

Metrical passages in the Khotanese *Samghāṭa-sūtra*

Nicholas Sims-Williams | ORCID: 0000-0002-7444-2376
SOAS University of London, London, UK
ns5@soas.ac.uk

Abstract

The Buddhist Sanskrit *Samghāṭa-sūtra* includes several longer or shorter passages in verse, mostly *ślokas*. Many though not all of these verse passages also appear in metrical form in the Khotanese version, which makes use of all three of the metres known from the longest Old Khotanese poem, the *Book of Zambasta*. The aim of the present article is to analyse these metrical passages in order to determine to what extent the treatment of the metres conforms to the practice of the *Book of Zambasta*. The relevant passages are therefore presented with a detailed metrical analysis as well as an English translation and brief commentary.

Keywords

Khotanese language – Old Khotanese poetry – metre – *Samghāṭa-sūtra* – *Book of Zambasta*

Introduction

The *Samghāṭa-sūtra* (henceforth: “*Sgh*”), a popular Mahāyāna devotional text originally composed in Sanskrit, was translated into many of the languages used by Buddhists in East and Central Asia, including Chinese, Tibetan, Sogdian and Khotanese. The popularity of the Khotanese version is clear from the fact that it is attested by about 150 folios or fragments belonging to more than 25 different manuscripts. In 1993 Giotto Canevascini, building on earlier work by Ernst Leumann, Sten Konow, H.W. Bailey and Oskar von Hinüber, incorporated almost all of this material into his excellent edition *The Khotanese Saṅghāṭa-*

sūtra (henceforth: “KS”).¹ A few additional fragments have since been identified by Duan Qing, Mauro Maggi and Prods Okto Skjærvø.² A preliminary edition of the underlying Sanskrit text, supplied by von Hinüber, is included in Canevascini’s edition, but this is now superseded by von Hinüber’s *editio maior* of 2021.

While most of the Sanskrit *Sgh* is composed in prose, several sections are in verse, almost all *ślokas*. Many of these verse passages also appear in metrical form in the Khotanese version, where they tend to be much more freely translated than the surrounding prose—sometimes so freely that the correspondence between the two texts is hardly discernible.³ The verse passages are presented in all manuscripts as continuous text, making it difficult to distinguish verse from prose in broken passages.⁴ Some of the Sanskrit verses seem to be translated into Khotanese prose, though it cannot be excluded *a priori* that some of them may attest a metre or metrical system otherwise unknown.⁵ Those parts of the Khotanese translation which are clearly in verse make use of the same three metres which are known from the most substantial Old Khotanese poem which has come down to us, the *Book of Zambasta* (= *Z*). In a recent book (Sims-Williams 2022), I have given a new analysis of these three metres, conventionally referred to as A, B and C, as they are attested in *Z*. The existence of verses in the same metres in another source provides an opportunity both to test this analysis and to discover whether these metres were treated differently by different poets. In this connection it is worth noting that the oldest surviving fragments both of *Z* and of the Khotanese *Sgh* are written in what Lore Sander has defined as “Early Turkestan Brāhmī, type b”, which suggests that the composition of both works took place not later than the fifth century.⁶ Any differences between *Sgh* and *Z* in the treatment of the metre, therefore, are unlikely to be due to chronological factors.⁷

1 See Canevascini (1993) and the earlier publications listed below in the bibliography. I take this opportunity to thank Ruixuan Chen and Mauro Maggi for a number of helpful suggestions, the most important of which will be acknowledged at the appropriate point.

2 Duan (2011); Maggi (2017b); Skjærvø (2002): 119–120 (Or. 12452D/14), 217 (IOL Khot 23/2), 231–232 (IOL Khot 28/9, which supplements 28/6), 232 (IOL Khot 28/10), 243 (IOL Khot 31/11), 313 (IOL Khot 115/6), 395–396 (IOL Khot 177/8, which supplements 177/7), 408–409 (IOL Khot 186/6), 427 (IOL Khot 192/1), 429 (IOL Khot 193/4), and probably some others listed in the index *ibid.*, 608, under the heading “Saṅghāta-sūtra(?)”.

3 See for instance below on 6.5 and 9.2.

4 One Sanskrit verse is often translated by two in Khotanese. The occasional verse numbers in the Khotanese text often seem to refer to the underlying Sanskrit verses, see KS xvii.

5 See discussion below of passage no. 11 (*Sgh* 253).

6 See Maggi (2004), especially p. 186.

7 Note the following conventions employed below: H = heavy syllable, L = light syllable,

Verses in Metre C

Sgh 99 includes a series of verses in metre C, which I have re-edited and studied in a forthcoming article.⁸ Some verses, all of which are attested only in one manuscript (“MS 6” according to Canevascini’s numbering), appear to contain a few copying errors. Thus, in two *pādas* (3d, 7a) a 3-mora sequence is lacking and in another (5c) it appears necessary to delete a superfluous negative *ne*. Similar errors are not uncommon in Z. The only detail in this metre C passage which seems seriously to contravene any of the metrical “rules” deduced from Z is the occurrence of *stōrě* ‘HL “strong” at the end of the hemistich 8ab, where a word of the shape ‘LL is expected. Rather than being a mistake for *sturě* “heavy”, as I first suspected, this cadence may indicate that the first syllable of *stora-* < **stabra-* “strong” can be read with either a long or a short vowel, as in the well-established case of *jseiṇa-/jsāṇa-* ‘HL/LL < **jašna-* “small, fine”, which occurs several times at the end of a metre C hemistich.⁹

Apart from the details mentioned in the last paragraph, the metre C verses in *Sgh* 99 do not contain anything which would be regarded as irregular if it were attested in Z. They do however attest at least one feature which can plausibly be attributed to the fact that the *Sgh* and Z are works by two different authors, namely, the remarkable frequency of 7-mora cadences ending with ‘LLL (˘˘˘) instead of the more usual ‘HL (˘˘).¹⁰ The difference between the

˘ = heavy syllable with metrical lightening, μ = one mora (i.e. one light syllable or half a heavy syllable), ' = metrical ictus, || = end of cadence, | = compulsory word- or compound-boundary, + = compulsory syllable-boundary, ! = metrical irregularity. The hyphen in a formula such as -LHL (below, 3.1a) marks a segment which is short by one mora, cf. Sims-Williams (2022): 66–67. Wherever possible, the length of the ambiguous letters *e* and *o* is marked: *ě* *ō*, *ē* *ō*. Bold type, e.g. *śada*, *buttě*, indicates a consonant which is treated metrically as double. Superscript letters, as in *ys^hyāmatu*, represent sounds pronounced but not written; subscript letters, as in *u_snaura*, represent letters which are disregarded in the scansion. The grave accent, e.g. *ì*, *àù*, marks a long vowel or diphthong which is to be read as short (often but not always for metrical reasons).

8 Sims-Williams (forthcoming a), text no. 4. Originally the series probably consisted of about 40 verses, of which some 24 are reasonably well preserved.

9 Sims-Williams (2022): 40, 45.

10 In *Sgh* 99 the metre C 7-mora cadences ending ‘LLL make up 20–30% of the total (depending on how one scans a few ambiguous cases) as opposed to less than 2% in Z. It is interesting to note that the parts of *Sgh* in metres A and B contain only two more clear instances of a 7-mora cadence ending in ‘LLL (below, 9.4b and 12.1b, both ending *vātā śtā*). It seems therefore that the poet’s apparent predilection for such cadences was limited to metre C, perhaps because such cadences echo the usual ‘LLL at the end of that metre’s 5- and 6-mora cadences. Cf. the strong association in Z

Sgh and Z in this respect is quite striking and clearly statistically significant. The *Sgh* passage also includes two rare 9-mora cadences, HLL'LLLLL (or perhaps HL'LLLLLL) in 9c and LH'LLHL in 10c, which happen not to be attested in metre C in Z. However, since they do occur there in metre A, and the two metres seem to employ essentially the same range of 7-, 9- and 10-mora cadences, their occurrence in metre C in *Sgh* cannot be regarded as having any particular significance.

Verses in Metres A and B

In the following pages I will discuss all the remaining passages of the Khotanese *Sgh* which correspond to metrical passages in the Sanskrit original, both those in metres A and B and those which appear to be non-metrical. The metrical passages will be edited, translated and provided with a metrical analysis. The notation of the texts is designed, like that of Z in Sims-Williams (2022), to show unambiguously both the readings of the manuscripts and the proposed metrical interpretation. Here however, I will retain the punctuation and verse numbers of the manuscripts, which are omitted from my text of Z. Other differences from the scanned text of Z in that book include a systematic marking of what I take to be the position of the ictus, both in the text (e.g. *karma yā' dāmdā*) and in the interlinear analysis (e.g. HLL'HL).

In my analysis of the metre of Z, I have attempted to show that the metrical system was indeed moraic (as Ernst Leumann and others have previously argued) but that it is also characterized by a compulsory ictus at a specific point in most or all of the cadences. In the case of metre A, each hemistich attests one of the following patterns of morae:

$$\begin{array}{l} 5+7 \quad || \quad 5+7 \quad || \\ 5+9 \quad || \quad 3+7 \quad || \\ 5+10 \quad || \quad 2+7 \quad || \end{array}$$

The equivalent patterns in metre B are as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} 5+3 \quad || \quad 3+7 \quad || \\ 5+4 \quad || \quad 2+7 \quad || \end{array}$$

between metre C and 7-mora cadences beginning with LH, for which see Sims-Williams (2022): 49–50.

