

# 神戸市外国語大学 学術情報リポジトリ

Review article : P. O. Skjaervo, Khotanse  
manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the  
British Library

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2004-12-25 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 吉田, 豊, Yoshida, Yutaka メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/793">https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/793</a>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons  
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0  
International License.



## 書評論文

Prods Oktor Skjaervø, with contribution by U. Sims-Williams, *Khotanese manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library. A complete catalogue with texts and translations*, London, The British Library, 2002, lxxviii+609 pp. with 8 plates.

吉 田 豊  
Yutaka Yoshida

Khotanese is a member of the Indo-European language family. It belongs to the Iranian branch of the Indo-Iranian subgroup of that family and is one of the eastern group of Middle Iranian languages comprising such dead languages as Bactrian, Choresmian, Sogdian, and Tumshuqese. It was once spoken in what is now Khotan, an oasis city located at the southern edge of the Tarim basin. The Khotanese language is the most closely related to Tumshuqese spoken in an oasis just opposite of Khotan across the Taklamakan desert and the two are sometimes referred to as Khotanese Saka and Tumshuqese Saka on the assumption that one part of a nomadic people called Saka had settled in the western part of the Tarim basin while the main part invaded Gandhāra and Seistān (<\**Sakastāna*) in eastern Iran during the second and first centuries BCE. Khotanese was spoken until the early 11th century when the city state was conquered by Turkish speaking Qarakhanids, and since when the local people adopted Turkish and Islam. During the 10th century possibly under the pressure of Islamic invasion the royal family of Khotan tried to form an alliance with

another Buddhist oasis state of Dunhuang located far east in the western frontier of China.

Pre-Islamic Khotan had been a centre of the Mahāyāna Buddhism and both the royal family and ordinary people were devotees of Buddhism who sponsored numerous monks and temples, as the result of which a large number of Buddhist Sanskrit texts were copied. Under this strong Buddhist and Indian influence they adopted Brahmī script to write their own language and translated popular texts into Khotanese. All these pre-Islamic Khotanese materials had been consigned to oblivion for almost nine centuries when towards the end of the 19th century Western travellers and those attached to Russian and British consulates based on Kashgar acquired bunch of old manuscripts from the local people. The early 20th century saw many expeditions sent from Europe and Japan to the Tarim basin, and the ruins in Khotan and a cave temple of Dunhuang yielded many manuscript remains as well as archaeological objects. Of course the recent archaeological surveys conducted by the Chinese have also brought to light several Khotanese texts. Thus Khotanese mss. are now preserved in the libraries of Europe, China, and Japan.

The Khotanese section of the British Library collection comprises thousands of manuscript fragments and is the richest and most variegated among the comparable collections housed in libraries all over the world. They come from various sources; while the major part was acquired by A. Stein during his four expeditions, the rest consists of various groups of mss. which were mainly purchased from the local people resident in Khotan and entered the British Library in several occasions. Particularly worth mentioning is the fact that thanks to A. Stein's meticulous effort every single ms. of the Stein collection is provided with a signature indicating its place of discovery. Only from Stein's records we now know that the bulk of the Khotanese materials originating from Khotan and currently preserved in Stockholm (so-called Hedin collection) and St. Petersburg were unearthed in the eastern part of Khotan. Incidentally, Pelliot's collection of Khotanese

mss. kept at Bibliothèque National in Paris was discovered in Dunhuang and has its counterpart also in the Stein collection.

The study of the Khotanese mss. of what is now the British Library collection was begun by A. F. R. Hoernle as early as in 1897, who was followed by S. Konow. However, the comprehensive publication of the British Library collection was completed only in 1963 by H. W. Bailey in his series of publications: *Khotanese texts* I-V, Cambridge 1945-1963 and *Khotanese Buddhist texts*, Cambridge, 1951. In a series of articles published during some 40 years since late 30s Bailey also selected some interesting texts from the collection and provided translation and commentary; he also published facsimile reproductions of some materials which were accompanied by the text volume: *Saka documents* I-IV, London, 1960-1967 and *Saka documents. Text volume*, London, 1968. Nevertheless, Bailey's transcriptions were presented in such an inconsistent way that one often finds it difficult, if not impossible, to grasp the collection in its totality; sometimes texts found in one and the same ms. are dismembered and published in different places. In the meantime, M. Dresden published a handlist of all the Khotanese texts available in 1977 ("Khotanese (Saka) manuscripts. A provisional handlist", in *Varia* 1976, Acta Iranica 16, Tehran and Liège, 1977, pp. 27-85) but this list was based on the published texts and hardly gives any information on the location of each ms. in the library. In other words, very few people have had concrete idea as to what the entire collection looks like. Moreover, while one part of the Khotanese mss. was preserved in the British Library, the other was housed at the former India Office Library, which was combined with the former only in 1996. This was the situation of what is now the British Library holdings of Khotanese mss. when in 1979 Skjaervø first visited the library, at that time still two libraries, in search of unpublished materials of the Khotanese version of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottama-sūtra*.

