

The papers of the Central Asian scholar and Sanskritist Rudolf Hoernle*

Ursula Sims-Williams, London

Introduction

Augustus Frederic Rudolf Hoernle¹ was born on 14 November 1841² in Secundra, India, the second of nine surviving children of the Reverend C. T. Hoernle. At the age of seven, he was sent to his grandparents in Germany for his education. After completing theological studies in Schönthal and the University of Basle, he went to theological college in London in 1860, and, from 1864 to 1865, he studied Sanskrit at University College London with Theodor Goldstücker. He obtained his Ph.D. from Tübingen in 1872.

Hoernle was ordained in 1864 and returned to India in 1865, where he was posted by the Church Missionary Society to Mirat. His work there consisted of preaching and teaching in schools. In 1869, he was transferred, at his own request, from active missionary service to work as Professor of Sanskrit and Philosophy at Jay Narayan College, Benares.³ From 1878 to 1881, Hoernle was Principal of the Cathedral Mission College, Calcutta, and, in 1881, he joined the Indian Educational Service as Principal of the Calcutta Madrasah. He worked there until his retirement in 1899, when he returned to England and settled in Oxford. He died after a short attack of influenza on 12 November 1918.

In 1877, he had married Sophie Romig. They had one son, the philosopher R. F. Alfred Hoernle (1880-1943).

The Hoernle Collection

Hoernle's interest in Central Asia began with the discovery of the Bower manuscript, a fifth-century medical birch-bark manuscript in Sanskrit discovered near Kucha in 1889.⁴ Encouraged by the success of the Russians, whose Consul in Kashgar, N. F. Petrovsky,

* I am particularly grateful to Prods Oktor Skjærvø for his helpful advice and many discussions on Hoernle and his work and to Klaus Wille, who kindly identified several Sanskrit items for me.

¹ For a detailed account of Hoernle's life and work, see Sims-Williams, 2004; Skjærvø, 2002, introduction; and Grierson, 1919.

² As stated by Hoernle in his Curriculum vitae (Tübingen University Archives: 131/21b, Nr. 25). Grierson, however, in his obituary of Hoernle, cites 19 October 1841 as his date of birth.

³ British Library Ms. Add. 43629, ff. 24-25: A. F. Rudolf Hoernle: "Statement of my clerical and missionary duties since my ordination."

⁴ See Hoernle, 1891; 1899, p. x; and 1893-1912.

collected manuscripts and other antiquities for them, Hoernle wrote on 1 June 1893 to the Home Secretary of the Government of India suggesting that the Political Agents in different parts of Central Asia might be instructed to make enquiries and obtain whatever examples they could.

Hoernle's suggestion was taken up⁵ and, between 1895 and 1911, the Government of India sent him 33 consignments of manuscripts for decipherment.⁶ The first consignment (unnumbered) was received from George Macartney⁷ in April 1895; the others, named after the agents who had supplied them, were G (Godfrey)⁸ 1-10; M (Macartney) 1-11; T (Talbot) 1; followed by H (Hoernle) 142-44, 147-152, and 156, numbered according to Hoernle's Register of Central Asian correspondence (1.1). These manuscripts formed what became known as the Hoernle Collection or the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia, now kept in the British Library, London.⁹

The manuscripts in Brahmi script from Sir Aurel Stein's first two expeditions in 1900-1 and 1906-8 were also sent to Hoernle, who was made responsible for cataloguing them (Stein, 1907, pp. 295-303, pp. 439-40; 1921, pp. 1432-59). He was also charged with the task of dividing them equitably between the British Museum and the Government of India (as represented by the India Office Library, London, and what is now the National Museum, Delhi).

In addition to the official manuscripts in his charge, Hoernle had a personal collection of manuscripts collected during his time in India. These included nine manuscripts which he first received in 1892 from the Reverend F. Weber, a Moravian missionary in Leh in Ladakh,¹⁰ and which he subsequently purchased and finally sold to the Bodleian Library, Oxford, in 1902.¹¹ He also owned 88 Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Hindi manuscripts, 80 of which were sold in 1908 and are now in Tübingen University Library. Eight others were sold separately the same year to Otto Harrassowitz.¹²

⁵ Hoernle, 1899, p. ii: "...the Foreign Secretary, Sir M. Durand, who also fully approved of the proposal, caused the necessary instructions to issue, on the 22nd August, 1893, to Lt.-Colonel D. W. R. Barr, Officiating Resident in Kashmir, and through him to the Political Officers in Gilghit, Chitral, Kashghar and Leh."

⁶ Unnumbered collection (Apr. 1895); G1 (Nov. 1895); M1 (Dec. 1896); M2 (Aug. 1897); G2 (1897); G3 (Oct. 1897); M3 (Nov. 1897); G4 (Nov. 1897); M4 (Nov. 1897); T1 (Dec. 1897); M5 (Dec. 1897); G5 (Jan. 1898); G6 (Jan. 1898); G7 (Feb. 1898); M6-8 (June 1898); G8 (July 1898); G9 (Aug. 1898); M9 (Oct. 1898); G10 (Nov. 1898); M10 (Nov. 1899); M11 (June 1900); 142 (1903); 143 (Feb. 1904); 144 (June 1904); 147 (Dec. 1905); 148 (Apr. 1906); 149 and 150 (June 1907); 151 (Feb. 1908); 152 (Aug. 1908); and 156 (June 1911).