TABLE 1 The cadences of metres A and B

3-mora cadence (metre B)	μμμ
4-mora cadence (metre B)	μμ+μμ
7-mora cadence (metres A and B)	μμμμ+'μμL
9-mora cadence, type 1 (metre A)	μμμμ+'μμ+μμμ
10-mora cadence, type 1 (metre A)	μμμμ+'μμHμμ
9-mora cadence, type 2 (metre A)	μμμ+'μμLμμμ
10-mora cadence, type 2 (metre A)	μμμ+'μμLHμμ

In both metres, the hemistich consists of two *pādas*, each beginning with a non-cadential segment and ending with a cadence. In principle,¹¹ the first non-cadential segment consists of 5 morae, while the second cadence always contains 7 morae. The first cadence is of varying length: in metre A it contains (usually) 7, (rarely) 9 or (even more rarely) 10 morae, while in metre B it consists of 3 or 4 morae. In each case the length of the segment following the first caesura varies with that of the preceding cadence in such a way that the two together add up to 12 morae in metre A and to 6 morae in metre B.

The non-cadential segments are unstructured, containing any combination of light and heavy syllables which adds up to the required number of morae. Each of the cadences, apart from the shortest two, has a specific structure requiring at least a syllable-boundary and an ictus at a particular point. The cadences used in metres A and B are more precisely defined in table 1 above.

The above description of metres A and B is a summary of that in Sims-Williams (2022), which is exclusively based on an analysis of Z but which proves to apply equally well to the metrical passages in the *Sgh*.¹² In particular it is worth noting that nothing in the *Sgh* contradicts my argument, which some may regard as controversial, that there is a caesura (or at the very least a fixed word-boundary) in the middle of the metre B hemistich.¹³ The treatment of the non-cadential segments shows the same “irregularities” as in Z: sometimes the segment has only 4 morae instead of the expected 5 (e.g. *jadīna* -LHL 9.3c, similarly 3.1a, 3.1d, 4.2b, 6.1c, 7.2a(?), 7.4a, 9.10a);¹⁴ sometimes it appears to have

11 For exceptions see Sims-Williams (2022): 64–72.

12 For a possible exception see the commentary to 9.9 below.

13 On this point see Sims-Williams (2022): 19.

14 Cf. Sims-Williams (2022): 66–67.

TABLE 2 7-mora final cadences (metres A and B, *pādas* b and d) in Z and the *Sgh*¹⁵

	Z	<i>Sgh</i>
HLL'HL	2,635 (= 74 %)	58 (= 69 %)
HH 'HL	392 (= 11 %)	5 (= 6 %)
LLL'HL	359 (= 10 %)	16 (= 19 %)
LHL'HL	97 (= 3 %)	3 (= 4 %)
LLH 'HL	29 (< 1 %)	0
μμμμ'LLL	29 (< 1 %)	2 (= 2 %)
Total	3,541	84

6 morae, in which case it is likely that a heavy syllable must be lightened (e.g. *ysamaśśa_mdīya* LLLL 8.1a, similarly 6.2a, 6.8c, 7.5c).¹⁶

Some metrical features found in Z are absent from the surviving fragments of the *Sgh*,¹⁷ but this may be due to nothing more than the limited amount of material (about 100 fairly complete hemistichs in these two metres, as opposed to nearly 3,500 in Z).

While the definition of metres A and B based on Z does not require any significant modification in order to accommodate data from the *Sgh*, it seems that, as in the case of metre C, the two poets display slightly different preferences in their use of the metres.

In the first place, the frequency of the various forms of the 7-mora cadence which occur at the end of each hemistich in these two metres is notably different in the two texts. In particular, as can be seen from Table 2, the final cadence LLLL'HL is found in the *Sgh* almost twice as frequently as in Z.

Secondly, and even more strikingly, the proportion of 9- and 10-mora cadences (as opposed to 7-mora cadences) in the first *pāda* of each metre A hemistich is almost twice as great in the *Sgh* as in Z. The contrast is even greater if one takes into consideration only the 9- and 10-mora cadences of type 1 (those with the ictus on the 5th mora), as can be seen from Table 3:

15 In this table and the next cadences which are unclear or apparently corrupt are ignored. Percentages are given to the nearest whole number.

16 Cf. Sims-Williams (2022): 67–71.

17 For example, the types of metrical lightening which I have named the “*ttarandara*-effect” (Sims-Williams 2022: 52–53) and the “*uysnorāṇu*-effect” (ibid., 56–58) are absent from the surviving *Sgh* fragments. However, the more common “*uysnora*-effect” (ibid., 51, 91–92; cf. Hitch 2014: 15–17) is attested at least twice (in 1.1d and 1.3b).

TABLE 3 Metre A first cadences (*pādas* a and c) in Z and *Sgh*

	Z	<i>Sgh</i>
7-mora	1,911 (= 75%)	19 (= 53%)
9-mora (type 1)	374 (= 15%)	11 (= 31%)
10-mora (type 1)	57 (= 2%)	4 (= 11%)
9- and 10-mora, type 1, total	431 (= 17%)	15 (= 42%)
9-mora (type 2)	186 (= 7%)	2 (= 6%)
10-mora (type 2)	20 (< 1%)	0
9- and 10-mora, type 2, total	206 (= 8%)	2 (= 6%)
Total	2,548	36

Finally, though it is not strictly a metrical issue, it is worth noting an apparent difference between the preferences of the two poets in respect of the two alternative forms of the 1 sg. m. tr. perfect, one formed with *īmā* ‘I am’, e.g. *yā’daimā* L’HL ‘I did’ < *’yādē + ’īmā*, and one formed with the enclitic equivalent *mā*, e.g. *’yādē mā* ‘LLL “id.”¹⁸ In Z the form in *-aimā* HL occurs more than 4 times as often as that in *-ē mā* LL, whereas in the *Sgh* the two forms seem to be equally frequent.¹⁹

•••

As a matter of convenience I have numbered the passages discussed or edited below from 1 to 12 and refer to them by these numbers. Note that 5.1–40 is the passage in metre C edited in Sims-Williams (forthcoming a). My text, like Canevascini’s, is eclectic. Differences between the copies in grammatical forms or spelling are not uncommon, but in general are only recorded here if they have a bearing on the understanding of the text or its metrical analysis. The texts are printed in Roman type, uncertain readings being indicated by italics.

18 On the two forms see Emmerick and Maggi (1991): 69 and Sims-Williams (2022): 30.

19 Z has the HL ending ×32 (spelt *-aimā*, once *-ēmā*, Z21a.55, see Sims-Williams forthcoming b), LL ×7 (*-ē mā*, once *-aimā*, Z22.293b, see Sims-Williams 2022: 30 n. 42). If one discounts *jsatai* (*jsatai?*) *mā*, 5.35c (where the scansion is ambiguous, see Sims-Williams forthcoming a), the metrical parts of the *Sgh* have the HL ending ×8 (*-aimā*, once *-ēmā*, 5.41d), LL ×8 (*-ē mā* or *-ā mā*, once *-aimā*, 7.5b).

Where text is quoted in italics in the discussion, the usage is reversed, Roman type being used if necessary for uncertain readings.

Photos of manuscripts with the prefix “S1 P” can be found in Emmerick and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja (1993) and of those with the prefix “IOL Khot” on the website of the International Dunhuang Project.²⁰ For fragments in the Francke-Körber collection in Munich, of which no photos are available to me, I have relied on the readings of Skjærvø (2002).

1 *Samghāṭa-sūtra* 43

Diplomatic edition and translation in KS 20, based on three manuscripts:

- MS 19, transcribed in KS 236–237 (IOL Khot 35/4, v2–5, cf. KT5: 175, #337; Skjærvø 2002: 252);
- MS 22, transcribed in KS 239–240 (IOL Khot 5/1, r3–v5, cf. Leumann 1920, 13–15; Konow 1932: 70; KT5: 388, #24; Skjærvø 2002: 171);
- MS 24, transcribed in KS 244–245 (IOL Khot 32/2, v1–6, cf. KT5: 126, #227; Skjærvø 2002: 245).

The equivalent Sanskrit text is edited in von Hinüber (2021):17 (verses 1–7), with English summary of the contents on pp. lx–lxi.

Metre A, cf. the summary metrical analysis by M. Leumann *apud* E. Leumann (1933–1936): xxvi n. 1.

