Introduction

1. The *Book of Zambasta* and the 'Tale of Bhadra'

The *Book of Zambasta* (= Z) is the longest surviving work of literature in Old Khotanese, the ancient language of the kingdom of Khotan to the south-west of the Taklamakan desert in what is now the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region of China. The work, which is an original composition in Khotanese though based on Indian sources, is a poem setting out the doctrines and traditions of Mahāyāna Buddhism in at least 24 chapters. Neither the original title of the work nor the name of its author is known. The title 'Book of Zambasta' was suggested by Sir Harold Bailey on the basis of the fact that the principal manuscript was commissioned by an official named Zambasta (*Ysaṃbasta* in Khotanese orthography). Of this manuscript some 209 folios are preserved in whole or in part, most of them (including those illustrated on the plate on p. 6) in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, St. Petersburg.

Chapter 2 of the *Book of Zambasta* ('Z2') is dedicated to the story of Bhadra, a non-Buddhist sectarian (*ttärtha-*, here for the sake of simplicity translated 'heretic'). Bhadra attempts to demonstrate that the Buddha is not all he claims to be, and in particular that he is not an Omniscient One (Khot. *sarvaña-*, Skt. *sarvajña-*). He does so by inviting the Buddha and his monks to visit him for a meal, where he sets a trap, explaining that if the Buddha remains unaware of the trap, this ignorance will demonstrate his claim to omniscience to be a lie.

The Khotanese text of this chapter is completely preserved with the exception of some damage to the folio containing vv. 7–18. Most of the first part of this chapter, vv. 1–30 and 43–138, was included in Ernst Leumann's edition of the manuscript, published posthumously by his son Manu Leumann (Leumann 1933–36: 6–27). The folios containing vv. 139–244 were first published by V. S. Vorob'ëv-Desjatovskij and M. I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja (1965) and soon afterwards re-edited by R. E. Emmerick (1967), with an English translation, notes and glossary. Virtually the same text and translation were included the following year in Emmerick's complete edition of the *Book of Zambasta*, but the earlier article remains extremely useful since the 1968 edition includes only a few notes and no glossary. The whole text, in so far as it was then known, was translated into Italian by Mauro Maggi (2004). Finally, the one missing folio, containing vv. 31–42, was brought to light and edited by Nicholas and Ursula Sims-Williams in 2023.

Apart from the 'colophons' at the end of some chapters, the *Book of Zambasta* is written entirely in verse. It makes use of three metres, conventionally referred to as A, B and C, of which two are attested in Chapter 2: metre A for the main narrative and metre C for the verses emitted by the gong (vv. 105–22). In both metres, a verse consists of two parallel hemistichs. In the manuscript each verse is written in a single long line divided into four columns separated by spaces (see the plate on p. 6). In principle, these spaces should mark the end of the first hemistich and the caesura within each hemistich, but the scribe sometimes disregards the metrical structure of the verses in order to achieve a more regular appearance on the page. Here (as in Leumann's edition, but not Emmerick's) the layout has been modified in order to conform more closely to the assumed structure of the verses. For practical reasons, the two hemistichs which together form each numbered verse are not presented in a single line, but (as in almost all editions) in two lines.

For those interested in the metrical structure of the verses, a brief metrical analysis and a metrically scanned text are provided on pp. 79–102 below.