⁷ Sir George Macartney (1867-1945), representative for the Government of India in Kashgar from 1890, Consul in 1908, and Consul-General 1910-18.

⁸ Lieutenant-Colonel Stuart Hill Godfrey (1861-1941), Joint-Commissioner of Ladakh in 1896 and Assistant to the Resident Lieutenant-Colonel A. C. Talbot in Kashmir 1897-99.

⁹ The artefacts (coins etc.) from the Hoernle Collection are still in the British Museum. The British Library collection comprises the transferred British Museum manuscripts, in addition to the India Office Library collection.

¹⁰ See Hoernle, 1893.

¹¹ Bodleian MS. Sansk.e.23 (P), no. 1091 in *Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. 2, Oxford, 1905, pp. 111-12.

¹² Hoernle's original sale catalogue preserved in Tübingen University Library, annotated: "Sammlung Hoernle Schenkung Otto Bayer."

From 1891 until his death in 1918, Hoernle worked extensively on the Central Asian collections. His main interests were Indian medicine, epigraphy, palaeography, and, especially, the decipherment and identification of material in previously unknown scripts¹³ and languages, namely Khotanese, which he was the first to identify as Indo-Iranian, and Tocharian.¹⁴

Hoernle's collaborators

Hoernle's earliest articles on the Central Asian collections (Hoernle, 1897, 1899, 1901) were published with the intention of making the material widely available as quickly as possible. For this he relied mostly on his own knowledge, but was assisted by Macartney and others with the Chinese and by D. S. Margoliouth¹⁵ with the Persian.

From 1903, the volume of material increased to the extent that Hoernle could no longer edit it all himself. As early as 1905, he arranged to bring out a series of volumes of facsimiles and transcriptions to be published by the Clarendon Press, the first of which he hoped would be ready by the end of 1906. To achieve this, Hoernle called on the assistance of other scholars. He did an initial sorting and listing of the fragments himself and then sent them to colleagues for further study. His papers record details of the progress that was made, but also provide useful and interesting insight into his relations with his collaborators.

Initial work on the Sanskrit manuscripts

In 1905, Hoernle wrote that he had "secured the assistance of several well-known scholars, among whom I may mention Mr. F. W. Thomas, Librarian of the India Office, Dr. L. D. Barnett, of the British Museum, and Professor Lüders of the University of Rostock."¹⁶ In June 1906, he sent 208 Sanskrit manuscripts from H 142, 143, 143a, 144, and 147 to Thomas (1.2.4); 139 Sanskrit manuscripts from H 142-144 and 147 to Barnett (1.2.6); and 97 items from H 142, 143, 143a, 144, 147, and 148 to Lüders (1.2.5).

On 25 March 1907, Thomas wrote to Hoernle enclosing his transliterations of the fragments and comments. These were, according to Hoernle's annotation in the correspondence file (2.1.1), then forwarded to Ernst Leumann in Strassburg in September 1908, together with the originals, which had also been returned.¹⁷ Although Leumann's student Kaikioku Watanabe wrote in his preliminary report (3.5.4) that he was able to identify almost all the unidentified fragments, his work was never published, and Thomas'

¹³ The unknown scripts proved subsequently to be forgeries. See Sims-Williams, 2000.

¹⁴ Part 9 of the "Weber" manuscripts (see Hoernle, 1893) included 25 leaves of a Tocharian manuscript, which he published in transcription in 1901, together with a further 17 sent to him in 1896, (Hoernle, 1901, p. 19 and appendix; 1899, pp. x-xii; facsimile ed., 1902). Already in 1893, Hoernle identified the language as being the same as that of S. Oldenburg's "Kashgar" manuscript (Oldenburg, 1892), which he thought might be "some kind of Mongolian, with Sanskrit technical terms interspersed" (*ibid.*, p. 40).

¹⁵ David Samuel Margoliouth (1858-1940), Professor of Arabic at the University of Oxford from 1889 to 1937.

¹⁶ MSS Eur F 302/14/5: Draft letter of 23 Nov. 1905 to H. G. Stokes, Under Secretary to the Government of India (Archaeology and Epigraphy).

¹⁷ MSS Eur D 723/4, f. 22: note by Hoernle "N.B. the MS. Copy of Mr Thomas' Contribution, together with the Original Fragments, belonging to it, was sent to Prof. Leumann in Strassburg... Sept. 1908. P.S. This contribution was received back from Prof. Leumann early in 1911."

contribution was eventually recovered in 1911 and sent back to him in March the same year. On 1 May 1912, he returned the originals and his revised text to Hoernle, and they were published in *Manuscript remains*.¹⁸ In 1908, Hoernle also sent Thomas six fragments of the *Dharmapada* from consignment 149 (1.2.4).

Lüders, for his part, published six manuscripts,¹⁹ which he then returned. In December 1911, Hoernle sent him five further fragments of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*,²⁰ two which had been returned by Barnett (H 147 SB 112 and 114) and three which had been returned by Leumann (H 150 nos. 9, 12 and 30). These are now, with Hoernle's accompanying letter, in the Staatsbibliothek Berlin, together with 31 manuscripts from the original consignment.²¹ The remaining 60 appear to be missing, perhaps lost during the war.

