerts à Philippe Gignoux*, Bures-sur Yvette, 1995, pp. 51-66.

Idem, “A Khotanese Monastic Account Book,” in R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, I. Warnke, and P. Zieme, eds., *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang: Vorträge der Tagung “Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung,” veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.-12.12.1994)*, Berlin 1996, pp. 51-66.

Idem, “From the Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatārasūtra,” in P. Kieffer-Pülz and J.-U. Hartmann, eds., *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Swisttal-Odendorf, 1997a, pp. 81-90.

Idem, “Two Problems in the Khotanese Rāmāyaṇa,” in Sh. Akiner and N. Sims-Williams, eds., *Languages and Scripts of Central Asia*, London, 1997c, pp. 25-29.

Idem, “The Khotanese Sumukhasūtra,” *Indologica Taurinensia* 23-24, 1997-98, pp. 387-421.

Idem, “More Verses from the Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatārasūtra,” in P. Harrison and G. Schopen, eds., *Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Swisttal-Odendorf, 1998, pp. 33-42.

Idem, “Polyandry in the Khotanese Rāmāyaṇa,” in C. Chojnacki, J.-U. Hartmann, and V. M. Tschannerl, eds. *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, Swisttal-Odendorf, 2000, pp. 233-38.

Idem, “Hunting the Hapax: Sir Harold W. Bailey (1899-1996),” in N. Sims-Williams, ed., *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples*, Proceedings of the British Academy 116, Oxford, 2002, pp. 1-17.

R. E. Emmerick and M. Maggi, “Thoughts on Khotanese *e* and *o*,” in R. E. Emmerick and D. Weber, ed., *Corolla Iranica: Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. David Neil MacKenzie on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday on April 8th, 1991*, Frankfurt am Main, 1991, pp. 67-73.



R. E. Emmerick and A. Róna-Tas, “The Turkish-Khotanese Wordlist Revisited,” *Central Asiatic journal* 36, 1992, pp. 199-241.

R. E. Emmerick and M. I. Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja, *Saka Documents VII: The St. Petersburg Collections [SD VII]*, Corpus Inscr. Iran. II/V, London, 1993.

Idem, *Saka Documents. Text Volume III: The St. Petersburg Collections [SDTV III]*, Corpus Inscr. Iran. II/V, with contributions by H. Kumamoto et al., London, 1995.

A. Filigenzi and M. Maggi, “Pelliot tibétain 2222: a Dunhuang Painting with a Khotanese Inscription,” *Journal of Inner Asian Art and Archaeology* 3, forthcoming.

J. Hamilton, “Autour du manuscrit Staël-Holstein,” *T’oung pao* 46, 1958, pp. 115-53.

Idem, “Nasales instables en turc khotanais du Xe siècle,” *BSOAS* 40, 1977, pp. 508-21.

A. F. R. Hoernle, “Three Further Collections of Ancient Manuscripts from Central Asia,” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 66/1, 1897, pp. 213-60, pls. vii-xxx (repr. Calcutta, pls. i-xxiv).

S. Konow, “A Saka Name of Mazār-Tāgh,” in *A Volume of Eastern and Indian Studies in Honour of F. W. Thomas*, Bombay, 1939, pp. 146-47.

Idem, *A Medical Text in Khotanese: Ch. ii 003 of the India Office Library with translation and vocabulary*, Oslo, 1941.

H. Kumamoto, “Khotanese Official Documents in the Tenth Century,” Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1982.

Idem, “Some Problems of the Khotanese Documents,” in R. Schmitt and P. O. Skjærvo, eds., *Studia grammatica Iranica: Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*, München, 1986, pp. 227-44.

Idem, “Sei-iki ryokōshayō sansukuritto-kōtango kaiwa renshūchō”/“A Sanskrit-Khotanese Conversation Manual for Central Asian Travelers,” *Seinan Aja kenkyū/Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies* 28, 1988, pp. 53-82.



Idem, "Some Khotanese Letters in Verse," *Tokyo University Linguistics Papers* 12, 1991a, pp. 59-80.

Idem, "Two Khotanese Fragments concerning Thyai Paḍā-tsā," *Tokyo University Linguistics Papers* 11, 1991, pp. 101-20.

Idem, "More Khotanese Letters and Verses," *Tokyo University Linguistics Papers* 13, 1993, pp. 145-84.

Idem, "Miscellaneous Documents from the Pelliot Collection," *Tokyo University Linguistics Papers* 14, 1995, pp. 229-58.

Idem, "The Khotanese Documents from the Khotan Area," with an appendix by T. Saitō, in *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 54, 1996a, pp. 27-64.

