A Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-śūtra Manuscript from Khotan: The Gift of a Pious Khotanese Family*

Oskar von Hinüber

The exact location, at which this manuscript was found, is unknown. However, it is certain that it was discovered by treasure-hunters during the last decade of the 19th century in the vicinity of Khotan, split up and eventually sold to different European researchers. The by far largest share of the manuscript was preserved first in the Asiatic Museum (Азиатский Музей), where it arrived, it seems, in two batches. Later, it was handed over to the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Институт Восточных Рукописей Российской Академии Наук) in St. Petersburg, where it is kept today. Part of this manuscript of the altogether 396 folios was acquired by Nikolaj Fedorovič Petrovskij (1837–1908), who was the Russian consul in Kashgar between 1st June 1882 (date of appointment) and August 1903. Consequently, the manuscript was known under the name “Kashgar Manuscript” for a long time, before Ronald Eric Emmerick (1937–2001) drew attention to the colophons, which are written in Khotanese and therefore point to a provenance from Khotan rather (see below). The date of acquisition is sometimes given as 1903 probably following A. Yuyama’s important bibliography instead of the correct 1892, if not earlier. For, a note on this manuscript appeared already in the Zapiski Vostočnogo Otdelenija Rossijskogo Archeologičeskogo Obščestva (Записки Восточного Отделения Российского Археологического Общества) “Memoirs of the Oriental Branch of the Russian Archaeological Society” no. 7 of the year 1892 (published 1893) by Sergej F. Ol’denburg: Kašgarskaja rukopis’ N. F. Petrovskogo (Kas-

The Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, were presented to the Imperial Russian Academy in St. Petersburg in 1910 by George Macartney (1867–1945), consul at Kashgar between 1890 and 1918. It is not clear, how many folios belong to each gift.

Furthermore, the British Library holds 40 folios in the Stein Collection and 4 folios in the Hoernle Collection. Lastly, a small number of folios is scattered over different libraries: 9 folios of the Trinkler Collection are kept in Staatsbibliothek, Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin. These are the “Marburg Fragments,” which were carefully studied by Heinz Bechert; 7 fragmentary folios belonging to the Otani Collection are in the Lüshun Museum (formerly Port Arthur), and finally 1 fragment in the Ellsworth Huntington Papers belongs to the Sterling Library of Yale University in New Haven.

At the beginning, it was not clear that all these folios were actually parts of one split up manuscript. First, the four folios of the Hoernle Collection were studied in great detail by Heinrich Lüders (1869–1943). While Lüders was working, the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra edition by Bunyiu Nanjio (1849–1927) and Hendrik Kern (1833–1917) appeared between 1908 and 1912. H. Kern was able to use the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript only after the main body of the text, which was established by B. Nanjio, had already been completed, and H. Kern did so in a very erratic way. With more and more material becoming available, it was slowly recognized that all these dispersed folios belonged to one and the same manuscript.

A first complete edition, or rather transcript, of the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript was prepared by Hirofumi Toda (1936–2003) first in seven parts between 1977 and 1979 and then again in a revised edition in 1981. A most useful updated survey of research was provided by Klaus Wille in 2000.

The Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript is, however, only one of a considerable number of Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra manuscripts recovered from the vicinity of Khotan, although the provenance of many Central Asian manuscripts is either uncertain or even unknown due to the lack of pertinent notes left by those who acquired them, or very often because of the reluctance of the “treasure-hunters,” from whom they were acquired, to reveal their sources. It can be assumed that at least the following 13 manuscripts and fragments may have been copied in the Khotan area:
The Lüshun manuscripts are by far the oldest, although a dating to the middle of the fifth century as suggested by Z. Jiang, p. 18a according to the palaeography, is perhaps a little early. While manuscript B may have been copied during the sixth century according to Z. Jiang, p. 18a, the other manuscripts, even those from Gilgit are younger, the Nepalese manuscripts even substantially.