Khotanese

In a draft letter of 23 January 1906 to John Marshall, Director General of the Indian Archaeological Service, Hoernle wrote that he had recruited the assistance of the indologist Sten Konow of Christiania (Oslo) University to work on the manuscripts "in the unknown languages." As early as 1901, Hoernle had thought Khotanese might be related to some of the Pamir dialects,²² and he felt that Konow, who had been working with George Grierson on the Linguistic Survey of India, was therefore particularly well qualified to attempt to decipher the new language. In April 1906, Hoernle sent Konow 136 fragments from H 142-144 and 147 (NS 1-136) together with 9 fragments from H 149 and 7 from H 150 (1.2.7, and 1.2.8). After only two or three weeks, however, Konow accepted the position of Government Epigraphist for India²³ and had to return the manuscripts.

In 1907, Sir Aurel Stein published photographs of 3 leaves in a "non-Sanskritic" language in the report of his first expedition to Chinese Turkestan, *Ancient Khotan*. These were transcribed by Leumann, who recognised the title of the text, *Samghāṭasūtra*, and the name of the Bodhisattva Sarvaśūra. With Watanabe's help, he was able to identify the text and compare it with Chinese versions.²⁴ This led Leumann to write to Barnett asking for permission to study the originals. Leumann's subsequent involvement is described in detail in a letter from Hoernle to Stein dated 5 September 1910.²⁵ On 21 August 1907, Hoernle received a letter from Barnett saying that Leumann wished to borrow some fragments from the Stein collection. Letters were exchanged, and it was finally arranged that Leumann and

¹⁸ *Manuscript remains*, pp. 85-138: SA 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 16, 17; SB 2, 9, 53, 87. For convenience I have omitted the consignment number when referring to these manuscripts, using only the category number (i.e. H 144 SA 1 = SA 1).

¹⁹ *Manuscript remains*, pp. 139-175: SA 22-25; SB 12, 35.

²⁰ See Wille, 2000, pp. 137-145, for an edition of these fragments and a transcription of Hoernle's letter of 11 Dec. 1911.

²¹ See Wille, 1996. In 1906 he sent SA 8, 12-15, 18; SC 13, 15, 18, 31, 153, 154, 156, 164, 165, 169, 172, 175, 176, 183-185, 193, 199, 202, 210, 212, 227-229, 244; in 1911 he sent SB 112, 114, H 150 nos 9, 12, 30.

²² Hoernle, 1901, pp. 32-33: "Only a few of the words or phrases have, as yet, been determined, but these seem to prove clearly that the language of the documents is an Indo-Iranian dialect... To me it appears that it has its nearest congeners in the so-called Ghalchah dialects of the Pamir."

²³ *Manuscript remains*, p. 215.

²⁴ Leumann, 1920, p. 1.

²⁵ Preserved in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences: Stein mss. box 5, ff. 142-45.

Watanabe should collaborate with Hoernle on the first volume of a projected series on the manuscript remains of Central Asia. Leumann was sent the manuscripts E.i.7 and D.iii.1, together with the Sanskrit manuscripts E.i.2, 4, 5, 39, 41-43 specifically for Watanabe (received 3 and 11 October 1907), followed by all the fragments in the "unknown" language from the Hoernle collection together with further Sanskrit material for Watanabe (received 1 and 9 November 1907 and 29 September 1908).

At this initial stage there was some friction between Leumann and Konow, who wrote to Hoernle in January 1908: "Professor Leuman [*sic*] wrote some weeks ago to inform me that he has got the materials in an unknown language from you. The tone of his letter was not such that I should like to communicate with him direct, and I should be obliged if you would kindly let him know that what you asked me to contribute, was a specimen of the texts, with such remarks as presented themselves at first sight, and not an attempt at a final solution of the question of language. I had not, as you know, time to make a thorough study of the matter before I left for India."²⁶

Leumann wrote to Hoernle several times in 1907 and 1908 (2.1.2) and published his preliminary findings in two articles.²⁷ In September 1908, he undertook to revise Thomas' and Watanabe's contributions, and, in November of the same year, he agreed to be co-editor of the projected series. Their relationship soon started to deteriorate, however. Between 17 November 1908 and 5 September 1910, Hoernle heard from him only once, when Leumann announced (23 May 1909) that he had been made Dean of his Faculty and, at the same time, forwarded Watanabe's contribution, unrevised and without the original manuscripts to which it referred. On 28 July 1909, Hoernle wrote to Leumann explaining that, as he had received no reply, he felt obliged to ask for the return of the fragments and Thomas' article. Still without a reply, he wrote to Stein, "Why he should act thus, I am at a loss to understand. I have always met every wish of his... I can only think he must have taken offense at some imaginary slight, though what it can be, I do not know... So far as I know, Prof. Leumann does not communicate with Dr. Thomas either. Perhaps he may prove amenable to you. I hope and wish that that may be so, so that we may, at least, secure the return of the materials entrusted to him."²⁸

Leumann returned the fragments in March 1911 (1.2.8). His edition of them, however, did not appear until 1920.²⁹ Meanwhile, in 1910, Hoernle had published photographs and transcriptions of excerpts from the Khotanese *Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitā* and the *Aparimitāyuhśūtra*.³⁰ In 1911, Konow once again resumed responsibility for the Hoernle fragments³¹ and was invited by Stein to edit the Khotanese manuscripts from his second

²⁶ MSS Eur F 302/14/11: Sten Konow, Government Epigraphist, to Rudolf Hoernle, 26 Jan 1908.