Since Dresden's handlist solely based on Bailey's printed texts was far from being a proper catalogue, and because in subsequent years

Skjaervø had come across a plenty of unpublished fragments left unnoticed for almost hundred years, it was only natural for him and the staff of the renewed library to conceive a plan to prepare a comprehensive catalogue of the entire collection. However, to compile a catalogue of thousands of fragments in a not well understood language is no easy task. We therefore are most grateful to Skjaervø and the curators of the library, in particular U. Sims-Williams, who herself is a competent Iranianist and did much in assembling and assorting the manuscripts scattered all over the library, for finally making the catalogue public in this handsome form. (On the latter's contribution see also U. Sims-Williams, "Forgeries from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library's Hoernle and Stein collections", in: *BAI* 14, 2000 [2002], pp. 111-129.) As one can see from the foreword the book under review (hereafter *Catalogue*) is the result of Skjaervø's painstaking work of more than twenty years during which he not only spent his time on compiling the *Catalogue* but also published a large number of substantial works on Middle and Old Iranian studies.

The *Catalogue* consists of three principal parts: (1) introduction explaining the provenance and contents of the mss. and also briefly discussing the history and language of Khotan; (2) catalogue of the mss. arranged in accordance with the shelf numbers of mss.: (a) those belonging to the former Department of Oriental Manuscripts and Printed Books of the British Library, (b) those from the former India Office Library, and (c) the rest which either are not in the British Library but are known only from photographs, or currently belong to other institutions; (3) concordances and indexes by means of which one can look up items searched for from every possible corner, namely signatures, pages and numbers in Bailey's publications (*Khotanese texts* I-III, V and *Khotanese Buddhist texts*), photographs reproduced in various publications, and subjects of mss. Apart from them a detailed bibliography is provided together with eight colour plates showing two maps of the area where the mss. were discovered and reproducing some mss. for illustrating typical types of handwritings.

One may notice that the *Catalogue* also finds its place in the series of *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum: Part II, Vol. V, Texts VI*.

Some features of the *Catalogue* deserve special mention. In the introduction first systematic attempt is made at classifying the various ductuses of Brahmī script employed for writing Khotanese; Skjaervø also classifies stages in the development of the Khotanese language into three, Old, Middle, and Late Khotanese, and provides some formal criteria for the classification, cf. pp. lxix-lxxii. One may regret that Skjaervø applies his classification of stages of the language and ductuses only occasionally, vast majority of mss. not being classified. One may also be curious about the relationship between Skjaervø's three stages and Emmerick's two types of orthography, on which see R. E. Emmerick and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, M. I., *Saka documents. Text volume III*, London, 1995, p. 17 and M. Maggi, *IJ* 41/3, 1998, p. 284. The catalogue proper, which comprises 586 pages, is unique in that it not only gives description of each ms. (shelf number, signature, place of publication, definition of contents, etc.) but also provides its full text, transcribed afresh by the author, and translation occasionally followed by a brief commentary on reading and references to comparable passages in other mss. Translations are again prepared afresh by the author with the exception of Or. 8212/162 and 186, for which H. Kumamoto's work is used. However, translations are dispensed with when Buddhist texts are identified with their originals, and in the cases of well edited and well-known texts such as *Vajracchedikā*, *Siddhasāra*, etc. neither texts nor translations are given. In the description of each item one may miss measurements, which will be included in the database of International Dunhuang database Project (IDP); the present catalogue is also designed for use in the IDP web site.