As noted in *Intro*. §29.30: 'Since the *Book of Zambasta* is a poem, the word order very often diverges from that of standard prose for the purpose of accommodating words into the metrical scheme'. Many sentences from the *Book of Zambasta* are in fact cited throughout Emmerick's 'Introduction', but there the words 'have been placed ... in the standard prose word order' (*ibid*., 4). Old Khotanese, as attested by the manuscripts of Z, also differs from that taught in the 'Introduction' in several other ways. In the first place, for pedagogical purposes, Emmerick presents an idealized form of the language, distinguishing more systematically than most Old Khotanese manuscripts between forms such as nom. sg. *-ä* and gen. sg. *-i* in *a*-stem nouns or 3 sg. pres. act. *-ätä* and mid. *-äte* in type A verbs. Moreover, since the principal manuscript of Z is a 7th- or 8th-century copy of a work probably composed in the 5th century, we have to consider the possibility that the scribe and his predecessors may have introduced forms or spellings characteristic of the language of their own times. Where apparently later forms appear in the manuscript, it may be that the text originally contained an older form, as is sometimes suggested by the metre, e.g. *ttata* 'money' (v. 30), probably to be read *ttatatu*. On the other hand, it is clear that both formal (usually longer) and vernacular (usually shorter) forms of certain words were available to the poet, who could use whichever was metrically convenient in any particular context. For example, in v. 204 we find *cī* (scanning as a monosyllable) for older *cītä*, *cīyä* 'when, if'. Elsewhere, though by chance not in Z2, it sometimes happens that *cī* is written but the metre indicates that the older form *cītä* or *cīyä* should be read; conversely, the scribe sometimes writes *cīyä*, but the metre requires the reading *cī*. Similarly, though *hvāñäte* or *hvāñite* 'he says' is always so written in Z, the metre often requires it to be read as *hvāñe*. A form such as *hvāñe* has sometimes been regarded as 'Late Khotanese' (or 'Middle Khotanese', according to the periodization of Skjærvø 2002: lxx), but in fact such forms clearly existed in the colloquial language at the time of the composition of the *Book of Zambasta* and other Old Khotanese texts, cf. *hvemä* for *hvataimä* 'I said' in IOL Khot Wood 7 = F II.i.006 (Skjærvø 2002: 561), the script of which indicates a date not later than the 6th century (Maggi 2004a: 186).

2. Sources and parallels to the Khotanese version of the 'Tale of Bhadra'
<div align="right">(Jonathan A. Silk)</div>

The *Book of Zambasta*'s presentation of the story of Bhadra is clearly based on a version of the Mahāyāna *sūtra* known to us as *Bhadramāyākāravyākaraṇa* 'The prediction to Buddhahood of the illusionist Bhadra' (Bhmv). In this text, the frame story consists of the planning for the deception, and, of course, the Buddha's immediate perception of what is really going on. This work is available to us now in a Tibetan translation, preserved in the Kanjur compilations (Derge Kanjur 65), and in two Chinese translations, the older (plausibly) attributed to Dharmarakṣa (竺法護), the *Huanshi renxian jing* (幻士仁賢經, T. 324), the newer to Bodhiruci, *Shou huanshi batuoluo ji hui* (授幻師跋陀羅記會, T. 310 [21]). Of these sources, only Dharmarakṣa's translation is older than the *Book of Zambasta*. The availability of Régamey's 1938 edition and English translation of the Tibetan text, which also makes reference to the two Chinese versions, has meant that most comparisons

have so far consulted primarily the Tibetan text (often via Régamey's translation).[1] While its connection with the *sūtra* is obvious, the treatment in Z frequently deviates from the *sūtra* as we have it, though there are also places of close correspondence, as will be noted in the Commentary below when appropriate. The flexibility of the adaptation seems to be generally consistent with what we see elsewhere in Z when Indian materials are adapted.

While the relationship between Z2 and Bhmv has long been well known, what is less discussed is the connection of this story with another complex of stories built on the same narrative frame, a complex extremely widely known throughout the Buddhist world, including Central Asia, and likely to have been known also to the author of Z. This more widely known story is that of Śrīgupta, told and retold in Pali, Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan, referred to by Chinese pilgrims, included in Japanese tale collections and depicted in sculpture and painting. Régamey (1938: 3–5), following Leumann, already pointed to a Pali version of the Śrīgupta story in the commentary to the *Dhammapada*, in which the central character is Sirigutta (the Pali form of the Sanskrit Śrīgupta). In contrast to the framing of Bhmv, Sirigutta is a follower of the Buddha, and in competition with the Jaina (Nigaṇṭha) Garahadinna. Sirigutta proves that the Jains are not omniscient by trapping them into falling into a pit; when the Jains attempt to trap the Buddha in a similar way, he recognizes the deception and transforms the prepared pit with burning embers into lotuses.

In other versions, Śrīgupta is mostly cast in the role of the Buddha's antagonist (see Lamotte 1944: 184 n. 4) rather than his follower as in the Pali text just mentioned. In terms of primary sources, this story is found in the *Ekottarikāgama* 45.7 (T. 125 [II] 773c20–775b28; Anālayo 2016: 101 n. 26), and is transmitted as a Mahāyāna *sūtra*, **Śrīgupta-sūtra*, in Tibetan (Derge 271; tr. Liljenberg & Pagel 2021) and in three Chinese translations: *Yueguang tongzi jing/Yueming tongzi jing* 月光童子經/月明童子經 (T. 534) ascribed to Dharmarakṣa; *Shenri jing* 申日經 (T. 535), an anonymous scripture of the Western Jin period or earlier; and *Shenri er benjing* 申日兒本經[2] (T. 536) of the same date.[3] All these sources record the same basic frame story of an attempt to deceive the Buddha. This *sūtra* is also of some note as providing the motivation for the influential stories of 'Prince Moonlight' in mediaeval China (see Zürcher 2013: 207–8).

