

\* Referred to as 'detached papers' in my *Excat.*, Pt. I, p. 28.

the further Collections of Ancient Manuscripts from Central Asia.—By  
A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE, C.I.E., PH.D.  
(With Plates VII—XXX.)

[Read August, 1897.]

Since the publication in this *Journal*<sup>1</sup> in 1893 of my account of Weber Manuscripts, three further collections of Central Asian manuscripts have been placed in my hands by the Foreign Department of the Government of India. I received them in April 1895, November 1895, and December 1896, respectively.

I. FRAGMENTS. (Plate VII.)

The first of the three collections consists of mere scraps of manuscripts. A preliminary account of these was published by me in the *Proceedings* of this Society for May 1895 (pages 84, 85). They had been presented to Mr. Macartney, the British Agent in Kashgar by the Manager of the Chinese Foreign Commerce in that town. Mr. Macartney sent them to Sir A. Talbot, K.C.I.E., the British Resident in Kashmir, who forwarded them to the Foreign Office in Simla, which he then sent over to me. In the same way, I may here add, the other two collections of manuscripts have come into my hands.

The Foreign Office letter, of the 28th March, 1895, forwarding to me the fragments, simply stated that they had been dug out in Kuchar. My request for further particulars, Mr. Macartney very kindly forwarded to me "the translation of a letter received in Kashgar on the 7th December, 1894, from Lew, Amban of Kuchar, to Tsing, Manager of the Foreign Commerce Office in Kashgar." This letter, I added, contained all the information he was able to afford with reference to my request. The letter runs as follows:—

"I have received your letter, desiring me to enquire whether there are any sacred Tibetan Manuscripts in the family of Timur Beg. I lost no time in summoning him. He stated that he had no such manuscripts, but that some people had, several years ago,

<sup>1</sup> See *ante*, Vol. LXII, p. 1 ff.

*See my Excat. Pt. I, p. 28. It appears that the old Mr. Macartney had these papers in 1894. The letter referred to in Dec. 1894, and which it would seem the old Macartney got in some way or other. See also the letter from the Manager of the Chinese Foreign Commerce in Kashgar to the British Agent in Kashgar, dated 7th Dec. 1894, and the letter from the British Resident in Kashmir to the Foreign Office, dated 28th March 1895.*

dug some out from a big mound situated at the west of the city [Kuchar], and almost 5 *li* [slightly over a mile] from it, and that as this took place a long time ago, the documents had now either been sold or burnt. I also went in person to make an inspection of the mound which was about 10 *chang* [approximately 100 feet] in height and of about the same dimension in circumference. As people had already been digging there, a cavity was seen, which, however, had fallen in. I hired 25 men to dig under proper supervision. After two months' work, they only dug out a parcel of torn paper and torn leaves with writing on them. I now forward this to you. If afterwards I discover any person possessing such manuscripts I shall again communicate with you."

The locality of the find, indicated in this letter, as I shall show further on (*infra*, p. 240), appears to be the same as that from which the Bower MSS. and the Weber MSS. have been recovered.

Specimens of the fragments, which constitute this collection, are shown on Plate VII in full size. It will be seen that they are the merest scraps of manuscripts. There is none among them of any larger size than the largest shown in the plate. Of course, the most legible specimens have been selected for exhibition, though even among them there are some which are only legible with the greatest difficulty. But their interest lies not so much in what they contain, as in the various types of character in which, and the material, on which they are written.

The material of the fragments is of three different kinds: palm-leaf, birch-bark, and paper. The fragments of palm-leaf are shown under No. I: they are all that were found in the collection. Those of birch-bark are shown under No. II: there are four more which have not been figured. The whole of the remainder are scraps of paper. It will be noticed that the paper is of several very distinct varieties, from a very brown and hard (No. IX) to a very white and soft (No. XII) kind. The latter, like the paper of some of the Weber MSS., is coated with a thick sizing of gypsum.

The following is a summary of the collection:—

No.	I, palm-leaf,	9 pieces.
"	II, birch-bark,	13 "
"	III, paper,	12 "
"	IV, do.	1 "
"	V, VI, do.	8 "
"	VII, do.	10 "
"	VIII, do.	2 "
"	IX, do.	25 "

No.	X, paper	20 pieces.
„	XI, do.	36 „
„	XII, do.	9 „

---

Total 145 pieces

Quite irrespective of the material, these fragments are inscribed with two quite distinct types of Brāhmī character, *viz.*, Northern Indian (Gupta) and what I have called in my paper on the Weber MSS.<sup>2</sup> Central Asian. To the former division belong Nos. I, II, III (with the exception of piece No. IIIc), V, VI, VII, VIII (probably), and XI. Of these No. I is of palm-leaf, No. II of birch-bark, and the others of paper. To the Central Asian division belong Nos. IV, IX, X and XII. The best test-letters for distinguishing the North-Indian from the Central Asian are the superscribed vowels  $\bar{e}$  and  $ai$ . These, in the Central Asian, are made in the form of an almost perpendicular stroke with a slight top-curvature to the right,<sup>3</sup> while for the short vowel  $i$  the same form is used which the North-Indian uses for  $\bar{e}$ . Hence what is  $\bar{e}$  in the North-Indian, is  $i$  in the Central Asian. Regarding the time when these Central Asian forms of  $\bar{e}$  and  $ai$  originated, I may offer the following suggestions. In the Northern Indian Gupta, at a certain time, the tendency shows itself, to give to the usual superscribed curve of  $\bar{e}$  a serpentine form. This form may be seen on one of the Godfrey MSS., on Plate VIII, leaf 11, reverse, line 3, in the word *manasē*, while the usual form occurs just below in *ghōṣē*. Now by straightening the serpentine line, but preserving the upward curve, at the left end, the Central Asian form of  $\bar{e}$  is produced. The serpentine line was a mere artistic fancy in vogue at a certain time, but I believe it eventually led to the evolution of the Central Asian forms of  $\bar{e}$  and  $ai$ . A look at Professor Bühler's Table IV (column XII-XIX) in his *Indian Palæography*<sup>4</sup> shows that the period during which the fashion of writing the serpentine forms of  $\bar{e}$ ,  $ai$ ,  $\bar{o}$ ,  $au$  prevailed in Northern India with regard to engraved documents was the 6th and 7th centuries A.D. For manuscripts the fashion must have commenced much earlier. Manuscripts, therefore, showing that fashion cannot be well dated later than the 6th century A.D., and may be placed the earlier, the more sporadic the observance of the fashion shows itself. To that period, say the fourth or fifth century A.D., may be referred the evolution of the Central Asian forms of medial  $\bar{e}$  and  $ai$ . See also the remarks, *infra*, p. 257.

<sup>2</sup> See *Journal, As. Soc. Bengal.*, Vol. LXII, page 4.

<sup>3</sup> The same is the case, of course, with the superscribed vowels  $\bar{o}$  and  $au$ ; only with them, from the nature of the case, the distinction is not so clearly marked.

<sup>4</sup> In the *Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research*.

An equally good test-letter is the *akṣara ma*. The Central Asian form of it is made in two distinct divisions: an open square (like the ordinary Brāhmī *pa*) above and a horizontal line below. On the other hand the North-Indian (Gupta) form consists only of an open square, the left side of which is serpentine. The two forms can be distinctly seen and compared in IVa<sup>2</sup> (*mi* Central Asian) and VII<sup>3</sup> (*ma* Northern Indian).<sup>5</sup> It will be noticed here that the Central Asian form originated by prolonging the dent of the left perpendicular line of the North-Indian form so far as to touch its right perpendicular line.

Another minor test is the general slant of the writing in Central Asian, contrasted with the upright writing of the Northern Indian; this, however, makes itself not so apparent in single letters or words as in a whole page, where the difference of the two types of Brāhmī characters forces itself at once on one's attention. There are other minor points of difference between the two types: thus the medial long *ā*, made by a long horn-like projection or curve as in *hā* (VIIIa<sup>1</sup>), *tā* (IXa<sup>4</sup>, IXc<sup>4</sup>), *svā* (IVa<sup>3</sup>), *yā* (III d<sup>5</sup>, XI b<sup>3</sup>).

A further good test is the form of *ya*, which in the Northern Indian is distinctly tridental, whence it passes, through an intermediate, into the modern square form. In the Central Asian, on the other hand, the old tridental form of *ya* gradually passes into a bi-annular form. It is particularly to be noted, as a land-mark for chronological purposes, that the Northern Indian intermediate form only existed for a comparatively short time. It first appears in engraved documents about 370 A.D., and disappears again about 540 A.D.<sup>6</sup> It lasted in round numbers for (say) 200 years, and was only used in conjunction with the superscribed vowels *ē*, *ai*, *ō*, *au*. It was clearly an attempt at producing a more convenient cursive form. It consisted in the closure of the left side of the trident, producing an irregular circlet. By the gradual broadening of this circlet, and the concurrent atrophy of the right side of the trident, the modern form of *ya* was produced. The latter is practically dominant in Northern India from (say) 600 A.D. It is curious to observe that the subscribed conjunct *ya* passed through a very similar course of evolution, though several centuries earlier than the non-conjunct *ya*. There the process occurred in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D., the period being also about 200 years, and there was also the same intermediate form of *ya*. An instance of the latter is given by Prof. Bühler, from the 1st century A.D., in Plate III (Column

<sup>5</sup> Raised numbers indicate lines. Thus IVa<sup>2</sup> means the second line on fragment a, belonging to No. 4 on Plate VII.

<sup>6</sup> See detailed proof in my paper on the date of the Bower MS. in *Journal, As. Soc. Beng.*, Vol. LX, pp. 83, ff.

III, line 42). The trident form maintained itself sporadically in the 2nd century, but from the 3rd century (say, 300 A.D.) the final square form is dominant. In Central Asia a somewhat similar evolution, though in another direction, took place. Both sides of the original trident followed a tendency to close up and become irregular circlets; the left side, first; the right side, later on; till at last the whole form became a combination of two circlets. In this manner the Central Asian form of *ya* became in appearance very much like the ancient form of the numeral figure 10.

The fragments, shown on Plate VII, afford a useful means of study of the gradual evolution of the Central Asian type of the Brāhmi characters. Thus in general appearance the Central Asian piece III*d* is hardly distinguishable from the surrounding Northern Indian pieces III*a* to III*b*. But No. III*d* is known by its distinct Central Asian *i* and *ma*. Compare, for example, *ri* in III*d*<sup>6</sup> with *ri* in III*f*<sup>1</sup>; also *m* in III*d*<sup>6</sup> with *mya* in III*f*<sup>2</sup>. So also in general appearance the Central Asian piece, No. IV, closely resembles the Northern Indian pieces No. VII*ab*; but the former can be distinguished as Central Asian by the forms of its *ē* and *ma*. Observe, e.g., *rē* in IV<sup>2</sup>; also compare *ni* in IV<sup>2</sup> with *ma* in VIII*b*<sup>2</sup> and *m* in VII*a*<sup>1</sup>. By 'general appearance' I mean principally the absence of the characteristic slant; but note also the presence still of the trident form of *ya*, e.g., in *yā* III*d*<sup>6</sup> and IV<sup>2</sup>. Here, then, we have two examples of the beginning divergence of the Central Asian from the Northern Indian, shown in two quite distinct handwritings.

The next step of the evolution we have in No. IX. The general appearance is still upright; but note the characteristic forms of *ya* in IX*c*<sup>2</sup> and IX*f*<sup>2</sup>, which are no more trident, the left side having been closed up into a circlet (the whole resembling the old numeral 10). Note also the characteristic forms of *ē* and *m* in *mē* IX*a*<sup>2</sup>, *ma* IX*a*<sup>1</sup>, *vē* IX*e*<sup>1</sup>, *et passim*. A further step in advance is shown in No. X. Here the general slant is already clearly marked; compare this No. with No. VII by its side. Note also the distinctive Central Asian *ya* in X*a*<sup>2</sup>, X*c*<sup>2</sup> (exactly like the numeral 10), *ē* in *ē* X*c*<sup>4</sup>, *yē* X*c*<sup>7</sup>, *bhē* X*d*<sup>2</sup>, *ā* in *tā* X*a*<sup>2</sup>, *m* in X*b*<sup>2</sup>. As to the form of *m*, No. X shows a curious further development in closing the top of the ordinary Central Asian form of this letter. This is the only case in which I have hitherto noticed this very peculiar form of the Central Asian *m*. On comparing this piece with Part VI of the Weber MSS. (*Journal, As. Soc. Beng.*, LXII, plate II, fig. 2) it will be observed that they are both written in exactly the same handwriting: the only difference is in the form of *m*, Part VI of the Weber MSS. showing the usual Central Asian form of that

letter. The last step of the evolution is reached in No. XII, which shows all the characteristics of the Central Asian type of Brāhmī, just like Part IX of the Weber MSS. (*ibidem*, Plate III, fig. 3-5); but note especially the full biannular form of *ya* in  $y\bar{a}$  XIIb<sup>8</sup>, also the angular form of *dha* in XIIb<sup>8</sup>.

I proceed to notice some details of this collection of fragments.

No. I. This is written on palm-leaf, in a very neat, clear, and careful hand, so that it is a pity that not more has been preserved of the manuscript. The characters are of the Northern Indian Gupta class, and their type indicates a rather early Gupta period. The letter *ya* is used in its tridental form; even the intermediate form is absent; see  $y\bar{o}$ ,  $yai$  in I,  $h^8$ ,  $y\bar{e}$  in Ii<sup>8</sup>. The superscribed conjunct *r* is formed within the line, see  $rda$  I $h^8$ ,  $rta$  Ic<sup>1</sup>. A date before 350 A.D. suggests itself. There is nothing in the fragments to indicate the size of the leaves, or the extent and contents of the work. The fragment *h*, however, shows the number 2 on its margin, which would seem to indicate it as the remnant of the second leaf.

No. II. These fragments are written on birch-bark and might be of a work of the same age as the Bower MSS. From the style of the characters they might, indeed, be fragments of that work, though there is nothing in them to indicate the nature of the work to which they may have belonged. Fragment IIc is written in a larger hand than the others, and probably belonged to a separate work.

