Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society

<http://journals.cambridge.org/JRA>

Additional services for *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

XXXI. The “Unknown Languages” of Eastern Turkestan

A. F. Rudolf Hoernle

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society / Volume 42 / Issue 04 / October 1910, pp 1283 - 1300

DOI: 10.1017/S0035869X00040648, Published online: 15 March 2011

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0035869X00040648

How to cite this article:

A. F. Rudolf Hoernle (1910). XXXI. The “Unknown Languages” of Eastern Turkestan. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 42, pp 1283-1300 doi:10.1017/S0035869X00040648

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

XXXI

THE "UNKNOWN LANGUAGES" OF EASTERN TURKESTAN

By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE

IN the July number of this Journal, p. 836, I promised to publish the text of the *Aparimitāyuh Sūtra*. As I have not yet received the Cambridge manuscripts of that Sūtra, I must defer the fulfilment of my promise to a later issue of the Journal. In the meantime I have compared the Sanskrit text of the *Vajracchedikā*, in Max Müller's edition, with the "unknown language" text in Dr. Stein's manuscript; and I may now present two extended "bilingual" extracts from the two texts. So far as I am able to judge at present, the East-Turkestan text does not appear to be a translation, throughout, of the Sanskrit text, as published by Max Müller. It is so, however, quite clearly in certain portions; and it is some of these portions that I am now presenting as a preliminary contribution. I may add that I have compared the East-Turkestan text of Dr. Stein's manuscript also with the Sanskrit text preserved in the manuscript of Dr. Stein's first collection (1900-1), of which I gave a short notice in this Journal for 1903, p. 364. That manuscript is incomplete, and the second extract, given below, is not found in it, having stood on its fol. 12, now missing. A portion of the first extract occurs in it, but its Sanskrit text is rather shorter than the Sanskrit text printed in Max Müller's edition, and, to that extent, differs also from the East-Turkestan text.

I take this opportunity also to reprint corrected versions of the extracts from the *Vajracchedikā* and the *Aparimitāyuh Sūtra*, given on pp. 837-8 of my previous communication. Not having had the originals to refer to

when I wrote from Wiesbaden, certain letters had been wrongly transcribed.

The Sanskrit text is printed in italics, interlinearly and verbatim, under the lines (in roman) of the "unknown language" text. In either case the words of the text are printed in the exact sequence (with two or three exceptions, duly indicated by numerals) of the originals. Where the East-Turkestani text differs, or is not intelligible, the syllables (*akṣara*) are printed discretely.

VAJRACCHEDIKĀ: FIRST EXTRACT.

Stein MS., fol. 3bⁱⁱⁱ = M.M. ed., p. 9, § 1.

Nta-nta¹ maṁmā pyūṣṭā śe snye (śe snye²) tā gyastānā
Evam mayā śrutam | ekasmin samaye —————
 gyastā-^{iv}ḥaysā³ Śrāvastā-kṣirā āstā-vyā⁴ Jivārispurābāṣa
bhagavān Śrāvastyām viharati-sma Jetavane
 Anā[4aⁱ]thapiṇḍi-hārū saṁkhyerma mistāna⁵ bil-sāgāna⁶
Anāthapiṇḍasya ārāme mahatā bhikṣu-saṁghena
 haṁtsa | dvāsi-paṁjsāⁱⁱ śau āśīryaujsa ——— ———
sārdham ardha-trayodaśabhir bhikṣu -śataiḥ sambha
 ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— ——— ———
 ntī ——— gyastānā
hulaiś ca bodhisattvair mahāsattvaiḥ | atha khalu ———
 gyasta-ḥaysā brū-haḍāna⁷ ——— ——— vāysyeⁱⁱⁱ pāntarā -
bhagavān pūrv-āhṇa -kāla-samaye nivāsyā pātra-
civara pananāti Śrāvasta mistā-kitha piṇḍā traṁḍa
civaram ādāya Śrāvastīm mahā-nagarīm piṇḍāya prāvīkṣat |

¹ Lit. Skt. *evam etad* ; see fol. 7aⁱⁱⁱ.

² Wrongly repeated ; śe is loc. sg. of śau = Skt. *eka* ; see fol. 5bⁱⁱ.

³ See Remark 11, below.

⁴ Apparently lit. Skt. *viharan abhūt* ; see *vya* in fol. 33aⁱⁱ.

⁵ Cf. Skt. *mahiṣṭha* = mistā, of which mistāna is the instr. case.

⁶ Sāgā = Skt. *saṁgha* with disaspirated *gh*, as in *darma* = Skt. *dharma*.

⁷ Haḍāna, loc. sg. of haḍā, Skt. *ahan* ; see below, in Remarks 7 and 13.

^{iv}nti — gyastā-ḥaysā (nti gyastā-ḥaysā¹) kū Śrāvastā
 atha khalu bhagavān Śrāvastīm
 māstā-kītha piṇḍā [4bⁱ] vātsuta-hamye² tā kū
 mahā-nagarīm piṇḍāya caritvā — —
 khāysta-kirā-yuḍā¹ - yuḍe hvaḍā khāysā³ kūⁱⁱscetā-
 bhakta — kṛta - kṛtyaḥ paścād bhakta- — piṇḍapāta
 paryeta-hamye² pāntara - cīvarā pajsi byi-pāha⁴
 pratikrāntaḥ pātra - cīvaram pratiśāmya pādau
 ysnātā — — ⁱⁱⁱpraṇavyi — āysam vira ṇastā⁵ bastā
 prakṣalya nyaṣīdat prajñapta eva āsane
 palamgā (ra-ṣṭā nta raṁ da ^{iv}ra na vi snā tā
 paryamkam (ābhujya ṛju kāyam praṇidhāya
 pyam tsā ntū śā nte tā byā ta jā va e vyetā |)⁶
 pratimukhīm smṛtim upasthāpya |)⁶
 Nti tā [5aⁱ] pharāka āṣīrya⁷ kaṁma hālai
 Atha khalu sambahulā bhikṣavo yena — —
 gyastānā gyastā-ḥaysā vyeta⁸ hāṣṭā tsuāmⁱⁱdā kū
 — — bhagavān — — (tena) upasamkraman —
 vara-hamya gyastānā gyastā-ḥaysā pā ntirājsa
 (upasamkramya)⁹ — — bhagavataḥ pādau śīrobhir
 namasyāⁱⁱⁱdā gyastā-ḥaysā dṛai tcīra-hvaram¹⁰-cai-ñā-
 abhivandya bhagavantam triṣ pradakṣiṇī - kṛtya
 tvanā tsuāmⁱⁱdā¹¹ u śau-hā^{iv}laimi¹² ṇasta |
 — — — — — ek - ānte nyaṣīdan ||

¹ The bracketed phrase is wrongly repeated.