²⁷ Leumann, 1907 and 1908.

²⁸ Letter of 5 Sept. 1910 (see note 25).

²⁹ Leumann, 1920.

³⁰ Hoernle 1910a and b.

³¹ MSS Eur F 302/14: draft letter to J. Ph. Vogel, 14 July 1911: "Prof. Leumann who had been working for 4 years on the unknown language materials... finally relinquished the task of contributing to my volumes, and I had to make a provisional arrangement with Prof. Sten Konow, who now works on those materials since April of this year."

expedition (1906-8). His complete editions of the Khotanese *Vajracchedikā* and *Aparimitāyūḥsūtra* were published in *Manuscript remains*.³²

Other collaborators

On seeing photographs of the Sanskrit fragments E.i.4 and 39 in *Ancient Khotan* (Stein, 1907, plate 109), Watanabe was able to identify them as a leaf from the *Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvātārajñānālokālamkārasūtra*.³³ As a result, in October 1907, Hoernle sent him the remaining fragments of the same manuscript (E.i.2, 4, 5, 39, 41-43) together with his preliminary transcriptions (3.1.1). Hoernle subsequently forwarded to him further Sanskrit manuscripts from consignments 149 and 150 (sent 7 November 1907, see 1.2.11, 1.2.15) and the fragments that Thomas had edited (sent September 1908). Leumann's revised version of Thomas' and Watanabe's transcriptions (3.5.2-3) were returned in 1911. Watanabe's preliminary report (3.5.4) was never published as such, but proved to be of invaluable assistance to Hoernle, as he fully acknowledged:³⁴ "I am under great obligation to the distinguished Japanese scholar, Professor Dr. Kaikioku Watanabe. With the kind intermediation of Professor E. Leumann of Strassburg these, and other, fragments were transmitted by me to him during his residence in Strassburg in 1908-9. It is solely due to his familiarity with the Buddhist Canonical Scriptures that the identity of the fragments has been recognized. In June 1909 he submitted to me 'a Preliminary Report on Studies of Khotan Fragments', containing his identifications, and collations with the Chinese Canon. In the following pages these 'Studies' have been, as far as possible, utilized."

Between 1911 and 1914, Hoernle sent Sylvain Lévi, professor at the Collège de France, the Tocharian manuscripts from consignments H 149, 149 add. (= additional), 150, and 151 (2.1.3). Four were published in *Manuscript remains*.³⁵

Hoernle's other collaborators included Edouard Chavannes, professor at the Collège de France, who, with Hoernle and Lévi, edited a bilingual fragment in Chinese and Khotanese;³⁶ Barnett, who edited a Khotanese and Tibetan fragment with Hoernle;³⁷ and the Indian historian F. E. Pargiter, who edited the Sanskrit *Vajracchedikā*.³⁸

In the event, Hoernle's *Manuscript remains* was the only volume of the projected series to be published. Nevertheless, much material had been accumulated for further volumes which remained unpublished at the time of Hoernle's death in 1918.

³² *Manuscript remains*, pp. 214-356: Ch.00275, Ch.xlvi.0012A, Ch.xlvi.0013b.

³³ See his "Preliminary report" (3.5.4), f. 42: "When my identification of this Sūtra was reported to Dr. Hoernle, through Professor Leumann, he had sent us the whole collection of fragment [*sic*] together with his preliminary transcription of the text very generously. With these materials I was able to reconstruct the lost order of leaves mainly from the comparison of the Chinese translations."

³⁴ *Manuscript remains*, p. 3. Hoernle edited the following manuscripts (pp. 1-84): H 149.x.1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25, 29, 31, 35; H 150.vii.5; Stein Ch.vii.001B.1, 2, 3; Khora 005a, b.

³⁵ *Manuscript remains*, pp. 357-86: H 149.x.3-5, H 149 Add.33.

³⁶ *Manuscript remains*, pp. 387-99: two unnumbered fragments from H 142 and 143 (Or.8210/S.9224-5).

³⁷ *Manuscript remains*, pp. 400-04: H 143a MBL 1.

³⁸ *Manuscript remains*, pp. 176-95: D.III.13b.