No. III. All these fragments are written on paper. The five pieces *a*, *b*, *c*, *e*, *f* are written in Northern Indian Gupta, while piece *d* is written in Central Asian. The latter, therefore, belonged to a work quite different from the others. But the handwriting in the pieces *a* and *b* is a little different from that in the pieces *c*, *e*, *f*; and these two sets, therefore, may have belonged to two different manuscripts, though their purport is the same: they treated of spells. Pieces *a* and *b* are still connected with the original thread; and other pieces of thread which I received together with this collection of fragments are shown in the centre of the Plate. I would place the date of the manuscript to which pieces *a* and *b* belonged early in the 5th century, contemporary with the Bower MS., on account of their showing the intermediate form of *ya* in  $y\bar{o}$  III a.<sup>8</sup> But it must be noted that the tridental form also occurs in  $y\bar{o}$  III c.<sup>8</sup> The superscribed conjunct *r* is formed within the line; see  $r\bar{n}i$  III e.<sup>1</sup>

No. IV. Written on thin paper, in bold and clear Central Asian of a very early type, as shown by the tridental form of *ya*, and the straight form of the medial *u* in *asuka*, line 1. Both forms point to a date not later than (say) 450 A.D. The curious appendage to the foot

The horizontal stroke of *a*, *k*, *r* and *su* is worth noting. Its intention, of course, is to delimit that stroke.

Nos. V and VI. These two fragments, both on paper and in Northern Indian, seem to me to be the most archaic looking in the collection.

No. VII. In Northern Indian and on paper. Piece *a* shows the old numeral 3 in the third line.

No. VIII. On paper and in Northern Indian. In hardly legible condition. The large letter *lu* on piece *b* possibly indicates the numeral although its position in the lower right-hand corner is not the usual position for pagination.

No. IX. On brown paper, and in Central Asian in a large, bold hand and of a somewhat later type than No. IV. Piece *d* shows a numeral figure on the margin, which I take to be 9. Piece *h* shows a numeral figure for 90 and below it that for 2.7 This fact shows this to be the remnant of the 92nd leaf of some large work of an unknown character.

No. X. On paper, and in Central Asian Nāgarī of exactly the same type as in Part VI. of the Weber MSS. The original breadth of the leaves is shown by piece *c*, which measures about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches, and shows that there are eight lines to the page, the top and bottom lines nearly touching the margins. The leaves of Part VI of the Weber MSS., measure  $2\frac{3}{4}$  inches in breadth, and there are only seven lines on a page. Moreover, as already stated (*ante*, p. 217) the letter *m* is formed differently in the fragments. All these circumstances prove sufficiently that our fragments cannot have belonged to that Part VI, which contains an ancient Sanskrit *koṣa* or vocabulary. On the other hand, from the occurrence, in No. X, of the phrase *padau vanditvā*, it seems probable that the subject of this manuscript was the same as that of Set Ia of the Macartney MSS. and Parts V and VII of the Weber MSS.

No. XI. On thin paper, and in Northern Indian Gupta of an early type as shown by the absence of the intermediate form of *ya* in *yē* XIa<sup>b</sup> and *ye* XIa<sup>b</sup> and XIa<sup>b</sup>. It may be referred to the 4th century A.D. Noteworthy are the curious elongated forms of medial *i* and substituted *y*.

No. XII. On soft white paper, thickly coated with a white sizing; written in fully developed Central Asian, of the same type as in Part IX of the Weber MSS.

Of the second stroke of 2 only a minute trace remains. Of course, it is possible that there may have been a third stroke, which would make the number to

See *infra*, page 243, on Leaf II, obverse, lines 4 and 5.

The language of every one of these fragments is Sanskrit. Their subjects cannot be determined, except in the case of Nos. III, IV and X. Nos. III and IV belong to some kind of works on spells, and No. X appears to have contained the story of the Mahāyakṣa General Māṇibhadra:

## TRANSCRIPTS. PLATE VII.

- No. I, a. Line 1: mā hitau ◡<sup>9</sup>  
 „ 2: ndama
- No. I, b. Line 1: cakkra-vighā(ta)  
 „ 2: hāyaḥ (ṣa)  
 „ 3: + va +
- No. I, c. Line 1: rā varttaya  
 „ 2: sa-vigha
- No. I, d. Line 1: haya  
 „ 2: nī +
- No. I, e. Line 1: +y  
 „ 2: nanō ha  
 „ 3: + + +
- No. I, f. Line 1: citābhasam
- No. I, g. Line 1: +y + āvarṇa-dhāra  
 „ 2: p(r)atiṣ=c=āṣṭ-ōttari vā rāṣ(a)  
 „ 3: + +
- No. I, h. Line 1: (m)ṣ yātrā s(a)  
 „ 2: khē ṣatrūpām=abhimarda  
 „ 3: 2 dēyā na kātarāy=aiṣō rō(ṣa)
- No. I, i. Line 1: rā ca (ṣa)  
 „ 2: mō nilakaṇṭhāya ◡  
 „ 3: [v]i(j)ayē ◡  
 „ 4: +ḥ
- No. II, a. Line 1: guṇē ya(jē)
- No. II, b. Line 1: ṣantā
- No. II, c. Line 1: praha
- No. II, d. Line 1: samāha
- No. II, e. Line 1: + ty(a)n(amaṣ) = ca  
 „ 2: ptō mahā-ma
- No. II, f.<sup>10</sup> Line 1: sam̄ (ju)hu

<sup>9</sup> This is either the sign of the numeral 1, or more probably a mark of inter-punctuation.

<sup>10</sup> This piece is placed upside down on the plate.



- No. II, g. Line 1: + +  
 „ 2: +kaṁ ci  
 „ 3: +ē
- No. II, h. Line 1: ṛ(a)  
 „ 2: kaṁ çai  
 „ 3: + ṁ +i
- No. II, i. Line 1: +y  
 „ 2: (tē) hi  
 „ 3: (pita)ṁ
- No. III, a. Line 1: (p)ā ça(tru)  
 „ 2: prayō +sa(ti) vi +  
 „ 3: +natō va(d)ya gaṇḍi + +  
 „ 4: (va) ○ tavya (bbhyaṇḍa) +  
 „ 5: va  
 „ 6: n + +
- No. III, b. Line 1: taga + + va +  
 „ 2: + va ṅ harṣa<sup>11</sup>-vāja-vyōma  
 „ 3: (ā) ○ tanā ○ phalaḥ pā + +  
 „ 4: k(ā)çi ○ tili ○ nahuli  
 „ 5: +ṣani bhavanti tad = ya [thā]  
 „ 6: gaccha ṛvi □ □ i  
 „ 7: (ṇa) çar(ma) +
- No. III, c. Line 1: svāha ruru ○ (ku)ru ○  
 „ 2: vaṇyamāyabhabhu ṛ + +<sup>12</sup>  
 „ 3: +(ka)çatō bhayō . tasya +  
 „ 4: +(maṁ junī dra) + (ja)nis=trayasya puruṣasya  
 „ 5: ḥ ○ tad=yathā ○ hili ○ mili ○ da(nṛ)mili ○ +  
 „ 6: (a)ṣtamī ○ mani ○ va(ma) ○ akṇā ○ haru +
- No. III, d.<sup>13</sup> Line 1: + +  
 „ 2: + + +  
 „ 3: + + + va + + tha + + ṣata + ṁ  
 „ 4: ggram sa(tēm)ṣā(ta) + ṛçu  
 „ 5: çniyāt ghr(tam) v(ā) ā(h)ritam +  
 „ 6: çōṇitam sa(r)va

<sup>11</sup> The akṣara ṣa, which had been erroneously omitted, is inserted below the line, the proper place being indicated by a dot above the line.

<sup>12</sup> This line apparently indicates an interpolation. It is written interlinearly, and in much smaller letters, which are very difficult to read.

<sup>13</sup> This piece is written in Central Asian character, but in the Sanskrit language.

- No. III, e. Line 1: arṇṇ(i) (sa) ++  
 „ 2: sanā(gh)ō  
 „ 3: +i +i +i ◊ (pa)
- No. III, f. Line 1: +ri gṛṇya ◊ ṇi +  
 „ 2: (hata) bavamha bhama  
 „ 3: ṣ(ṭa)-duṣṭa-bandhō 'si ◊ mā  
 „ 4: nā uktaṃ pratibhāpasi  
 „ 5: + + +i +ō ta(m) ◊ hari  
 „ 6: yakṣa ◊ yamō ha  
 „ 7: ṣṭa-baddhō 'si :  
 „ 8: + tisi's  
 „ 9: + ta
- No. IV. Line 1: mandrēna asuka asuka(ñ)=ca  
 „ 2: + mi ◊ vittayāmi ◊ vighrayā[mī]  
 „ 3: + cirēpi svāha ◊ anta-pakṣō  
 „ 4: + ◊ a(mā) + ◊ (ta)mēna svāha ◊  
 „ 5: + svāha ◊ vi +
- No. V. Line 1: + maḥ prava  
 „ 2: + m = ava + ṇa (jra)  
 „ 3: + ramā +  
 „ 4: +
- No. VI. Line 1: +bdha + +ṭa +  
 „ 2: cittṣu sūpta  
 „ 3: + u-āny-añja
- No. VII, a. Line 1: n=āsti (m)i  
 „ 2: manyasaṃ param ṇ tya +  
 „ 3: 3
- No. VII, b. Line 1: (mam) a  
 „ 2: + ṣayam  
 „ 3: siddha-pitāma  
 „ 4: (ṣ)ū kāka-hṛdayaṃ  
 „ 5: (ta)
- No. VIII, a. Line 1: +  
 „ 2: (ti)kṣṇāni + +  
 „ 3: (mu)dg-ōdakaṃ (pra)  
 „ 4: jaṃ ṣa + +  
 „ 5: ṣarāvakā + i  
 „ 6: vata  
 „ 7: +

- No. VIII, *b*. Line 1: +  
 „ 2: +  
 „ 3: lu (or 30)
- No. IX, *a*. Line 1: + ◡ mahārā(ja)-sa(ma) + +  
 „ 2: ma + m̄
- No. IX, *b*. Line 1: ∏ haritālam = a +  
 „ 2: + ā + + i
- No. IX, *c*. Line 1: + + + r + (kapada) + ṣ(ṭ)  
 „ 2: (cchā)satāya : appratihata
- No. IX, *d*. Line 1: 9 ga  
 „ 2: (rāka)
- No. IX, *e*. Line 1: kēcid = bhavē
- No. IX, *f*. Line 1: +  
 „ 2: + gra +  
 „ 3: tam yaḥ  
 „ 4: + d(ūra)
- No. IX, *g*. Line 1: tani +  
 „ 2: trasya ◡  
 „ 3: vāra  
 „ 4: + yā
- No. IX, *h*. Line 1: sani  
 „ 2: (vāva)  
 „ 3: ṇṣṭ(i)  
 „ 4: sādha  
 „ 5: 9ḍ +
- No. IX, *i*. Line 1: kṛtvā  
 „ 2: mēna ◡  
 „ 3: (m)ida  
 „ 4: + kalpayē(t)
- No. X, *a*. Line 1: (va)  
 „ 2: ya  
 „ 3: + +  
 „ 4: tāç = ca
- No. X, *b*. Line 1: + ṣa ta<sup>14</sup>  
 „ 2: tatr = ā(ka)  
 „ 3: + mama  
 „ 4: +

<sup>14</sup> The akṣara *ta* stands interlinearly and its exact relation is unknown.

- No. X, c. Line 1: +  
 „ 2: +  
 „ 3: (çata çā)  
 „ 4: çētā pratha  
 „ 5: (dha)rm[ō]'yam ca vi  
 „ 6: padau vandi(tv)ā  
 „ 7: + + ç=ca yē(na)  
 „ 8: ç=ca + + (tana)
- No. X, d. Line 1: + + (dya) ᳚ rāṣ(ṭa)  
 „ 2: + āstyapabhōti  
 „ 3: + dhō mē mantra(ū=ca)  
 „ 4: dasy=āsi va  
 „ 5: + m + i
- No. XI, a. Line 1: + ya + çañṭa +  
 „ 2: + vā tadyā idam  
 „ 3: prathamayō
- No. XI, b. Line 1: + di + cha  
 „ 2: + y + iyami  
 „ 3: + + i + + i  
 „ 4: m=aṣṭa-vārasahā  
 „ 5: ddhaḥ a yad=icchanty=ākāçṣ ruprō  
 „ 6: + + ti + ti yad=icchati parasya vā  
 „ 7: "
- No. XI, c. Line 1: + ē ca hṛdayam tā(va)  
 „ 2: rātrō pauṣitēna<sup>16</sup> sahā  
 „ 3: + m=anuyittāda +  
 „ 4: + dēvi māraṇam
- No. XI, d. Line 1: + mā ca rā + +  
 „ 2: (ṭhaṇa)nāma mūla-mala +  
 „ 3: ṣayēt chāyāya pariçōṣa  
 „ 4: mṛṣṭav=ānugamiṣyati  
 „ 5: + am sapra(bu) + i
- No. XII, a. Line 1: cakṣyā(ṇap)r(ṇā)  
 „ 2: (bhamta) + (va)
- No. XII, b. Line 1: khavēham(ḷaṇa)  
 „ 2: ndurārēma + + + + + + +  
 „ 3: + āyā ardlini cā + +  
 „ 4: jvaraç=c=aiva

In the foregoing transcripts, illegible letters are indicated by crosses, missing letters by squares or angular brackets, and indistinct letters by round brackets.

<sup>16</sup> Read *rātrau pōṣitēna*.



## II. THE GODFREY MANUSCRIPTS.

(Plates VIII-XIV and XXVII-XXX.)

A short preliminary notice of these Manuscripts will be found in Mr. A. Pedler's Presidential Address of 1896. They were forwarded to me, in the manner already explained, towards the end of November, 1895. They were secured by Captain S. H. Godfrey, at that time British Joint-Commissioner of Ladak, now Political Agent at Gilgit, and, for that reason, they have been named by me "the Godfrey Manuscripts."

Captain Godfrey has been good enough to supply me, in a letter, dated the 27th June, 1897, with the following information regarding the circumstances in which the Manuscripts came into his possession:—

"In 1895, when British Joint-Commissioner of Ladak, I was telegraphed to from Kargil that the Leh trade route had been broken down by disastrous floods, and that the traffic valuing lakhs of rupees was consequently at a standstill. On my arrival at Kargil in July, I found the sarais blocked with merchants and their wares, unable to proceed to Central Asia, and unwilling to lose their whole venture by a return to India. For a month I was camped with a party of officers on the banks of the ~~Shayak~~ endeavouring to throw a cantilever bridge across the flooded river. At last we got up wires from Kashmir and succeeded in passing over the traffic. A party of Pathān merchants, bound for Yarkand with a valuable consignment of coral, asked me how they could mark their sense of obligation for being saved from heavy loss, if not ruin, by the success of our measures. I said that if they could procure me some of the old manuscripts found in the sand-buried cities of Tibet or Central Asia, I should consider the debt to be on my side. I returned from Ladak in the autumn, having forgotten the incident. But while at Sialkot, I received a parcel done up like *caras*, containing the MSS. now in your hands."