Identifications of Buddhist texts are also to be noted. In the course of his examination of the mss. Skjaervø was able to join small fragments to make bigger folio and to identify many texts either as hitherto unnoticed parts of already known works or as so far unknown

Khotanese versions of certain Buddhist sūtras. Thus, many more texts of the *Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra* than were once edited by Emmerick are known now, cf. Emmerick, *The Khotanese Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra*, London, 1970. As for an example of the latter case, Skjaervø discovered three fragments bearing the Khotanese rendering of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* among the British Library collection. He edited them together with other two fragments of the St. Petersburg collection, cf. Skjaervø, "Fragments of the *Ratnakūta-sūtra* (*Kāśyapaparivarta*) in Khotanese", in: C. G. Cereti et al. (eds.), *Religious themes and texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia*, Wiesbaden, 2003, pp. 409-420 with plates 11-12. As for secular documents among the collection, which are considerably richer than those found in other collections, Skjaervø also made a lot of intriguing discoveries. His contributions to the understanding of these difficult texts were published in several places of the *Studies in the vocabulary of Khotanese III*, Wien, 1997 edited by Emmerick and Skjaervø, while his profound knowledge of the history of Khotan as gleaned from the documents resulted in a most learned article entitled "Kings of Khotan in the eighth century", in: *Histoire et cultes de l'Asie Centrale préislamique. Edition du CNRS*, Paris, 1991, pp. 255-278. The last article inspired a few specialists of the subject, who published their own theories on the chronology of Khotanese documents, cf. H. Kumamoto, "The Khotanese documents from the Khotan area", in: *The Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko* 54, 1996, pp. 27-64; Zhang G. and X. Rong, "Khotan between the second half of the 8th century and early 9th century (in Chinese)", in: *Tang yanjiu* 3, 1997, pp. 339-361 with plate 1.

What I have explained thus far is enough to show the great contribution of the present catalogue: we now have the virtually entire texts of the richest collection of Khotanese texts transcribed afresh by the most competent scholar. Moreover, in the case of unidentified Buddhist texts and secular documents, provisional translations are also provided. Last but not least, Skjaervø included in this catalogue some non-Khotanese texts which are incorporated into

IOL Khot plates, with a welcome result that some Tumshuqese, Tokharian, and Sanskrit fragments are made public for the first time. (Incidentally, IOL Khot 221 transcribed in page 479 is not written in Kharosṣṭhī but in Brahmī script.) Skjaervø's brave decision to furnish translations to most of the texts is to be highly appreciated, because non-specialists of Khotanese philology are profited from reading his translations: Buddhologists will certainly be able to find out the originals of Khotanese texts, while historians may discover interesting historical facts or recover social structures of the small oasis state in Chinese Turkestan. Skjaervø's translation of all these secular documents happened to bring about a most propitious circumstance for those who are interested in the pre-Islamic history of Central Asia, nowadays commonly referred to as "Silk Road studies": almost all the documents discovered from the Khotan area are now provided with translations, namely Hedin collection translated by Bailey (*Khotanese text* IV), St. Petersburg collection edited by Emmerick and Vorob'eva-Desjatovskaja (*Saka documents text volume III*), and the present collection.

In what follows, I refer to a few items to exemplify how useful the *Catalogue* is even to non-specialists.

Basing on Skjaervø's English renderings the present reviewer was able to identify the following four fragments as the Khotanese version of the *Rāsmivimalaviśuddhaprabhā-dhāraṇī*, of which the Chinese version is found in the *Taisho Tripitaka* vol. 19, no. 1024, pp. 717-721:

Or. 6402B/2.1 (folio 9; p. 24): T.T. vol. 19, p. 719a10-16; b6-10 (correspondences are somewhat obscure; can the folio number be correct?)

Or. 6402B/2.4 (folio 10; p. 25): T.T. vol. 19, p. 718b19-27 (facsimile reproduction of the recto side is published in: *The Silk Road. Trade, travel, war and faith*, ed. by S. Whitfield with U. Sims-Williams, London, 2004, p. 163, no. 66)

IOL Khot 172/4 (folio number lost; p. 383): T.T. vol. 19, p. 720b26-c12



IOL Khot 172/5 (folio number lost; p. 384): T.T. vol. 19, p. 720c11-20

Incidentally, SI M 44.1 (folio 26, cf. Emmerick and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, *op. cit.*, p. 233), one of the St. Petersburg collection, is a folio from another ms., cf. Yoshida, *BSOAS* 60/3, 1997, p. 568; it corresponds to T.T. vol. 19, p. 720b10-19.