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

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

Even though the undated Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript preserves a much older and more Middle Indic text than the Gilgit-Nepalese branch, it is difficult to date this manuscript, because the script used in this copy did not change over a certain period of time. Earlier scholars such as Nikolaj Dimitrievič Mironov (1880–1936) tried to date the Kashgar
(Khotan) Manuscript to the 7th century. In contrast, R. E. Emmerick assumed that the language of the colophons, which are not written in Sanskrit, but in late Khotanese, would hardly allow for a date earlier than the ninth, probably even the tenth century rather. If correct, the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript would have been copied more or less at the same time as the oldest Nepalese manuscripts, which are dated to the 11th century. However, given the uncertainty of dating “late Khotanese”, a date during the eighth or early ninth century seems to be more likely for the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript.

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

H. W. Bailey provided a transcript and a translation of the colophon at the end of the text for the first facsimile edition published by Lokesh Chandra. Unfortunately, the last folio of the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript is damaged with the middle part of the folio being lost and only the left and right parts being extant. These two fragments may preserve more than half the text of the colophon at the end of parivarta XXVIII Anuparindanā-Parivarta (folio 459b1–9):


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

Next, it is difficult to find out, what this number might refer to. A date is very unlikely, even if “800” is read, because there is no era only remotely matching this figure, and a round figure such as “800” is suspicious in a date anyway. Sometimes the length of the text is mentioned in the colophon, e.g., in the Mahāvastu granthapramāṇam śloka 25000 “the book extends to 25,000 ślokas,” which corresponds to 800,000 aksaras. A rough calculation shows that the complete Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript comprises 458 folios with 916 pages with seven lines of writing and with about 30 aksaras in each line, which amounts to 210 aksaras per page or about 420 per folio. Therefore, the sum of aksaras of the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript is 192,360 or 6,011 ślokas. Neither figure matches the number “800” or “8000,” not even approximately. The matter is further complicated by the colophons to parivarta V, which states on folio 140 pramāṇaṇaṁ śloka “the first quarter has come to an end,” and again to parivarta XIX on folio 360 “the third quarter has come to an end” (see below). Therefore, it cannot be ruled out that the figure “8000” might refer to the length of the last quarter of the text only. However, the length of the last quarter is 97 folios with 40,740 aksaras or 1273 ślokas. Lastly, the price for copying the manuscript might have been mentioned here as it is rarely done in much later Pāli manuscripts from Northern Thailand. Non liquet.

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

“[…] with the mother I share [the merit] and with the father, who have gone to the other world, and with the husband Jalāḍuṇḍa I share and …
with ... I share and then] I share the merit with Pharsaja + and Jaraulkulina, who [has gone] to the other [world and ... ] with and then the merit with my own brother Bramgalaka, who has gone to the other world, and I sha[re ... ] and then I share the merit together with sister Samdusṭā (Sanskrit Santuṣṭā), who has gone to the other [world ... ] I share and with daughter Jalottamā and daughter Śīksamāṇī, who [has gone] to the other world [ ... ] Buddhhasamgha and with Vinaya and together with the son’s wife Jalārjuṇāni [ ... ]ther Dattaka and together with brother Vikrama and sister Dharmakā and sist[er ... and then] I share [the merit with all frie]nds and together with all members of the household, with all relatives.”

The translation does not pose serious problems. Only pharsaja+na is obscure. H. W. Bailey takes this complex to mean “judge Ja+” which, however, results in an unusually brief and therefore rather unlikely personal name. Therefore, it is perhaps better to interpret Pharsaja + as one word and as a name.32

The overall context is clear not the least due to the repetitiveness of the colophon formula. The end of the colophon seems to follow an Indian model, if inscriptional evidence is compared. The inscription of the vinayadhara Dharmasena says evam ca savehi nāti-mita-baṁdhavehi and an inscription from Taxila has nāti-mitra-salohidāna.33 This corresponds to hayūna “friend” (mitra, cf. Saṁghāṭasūtra § 246,4 ha[yūna] = sakhāyā)34, bisvāra / busvāra “kinsman” (probably bāndhava) and ysani “kinsman” (nāti, cf. Saṁghāṭasūtra § 243 verse 30 ysāne = jñātayaḥ; ysani also translates bandhujana)35.