Alongside the scriptures, we also find the Śrīgupta story in Vinaya sources, which served as great repositories of narrative. These include the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya (T. 1435 [XXIII] 464b8–465a2; extracted in T. 2122 [LIII] 615c18–616a12), and the Mūlasarvāstivāda **Nidānamuktaka* (T. 1452 [XXIV] 443b24–445b5, summarized in Lévi 1908: 152–8). Story collections also recount the tale. Very importantly in the context of possible Khotanese familiarity with this story, it is preserved in detail in the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*, otherwise known as the **Sūtrālaṁkāra* (T. 201 [IV] 327c11–333a3, tr. Huber 1908: 361–86). In Sanskrit materials from Central Asia, which are preserved fragmentarily (ed. in Lüders

---

[1] In addition we now have another English translation of the Tibetan version (Kīrtimukha Translation Group 2024), an abbreviated translation from Chinese (Chang 1983: 3–22) and an anonymous rendering from Chinese at https://lapislazulitexts.com/tripitaka/T0310-LL-21-bhadra/. Largely overlooked, although duly mentioned by Régamey (1938: 2), is the fact that already Leumann (1933–36: 361–6) gave a paraphrase of the *sūtra*, as well as of the Śrīgupta story (1933–36: 366–7) to be mentioned below. For fuller references to the text see https://bibliography.openphilology.eu/bibliography/sutra/21/

[2] Variously known as *Shenri'er jing* 申日兒經; *Shenridou ben jing* 申日兜本經; *Shenridou jing* 申日兜經; 申日兒本經; *Shenyuedou ben jing* 申日兜本經.

[3] There is an unusual amount of controversy over the ascription of these translations; see https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/665/.

1926: 184–8), the story is called the *Śrīguptacarita*. This version was discussed by Lévi (1908: 152–9). The story is also retold in the 11th century as the 8th chapter of the *Bodhi-sattvāvadānakalpalatā* of Kṣemendra, a text very widely known in Tibet (ed. in Tibetan and Sanskrit in Straube 2009: 94–109, tr. 249–54, cf. also the translation of a prose retelling in Black 1997: 39–42).

Further references indicate how widespread the story was. In the travel account of Faxian (法顯), the Buddha's opponent is called Nirgranthaputra (尼犍子), almost certainly meant to be a Jain, who is said to have made a fire pit, and to have poisoned the food which he then invited the Buddha to eat (T. 2085 [LI] 862c15–16, tr. Drège 2013: 52; Deeg 2005: 551). The later account of Xuanzang (玄奘) refers to the place where the pit dug by Śrīgupta was to be found (T. 2087 [LI] 921a2–15, tr. Li 1996: 238–9). The story appears to have been alluded to in the account of Yijing (義淨) as well (T. 2125 [LIV] 209c17, tr. Takakusu 1896: 39). The story reached Japan in the Heian period, when a large body of narrative literature arrived from China. The *Sanbōe* (三寶繪), compiled in 984 by Minamoto no Tamenori (源爲憲, 941–1011), in its Introduction to *kan* 1 alludes to the Śrīgupta story, which must therefore have been already well known, by saying 'he turned fire into a pond and so was able to pass Śrīgupta's house without accident'[4] (Kamens & Bushelle 2023: 145). Somewhat later, in the early 12th century, the *Konjaku Monogatarishū* (今昔物語集) recounts the tale in full in its twelfth story (佛勝蜜外道家行給語, tr. Dykstra 2014: 36–7).

Finally, we find visual evidence for this tale both in Gandhara and in Kyzil (Kucha). For the first we have several scenes depicted in stone carvings (Ingholt & Lyons 1957: 77, no. 100; Kurita 1988, figs. 374–380), for the second we have very fragmentary wall-paintings (Lesbre 2001: 319–20). The literary evidence and the images from Gandhara, though not the Central Asian paintings, are discussed in Zin 2006: 124–35.

It will repay future research to investigate the context of the frame story so closely shared by the Bhmv with the Śrīgupta stories. One theme that ties together Z2, Bhmv and the Śrīgupta stories is the emphasis on omniscience. The Buddha's omniscience becomes a central concern in later Buddhist philosophy, but was evidently already a theme of great importance from the earliest periods of Buddhist competition with its Indian rivals.