Sura

In Captain Godfrey's Report, forwarding the manuscripts to the Resident in Kaçmir, they were, on the authority of the merchants, from whom he had received them, stated to be "very ancient Tibetan Manuscripts." This, as will be shown presently, is a misdescription. It appears to be a very common idea in those parts of the country to look upon old manuscripts, procured from Central Asia, as Tibetan. The Weber MSS. which also came to me from Leh in Ladak, were also originally described to me as Tibetan. In explanation of the possible

source of this error, Captain Godfrey writes to me in a letter dated the 18th July, 1897:—

“ I am personally ignorant of the language of Tibet, but having heard that old manuscripts of alleged Tibetan origin were occasionally found in the Central Asian deserts by excavation, I requested certain merchants trading with countries to the North and North East of Leh to endeavour to procure me any of which they might hear. These merchants were under some obligations to myself, and they promised to do their best. On their return journey they brought me the old papers which are now in your hands. You are probably aware that the Chinese authorities of the New Dominions do not regard the excavations of old ruins with favour. They are said to believe that archæological interest is merely a pretext, and that a search for buried treasure is the main object. However this be, the merchants referred to were anxious that their names should not appear, and sent me little information beyond a statement that the manuscript was very old, that it was of Tibetan origin, and that it was dug up near some old buried city in the vicinity of Kuchar. These merchants trading in Chinese territory had obvious reasons for not causing displeasure to the Chinese authorities. The crushed lumps of paper were transmitted to me sewn up in skin as though the packet were a sample of *caras*.”

Specimens of these manuscripts are figured on Plates VIII to XIV. A glance at them will show that there is nothing Tibetan about them. There are various styles of character used in Tibetan writings, but they are all of a different type from that occurring in these manuscripts. The fact also that they were dug up near Kuchar militates against their being Tibetan. Further reasons against the Tibetan theory will appear later on. In fact there is no evidence whatever to connect them in any way with Tibet.

Captain Godfrey's description of the original appearance of these manuscripts as a parcel of *caras* gives a good idea of them. When they came into my hands, they were a mass of pieces of flimsy, and apparently rotten paper, crumbled up into a large number of shapeless lumps. The first thing to be done was to open out these lumps, flatten them, and fix them between panes of glass. This had to be done most carefully; and was a very tedious and laborious work, consuming a good deal of time. However, it was done successfully, and practically the whole by the deft fingers of my wife.

It now was seen that there were seventy-one pieces of manuscript. With the exception of four or five, all these pieces are mutilated. They are of several entirely different sizes and shapes, and may be distributed into several sets.

(1) The first set consists of long oblong leaves measuring  $11 \times 2\frac{1}{2}$  inches. Two of these leaves are shown on Plates VIII and IX. There is a third leaf of this set which is nearly perfect. Besides, there are two small fragments. The total is five pieces of manuscript. The material of this manuscript is Daphne paper of coarse texture, but rather thick. It is inscribed on both sides. The characters are Brāhmi of the North-Indian (Gupta) type, written in a clear and bold, thick hand. The language is Sanskrit. The purport, so far as may be judged from the fragmentary state of the manuscript, is the teaching of incantations. One point should be noted: the leaves are numbered on their obverses (left-hand margin), as may be seen from the transliterations given below. One leaf (Plate VIII) is clearly numbered 11 (or it may be 17), i.e., the numeral 10, with the numeral 1 (or 7) below it. Another leaf (Plate IX), I take to be numbered 19; but the numeral is not quite distinct. On the remaining fragmentary leaves the numbers are either lost or quite illegible. Professor Bühler, in his notice of the Weber MSS., in the Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. VII, p. 261, calls attention to this point, and seems disposed to suggest, that Central Asian manuscripts paginated in this manner are in some way connected with South-India, because the practice of numerating the leaves on their obverses is, in India, peculiar to the South, while in the North they are numbered on the reverses.<sup>16</sup> The difficulty, to my mind, about this suggestion is that there is nothing else in these manuscripts suggestive of South-India. If they had been written in South-India and thence carried away into Central Asia, they would exhibit a Southern Indian style of writing throughout; or, if a Southern Indian Buddhist had migrated into Central Asia, and there written the manuscripts, it does not seem probable that he would have retained his South-Indian method of pagination, while adopting, in all other respects, the North-Indian type of writing which prevailed, more or less modified, in his adopted country. Anyhow, paginating the obverses of leaves seems to have been a not uncommon practice in Central Asia, however it may have originated. Another instance of the same practice will be noticed further on (see page 247). The fact of the leaves of this set being numbered proves that the existing leaves are connected and are the remnants of a larger work. From the sporadic occurrence in this manuscript of the serpentine form of the medial *ṣ* (in *manasṣ*, fl. 11b<sup>3</sup>),<sup>17</sup> its date may be referred to the 5th century A.D. See my remarks on the subject on p. 215.

<sup>16</sup> See also Professor Bühler's *Indische Palæographie*, § 36, p. 86, on pagination.

<sup>17</sup> Here and subsequently throughout this paper, *a* and *b* mean obverse and reverse respectively; the raised numbers refer to the lines.



(2) Of the second set there is only one specimen. It is shown as No. 3 on Plate X. It is the merest fragment of a leaf, and it is impossible to say what its dimensions may have been. From the very large size of the letters, however, it may fairly be concluded that the leaves also were probably of considerable size. It will be noticed that on the margin, in the upper left-hand corner, there is the pagination number 90. As it is usual to inscribe these numbers in the middle of the margin, it is at any rate probable that the width of the leaf was about 11 inches, its existing portion being  $5\frac{1}{2}$  inches wide. The material is paper of a texture and thickness similar to that of the preceding set. It is also inscribed on both sides, in characters of the same type as those of that set, but even larger and thicker than those. The language is Sanskrit, but it is impossible to determine the purport of the work from the little that has survived of the text. The work, however, must have been one of a large extent, seeing that the existing leaf was its ninetieth.

(3) Of this set also there is only one specimen. It is No. 4 on Plate X. Both ends of the leaf are lost, thus rendering it impossible to determine its length. Its width is  $3\frac{3}{4}$  inches. Its material is paper, of a texture and thickness similar to that of the two preceding sets. The characters of the writing on it are also of the same type, and it is inscribed on both sides. The language, however, is not Sanskrit, nor, to judge from the peculiar ligatures occurring in it (*e.g.*, *ysā* on line 5), any Sanskritic language. I do not know what it is, nor, for that reason, what the purport of the writing may be. The occurrence, however, of the peculiar double dot, or double anusvāra, may be noticed. This mark connects it with No. IX of the Weber MSS.<sup>18</sup> and with the Petroffski MS. published by Dr. von Oldenburg.

(4) Of this set again there is only one specimen. It is No. 5 on Plate X. It is greatly mutilated, and its full size cannot be determined. Its width seems to be complete, and would be  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches. Its material is paper of a whiter colour, and rather finer and softer texture than that of the preceding sets; it is also covered with some sort of sizing. It is inscribed on both sides. The characters are essentially of the same type as the preceding ones, only smaller in size. The language seems to be some non-Sanskritic language. There is no instance of a double dot on the existing portion; but it is too small to admit of any safe conclusions.

(5 and 6) I may here add that there are two other fragmentary leaves among the Godfrey MSS., each being a single specimen of a separate work. They are in a too bad state of preservation, to admit of useful

<sup>18</sup> See *Journal, As. Soc. Beng.*, Vol. LXII, Part I, pp. 8, 9, 34.

duction: the ink is very much faded. They are both written on thin paper, exactly like that of the seventh set which will be next described; hence they are only inscribed on one side. Both mutilated at the two ends, thus rendering their length impossible termination; their width is preserved, and it is  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches in either

Both are furnished with string-holes, enclosed concentrically in a larger inked circle. The presence of these string-holes shows they are, in all probability, the solitary remnants of larger works. The reverse of the leaves is inscribed with characters exactly of the same as those of the fragment No. 4 on Plate X, but of smaller size. The other leaf is inscribed with characters of the cursive type, like those on Nos. 6 to 15, on Plates X to XIII.

(7) The seventh set consists of large, squarish sheets, measuring 8 inches. Of these No. 8 on Plate XI is a sample. Of these sheets there are two more, also in practically perfect condition, and five fragments of very large size, such as Nos 9 and 11, shown on Plates XII and XIII respectively. There are further a large number of small pieces, which are evidently fragments of similar sheets. Samples of these fragments are Nos. 6 and 7 on Plate X, No. 10 on Plate XII, and Nos. 12 to 15 on Plate XIII. There are altogether 51 of them. The total number

These sheets consist of a very coarse and flimsy species of paper, which is almost transparent. As a rule, the writing is inscribed on one side only, and traces of it show through on the back side; but there are some small fragments on which there is some writing on the back. The paper appears to be the ordinary Daphne paper, of the same type as that which is still made at the present day in the Himalayan countries. I have seen modern paper of the same coarseness, though not quite of the same tenuity. The characters of the writing are evidently Brāhmī of the very cursive type. Moreover, as shown by the forms of the characters inscribed *ē* and *ai*, they belong to that peculiar type of Brāhmī which is found in the Central Asian. See the facsimiles in the second column of Plates XXVII to XXX, which I have excerpted from Plates X to XIII, and arranged in alphabetical order. In the first column, I have given for comparison, alphabetical facsimiles of other portions of the same MSS. inscribed with Brāhmī of the Northern Indian type. The language on these sheets I am unable to identify. It does not appear to be any Sanskritic dialect, though, with one or two exceptions, I have not noticed the occurrence of any non-sanskritic ligatures. The forms of the syllables, indeed, are of the most simple character, and so far, might be prākritic; only there is nothing in the surrounding circumstances (*e.g.*, the frequent occurrence of the double *ai*) that renders that supposition at all probable. The occurrence,

three times, of the syllable *çri* in No. 9 is very curious. It is the solitary instance of a word with a distinctly Sanskrit sound, and seems to suggest that the following group of letters *ājhātai* is a name with the well-known Sanskrit honorific prefix *çri*. It is noteworthy that the cursive Brāhmī characters of this set occur side by side with Chinese on No 16 of the following 8th set. The frequent occurrence of numeral figures on these sheets is also a noteworthy circumstance, so also the repetition of the same phrases. Seeing that the Chinese fragment No. 16 refers to taxes and rents, it suggests itself that these sheets may be the records of an ancient revenue office in Turki (Uighur) territory, possibly under Chinese rule. Could they be in the Chinese language, though written in non-Chinese characters? My own impression is that the several pieces of this set do not form any connected series of the pages of a book, but that they are separate documents, though all of a similar character.

(8.) Of this set there are two specimens, Nos. 16 and 17 on Plate XIV. Both are fragments. No. 17 is of very coarse paper, a sort of packing paper. It looks as if it was one-quarter of a sheet of the size of No. 8. It is inscribed on one side only. No. 16 is of paper like Nos. 2 and 3; it is well covered with a sizing of a pinky-white colour. It looks like the fragment of an oblong leaf, of unknown length, and  $2\frac{3}{4}$  inches breadth. Both leaves appear to be inscribed with what looks like Chinese characters, but on No. 16 there is also a line of the same cursive Central Asian as on Nos. 6–15. The outer lines on this No. are Chinese; of the two inner lines, the left is Chinese, but the right is Central Asian Brāhmī. The latter does not run vertically like the Chinese, but horizontally, the three letters which compose the line being placed side by side parallel with the long side of the leaf. The first letter adjoins the broken line of the leaf. The three letters, as I read them, are

रि षै ऐ ri hau dē,

but I do not know what they mean. A similar group of letters occurs also on Nos. 10 and 11 (see *infra*, p. 236). Mr. A. Foucher, whom I had the pleasure of meeting in Calcutta, was good enough to submit a photograph of No. 16 to the well-known Chinese scholar Mr. Chavannes in Paris, who has had the great kindness of supplying me with the following explanation, reading the characters from top to bottom:

Colonne de droite.

- 1, "et autres" (marque du pluriel par rapport à ce qui précède.)
- 2, anciennes
- 3, (et) nouvelles

1, taxes }  
 5, (et) redevances } droits de douane.  
 3, ? (ce caractère ne se rencontre guère que dans  
 des noms de lieux.)

7, un (le nombre 1)  
 Colonne de centre. Colonne de gauche.  
 1, de soi-même, naturellement. 1, porte, catégorie.  
 2, rempli, parfait. 2, deux.  
 3, dix }  
 4, six } seize. 3, ?  
 5, ? 4, solide.  
 6, ?  
 7, ?

3, porte (signifies aussi catégorie, espèce).

I am ignorant of the Chinese language myself, and am unable, therefore, to offer any information on these two Chinese scraps; but it would be interesting to know whether the style of the Chinese writing affords any light with regard to such questions as the age of the manuscripts.

To sum up: the Godfrey Manuscripts appear to consist of eight distinct portions, comprising the following number of leaves or fragments of leaves:—

Set	I consisting of	5 pieces.
"	II	" " 1 "
"	III	" " 1 "
"	IV	" " 1 "
"	V	" " 1 "
"	VI	" " 1 "
"	VII	" " 59 "
"	VIII	" " 2 "
		—
<b>Eight Sets</b>	"	" 71 "

I now proceed to details, so far as the present state of my examination of the manuscripts permits me to do.

Set I. (Plates VIII and IX). Five pieces of manuscript; full size 2½ inches; letters, Northern Indian Brāhmī; language, Sanskrit; content, probably incantations. The figured leaves are numbered 11 and 19 (?); they read as follows:

LEAF 11: OBVERSE.

1, guṇē svāhā: Namō ṛi-pradipāya tathāgatāya: tad-yatbā siri  
 siri · pradipa-

- 2, siri svāhā : Namō jina-sūryāya tathāgatāya : tad-yathā jinē  
jinē · ji-
- 3, na-sūryē svāhā 91 Namau mēgha-vipul-ābhāya tathāgatāya : tad-  
yathā vi-
- 4, pulē vipulē gagana-vilē svāhā 2 Namō ratna-ṅri-pradipa-guṇa-  
kṣtavē tathāga-
- 5, tāya : tad-yathā pradipē · pradipē · ṅri-tēja-pradipē svāhā 3  
Nama siddha-vratā-

## REVERSE.

- 1, ya tathāgatāya : tad-yathā siddhē su-siddhē mōcāni mōkṣāni ·  
muktē vimuktē
- 2, amalē vimalē maṅgalyē · hiraṇya-garbhē · ratna-garbhē · sarv-  
ārtha-sādhani · para-
- 3, m-ārtha-sādhani manasē · mahā-manasē · adbhitē · a(ty)ad-  
bhitē · vīta-
- 4, bhayē suvarṇē brahma-ghōṣē · brahma-dhyuṣitē · sarv-ārthē  
sva-parājitē sarva-
- 5, tr-āpratihatē · catu-ṣaṣṭi-buddha-kōṭi-bhāṣitē · Nama sarva-  
siddhānām tathāgatānām svāhā.