1.1ab	cu mānau nē usah _{yā} ta 'pyūṣṭā	ttātē p ^u va _m navīya sa'lāva .
	LHH LLL'HL	LLLLL HLL'HL
1.1cd	haṃggūjsu narīyō du'kh _y au jsa	cu ttā vaśivindā u _{ys} 'naura 1
	HHL LLL'HL	LLLH HLL'HL
1.2ab	kyē haḍā śśāru yīndā śśā'ruī bī[ḍ]ā	[ky]ē vā ḍīru [ya]'nīṃdā
	LLLLL HLL'HHL	LH HLL'HL
1.2cd	dukha vaśividā 'narīyō ṣṭāna	crrāma karma yā'ḍāṃdā 2
	LLLH HL'LLHL	HL HLL'HL
1.3ab	ys'yāmatu maraṇu u 'dukha kā[ṣk]yē	[tca]mana basta u _{ys} 'naura :
	LHLL LLL'LLHL	LLL HLL'HL
1.3cd	jaḍa rro vā oṣku du'khautta	suhi ju nyāṃnartha nē 'īndā
	LLLH HLL'HL	LLLH HLL'HL
1.4ab	haj ^u va vā oṣku su'hautta	balysā vātē haurā nā 'byāta
	LLLH HLL'HL	HLLL HLL'HL

²⁰ <http://idp.bl.uk/>

1.4cd	ṣada nā rro āstā ma'hāyāña	ttā nē avāyā nē 'tsīdi 4
	HLLL HLL'HHL	LLL HLL'HL
1.5ab	tvi padī karma 'sarvaśśūra	paḍāṃjs'ya yānu 'byāta :
	HLH HL'HLHL	LH LLLL'HL
1.5cd	batāna kiḍāgānāna 'satva	māstu vīvāgā ba'rindā 5
	LLLLL HLL'HL	HLH HLL'HL
1.6ab	bataku j ^u vē tīma pā'rēndā	pharu yē vīvāgu pa'jāysdē .
	LLLLL HLL'HL	LLLH HLL'HL
1.6cd	ku yē ttu māṣa byēhātē 'balysāna	ku karā tīma nē 'jīyē 6
	LLLLL HLL'HHL	LLL HLL'HL
1.7ab	haj ^u vānu ṣā suhā cu 'hayārīṃdi	ōṣku balysi pa'rauaya :
	LLHL LLLL'LLHL	HL HLL'HL
1.7cd	cu rō parēhārē hā'r _y au dīryau	ōṣkā [śśāru ya'nīndā]
	LLLH HLL'HHH	H LLLL'HL

¹Although you cannot bear to hear these fearful words, the encounter with sorrows in hell which those beings experience, ²yet (he) who does good, to him it brings good; but (those) who do evil experience sorrows in hell (according to) whatever acts they committed: ³birth, death and sorrows, the anxieties by which beings are bound. Fools, too, (being) always afflicted, are not informed about happiness, ⁴but the wise (are) always happy. They remember to give to the Buddha, they also have faith in the Mahāyāna, (so) they do not undergo an evil rebirth. ⁵In this way, Sarvaśśūra, remember (your) former acts: as a result of a little (evil) action, beings bear a great retribution. ⁶(When) one sows a tiny seed, one gains much reward, so that one reaches the Buddha-field where the seed does not perish at all. ⁷This is happiness for the wise, that they always delight in the Buddha's command, (and) also that they restrain themselves from evil things (and) always [do good].”

1.1. On the expression *cu mānau* see Emmerick (1970): 74–75.

The ending of *usahyāta* is only attested in MS 22. In SGS 16, Emmerick tentatively takes the form as 3 sg. injunctive, but the construction seems to require a second person form (see KS 126 n. 2). Leumann (1920): 14 assumes that the scribe has written 2 pl. pres. by mistake for 2 sg., as the Buddha here addresses Sarvaśśūra alone. A purely graphic explanation is another possibility, “intrusive *-t-*” being a fairly common feature of the manuscripts. For further certain or possible examples in the *Sgh* see 5.10 and 5.36 in Sims-Williams (forthcoming a), 5.44 and 12.3 below; cf. also KS 140 n. 17. At any rate, the metre here requires the suppression of one mora.

1.2. MS 22 has *naryo* (as in the preceding verse), while MS 19 has the alternative loc. sg. form *narya*. From the 7-mora cadence *ōṣku mā 'nar'ya* HLL'LLL in 5.7c (Sims-Williams forthcoming a), it is clear that this word is stressed on the first syllable and hence that the present cadence is to be read *vaśī'vidā 'nar'yṽ ṣṭāna* HL'LLHL,²¹ a “type 2” 9-mora cadence (rather than “type 1”, which would require the stress **na'r'yṽ*).²²

1.3. *u*, which is required for the metre, is found in MS 22 but omitted in MS 24.

Leumann read the last word of the verse (only attested in MS 22) as *tśindā*. Most subsequent editors have followed him, but Skjærvø's [*ī*]*ndā* is more likely.

1.6. As already noted by Leumann (1920): 14, *jve* (i.e. *j^uvē*) stands for *ju yē*. See further Maggi (2017a): 279–281, where this example is cited with several others.

On *ttu māṣa* see KS 127 n. 12 and Maggi in SVK3: 69–70 s.v. †*tumāṣa*.

2 *Samghāṭa-sūtra* 47

Edition and translation in KS 22, based on MS 17, transcribed in KS 227–228 (IOL Khot 161/2, r4–v4, cf. Leumann 1920: 15–17; Konow 1932: 71; KT5: 70, #155; Skjærvø 2002: 360). The equivalent Sanskrit text is edited in von Hinüber (2021): 20 (verses 10–13), with English summary of the contents on p. lxi.

Most of the text is too poorly preserved to be interpreted metrically. However, Leumann was probably right to recognize *bal'ysūstu va'rālstō* HLL'HL “towards enlightenment” (cf. 7.1 below) as the 7-mora cadence ending a verse in metre A or B.

3 *Samghāṭa-sūtra* 49

Diplomatic edition and translation in KS 23, based on two manuscripts:

- MS 10, transcribed in KS 197 (IOL Khot 178/3, r1–2, cf. Konow 1932: 72; KT5: 330, fol. 20; Skjærvø 2002: 397);
- MS 18, transcribed in KS 233 (SI P 67.19, v1–2, cf. SDTV3: 77).

The equivalent Sanskrit text is edited in von Hinüber (2021): 21 (verses 14–15), with English summary of the contents on p. lxii.

21 Here the parenthesis is used to mark off part of a word which does not form part of the segment under discussion. In Sims-Williams (2022) I used a square bracket for this purpose, but this can lead to ambiguity.

22 On the two types see Sims-Williams (2022): 55–59.

What remains of the Khotanese text corresponding to Sanskrit verse 14 does not seem to be metrical: *hāmātē · pyū'vīru uhu nyanḍyau* “... will be ... Listen, you Nirgranthas!”. At least the beginning of the following Sanskrit verse 15 appears to be represented by a verse in metre A, though it is hard to discern a metrical form in the poorly preserved passage which follows. This begins with the words *aysu pandāyā nājsā'kā* “I (am) the shower of the way”, a plausible metre A *pāda* (-LLH HLL'HL), but also contains the phrase [*balysā*]nyau *tcē'māñy,au* HHHHLH “with Buddha-eyes” (~ Sanskrit *buddha-cakṣuṣā*), which is difficult to fit into a regular metrical structure.

3.1ab	jaḍyau ku suhū <i>ju</i> 'ništā	tta ku ṣṭau purrauṣca hā['mātē]
	-LHL LHL'HL	LLHL HLL'HL
3.1cd	[rraṣṭō pa]ndō nē pa'ysānda	tta ku ṣṭau purrauṣca hā'm[ā]tē
	HLH HLL'HL	LLHL HLL'HL

“Fools! Since you have no happiness, where then [will] be your victory?
[Since] you do not recognize the [right] path, where will be your victory?”

My restoration is based on similar contexts such as Z22.275b: *cau rraṣṭō pandō nijaṣṭdē* “who shows you the right path”. There, however, as in all the other six instances of the acc. sg. *pandō* in Z, the metre clearly requires the reading *pandō* HL. The word for “path” shows the regular inflections of a stem *pandāa-* in all cases except the nom. and acc. sg., where Old Khotanese attests forms from a stem *pandā-*: nom. *pandē* < **pantāh* (Avestan *paṇtā*), acc. *pandō* < **pantām* (Avestan *paṇtqm*). The unique inflection of this word was clearly unstable: as noted by Emmerick, SGS 308, Late Khotanese tends to replace these two forms by the regular *āa*-stem nom.-acc. sg. ending *-ā*, and the acc. sg. *paṁdā* is already found in *Sgh* 253 in MS 17 (SI P 53.11+18, v2–3, in SDTV3: 58), a manuscript in “late” script, but one where the influence of Late Khotanese orthography is “not strong” (KS 220). If the present passage is indeed metrical, the metre requires the reading *pandō* HH. Such a form, beside that in *-ō*, might have been created on the analogy of the word for “earth”, for which the two acc./loc. sg. forms *śśandō*, *śśandau* (stem *śśandaā-*) and *śśandō*, *śśaṁdu* (stem *śśandā-*) are both unambiguously attested in Z (see Sims-Williams 2022: 32). Unfortunately *paṁdau* in *Sgh* 244 (10.1 below), which looks like a variant spelling of *pandō* HH, does not provide any confirmation, since, if the passage is metrical at all, it must be read *paṁdau* = *pandō* HL.

4 *Samghāṭa-sūtra* 51–52

Diplomatic edition and translation in KS 24, based on two manuscripts:

- MS 10, transcribed in KS 198 (IOL Khot 178/3, v1–5, cf. Konow 1932: 73; KT5: 330; Skjærvø 2002: 397);
- MS 18, transcribed in KS 233 (IOL Khot 26/8+24/6, r1–5, cf. KT5: 157, #295; Skjærvø 2002: 222).

The equivalent Sanskrit text is edited in von Hinüber (2021): 21–22 (verses 16–19), with English summary of the contents on p. lxii.