Hoernle's papers

In December 1918, the Librarian of the India Office, F. W. Thomas, collected all the Central Asian manuscripts from Hoernle's house in Oxford together with his registers, notebooks, and unpublished work. Thomas listed the collection on its arrival in the Library, and part IV of his list gives details of Hoernle's papers as described below:³⁹

1. Text, translation, and notes to the *Siddhasārasāstra* "in cursive Gupta" (3.3.5).
 2. Materials for studies in Indian medicine (2.2.1; 3.2.1-5).
 3. Papers referring to eye diseases (2.2.2).
 4. *Carakasamhitā* vocabulary: 3 volumes and a box of slips (3.2.6-7).
 5. *Suśrutasaṃhitā* vocabulary: 2 volumes and index (3.2.8).
 6. Descriptions of the scroll Ch.73.xv.001 and pothi Ch.83.vi.001 (3.3.4).
 7. 2 notebooks of transcriptions of Stein manuscripts: "plates X and XVI (Leumann)" (3.3.2).
 8. Description of the fragment Miran 31 (3.1.4).
 9. Tracings of inscriptions on frescos and pottery (2.3.4).
 10. Tracings for plates (4.4).
 11. (a) Watanabe's reading of two Chinese fragments nos. 150.52 and 151.⁴⁰
(b) Watanabe's "contribution" (3.1.1).
(c) Watanabe's "paper" (3.5.4).
 12. 3 photographs belonging to the "'gigantic roll' (No. 56)."⁴¹
 13. Envelope: papers on Central Asian antiquities nos. 87, 121-139 (2.3.1).
 14. Envelope: papers on Central Asian antiquities nos. 140-160 (2.3.2).
 15. Parcel of readings (3.3.3).
 16. Register of correspondence on Central Asia (1.1).
 17. Correspondence with Miss Lorimer⁴² and others on the Stein Collection (2.4.1).
 18. Proofs for several plates in *Ancient Khotan* (4.5).
 19. Typewritten distribution list of Kharoṣṭhī documents from Stein's first expedition (1.3.1).
 20. Manuscript distribution list for Stein's first expedition (1.3.2).
 21. Barnett's contribution to *Manuscript remains* (3.5.1).
 - 22.⁴³ Volume containing an index to Stein's Brahmi manuscripts and an index to the "non-Sanskritic" Stein manuscripts (3.1.5).
- Stein's map of the Khotan oasis and a photograph "Buddhist caves in Turkestan?" supplied by Charles Nouette of the Pelliot Mission (4.6).
23. Three notebooks containing notes and transcriptions of Stein's manuscripts (3.3.1).

³⁹ MSS Eur F 303/89: Lists of documents received from Mrs. Hoernle on Dec 12th 1918, and Jan. 10th and 13th 1919.

⁴⁰ Not found.

⁴¹ Not found.

⁴² Miss F. M. G. Lorimer (1883-1967), Stein's "Recording Angel," worked at the Stein Collection in the British Museum from 1909-18, and then, with Stein, in Kashmir until November 1922 (see Wang, 1998).

⁴³ Nos. 22 and 23 were added later (L/R/9/13: Committee papers and reference, library 1919-21).

In 1923, F. E. Pargiter published a more detailed description of these papers.⁴⁴ Several of the items in Thomas' list had already been mislaid, however, so it is convenient to have the original description to refer to. I have cited the corresponding "Thomas" number in each description below wherever it was possible. Pargiter's partial descriptions do not correspond to the present arrangement of the material, but are particularly useful when they describe items now missing. A systematic listing was only completed recently, and fuller descriptions of some of the items listed below can be found by searching under "Hoernle" in the catalogue of India Office Select Materials on the British Library website.⁴⁵

Broadly speaking the papers fall into the following four categories:

1. Registers and concordances of the Hoernle and Stein Collections.
2. Correspondence with scholars, collaborators and Government officials.
3. Notebooks containing transcriptions, manuscript descriptions, and published and unpublished papers.
4. Miscellaneous items.

1 Registers and concordances of the Hoernle and Stein Collections

1.1 "Register of Correspondence on Central Asia. Chronological"

This is a detailed list of letters numbered 1-160, received between 28 March 1895 and 8 October 1914. It includes details of all the manuscript consignments sent by the Government of India, as well as some personal correspondence on Central Asian matters. Thomas 16 (MSS Eur F 302/13).

1.2 Registers of the Hoernle Collection

Most of these lists detail the number of folios, the size, consignment number, condition, number of lines, and the script ("Kal¹" = Calligraphic 1st class; "Kal²" = Calligraphic 2nd class; "Ord" = ordinary; and "Blank"). Some of the items have additional annotations in red

The items are further categorised as S.A. [SA] = Sanskrit: complete folios; S.B. [SB] = Sanskrit: large fragments; S.C. [SC] = Sanskrit: small fragments; M.BL. [MBL] = Miscellaneous bilingual; M.BD. [MBD] = Miscellaneous Brahmi document; M.NS. [MNS] = Miscellaneous Nestorian Syriac;⁴⁶ NS.B. [NSB] = Non-Sanskritic manuscripts. Large fragments.

Several items were originally kept in a file case,⁴⁷ which, according to Hoernle's label on the cover, contained:

1. General registers of manuscript fragments sent out to scholars, in three parts: SA, SB, SC. All Sanskrit.
2. Special register of manuscript fragments sent to Dr. Thomas (with correspondence).
3. Special register of manuscript fragments sent to Dr. Barnett.

⁴⁴ Pargiter, 1923.

⁴⁵ www.bl.uk/catalogues/indiaofficeselect/welcome.asp.

⁴⁶ This misleading description refers to two fragments only, one Sogdian, the other Uighur.

⁴⁷ MSS Eur D 723 f. 513.