3. The plan of this *Reader*

This *Reader* is intended to provide everything necessary for a learner to read and understand the Khotanese version of the 'Tale of Bhadra'. The beginner would be well-advised to start by reading, or at least skimming through, this introduction, especially the sections on the script and morphology, before embarking on reading the text.

The main part of the *Reader* consists of the following:

Text. The text printed below is essentially the same as in Emmerick's 1968 edition, with the addition of vv. 31–42, but omitting the manuscript's sporadic (sometimes clearly incorrect) verse-numbers and punctuation points. Square brackets [ ] indicate lacunae in the manuscript. Emmerick's occasional italics (indicating uncertain readings or supplements due to Leumann) are ignored. In addition, I have suppressed the hyphens sometimes used by Emmerick to mark compounds (to avoid confusion with the hyphen which I use for a differ-

---

[4] 火を変じて池と成ししかば、勝蜜(しようみつ)が門(かど)空(むな)しく過ぎ.

ent purpose in the metrical analysis) and have consistently transcribed the *anusvāra* as *ṃ*.[5] As noted in §1 above, the manuscript's layout has been modified in order to conform more closely to the assumed structure of the verses. As in Emmerick's edition (though not Leumann's), irregularities of spelling and morphology are left uncorrected, so as to show clearly the manuscript's mixture of forms—older or later, formal or colloquial (see the end of §1 above). For consistency, even the most obvious scribal errors are allowed to stand in the text, but the necessary corrections are discussed in the Commentary which follows.

Translation. The translation facing the text differs from Emmerick's to a greater extent. In addition to corrections resulting from the progress of research since 1968, some changes have been introduced to assist the reader who may not be an expert either in Khotanese or in Buddhism. The translation is therefore rather more literal than Emmerick's, words added for clarity but not directly expressed in the Khotanese text being placed in parentheses. The Sanskrit technical terms used in Emmerick's translation have been replaced with English equivalents wherever possible.

Commentary. The commentary following the text and translation includes references to publications since 1968 in which new interpretations of particular words or passages have been proposed, as well as explanations of difficult or less common linguistic features and points of Buddhist doctrine and tradition. Some of these notes summarize or refer to observations made by Emmerick in his 1968 edition and his earlier articles (1967, 1967a).

Metre. The brief metrical analysis on pp. 79–81 and the metrically scanned text on pp. 82–102 may help the reader to appreciate the text as poetry. These sections, as well as occasional remarks on such matters in the explanatory notes, conform with the theory of Khotanese metre and stress developed in Sims-Williams 2022. It is only fair to note that these matters are highly controversial (cf. Hitch 2024; Sims-Williams 2025a; Fattori 2025a) and that my views on the position of the stress in Old Khotanese differ from those of Emmerick and others in important respects. For example, Emmerick took the view that no word bears a stress on its final syllable (*Intro*. §1.15), whereas in my view all or most words ending with a syllable containing a long vowel or diphthong are stressed on that syllable. Consequently, a word such as *thatau* 'quickly' is given in the metrical analysis here with a different stress (*tha'tau*) from that suggested by Emmerick (['tʰa'oː], *Intro*. §1.16).

Glossary. In compiling the glossary I naturally made use both of the glossary to vv. 139–244 in Emmerick 1967 and of the glossary which Manu Leumann added to his father's edition of the previously known folios (Leumann 1933–36: 385–530). In general, the stems cited as lemmata are given in the same form as in Emmerick's 'Introduction'. All inflected forms are fully parsed, so that they can easily be looked up in the morphological analysis (§4 below). Since this book is primarily intended for beginners, it did not seem appropriate to give a full discussion of the etymology of each word, but some brief hints are provided for those interested in such matters.

---

[5] The *anusvāra*, a superscript point indicating an unspecified nasal, is traditionally transcribed either as *ṃ* or, if it is regarded as unetymological, with a hook below the vowel, e.g. *ą* (*Intro*. §1.10).

4. The Brahmi script as employed in the *Book of Zambasta*

<u>Vowels</u>

   a i u are short vowels;

   ā ī ū are the equivalent long vowels;

   ä is another short vowel, perhaps [ə], which often results from the weakening of unstressed *a* but can also occur in stressed syllables and tends to fall together with *i*;

   e o can be either long or short.