## LEAF 19 : OBYVERSE.

- 1, tad-yathā avabhāsē · avabhāsē : avabhāsa-karaṇē svāhā : 92  
Namō mēgha-
- 2, vil(am)bitē svāhā ॥ Namau sūrya-tējasē tathāgatāya : tad-yathā  
suru
- 3, suru · sūrya-uditē svāhā 4 Namō dharma-pradipa-ṅri-mēravē  
tathāgatā-
- 4, ya : tad-yathā dipē dipē · dharma-pradipē svāhā : Namaḥ arca-  
kāya tathāgatā-
- 5, ya : tad-yathā ciri ciri · ciciri svāhā 3 Namō dēva-ṅri-garbhāya  
tathāgatā-

## REVERSE.

- 1, ya tad-yathā dēvē dēvē · dēva-(p)ū(j)itē svāhā : Nama simā-  
vina(rd)i(t)a-vidyut-pra-
- 2, bhāya tathāgatāya : tad-yathā simē simē · buddha-sim(hē) simē  
svā-
- 3, hā : Nama samanta-guṇa-mēghāya tathāgatāya : tad-yathā mēru
- 4, mēru : buddha-mēru svāhā ॥ Namō gagana-cittāya tathāgatāya :  
tad-yathā
- 5, gagana-gatāya svāhā : Nama su(stha)-bhava-vyūhāya tathāga-  
tāya tad-ya

The bracketed letters are not quite certain. The akṣara *pū* in *ē* (fl. 19b<sup>1</sup>) rather looks like *bū*; so also *pra* (fl. 11b<sup>1</sup>) like *bra*. *au* in fl. 19a<sup>3</sup> and fl. 11a<sup>3</sup> is apparently a clerical error for *namō*, also *gagana-vilē* in fl. 11a<sup>4</sup> for *gagāna-vipu/ṣ*. *Mēghāya* in fl. 19b<sup>3</sup> is more like *mēyāya*, but *gha* and *ya* have very similar forms. The *ṣ* in *ṣṛi* is not perfect; the sandhi of *namaḥ* is frequently wrong. The numeral sign for 92 in fl. 19a<sup>1</sup>, if read correctly, shows that this follows the other which is numbered 11.

The purport is a series of invocations addressed to the Tathāgata (Buddha) under his various names of Sūrya-tējas, Dharma-pradīpa, Māru, Arcaka (?), Dēva-ṣṛi-garbha, Simā-vinardita Vidyut-prabha,<sup>19</sup> Anta-guṇa-mēgha, Gaṅgana-citta, Sustha(?)-bhava-vyūha, Ṣṛi-pradīpa, Jina-sūrya, Mēgha-vipulābha, Ratna-ṣṛi-pradīpa-guṇa-kētu, Siddha-śāstra. Probably all or most of these names may be traced in known Buddhist works. In the charms themselves, introduced by *tad-eva* 'as follows,' the female counterparts of the Buddhas seem to be invoked. *Mōcanī* and *mōkṣaṇī* (fl. 11b<sup>1</sup>) can only be feminine names; which shows that the other forms ending in *ē* must also be taken as vocatives of feminine names.

Set II. (Plate X, No. 3.) One piece of manuscript. Breadth probably 11 inches, length unknown. Letters, Northern Indian Brāhmī, similar to those of Set I. (Plates XXVII-XXX, column 1). Language, Sanskrit; purport, unknown. The figured leaf is numbered 90. It reads as follows :

1, ⊕ रतः	= 90 rataḥ .....
2, चरता	= caratā .....
3, न्युप	= nyupa .....[ē-]
4, वमेव	= vameva .....[ta-]
5, दथा स	= d-yathā s(v)a .....
6, संविद्यते	= samvi(d)yatē.....
7, न संविद्य	= na samvi(dya)[tē]...

Set III. (Plate X, No. 4.) One piece of manuscript. Breadth 11 inches; length unknown. Letters, similar to those of Sets I and II (Plates XXVII-XXX, col. 1.) Language and purport, unknown. The figured leaf reads as follows :—

1, (kh)ō + pyū ṣvā ndā ntā + yu +

<sup>19</sup> I.e., 'bright as a lightening the thunder of which reaches to the horizon.' The meaning *vinardita*, however, is uncertain. *Simā* seems to stand for *śimā*, or it may mean 'everywhere' from *sima* 'whole.'

- 2, + cum dā vā tē tu a ta (bbh)a ra nā
- 3, + ā ndā vā ta · a ta a ci ma jsē v(i)
- 4, pha tē u spu cā hā mā tē vā tē
- 5, sta mā na pra ysā tā na ṣṣa ddē

The bracketed letters are uncertain. Thus, what I have read as *bbh* in line 2, might be *ñṣa*; the upper portion looks like *b*, but the lower rather seems to be *ṣ*. Crosses indicate indistinctly visible letters. The double dot occurs very frequently; but I may note here that it never, so far as my observation or memory serves me, occurs with any vowel but short *a*, of which it would hence seem to indicate some variety.

Set IV. (Plate X, No. 5). One piece of manuscript. Breadth  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches; length unknown. Letters, similar to those of Sets I to III. Language and purport unknown. What is distinguishable of the figured leaf, reads as follows:

- 1, + + + +
- 2, ysē ra trā nda
- 3, vi + gam jri va svē ba
- 4, pra (cca) + (t)i bu nti (or tti) cu

Set VII. (Plates X to XIII, Nos. 6 to 15.) Fifty-nine pieces of manuscript. Size of full leaf about  $11 \times 9$  inches. Letters, a kind of cursive Brāhmī of the Central Asian type, especially with reference to the formation of the superscribed vowels *i*, *e*, *ai*. See Plates XXVII to XXX, col. 2. Language and purport unknown. It may be noted as a peculiarity that the right-hand one of the double-dots is, a rule, made with a curve to the right: also, that ligatures are not very common, and those that occur are, with rare (and uncertain) exceptions, such as might be found in a Sanskritic dialect.

In the subjoined transliterations, undetermined consonants are indicated by a query; uncertain letters, by italics; indistinctly visible letters, by a cross or within round brackets; and missing letters, by a square or within angular brackets. Recurrent groups of letters are joined by hyphens, see especially Nos. 9 and 11. It must be understood that the value of some of the letters, though not specially indicated, is more or less conjectural; thus, *t* and *n* are difficult to distinguish, and in every case, what has been given as *t* may really be *n*, or *vice versa*. Otherwise, however, I believe the values given are fairly certain; but ultimate certainty will only be attainable, when the language of the writing has been determined.

## No. 6. (Plate X).

- 1, ña + i yau di (ā) ṅā vi (ṣ)au
- 2, ji ṅū ra hañ gō pra (ṣṇi) (ka) h(i)
- 3, hva ?ta kō □ + + (lya) (b)ā □ē
- 4, □ām + i + ā + i yañ □i.

## No. 7. (Plate X).

- 2, 40 2 hvam □
- 3, ṅū ri ntā
- 3, 40 2 (t)ē (hv)

## No. 8. (Plate XI).

- 1,  $\mathbb{J}^{20}$  sa li 20 ṅā ṇā cvā na ja ha dā pi 3 nyē hṛm tā ūm dā vā ṣr vā hañ dā jyē ṣṣau vā jya
- 2, da ttā gā-rya vā dā pi da kā nyē pra cai ta cā bu-gu-ra ṇaṁ-dru sā ta cañ dā gā-ryē a vi (jya)
- 3, gañ rsa kru dai vi ra jrai kru ṣōm rcū-rā-vā-ṣṛm-ra pi ha vē ṅū rā jhā rā ttā bu-rā nyē cañ jyē ha jjha
- 4, (rañ) + ā + cā (jjh)ai p(r)a ña vā ṣā hi ya + m + ū vā jhi sa nē kra lā hi (v)i (k)a (ḍ)a dā (rā) ña
- 5, + + m + ā khi (bu)-gu-ra + ā kā ra kṛ stā i dā khai tti ṇaṁ-dru sā rcū-rā-vā-ṣṛm-ra bu-(rā)
- 6, i-jhgā tā nē (i)-jhgē dē ṇaṁ gā da ra tā i-jhgā-rya hā ṅā + ra pā (p)i □ prañ
- 7, ṅāñ khu ha ṇaṁ-dru sañ (hañ)(gu) ṣṭā vā ṇā ttā bu-rā va ra byāñ ta ya byē a sō lañ byē
- 8, u + ai bu-(rā) ta (k)ā byē □ dā ≈ ṇaṁ-dru | sā | hañ.

## No. 9. (Plate XII).

- 1, ṣṭ(i) pi rā va<sup>21</sup> kpi (or kyī) ra sē ca<sup>22</sup> tām-pu-vya-kam-tha gōm □
- 2, □ tā bhā<sup>21</sup> bā ri bē rām ñā ri · ū ha ji +
- 3, (t)ā ṣa ṣa-puñ-ti · si gañ jjha tām-puñ-ya-kam-tha hā
- 4, pa rjhu ñai yē-paṁ jjhā sō (or sā) gañ pha hā ṣṇi i □
- 5, jha ta<sup>21</sup> va<sup>21</sup> jjh[a] [ṣ]ṭ[a] (pu) sti nta ri da ri ta hvam ji (d)i
- 6, □ (pa) + ṣṇi ṣa-puñ-ti ya va khyāñ ti kā da bā ji □

<sup>20</sup> This is a symbol which occurs at what seems to be the head of each fresh entry on the sheets. It reminds one of the Sanskrit symbol for *om*.

<sup>21</sup> The black spots under *va* and above *bhā*, shown in the photographic facsimile, are really holes in the paper. This unlucky result of photography occurs also in other places, though only in the case of minute holes. Bigger holes show distinctly enough as white places.

<sup>22</sup> *Ca* is distinguished from *va* here, and elsewhere in these MSS. by a distinct tail on the left of the loop. By a similar tail *bha* is distinguished from *ta* or *na*; see the comparative table in Plate XXII.



- 7, sti u (k)ā pu hā-lai puṁ-ñu-ṛi<sup>23</sup>-ā-jhā-(t)ai
- 8, ña-ṛi<sup>23</sup>-ā-jhā-tai nta-hvō-si cu hi ri kē ṇa □
- 9, ṣṭi ta rma pu-ña-ṛi<sup>23</sup>-ā-jhā-tai bhī nta-(hv)ō-[s]i
- 10, chā pa ta ya tba (or tva) a jhu ra su va (ṇ)a
- 11, +i ra ga rām tu<sup>24</sup> ū di çau hā-lai □
- 12, □ ti pyā khu pu ? u (su) jh(y)ā □
- 13, □ pyā +i +i rvō hi □i
- 14, □ +ām +i nfi + □ ḍi

## No 10. (Plate XII).

- 1, (chā)
- 2, 2 bhi
- 3, + hvam (ḍ)i 10 7
- 4, + 1000 900 50 hvam (ḍ)i 10
- 5, 10 3 thau-ta hau-ḍi<sup>25</sup> 10 3 va (ñai)
- 6, (ḍi)-[th]a]u-ta i-di 10 8 va ñai □
- 7, (ḍi)-thau-ta i-di 10 1 (va) (ñ)ai
- 8, 4 u 2 chā 3 (a)
- 9, jjha □ ki 3000 800 50

## No. 11. (Plate XIII).

- 1, J (ç)a lā u + + +
- 2, çnō (or çrō) 10 3 □ō □ (k)ai ṣpi pi kpa ki rdō ña cai na ca ū ha
- 3, + ḍi-yō-çōm-u-tai-hōm-ḍi<sup>25</sup>-yu-ḍi-va-ñai
- 4, da-sō-chā-ya bhī ri ñam prām hō pri
- 5, ṣṭi vi çnō ū ha da | bhō | ham-| gū-ṣṭi
- 6, + pu-ḍi-yō-çōm-u-(t)ai-hōm-ḍi<sup>25</sup>-yu-ḍi-va-ñai
- 7, □ ḍi-thau-ta (see No. 10) ka hō-ḍi (see No. 12) ddha da-sō-chā-ya
- 8, hā (r)am-pra-ki-ham-gū-ṣṭi | vi çnō | | |
- 9, (r)am-pra-ki-ham-gū-ṣṭi

## No. 12. (Plate XIII).

- 1, + (va) (8) +
- 2, thau-ta h(ō)-ḍ(i) (see No. 10) 8
- 3, (ḍ) 9

## No. 15. (Plate XIII).

- 1, +i bhi tva hvam (ḍ)ām ṇū ri hi +ā ri □ 2
- 2, □ā sa paṁ □ā si chā bhī
- 3, □ā
- 4, □ōm hi (n)ā □i 8000 900

<sup>23</sup> This is the only akṣara or word which has a distinctly Sanskrit sound.

<sup>24</sup> Over this akṣara there is the mark of the vowel *ē*, cancelled by a stroke drawn through it.

<sup>25</sup> See No. 16, on page 230.

## III. THE MACARTNEY MANUSCRIPTS.

(Plates XV-XXVI).

These manuscripts were sent to me by the Foreign Office, with their D. O. letter, dated the 14th December, 1896. They were obtained by Mr. G. Macartney, the Special Assistant for Chinese Affairs at Kashgar to Lt.-Colonel Sir A. C. Talbot, K. C. I. E., British Resident in Kaçmir. On that account, following the precedent hitherto observed, I have named them "the Macartney MSS."

When I received the manuscripts, they were carefully arranged in six distinct sets. This arrangement had been made by Mr. Macartney. It has only reference to the circumstances in which they reached him. It has no intrinsic value, as will be seen in the sequence. But, for the present, it has been found convenient to retain it, with reference to the facsimile plates XV to XXVI.

In a letter, dated the 12th October, 1896, and addressed by Mr. Macartney to the Resident in Kaçmir, he gives the following account of the circumstances under which the manuscripts were discovered and given to him.

"Set, No. 1. This is a manuscript presented by Dildār Khān, an Afghan merchant in Yarkand. It appears that when the Bower MS. was found in Kuchar, two others were at the same time and under the same circumstances discovered. Dildār Khān obtained possession of the latter and took them to Leh in 1891. He gave one to Munghī Aḥmad Dīn, who in his turn presented his acquisition to Mr. Weber, Moravian Missionary. Hence the origin of the Weber Manuscripts. The other manuscript in Dildār Khān's possession was taken by him to India and left with a friend of his at Aligarh, a certain Faiz Muḥammad Khān. Dildār Khān brought it back to Turkistan last year and presented it to me.