² Apparently lit. Skt. *caran bhūtvā, pratikrāman bhūtvā*.

³ Probably wrong for khāystā.

⁴ Apparently Skt. *dvau pādau*.

⁵ ṇastā = Skt. *nyaṣīdat* is transplaced ; see fols. 5a^{iv}, bⁱ.

⁶ Apparently in the bracketed portion the two texts differ.

⁷ Apparently āṣīri sg., āṣīrya pl. = Skt. *bhikṣuḥ, bhikṣavaḥ*.

⁸ Apparently vyeta = Skt. *abhūt* or some similar word ; cf. fol. 4b^{iv} ;
 ante foot-note 4, infra foot-note 22.

⁹ The bracketed equations are doubtful.

¹⁰ Hvaram = Skt. *dakṣiṇam* ; cf. fol. 5bⁱⁱ.

¹¹ Repeated from above.

¹² Hālaimi, loc. sg. of *hāla*, "locality" = Skt. *anta* = *sthāna* ; cf. fol. 5aⁱ,
 hālai.

Ntye (scera vā-tcā)¹ ————— āṣīri Subhūta vara²
 Tena (khalu punaḥ)¹ samayena āyusmān Subhūtis —
 ntiṇa parṣaṇa [5bⁱ] haṃgrī vyitā³ u⁴ ṇastā
tasyāṃ parṣadi samnīpatito 'bhūt — samnīṣaṇṇaḥ
 nti ————— āṣīri Subhūta āysaṃ napatataⁱⁱ śau - sve
atha khalu āyusmān Subhūtir āsanād utthāya ek - āmsaṃ
 cīvarā prahaṣṭi⁵ u⁴ hvaraṃ dai ysāṃṇu —————
uttarāsaṅgaṃ kṛtvā dakṣiṇaṃ — jānu-maṇḍalaṃ
 śadya pārauⁱⁱⁱnti kām̐ma hālai⁶ gyastā-ḥaysā
prthivyāṃ pratiṣṭhāpya yena — bhagavān
 āṣṭā⁷ hāṣṭā ajaṃlā⁸ dastā^{iv}yudai⁹ u gyastā-ḥaysā
 ————— (tena) aṃjalīm praṇamya — bhagavantam
 nta hve sā¹⁰-duṣkarā miḍāṃma gyasta-ḥaysa [6aⁱ]
etaḍ avocat — āścaryāṃ ————— bhagavan
 ————— ————— ————— cu ntira gyastānā gyastā-
 (param-āścaryāṃ Sugata)¹¹ yāvaḍ eva —————
 ḥaysāna ntāhiraḥvāṇākānā (pa-jsa-ⁱⁱmānā ā ṣa ṇna ṛa-
 ————— tathāgatena (arhatā samyak-
 ṣṭā bi-sā hā lā bi ysā dā a hu jsa)¹² bauⁱⁱⁱdhisatva
sambuddhena)¹² bodhisattvā

¹ The two texts differ; the E. Turk. may mean Skt. *piṇḍapātaṃ cāritvā*; cf. fols. 4a^{iv}, bⁱ, ⁱⁱ.

² See fol. 5aⁱⁱ, vara-hamya; Sanskrit equivalent unknown.

³ Apparently vyitā = vyeta, fol. 5aⁱ, foot-note 15.

⁴ Here, and elsewhere, u = Skt. *ca*, resolving Skt. conj. participles into finite verbs.

⁵ Probably śau-sve cīvarā prahaṣṭi lit. = Skt. *ekāṃsāc cīvaram apanīya*, having withdrawn the robe from one shoulder.

⁶ Hālai, loc. sg. of *hāla*, "locality" = Skt. *anta* = *sthāna*; cf. fol. 5aⁱ, hālai.

⁷ Perhaps Skt. *abhūt* or *āsīt*; cf. *āstā-vya*, fol. 3b^{iv}, and *astā*, fol. 32a^v.

⁸ Probably wrong for aṃjalā.

⁹ Apparently lit. Skt. *hastāṅjalīm kṛtvā*; cf. *yudā-yude*, fol. 4bⁱ, and *dastā* = *hasta*. Regarding the whole passage, see Professor Leumann's remarks in JGOS., lxii, p. 107.

¹⁰ Perhaps sā = Skt. *parama*.

¹¹ Bracketed phrase omitted in E. Turk. text.

¹² The equivalence of the two bracketed texts is not intelligible.

mistä-ḡaysuṃ ṇavuysā¹ haṃdāḡana biṣāpirmā^{iv}ntamye²
mahā - sattvā ————— anugrhitāḡ paramēṇa
 haṃdārājsa ————— cu ntarā gyastā-ḡaysāna
anugraheṇa | āścaryāṃ bhagavan yāvad eva —————
 ntāharātsukana [6bⁱ] (tkhai ṣi nām nā sā nām nā tvī ṣā
tathāgatena (arhatā
 ya nā-kā-na sa mna bi-ṣāṃ nā hi rām nāⁱⁱva ma sā-
*samyak-sambuddhena)*³
 ka-na u hu jsa)³ baudhisattvā mistä-ḡaysuṃ ṇavuysā¹
bodhisattvā maha - sattvāḡ —————
 ysiⁱⁱⁱniyahauḡi biṣāpirmāntamye² ysiⁱⁱⁱniyahaurāmmejsa
parinditāḡ paramayā parindanayā |
 nta khu^{iv}vā miḡāmna gyasta-ḡaysā ḡaysu⁴ ṇavuysaina¹
tat kathāṃ ————— bhagavan —————
 baudhisattva-yāmṇa- [7aⁱ] haṃjsadaina mara⁵
bodhisattva - yāna- samprasthitena kulaputreṇa vā
mahāyāmṇā ————— viṣṭāṇa u khvai
kuladukhitrā vā sthātavyāṃ kathāṃ pratipattavyāṃ - kathāṃ
 aysmu baysamjāmṇa
cittāṃ pragrahitavyam ||