The translation of the verse in *Sgh* 52 does not seem to be metrical, but the two verses in *Sgh* 51 are in metre A.

4.1ab	ně ně <i>ju</i> muhu vaṃṃa tta'ttika	māta pātē trāstu ya'nindā ·
	LLLLL HLL'HL	HLLL HLL'HL
4.1cd	sa[mu] śśū[kě . . d'i'yā]mä	ttuśśē k[y]ě ně <i>ju</i> nyāpātā 'nīrā ·
	LLHL μμL'HL	LLLLL HLL'HL
4.2ab	ně ně <i>ju</i> vara <i>gyasta</i> ně 'hva'ndā	ně banhya ō vā 'kṛṅga
	LLLLL HLL'HL	-LHL HH'HL
4.2cd	vara ttō diśō daindā an'āsp[ētō]	[ku ně ně dā]stā štā 'balysā
	LLLLL HLL'HHL	LLL HLL'HL

¹Mother (and) father cannot protect me here now. We [see] merely lonely empty [forests], in which no water is found. ²No gods (are) there, no men, neither trees nor cocks.” They see that place there (as) providing no refuge [since] the Buddha did [not appear].

4.1. With some hesitation I have followed Bailey’s reading of the unclear *akṣara* after *ttuśśē* as *k[y]e* (rather than *ne* with Canevascini and Skjærvø). Here *kye* would be used as gen. sg. of *cu*, lit. “of which”.

4.2. The 9-mora cadence of 2c is probably “type 1” in the classification of Sims-Williams (2022): 55–59, with stress on the 5th mora, i.e. *an'āsp[ētō]*. Since there is no other evidence for the stress in this word a “type 2” cadence with stress on the 4th mora, i.e. *'anāsp[ētō]*, cannot be ruled out absolutely, though the resulting pattern HL'LHHL would in fact be unique.

5 *Samghāṭa-sūtra* 99

Diplomatic edition and translation in KS 44–47. The equivalent Sanskrit text is edited in von Hinüber (2021): 39–42 (verses 20–43), with English summary of the contents on pp. lxxvii–lxxviii.

Of the Sanskrit verses, 28–34 are in *triṣṭubh/jagatī* metre,²³ whereas verses 20–27 and 35–43 are *ślokas*, like virtually all the other verses in the *Sgh*. The Khotanese version of Sanskrit verses 20–27, 35–41 (*ślokas*) and verse 34 (*triṣṭubh/jagatī*) is in metre C. This was probably also the case with the translation of Sanskrit verses 28–33, but at this point the Khotanese text is too badly preserved for any certainty. At any rate, it seems that the changes of metre in the Khotanese version do not correlate with those in the Sanskrit text. The last two Sanskrit *ślokas*, 42–43, are represented by four Khotanese verses in metre B.

Since I have already given a metrical restoration of the verses in metre C (numbered as 1–40 in Sims-Williams forthcoming a), only the final verses in metre B are considered here. My numbering of the verses continues from that of the preceding verses in metre C. The relevant passage is partially preserved in two manuscripts:

- MS 12, transcribed in KS 216 (IOL Khot 162/6, r1–3, cf. KT5: 48, #123; Skjærvø 2002: 363);
- MS 17, transcribed in KS 229 (SI P 53.9, r2–v1, cf. SDTV3: 55).

5.41ab	[cu] mā [īndā dāruṇa]	[kāḍāyānē nē] 'pyūṃjē
	LLHL HLL	LL HLL'HL
5.41cd	cu buraṇ aysu yāḍā mā	u parstēmā sē 'yanda ·
	LLLLL LLL	LH HLL'HL
5.42ab	tt'yētē k[āḍāyānā	ma vīvā]tu ba'rīmā
	LLLLL HL	LH HLL'HL
5.42cd	ma nē ttā dukha vīyanē	mamā bērā hā'māndē
	LLLLL HLL	LL HLL'HL
5.43ab	rāṣayā ttrāy[ākā]	[mamā hāmātē] du'[kh _y]au [jsa]
	LLLH HL	LLL HLL'HL
5.43cd	[cu mamā] vātē dāruṇa	kāḍāyānē j'yāndē
	LLLLL HLL	LL HLL'HL
5.44ab	[.]ā × yau mā aysm ^{iy} _{at} a	jina ka m[.]
	LLHL HLL	LL μμμμ'μμμ
5.44cd	[aysu tā] hāmē bīsā	yāvajīvī 'braucā ·
	LLLLL HL	HL HH 'HL

⁴¹[Whatever are] my [terrible deeds], I [do not] deny (them), whatever I did and (whatever) I ordered, saying: 'Do (it)!'⁴²May I [not] bear [the

²³ See von Hinüber (2021): lxviii with n. 151.

result] of this [deed]! May these sorrows (and) pains not have to be borne by me! ⁴³[May] the *ṛṣi* [be my] deliverer from sorrows! [Whatever] were [my] terrible deeds, may they be removed! ⁴⁴... in my mind, destroy ...! [I] will be [your] servant so long as I live.”

5.41. For the restoration *dāruṇa* cf. 43cd. Canevascini’s *dīra* is too short by one mora.

5.42. *tyete* is a variant spelling of *ttātāye*, gen. sg. m. of *ṣāta*-. This reading (as in SDTV3) is to be preferred to *tye ne* (as in other editions of both manuscripts).

For *ma* + 1 sg. pres. indicative see Emmerick (1991): 105 n. 22.

dukha vīyanē “sorrows (and) pains”. Although the underlying Sanskrit compound *duḥkhavedanā* is most naturally interpreted as a *tatpuruṣa* “unpleasant sensations”, it seems that Khotanese *dukha*- is only used as a noun (see Canevascini, KS 126, note 5 to § 42).

5.43. It is difficult to see how *vāte* can be the postposition here. Canevascini, KS 256a s.v. *ah*-, hesitantly takes it as 3 pl. m. intr. perfect of the verb “to be” (the expected form being *vāta*).

5.44. *aysmyata* is another example of “intrusive -t-” (see above on 1.1).

6 *Samghāṭa-sūtra* 199

Diplomatic edition and translation in KS 80–81, based on two manuscripts which only overlap for one hemistich (6.6cd):

- MS 7, transcribed in KS 183–184 (IOL Khot 170/4,²⁴ r5–v5, cf. KT3: 141; Skjærvø 2002: 381);
- MS 10, transcribed in KS 208 (IOL Khot 182/3, r1–4, cf. Konow 1932: 91–92; KT5: 339, fol. 77; Skjærvø 2002: 402).

The equivalent Sanskrit text is edited in von Hinüber (2021): 80–81 (verses 54–63), with English summary of the contents on p. lxxxiv. The Khotanese version is in metre A.

6.1ab	[. .]ṣvajsei' āchei 'ōśā	ācheina puva'ṇa hä'märē .
	HLH HH 'HL	HHL LLLL'HL
6.1cd	naro haḍē hiśtā ma'raṇā pūryau	āchei ma pu'va'ta'
	-LLLL HLL'LLHH	H HLL'HL

24 This is the number given in Skjærvø (2002): 381. The photo is found in the IDP database under the number IOL Khot 170/3.

- 6.2ab tta parrīyū hāmāt[ě] u 'mam pūryau āchyaupuva'ṅyau jsa
 LLLH LLLL'HHH || H HLL'HL ||
- 6.2cd ttārā haḍē daidā sē 'māvīyau nē maraṇā d'iyē 'ātē ||
 HLLL HLL'HHH || LL LLLL'HL ||
- 6.3ab biśā nā [. . .] aṃṅga ma'raṇu dyāmu uys,ān'iyē nē nē 'vaṃṅā
 LLLμμ HLL'LLHL || LH LLLL'HL ||
- 6.3cd bajāṣa {nē} pyūvā'manē 'gūvyau jsa tcēman,ō rūva nē {nē} 'dyāmā 3
 LHLL HLL'HL || HLH HLL'HL ||
- 6.4ab [.] bu]śā nē bu'vā[r]ě [.]
 μμμμμ LLLL'HL || μμμμμ μμμμ'μμμ ||
- 6.4cd [. . .]ī × hamara 'gūsindā samu khaū cakalā < . . . >
 μμμμμ LLLL'HHL || LLL LLLμ'μμμ ||
- 6.5ab <tt'yē> ttaramdarā mā 'ttrā[yākā] [nīstā]
 LLLH LLH|'HHL || HL μμμμ'μμμ ||
- 6.5cd [.] ttau hvatē mā kō nē pu'vā'ta
 μμμμμ μμμμ'μμμ || HLLL HLL'HL ||
- 6.6ab maraṇū ju karā na[rō 'ātā] [.]
 LLHL LLLL'HL || μμμμμ μμμμ'μμμ ||
- 6.6cd nē ju ttavai āchai 'yīndā mā dukha maraṇā nā 'ātā 6
 LLLH HH|'HL || HHL LLLL'HL ||
- 6.7ab nuṣṭhuru ṅā ātā ma'raṇā patana cē mā jīvātā 'nāstē
 HLLL HLL'LLLL || LH HLL'HL ||
- 6.7cd ttaramdarā ṣṭānā nā 'hamthristā ttā dukha harbiśśā 'dyāmā 7
 LHLL HLL'HHL || LLL HLL'HL ||
- 6.8ab cē nā rō trāyākā u 'āspāta hāmātē vaṃṅā tta'ttika
 LLLH HLL'HHL || LLL HLL'HL ||
- 6.8cd tt'yē mārāpātara tta 'hvāñindā aśka auṣṭai 'gyasta 8
 LLHL LLLL'HHL || HL HH|'HL ||
- 6.9ab gyastānu gyaysnā [. . .] [. . .]ru hāmātē ×[. . .]
 HHL HLL'μμμ || μμμμL LLμμ'μμμ ||
- 6.9cd mara[ta] yanda khō ttērā 'iyā ka haḍē mamā tsāṣṭā hā'mātē 9 ||
 LLLH LLLL'HL || LLLL HLL'HL ||

¹The ... illness (is) bad (and) fears arise from the illness, but death is not yet coming, sons. Do not fear the illness! ²So there will be deliverance from illnesses (and) fears for you, sons." But those (sons) see (rightly, saying): "... death has come to be seen by us. ³All our limbs [ache]; we see death for (our)self. Now we do not hear sounds with (our) ears, we do not see shapes with (our) eyes. ⁴[Our nostrils do] not perceive odours ... [our] joints are being loosened/broken just like a <senseless?> piece of wood.