4. Special register of manuscript fragments sent to Professor Lüders.
5. Register of miscellaneous bilingual and non-Sanskritic manuscripts.
6. Folded registers of manuscripts, arranged according to language and scripts, enclosed in envelope.
7. Register of “Khotānī” manuscript fragments sent to Prof. Sten Konow.
8. Register of “Kuchārī” manuscript fragments sent to Prof. S. Lévi and returned by him.

1.2.1 “Register of Manuscript Fragments received from East. Turkestan / S.A. = Sanskrit complete.” Lists 25 items from consignments H 143, 144, and 148. Marked items were sent to Thomas and Barnett 13 June 1906 and to Lüders 12 June 1906 (**MSS Eur D 723/1**).

1.2.2 “Register of Central Asian MS. Fragments. / S.B. = Sanskrit. Large Fragments.” 114 items from consignments H 142, 143, 143a, 144, and 147. Marked fragments were sent to Thomas and Barnett 13 June 1906 and to Lüders 12 June 1906 (**MSS Eur D 723/2**).

1.2.3 “Register of Central Asian MS. Fragments. / S.C. Small Fragments in Sanskrit.” Details 318 items from consignments H 142, 143, 143a, 144, and 147. Marked fragments were sent to Thomas and Barnett 13 June 1906 and to Lüders 12 June 1906 (**MSS Eur D 723/3**).

1.2.4 “Register of MS. Fragments sent to Dr. Thomas on 13th June 1906.” Lists 208 fragments from consignments H 142, 143, 143a, 144, and 147. Also “Register of MS. fragments of the / Dhammapada / given to Mr. Thomas, 13 Oct 1908,” listing 6 fragments from H 149 (H 149. 130, 136, 195, 246, 255, 272) (**MSS Eur D 723/4**).

1.2.5 “Register of MS. Fragments sent to Professor Lüders on 12th June 1906.” Details 98⁴⁸ items from consignments H 142, 143, 143a, 144, 147, and 148 (**MSS Eur D 723/5**).

1.2.6 “Register of MS. Fragments sent to Dr. Barnett on 13th June 1906.” Lists 139 fragments from consignments H 142, 143, 143a, 144, and 147 (**MSS Eur D 723/6**).

1.2.7 “Collection of Central Asian MSS / NS.B. = Non-Sanskritic MSS large fragments.” Lists 136 items from consignments H 142, 143, 143a, 144, and 147. Marked “Whole collection sent to Dr. Sten Konow 24 April 1906. Ditto to Prof. Leumann 28 Oct. 1907” (**MSS Eur D 723/9**).

1.2.8 “Register of Manuscript Fragments of IInd Consignment / in an unknown language, sent to Dr Konow.” Lists the same items as above in addition to 9 further fragments from consignment 149, and 7 from 150. A note dated 10 March 1911 explains that “This [the

⁴⁸ Hoernle’s list goes as far as 104, but he omitted nos. 51-56. His no. 47 (SC 119) was, in fact, never sent to Lüders but went to Barnett instead.

list?] had gone to Prof. Leumann with IInd Consignment, 7. Nov. 1907. Returned by him 8. March. 1911” (MSS Eur D 723/7).

1.2.9 “Collection of Central Asian MSS / Biliteral or Bilingual.” Lists 25 fragments: 10 MBL (Miscellaneous Biliteral), i.e. 3 Khotanese, 1 Tibetan/Khotanese, 1 Sanskrit/Khotanese, and 5 Chinese/Khotanese (marked Chavannes nos. 1-5); 13 MBD (Miscellaneous Brahmi documents); 2 MNS (Miscellaneous Nestorian Syriac i.e. 1 Sogdian and 1 Khotanese-Uighur?), from consignments H 142, 143, 143a, and 147 (MSS Eur D 723/8).

1.2.10 “General register of No 149 / List of MS. Fragments in No. 149. / Mostly in Slanting Gupta.” Lists 342 items (Sanskrit and Non-Sanskritic, i.e. Tocharian). According to notes, nos. 1-35 were sent to Leumann, 48 others were sent to Lévi 22 Dec 1911, and a further 34 with 1 Chinese were sent to him in May 1912 (MSS Eur D 723/10).

1.2.11 “Register of Consignment No. 149.” Nos 1-35 were from packet X, of which the non-Sanskrit, marked with a red circle, were sent to Leumann 28 October 1907, the Sanskrit, marked with a blue circle, were sent to him for Dr. Watanabe 7 November 1907. The rest of the register, covering 149.36-91, is headed by Hoernle’s note “List continued on 22 Sept. 1908. No. 149 but Sanskrit not sent yet to Prof. Leumann, only the Non-Sanskritic” (MSS Eur D 723/13, f. 65).

1.2.12 “General register of No. 149. Additional Fragments in both / Sanskrit and Tokhāri Languages and Slanting Gupta.” Lists 172 items, of which 48 are Tocharian (MSS Eur D 723/11).

1.2.13 “Special register of No. 149, Add(itional) MSS. Fragments from E. Turkestan, / in the Tokhari Language, and in Slanting Gupta Script.” Lists 118 fragments. Nos 1-48 were sent to Lévi 17 March 1911 and nos. 49-118 on 8 August 1914 (MSS Eur D 723/12).