ⁱⁱNtye hvaye-hvaṇai gyastānā gyastā-ḡaysā āṣiri
Evam ukte ————— bhagavān āyusmantam

¹ Here mistä-ḡaysuṃ = Skt. *mahā-sattvā*, but the two texts really do not agree. In the Sanskrit text *mahāsattvāḡ* goes with *bodhisattvāḡ*, both being nom. plur., but in the E. Turk. text mistä-ḡaysuṃ ṇavuysā seems to stand by itself, for some of the parallel passages have only ḡaysuṃ ṇavuysā (fols. 6b^{iv}, 7a^{iv}, 8aⁱ, bⁱⁱⁱ, 9aⁱⁱⁱ), though what the word ṇavuysā may exactly mean is not clear. See Professor Leumann's remarks in JGOS., lxii, p. 109, with which, however, I do not agree.

² Mye, or ma, is an inflectional suffix, like mī in hālamī, fol. 5a^{iv}.

³ The equivalence of the two bracketed texts is not intelligible.

⁴ Probably wrong for ḡaysuṃ.

⁵ Apparently mara corresponds to the technical term *jāva*, Skt. *yāvat* of Jaina texts, used to indicate omitted standing formulæ, such as *kulaputreṇa*, etc. It means also Skt. *iha*, fols. 9aⁱⁱ, 31bⁱ.

Subhūtaⁱⁱⁱ nta hve śirā śirā Subhūta nta nta ṣi-hārā¹
Subhūtim etad avocat sādhu sādhu Subhūte evam etad —

Subhūta — — — — — hamdādā^{iv} gyasta-ḥaysāna
Subhūte evam etad yathā vadasi | anugrhitās tathāgatena
 baudhisatva — — — — — ḥaysuṁ ṇavuysaina²
bodhisattvā mahāsattvāḥ — — — — —

biśāpirmāntamye³ [7bⁱ] hamdārājsa

parameṇa

anugraheṇa

⁴ cu ntirā gyasta-
 ḥaysāna ntāhirautesukana tsai ṣi nām nā sā nām nā tvī
 ṣā ya nā-kā na sa mna ba-śām na hi rāmⁱⁱⁱ nā va ma
 sā-kā-na u hu jsa baudhisatva mistā-ḥaysuṁ ṇavuysai
^{iv} na ysiniyahauḍā biśāpirmāntamye ysiniyāhurāmmejsa
 [8aⁱ] nta khuvā miḍāmnā gyastā-ḥaysā ḥaysu ṇavuysaina
 baudhisatva-yāmⁱⁱ ṇā-hamjsadaina mara mahāyāmṇā viṣṭāṇa
 u khuai aysmu nāⁱⁱⁱ sāṇā⁴ ntye hvaye-hvaṇai gyasta-ḥaysa
 āṣiri Subhūta nta hve^{iv} śirā śirā Subhūta nta nta ṣi-hirā
 Subhūta hamdāḍa ḥaysana⁵ bau[8bⁱ] dhisatvā biśāpīr-
 māntamā hamdārājsa

ysinihauḍā⁶ gyastā-ḥaysāna bauⁱ dhisatva — — — — —
parinditās tathāgatena bodhisattvā mahāsattvāḥ
 biśāpirmāntamā ysinihaurāmmejsa ta ntina Subhūta pyū
paramayā parindanayā ² ¹ *hi tena Subhūte śṛṇu*
ⁱⁱⁱ *śiri* — subijī — aysmayayaṁ asye hvāñi mā khu
sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasi kuru | bhāṣiṣye aham yathā
 ḥaysu⁷ ṇavu^{iv} ysaina baudhisatva-yāmṇā-ḥadaina
 — — — — — *bodhisattva-yāna-saṁprasthitena*

¹ Apparently ṣi-hārā = Skt. *tasya*, gen. of ṣi or ṣā, Skt. *saḥ*, demonstrative pron., corresponding to ci-hārā = Skt. *kasya*, interrog. pron., fols. 10a^{iv}, bⁱ, 31b^{iv}, 32aⁱⁱ, 37a^{iv}; the rel. pron. is cu = Skt. *yaḥ*, nom. sg., fols. 9bⁱ, ii, iii, 32a^{iv}, bⁱⁱ, iv, 33aⁱ, ii.

² See n. 1, p. 1287.

³ Mye, or ma, is an inflectional suffix, like mī in hālaīmī, fol. 5a^{iv}.

⁴ Apparently by the copyist's carelessness this paragraph has been repeated from fol. 6aⁱ, the only point of difference being nāsāṇā = Skt. *pragrahīṭavyam* for baysamjāmṇā, introduced from fol. 9aⁱ.

⁵ Read gyasta-ḥaysāna, as above, fol. 7a^{iv}.

⁶ Apparently wrong for ysiniyahauḍā; see fol. 6bⁱⁱⁱ.