⁵For <this?> body we [have no] protec[tor] ...” [The father says:] “Thus I said to you: ‘You should not be afraid!’ ⁶Death [has] not [yet come] for you.” [The sons say:] “The fever illness is not causing us sorrows: death has come to us. ⁷Harshly has death come before us, which will take our life. Our body is oppressed; we see all these sorrows. ⁸Who will be our protector and refuge now here?” His parents say thus: “Perhaps you have angered the gods. ⁹A sacrifice to the gods ... will be ...” “Do (it) here so that it may be thus. If only it might be easy for me!”

6.1. Canevascini (KS 272) draws attention to the spelling of 2 pl. impv. *puva'ta'* with *t* rather than the expected *tt*.

6.2. *u maṃ* “and for me” cannot be correct, since the mother and father are both speaking (*hvāñīndā* “they speak”). Canevascini’s emendation to *umā* “for you” is probably correct (though this word is redundant beside its encl. equivalent *-ū*).

māvīyau nē maraṇā dīyē ātē is problematic. Canevascini left the sequence *vī × ne* uninterpreted and tentatively understood the rest as: “Our (*mā*) ... have come (*āte*) to-be-seen (*dye < dāte*) in death (*marañu*)”, comparing the expression in *Sgh* 85.4: [... *gya*] *sta balysa dāte tsutānda* “[these] Lord Buddhas have come to-be-seen [by you]” translating *ete ... tathāgatās ... upasamkrāntā darśanāya*. I have adopted this interpretation of *dīyē ātē*, but take *nē* (for *nā*) to be the 1 pl. encl. pronoun and the subject of *ātē* (for *ātā*, 3 sg. m. intr. perfect) to be “death”, cf. 6cd below: *nē ju ttavai āchai yīndā mā dukha maraṇā nā ātā* “the fever illness is not causing us sorrows: death has come to us”. A possible but very hypothetical interpretation of *māvīyau* might be “O (parents of) ours”, voc. pl. of an adj. *māvīya-* formed from *māvu*, gen. pl. of the 1 pl. pronoun, here used as a noun like French “les nôtres”.

6.3. As Canevascini implies, *uysānye* stands for *uysānye* “self”, translating Sanskrit *ātmanaḥ*. The treatment of the first syllable as light is therefore as expected.

On the writing *pyūv'-* in place of *pyūv'-*, the pre-vocalic form of the verb *pyūṣ-* “to hear”, see Sims-Williams (2022): 42. Even if one reads *pyūv-* here as in other such cases, *pāda c* is still one mora overlong. The simplest correction is to delete the negative *nē* (which is redundant, as the sentence already has a double negative *nē nē* in *pāda b*). As it stands in the manuscript, *pāda d* is also overlong by one mora, which can similarly be corrected by deleting one of the two negatives.

6.4. The words *hamara gūsīndā samu khau cakalā* are discussed by Emmerrick in SVK1: 125–126, where the meaning of *hamara* “joints” is established. The equivalent Sanskrit text (verse 58) was previously read as *aṅga-m-aṅgāni*

mucyaṃti kāṣṭhā iva acetanāḥ “my limbs are loosened like an unconscious piece of wood” (see *ibid.*, 126 n. 1, and KS 80), on the basis of which *gūsīndā* was interpreted as belonging to *ggūs-* “to escape, be delivered, set loose”. However, the correct reading of the verb is now known to be *bhidyamti* (see von Hinüber 2021: 81 and lxxxiv n. 208). While *bhid-* can have a meaning compatible with that of *ggūs-* (cf. PW s.v. *bhid-* 5) “lösen, entwirren; Pass. sich lösen, aufgehen”, as Ruixuan Chen points out to me, the literal meaning of *bhidyamti* “are split” seems to make better sense of the simile comparing the limbs with a piece of wood. It is therefore worth considering the alternative possibility that *gūsīndā* stands for *gūsīndā*, 3 pl. pres. act. of an otherwise unattested verb **gusid-* “to be split” < **wi-sid(y)a-*, cf. MP *wisinn-/wisist-* “to break, split”, Old Indian *vi-chid-*. Phonologically, **gusīndā* would be exactly parallel to *bīndā*, 3 pl. pres. act. of *bid-* “to pierce” < **bida-* (cf. SGS 96). Both interpretations allow a metrically regular reconstruction of the cadence of *pāda c* and the following segment, either 9 || 3:

[. . .]ī × hamara 'gūsīndā	samu khaù cakalā < . . . >
μμμH LLLL'HHL	LLL LLLμ'μμμ

or 7 || 5:

[. .]ī × hamara gù'sīndā	samu khaù cakalā < >
μμHμ LLLL'HL	LLLLL Lμμμ'μμμ

In each case one must assume that there is an omission in the manuscript after the words *samu khaù cakalā* “like a piece of wood”, where *ttaramdarā* “body” appears to be neither meaningful nor metrically acceptable.

6.5. The partial restoration of 5ab is of course very hypothetical and is intended only to show that the surviving words could fit into a meaningful and metrically correct sentence. In the next hemistich Bailey’s “-*tau*” which I have completed to *ttau* “thus to you”, is preferable to the graphically and metrically impossible [*pū*]ryau “O sons” of the other editions. The 3 sg. m. form *hvatē mā* “I said” implies that the father is speaking rather than the mother as in the Sanskrit. An emendation to the equivalent f. form **hvatāmā*, as tentatively suggested by Canevascini (KS 149 n. 14), is metrically impossible. This discrepancy is similar to that between the consistent sg. “son” in the Sanskrit and the varying sg./pl. “son(s)” in the Khotanese version of the story (see below on 6.8). In any case, the content of the speech cannot be reconciled with that of the Sanskrit text: *vaktuṃ nārhasi putraivaṃ mā me trāsaparāṃ kuru* “You should not say thus, son! Do not cause me excessive fear!”.

I owe the correct reading *puvā'ta* (2 pl. subj., rather than *puva'ta*, 2 pl. impv.) to Mauro Maggi.

6.6. MS 10 has *mā dukha*, the reading adopted by Canevascini. Since *kh* in this word is sometimes treated as a double consonant (Sims-Williams 2022: 85), one can read *mā dukha* HHL as a regular 5-mora segment. Before *dukha* MS 7 inserts *tā ttā*, suggesting a possible alternative reconstruction of the segment as *mā ttā dukha* HLLL.

6.7. *ṇā ātā maraṇā patana* “death has come before us”. I owe the excellent reading *patana* (for **patāna*) to Ruixuan Chen. Canevascini read *pvatana* (taking this for **pvaṇā* “fear”, with “intrusive *-t-*” and irregular *-n-* for *-ṇ-*).

6.8. It seems that, except where *is* is used as a proclitic article, the gen. sg. form *ttye* is always realized as disyllabic *ttiyē* (see Sims-Williams 2022: 33 with n. 54). This implies that either the first or the second syllable of the following *mārāpātara* “parents” must be subject to metrical lightening in order to obtain a regular 5-mora segment. In the text above I have placed the reading *mārā*^o, but the choice of this solution rather than *mārā*^o is essentially arbitrary (cf. Sims-Williams 2022: 71 (iv)).

As noted by Canevascini, KS 148, note 2 to *Sgh* 198, by referring to “his parents” the Khotanese version here abruptly switches to referring to one son (as in the Sanskrit text) rather than several. The verb in 8d has so far been read as 3 sg. m. tr. perfect *auṣṭē* “he has angered”, but a reading 2 sg. m. *auṣṭai* “you have angered” seems equally possible from the traces visible and is to be preferred as giving a regular 7-mora cadence HH|HL.

6.9. The reading and interpretation of this verse is largely guesswork. Only the last *pāda* is really clear.

7 *Samghāṭa-sūtra* 213

Diplomatic edition and translation in KS 88. The passage is partially preserved in MS 10 (whole passage) and MS 11 (verse 1 only):

- MS 10, transcribed in KS 210 (IOL Khot 183/3, r4–v1, cf. Konow 1932: 99–100; KT5: 341, fol. 83; Skjærvø 2002: 404);
- MS 11, transcribed in KS 214 (IOL Khot 169/2 + FK. 913 Kha. 28,²⁵ v5, cf. Skjærvø 2002: 379; for the London fragment only cf. Konow 1932: 98 n. 1; KT5: 264, #556).