Set, No. 2. Munghī Aḥmad Dīn purchased these leaves during my absence from Kashgar. They were found by a certain Islām Ākhūn Khōtani. This person was sent to Kashgar with them in July last [1896] by the Afghan Aksakal in Khotan, to whom I had written desiring him to obtain ancient manuscripts for me. Islām Ākhūn gave me the following particulars regarding his discovery. The manuscripts were found at Aksuñil, an uninhabited place in the desert, situated at about three marches N. E. of Khotan. His attention was first attracted by the presence on the sand of a few pieces of charcoal, near which was a piece of woollen cloth, with the lower portion of it buried in the ground. In digging this cloth out,

J. 1. 31

*See note on p. 233. Mr. Macartney had written to me on 12th Dec. 1896, giving me the following account of the discovery of the MSS. at Kuchar. It is very interesting.*

*1895, i.e. year before 1896.*

the manuscripts were found wrapped up in it, and buried in about three feet of earth.

Set, No. 3. Purchased by Munshī Aḥmad Dīn at the same time as set No. 2. These leaves were also discovered by Islām Ākhūn, at Jabu Kum, which appears to be situated at 50 or 60 miles N. E. of Khotan in the midst of the Takla Makan desert. Islām Ākhūn states that at Jabu Kum some ruins of a mud wall are still visible. The manuscript was found wrapped up in a piece of cloth, and mixed up with human bones, the whole lying on some partially exposed boards of a wooden coffin.

Set, No. 4. Found by Islām Ākhūn in August last at Kara Kul Mazar Khojam, said to be situated in the desert at 50 miles East of Guma (long. 78° 25' and lat. 37° 37'). The manuscript was simply picked up on the sand. It was originally bound between two little wooden boards, which, having been broken on Islām Khān's journey to Kashgar, he did not bring with him. Kara Kul Mazar Khajan [sic] is described as an immense graveyard in ruins, possibly ten miles long.

Set, No. 5. Found in October last [1895] by Islām Ākhūn in the desert at Kuk Gumbaz (green dome), which is said to be five days march East of Guma. Islām Ākhūn there saw a circular wall of baked bricks three feet high; and at about 15 paces from it, there was another wall, in which a hole plastered over with mud was discovered. In removing this mud, the manuscript was found, contained in the remnant of what was once an iron box.

Set, No. 6. These leaves were also found by Islām Ākhūn at Kuk Gumbaz. They were picked up from the ground."

Specimens of the first five sets are figured on Plates XV to XXVI. The leaves of the sixth set are in a too bad state of preservation, to make them, for the present, worth reproduction. The first glance over these plates will show that the manuscripts of the 1st set, shown on Plates XV and XVI, are of an entirely different class and character from those of the other sets, shown on Plates XVII to XXVI. They are moreover from two quite different localities, Set I being from Kuchar, on the Northern side of the Gobi desert, while Sets II to VI are from Khotan, on its southern side.

With regard to Set I, a point of greatest interest and importance is that it was found at the same time and under the same circumstances as the famous Bower MS.<sup>26</sup> There is, however, a slight mistake or

<sup>26</sup> I may here mention that my edition of this Manuscript, published by the Government of India, is now finished, as far as the original text is concerned. An introduction on its history, age, etc., is in course of preparation.

misunderstanding in the details of the account of the discovery. Mr. Macartney states that, together with the Bower MS., "two other manuscripts" were found which ultimately found their way into the hands of Mr. Weber and himself respectively. Now the Weber MSS., as I have shown elsewhere,<sup>27</sup> by themselves consist of several, not less than nine, separate manuscripts; and Set I of the Macartney MSS., as I shall show presently, consists of two separate manuscripts. It cannot, therefore, be correct that "two other manuscripts" were found: what was probably found were two bundles of manuscripts. What, however, appears to me to be probably the truth of the matter, is that, in addition to the Bower MS., a large bundle of other manuscripts was found. Of this bundle Dildār Khān obtained possession, and he divided it into two parts, one of which he gave to Munshi Aḥmed Din, whence it passed to Mr. Weber, while the other was retained by himself and ultimately reached Mr. Macartney. This would seem to agree with the earlier, but somewhat vague, information given to me by Mr. Shawe, and published by Sir ~~A. Croft~~ in his Presidential Address of 1894, where it runs as follows (p. 33):

Dr. Elliot

"I may add as the latest information that Dr. Hoernle has lately been informed by Mr. Shawe, a colleague of Mr. Weber, that it now appears that the [Weber] MSS., were not found in "Kugiar," as reported at first, but in Kuchar. They come, therefore, from the same locality as the Bower MS. Mr. Shawe also writes that he has ascertained that a packet of manuscripts similar to the Weber MSS., but larger in bulk, were in the hands of a Paṭhāu who cannot now be traced, but who is said to have gone to Kabul. Dr. Hoernle suspects that he went in the other direction, to Kashgar, and that his manuscripts eventually got into the hands of the Russian Consul in Kashgar, and that they are identical with the Petersburg collection of manuscripts, on which Professor von Oldenburg is now engaged. What leads him to think so, is that the Petersburg collection appears to contain other portions of the same manuscripts of which portions were found by him in the Weber MSS."

The Paṭhan, spoken of in the above quotation, would seem to be identical with the Afghan merchant Dildār Khān of Mr. Macartney's report. This "Afghan merchant," as Mr. Weber also calls him,<sup>28</sup> in

<sup>27</sup> See *Journal, As. Soc. Bengal*, Vol. LXII, Part I, page 1 ff. I may here mention that, in the meantime, the Weber MSS. have passed into my own possession by purchase from Mr. Weber.

<sup>28</sup> See *ibidem*, p. 1.

hopes of discovering buried treasure, undertook the excavation of a "house" near Kuchar (not Kugiar), and there found the manuscripts as well as the bodies of some "cows." It is now clear, what this so-called "house" was. It was evidently the stūpa or vihāra, with the usual settlement of Buddhist monks, from which the Bower MS. also was dug out.<sup>29</sup> From the fact that Dildār Khān obtained possession only of one half of the find, it may safely be concluded that his search in the vihāra was a joint-undertaking with some one else to whom the other moiety of the find (the Bower MS.) went. Who this other person was, appears from Major Bower's account, in the *Geographical Journal*,<sup>30</sup> of the acquisition of his manuscript, in which he informs us that "a Turkī who had been in India [Afghanistan?] told him that he and one of his friends [the Afghan merchant Dildār Khān?] had gone there [to the ancient vihāra] and dug for buried treasure, but had found nothing except a book [the Bower MS.]." But further, Mr. Macartney's report accounts only for "two other manuscripts" or, more correctly, for two portions of the bundle of manuscripts, which was discovered together with the Bower MS. But there is every probability that there was a third portion of that bundle. For the collection of manuscripts which is now in St. Petersburg and which was sent there by the Russian Consul in Kashgar, contains complementary parts of some of the Weber MSS. (see *infra*, under Set Ia), and must originally have come from the same source as the latter manuscripts and Set I of the Macartney MSS. It follows, therefore, that Dildār Khān, if he really obtained possession of the whole of the moiety of the Kuchar find, must have divided it into three portions: one portion he gave to Munshī Aḥmad Dīn (and thus to Mr. Weber), while of the remainder he gave one portion to Mr. Macartney, the British Agent, and the other to the Russian Consul. This, from his point of view, would be a natural and impartial division between the representatives of the two Empires whom he no doubt wished to gratify; and that he did not introduce either of those officers into the secret of his diplomacy is equally natural. But there is one comfort in all this, that we have probably not yet heard the last of that Kuchar discovery, and that we may hope that further instalments of the manuscripts, found on that occasion, may yet come to light. Of most of the manuscripts which constitute the Weber MSS. collection, only the merest fragments—a few leaves—have yet been recovered, and of the palm-leaf manuscript (No. I of the Fragments, described on p. 218) which must also have been

<sup>29</sup> See *Proceedings As. Soc. Beng.*, 1890, p. 221; *Journal, As. Soc. Beng.*, Vol. LX, Part I, p. 93; the *Geographical Journal* (Roy. Geogr. Soc. of London), Vol. V, 1895, p. 255.

obtained from that ruined vihāra, only the veriest scraps. Some of these fragmentary manuscripts, e.g., the Sanskrit vocabulary in Part VI of the Weber MSS., are sufficiently important to make us wish to obtain the complement. It is possible that the missing portions of these manuscripts may have suffered destruction in the course of the excavation of those two treasure seekers; a good deal undoubtedly must have been destroyed; but it is also quite possible that some further portions are still held back by the finders, and may come to light hereafter as a result of suitable inducement.

I now proceed to a detailed account of the several sets of the Macartney MSS.

SET I. This set consists of two entirely different manuscripts, specimens of which are shown on Plates XV and XVI respectively. They are written in two different types of Brāhmi, Set Ia being in the Central Asian, while Set Ib is in the Northern Indian type.

Set Ia consists of 35 leaves, two of which are shown on Plate XV. They are all broken off on one side. Their width is complete,  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches. The existing length is 5 inches, and about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches must be broken off; the total length, therefore, would be  $7\frac{1}{2}$  inches. In the missing part there must have been the string-hole. This calculation can be easily proved. Comparing the Macartney MSS. fragment with the Weber MSS. fragment No. VII,<sup>80</sup> and with the Petroffski MSS. fragment No. VIII,<sup>81</sup> it will be seen at once that all these three fragments absolutely agree in all points of shape, size, and type of letters. If we add to this that all three fragments treat of the story of Māñibhadra, there cannot remain the slightest doubt but that they are portions of the same manuscript, one of which has gone to St. Petersburg, while the other two are in my hands. Now, by a careful comparison of the eight leaves in his possession, Dr. von Oldenburg has been able to practically restore the text on the obverse side of his leaf No. 3. The restored transcript of this page he has published, as well as its original.<sup>81</sup> It will be seen from the transcript that the average number of akṣaras on a full line is 34. On the second line of the page the existing akṣaras number 23, and the line itself measures nearly 5 inches. Accordingly the missing 11 akṣaras, together with a small margin, would require a space of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches. Hence the page, when complete, would have measured  $7\frac{1}{2}$  inches. Further, the missing akṣaras on the second and fifth lines number 11 and 12 respectively, while on the third and fourth

<sup>80</sup> See *Journal, As. Soc. Beng.*, Vol. LXII, Part I, p. 31, and Plate II, fig. 3.

<sup>81</sup> See *Journal, Imp. Russian Archæological Society*, Vol. VIII, pp. 13, 17, and Plate II, fig. 8.

lines they number only 6 each.<sup>32</sup> This difference can only be accounted for by the fact that the string-hole stood on the missing portion of the leaf and, with its surrounding blank, took up the space of about 5 or 6 akṣaras. Precisely the same conclusions may be drawn from the obverse of the Macartney MS. Leaf I, a restored transcript of which is given by me below. In lines 2 and 4, about 14 and 12 akṣaras respectively are missing, while in lines 2 and 3 only 8 and 2 akṣaras respectively, thus suggesting a space for the string-hole in the latter lines. The total number of akṣaras in the 2nd and 4th lines is about 35, which represents a length of leaf of about 7½ inches.

To complete the case of this manuscript, it is now clear that altogether fifty leaves of it exist: 6 leaves are in the Petroffski collection, 7 in the Weber collection, and now 35 in the Macartney collection. This gives a fairly large manuscript, and when all the three portions are once brought together, read and compared, it will probably appear that nearly the whole, if not the whole, of the manuscript has been recovered.<sup>33</sup>

This manuscript is written in the Central Asian Brāhmī, marked by the peculiar form of *ṣ* and the peculiar general slant of the letters. The alphabet of it has been published by me in my paper on the Weber MSS. in volume LXII of this *Journal*, Plate IV.

The subject of the manuscript is the story of the Great Yakṣa General Māṇibhadra, and how he visited Buddha and received from him a powerful spell. It was a favourite story with the Buddhists; for it seems to be also the subject of Part VII of the Bower MS.<sup>34</sup> It is also very briefly told in one of the Sūtras of the Saṃyutta Nikāya.<sup>35</sup>

TRANSCRIPT. PLATE XV. LEAF I: OBTVERSE.

- 1, || Nagar-ōpama ārāmō sōlmē p(rārambha)
- 2, [Ēvaṃ mayā ṣrutam=ēka-samayē Bhagavāṃ vi]ha[rati] jētava-  
n(ē) Anāthapiṇḍad-ārāmō · atha khalu
- 3, [Māṇibhadra mahāyakṣa](s)napati pañca-yakṣa-ṣata-parivārō  
pu(rask)ṛta-pari(kṛtō) atikrā-
- 4, [ntāyāṃ rā](tīyāṃ) sarvaṃ jē(ta)vanam=udār(ē)ṇ-āvabhāṣēna  
(s)pharitvā (yēna) Bhaga-

<sup>32</sup> The word *astu* in the fourth line, printed by Dr. von Oldenburg in italics as missing, really exists on the original leaf, and should have been printed in Roman.

<sup>33</sup> I may add that the same story of Māṇibhadra is also contained in Part V, of the Weber MSS., of which 8 leaves exist in that collection, and apparently one leaf in the Petroffski collection, No. 7 in Dr. von Oldenburg's paper.

<sup>34</sup> See my edition of the Bower MS., p. 236.

<sup>35</sup> See Series of the Pali Text Society, Part I, p. 208. This was first pointed out by Dr. von Oldenburg.

- 5, [vān=tēn-ōpasamkramitvā + + + +]tā sarddha-sa + + sammoda-  
ti samrañjati kathām vividhām=upasamhī-  
6, [tya + + + + + + + + + +]Māñibhadra mahāyakṣa sēnāpa-  
tir=Bhagavantam=idam=avōcat

## LEAF I: REVERSE.

- 1, (ha)yata svadhyāyata paryavāpnuta manasi kuruta tat-kasmā  
2, [nagar-ō]pamam vyākaraṇam dharm-ōpasamhitam ādi brahma-  
caryasy=ābhi-  
3, nirvāṇ-ā + + + + (a)tha ca punaḥ kula-putrēṇa bra-  
4, + yā agāraṇa-nagarika (pravra)ditvā nagar-ōpamam vyāka-  
5, [raṇam + + + +] + dhārayita(vyam) (udgrā)hayita(vyam) vācay-  
itavyam svadhyā-  
6, [yitavyam] + + + + + Bhagavām a(stu) mana + ēbhi.