⁷ Probably wrong for ḥaysuṁ.

mara¹ mahāyāmñā — viṣṭāñā u khui [9aⁱ] mara²
sthātavyam yathā pratipattavyam — yathā
 aysmu nāsāñā nta nta śirā³ gyasta-ḥaysa —
cittam pragrahitavyam | evam — — bhagavan iti
 ntūñājsaḍā āṣiⁱⁱⁱri Subhūta gyasta-ḥaysāna pyūṣṭe
 — āyūṣmān Subhūtir bhagavataḥ pratyāśrauṣit ||
 Gyastā-ḥaysi nta hve maraⁱⁱⁱ Subhūta ḥaysu⁴
Bhagavān etad avocat | iha Subhūte —
 ṇavuyśaina⁵ baudhisatva-yāmñā-hamśamḍai^{iv}na nta
 — bodhisattva-yāna-saṃprasthitena evam
 (nta⁶) aysmu upevāmñā cu-burā — satva —
 — *cittam utpādayitavyam yāvantah Subhūte sattvāḥ sattva-*
 — *satvām-nāsāmejsa haṃ[9bⁱ]khiṣaysāya⁷ u āhya-*
dhātau sattva-saṃgrahaṇa saṃ gṛhīta — aṇḍa-
ysāta wa purāmñā-ysāta cu⁸ ganiṣṭā-ysāⁱⁱta — ūvavā
jā vā jarāyū-jā vā saṃsveda-jā vā upapādukā
cu⁸ haṃtsa-rūvina⁹ (rūvana¹⁰) — anau-rūvāna¹¹ cu⁸
vā rūpiṇo vā a-rūpiṇo vā
haṃⁱⁱⁱtsa-syāmejsa cu⁸ anau-syāmejsa cu-vā⁸ nti satva cu
saṃjñīno vā asaṃjñīno vā eva² — —
ni haṃ^{iv}tsa-syāmejsa — anau-syāmijsa — ku-burā
naⁱ saṃjñīno na asaṃjñīno vā yāvan-kascit
satva-dāta-praṇāvāñā [10aⁱ] ma-ta-ñā-pi-ya nti —
sattva-dhātu-prajñāpyamānaḥ prajñāpyate te ca
satva muhujśa harbiśā aharīna nirvāñā —
— mayā sarve anupadhiśeṣe nirvāñā-dhātau

¹ See n. 5, p. 1287.

² Mara, if it is = *jāva* = *yāvat*, seems to be here superfluous.

³ The Sanskrit equivalent of the E. Turk. text would be *evam etad sādhu*.

⁴ Probably wrong for ḥaysuṃ.

⁵ See n. 1, p. 1287.

⁶ Apparently nta has been wrongly repeated.

⁷ Reading doubtful, folio damaged.

⁸ The Sanskrit text has *vā*, but the E. Turk. *cu* would rather be = Skt. *yah*, rel. pron.

⁹ Lit. Skt. *sārdham-rūpiṇaḥ*.

¹⁰ Wrongly repeated.

¹¹ Lit. Skt. *vinā-rūpiṇaḥ*.

paⁱⁱranirvāṇa | dādirā avamāta satva ku
 parinirvāpayitavyāḥ | evam aparimānān satvān api
 parinirvāye ⁱⁱⁱhamāti ¹ | na haḍi ²kāmuḍā ṣai śau ³satva
 parinirvāpya na — kaścīt — — sattvaḥ
 paranirvāye ^{iv}hāmā | nta ci-hārā kiḍna — ci Subhūta
 parinirvāpito bhavati | tat kasya hetoḥ | sa cet Subhūte
 baudhisatva — — samñña [10bⁱ] hāmātā ni ṣā
 bodhisattvasya sattva-samññā pravarteta na sa
 baudhisatvā — hvañai . nta ci-hārā kiḍna | ni ṣi Subhūta
 bodhisatva iti vaktavyaḥ | tat kasya hetoḥ | na sa Subhūte
 bauⁱⁱdhisatvā hvañai ci satvā-vīra-samñña hamātā
 bodhisattvo vaktavyo yasya sattva — samññā pravarteta
 wa jvākā ⁴-vīra-ⁱⁱⁱsamñña wa pudgalā-vīra-samñña —
 jīva — samññā vā pudgala — samññā vā
 hāme
 pravarteta |

Here four folios are missing, Nos. 11–14.

SECOND EXTRACT.

Stein MS., fol. 31aⁱⁱⁱ = M.M. ed., p. 35, l. 18, § 17.

Nti vā āṣiri Subhūtā gya^{iv}sta-ḥaysā nta hve
 Atha khalu āyusmān Subhūtir bhagavantam etad avocat |
 khuvā miḍāṁna gyasta - ḥaysā baudhisatvā - yāṁni
 katham ————— bhagavan bodhisattva-yāna
 marā ⁵ [31bⁱ] mahāyāṇa ⁶ —————
 samprasthitena sthātavyam katham pratipattavyam
 ————— aysmu biysamñjāmñā gyastā-ḥaysi nta hve
 katham cittam pragrahitavyam | bhagavān — āha |

¹ The two texts seem to differ in this passage; dādirā is hardly = Skt. *evam*, which is *nta*, and *ku* parinirvāye *hamāti* would mean Skt. *kaḥ* (or *katham*) *parinirvāpitaḥ pravarteta*; see fols. 10aⁱⁱⁱ, bⁱ, 31b^{iv}, 32aⁱⁱ.

² The colophon of the MS. has *haḍi* = Skt. *ārya*, fol. 44bⁱ.

³ Lit. *kāmuḍā ṣai śau* = Skt. *kaścīt sa ekaḥ*.

⁴ Perhaps a mere clerical blunder for *jīva*; see fol. 32aⁱ.

⁵ See n. 5, p. 1287.

⁶ Read *mahāyāmñā*; cf. fol. 7aⁱ.