   The sign transcribed ' (in the original a hook under the syllable) may indicate a breathy vowel. Etymologically, it is generally associated with the loss of earlier **z* or **h*.

   Diphthongs and triphthongs include *ai ei au uī uai* and in certain positions *vī* (= *uī*), *vai* (= *uai*) and *yau/yo*.

   Note that *r̥* is not a simple vowel but equivalent to the consonant+vowel sequence *rä* or *ri*.

   The point *anusvāra*, transcribed as *ṃ* (see above, p. 19 n. 5), indicates an unspecified nasal (nasalization of a vowel, or a nasal consonant homorganic with a following consonant).

<u>Consonants</u>

Table 1: Old Khotanese consonants

	plosives			affricates			fricatives		nasals	glides
	voiceless	voiced	aspirate	voiceless	voiced	aspirate	voiceless	voiced		etc.
velar	k	gg	kh					g	ṅ	h
palatal				c/ky	j/gy	ch	śś	ś	ñ	y
retroflex	ṭ	ḍ	ṭh	kṣ?	jṣ?		ṣṣ	ṣ	ṇ	r
dental	tt	d	th	tc	js	ts	s	ys	n	rr l
labial	p	b	ph					v	m	v

   Note that *v* probably represents not only the semivowel [w] (thus *Intro.*) but also the fricative [v] (see Sims-Williams 2022: 39–40).

   According to *Intro.* §1.13, *kṣ* may have been pronounced [ṭṣʰ], i.e. IPA [ʈ͡ʂʰ]. However, it does not contrast with a non-aspirate equivalent.

   All Khotanese aspirate consonants are voiceless. The letters for voiced aspirates *gh jh ḍh dh bh*, which are not included in the table above, are chiefly used in Indian words. On the rare occasions when they occur in native words, they have the same value as the equivalent non-aspirates, e.g. *dhāta-* beside *dāta-* 'Law'.

   Single *t* is also not included in the table. In intervocalic position *t* is usually a historical or pseudo-historical spelling for a lost consonant, which may have been replaced by a glottal stop [ʔ] (thus *Intro.*) or a flap [ɾ]. In some such cases it alternates with *g* or *s*, which are also historical or pseudo-historical, or a glide such as *y* or *v* (depending on phonetic context), which acts as a hiatus-filler between two vowels. In consonant clusters (e.g. *st tr tv*), *t* stands for [t] and may alternate with *tt*, e.g. *trāmä ~ ttrāmä*.

   Similarly in the other cases of consonant doubling (*gg śś ṣṣ*), the single letter can be used instead of the double letter in consonant clusters. This is clear from alternations such as *bilsaṅgu ~ bilsaṃggu* and *biśye ~ biśśäye*. A similar rule applies to *r* and *rr* (on which see Del Tomba 2025 and forthcoming): *braṣṭe ~ brraṣṭe*.

   Other digraphs not listed above which probably represent single consonants are *hy* [hʲ] and *hv* [hʷ].

5. Morphological summary

The paradigms given below, together with the analysis of each inflected form in the glossary, should enable the user to identify all forms which occur in the text. The notation and terminology generally follow those of Emmerick's 'Introduction to Khotanese', including the classification of present stems into the four classes A, B, C, D and the use of the superscript 'i' in the paradigms to indicate an ending which has the potential to cause palatalization of a preceding vowel or consonant. However, for brevity I refer to the syncretic cases as 'genitive' rather than 'genitive-dative' and 'ablative' rather than 'instrumental-ablative'. Another innovation is the use of subscript index letters or numbers, e.g. 'loc. sg. m.' (or, if necessary, 'loc. sg. m.$_1$'), 'loc. sg. m.$_2$', 'loc. sg. m.$_3$', 'loc. sg. m.$_4$', to indicate forms which share the same function but have different origins (as opposed to the numerous instances in which alternative forms are merely orthographic or phonological variants).

5.1. Orthographic and phonological variants

The great majority of orthographic and phonological variants result from a series of predictable alternations (cf. *Intro.*, Chapter 29), of which the most important are the following:

In all positions:

1. *ä > i* and *vice versa*[6]
2. *rä/ri > ṛ*
3. *ei > ai* and *vice versa*
4. *au > o* (less often *vice versa*)
5. *ä/i > e* (by dissimilation) after a syllable containing *ä/i*.

In final position:

6. *-äna > -na*
7. *-e > -ä/-i* (less often *vice versa*, except in the case of the dissimilatory change mentioned above under 5)
8. *-o > -u* (less often *vice versa*, except after *r*).