Sinologists will find no difficulty in identifying *pem'ba'si* of IOL Khot Wood 3 (p. 560) with a Chinese title *bingmashi* 兵馬使 “commissioner for foot and horse” which is actually attested in one Chinese document of the Tang period discovered in Khotan, cf. H. Maspéro, *Les documents chinois de la troisième expédition de Sir Aurel Stein en Asie Centrale*, London, 1953, p. 186, no. 448=Balawaste 0163. The possibility may even be envisaged that the Chinese document dated to a certain day of the 5th month of 789 C.E. refers to the same event as described in IOL Khot Wood 3 which was issued on the 14th day of Simjsimmja, month corresponding to the 4th Chinese month. The Khotanese document in question is a message sent to *spāta* Sīdaka by *spāta* Tturgāsi in which an order issued from *sūkṣuḥa* of Phema is transferred: Sīdaka is to collect and deliver three pack-animals(?). As I once showed (cf. Yoshida, *ibid.*), *sūkṣuḥa* is a transcription of *shouzhuo* 守捉 “garrison” based in an oasis city of Phema, of which the Chinese designation was Kancheng 坎城. Thus, the document gives a clear hint at the administrative system installed by the Chinese army of the Tang Empire garrisoned in the Tarim basin: the Chinese did not collect their provisions directly from individual taxpayers but indirectly from Khotanese officials. One actually finds a Chinese document (Dx. 18915) issued by the Chinese army to the local people of Gaysāta to deliver certain amount of wool, cf. Zhang and Rong, *Dunhuang Tulufan yanjiu* 6, 2002, pp. 222-224; apparently the order was translated into Khotanese and transferred to a local official rather than to individuals.

Present reviewer is particularly happy to find out *chaupam* in Or. 12637/13 (p. 123), which was read as *raupam* by Bailey, cf. *Khotanese*

texts V, p. 277. In my recent article I argued that *chaupam* is to be compared with Turkish *čupan* “minor official, village headman” and with Bactrian *σωπανο* “id.”, cf. Yoshida, “Some reflections about the origin of *čamūk*”, in: T. Moriyasu (ed.), *Aspects of international trades and cultural exchanges as seen from the textual and material remains unearthed from Central Asia*, Osaka, 2004, pp. 127-135. *Ustākajaña biša chaupam* may be translated as “all the *chaupams* of Ustāka”. Ustāka is most likely to be a place name transcribed in Chinese characters as Wuxigui 屋悉貴 (Middle Chinese \*·uk siēt kjwei) attested in Chinese wooden strips discovered in Mazar Toghruk, cf. E. Chavannes, *Les documents chinois découverts par Aurel Stein dans les sables du Turkestan Oriental*, Oxford, 1913, p. 218, *Xinjiang Wenwu* 1998/3, p. 104, and a still unedited bilingual document Dx. 1461. The fact that in the Chinese texts Wuxigui is often followed by *chiban* 叱半 lends support to my identification of *chiban* with *chaupam*, cf. Yoshida, *Seinanajia kenkyū* 48, 1998, p. 45.

Several documents bilingual in Khotanese and Chinese are included in the catalogue; Domoko C and D (p. 582; Domoko D is dated to the 22nd day of the 3rd month rather than the 12th) are particularly interesting in that they give a clue to the correct understanding of Khotanese word *pe'ma* which is generally translated as “wool” on the etymological ground. Those documents which are connected to the two texts in recording the collection of textiles in the 35th and 36th years of an anonymous king are not few; apart from parallel texts Hedin 15 and 16, Skjaervø made it clear that Hedin 1, 13, and Or. 11344/4 (p. 109) are also related, cf. *Studies* III, pp. 139-140 and *Catalogue*, p. 109. The Chinese counterpart of the textile in question is *shichou* 絨紬 “pongee made out of floss silk” which was one of the special products of Khotan noted by Xuanzang, cf. Zhang and Rong, *Tang yanjiu* 3, 1997, p. 359, n. 39. Since Hedin 1 describes the textile as *pe'mīnai thau* “textile made out of *pe'ma*”, *pe'ma* is likely to denote floss silk rather than wool. Close look at the translations leads one to suppose that Hedin 19, Or. 11252/30 (p. 99), OIOC photo 392/57 T.O. 20 (p.