## LEAF II: OBERSE.

- 1, + + (mahā)-v(ā)cya(m) pūrva-vad=idam vaditvā brahmā Sa-  
natkumā-  
2, [raḥ] + =pradakṣiṇī-kṛ(tvā)(tatr=ai)=(ā)ntarhitāḥ atha catvārō  
mahārā-  
3, [jānō] abhikrāntāyām rātryām yēn=(āha)m tēn=ōpasamkrānta  
(upētya)  
4, [padau ḥirasā] vanditvā yathā svaka-sva(ka) + + i niḥḥṛtya  
ēkāntē tasthurō  
5, [i](da)m vaditvā catvārō mahārājānō mama pādau ḥirasā vaṁdi-  
6, [tvā pradakṣiṇī-kṛtvā ta](tr-ai)v=āntarhitā udgrhṛata bhik-  
ṣavō nagar-ōpamam vyāka-

## LEAF II: REVERSE.

- 1, [raṇam] + ya (s)phalēn=mūrdhā daḍadhā hṛdayam phalēt idam  
vaditvā  
2, (pa)daṁ ḥirasā vanditvā Bhagavantam trs-pradakṣiṇī-kṛtvā tatr=  
ai-  
3, [va] Bhagavām ēva ra + + utyāyāt=purastād=bhikṣu-(saṁgha)  
4, nyāṣīdat niṣadya Bhaga(vām) (bhi)kṣūn=āmantryayati (c=  
ārtha)=dya-  
5, +(vēṇa) abhi(krāntā)yām rā(tryām) yēn=āham tēn=ōpasam-  
krāntaḥ  
6, + + + + + [ē]k(ā)nta-sthita (bra)[hm]ā Sanatkumārō

Imperfectly visible letters are shown in round brackets; missing  
letters and restorations, in angular brackets. Of *sōlmē* (Ia<sup>1</sup>) I can  
make nothing; one would expect a number, say *ṣōḍaṣṭhī*, Pāli *sōlasō* or  
*ṣoḷasamō* 'sixteenth.' We have clearly here the beginning of a new  
chapter, in which Buddha appears to narrate to Māñibhadra the story of



the Brahmā Sanatkumāra. The name of the chapter would seem to be *Nagarōpama Ārāma* or 'the town-like park.' On the obverse of Leaf I I have restored what can be concluded with much probability to be the missing portions. This will give an idea of the original state of the page.

Set I, b. This set consists of 15 leaves. As a rule there are 9 lines on a page, only exceptionally 10, as on fl. 23a. The manuscript is incomplete, both as regards the number and the size of the leaves. Its beginning and end are missing; but, so far as I can see from Dr. von Oldenburg's paper in the *Journal of the Imperial Russian Archæological Society*, no portion of it appears to have gone to St. Petersburg. All the leaves are mutilated at their right-hand side, and the only indication of their original length lies in the well-known fact, that Central Asian manuscripts have their string-hole on the left side of the leaf, at the distance of about a quarter of the length of the full page. Hence it may be concluded with some probability, that about one-quarter of each leaf is missing. As the existing length is about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches, this gives the full length as probably about 6 inches.<sup>86</sup> The breadth of the leaves is about 2 inches. The material is a very soft kind of paper of a darkish colour; it is in a very rotten and broken state.

The writing is very slovenly done. Small and big letters frequently alternate without any apparent reason; and the lines are not kept properly straight and apart, so that their letters occasionally run into one another. Also errors occur not unfrequently, syllables or sounds being occasionally omitted; thus fl. 22a<sup>b</sup> *pañca* for *pañcamē*, fl. 22a<sup>b</sup> *trayōdaçamañ* for *trayōdaçamañ*; fl. 23a<sup>b</sup> *rāṣṭōpadravē* for *rāṣṭōpadravē*, etc. All these blemishes aggravate the difficulty of reading the manuscript, and, I hope, will be accepted in extenuation of the imperfect state of the transliteration, given by me below.

The characters used in this manuscript distinctly belong to the Northern Indian class of Brāhmī, of the early Gupta period. They are of a rather archaic type, as I shall presently show in some detail. It will be seen from the excellent comparative tables, published by

<sup>86</sup> Professor Bühler in the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, Vol. VII, p. 261, points out that "numerous copperplate grants with one string-hole on the left" exist in India, and infers from it that manuscripts with one string-hole on the left "were once not unknown in India." There is every probability that this inference is correct. For as the material (birch-bark or palm-leaf) shows, some of the Central Asian manuscripts, (e.g., the Bower MS.) must have been imported from India (see p. 258). In fact, in the case of such exported Indian manuscripts, the peculiar position of the string-hole is an additional proof of their great age. For no Indian manuscript, found in India itself, shows that position; they either show one hole in the middle, or one on either side. Even the Horiuzi MS., exported from India to Japan early in the 6th cent. A.D., already shows the double hole.

Professor Bühler in illustration of his essay on Indian Palaeography,<sup>87</sup> the marks, enumerated by me below, have, in their cumulation, nearly disappeared from all engraved records (copperplates, stone-ets, rocks, etc.) in India, from about the seventh century (say, A.D.). It is a natural result of the process of engraving that alphabetic forms of letters, which as a rule are simpler and stiffer than cursive ones, conserve themselves much longer in such records than manuscripts. It is a principle, now universally admitted, that manuscripts show the presence of cursive forms very much earlier than engraved records. It may be expected, therefore, that the marks above referred to will have disappeared very much earlier from all manuscripts, to give place to their corresponding cursive forms. This expectation is fully born out by the Bower MS., the date of which, from the occurrence in it of a special cursive form (the intermediate form) can with certainty be fixed to be about 450 A.D., *i.e.*, about two centuries anterior to the term above-mentioned for engraved records. In that manuscript, indeed, none of the marks, enumerated below, occur at all. On the other hand, in our Macartney MS., they are all present in their original form. This proves very clearly that this Macartney MS. must be very considerably older than the Bower MS. Further, some of those marks have disappeared from engraved records, from about the end of the fourth century (say, 400 A.D.). They prevail in them in the first, second and third centuries : they also prevail in this Macartney MS. It may, therefore, as it seems to me, safely be concluded that this Macartney MS. may not be dated later than the middle of the fourth century, and that it may be very much older. Provisionally I would suggest 350 A.D. as a fairly safe date. This result makes this particular Macartney MS. the oldest existing Indian manuscript. For, though found in Central Asia, it is abundantly clear from the characters of its writing, that if not written in India itself (which, for my part, I am disposed to doubt on account of the material on which it is written), it was written by a Native of India, or an Indian Buddhist, who had emigrated to Central Asia.<sup>88</sup>

The marks, above referred to, are the following :—

(1) Initial long *ā*, with curve, indicating length, attached to the right-hand side of the vertical line ; disappears from the fourth century. After that date, the curve is attached to the foot of the vertical line, and this is also the case in the Bower MS. See fl. 23a<sup>1, 8</sup>.

<sup>87</sup> In the *Encyclopedia of Indo-aryan research*. See his Plates III to V.

<sup>88</sup> It is a well-known fact that Indian Buddhist teachers, either on their own initiative, or on vocation by others, frequently settled in foreign parts (*e.g.* Tibet and China).

(2) Initial short *i*, with the apex turned to the right, disappears from the third century. After that date, the apex is turned to the bottom, in the Bower MS. it is to the top. See fl. 22b<sup>2</sup>, 23a<sup>5</sup>.

(3) Medial short *i*, made by a nearly perfect circle, extremely rare, even in the most ancient records. From very early times (first century) it is usually made by a line curving to the left. See fl. 22a<sup>4</sup> (*bhi*), 22a<sup>5</sup> (*fi*), 23a<sup>7</sup> (*pi*).

(4) Medial long *i*, made by a line curving to the left, like short *i*, but more convoluted; disappears from the beginning of the fifth century (last seen in the Bilsad record 414 A.D., in *hi*, *crī*) and is not found in the Bower MS. It occurs regularly here, see fl. 22a<sup>3</sup> (*sthī*, *vī*, *mī*), 22a<sup>4</sup> (*dhi*), 22a<sup>5</sup> (*rī*), 22b<sup>5</sup> (*nī*) 23b<sup>9</sup> (*kī*), *et passim*.

(5) Medial short *u*, in the form of a straight line, attached to the bottom of the consonant, disappears from the end of the sixth century. After that date curves or wedges are used; the latter also in the Bower MS. See fl. 21a<sup>1</sup>, 22a<sup>3</sup>, 23b<sup>5</sup> (*su*), 21b<sup>5</sup> and 23a<sup>5</sup> (*pu*), 22a<sup>4</sup> (*hu*), 22a<sup>5</sup> (*mu*), 23a<sup>1</sup> (*ju*), 23a<sup>3</sup> (*dhu*).

(6) Initial *z*, with the apex turned upwards ( $\Delta$ ), disappears from the end of the fourth century (last seen in the Allahabad record, 375 A.D.). After that date the apex is turned to the bottom, in the Bower MS. to the left. See fl. 22a<sup>3</sup> and 22b<sup>5</sup>.

(7-11) *Ka*, *gga*, *ja*, *na*, and *ra* made with stiff straight lines, disappear with the end of the sixth century, *ja* and *na* even earlier. After that date the lines are curved and the ends wedged. In the Bower MS., the ends of the vertical lines of *ka* and *ra* are always wedged, and the lines of *ja* and *na* are curved. See fl. 22a<sup>4</sup> (*kē*, *kām*), 21a<sup>1</sup>, 23a<sup>5</sup> (*gga*), 23a<sup>1</sup> (*ju*), 23b<sup>9</sup> (*na*), 23b<sup>7</sup> (*rā*), *et passim*.

(12) *Ya*, in its tridental form, disappears from the end of the sixth century.<sup>89</sup> After that date its square form is universal, while an intermediate form occurs with the vowels *e*, *ai*, *ō*, *au*, from about 370 to 540 A.D. In the Bower MS. the only forms that occur are the tridental and the intermediate. In the Macartney MS., the tridental form alone occurs, thus showing that it cannot be placed later than 370 A.D., and probably dates from much earlier.

(13) The numeral figures 1, 2, 3 and 20 are of an ancient type. See the left-hand margin on the obverses of fl. 21, 22, 23. In the Bower MS. the same forms are used, though occasionally the figure 3 has a more modern form.

I may add that the superscribed conjunct *r* is, in our manuscript, always written above the line; see fl. 21b<sup>5</sup>, 23a<sup>7</sup> (*rva*), 22b<sup>7</sup> (*rta*), *et*

<sup>89</sup> See *ante*, pages 216 and 217.

*passim*. The only exception is in the case of the ligature *rya*, when *r* is formed on the line; see fl. 22a<sup>3</sup>. All this, however, is a practice which goes as far back as the first century A.D.

I may also note, that as a rule no marks of interpunctuation or division are used. Exceptionally, however, a circular mark occurs, to mark the end of a chapter (*adhyaṅga*), as on fl. 21a<sup>5</sup>, 21b<sup>3</sup>, and an oblong mark to indicate the end of a paragraph as on fl. 23b<sup>4, 6</sup>.

It may also be worth noticing that the leaves of this work are also numbered on the obverse pages. This a practice on which I have already remarked on page 227.

The language of the manuscript is Sanskrit, but of the well-known ungrammatical or mixed type which was peculiar to the earlier Buddhist writers. Examples of this are the prakriticisms *aikō* (for *aikah*) in fl. 22a<sup>4</sup>, *tasmā* (for *tasmāt*) fl. 22a<sup>4</sup>, *bhavē* (for *bhavēd*) fl. 22a<sup>3, 5</sup>, *mantrēna* (for *mantrēna*) fl. 22b<sup>1</sup>, 23b<sup>4, 5</sup>.

The work is written partly in verse (*śloka*) and partly in prose. The *śloka*s, however, are frequently, very irregularly formed, the *pāda*s being sometimes too short, sometimes too long by one syllable; sometimes two *pāda*s are run into one uninterrupted half-verse; see fl. 22b<sup>6</sup>, 23b<sup>9</sup>. In my transcript, below, I have indicated any *śloka* that could be recognized by the insertion, within angular brackets, of the usual single and double lines of division. A clear prose passage can be distinguished in fl. 23b<sup>5, 7</sup>.

The work appears to have been divided into *adhyaṅga*s or chapters. On fl. 22a<sup>5</sup> we have the end of the eighth chapter, and on fl. 22b<sup>9</sup> the mutilated ending of the ninth chapter. The tenth chapter which follows seems to have been called *gandharva-karma* or 'business of Gandharvas.'

A point worth noting is the frequent occurrence of unusual or unknown words. I have noticed the following instances: *kējala* fl. 22a<sup>7</sup> (for *kiñjala* ?), *yanti* 'ingredient' fl. 22b<sup>4</sup>, *kaṇavīra* fl. 23a<sup>6</sup> (for *kaṇajīra* or *karavīra* ?); *spandana* and *rāsabha* fl. 23a<sup>5</sup> as names of two medicinal plants. This adds to the general archaic look of the work. On fl. 23a<sup>2</sup> there occurs the word *rājamātra* or 'a person of princely position'; it occurs together with the word *rāja*. According to the St. Petersburg dictionary, the word *rājamātra* is extremely rare; it seems to occur but once, in Caraka, part I, chapter 15. The context in Caraka is different; but the coincidence is surprising. Could our manuscript have anything to do with the original Caraka, that is, the work of Agnivēṣa ? For the nature of the work in our manuscript is undoubtedly medical or semi-medical.