In internal position:

9. *-n- > -ṇ-* in the presence of the hook *'* or after a syllable containing *r* or *ṣ*
10. *-yy- > -y-*
11. *-y-* and *-iy-/-äy-* alternate after a consonant
12. *-v-* and *-uv-* alternate after a consonant
13. *-t-* replacing *-y-* between two palatal vowels, replacing *-v-* between two rounded vowels (e.g. *-äye > -äte, -uvo' > -uto'*)
14. omission of nasal before consonant
15. omission of potential palatalization. See the next section.

---

[6] Note the strong preference for *-i* rather than *-ä* after *ñ*, e.g. nom. sg. m. *sarvañi* 'all-knowing' *passim* (Leumann 1933–36: 512).

5.2. Palatalization

Nominal and verbal endings with the potential to cause palatalization are indicated in the paradigms below with a superscript 'i'. The following types of palatalization are attested in Z2:[7]

Palatalization affecting the preceding vowel(s):

a > ī	(across *ḍ t tt d nth nd r v*) e.g. 3 sg. pres. act. *hvīḍä*, past inf. *hvīte*, 3 sg. pres. act. *pīttä*, *varrīttä*, abl. sg. f. *brīnthe jsa*, 3 sg. pres. act. *yīndi*, loc. sg. m. *vīra*, gen. sg. f. *ṣṣīve*
ā > e	(across *t nd r*) e.g. abl. sg. f. *hajvattete*, 3 sg. pres. act. *paysendä*, gen. sg. f. *tterä*
āmat > emVt	e.g. gen. sg. f. *syemate*, abl. sg. f. *bvemäte jsa* (once *bvemete jsa*)
ū > ī	(across *t ṣṣ*) e.g. 3 sg. pres. act. *tsītä*, nom.-acc. pl. **mīṣṣä*(?)
ū > vī	(across *r*) e.g. gen. sg. f. *kvīre*
o > vai	(across *tt*) e.g. past inf. *kṣamvaittä*
au/o > e	(across *ḍ r*) e.g. 3 sg. pres. act. *heḍä*, 2 sg. pres. act. *herä*

Palatalization affecting the preceding consonant(s):

ṃgg > ṃgy/ṃj	e.g. loc. sg. m. *paliṃgya*, loc. sg. m.$_4$ *paliṃju*[8]	
tc > c	e.g. loc. sg. f. *ūca*	
n > ñ	e.g. 2 sg. pres. act. *närmäñi*	
ṃts > ṃch	e.g. loc. sg. m. *ggaṃcha*	
ys > ś	e.g. loc. sg. m. *khāśa*	
rn > rñ	e.g. abl. sg. f. *urñe jsa*	
rst > rśt	e.g. 3 sg. pres. act. *parśtä*	
lysd > lśd	e.g. acc. sg. f. *mulśdu*	
s > śś	e.g. loc. sg. f. *biśśa*	
st > śt	e.g. 3 sg. pres. act. *paśtä* (*śt < st^i < js+t^i*), *grūśti*	

Palatalization affecting both vowel and consonant(s):

ast > īśt	only loc. sg. m. *dīśta*
ūs > īśś	only loc. sg. m. *kīśśa*

Some words cannot show palatalization because their stem already contains a palatal vowel or consonant (or both). Examples of the omission of palatalization in contexts which would not appear to exclude it are most common in unassimilated foreign words (as noted in Hitch 1990, the most detailed systematic study of Khotanese palatalization; see also Del Tomba 2024a).

5.3. Nouns

In the table on the facing page the principal noun declensions are listed with the most basic (i.e. oldest) spelling of each individual form. Some forms not attested in the 'Tale of Bhadra' are included in [ ]. For declensions not listed here, references to SGS and/or *Intro*. are given at the appropriate places in the glossary. Adjectives are inflected to a large extent

---

[7] Not included here are the 3 sg. pres. act. forms of the irregular type A verb *käṣ'*- 'to think' and of type C verbs (see below on the Present indicative active, notes iv–v).

[8] On these loc. sg. forms of *palaṃgga*- '(act of) sitting cross-legged', see the commentary to v. 156 below.

in the same way as nouns, but forms exclusively found in adjectives (see §5.4) are not included in the table.