25 A fragment from Khadalik in the Francke-Körber collection, Munich.

The equivalent Sanskrit text is edited in von Hinüber (2021): 88–89 (verses 66cd–69), with English summary of the contents on p. lxxxvii.

The Khotanese text is in metre B. Manu Leumann, *apud* Leumann (1933–1936): xxvi n. 2, also gives a metrically restored version of this passage based on Konow's edition.

7.1ab	ně ma stā stā rruštā	ttagatā · vas _{vā} ^u tā yā'ḍaimā
	LLHL HL	LLL LLLL'HL
7.1cd	praṇāhānā hastamu	balysūstu va'rālstō
	LLHL HLL	H HLL'HL
7.2ab	[ku] ṣṭā nā[r]vā[nā	tsāṣṭā] balysa tsu'tāndā
	-LLH HL	HL HLL'HL
7.2cd	hālstō aysu tsīñā	u balysūstu bu'vānē ·
	HLLL HL	LH HLL'HL
7.3ab	umā hvāññā	dātu tcamna yē 'hīstā
	LHH HL	HL HLL'HL
7.3cd	nārvā[nā kī]ntha	ku biśśā p ^u va'ṇa j ⁱ yārē ·
	HHL HL	LLL LLLL'HL
7.4ab	palamgu bastē	ṣā naḍē tta hv ^{at} ē yā'ḍaimā
	-LHL HL	LLL LLLL'HL
7.4cd	paḍā kāḍātānē	cu banō kaṣṭumā 'rruīya ·
	LHLL HL	LLL HLL'HL
7.5ab	kyē bu[r]ō ttātā	py _u ^{vā} 'ndē cu aysu hvatai mā sa'lāva
	LLLL HL	LLL LLLL'HL
7.5cd	kāḍātānai harbiśśā	hārṣṭāyā jā'tāndē
	LLLH HLL	H HLL'HL

¹The wealth of royalty is not necessary for me. I have made a pure vow towards best enlightenment. ²Where the buddhas have gone [to peaceful] *nirvāṇa*—thither may I go and realize enlightenment. ³May I tell you the Law by which one comes to the city of *nirvāṇa*, where all fears are removed.” ⁴The man adopted the *paryāṅka* position. He said: “Formerly I committed (evil) deeds whereby I fell into the royal prison. ⁵Whoever may hear these words which I have spoken—may all his (evil) deeds really be removed.”

7.1. *vasvātā* “pure” (MS 10) seems to be a compromise between Old Khotanese *vasutā* and later forms such as *vasvā*, i.e. *vas^uvā*. The same spelling is attested in Z2.167, see Sims-Williams (2022): 41 n. 83, referring to the explanation of this form by Leumann and Emmerick.

hastamu “very excellent” is the reading of MS 10, in place of which MS 11 has the equally possible variant *aysm̐ya* “in (my) mind” (though this is preceded by *mā* “my”, which would have to be deleted as unmetrical).

7.2. The restoration *tsāṣṭā* “peaceful” (~ Sanskrit *śānte*) is suggested by Rui-chen Chen.

7.5. *kāḍātānai* is one mora overlong. M. Leumann proposes lightening the final diphthong, for which there is no parallel. A reduction of the long *ā* is more plausible, cf. 5-mora segments such as *paramāṇav* (Sims-Williams 2022: 70 (ii) with n. 142).

8 *Samghāta-sūtra* 214

Diplomatic edition and translation in KS 89, based on two manuscripts:

- MS 8, transcribed in KS 185 (IOL Khot 177/5 + two fragments from the Francke-Körber collection, Munich, r2–v1, cf. Skjærvø 2002: 394; for the London fragment only see also KT5: 353, #721);
- MS 10, transcribed in KS 211 (IOL Khot 183/3, v5–6, followed by IOL Khot 184/1, r1–4, cf. Konow 1932: 100–101; KT5: 342, fol. 83–84; Skjærvø 2002: 404).

The equivalent Sanskrit text is edited in von Hinüber (2021): 89–90 (verses 70–75), with English summary of the contents on p. lxxxvii.

The Khotanese version of verses 70–72 does not seem to be metrical, and the king’s second question (verse 74) is not translated. However, the last speech of the birds (corresponding approximately to Sanskrit verses 73 and 75), which is described as being *ggāhāna* “in verse” (IOL Khot 184/1, r2), is represented by three verses in metre B.

8.1ab	<i>ysamaśśa</i> _m <i>d̐ya hastamā</i>	<i>rründētē ya'nākā</i>
	LLLLL HLL	H HLL'HL
8.1cd	<i>hämätē balys[ū]stu</i>	<i>bustā cē bamhyā 'rr[u]stā</i>
	LLLH HL	HL LHL'HL
8.2ab	<i>cē nā rrustā bamhyā</i>	<i>ṣā vā śātē naḍē {tta} 'dyāñā</i>
	LLHL HL	LH LLLL'HL
8.2cd	<i>ṣā vā dīvatattā</i>	<i>[.]e[.]ttaru khō 'balysā</i>
	LHH LLL	μμμ LLLL'HL
8.3ab	<i>ttānau śāru <tcērā></i>	<i>cē vīvāgā kṣa'mīyā</i>
	LHLL HL	LH HLL'HL
8.3cd	<i>ku yē nē puña yandē</i>	<i>ṣā vīvātā ku 'nāstē</i>
	LLLLL HL	LH HLL'HL

“¹He will be the best enlightener in the world. (He) whose tree grew has realized enlightenment. ²(He) whose tree did not grow, the second man, (is) to be viewed thus: He (is) Devadatta ... rather than the Buddha! ³Therefore (he) to whom a reward would be pleasing <should act> well. When one does not perform meritorious acts, where will one obtain the reward?”

8.2. *Pāda* b, as it stands in both manuscripts, is overlong by one mora. This can most easily be corrected by suppressing *tta* “so”. Alternatively, one might delete either *sūtē* “second” or *naḍē* “man” and read *d’yāñā* L’HL in place of *dyāñā* ‘HL.

śā vā, the first two words of *pāda* c, are clear in MS 8, where they are followed by a lacuna. The following words are found in MS 10, where the *akṣaras* (apart from the superscript vowels) are partially obscured by mirrored writing transferred from another folio. Here Canevascini cautiously has only *-i v- ta -ā -e*, while Konow has *dīvata* [*vāte*] and Bailey and Skjærvø read *dīvata vāte*. However, nothing in the Sanskrit text explains the mention of a “god” (*dīvatā-*), while Sanskrit verse 75 clearly identifies the “fool whose tree did not grow” as Devadatta.

8.3. The first *pāda*, found only in MS 8, seems to be lacking three morae. The sense requires a form of the verb “to do”, perhaps *yīndā* “he does” or *tcērā* “(it is) to be done”.

9 *Samghāṭa-sūtra* 243

Edition and translation in KS 101–102 (with transcription of the single MS 17, i.e. SI P 53.10, in KS 229–230, and Emmerick 1995: 163–164) and in SDTV3: 56–57. The equivalent Sanskrit text is edited in von Hinüber (2021): 106–107 (verses 111–119), with English summary of the contents on p. xcv.

The Khotanese version of these verses, which is perfectly preserved, is in Metre B.

- 9.1ab ku vā bihō buḍē mā jsatē mā pūrnyau 'gūysna
 LHLL LLL || LLL HH|'HL ||
- 9.1cd tta vā pharu haṃndara datē tvīṣṣē yā'ḍaimā
 LHLL HLL || LL HLL'HL ||
- 9.2ab īṇāta lauva ttāma gūstō hva'ḍāndā
 HHL HL || HL HLL'HL ||
- 9.2cd dukha ju vīvātu vaṃṇā sūkā ba'rīmā ·
 LLLH HL || HL HLL'HL ||

- 9.3ab nə ju yiðē mā āysda maraṇu sē rraysgu 'hištā
 LLLLL HL || LLL LHL'HL ||
- 9.3cd jaḍina pādā mā ttātā atāraña 'aṃga
 -LHL HLL || LL LLLL'HL ||
- 9.4ab ku mā maraṇā ātā karā mā trāṇā nə 'vātā štā
 LLLLL HL || LLL HLL'LLL ||
- 9.4cd ysanē ma samu šāmiña spāšīrō ttu 'kālu
 LLLLL HLL || H HLL'HL ||
- 9.5ab gūnē bārātāndā u bārštāndā prra'hōṇu ·
 HLLL HL || LH HLL'HL ||
- 9.5cd haryāsa auśa cu pamātāndā ttu 'kālu
 HHL HL || LLL HLL'HL ||
- 9.6ab kamalu vātā phānā dukhāna pārja du'virē
 LLLLL HL || LLL HLL'HL ||
- 9.6cd nə ma ju haḍē ciṃdāku hanu trāstu ya'nārō ·
 LLLLL HLL || LL HLL'HL ||
- 9.7ab bārga rrūvāsa šuṃndā švānū 'suthṭha
 HLH HL || HL HH|'HL ||
- 9.7cd ājäväšā bihara kyē samu gūstō hva'rindā
 HLLL LLL || LLL HLL'HL ||
- 9.8ab ttaraṃndarā šṭāna ttā vaṃña mamā hva'rindā
 LHLH HL || LH LLLL'HL ||
- 9.8cd kyē nə ju dukhā hāmātē kyē ttātā yiðē kāḍā'tānē
 LLLLL LLL || LLL LLLL'HL ||
- 9.9ab nə ju ar^uva' vījā nā haṃndara saṃ'bāra
 LLLLL HL || LH LLH'HL ||
- 9.9cd muhō maraṇu vīrā ttaṃdu trāstu ya'nārō
 LLLLL HL || HL HLL'HL ||
- 9.10ab kyē ttā yiðē dīra karaṇa vara sātē 'vaṃña
 -LLLL HL || LLL LLLL'HL ||
- 9.10cd šā ju nə d[u]khu buttē u maṃ vīyanē 'vaṃña
 LLLLL HL || LH HLL'HL ||