## TRANSLITERATION. PLATE XVI.

## LEAF 21: OBERSE.

- 1, + ka[r]tavyā (nāra)dati buta + + va vasuṣ=ca(trā)ṅgadaṣ=ca  
+ + +
- 2, nām prastha (3) (pañca)-rātram jāpam=anuvartana-sarva-  
gandha + +
- 3, kṣatā sampūjanā + m(ca) maddhyēvinām kuryāsi + +
- 4, jana çamta ku(mati) sarva-dēva-nāga-yakṣām vai +
- 21 5, + m + muddyat=iti ○ aṣṭamō 'ddhyāyaḥ ◎
- 6, + tyāyam ni(t)o + mē + + bhanēna ça + +
- 7, + ganētō māṣa ya
- 8, + + ā + sarva + + ai +
- 9, + + + +

## REVERSE.

- 1, + + + +
- 2, + + + + +
- 3, nyaiç=ca pūjayitavyam + + +
- 4, + + + pam=anuda(t)ō manaḥ sa(pta-rā)tram ma +
- 5, + + + ti tatō ○ 'sya so puruṣō maṇi-rū
- 6, + + ch +(tataṣ=ca + +(bha)m gacchati manuṣyānām
- 7, sya (dha)nikām + + + tā + + lam lapsati divē +
- 8, (va)mō 'dhyāy(a) (sa)māp(t)am ◎ Atha gandharva-karmaṃ  
nāma bhavati +
- 9, + ānām hitāya tu pañca-rā(tra)-su + + + pūrv-ātmā + + +

## LEAF 22: OBERSE.

- 1, <sup>40</sup> pravālam ca [i]suvarṇam rajata[m] tathā [n] kṛṣṇ-āyasam  
ca tāmrām ca [i] kā(ṇḍa)m ca trapus(ā)-sam
- 2, yā pañca<sup>41</sup> [i] ṣaṣṭhi bhavati mṛttikā [n] saptami brahma-(k)u-  
[ça]n [i]=tusa-vijāni v=āṣṭamē [n] +
- 3, (mi)[i]daçamē triṇi tējasā [n] śkādaça tu gandha-dakam [i] bha-  
vē[d] dvādaçē tu (ku) +
- 4, trayōdaçamam<sup>42</sup> kējalam [n] sahaer-ābhihutaṣ=c=aikō [i] tasmā [t]  
sthānam vidhiyatē
- 22 5, yā bhavē[d] nārī [i] ○ sadyaḥ snātā labhēt=sutam [n] rā(ṭi)-dvārē  
vī + dōṣu [i] +
- 6, vighrahēṣu vā sadyaḥ [i] snātō muc(y)ētē sadyas=tatō [n] jā + ya  
+ (drayō)

<sup>40</sup> This akṣara is written very minutely on the margin.

<sup>41</sup> Read *pañcamē*.

<sup>42</sup> Read *trayōdaçamam*.

- 7, rājya sadya + + + jam +yañ=ca +i + + + + yamtra + +ā +  
 8, sās=tu sudaruṇām vā + tinā + +kā + + ya granthānā + +  
 9, + + + + +

## REVERSE.

- 1, + + + + +  
 2, va mantrēna i + + dhā + + mantra ana + + + + (ca bā va  
 piṇva)  
 3, sa saha(srē) + + + + cakra la + + + + (ṇṭhi tra) + hā  
 4, nandini tathā[ṃ]ksirikā-tvaya-yantiç=ca[ī]apām ma + + (sam-  
 gha)rē ca  
 5, n=aiv=ērgu ca ta o thā[ṃ]sūry-ānuvartini çuri vā n=āgra-danti  
 ca +  
 6, bala tathā[ṃ]ētās=tu dōṣam dbhidim vyāsam[ī]vā vighnā-vinā-  
 çani[ṃ]catu +  
 7, laçu[ī]kartavyā dvija-sattamaḥ[ṃ]samāyām sn(ā)p(t)a-liptāyām  
 sōmya-sāmya +  
 8, mūlāma-vyagra [ī]sa-(vi)çāṇa<sup>45</sup> su-kuṣiṇaḥ[ṃ]daça-dānta ca  
 kartavyā[ī]kalaçā snāptā  
 9, nēyyanti<sup>44</sup> tvi sō rgha vyā ghī + + + va sahaṃ(ta) saha(dēçam)  
 +(divjānām) + +

## LEAF 23: OBERSE.

- 1, nāhula-drakṣamayānām āç[ī]ti<sup>45</sup>-sahasraṃ juhōtavayam āturasya  
 sa +  
 2, tirājō rāja-mātrē vā dēv(ē) (ampu)rikāsu ca n=ānyasmimn<sup>46</sup>=  
 ēṣa mantra-pralō +  
 3, mantrēṇa rāṣṭ<sup>47</sup>-ōpadravē tr<sup>48</sup>-hastam mā(rum)guram kṛtvā hari-  
 taki vibhitakam=āpi + yani  
 4, (da)sth-ōdumbara-bilva-palāça-vijaka[ṃ]-saptaparnaç=ca[ī]drōṇam  
 vaça(n=ta)thā + i  
 5, spandanam candanam ta o thā [ṃ]sarj-ārjunam vijakam [ī]  
 rāsabham mōkṣakam tathā [ṃ] + karē 2 ima  
 6, nāgam vaṇça-kulam tathā [ṃ] priyangum=atha pumūnāgam=[ī]  
 arkam kaṇaviram ca kadambaṃ + manam drōṇa  
 7, vṛkṣō 'pi yō + + + + gandham sarvō maddhyaḥ [ī] sarva-dhū  
 + + +ōmayam [ṃ]

<sup>45</sup> The akṣara ṇa is placed below viçā, between the lines.

<sup>44</sup> The two ya are placed side by side, overlapping one another.

<sup>46</sup> Read açiti.

<sup>47</sup> Dele the anuvāra.

<sup>48</sup> Read rāṣṭr-ōpadravē.

<sup>49</sup> Read tri-hastam.

- 8, dhi<sup>49</sup>-madhu-ghṛt-ākta + + ç=ca āhati-sahasraṁ hō + + yō  
+ + +  
9, myanti<sup>50</sup> viṣayō + + + + + anōn=aiva (ma)[ntrēṇa]  
+ ha(n-ō)padra  
10, + + + + +

## REVERSE.

- 1, + + + + + (kara) + +  
2, + ka-rātra (su-bāta)sa-bilva-samidhānā (vō) + + + ghṛtākta  
3, hōtavayam kṛṣṇa ca + + + + + + pūrv-ōktē tā + + + + +  
pūrva +  
4, ç-pathē<sup>51</sup> nadi-pula(napa)+anōna mantrēna<sup>52</sup> || ch(a)trēṇa  
dhruva + +  
5, anilō kṛṣṇa-vā O sasō vṛga-bhūtē 'mki tiṣṭhasē asukō mō tathā vā  
6, hā || sō 'sya rājā vaçyō vidhēyō bhavati ātmauēna dhanēna vā  
jijñāsā  
7, ktavyam prāṇātyayō bhavati dharmaç=ca rāja-ghātinō bhavati  
rāja-ghātinō ta(thā)  
8, narakēṣu ca paccatē<sup>53</sup> · anōna mantrēna<sup>52</sup> rāj-antarēṣu pūrvam  
dakṣiṇam datvā ça  
9, rayēṣa dakṣiṇasya siddh(ā)nta-mantra[!]-vidhir=ōṣa prakīrti-  
taḥ [!] samī + + ām (ça) +

With regard to the remaining sets of the Macartney MSS., I must, for the present, content myself with merely publishing photographic specimens, and adding a few words of description. These manuscripts are written in characters which are either quite unknown to me, or with which I am too imperfectly acquainted to attempt a ready reading in the scanty leisure that my regular official duties allow me. I thought, however, that even a mere publication of specimens of the original manuscripts would be welcome to Oriental scholars. My hope is that among those of my fellow-labourers who have made the languages of Central Asia their speciality, there may be some who may be able to recognize and identify the characters and language of these curious documents. To such I would only ask to be permitted to address the request that any discovery made by them may be communicated to me, with a view to arranging a full publication of the manuscripts.

Regarding their age I cannot venture to give any opinion, except

<sup>49</sup> The full word is *dadhi*.

<sup>50</sup> Perhaps *çamyanti*.

<sup>51</sup> The full word is *catus-pathē*.

<sup>52</sup> Read *mantrēṇa*.

<sup>53</sup> Read *paccatē*.

that I am not disposed to believe that they are so old as the other manuscripts which came from Kuchar. All these came from the neighbourhood of Khotan, and there is nothing in the circumstances of their discovery which necessarily involves a very high antiquity, or need make them older than the early middle ages. The occurrence in them of what appears to me Uighur and Tibetan writing also seems to point in the same direction. See also *infra* pp. 255 and 256.

They are all written on a coarse, stiff paper, of a very dark dirty-brown colour. It is very different from the comparatively white and soft paper of the Kuchar manuscripts. The condition, however, in which they are now, may be partially due to their long burial in the hot, dry sand from which they were rescued. Unfortunately the dark colour of these Khotan manuscripts has proved a great difficulty in photographing, and some of the Plates are not quite so clear as one would wish.

SET II. This consists of two distinct parts, of very different shape and size. One part (Plates XVII and XVIII) consists of two large sheets of paper, measuring about  $16 \times 11\frac{1}{2}$  inches. The second part (Plates XIX-XXII) consists of 12 sheets, of which eight are folded in the middle to make 2 leaves each. Hence there are 16 double-leaves and 4 single leaves; that is, the 12 sheets make up 20 leaves. These leaves measure about  $6\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$  inches each; or a double-leaf measures  $13\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$  inches. The double-leaves show, close to their folded margin, four pin-holes, which seem to indicate that they were once stitched together, though no trace of a thread has survived. These 12 sheets are inscribed with four different kinds of characters; nevertheless, of course, they might form a connected whole; but this I am unable to determine. Accordingly I shall describe them in four separate, subordinate sets.

Set II a. Plates XVII and XVIII show the two sides of one of the two large sheets. Each of these sheets bears writing in two different characters, and two different inks. The lines of writing are, as a rule, arranged so that two lines of black letters alternate with one line of white letters. On one side (Plate XVIII) the double lines of black writing are separated from the single line of white writing by straight lines strongly marked in black ink. The white writing appears to me to be in Uighur characters; those of the black writing I am unable to identify. On one side (Plate XVII) there are the distinct impressions of three seals; the two outer ones in black, the middle one in white ink. The latter should be again in Uighur,<sup>64</sup> to correspond with the white writing. The regularity of the alternation of the white and

<sup>64</sup> One line has a curious resemblance to Kufic, and reminds one of ; but it is probably an angular form of Uighur.



black writing seems to suggest that one gives the translation of the other, the document being bilingual. The second sheet is, in every respect, similar to the figured one, except that it bears only two seals, and that the writing which corresponds to the white one is in black lead or what looks very much like it; it is clearly distinguishable from the black-ink writing.

Set II *b*. Plate XIX shows a single leaf of this portion of the second part of Set II. There are also three double-leaves in this subordinate set, the total being seven leaves. These appear to me to be written in Chinese or in something greatly resembling Chinese characters. The number of letters in the perpendicular lines vary from 9 to 12; and the number of lines itself varies from 8 to 11. One half of one of the double-leaves (two pages), even, numbers 13 lines to the page, and (apparently) 18 or 20 letters to the line, the letters being only about one-half as large as those on the rest of this manuscript. Each page of writing is enclosed in a double-lined quadrangle. Each side of a double-leaf, of course, has two such inscribed quadrangles (or pages) side by side, the fold of the paper running between the quadrangles.

Set II *c*. Plate XX shows a double-leaf of this subordinate set. It will also best explain what is meant by a double-leaf. There are two of these double-leaves; and there is also one single leaf; so that the total number of leaves is five. Every page (except the two pages of the single leaf) is enclosed within a double-lined quadrangle. There are from 9 to 11 lines of writing on a page: the usual number is 10. The writing is unknown to me: there is a faint suggestion about it of a very cursive form of the Indian Brāhmī characters; but this appearance is probably deceptive.

Set II *d*. Plate XXI shows a double-leaf of this portion of the set. There are two more such double-leaves, the total number of leaves being six. Every page is enclosed within a double-lined quadrangle, and the quadrangles themselves are divided, by double lines, into six compartments each. Each compartment contains two lines of writing, the whole page, thus, having 12 lines. The lines of writing stand closer to the double lines of division than to one another. I do not know the writing; it appears, however, to be similar to that of Set II *c*.

Set II *e*. Plate XXII shows a leaf of this subordinate set. There is another leaf of this set which is inscribed only on one side. This side has eight lines, while the two pages of the figured leaf have ten lines each. The writing is in white ink,<sup>55</sup> and appears to be in Uighur characters.

<sup>55</sup> It is not chalk; at least it is tolerant of washing. I may here add that the black ink, too, in all these manuscripts, tolerates the application of a wet sponge.

The following is a summary of Set II:—

Set II a, sheets	2,			total	2
b, single leaf	1, double-leaves	3,		„	7
c, „ „	1, „ „	2,		„	5
d, „ „	0, „ „	3,		„	6
e, „ „	2, „ „	0,		„	2
					Total
					22

SET III. Plate XXIII shows two leaves of this set. There are other 12 such single leaves. They measure about  $6\frac{1}{4} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$  inches, have 6 or 7 lines to the page. The writing on them is much interspersed with what look like Brāhmī ligatures, in the Tibetan type characters. This seems to render it probable that the rest is also written in Brāhmī characters of a very cursive type; but I have had time to study it more closely. The leaves show no holes, and they do not appear to have ever been fastened together, though it can hardly be doubted that they form a connected series.

SET IV. Plates XXIV and XXV show two double-leaves of this set. It consists of a thick manuscript of small sized double-leaves, of which some 3 or 4 have split into single leaves. Accordingly there would be 112 leaves, but actually there are only 111 leaves, and these measure about  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$  inches each. The lower corners of the leaves are damaged. Each double-leaf, when folded up into two single leaves, forms up a so-called 'form,' and these 'forms' are bound together as a 'book' by means of a metal nail which is passed through the middle of the 'forms' of leaves near their left-hand margin. The 'forms' are secured from falling off the nail, by a metal disk screwed on one of its ends and a metal knob, into the other. The 'book' is bound up and ends with a couple of blank 'forms,' but whether this set is complete, I cannot say, though it seems to be so. There are six or seven lines on each page, and these lines are neatly partitioned off into four columns. The number of letters in each column line varies; it is usually six; but I have noticed them from five to seven. In this manuscript, too, ligatures of the Tibetan type occur on nearly every page, which would suggest a Brāhmī cursive character for the rest of the writing. Whether the latter is the same as the one similar to, that occurring in Set III needs investigation. I have no time for closer examination.

SET V. Plate XXVI shows three leaves of this set. It is a manuscript very similar in every respect to the preceding one. All its leaves are of the same size, about 100; their exact number is uncertain, as a few of

the leaves are broken in fragments, the paper being very brittle. They measure about  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 2\frac{1}{2}$  inches. They are also made up into a 'book,' by a metal nail passed through the left-hand side of the leaves. There are two blank leaves at the end of the book, and the leaf preceding them is inscribed on one side only. There appears to have been also a blank leaf at the beginning of the book, but it is now broken into fragments. All this would seem to indicate that the manuscript is complete; but not being able to read it, I cannot say so for certain. There are five lines on each page, and these are partitioned off into four columns. The letters in each columnar line number eight.<sup>58</sup> Ligatures of the Tibetan type occur much less frequently than in the preceding manuscript (see obverse of leaf I, line 3); nevertheless the writing may turn out to be a species of very cursive Brāhmī. I have had no time for any closer examination.