Table 2: The principal Old Khotanese declensions

(*Intro.* §	*m.* *a-stems* 7.4	*f.* *ā-stems* 5.18	*m.* *aa-stems* 11.10	*f.* *aā-stems* 25.5	*m.* *ia-stems* 26.4	*f.* *iā-stems* 26.8)
nom. sg.	-ä	-a	-ei	-ā	-ī	-ya
nom. sg.₂		-ä				
acc. sg.	-u	-o	-au	-au	-ī	-yo
acc. sg.₂	-ä	-a	-ei			-ya
acc. sg.₃		-ä				
gen. sg.	-i	-ⁱe	-ai	-ye	-ī	[-ye]
abl. sg.	-äna	-ⁱe ±jsa	[-eina]	[-ye ±jsa]	-īna	-ye ±jsa
loc. sg.	-ⁱa	-ⁱa	[-ya]	-ya	[-ya]	[-ya]
loc. sg.₂	-u	-o		[-o]	-yo	-yo
loc. sg.₃	-i	-ⁱe				
loc. sg.₄	-ⁱu	[-ⁱo]				
voc. sg.	-a	[-ä]	[-ā]	—	-ya	—
voc. sg.₂	-ä	[-a]		[-ā]		
nom.-acc. pl.	-a	-e	-ā	-e	-ya	-ye
nom.-acc. pl.₂	-e		-e		[-ye]	
gen. pl.	-ānu	-ānu	[-ānu]	[-ānu]	[-yānu]	[-yānu]
abl. pl.	-yau ±jsa	-yau ±jsa	[-yau ±jsa]	-yau ±jsa	-yau ±jsa	[-yau ±jsa]
loc. pl.	[-uvo']	-uo'	[-uvo']	—	[-iyvo']	—
voc. pl.	[-yau]	—	[-yau]	—	—	—

(*Intro.* §	*m.* *āa-stems* 21.12	*m.* *ua-stems* 27.4	*f.* *uā-stems* 27.8	*m.* *au-stems* 28.2	*f.* *i-stems* 16.3–4⁹)
nom. sg.	[-ā]	-ū	[-uva]	-au	-ä
acc. sg.	[-ā]	-ū	[-uvo]	-au	-ⁱu
acc. sg.₂					-ä
gen. sg.	-āyi	-uī, -vī	—	-uai, -vai	-ⁱe
abl. sg.	[-āna]	-ūna	—	-auna	-ⁱe ±jsa
loc. sg.	-āya	-ya¹⁰	—	[-auya]	-ⁱa
loc. sg.₂		[-uvo]			
voc. sg.	—	—	—	—	—
nom.-acc. pl.	-ā	[-uva]	-uve	-au	-ⁱä
nom.-acc. pl.₂		-uve			
gen. pl.	—	[-vānu]	—	[*-aunu]	[-ⁱänu]
abl. pl.	—	-vyau ±jsa	—	[-vyau ±jsa]	-ⁱyau ±jsa
loc. pl.	[-āvo']	[*-uvo']	—	—	[-ⁱuvo']
voc. pl.	—	—	—	—	—

---

[9] Del Tomba 2024a shows that, contrary to what is stated in *Intro.* §16.3–4, all the pl. endings in the *i*-declension cause palatalization.

[10] Only *aysmya*, *aysmiya* 'mind' probably simplified from unattested **aysmv(i)ya* (SGS 324).

Users of the table on the preceding page need to bear in mind that the endings listed are often attested in several alternative spellings, cf. §5.1 above. On absence of palatalization before endings with the potential to cause palatalization see §5.2.

Forms with subscript index numbers in the table belong to the following categories:

Nom. sg.$_2$: occasionally, $\bar{a}$-stems have the ending $-\ddot{a}$ in the nom. sg., possibly borrowed from the i-declension, see *Intro.* §16.8. The only example in Z2 is nom. sg. f.$_2$ *dīvatä* 'deity'.

Acc. sg.$_2$: in a few declensions, nom. and acc. sg. are identical (and nom. and acc. pl. are identical in all declensions). In those declensions which have a distinct acc. sg. form, the nom. sg. may be used as an alternative acc. sg. form (indicated as acc. sg. m.$_2$, acc. sg. f.$_2$). Examples: acc. sg. m.$_2$ *balysä*/*balysi* (*a*-stem), *balysūñavūysai* (*aa*-stem), *nei'* (*äta'*-stem, see SGS 330–32), acc. sg. f.$_2$ *bvāmata* (*ā*-stem), *ggaṃḍya* (*iā*-stem),[11] *bā'yä* (*i*-stem).