Idem, "The Khotanese in Dunhuang," in A. Cadonna and L. Lanciotti, eds., *Cina e Iran: da Alessandro Magno alla dinastia Tang*, Firenze, 1996b, pp. 79-101.

Idem, "Textual Sources for Buddhism in Khotan," in J. R. McRae and J. Nattier, eds., *Collection of Essays 1993: Buddhism across Boundaries: Chinese Buddhism and the Western Regions*, Sanchung, 1999, pp. 345-60.

Idem, "The Concluding Verses of a 'Lyrical Poem in Khotanese'," in R. Tsuchida and A. Wezler, eds., *Harānandalaharī: Volume in Honour of Professor Minoru Hara on his Seventieth Birthday*, Reinbek, 2000, pp. 143-54.

Idem, "Sino-Hvatanica Petersburgensia (part I)," *Manuscripta Orientalia* 7, 2001, pp. 3-9.

Idem, "Sino-Hvatanica Petersburgensia. Part II," in M. Macuch, M. Maggi, and W. Sundermann, eds., *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan: Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*, Wiesbaden, 2007, pp. 147-60.

E. Leumann, *Das nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus*, Leipzig, 1933-36.

M. Leumann, "Zu zwei khotansakischen Fragmenten," *ZDMG* 113, 1963, pp. 80-86, 1 pl.

Idem, "Zur altkhotanischen Metrik," *Asiatische Studien* 25, 1971, pp. 456-80.



Lokesh Chandra, *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra: Kashgar Manuscript*, New Delhi, 1976.

M. Maggi, “Studi sul sistema accentuale del cotanese,” Ph.D. diss., Istituto Universitario Orientale, Naples, 1992.

Idem, *The Khotanese Karmavibhaṅga*, Roma, 1995.

Idem, “A Chinese-Khotanese Excerpt from the Mahāsāhasrapramardanī,” in *Convegno internazionale sul tema La Persia e l’Asia Centrale da Alessandro al X secolo* |, Roma, 9-12 novembre 1994, Roma, 1996, pp. 123-37.

Idem, *Pelliot Chinois 2928: a Khotanese Love Story*, Roma, 1997.

Idem, “Three Indian Loanwords in Khotanese,” in R. Torella et al., eds., *Le parole e i marmi: studi in onore di Raniero Gnoli nel suo 70° compleanno*, Roma, 2001, pp. 537-38.

Idem, “Canonical Quotations in the Khotanese *Book of Vimalakīrti*,” in G. Verardi and S. Vita, eds., *Buddhist Asia 1: Papers from the First Conference of Buddhist Studies Held in Naples in May 2001*, Kyoto, 2003a, pp. 85-101.

Idem, “More Verses from the Khotanese *Book of Vimalakīrti*,” in C. Cereti, M. Maggi, and E. Provasi, eds., *Religious Themes and Texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia: Studies in Honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday on 6th December 2002*, Wiesbaden, 2003b, pp. 247-55.

Idem, “Le *bhūmi* nel *Libro di Vimalakīrti* cotanese,” in C. G. Cereti, B. Melasecchi, and F. Vajifdar, eds., *Orientalia Romana, 7: Varia Iranica*, Roma, 2004a, pp. 131-36.

Idem, “The Manuscript T III S 16: its Importance for the History of Khotanese Literature,” in *Turfan Revisited: the First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*, ed. D. Durkin-Meisterernst et al., Berlin, 2004b, pp. 184-90 and 457.

Idem, “*Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra* Quotations in the Khotanese *Book of Vimalakīrti*,” in M. Macuch, M. Maggi, and W. Sundermann, eds., *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan: Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*, Wiesbaden, 2007, pp. 205-23.

Idem, “A Khotanese Medical Text on Poultices: Mss. P 2893 + IOL Khot S 9,”



Traditional South Asian Medicine 8, 2008, pp. 1-9.

Idem, “Khotanese Literature,” in *The Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran*, ed. R. E. Emmerick and M. Macuch, *A History of Persian Literature Companion Volume 1*, London, forthcoming.

Mathews’ Chinese-English Dictionary, rev. American ed., Cambridge, Mass., 1943.

G. Morgenstierne, “Iranica,” *Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap* 12, 1942, pp. 258-71.

J. Nobel, *Ein alter medizinischer Sanskrit-Text und seine Deutung*, Supplement to the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11, Baltimore, 1951.

E. G. Pulleyblank, “The Date of the Staël-Holstein Roll,” *Asia Major*, N.S. 4, 1954, pp. 90-97.

L. Sander, “Zu dem Projekt ‘Paläographie khotansakischer Handschriften’,” in W. Skalmowski and A. van Tongerloo, eds., *Middle Iranian Studies: Proceedings of the International Symposium Organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982*, Leuven, 1984, pp. 159-86.

