

mentary portions of various canonical texts of the Mahāyāna, there are found among them leaves of the *Udānavarga* of Dharmatrāta² and a composition of Māṛceta. The fact that the writing in all these Pōthīs is in the Slanting Gupta script, not found in Tun-huang manuscripts of obviously local origin, points to their having been Central-Asian imports. Indian origin is certain in the case of the large palm-leaf Pōthī, Ch. 0079. A, which contains in sixty-four folia about one-third of the *Prajñā-pāramitā* in the *Śatasāhasrikā* version, and also in that of the single palm-leaf, Ch. 0079. b, preserved out of what must have been a large Mahāyāna Sūtra text.³ Both manuscripts are in Upright Gupta script and are likely to have reached Tun-huang through Tibet from the Nepālese side.

MS. rolls
with Sans-
krit texts.

Among the rolls with Sanskrit texts two, Ch. 0092 and Ch. 00330, deserve special mention. The first shows a portion of the *Nīlakanṭhadhāraṇī* with an interlinear Sogdian version. Since its publication by MM. de la Vallée Poussin and Gauthiot, M. Sylvain Lévi has suggested strong reasons for placing the date of this bilingual manuscript between A.D. 650-750.⁴ The other roll contains a short version of the *Prajñā-pāramitā* in Sanskrit with a Chinese transliteration in alternate columns, both closely agreeing with a well-known Horiuji manuscript of the sixth century. Various Buddhist texts in corrupt Sanskrit are found written on the reverse of Chinese rolls,⁵ a circumstance which together with the Cursive Gupta script points to their having been copied locally. Similar in language and character, but written in Upright Gupta, are most of the contents of the gigantic roll, Ch. c. 001,⁶ over 70 feet long, while the rest are in Khotanese and Cursive Gupta script.

Pōthīs in
Khotanese
language.

Far more numerous are both Pōthīs and rolls containing texts in the language which after having been, during earlier stages of its study, designated variously as 'Unknown Language II', 'North-Aryan', 'Eastern Turkestānī', 'Eastern Irānian', may conveniently be called now 'Khotanese' in accordance with the views arrived at by Dr. Hoernle, the pioneer of its study, and by Professor Sten Konow.⁷ In my collection of Ch'ien-fo-tung manuscripts it is represented by some fourteen Pōthīs and thirty-one rolls, some complete, some fragmentary. In the case of the rolls one side of the paper almost invariably displays a Chinese text, wholly unconnected in character with the Brāhmī text on the other.⁸ Both the Upright and Cursive Gupta scripts are found in the Khotanese texts. The most interesting among these are, perhaps, the two Pōthīs, both complete, containing the *Aparamitāyuh-sūtra* and the *Vajracchedikā* respectively.⁹ Both being literal translations of well-known Buddhist texts available in their Sanskrit originals, they first supplied Dr. Hoernle with the means for the systematic interpretation of connected passages of Khotanese text,¹⁰ and subsequently served Professor Sten Konow for his critical edition of these Khotanese versions.¹¹ Among other Khotanese Pōthīs which specimens reproduced in Plates CXLVIII-CL, CLII

² See for specimens, Pl. CXLIII.

³ For specimens of both manuscripts, see Pl. CXLII.

⁴ Cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1912, pp. 629 sqq., 1063 sqq.

⁵ See Ch. 0041, 0044 (Pl. CXLVII), 0047.

⁶ Cf. Hoernle, *The 'Unknown Languages' of Eastern Turkestan*, II, *J.R.A.S.*, 1911, pp. 471 sqq.; for specimens, see Pl. CXLVI (where a portion of the roll has by mistake been reproduced topsy-turvy).

⁷ Cf. *MS. Remains of Buddhist Literature*, ed. Hoernle, i, pp. x, 218 sqq. For earlier views as to the linguistic relation of this language, cf. also Pelliot, *Un fragment du Suvarṇa-prabhāsa-sūtra*, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique*, xviii (reprint), pp. 1 sq.

⁸ In Ch. 0045-6, 0049, 00271, 00331, where the Chinese writing on one side is wanting, the roll is fragmentary. In

Ch. c. 002 there is clear proof that an old Chinese roll had been used on the reverse as an 'exercise book' in Brāhmī. It is probable that in the majority of the cases the Chinese side is the obverse, containing the earlier writing. But see also Pelliot, *loc. cit.*, p. 3. The roll Ch. ii. 001, which is incomplete, has Khotanese on both sides. This is the case also in cvi. 001, where the reverse bears in addition Tibetan writing, apparently contemporaneous.

⁹ For specimens of the *Aparamitāyuh-sūtra*, Ch. xlvi. 0015, see Pl. CL; of the *Vajracchedikā*, Ch. 00275 + xlvi. 0012. a, in 44 foll., Pl. CXLIX; also *MS. Remains of Buddhist Literature*, i, Pl. V-XVI.

¹⁰ Cf. Hoernle, *The 'Unknown Languages' of Eastern Turkestan*, *J.R.A.S.*, 1910, pp. 836, 1283 sqq.

¹¹ Cf. Sten Konow, *The Vajracchedikā and the Aparami-*