581), and possibly Hedin 12 are also related to the levy of pongee in question. One is also induced to refer to the loan of *men-dri* “(a kind of) silk cloth” by a Khotanese named Li Sar zhong recorded in a Tibetan text of the Hedin collection (Hedin 2), because two Khotanese Li Sar zhong and Spa Yang Ber myi mentioned in the Tibetan contract are also met with in Hedin 1: *spāta* Sudārrjām and *spāta* Yamnivi, cf. T. Takeuchi, *Old Tibetan contracts from Central Asia*, Tokyo, 1995, pp. 187-190. According to Zhang and Rong the king in question is to be identified with Viśa’ Vāhaṃ and the 35th and 36th years of his reign correspond to 801 and 802 CE (differently Skjaervø, art. cit., pp. 266-267 and Kumamoto, art. cit., pp. 40-42; yet another dating is proposed by Kumamoto in his unpublished article entitled “The St. Petersburg bilingual documents and problems of chronology”) and the pongee was collected for the sake of the Tibetan king, cf. *Tang yanjiu* 3, 1997, pp. 349-350. Unfortunately, the reason why so much amount of pongee was demanded by the Tibetans remains to be inquired into. In my opinion the war expenditure needed for the battle fought against China over the control of Nanchao in what is now Yunnan was the main reason.

A number of name-lists are found in the *Catalogue* and the prosopography and the signature looking like a Chinese character *fu* 副 indicate that the majority of them were drawn up by *spāta* Sudārrjām just mentioned; the most extensive is Or. 11344/1 (pp. 104-106). In many cases the lists enumerate those people who served as *spaśara* “inspectors” or *ṣapāñara* “cooks”, e.g. Or. 11252/14 (pp. 93-94). This situation reminds one of the Tibetan wooden strips discovered in Mazar Tagh in which Khotanese watchmen and cooks are named, cf. Bailey, *Khotanese texts* IV, p. 100 and Takeuchi, *Old Tibetan wooden slips from Central Asia*, Kobe, 2003, pp. 24-25. In another Tibetan contract (Hedin 3) Sudārrjām hires one man for performing military service in his place, cf. Takeuchi, *Old Tibetan contracts...*, 1995, pp. 271-274. Apparently the service lasted more or less two weeks, because the lists often give two dates in a month with

an interval of about two weeks when a new group of people are supposed to go for conducting service, e.g. the 4th and 21st of the month of Rrāhaja, cf. pp. 104-105. Sometimes when several groups of people were dispatched on the same day, each group is preceded by a word *būka* and first to third *būkas* are known. However, the system of shifts is not clear.

It is to be noted in passing that Skjaervø is, in my opinion, wrong in following Bailey's translation of 副 as "COPY", cf. *Khotanese texts* IV, p. 71; the usages of signa in Khotanese documents clearly indicate that the Chinese character was employed by Sudārrjām as his signum. Skjaervø also wrongly follows Bailey in understanding two short parallel strokes encountered in Or. 11252/2 (pp. 85-86) as representing a Chinese character *xing* 行 (cf. *Saka documents. Text volume*, p. 34) and in translating it as "OK". As Kumamoto says, these two strokes are a kind of punctuation indicating an end of a paragraph, cf. Kumamoto, art. cit., p. 46. Similarly, *jun* 俊 affixed at the end of IOL Tib N 2220 (=Balawaste 150; p. 574) is translated by Skjaervø as "excellent", but it is also a signum, in this case, possibly of a Chinese official named Zhaojun 趙俊 encountered in a Chinese document, Balawaste 0160, dated to 772 CE, cf. Maspéro, *op. cit.*, p. 186. The signum is also attested in Hedin 8; here again Bailey takes it for a message in Chinese meaning "urgent", cf. *Khotanese texts* IV, p. 93.

When reading translations of secular documents one also needs to be cautious about numerals: Skjaervø does not always distinguish *ysā'ca* from *ysāra* "thousand". Emmerick translated the former as "thousander" and took it for a special term denoting a coin of high value, cf. Emmerick, "Tibetan loanwords in Khotanese and Khotanese loanwords in Tibetan", in: G. Gnoli et al. (eds.), *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci memoriae dedicata*, Rome, 1985, pp. 301-317, esp. p. 305. If one thinks of the ancient Chinese monetary system it seems almost certain that *ysā'ca* corresponds to *min* 緡 "a string of cash (comprising 1000 coins)" or *guanwen* 貫文 "a string of 1000 cash", the latter of which is actually attested in a Chinese document discovered in Mazar Tagh,

cf. Maspéro, *op. cit.*, p. 189. In those days each *min* or *guanwen* usually comprised less than 1000 coins so that there was a good sense in distinguishing *guanwen* from 1000 coins. However, in a Chinese-Khotanese bilingual contract, Chin. 壹拾陸阡文 “16 thousand coins” does correspond to *kṣasi ysā'ca mūrā*, cf. Kumamoto, *Manuscripta Orientalia* 7/1, 2001, p. 4, where Kumamoto reads *kṣasi ysārru būnā*.