A number of deceased persons are mentioned in the beginning after the principal donor, lady Suviprabā, whose husband is named among the persons enumerated to share the merit. The names of altogether 26 persons are preserved in this fragment. Moreover, at least 7 names can be inferred as missing out of an uncertain number of names actually lost. It is impossible, to calculate the number of persons probably exceeding 50 exactly (see below).

For, as a complete folio measures 57 cm by 18 cm, while the extant right part of the colophon folio measures only 13 cm by 21 cm, approximately only half the text of the colophon is extant here, which, however, can be supplemented in part by the fragment in the British Library (cf. note 27 above). The space at the bottom of the fragment shows that the last line is preserved. Therefore, about 5 cm of the topmost part of this folio are lost. This missing part of the fragment contained two lines (ca. 60 aksaras) in formal script with the end of the
Saddharmapuṇḍarīkāsūtra and at least a brief colophon. In front of the extant part of the colophon in formal script about 14 akṣaras are lost, if the text was distributed symmetrically on both sides of the rosette. The text of line 3 breaks of with Saddharmapuṇḍarīkāsūtra and at least a brief colophon. In front of the extant part of the colophon in formal script about 14 akṣaras are lost, if the text was distributed symmetrically on both sides of the rosette. The text of line 3 breaks of with saddharmapuṇḍarīkāsūtra or saddharmapuṇḍarīkāsūtra with 6 akṣaras or 7 cm missing at the end.

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

The extant persons are the following:

0. Lady Suviprabhā, the principal donor
1. mother of Jalapuṇānā†
2. father of Jalapuṇānā†
3. husband Jalapuṇā
4. name(s) lost
5. Phāraṣaja+ (not clear) (†?)
6. Jaraṅkulina†
7. name(s) lost
8. brother Bramgalaka†
9. name(s) lost
10. sister Santuṣṭā†
11. name(s) lost
12. daughter Jalottamā
13. Śīksamāṇī†
14. name(s) lost
15. Buddhasaṃgha
16. Vinaya
17. son’s wife (daughter-in-law) Jalārrjuṇāṇī
18. name(s) lost
19. brother Dattaka
20. brother Vikrama
21. sister Dharmkā
22. name(s) lost
23. friends (mitra)
24. family (bāṇḍhava)
25. kinsmen (jñāti)

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

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

At the end of the introductory Stotra (4b4):
Sadharmapuṇḍarikamahāyānasūtrakāyatotram kṛtirāṃ ācārya-

**Rahulabhadrasya**
At the end of the introduction (6b2-4):
namāḥ sarvajñāya nama āryasamantabhadraśyā bodhisatvāya mahāsatvāya.
ayam deyadharman dānapati Jalapuñāṣya. siddham namaha
sarvabuddhabodhisatvebhyaḥ. evam mayā śrutam … (Beginning of the
text of the sūtra)

Colophons at the end of the individual parivartas:
I. Parivarta (36a1):
… samāptah. ayaµ deyadharman dānapati Jalapuñāṣya. atha khalu …

II. Parivarta (64a6f. foll.)
… samāptah 2 ll misjei’ jalapuñāṃna parstā pidi saha jalārjunaṣya.
atha khalu…

III. Parivarta (101b5 foll.):
… samāpta 3 ll deyadharmao yam dānapati Suviprabhasya ll atha khalv …

IV. Parivarta (121a5):
… samāptah 4 deyadharman yam jalottamasya ll atha khalv …

V. Parivarta (140a6):
… samāptah 5 ll prathamacaturbhāgaḥ samāptaḥ ll—ttū namau
sadharmapuṇḍarī parśeei’ jalapuñāṇa parstā pidi. haṃṭsa pūri
śparadattina ll atha khalv …

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

XII. Parivarta (255b7):
duḥita (dūvaka)sya (end of folio 255b; beginning of folio 256a1) atha
khalu …

H. Toda supplies [saha duḥita jalotama]sya, which contradicts the
evidence found in the (new) facsimile edition, where it is clear that the
name of the daughter consists of only three, not four akṣaras. Moreover,
the shape of the slightly blurred akṣaras clearly points to dūvakasya,
again a feminine name with a masculine ending, cf. note 43 below. The gap following deya[ is tentatively filled by supplying text from the colophon to parivarta III, etc.