¹When I rode out to the hunt I killed deer with arrows. ²Strangers then ate the meat, (but) now I alone bear sorrows (and) retribution. ³I did not pay attention to death, (thinking): It will come swiftly! Out of foolishness I nourished these ungrateful limbs. ⁴When my death came I had no protection at all. (My) kinsmen would just look me in the face at that time; ⁵they dishevelled (their) hair and in anger they tore the black clothes which they put on at that time; ⁶(there was)

dust on (their) head; out of sorrow they would beat (their) breast. But they will not be able to protect me, (not) even a little. ⁷Wolves, jackals, ravens, dogs and birds of prey, snakes (and) ..., which eat only meat—⁸they are now eating my body, which has no sorrow (but) which did these (evil) deeds. ⁹No medicine, (no) doctor, no other equipment will be able to protect me (even) a little at (the time of) death. ¹⁰(The body) which did these evil acts lies there now. It does not know sorrow and now the pains (are) mine!”

9.2. The Sanskrit text says nothing about the meat being eaten by others. The words *īnāta lauva* “foreign people, strangers” seem to derive from the phrase *paraloka ajānatā* “not knowing the other world”, though it is hard to imagine that the translator could have misunderstood such a commonplace expression if that was the reading of his source.

9.5. On *bārātāndā* “they dishevelled” see Emmerick (1995).

9.6. On *pārijā-* “breast” see Maggi (2022): 326–327.

duvīrē is an unusual spelling for 3 pl. opt. **duvīrō*, see KS 157. For the use of the optative cf. *spāśīrō* in verse 4.

9.7. *bihara-* is an unknown word, which evidently denotes some carnivorous animal.

9.9. *haṁn)dara saṁ'bāra* LLH'HL! seems to be an exceptional 7-mora cadence without what seems in general to be a compulsory word- or compound-boundary between the two heavy syllables: LLH|'HL. In the whole of Z there is only one possible example of such an irregularity, namely, *marū kau'sāmā* “here in Kauśāmbī” Z24.466b. However, as noted in Sims-Williams (2022): 50 n. 101, the hemistich 466ab is problematic in other respects, and it is likely that the cadence should be emended, perhaps to *mar^{at}ū kai'śāmā* LLLL'HL, with lightening of the syllable preceding the ictus by the “*uysnora*-effect”. A similar solution of the problem here can be achieved by emending to **haṁn)dāra sa_m'bāra* HLL'HL. Alternatively, it may be that LLH'HL, without the usual word- or compound-boundary, may have been regarded by some poets, perhaps including the author of the present text, as an acceptable 7-mora cadence. Possible examples in other texts in metre A include *khu ji ur'maysdi* “like the sun” in the *Suvarṇabhāsottama-sūtra*²⁶ and *sar)bātā ur'maysd[ē]* “the sun rises” in the *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabharāja-sūtra*,²⁷ in both of which it appears that the last word scans as H'HL, without the lightening to *u_r'maysdē* L'HL which is systematically attested in this context in Z.

26 *Suvarṇabhāsottama-sūtra* 3.2a, see Leumann (1920): 57; Skjærvø (2004, vol. 1): 36.

27 IOL Khot 147/3, r3, see Leumann (1920): 107; Skjærvø (2002): 332.

10 *Samghāṭa-sūtra* 244

Edition and translation in KS 103 (with transcription of the single MS 23, i.e. 10L Khot 159/9, r1, in KS 243); cf. also Leumann (1920): 41; Konow (1932): 105; KT5: 80, #167; Skjærvø (2002): 357. The equivalent Sanskrit text is presumably verse 140 as edited in von Hinüber (2021): 109, with English summary of the contents on p. xcvi, though the correspondence is quite vague.

The text as restored by Canevascini can be scanned as part of a verse in metre B, but since only a few words are preserved it is not quite certain that the passage is metrical.

10.1ab [. . hutsutu] paṃdaù jsātā pīrmō bā'śśā[nu]
 μμLLL HL || HL HLL'HL ||
 10.1cd [rraṣṭō balysūstu] [buttē]
 HLH HL || HL μμμμ'μμμ ||

... he will tread the [well-trodden] path, [he will realize true enlightenment], foremost of all (things).

10.1. Regarding *paṃdaù* HL see above on 3.1.

11 *Samghāṭa-sūtra* 253

Diplomatic edition and translation in KS 107–112, based on four manuscripts, of which only the first two overlap:

- MS 24, transcribed in KS 251 (FK 210,2 Do.14, otherwise unpublished), verses [38]–[46]²⁸ = Sanskrit verses 188–196;
- MS 17, transcribed in KS 231 (SI P 53.11 + 18 and 53.12, cf. SDTV3: 57–60), verses [43]–[59] = Sanskrit verses 193–209;
- MS 22, transcribed in KS 240–241 (10L Khot 6/1, cf. Leumann 1920: 34–37; Konow 1932: 106–108; KT5: 77, #163; Skjærvø 2002: 172), verses [71]–[80] = Sanskrit verses 221–230;
- MS 2, transcribed in KS 177–178 (10L Khot 141/1, r1–v2, cf. Leumann 1920: 37–39; Konow 1932: 108–109; KT5: 78, #164; Skjærvø 2002: 322), verses [83]–[90] = Sanskrit verses 233–240.

28 Verse-numbers in [square brackets] are those of Canevascini's edition.

In addition, Skjærvø (2002): 217 and 313 identifies 10L Khot 23/2 and 10L Khot 115/6 (not in Canevascini's edition) as containing parts of verses [65]–[71] and [86]–[87] respectively, corresponding to Sanskrit verses 215–221 and 236–237.

The equivalent Sanskrit text is edited in von Hinüber (2021): 117–123, with English summary of the contents on pp. c–cii.

Some of these verses are too fragmentary for analysis. Those that are better preserved do not appear to be metrical. Canevascini, KS xvii, apparently considered that some of these verses attest variant forms of the usual metres, for instance describing the phrase *ysojsa khāyṣaṅṅā* ~~~ in his verse [56] as a metre B “cadence 9” (according to Emmerick's system), here appearing irregularly at the end of the verse. In the following verse [57] he sees a possible trace of “an older metrical system based on the morae”, suggesting that it could be scanned thus “as an Indian *ganacchandās*”:

u kṣamātā mājai ttarandarā ttonāka śārka skomata skute
 ~ ~ ~ ~ | - - | ~ - ~ | ~ - ~ | ~ - ~ | - | ~ ~ ~ ~

Leumann (1920): 34–35 regarded the text of the well-preserved folio 10L Khot 6/1 as a kind of free verse or rhythmical prose,²⁹ noting that several phrases can be interpreted as *pādas* in metre A,³⁰ or even as complete hemistichs in metre A or metre B:

sarvvasatvānu u_{ys}'naurānu vaska hāvaṃ-'gārā [75], metre A
 HLH HLL'HLL || HL HH|'HL ||

lakṣaṇ_{ya}u haṃphutē kvī pajsamu ya'nāmā [77], metre B
 HLH HLL || H LLLL'HL ||

It would be possible to reach more than one conclusion on the basis of such observations. One is that the text was composed in the standard Khotanese metres, but that the original metrical structure of the verses has been obscured

29 Though he does not actually use these terms, referring rather to the “wechselvolle Rhythmengruppierung” resembling “eine rhythmisch ähnliche Variabilität der griechischen Lyrik”.

30 Leumann's examples (here transposed into modern orthography and accompanied by Canevascini's verse-numbers) include: *ku yē ttusāttētū dyē 'yīndi* LLLH HLL'HL [71], *ku yē thatō balysā pa'nām^{ātē}* LLLH HLL'LL [76], *sē āysda yanīru u_s'kyāstu* LHLL HLL'HL [78], *paṃjsa s^{ātē} ysārē ku'lāra* HLLL HLL'HL [79].

by later revisions or interpolations. The other is that it was originally composed in a sort of semi-verse or a mixture of verse and prose as Leumann implies.

12 *Samghāṭa-sūtra, Unlocated*

Transcribed in KS 230, based on MS 17, i.e. SI P 53.16, edited with translation in SDTV3: 63. Not definitely located, but Canevascini draws attention to parallels in *Sgh* 253. The numbering indicates that the underlying Sanskrit verses were numbered 22–29.

Metre B.