mara Subhūta baudhisa^{it}va ————— māstā-
 iha Subhūte bodhisattva-yāna-saṃprasthiteṇa ———
 ḥaysuṃ ṇavuyśaina¹ nta-nta aysmu upevāñā biśā
 ————— evaṃ cittam utpādayitavyam sarve
 satva ——— aharīⁱⁱⁱna ————— paranirvāyāmñā |
 sattvā mayā anupadhīśeṣe nirvāṇa-dhataṃ parinirvāpayitavyāḥ |
 ————— ni haḍi² kāmujā satva
 evaṃ ca sattvān parinirvāpya na ——— kaścit sattvaḥ
 paranirvāñā³ ^{iv}hāmā | nta ci-hārā⁴ kiṇa | — ci Subhūta
 parinirvāpito bhavati | tat kasya hetoḥ | sa cet Subhūte
 baudhisattvā satva-saṃñā hamāti [32aⁱ] ni ṣa
 bodhisattvasya sattva-saṃjñā pravarteta na sa
 baudhisattvā — hvañai wa ātma-saṃñā wa vā jīva-
 bodhisattva iti vaktavyaḥ | [vā ātma-saṃjñā⁵] vā — jīva-
 saṃñā — wa pudgalā-saṃñā — ⁱhamāti ni ṣi
 saṃjñā yāvāt vā ²pudgala-saṃjñā vā pravarteta na sa
 baudhisattva — hvañai nta ci-hārā kiṇa ni-śtā ———
 bodhisattva iti vaktavyaḥ | tat kasya hetoḥ | nāsti Subhūte
 ṣi dharmā ⁱⁱⁱkāmujā — baudhisattva-yāmñā-haṃjsedai āya |
 sa dhārmaḥ kaścit yo bodhisattva-yāna-saṃprasthito nāma ||
 ————— aśtā nai ṣi Subhūta ———
 Tat kim manasye Subhūte asti — sa ——— kaścīd
^{iv}dharmā cu⁴ gyasta-ḥaysāna Dīpaṃkarā gyasta-baysā
 dharmo yas tathāgatena Dīpaṃkarasya tathāgatasya
 iñaka ————— biśāpīrmāntamā [32bⁱ] ḥaysu-śtā
 antikād anuttarām samyak- sambodhiṃ
 bustā āya ntye hvaye-hvanai āsiri
 sambuddhaḥ | [nāma] evam ukte āyusmān
 Subhūta gyastā-ḥaysā ⁱnta hve ———
 Subhūtir bhagavantam etad avocat | yathāham

¹ Here the two texts do not quite agree ; see fols. 6b^{iv}, etc.

² The colophon of the MS. has haḍi = Skt. ārya, fol. 44bⁱ.

³ Read paranirvāye, as in fol. 10aⁱⁱⁱ ; for paranirvāñā = Skt. parinirvāpayitavya see fol. 10aⁱⁱⁱ.

⁴ See n. 1, p. 1288.

⁵ For the Sanskrit version see foot-note 1 on p. 21 of M.M. edition.

_____ sā ni-śtā
bhagavan bhagavato bhāṣitasya artham ājānāmi — nāsti
*mādāmna — gyastā-ḥaysā kāmujā śi dharmā cu*¹
 _____ *sa bhagavan kaścid — dharmo yas*
*gyasta-ḥaysā*ⁱⁱⁱ *na* (_____
tathāgatena (Dīpaṃkarasya tathāgatasya arhataḥ

samyak - sambuddhasya antikād anuttarām
*biśāpirmāntama*² *-ḥaysu-śtā bustā āya*)³ *ntyē hvaye-hvanai*
*samyak-sambodhim sambuddhaḥ|)*³ *evam ukte*
gyasta-ḥai^{iv} *ysā āśiri Subhūta nta hve nta nta*
bhagavān āyusmantam Subhūtim etad avocat | evam etad
 _____ *śi-hārā*¹ *Subhūta ni-śtā kāmujā śi*
*Subhūte evam etad — Subhūte nāsti kaścid*¹ *sa*
*dharmā cu*¹ [33a¹] *gyasta-ḥaysna Dīpaṃkarā*
dharmo yas tathāgatena Dīpaṃkarasya
*gyasta-ḥaysana*⁴ (_____
tathāgatasya (arhataḥ samyak-sambuddhasya
 _____ *-ḥaysu-śtā bustā āya*)³ —
*antikād anuttarām samyak-sambodhim sambuddhaḥ|)*³ *sa*
*cī — Subhūta*ⁱⁱ *kāmujā śi*¹ *dharmā vya cu*⁵
cet punaḥ Subhūte kaścid — dharmas — —
gyasta-ḥaysana ḥaysuśtābustā vya ni muhu
tathāgatena abhisambuddho abhaviṣyat na mām
 _____ *iii* *vyirasā hamathu — māṇavā*
Dīpaṃkaras tathāgato vyākariṣyat bhaviṣyasi tvam māṇavān

¹ See n. 1, p. 1288.

² This represents here Skt. *samyak*, and in fols. 6aⁱⁱⁱ, 6ⁱⁱⁱ, 7a^{iv}, 8bⁱ, Skt. *parameṇa* or *paramayā*; and *biśā* by itself represents Skt. *sarve* (properly *viśvāḥ*) in fol. 31bⁱⁱ; hence *biśā-pirmāntama* perhaps lit. = Skt. *sarva-prakāreṇa*, or some similar phrase.

³ In the bracketed portion the two texts do not agree.

⁴ Perhaps wrong for *gyasta-ḥaysā*, for the form ending in *na* usually stands for the instrumental case.

⁵ *Vya cu* = Skt. *abhaviṣyad yaḥ*, missing in the Sanskrit text.

ustamājsi bādā Śākya-munā nāma gya^{iv}sta-ḥaysā |
 āgate adhvani Śākya-munir nāma tathāgato

arhan samyak-sambuddha iti ||

The continuation does not seem to agree in the two texts.

APARIMITĀYUḤ SŪTRA, fol. 1b.

Saddham nta nta muhujṣa pyūṣṭā śiṇa¹ beḍa
 Siddham | evaṃ — mayā śrutam | ekasmin samaye
 gyastā-ḥaysā Śrāvastā āsta-vye Jivārispurābāśa
 bhagavān Śrāvastyām viharati-sma Jetavane
 Anāthaⁱⁱpiṇḍi-hārū saṅkhyerma —————
 Anāthapiṇḍasya ārāme mahatā bhikṣu-saṅghena
 ————— dvāsse-paṃjsā śau āśiryaujsa ————— u
 sārḍham ardha-trayodaśabhir — bhikṣu - śataiḥ² ca
 pharākyau baudhisatvau mistyau-ḥaysu ṇavuⁱⁱⁱysyaujsa²
 sambāhulaiś bodhisattvair mahā-sattvaiḥ —————
 hatsa³ | Ntiṇa⁴ ————— beḍami gyastā-ḥaysā Maṃjuśrī
 ————— Tatra khalu ————— bhagavān Maṃjuśriyam
 eysāxam⁵-gurṣṭe untaipastisa aścā⁶ Maṃjuśryu
 kumāra-bhūtam āmantrayate-sma | asti Maṃjuśriḥ
^{iv}sarbaṃdā-hālai guṇa⁷ Aparamintā-saṃcayā nāmma
 upariṣṭāyām aparimīta-guṇa-saṃcayo nāma
 lova-dāvara⁸ |
 loka-dhātuh |

¹ Loc. sg. of śau = Skt. *eka*.