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

XIV. Parivarta (283a2):
… caturdaśamaḥ samāptah 11 || [de]yadharmau yam suviprab(ṣ)asya saha duhitā jalotamasya atha khalv anya[…

XV. Parivarta (302a7–302b2):
… paṇcadaśamaḥ samāptah 15 || mijśei’ jalapuñāna parstā piḍi uysānye jśiṇi paderāṣci kiḏina. haṃtṣa kṣā’ daī jalapuñina u pūri jalārrjāṇa dvrā jalotamā jsa u pūrā śparadatāna u dūvakā jsa. atha khalu …

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

XVII. Parivarta (331a1):
… aṣṭādaśamaḥ samāptah deyadharma suviprabhasya saha putrā jalārrjunasya. atha khalu …

XVIII. Parivarta (340b3):
… aṣṭādaśamaḥ samāptah deyadharma suviprabhasya saha putrā jalārrjunasya. atha khalu …

XIX. Parivarta (360b3):
… ekonaviṇṣatimāḥ samāptah 19 triśaś caturbhāgaḥ samāpta || ayaṃ deyadharma suviprabhasya : atha khalu …

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

XXI. Parivarta (380b2):
… samāptah 21 deyadharma yam dānapati jalapuñasya saha putrā jalārrjunasya. atha khalu …

XXII. Parivarta (387a7):
jalapuñasya saha suvipra[ḥa…]

XXIII. Parivarta (397b1):
] 23 deyadharma suviprabhasya [atha khalu …
Most likely, the complete colophon is extant.

XXIV. Parivarta (421a1):
caturviṇṣa]timāḥ samāptah 24 deyadharma yam [ ca. 17 aksaras ]sya atha khalu …
According to the length of the gap, this colophon could correspond to the one of Parivarta II.

XXV. Parivarta (432b1f.):
… paṇcavimśatimāḥ samāpta. jalapuñasya [ (gap)

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

XXVII. Parivarta (455b7):
… saptaviṃśatimahiṃ samāptah || atha khalu … (No donor is mentioned)

XXVIII. Parivarta (459a6):
[sadevagandharvamānuśāsurāḥ ca (End of the line)
(459a7): lost (ca. 30 aksaras)
(459b1): lost (ca. 30 aksaras)
(459b2): lost (ca. 30 aksaras)
(459b3): + + + + + + + + + + + + ] 800 || tuu namo saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra
(459b4): /1/ ]meri jsa hambrīhyā u pyarāna cu parilo tsuāmdā u kṣadai jala
(459b5): /2/ [puṇīna jsa hambrīhyā u … jsa hambrīhyā u tti ru] puṇa phar śaja+(na) hambrīhyā u jaraukulina cu pari
(459b6): /3/ [lo tsue u … ] jsa u tti ru puṇa hīvī brātarā bramgalaina cu parilo tsue u ha[m]
(459b7): /4/ [ … ] u tti ru puṇa hamtsa hvārakā samduṣṭi jsa hambrīhyā cu pa
(459b8): /5/ [rilu tsue …] hambrīhyā u dvīrā jalottamā jsa u dvīrā śikṣamāṇā cu parilo
(459b9): /6/ [tsue …] budasamgāna u hamtsa vinayā jsa u <ham> tsa pūrā nerā jalārjunaṃṇāḥ jsa
(459b10): /7/ [ … brā](ta)ṛā dattakāṇa u hamtsa brātarā vikramma u hvārakā dhamrakā jsa u hvā