- 12.1ab [.....] [.....]tā 'vā[tā] śtā
 μμμμ μμ || μμ μμμL'LLL ||
- 12.1cd yanā ku nā niśtā satvā cē hāva 'paśtā 2
 LHLL HL || HL LHL'HL ||
- 12.2ab [.]ā[.....] [.....]
 [
- 12.2cd [cu] burō yādē iyā ggarkha dāruṇa 'karma ·
 LLLLL HL || HL HLL'HL ||
- 12.3ab pātcu mara tta [...] [.....]yā
 HLLL μμ || μμ μμμμ'μμ ||
- 12.3cd vīyata paru × ttērā gyasta balysa hā'māru 23
 LLLLL LLL || HL HLL'HL ||
- 12.4ab cērā ttā[mu ...] [.....]
 LLHL μμ || μμ μμμμ'μμ ||
- 12.4cd [...]ä × [.]āña [.]ē ttū dātu pyu'vā'tē 4
 μμμμ HL || LH HLL'HL ||
- 12.5ab ttāna ka pharu [...] [.....]
 LLLLL μμ || μμ μμμμ'μμ ||
- 12.5cd [.....]dā hāmātē ttōlstō ustamu 'bāḍā ·
 μμμμL LLL || HL HLL'HL ||
- 12.6ab ttāmu [ha]spāśtā ku [.....]
 HLH HL || μμ μμμμ'μμ ||
- 12.6cd [.....]štē ttārā puñōndā khō 'balysā 25
 μμμμ μμL || LLL HLL'HL ||
- 12.7ab nūvarā satva panata ma[.....]
 HLH HL || LLL μμμμ'μμ ||
- 12.7cd [.....] [...] mara [nē] ka'sindā
 μμμμ μμ || μμ LLLL'HL ||

- 12.8ab ka vā mā kāḍāna balysā nārmātē 'i[yā]
LHH LLL || HL HLL'HL ||
- 12.8cd [.] [. . . .]ndā du'kh_yau jsa ||
μμμμμ μμμ || μμμ HLL'HL ||
- 12.9ab jaḍa hāḍē hva'ṁdā cē bata bvāmata 'hau[ta]
LLHL HL || LLL HLL'HL ||
- 12.9cd [.] [. . . .]× mā 'nāstā.
μμμμμ μμμ || μμμ μμH'HL ||
- 12.10ab ṣṣai prrār_{āt}ā satvā paiya hvāñātā 'drūjō
HHL HL || HL HLL'HL ||
- 12.10cd [.] [. . . .]× × nda × 8
μμμμμ μμμ || μμμ μμμμ'μμμ ||
- 12.11ab ṣā biśū tta tta rraṣṭu khō burō mara hvatē ['yīndā]
LLLLL HL || LLL LLLL'HL ||

¹... was ... May you make (it happen) that there is no being amongst them whose benefit matures [2]2

²[but who is not saved](?), whatever serious, terrible acts he may have committed.

³Then here ... there will be so many lord buddhas 23

⁴As then ... he should hear this law. [2]4

⁵Therefore if many ... he may be ... thither at a future time.

⁶Then he will strive so that ... as meritorious as the buddha. 25

⁷The young beings rose up ... here they will [not?] fall.

⁸Would that the buddha may be conjured up for us ... from woes!

⁹But foolish men, whose knowledge (and) ability (are) small ... is not ...

¹⁰Even a common being sometimes tells a lie ... [2]8

¹¹He [will do] everything rightly, exactly as he said here.

12.1. Since the agent noun *yanāku* (so read but left untranslated in SDTV3) does not seem to make sense, it seems better to interpret the sequence as *yanā* 2 sg. subj. mid. (a form attested in Z12.53) + *ku*.

The interpretation of *satvā cē hāva paṣṭā* as “being ... whose benefit matures” implies two minor irregularities: *hāva* for nom. sg. *hāvā* and *paṣṭā* for *paṣṭē*, 3 sg. pres. mid. of *pach-* “to be cooked or refined, to become mature”. As an alternative Mauro Maggi suggests that *hāva* may be nom.-acc. pl., the object of *paṣṭā*, 3 sg. pres. act. of *pajs-* in the sense “to bring to maturity”.

12.3. Bailey, DKS 129b (s.v. *tiranda-*) and 393b, lists *vyata* as a form of the verb “to be”. Skjærvø in SVK1: 50–51, shows that it is a misreading in the passage cited by Bailey. Nevertheless, here it is possible that we may have 3 sg. opt. *vya* with

“intrusive *-t-*” (cf. above on 1.44). Unfortunately the following *akṣaras* cannot be interpreted.

12.10. *prār_ä* “common, ordinary” < Sanskrit *prākṛta-*. Cf. *pratarā-*, *prarā-* “nature”, no doubt a loanword < Sanskrit *prakṛti-* (with Degener 1989: 317, 318) rather than a native Khotanese word as contemplated by Bailey, DKS 253–254.

References

- Bailey, Harold W. 1956. *Indo-Scythian Studies, being Khotanese Texts*, Volume III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, Harold W. 1963. *Indo-Scythian Studies, being Khotanese Texts*, Volume v. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, Harold W. 1979. *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [= DKS].
- Canevascini, Giotto. 1993. *The Khotanese Saṅghāṣūtra: A critical edition*. Wiesbaden: Reichert [= KS].
- Degener, Almut. 1989. *Khotanische Suffixe*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Duan Qing. 2011. “Some fragments of the *Saṅghāṣūtra* from the Xinjiang Museum, Urumqi.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 14: 127–134.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. 1968. *Saka Grammatical Studies*. London: Oxford University Press [= SGS].
- Emmerick, Ronald E. 1968a. *The book of Zambasta*. London: Oxford University Press [= Z].
- Emmerick, Ronald E. 1970. *The Khotanese Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. 1991. “Khotanese *ma* ‘not’.” In *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies held in Turin, September 7th–11th, 1987 by the Societas Iranologica Europaea*, Part 1, edited by Gherardo Gnoli and Antonio Panaino, 95–113. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1990 [1991].
- Emmerick, Ronald E. 1995. “Khotanese *bārātāndä*.” In *Proceedings of the Second European Conference of Iranian Studies held in Bamberg, 30th September to 4th October 1991, by the Societas Iranologica Europaea*, edited by Bert G. Fragner et al., 163–167. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Emmerick, Ronald E., and Mauro Maggi. 1991. “Thoughts on Khotanese *e* and *o*.” In *Corolla Iranica. Papers in honour of Prof. Dr. David Neil MacKenzie*, edited by Ronald E. Emmerick and Dieter Weber, 67–73. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Emmerick, Ronald E., and Prods Oktor Skjærvø. 1982, 1987, 1997. *Studies in the vocabu-*

- lary of Khotanese*, I, II, III. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften [= SVK1, 2, 3].
- Emmerick, Ronald E., and Margarita I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja. 1993. *Saka Documents Volume VII: The St. Petersburg collections*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Emmerick, Ronald E., and Margarita I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja. 1995. *Saka Documents Text Volume III: The St. Petersburg collections*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies [= SDTV3].
- von Hinüber, Oskar. 1973. *Das Saṁghāṭasūtra. Ausgabe und kommentierte Übersetzung eines nordbuddhistischen Lehrtextes in Sanskrit und Sakisch*. Mainz, unpublished Habilitation thesis.
- von Hinüber, Oskar. 2021. *The Saṁghāṭasūtra. A Popular Devotional Buddhist Sanskrit Text, editio maior* (Supplement to the Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University 24). Tokyo.
- Hitch, Doug. 2014. "Meter in the Old Khotanese *Book of Zambasta*." *Ars metrica* 2014/11: 1–43.
- Konow, Sten. 1932. *Saka Studies*. Oslo: Oslo Etnografiske Museum.
- Leumann, Ernst. 1920. *Buddhistische Literatur, nordarisch und deutsch*, 1: *Nebenstücke*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Leumann, Ernst. 1933–1936. *Das nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus*. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Manu Leumann. Leipzig: Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft, in Kommission bei F.A. Brockhaus.
- Maggi, Mauro. 2004. "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 culture of the Silk Road*, edited by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst et al., 184–190. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Maggi, Mauro. 2017a. "Annotations on the *Book of Zambasta*, IV: Ronald E. Emmerick's notes." In *Studia Philologica Iranica. Gherardo Gnoli memorial volume*, edited by E. Morano et al., 273–291. Rome: Scienze e lettere.
- Maggi, Mauro. 2017b. "Two fragments of the Khotanese *Saṁghāṭasūtra* in the Turfan Collection in Berlin." In *Zur lichten Heimat. Studien zu Manichäismus, Iranistik und Zentralasienkunde im Gedenken an Werner Sundermann*, 371–379. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Maggi, Mauro. 2022. "Two Khotanese etymologies: *parrama-* and *pūhe'itā*." In *The Reward of the Righteous. Festschrift in honour of Almut Hintze*, edited by A. Cantera et al., 321–333. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. 2022. *The Book of Zambasta: Metre and Stress in Old Khotanese*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. Forthcoming a. "Further texts in the Old Khotanese 'metre C'."
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. Forthcoming b. "A missing chapter of the *Book of Zambasta*."

Skjærvø, Prods Oktor. 2002. *Khotanese manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library. A complete catalogue with texts and translations*, by Prods Oktor Skjærvø with contributions by Ursula Sims-Williams. Reprinted with corrections 2003. London: British Library.

Skjærvø, Prods Oktor. 2004. *This most excellent shine of gold, king of kings of sutras: The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*, 2 vols. Cambridge MA: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University.