Idem, “Brāhmī Scripts on the Eastern Silk Roads,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 11-12, 1986, pp. 159-92.

Idem, “Auftraggeber, Schreiber und Schreibeigenheiten im Spiegel khotansakischer Handschriften in formaler Brāhmī,” in P. Kosta, ed., *Studia Indogermanica et Slavica: Festgabe für Werner Thomas zum 65. Geburtstag*, München, 1988, pp. 533-49.

Idem, “Remarks on the Formal Brāhmī of Gilgit, Bamīyān and Khotan,” in K. Jettmar, ed., *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies*, vol. 1. *Rock Inscriptions in the Indus Valley*, Mainz, 1989, pp. 107-30, pls. 56-215.

P. O. Skjærvø, “Kings of Khotan in the Eighth Century,” in P. Bernard and F. Grenet, eds., *Histoire et cultes de l’Asie Centrale préislamique: sources écrites et documents archéologiques: actes du colloque international du CNRS, Paris, 22-28 novembre 1988*, Paris, 1991, pp. 255-78.

Idem, “Eastern Iranian Epic Traditions I: Siyāvaš and Kunāla,” in J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Oliver, eds., *Mír curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*,



Innsbruck, 1998, pp. 645-58.

Idem, “Khotan, an Early Center of Buddhism in Chinese Turkestan,” in J. R. McRae and J. Nattier, eds., *Collection of Essays 1993: Buddhism across Boundaries: Chinese Buddhism and the Western Regions*, Sanchung, 1999a, pp. 265-344.

Idem, “Recent Khotanese Ghostwords,” *BAI*, N.S. 13, 1999b [2002], pp. 151-55.

Idem, *Khotanese Manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in The British Library: A Complete Catalogue with Texts and Translations*, with contributions by U. Sims-Williams, *Corpus Inscr. Iran. II/V/Texts VI [SDTV VI]*, London, 2002.

Idem, “Fragments of the *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra (Kāśyapaparivarta)* in Khotanese,” in C. Cereti, M. Maggi, and E. Provasi, eds., *Religious Themes and Texts of Pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia: Studies in Honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday on 6th December 2002*, Wiesbaden, 2003b, pp. 409-20, pls. 11-12.

Idem, *The Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras: The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra I-II*, [Cambridge, Mass.], 2004.

Idem, “A Khotanese Amulet,” in M. Macuch, M. Maggi, and W. Sundermann, eds., *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan: Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*, Wiesbaden, 2007, pp. 387-402.

Idem, “Legal Documents from Eighth-Century Khotan,” in *From Nisa to Niya: New Discoveries and Studies in Central and Inner Asian Art and Archaeology*, London, forthcoming.

T. Takata, *A Historical Study of the Chinese Language Based on Dunhuang Materials*, Tokyo, 1988.

F. W. Thomas and S. Konow, *Two Medieval Documents from Tun-huang*, Oslo, 1929.

V. S. Vorob’ëv-Desjatovskij [Vorob’ëv-Desyatovskii] and M. I. Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja [Vorob’ëva-Desyatovskaya], *Skazanie o Bhadre: novye listy sakskoï rukopisi “E,”* Moskva, 1965.

M. I. Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja [Vorob’ëva-Desyatovskaya], “Hotano-saki” (The Khotanese), in *Vostochnyi Turkestan v drevnosti i rannem srednevekov’e: étnos*,



yazyki, religii (Eastern Turkestan in antiquity and in the early middle ages: Peoples, languages, religions), ed. V. A. Litvinskiĭ, Moskva, 1992a, pp. 32-76.

Idem, “The Leningrad Collection of the Sakish Business Documents and the Problem of the Investigation of Central Asian Texts,” in A. Cadonna, ed., *Turfan and Tun-huang: the Texts: Encounter of Civilizations on the Silk Route*, Firenze, 1992b, pp. 85-95.

K. Wille, “Die Sanskrit-Fragmente der Crosby-Sammlung (Washington D.C.),” in U. Hüsken, P. Kieffer-Pülz, and A. Peters, eds., *Jaina-itihāsa-ratna: Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, Marburg, 2006, pp. 483-510.

Y. Yoshida, *Kōtan shutsudo 8-9 seiki no Kōtango sezoku bunsho ni kansuru oboegaki/Notes on the Khotanese Documents of the 8th-9th Centuries Unearthed from Khotan*, Kobe 2006.

Idem, “Notes on the Khotanese Secular Documents of the 8th-9th Centuries,” in M. Macuch, M. Maggi, and W. Sundermann, eds., *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan: Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*, Wiesbaden, 2007, pp. 463-72.