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

All parivartas of the first quarter (prathamacaturbhāga), the parivartas I to V, have colophons, while parivartas VI to XI do not. As can be seen in the manuscript donated by Intula37 the second quarter (dvitiyacaturbhāga) ends with parivarta X thus comprising parivartas VI–X. It is remarkable that there is space for names at the end of parivartas VI to X as indicated above. The length of the gaps left open varies between 6 aksaras, where just the genitive of a name would fit in as actually found in, e.g., parivarta XXV, and 27 aksaras a gap that allows inserting a longer colophon as at the end of parivarta X, where in addition to the name of a donor also dvitiyaścaturbhāgaḥ 2 would have
to be filled in. Consequently, the third quarter (त्र्यादसपञ्चमंग) comprises परिवर्तः XI to XIX, and the fourth quarter (चतुर्थपञ्चमंग) परिवर्तः XX to XXVIII. Thus, the distribution of parivartas and folios within the individual quarters is 5 + 5 parivartas in the first, and 9 + 9 parivartas in the second part of the text with twice approximately 135 + 90 folios: 1st quarter: 5 parivartas (folios 7 – 140 = 133 folios), 2nd quarter: 5 parivartas (folios 141 – 226a = 85), 3rd quarter: 9 parivartas (folios 226b – 360 = 134 folios), 4th quarter: 9 parivartas (folios 361 – 458 = 97 folios).38

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

The language of the colophons is a mixture of Khotanese and Sanskrit in a stereotyped wording. Consequently, grammar is often neglected in these formulas, particularly gender, when masculine endings are attached to feminine names. This is, obviously, an obstacle to the comprehension of the relationship among the persons named as donors. Following the rules of grammar blindly, it seems that there are two men, Jalapuña and Suviprabha. The husband (Khotanese kṣā’dai) Jalapuña has three children with lady (Khotanese miṣei’) Jalapuñånå, two sons (Khotanese pūra, Sanskrit putra), Jalårjuna and Śparadatta, and one daughter (Khotanese dvīra, Sanskrit duhitå) Jalottamå. Strangely, Suviprabha also seems to have a son named Jalårjuna and a daughter Jalottamå, a very unlikely coincidence indeed.

R. E. Emmerick tried to sort out this problem by assuming that the husband of Jalapuñånå had two names, Jalapuña and Suviprabha. The first name Jalapuñånå is derived from Jalapuña by help of the suffix -āña, a word formation that marks an affiliation thus corresponding to the Sanskrit suffix -āṇī indicating a wife since Vedic times such as Indra and his wife Indrāṇī.42 Here, the Khotanese suffix -āña shows that husband Jalapuña and wife Jalapuñånå are a couple. Also according to R. E. Emmerick Jalapuña (masc.) is the name of the husband, as the colophon of parivarta XV shows beyond doubt in kṣā’dai Jalapuñina “by the husband Jalapuña” and that of his wife is in Khotanese Jalapuñånā. In Sanskrit however R. E. Emmerick assumes that the name of the wife is Jalapuñyā, fem. For, the colophon of parivarta XXII jaḷapuññasya. saha suvipr[ interpreted by R. E. Emmerick as “Jalapuñā (fem.) with Suviprabha (masc.)” If so, Jalapuña (masc., parivarta XV) and Suviprabha (masc., parivarta XXII) should be two names of the
same person, the husband of Jalapuñā. However, that one and the same person bears two names, is not only unusual, but almost impossible.

The solution is comparatively easy. It is not the husband, who is mentioned under two names, but the wife, who is called in Khotanese Jalapuñānā “the one belonging to Jalapuñā (as wife)” and by her name Suviprabhā (fem.) in Sanskrit. Of course her gender is concealed in the colophons at the end of parivartas XIV and XXII by the masculine ending of suviprab(h)asya. The same is true for duhitā dūvakasya “of the daughter Dūvakā” and duhitā jalotamasya “of the daughter Jalottamā” in the colophons to parivartas XII and XIV respectively, which are clearly feminine names again with a masculine ending. The problem is created by the rigid deyadharma formula, in which the masculine case ending -asya is so firmly rooted that it is used irrespective of gender also with feminine nouns.43

Having sorted this out, we can have another look at the colophon at the very end of the text. At the beginning the principal donor was named. Therefore the missing text can be assumed to have started by something like:44]miśjei’ su[viprabha parstā piḍi. puṇa hamsa] meri jsa hambrīhyā u pyarāna cu parilo tsuāmdā “Lady Suviprabhā had (this text) written. I share the merit with my mother and my father, who have gone to the other world …”