² Cf. ṇavuyśaina in *Vajracchedikā*, fol. 31b^{iv}; i.e. ṇavuyśai with instrumental suffix na or jsa.

³ Hatsa = Skt. *sārḍham*, placed earlier after *saṅghena*.

⁴ Loc. sg. of nta = Skt. *tat*.

⁵ The consonant (x) of the final syllable is broken off.

⁶ Perhaps an error for āstā; see fol. 32a^{iv}.

⁷ *Guṇa* is placed differently in the two texts.

⁸ *Dāvara* may be a clerical error for *dātara*, for *v* and *t* are not unfrequently confounded, and *dāta* = Skt. *dhātu*, see fol. 9b^{iv}; *dātara* would seem to be the plural of *dāta*; see my "Report", JASB., 1901, Extra No. 1, p. 34.

REMARKS.

1. The term "E. Turk.," occasionally used in this paper, is not to be taken to prejudge the question of the identity of the "unknown language," but is simply a convenient way of indicating the language as coming to us from Eastern Turkestan.

2. A peculiar diacritical mark occurs in the original manuscript under certain syllables (*akṣara*). It resembles a rough semicircle, opening upwards (see Plate, fol. 3, l. 4, in *ḡaysā* and *bāṣa*, and in fol. 32, l. 1, *ṣa* and l. 2, *ṣi*). In the transcript it is indicated similarly. The syllables, with which, so far, I have found it, are *ṇa* (in *ṇastā*), *ba* (in *ḡaysa*), *ṣa* (e.g. in *parṣa*), *ḥa* (e.g. in *ḥadaina*, fol. 8b^{iv}), and once *pā*, fol. 5aⁱⁱ; again, *ṣi*, fols. 32aⁱⁱ, bⁱⁱ, and *ṣi* (e.g. in *āṣiri*). It will be seen that it usually occurs in syllables containing a short vowel, which, as a rule, is *a*, though it may be *i*. The single case of a long vowel is *pā*. The significance of the mark has, so far as I know, not yet been discovered; nor whether it is concerned with the consonant or the vowel of the syllable. I may, however, draw attention to the curious circumstance attending the spelling of the word which I have transcribed *ḡaysā*, as possibly throwing light on the phonetic value of the mark. The circumstance I refer to is detailed below in No. 11.

3. Another peculiar diacritical mark, now well known, is the double dot over a syllable containing the short ("inherent") vowel *a*. I have never found it with any other vowel, save an exceptional *ā*. Its significance is not exactly known, but it appears to indicate an indistinct, or "neutral", vowel; for some words are found spelled indifferently with *ā* or *i*, e.g., *mistā* or *māstā*, *hamāti* or *hamātā*, *hirā* or *hārā*, *ṣi* or *ṣā*; similarly, *munā* for Skt. *muni*, *rūvina* or *rūvāna* for Skt. *rūpiṇaḥ*. The exceptions of *ā* are *hamāti* or *hamātā*, fol. 10bⁱⁱ, and *hamdārajsa*, fol. 7bⁱ, or *hamdārajsa*, fol. 8bⁱ. It may be observed that in both these cases the usual *ā* occurs also in the adjoining syllable.

4. There occur two peculiar consonantal signs. One appears in *wa* = Skt. *vā*, fols. 9*b*ⁱ, 10*b*ⁱ,ⁱⁱ, 32*a*ⁱ; the other, as a conjunct, in *drai* = Skt. *tri*, and, as a non-conjunct, in *raštā* = Skt. *ābhujya*, fol. 4*b*ⁱⁱⁱ, etc. The latter I take to represent the cerebral consonant *ṛ* (as in Hindi). Its form may be seen in *ri*, in the accompanying Plate, fol. 3, l. 4, *akṣara* 7 from the right.¹ The other was identified by Drs. Sieg and Siegling in *Sitzungsberichte, K. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, No. xxix of 1908, p. 918, where its form is shown in facsimile. Its form may also be seen in the accompanying Plate, fol. 32, l. 1.²

5. Other peculiarities are an occasional disaspiration in Sanskritic words, such as *dāta* for Skt. *dhātu*, fol. 9*b*^{iv}, and *sägā* for Skt. *saṃgha*, fol. 4*a*ⁱ; and an occasional suppression of the vowel *a*, as in *baysna* (Skt. *sattvena*) for *baysana* or *baysāna*, fol. 33*a*ⁱ; perhaps also in *harbiśā*, fol. 10*a*ⁱ, for *hara-biśā*, for *biśā* by itself means Skt. *sarva* (properly *viśva*), fol. 31*b*ⁱⁱ; and in *bilsägāna*, fol. 1*a*ⁱⁱ, for *bila-sägāna*, Skt. *bhikṣu-saṃghena*.

6. Mere scribal errors are the repetition of *śe snye*, fol. 3*b*ⁱⁱⁱ, of *nti gyastā-baysā*, fol. 4*a*^{iv}, of *rūvana*, fol. 9*b*ⁱⁱ, of the long paragraph on fol. 7*b*, and probably of *nta*, fol. 9*a*^{iv}; so also probably the misspellings *ajamlā* for *aṃjalā*, fol. 5*b*ⁱⁱⁱ, *ysinihaudā* for *ysīniyahaudā*, fol. 8*b*ⁱ; and perhaps also *jvākā* for *jivā*, fol. 10*b*ⁱⁱ.

7. Regarding the inflection of nouns: *na* or *jsa* indicate the instrumental case, e.g., *gyasta-baysāna* = Skt. *bhagavatā* (or *tathāgatena*), by the Blessed; *mistāna bilsägāna*, Skt. *mahatā bhikṣu-saṃghena*, by a great congregation of friars; *brū-hadāna* = Skt. *pūrvāhna*, by (or in) the forenoon.

¹ See also No. iv, l. 4, *rā* (formerly read by me *cā*) of pl. iv in my "Report on Three Further Collections" in the JASB., vol. lxvi, p. 234, 1897.