What I have explained so far clearly shows that the book under review contains far more information than one might expect from the title word of “catalogue”. On the other hand Skjaervø himself admits that the period of compilation of the *Catalogue* extending more than twenty years has led to various inconsistencies both in translations and pieces of information given to each item, cf. pp. xxxii-xxxiii. It is also understandable that the book comprising more than 600 pages and containing transliterations and translations of thousands of Khotanese texts is not free from several misprints and minor errors. One sometimes notes misprints of Chinese characters; for example, in page lxxvii where a considerable number of Chinese characters are printed one finds three errors: 阿摩湖 for 阿摩支, 僕肘 for 僕射, and 洲 for 州. In a short section “the history of Khotan” (pp. lxv-lxix) I noticed the following lapses *calami*.

p. lxv, line 3 of the second paragraph: the Kharoṣṭhī document discovered in Endere is not a letter but a contract.

p. lxv, line 3 of the third paragraph: Suj-ab is generally identified with a ruin of Ak-Besim, cf. E. de la Vaissière, *Histoire des marchands sogdiens*, Paris, 2002, pp. 120-123.

p. lxvi, line 6 of the third paragraph: Xuanzang visited and stayed in Khotan in 644 CE; 629 CE (or more plausibly 627 CE) is the year when he is believed to have left China.

p. lxvi, n. 1: Casting of the coins named Kaiyuan Tongbao was not restricted to the Kaiyuan era but was begun already in 621 CE.

p. lxviii, line 12: The 14th year of Tianxing is not to be identified with 964 CE but 963 CE.

p. lxviii, in the middle: Re-examination of the question concerning

the dating of the era mentioned in Hedin 15, 16 and 24 was actually attempted by Zhang and Rong who proposed a very convincing hypothesis that the king whose 35th year was a snake year was Viśa' Vāhaṃ, cf. Zhang and Rong, *Tang yanjiu* 3, 1997, pp. 339-361. They argued that the king inaugurated his reign in 767 CE when the letter of nomination of Viśa' Vāhaṃ as king of Khotan seems to have arrived from the Tang court; before that he had only been a regent (*yauvarāya*). However, Kumamoto, in my opinion wrongly, refutes their dating in his unpublished article mentioned above.

It is particularly regrettable that one misses listing of the Khotanese texts found side by side with the Chinese texts published long ago by Chavannes and Maspéro, because they will shed light on the administrative system of the Chinese occupation: three wooden strips published by Chavannes (cf. Chavannes, *op. cit.*, pp. 218-219, nos. 977, 981, 982) and two paper documents (Balawaste 0160 and 0162) studied by Maspéro, *op. cit.*, p. 186. One also misses the Chinese texts of those wooden strips, the Khotanese sides of which have only been edited by Skjaervø, e.g. IOL Khot Wood 43. Incidentally, one small Chinese fragment among Or. 8212/1865 also bears a Khotanese text and a Khotanese text of Or. 8212/1700a (cf. p. 63) joins with another scrap preserved under the same signature which bears Chinese characters: 得百姓惣玖人 “find ordinary people altogether nine”. Speaking of bilingual texts, Skjaervø misunderstands a Tibetan text of the side b of Or. 11252/37 (p. 103): *spa : sor : zhang : la : spa*, which is to be rendered as “(sent) by *spāta* [Ṣanīra?] to *spāta* Sudārrjāṃ”. An ink inscription on a banner discovered in Dunhuang is not included in the *Catalogue* either, possibly because the banner has been preserved in the British Museum, cf. S. Whitfield, *The Silk Road*, London, 2004, p. 279, cat. no. 236.

In concluding this review article, it must be emphasized that all these minor errors never detract from the great value of the work which will no doubt remain to be a veritable mine of philological and historical data for many years to come.