The family is united in the colophon to parivarta XV: “Lady Jalapuñānā ordered (chapter 15) to be written for the sake of the maintenance of the life of herself: together with her husband Jalapuña, and her son Jalārjām, her daughter Jalotama and her son Śparadatta (cf. R. E. Emmerick, “postscript” p. 388), and (her daughter) Dūvakā” (R. E. Emmerick, p. 384 and on the name p. 386). At the same time this colophon underlines the purpose of the donation.45

With the exception of the Iranian names Śparadatta and Dūvakā, the others can be normalized in Sanskrit: The couple Jalapuṇya and Jalapuṇyāni = Suviprabhā had two sons, Jalārjuna and Śparadatta, and two daughters, who were still alive at the time of the donation, Jalottomā and Dūvakī. The third already deceased daughter Śikṣamāṇī is mentioned only in the colophon at the end.

In the colophon at the end only the deceased anonymous parents of Suviprabhā, her husband and one living daughter, Jalotamā, are mentioned. Most likely, the names of the other members of the family were also included, but are lost. On the other hand, one more daughter named Śikṣamāṇī surfaces together with Suviprabhā/Jalapunyāni’s brother Bramgalaka and her sister Santuṣṭā. All three are deceased. Therefore, they can participate in the merit created by the donation only
indirectly. For this reason, they are mentioned only in the colophon at the end, which obviously is the place, where a transfer of merit is made.46

Moreover, we learn from the colophon at the end that Suviprabhā/Jalapuṇyāṇī’s son Jalārjuna is married, and his wife is also named after her husband Jalārjunāṇī. The relationship of the remaining seven persons, Phārṣaja+, Jarākulina, Buddhāsamgha, Vinaya, Dattaka, Vikrama, and Dharmakā to the family of Jalapuṇya and Suviprabhā/Jalapuṇyāṇī, if any, or among themselves remains obscure.

Some very Buddhist names mentioned in the colophon are remarkable: Śūkṣmāṇī,47 Buddhāsamgha, Vinaya and Dharmakā. They recall the names of two ladies mentioned in the inscription of the vinayadhara Dhammasena: Bodhā and Buddhā.48 Names of this type obviously have enjoyed certain popularity, although they do not seem to occur in Buddhist literature, which, of course, does not at necessarily reflect Buddhist personal names as used in real daily life.

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

Jalapuṇā is mentioned again together with the title Saddharma-puṇarikasūtra on two folios which are at present detached from the Kashgar (Khotan) Manuscript, to which they belong as noted by R. E. Emmerick.49 As the text begins with siddham, it is likely that these two folios without pagination extant originally stood at the very beginning of the text. Here, Jalapuṇā expresses his wish to be reborn together with his parents and his wife (whose name is not given in this text) at a time, when the future Buddha Maitreya will appear on earth. Moreover, he praises the Buddha and his various selfless deeds done for all beings, among others: “He tore off the flesh of his own skin. He made (his) bone a document. He gave a pen … wrote with (it) one verse (śloka)” (R. E. Emmerick). This is a close parallel to the Book of Zambasta XXIII 16, where the well-known and also often quoted example of self-sacrifice by writing a Buddhist verse with one’s own blood is referred to. Consequently, the gap might be filled by hūni jṣa “with blood” and the translation adjusted accordingly: “He gave a pen. He wrote with (his) blood one verse.”51

The overall number of persons—perhaps as many as 50—participat-
ing in this donation by a large and obviously at least well off family—
copying manuscripts was fairly expensive—demonstrates that the Sanskrit version of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra was held in high esteem in Khotan as do the numerous manuscripts of this text found there and referred to above. This is further underlined by four miniature paintings found in a manuscript donated by the Khotanese donor Intula and preserved in the St. Petersburg collection.