² See also fig. 4, l. 3, *wa* (formerly read by me first as *kha*, afterwards as *ña*), of pl. iii in my "Report on the Weber MSS." in the JASB., vol. lxii, p. 35, 1893, also in the same Journal, vol. lxx, Extra No. 1, Appendix, pp. 1, 15, leaf 33*b*ⁱⁱⁱ, 1902.

Again, e.g., sg., muhujsa = Skt. *mayā*, by me, nāsāmejsa = Skt. *saṃgrahena*, by the complex, haṃdārājsa = Skt. *anugraheṇa*, by the grace; or pl., āṣiryaujsa = Skt. *bhikṣubhiḥ*, by the friars, ntirājsa, Skt. *śīrobhiḥ*, with the heads. Na indicates also the genitive, in sg. gyastabaysana = Skt. *bhagavataḥ*, of the Blessed, and in pl. gyastānā = Skt. *devānām*, of the gods. The suffixes mye, or mi, or ma, or mā indicate indifferently the locative or instrumental case; e.g., śau-hālaini = Skt. *ekānte*, in a solitary place, and biśā-pirmāntamye = Skt. *paramena* (lit. *sarva-prakāreṇa*), in every way, thoroughly. Hārā (or hirā) or hārū seem to indicate the genitive, as in cihārā = Skt. *kasya*, of which, Anāthapiṇḍihārū = Skt. *Anāthapiṇḍasya*, of Anāthapiṇḍa.

8. Regarding the inflection of verbs: we have 3rd sg. pres. ind., hāmā = Skt. *bhavati*, he is, fol. 10a^{iv}; 3rd sg. pres. subj., hamāti or hāme = Skt. *pravarteta* (or *bhavet*), fols. 31b^{iv}, 10bⁱⁱⁱ; 2nd sg. fut. (or perhaps rather the 2nd sg. pres.), hamathu = Skt. *bhaviṣyasi*, fol. 33aⁱⁱⁱ. To the same series apparently belongs hamye, fol. 4bⁱ, ⁱⁱ. To another auxiliary verb seems to point vya = Skt. *abhaviṣyat*, fol. 32aⁱⁱⁱ; in fol. 3b^{iv} it seems simply to mark past time, being attached to the part. āstā, he was staying (see below); it would seem to be an abbreviation of vyetā or vyitā = Skt. *abhūt*, fols. 4b^{iv}, 5bⁱ. Again, another is āstā = Skt. *asti*, fol. 32a^{iv}, ni-štā = Skt. *nāsti*, fol. 32aⁱⁱ. The suffix of the part. fut. pass. is ñā, or ñai; e.g., upevāmñā = Skt. *utpādayitavya*, fol. 9a^{iv}; nāsāñā = Skt. *pragrahitavya*, fol. 9aⁱ; paranirvāñā = Skt. *parinirvāpayitavya*, fol. 10aⁱⁱ; biysamjāmñā = Skt. *pragrahitavya*, fol. 31bⁱ; mahāyāmñā = Skt. *sthātavya*, fol. 7aⁱ; viṣtāmñā = Skt. *pratipattavya*, fol. 8b^{iv}; hvañai = Skt. *vaktavya*, fol. 10bⁱ. To the last-mentioned verb belong the 3rd sg. past, hve = Skt. *avocat* or *āha*, fols. 5b^{iv}, 31bⁱ, the 1st sg. fut., hvāñi = Skt. *bhāṣiṣye*, fol. 8bⁱⁱⁱ, and the part. past, hvane-hvanai = Skt. *ukte*, fol. 7aⁱⁱ. Forms of the participle, or of the

imperfect, in tā (ta) or dā, seem to be *nastā* = Skt. *niṣanna* or *nyāṣīdat*, fols. 5a^{iv}, bⁱ; *paryeta* = Skt. *pratikrānta*, fol. 4bⁱⁱ; *āstā* = Skt. *viharan* (*āsan*), fol. 5b^{iv}; *vātsuta* = Skt. *caran*, walking, fol. 4bⁱ; *namasyādā* = Skt. *abhivandya* (lit. *namaskṛtya*); *tsuamā* = Skt. *upasaṃkraman* or *upasaṃkramya*, fol. 5aⁱ, ⁱⁱⁱ.

9. Regarding pronouns, we have the personal, 1st nom. sg., *mā* = Skt. *aham*, fol. 8bⁱⁱⁱ; acc. sg., *muhu* = Skt. *mām*, fol. 33aⁱⁱ; instr. sg., *maṃma*, fol. 3bⁱⁱⁱ, or *muhjsa*, fol. 10aⁱ = Skt. *mayā*. Again, the demonstrative, nom. sg. masc., *sa* or *ṣi* = Skr. *saḥ*, fol. 10bⁱ, or *ṣai*, fol. 10a^{iv}, and neut., *nta* = Skt. *tat*, or *etat*, fols. 31aⁱⁱⁱ, bⁱⁱ; instr. sg., *ntyē*, fol. 5a^{iv}, or *ntina*, fol. 8bⁱⁱ = Skt. *tena*; gen. sg., *ṣi-hārā* (= Skt. *tasya*), fol. 7aⁱⁱⁱ; loc. sg. fem., *ntiña*, Skt. *tasyām*, fol. 5a^{iv}, and Ap., fol. 7bⁱⁱⁱ; nom. pl. masc., *nti* = Skt. *te*, fol. 10aⁱ. Again, the relative, nom. sg. masc., *cu* = Skt. *yaḥ*, fols. 32a^{iv}, bⁱⁱ; instr. sg., *kāmma* = Skt. *yena*, fol. 5aⁱ; gen. sg., *ci* (perhaps wrong for *ci-hārā*) = Skt. *yasya*, fol. 10bⁱⁱ, and quantitatively, nom. pl. masc., *cu-burā* = Skt. *yāvantaḥ*, fol. 9a^{iv}. Again, the interrogative, gen. sg., *ci-hārā* = Skt. *kasya*, fol. 10a^{iv}, or adverbially, *khuvā* (*kuvā*?) = Skt. *katham*, fol. 6bⁱⁱⁱ. Again, the indefinite, nom. sg. masc., *kāmuja* = Skt. *kaścit*, fol. 10aⁱⁱⁱ, or quantitatively, *ku-burā* = Skt. *yāvan kaścit*, fol. 9b^{iv}. That both the relative and interrogative pronouns equally show forms with initial *c* and *k* appears noteworthy.