1.2.14 “Register of Ms. Fragments, sent to Prof. S. Lévi from Consignment No. 149.” Details of 35 items: H 149.304, 305, 307-37, 339 and 342; also H 149.338, a Chinese fragment, sent 28-31 May 1912 (MSS Eur F 302/18).

1.2.15 “Register of Consignment, No. 150.” Lists 52 items, 1-40 from packet VII. Some marked with a red circle were sent to Leumann 28 October 1907, others marked with a blue circle were sent to him for Watanabe 7 November 1907. Nos. 41-52 were sent to Leumann 22 September 1908 (MSS Eur D 723/13, f. 66).

1.2.16 “From Consignment, No. 150, Set VII. / Register of Ms. Fragments from Eastern Turkestan / in Northern Aryan language and Upright Gupta script.” Lists 7 Khotanese

fragments:⁴⁹ H 150.vii.1, 6, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17 (MSS Eur F 302/45).

1.2.17 “List of Central Asian Ms. Fragments / No. 150.” Lists 127 items (83 Sanskrit, 43 Non-Sanskritic, 1 Chinese). Nos. 103-127 are marked as being sent to Lévi, 28 August 1911 (MSS Eur F 302/15).

1.2.18 “Register of No. 151.” Lists 52 items: 40 Sanskrit, 5 Non-Sanskritic, 1 Arabic, 1 Chinese, and 3 illegible or blank. The Non-Sanskritic pieces were sent to Lévi, 28 August 1911 (MSS Eur F 302/16).

1.3 Registers of the Stein Collection (see also 2.4.2)

1.3.1 “First expedition of Sir Aurel Stein / Register of Kharoshthi documents from Niya Site. / (Share of British Museum indicated by asterisks).” A typed list of 473 items. This and **1.3.2** below are presumably two of the three distribution lists submitted by Hoernle on 21 August 1915.⁵⁰ Thomas 19 (MSS Eur F 302/43).

1.3.2 Registers of Sanskrit and Khotanese fragments from Stein’s 1st expedition from Dandan-Uiliq (39 items), Niya (1 item), and Endere (10 items). The manuscripts allotted to the British Museum are indicated by asterisks. Thomas 20 (MSS Eur F 302/44).

1.3.3 Register of Stein Sanskrit and “North-Aryan” manuscripts on loan to Hoernle dated 23 August 1912; “Register of the Rolls in Stein Collection.” These lists demonstrate the confused numbering of the Stein scrolls, which Hoernle listed for the most part by obsolete, if any, signatures. They have been annotated with the revised numbers in a different hand⁵¹ (MSS Eur F 302/23).

2 Correspondence with collaborators, scholars, and Government officials

2.1 Collaborators

2.1.1 Correspondence between F. W. Thomas, Librarian of the India Office, and Hoernle relating to Thomas’ work on the fragments and his contribution to *Manuscript remains*. 7 letters dated 3 January 1906, 25 March 1907, 9 May 1907, 25 March 1911, 19 June 1911, 22 April 1912, 1 May 1912 (MSS Eur D 723/4).

⁴⁹ See Skjærvø, 2002, for details of these.

⁵⁰ “I now send you the following three sets of papers.” (MSS Eur F 302/25: Hoernle to Thomas, 21 Aug. 1915).

⁵¹ For example: “some Buddhist work, total 39 fols” = Ch.00274; *Vajracchedikā* = Ch.00275; Ch.00130 = Ch.00120; Ch.73.xiv.001 = Ch.00263; Ch.73.xv.001 = Ch.00264a-c; Ch.76.xi.001 = Ch.00265; Ch.77.i.001 = Ch.00266; Ch.80.iii.001 = Ch.00267; Ch.81.vi.001 = Ch.00268; Ch.81.vi.002 = Ch.00269; Ch.82.vii.005 = Ch.00270; Ch.85.vi.001 = Ch.00276; Ch.88.i.001 = Ch.00271; Ch.91.i.001 = Ch.00272; Ch.91.ii.1 = Ch.00273.

2.1.2 Enclosures to letters of 28 and 29 January 1908 from Leumann to Hoernle:

“Fragmente in Sprache IIa.” Leumann’s preliminary identifications (unsigned) of the Khotanese fragments which Hoernle had sent him (see **1.2.8**).

“Vorläufige Liste der Stein’schen und der Hoernle’schen Sanskrit-Fragmente,” by Leumann (unsigned) including a list of Watanabe’s identifications.⁵² These were: *Ātānāṭiyasūtra* (H 149.x.6); *Upasampadāvastu* (H 149.x.20); *Upasenasūtra* (H 149.x.11); *Upālisūtra* (H 149.x.21); *Karmavipāka* (H 149.x.1, 2); *Catuḥśataka* (H 149.x.17, 24, 31, 35); *Cullavagga* (Sanskrit version) (H 149.x.23); *Dharmapada* (H 149.x.7, 12, 13, 18, 27, 28, 32, 34); *piṇḍapāta* (H 149.x.16); *Prajñāpāramitā: Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (H 150.vii.24), *Pañcaviṃśatikā* (H 150.vii.28, 37, 40); *Pratītyasūtra* (H 149.x.9, 33); *Pravāraṇasūtra* (H 149.x.8); *Mahāpratyagīrādhāraṇī* (H 150.vii.5); *Samyuttanikāya* (Sanskrit version) (H 149.x.10); *Samgītisūtra* (H 149.x.25, 29); *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* (H 150.vii. 9. 12. 30); *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* (H 150.vii. 22, 38); *Hastikakṣyā* (H 150.vii. 18).