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

More puzzling are the empty spaces at the end of the five parivartas VI to X of the second quarter of the text, which could accommodate colophons of different length varying from only a simple name such as intulasya (quoted above in note 37 above) to a longer text. As stated above, all colophons within the text seem to have been written by the scribe of the manuscript in the same formal script without any indication that they were added only after copying was completed. Consequently, certain parts of the text must have been attributed to the respective donors from the very beginning, when the donation was planned and before the scribe began his work. If so, these gaps and particularly their varying length make little sense and are difficult to understand. Was there the hope to win additional donors to join (and share the merit as well as the expenses) during the act of copying only, who, however, were not found or declined? This, we shall never know.

Lastly, in spite of the indubitable popularity of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra in Khotan, it was not translated into Khotanese, in contrast to other texts such as the very popular Samghāta-sūtra or the equally popular Suvarṇabhāṣottama-sūtra. Only a very brief summary of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra in Khotanese exists, but that in rather many manuscripts, which again underlines the popularity of the text. Besides this summary there is one single verse translated from Sanskrit
into Khotanese and quoted in the Book of Zambasta.\textsuperscript{56} It is not likely that this verse is the only trace left of a once complete, but lost translation of the Saddharmapūṇḍarīkasūtra into Khotanese. Rather, it seems to be a spontaneous translation by the author of the Book of Zambasta who wanted to quote this verse in his enumeration of individual verses cited from different sūtra texts.\textsuperscript{57}

With the Saṃghāṭasūtra, which was obviously widely read in Khotan and in Gilgit in the same way as the Saddharmapūṇḍarīkasūtra was, the situation is exactly the opposite. While G. Canevascini was able to identify traces of no less than 29 Khotanese manuscripts of the Saṃghāṭasūtra, not a single Sanskrit manuscript can be traced back to Khotan. As far as the origin of the 11 Sanskrit manuscripts is known or can be inferred, they were either copied in Gilgit or in the northwest of the Indian subcontinent with the only exception being manuscript “L” written in “Proto-Bengali” script.\textsuperscript{58}

The Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra is represented by about 20 manuscripts in Khotanese and by a considerable number of Sanskrit fragments also from the vicinity of Khotan.\textsuperscript{59} This sūtra thus holds an intermediate position between the exclusively Sanskrit tradition of the Saddharmapūṇḍarīkasūtra and the equally exclusively Khotanese tradition of the Saṃghāṭasūtra in Khotan.

Given the total number of all fragments and manuscripts recovered from the Khotan area, it does not seem likely, though it is of course not impossible, that this situation is due to an accidental complete loss of all Sanskrit manuscripts of the Saṃghāṭasūtra or all Khotanese traces of the Saddharmapūṇḍarīkasūtra at Khotan. It is, however, much more likely that the Saddharmapūṇḍarīkasūtra was among the texts which were never translated into Khotanese,\textsuperscript{60} perhaps because, as it is said in the Book of Zambasta VI.4, “the Khotanese do not value the Law at all in Khotanese” (M. Maggi).\textsuperscript{61} If the author of the Book of Zambasta can be taken at his word, this reluctance to translate the Saddharmapūṇḍarīkasūtra again would stress the highest appreciation for this text.
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3 An obituary by Sergej Fedorovič Ol’denburg (1863–1934): Pamjati Nikolaja Theodoroviča Petrovskago 1837–1908 appeared in Zapiski Vostočnogo Otdelenija Rossiišskogo Archeologičeskogo Obščestva 20. 1910, pp. 1–8, where, most unfortunately, except for some bibliographical references no detailed information on antiquities collected by N. F. Petrovskij is given; nor is the end of his tenure at Kashgar mentioned; for the date cf. Skrine and Nightingale, Macartney at Kashgar, as below note 7, p. 134 and Bongard-Levin & Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja: Pamjatniki, as note 19 below, p. 17 mentioning only the year 1903.