Acc. sg.$_3$: similarly, in the $\bar{a}$-declension, it is possible that the nom. sg.$_2$ form in $-\ddot{a}$ (see above) is exceptionally used for acc. sg. The only example in Z2 is acc. sg. f.$_3$ *siyatä* 'sand'.

Loc. sg.$_{2/3/4}$: many declensions attest a considerable variety of loc. sg. forms. It is noteworthy that the loc. sg. forms which do not involve palatalization are particularly common in the case of foreign words. Without prejudice to the question of the origin of the various forms (on which see Sims-Williams forthcoming: 229–40), those which contain a rounded vowel ($-o$ or $-u$) without palatalization will be indicated as loc. sg.$_2$, those which resemble the gen. sg. as loc. sg.$_3$ and those ending in $-^iu$ or $-^io$ as loc. sg.$_4$. Examples: loc. sg. m.$_2$ *ātāśu* (*a*-stem),[12] *naryo* (*ia*-stem); loc. sg. f.$_2$ *parṣo* (*ā*-stem); loc. sg. m.$_3$ *ātāśi* (*a*-stem); loc. sg. f.$_3$ *ulatāñe* (*ā*-stem); loc. sg. m.$_4$ *paliṃju* (*a*-stem);[13] [loc. sg. f.$_4$ is not attested in Z2]. Yet another type of loc. sg. m. with an ending *-ña* borrowed from the *n*-stems is attested in Z2 only by *dāña*, loc. sg. m. of *dāa-* 'fire'.

Voc. sg.$_2$: in several declensions, the nom. sg. can be used as an alternative voc. sg. form. Z2 attests voc. sg. m.$_2$ *badrä*/*badṛ* (*a*-stem) and *brāte* (*r*-stem). Elsewhere in Z, voc. sg. f.$_2$ *anāha ysera* (*ā*-stems) and *ysamaśśaṃndā* (*aā*-stem) are attested in Z24.208 (cf. SGS 285).

Nom.-acc. pl.$_2$: a special group of *a*-stems has a nom.-acc. pl. form in $-e$ (variant $-\ddot{a}/-i$) rather than $-a$, e.g. nom.-acc. pl.$_2$ *date* 'wild beasts'.[14] An *a*-stem adjective agreeing with such a form may show either nom.-acc. pl. m.$_1$ $-a$ or (more rarely) nom.-acc. pl. m.$_2$ $-e$. The *aa*-stem *spätaa-* 'flower' also has the nom.-acc. pl. m.$_2$ ending $-e$ (here standing for a long vowel). Similarly, *puve* may attest *-uve* as nom.-acc. pl. m.$_2$ ending of a stem *pua-* 'footprint'.

Instead of (or in addition to) a nom.-acc. pl. in $-a$ or a nom.-acc. pl.$_2$ in $-e$, some *a*-stem nouns attest a nom.-acc. pl. in *-añi*. This form, originating in the *n*-stems, is not found in Z2, but two forms built on it do occur: abl. pl. m.$_2$ *päta'ñyau* and loc. pl. m.$_2$ *bāysañuvo'*, based

---

[11] Note *ggaṃḍyai* (= *ggaṃḍya* acc. sg. f.$_2$ + *-i*), where the contraction suggests that acc. sg. f.$_2$ *ggaṃḍya* is not merely the result of the scribe omitting the vowel diacritic for *-o*. A parallel case is *stunai*, Z22.159. (Differently Hitch 2017: 507 n. 24, where *ggaṃḍyai* is regarded as a simplification of *ggaṃḍyvai.)

[12] In Z2, this form is spelt *-o* only once (*ggūttäro*), as opposed to six occurrences of *-u*, but the contraction in *uṣṇīrvai* (= *uṣṇīro* loc. sg. m.$_2$ + *-i*) suggests a genuine phonological change of *-u* to *-o* after *r*. Cf. *inter alia* the usual spelling *rro* 'also' for what was probably once *rru (see Emmerick & Maggi 1991: 70–71) and the 3 pl. forms in *-āro*, *-īro* beside *-āru*, *-īru*.

[13] Note *paliṃjvī* (= *paliṃju* loc. sg. m.$_4$ + *-i*), where the contraction seems to indicate that the underlying ending is $-^iu$ rather than $-^io$.

[14] See *Intro.* §§11.11, 26.6, 27.7. On the multiple origins of this ending see Del Tomba 2022. Since *-e* is also the nom.-acc. pl. ending of most f. stems, the gender of some rarer words which attest this ending is uncertain.