SET VI. This is a small manuscript of 8 leaves, measuring  $5 \times 2\frac{1}{2}$  inches. It is in a very bad state of preservation: nearly the whole of its writing has become obliterated, and the leaves are very baked and brittle. From the little that is legible, it is certain that this manuscript was written in exactly the same characters as the preceding one (Set V), with the same sporadic interspersions of Tibetan-like ligatures. As the leaves show no hole, they do not appear to have ever been strung together. In this respect this manuscript is like that of Set III.

In conclusion I would add a few remarks concerning the probable age of these manuscripts. They are not offered as embodying final results; they are only thoughts which have forced themselves on my mind in the course of my investigations, and they are intended as suggestions to stimulate further researches by others. For my part, I am disposed to believe that they will eventually be found to err on the side of moderation rather than excess.

For the purpose of an enquiry into their age, these manuscripts must clearly be divided into two distinct classes. First, there are those found near Kuchar, and dug out from the ruins of the ancient vihāra. These are written in Brāhmī characters, either of the Northern Indian or the Central Asian type, and are composed either in Sanskrit or in Turki. They are also written on palm-leaf, or birch-bark, or paper. To the second class belong those found in the sands, in the neighbourhood of Khotan. These are written in Chinese or Uighur or some other unknown alphabet and language; they are also inscribed on paper of (apparently) a quite different kind. I omit for the present the Godfrey MSS., because it is not certain, whether they were also found in that

<sup>58</sup> This, if the language were Sanskrit, would point to a work in *çlōkas*.

ancient ruined vihāra, or in some other old ruined building near Kuchar. But provisionally, they must be placed with the first class, with which they agree in every other respect.

I will dispose of the second class first. For the present, there is too little information available to form any decided opinion. But the following points may be noticed. First: Sets 4, 5 and 6 of the Macartney MSS. were found in practically the same locality, i.e., 50 or 60 miles (5 days' march) East of Guma. The latter town lies about 100 miles W. N. W. of Khotan. The find-place of those three sets, therefore, must be somewhere about 60 miles North-West of Khotan. The sets 2 and 3 were found in a different direction, viz., North-East of Khotan, in the Takla Makan desert: Set 2 at three marches (say, 35 miles) and Set 3 at 50 or 60 miles from Khotan. The direct route from Khotan to China, by way of Lob Nor, skirts the Takla Makan desert. About 69 miles East of Khotan lies the town of Kiria, where that route turns North-East. Within the elbow thus made, and at a distance of about 3 or 4 miles to the left, lies the Takla Makan desert, stretching westward to the North of Khotan. The town of Pima (or Pein) lay a little to the North or North-West of Kiria, about 60 miles East of Khotan, and the China route ran originally by way of it (being thus a little shorter than the present loop-line by way of Kiria). The Chinese Buddhist Hiuen Tsiang, in 644 A.D., passed by this route through Pima on his return to China; so did Marco Polo on his way to China in 1274 A.D.<sup>57</sup> In their time the Takla Makan desert already existed; it lay a little to the North of Pima, and was advancing southward. In Hiuen Tsiang's time, Pima was a comparatively recent settlement, its inhabitants having migrated south-eastward to it from another town (called Ho-lo-lo-kia) on the destruction of the latter by the advancing sands. In Marco Polo's time, Pima still existed. At the present day, it has disappeared in the sands, and Kiria, still farther South, has taken its place. Beyond Pima and Charchan the sand had already encroached on the route, in Marco Polo's time. Not long after his time, about 1330 A.D., the town of Lob-Katak, lying North-East of Charchan, about 3 marches (say 40 miles) from Lob Nor, was overwhelmed by the sands.<sup>58</sup> It seems probable that the locality in which the manuscript Sets 2 and 3 were found, belonged to the original site of Pima, or was not far from it, perhaps at that of Ho-lo-lo-kia. The manuscripts might be, therefore, of the 13th century A.D., though they might also be much older. The

<sup>57</sup> See Yule's edition of Marco Polo, Vol. I, pp. 196-203. Also Beal's *Buddhist Records*, Vol. II, pp. 309 ff.

<sup>58</sup> See N. Elias' *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, p. 10.

find-place of Sets 4-6 would seem to belong to the western extremity of the Takla Makan desert. The locality of Set 4 is described as "an immense graveyard in ruins." This part of the country and farther North-West was the scene of the fierce struggles between the Muhammadans of Kashgar and the Buddhists of Khotan in the early part of the 12th century. A large cemetery at Ordam Padahah, near Yangi Hisar, marks the site of a great Muhammadan defeat in 1095 A.D. That site is now nearly buried in the sands. It was about that time, in the 11th century, that Sultān Satuk Bughra Khān succeeded in bringing together all the Uighur people into one nation.<sup>59</sup> All this would point to a similar conclusion, the 12th century, for the Macartney MSS. As to the chances of conservation of manuscripts under the condition in which they were found, I may quote the following remarks from Sir T. D. Forsyth's Report<sup>60</sup> with reference to the castellated city, Shahri Nukta Rashid, now more or less completely buried under sand:—

"As an instance illustrative of the dry character of the climate here, I may mention that we found sheets of matting, such as are used at the present day, in the foundations of walls, still in excellent preservation under the layers of raw bricks composing the structure of the battlements, although, as we are assured and as history tends to prove, the place has been in ruins for eight hundred years."

It not unfrequently happens, as Sir T. D. Forsyth remarks, that when the fierce wind sweeps over these sand-buried places, objects are disclosed to view temporarily and again buried under the sands. In this way, if not as the result of actual digging after treasure, the Macartney MSS. appear to have been obtained by their finder.

I will now turn to the other class: those found in Kuchar and written in the Brāhmī characters. These must be divided into two sections: (1) those written in the Northern Indian Gupta, and (2) those written in the Central Asian characters. Buddhism was very early introduced into Kuchar, probably as early as the 1st century B.C., and probably through Khotan, where it was introduced in the 2nd century B.C.<sup>61</sup> In the early centuries A.D. it was a stronghold of Buddhism; later on that religion retrograded under the spreading rivalry of Nestorian Christianity, and still more so under that of Muhammadanism. It never quite

<sup>59</sup> See Sir T. D. Forsyth's *Report of a Mission to Yarkand*, pp. 122-127 ff.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 38.

<sup>61</sup> See Beal's *Buddhist Records*, Vol. I, p. lxxviii, Vol. II, p. 313, 314. *Journal, As. Soc. Beng.*, Vol. LV, p. 197.

accumbed, and later, under the early Mongol conquerors, in the 13th century, it partially revived in the Lamaitic form of Buddhism introduced from Tibet. This conservation of Buddhism, however, is not of any particular importance with regard to the question of the age of the Kuchar manuscripts. The early missionaries of the Buddhist faith were natives of Northern India, taking "India" in the wider usage of those times. They brought with them their Buddhist scriptures written in the Northern Indian characters, and when settled in Kuchar, naturally used those characters in their own compositions. Their converts, the natives of Kuchar, learned the use of those characters from their religious teachers. But in their hands they soon began to undergo a process of modification, which resulted in what I have called the Central Asian Brāhmi, but which, perhaps, it may be better now to call the Kuchari, as I have not met with this alphabet in any manuscripts except those which came from Kuchar.

The initial epoch of that process of modification it seems possible to fix with some probability, with the help of the evolution of the various forms of *ya*. I have already (*ante*, pages 216 and 217) explained the two divergent lines of this evolution in Northern India and Central Asia. The Northern Indian evolution commenced in the extreme portion of North-Western India (Panjāb, Kaçmīr, Gandhāra, *i.e.*, the country of the Kushāns), (say) about 350 A.D., by the introduction of the intermediate *ya*, and completed its course in the modern square *ya* throughout Northern India within little more than two centuries, *i.e.*, about 600 A.D. From the same extreme portion of North-Western India the Brāhmi alphabet, together with Buddhism, had been carried into Kuchar. With it naturally went the changes which from time to time took place in that alphabet. This is shown by the case of the Bower MS., and by Nos. III *ab* of the Fragments, all coming from Kuchar and thus showing that the fashion of writing the intermediate *ya* had been carried to Kuchar. Now it seems to me evident, that if the process of evolution of the Central Asian or Kuchari alphabet had not already fully set in before that period of the introduction of the intermediate *ya*, the influence of that intermediate *ya* and its resultant square *ya* could have shown itself in the formation of the Central Asian *ya*. But there is not the smallest trace of it. The evolution of the Central Asian *ya* has taken a different course, which proves that it must have begun at a time when the fashion of writing the intermediate *ya* had not yet begun, or at least had not yet become a settled fact in North-Western India. That means that the initial epoch of the evolution of the Central Asian cannot be well placed later than the fourth or fifth century A.D. Further, when once a native Kuchari style of writing

had been formed, it follows that by the side of it the Northern Indian style of writing can only have maintained an artificial existence, that is to say, it can only have existed either in manuscripts imported from India, or in the usage of Native Indians who had immigrated into Central Asia (Kuchar). It follows further, first, that the maintenance of the Northern Indian style in Kuchar (or Central Asia) ceased from the time the importation of Indian manuscripts or the immigration of Indian Buddhist teachers came to an end; and secondly (which is the main point in the present argument), that all manuscripts written in the Northern Indian style and discovered in Kuchar must, as regards their age, be judged solely by the rules that apply to Northern Indian palæography. This postulate applies to the Bower MS., to Parts I, II and III of the Weber MSS., to Sets I a and I b of the Macartney MSS., and to Fragments Nos. I, II, III (exc. III d), V-VIII, XI. It applies also to Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 of the Godfrey MSS. As to the final epoch of the use of the Northern Indian alphabet in Central Asia (Kuchar), it may be noted that no manuscript has yet come to light, which shows the employment of the final square form of the Northern Indian *ya*. Hence it may fairly be concluded that after the sixth century, no more manuscripts were exported or Buddhist teachers emigrated from India to Central Asia. This practically coincides with the great Muhammadan invasions, and is probably to a great extent accounted for by the troubles attendant on them.

I may add that those manuscripts which are found written on palm-leaf or birch-bark are evidently importations from India, and it may be noted, as a confirmatory circumstance, that neither the palm-leaf fragment No. I, nor the birch-bark fragment No. II, nor the birch-bark Bower MS. shows any trace of the Central Asian style of writing. As neither the Tār-palm nor the birch exists in Central Asia (Kuchar), the facts could not well be otherwise. On the other hand, those manuscripts in Northern Indian Brāhmī, which are found written on paper, I am inclined to believe, must have been written in Central Asia by Indian Buddhists who had migrated there from India.

There remain the manuscripts written in the Central Asian Brāhmī. How long the use of this peculiar modification of the Brāhmī remained current in Central Asia (Kuchar), it is for me impossible at present to say. I know of no direct evidence. The ruling race in Central Asia, up to the time of the Mongols, were the Uighur tribes of Turks. It is well-known that they were a literate people, and that they adopted a modification of the Syriac characters from the Nestorian missionaries who came among them from the 6th century A.D., if not earlier. This modified Syriac became their national characters, and is known as the

Uighur. This adoption by them of a species of Syriac characters is significant, in view of the fact that there was at the time already in use among them a Sanskritic alphabet, the Central Asian Brāhmī (not to be mentioned at all the artificial Northern Indian). Probably that circumstance shows (1) that the Central Asian Brāhmī was the peculiar property of the Buddhists among them, and (2) that Buddhism was dominant among them to a minority, consisting of monks, but that the bulk of the nation had adopted Christianity, which accounts for their being frequently designated as *Tarsi* (or Christian).<sup>62</sup> Later on, the bulk of them adopted Muhammadanism, and with it the alphabet peculiar to

From this it would follow that as Buddhism gradually dwindled among them, the knowledge and use of the Central Asian Brāhmī died out. How soon this was the case, I do not know; but it seems certain that the knowledge of that alphabet had entirely died out by the time of the rise of the Mongol power in the 12th century A.D.; otherwise it is difficult to account for the fact of the Uighur characters being selected by a Tibetan Buddhist for the purpose of forming a Mongol alphabet.<sup>63</sup> If the Central Asian Brāhmī had still survived at that time, one would have expected a Buddhist to choose that peculiarly Buddhist alphabet in preference to the Uighur. I am disposed to believe that it had already died out some centuries previous to the elaboration of the Mongol characters.

Arranged chronologically, the manuscripts in the Central Asian Brāhmī may be placed thus: Fragments III<sup>d</sup>, IV and IX are the earliest and may belong to the 5th century A.D. Next come Parts I, V, VI, VII of the Weber MSS., which may belong to the 6th century. Then follow Part VI of the Weber MSS. and Fragment X, which may be assigned to the 6th or 7th centuries. Lastly come Part VIII of the Weber MSS. and Fragment XII, which may be as late as the 8th century. The Godfrey MSS., Nos. 6-15, which are written in the cursive Central Asian, are difficult to adjudge, and I will not attempt to estimate their exact age.

With regard to the language in which the Central Asian manuscripts are written, it may be noted that the following are written in Turki (Uighur?). First: the Godfrey MSS. Nos. 4 and 5 (Plate IV), which are written in Northern Indian Brāhmī; and secondly, Part IX of the Weber MSS. and the Kashgar MS., which are written in Central Asian Brāhmī. To the latter may be added the Godfrey MSS. Nos. 6-15, which are in an unknown (Turki or Chinese) language, and in cursive

<sup>62</sup> See N. Elias' *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, p. 96.

<sup>63</sup> See Koeppen's *Religion des Buddha*, Vol. II, pp. 99, 100.



Central Asian. It will be seen, that only a small number of manuscripts are written in a language which is not Sanskrit; the majority are written in Sanskrit. This goes to confirm the fact, also otherwise known, that, as a rule, the Turki-Uighur used their own Uighur characters for their native literature, and the Brāhmī, whether of the Northern Indian or of the Central Asian type, was practically limited to the Buddhists and to Sanskrit literature imported by them from India. And this further tends to show that the employment of the Central Asian type of Brāhmī is not likely to have survived for very long the cessation of the use of the Northern Indian type of Brāhmī. The latter, as I have shown, must have ceased to be in use with the cessation of importations from India, in the 7th century A. D.

P. S. I have just noticed that the ancient name of Kashgar and of the country round about was *Suli*. See Beal's *Buddhist Records*, Vol. II, p. 306, note; also N. Elias' *Tārīkh-i-Kashgārī*, p. 8, note. It is curious that the documents, Nos. 8 and others among the Godfrey MSS., (see *ante*, p. 240) begin with *Suli*, followed by a numeral. Could it be a date?