6 Unfortunately, this note is not accessible to me; quoted after Margarita Iosifovna Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja in: The Caves of One Thousand Buddhas. Russian Expeditions on the Silk Route, on the Occasion of 190 Years of the Asiatic Museum. Exhibition Catalogue. St. Petersburg 2008, p. 104 and Irina Fedorovna Popova: Foreword to

7 After M. I. Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja as preceding note and Bongard-Levin & Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja: Pamjatniki, as note 19 below, p. 17 with note 23, whereas the statement ibidem p. 78 “This manuscript was received by the Academy of Sciences as a gift from the English consul at Kashgar, G. Macartney in 1910” referring to manuscript SI P/5 (Kashgar [Khotan] Manuscript) is an obvious error, and thus the exact details of the acquisition of the Kashgar (Khotan) manuscript preserved in St Petersburg remain obscure due to partly contradictory comments by G. M. Bongard-Levin and M. I. Vorob’ëva-Desjatovskaja.—On Sir George Macartney: Clarmont Percival Skrine and Pamela Nightingale: Macartney at Kashgar. New Light on British, Chinese, and Russian Activities in Sinkiang, 1890–1918. London 1973, repr. Hong Kong and Oxford 1987 and Lady (Catherine Borland) Macartney: An English Lady in Chinese Turkestan. Hong Kong and Oxford 1985.
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14 Saddharmapuṇḍarīka ed. by Hendrik Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio. St. Petersburg 1908–
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16 H. Toda: Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts, as note 2 above.


18 The origin of Lüshun manuscript C is unknown, manuscript D is the Kashgar (Khotan) manuscript, cf. Z. Jiang, Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection, as note 12 above, p. 23 foll.


20 H. Bechert: Marburger Fragmente, as note 5 above, p. 15.
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28 Missing text is put into brackets [ ], damaged akṣaras into parentheses ( ), while < > marks an akṣara forgotten by the scribe, and + stands for a gap of one akṣara.

29 The numbers from this manuscript are conveniently collected by Klaus Wille: Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland. Supplementband 30. Stuttgart 1990, table p. 20.
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33 O. v. Hinüber: A Second Inscription from Phanigiri (Andhrapradesh): Dhammasena’s Donation. ARIRIAB 15. 2012, pp. 2–10, particularly p. 4, line 7 foll. with corrections in O. v. Hinüber: Again on the donation made by the vinayadhara Dham-


36 The name of an author is given in a corresponding way in kṛtir bhikṣor ācāryaDharmatrātasya, in: Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfundern. Teil 9: Die Kata

37 G. M. Bongard-Levin & M. I. Vorob’eva-Desjatovskaja: Pamjatniki, as note 19 above, p. 103, ms. P/10, folio 287b2 foll.: saddharmapundarikē mahāvaitulasyūrāratan
dharmabhānakariparivarto nāma dāśama samāptaḥ 10 dvitiyāścaturbhāgaḥ 2 deva-
dharmau yam dānapati intulasya, cf. also at the end of the first quarter in the same manuscript ibidem, p. 133, folio 206(not 240!)a3 foll.: saddharmapundarikē mahāvaitulasyūrāratan osadhhiparivarto nāma pañcamaḥ samāptaḥ 5 || prathamaścatur-
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38 It is conceivable that the distribution of parivartas and folios was quite regular in the “original” manuscript when this division into “quarters” was introduced. There are indications in the extant fragments of Intula’s donation of a Saddharmapundarikāsūtra manuscript (SI P/10) that the scribe tried to reproduce the folios of his exemplar, if the stretching (end of folios 296, 297, facsimile edition pp. 859, 861) and compressing (end of folio 299, facsimile edition p. 865) of the script is taken into consideration.

39 There is no example for this kind of text division in Louis Renou: Les divisions dans les textes sanskrits. Indo-Iranian Journal 1. 1957, pp. 1–32. It does occur once again, however, in the Saddharmapundarikāsūtra manuscript donated by Intula as indicated above in note 37.


44 misjei’ su is extant in the fragment preserved in the British Library, see note 27 above.

45 Devaśirikā, the donatrix of manuscript “D” of the Saṁghāṣṭasūtra expresses a similar wish: sva śarīre āyurvalavarnavṛddhi, O. v. Hinüber: Palola Śāhis, as note 36 above, no. 10 (Saṁghāṭasūtra).

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


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


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


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


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

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

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

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


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