10. Of numerals we have *śau* = Skt. *eka*, one, fols. 4aⁱⁱ, 5aⁱⁱⁱ, bⁱⁱ; loc. sg., *śe* or *śiña* = Skt. *ekasmin*; and *dvāsipamjsā*, fol. 4aⁱ, which corresponds to Skt. *ardha-trayodaśabhiḥ*, "with half-thirteen," but which literally seems to mean "with twelve and half" (Skt. *dvādaśa-ardhaiḥ*).¹

11. The word *baysä* has hitherto been transcribed as *baḥsä* by myself, as well as by Dr. Sten Konow in a dissertation

¹ See my "Report" in JASB., lxx, Extra No. 1, pp. 34 ff. In Document 5, l. 4, p. 38, occurs *trai-se pam-saya*, i.e. three hundred (and) half-hundred (350); also l. 5, *śau*, one; and in Document 8, l. 3, *pam-hsāro*, half-thousand (500). In the list on p. 34, "500" should be "50".

and transcript of some manuscript fragments in the "unknown language" supplied to me by him in 1906 (see JGOS., vol. lxii, p. 92, foot-note), and as *balysä* by Professor Leumann (see *ibid.*, p. 107). The fact is that the word is written in two different ways in different texts. In the two texts of the *Vajracchedikā* and *Apari-mitāyuh Sūtra* its first syllable *ba* is written with the semicircular mark under it, and its second syllable *ysä* is written with exactly the same conjunct sign as *ysa* in the word *ñavuysaina*. On the other hand, in other texts its first syllable is written *ba*, without the subscribed semicircle, and its second syllable is written with a conjunct sign which suggests the presence of some *l*-consonant, and which has been variously read as *lsä* or *lysä*. These two signs, *lsa* (*lysa*) and *ysa*, may be seen, in juxtaposition, in the second line of the obv. fol. 8 (D. iii, 1) in plate cx of Dr. Stein's *Ancient Khotan*, vol. ii, in the phrase *mästābalysū ñāvūysai*, as transcribed by Professor Leumann (see JGOS., vol. lxii, p. 107). Exactly the same phrase occurs in our *Vajracchedikā* text, fol. 31bⁱⁱ, l. 2 in the accompanying Plate, *mästābaysuñ ñavuysaina*, as transcribed by me in the second extract; but here the identical conjunct sign *ys* is found in both words *baysuñ* and *ñavuysaina*. This state of things seems to suggest some connexion between the semicircular mark and the *l*-sound. Might the mark not signify the cerebral consonant *ḷ* when it occurs as the second, or lower, part of a conjunct consonant, so that we should have to read the word in question as *blaysä*? The existence, in these "unknown languages" of Eastern Turkestan, of the cerebral *ḷ*, as a *consonant*, was first discovered by Professor Leumann; see his paper, "Ueber eine von den Unbekannten Literatursprachen Mittelasiens," in the Transactions of the Russian Imperial Academy, vol. iv, No. 8 (1900), p. 10. Its form, as non-conjunct, may be seen very clearly, e.g., in *sukṣmel* (formerly read by me wrongly *sukṣmeu*), fig. 5, line 2, of

plate iii in my "Report on the Weber MSS." in the JASB., vol. lxii, p. 36, 1893. It resembles closely enough the form of the semicircular mark. Indeed, if it were not for the fact that the mark is occasionally found with syllables containing the vowel *i*, it might be suggested that it simply indicates the cerebral *l* as a vowel.

12. As regards the word *gyastä*, its correspondence to the Skt. *deva* was first pointed out by Dr. Sten Konow, in the dissertation above referred to, from its occurrence in the standing phrase *gyasta-nāga-aysura*, etc. = Skt. *deva-nāga-asura*, etc. But though thus its positional parity is assured, it is not necessarily so with its connotional equivalence. In that respect *gyastä* might still be = Skt. *bhagavat*, the well-known Indian epithet of the Divine being. Similarly, it remains to discover the connotional equivalent of *āṣiri*, which takes the place of both Skt. *bhikṣu* and *āyusmat*.

13. So far as I can judge at present, the language seems, in the main, to be identical with the language of the "Brāhmī Documents", published by me, in 1902, in my "Report on the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia", in the JASB., Extra No. 1 to vol. lxx, pp. 30 ff. For example, both have *hadā*, day, *hāmā*, he is, *hamtsa*, with, *pañ*, half (see foot-note to No. 10), *pharāka*, many, *ṣi*, that, *u*, and, *ciburä*, as many, *beḍa*, time. On this point I am now disposed to agree with Drs. Sieg and Siegling (see their paper "Tocharisch, die Sprache der Indoskythen," in *Sitz. Ber., K. Preuss. Akad. der Wiss.*, xxxix, pp. 915 ff., 1908), and Professor Leumann, who has fully gone into the question in his paper on the "Arische Textsprache" (JGOS., vol. lxii, pp. 83-110, 1908). To the latter scholar, who has been working for some time with great acuteness and success, notwithstanding the absence, hitherto, of any bilingual text, on fragments of "unknown language" texts from my own collection as well as from that of Dr. Stein's first tour of exploration (1900-1), we may look for the

elucidation of those phrases and passages which, even with the now available Sanskrit version, remain obscure or unintelligible. In my "Report", p. 33, I connected the language with "the so-called Ghalchah dialects of the Pamir". As a fact, the people who spoke it appear to have lived (speaking roughly) in the south of Eastern Turkestan, while the people living in the north spoke the other "unknown language", which Drs. Sieg and Siegling, following herein Dr. F. W. K. Müller (*Sitz. Ber. P. Ak. W.*, liii, p. 960, 1907), call Tokhari ("Tocharisch," l.c., p. 916). The character, common to it and the Ghalchah dialects, appears to be that, while being Indo-European, there is no direct affinity with either the Iranian or the Indo-Aryan class of languages.