Hoernle’s summary: “State of Identification by Prof. Leumann acc. to letters of 28 & 29 Jan. 1908.” Annotated: “The following Nos. X, 10.12.23, VII, 9.22.28.30, have been asked from Prof. Leumann for Mr. Pargiter 8/II/08” (**MSS Eur D 723/13, ff. 59-64, 67-68**).

2.1.3 Receipts for fragments signed by Sylvain Lévi (see also **1.2.10, 13, 14, 17, 18**):

22 March 1911: H 149 (“MS. fragments in the ‘10th Fold;’ total 9 pieces” and “MS. Fragments in a ‘Heft.’ Total 39 pieces”).

9 September 1911: “Tokhari MS. scraps” from H 150 (25 pieces) and H 151 (8 pieces).

28 December 1911: 48 pieces from H 149 and 48 pieces from H 149 Add.

31 May 1912: 34 pieces from H 149 and one Chinese fragment.

9 July 1914: 70 fragments from H 149 Add.

(**MSS Eur D 723/15**).

2.2 Correspondence on medical manuscripts

2.2.1 Letters on medical matters from Prof. J. Jolly in Vienna and Würzburg of 2, 3, 17, 20 July 1902; 9 August 1902 and 12 January 1904; and Prof. E. Fuchs of 2 July 1902, with enclosed announcement from the *British Medical Journal* of 28 June 1902. Thomas 2 (**MSS Eur F 302/3**).

2.2.2 A portfolio “Papers referring to Eye-diseases. Dr. Hoernle” containing miscellaneous correspondence, articles, papers and notes relating to eye-diseases 1896-1910.⁵³ These include letters from:

Dr. P. Cordier: 21 letters and postcards dating from 23 January 1910 to 30 March 1901.

M. A. Stein, Camp Peshawar, 1 March 1905 about the locality of Panjpur.

⁵² See Hartmann and Wille, 1992, p.48-49, for identifications of many of these texts.

⁵³ For a fuller description, see Pargiter, 1923, pp. 553-54, and catalogue entry for MSS EUR F 302 in India Office Select Materials (<http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/indiaofficeselect/welcome.asp>).

Prof. Jolly, 2 October 1907.

Birajacharan Gupta Kabibhusan, 8 November 1907.

A. R. L. Anderson, London, 7 January 1908.

Miss C. Ridding, University Library Cambridge, with list of medical manuscripts, 27 October 1908.

File of letters, 1908, from and to Col. Waddell, Mr. Walsh, and Dr. Thomas, with 17 folios containing extracts from the Tanjur, apparently by Thomas.

F. E. Pargiter, 23 April 1910.

Col. Waddell, 13 September 1910.

Packet marked "Correspondence and Papers, etc., Referring to Surgical Instruments of India."

Thomas 3 (MSS Eur F 302/36).

2.3 Correspondence on the Central Asian collections

2.3.1 Correspondence originally contained in an envelope labelled: "Papers on Central Asian Antiquities Nos. 87 and 121-139."⁵⁴ These letters were arranged in sequence according to the number in Hoernle's Register of correspondence (1.1). They date from 11 February 1901 (no. 121) to 11 July 1902 (unnumbered) and include:

Stein to Hoernle from Keriya Darya, 11 March 1901 (no. 125), and Kashgar, 25 May 1901 (no. 126), giving an account of his discoveries, and a description of Islam Akhun's confession to having forged and sold faked manuscripts and antiquities.⁵⁵

Letters (no. 127) on forgeries from Prof. J. Jolly, 14 July 1901; E. Senart, 15 July 1901; Sir C. J. Lyall, 15 July 1901; and A. Barth, 16 July 1901.

Dr. E. West to Hoernle (no. 128), 22 and 25 July 1901, on Islam Akhun's supposed "Pahlavi" manuscripts.

Stein to Hoernle (no. 129), 22 July 1901, on his revision to the introduction to part II of Hoernle's Report (Hoernle, 1901).

Macartney to Hoernle (no. 135), 16 February 1902, on collecting further antiquities.

Letters from Sir A. Godly, Under Secretary of State, to Hoernle (nos. 132, 136 and 139), dated 3 February, 9 April and 9 July 1902, on the transfer of Hoernle's Central Asian collection to the British Museum.

Thomas 13 (MSS Eur F 302/51).

2.3.2 Correspondence labelled: "Papers on [Ce]ntral Asian Antiquities ~~Nos 132, 135, 136, 139, 140-150~~ Nos 140 - ~~159~~ 160," dating from 10 September 1902 (no. 141) to 8 October 1914 (no. 160).⁵⁶ They include much information on the circumstances and find-places of all of Hoernle's later consignments (H 142-156). The correspondence also includes Hoernle's

⁵⁴ Includes nos. 121, 123-29, 132, 135, 136, 139 and one unnumbered letter.

⁵⁵ See also Stein, 1907, pp. 507-14. For a full account of Islam Akhun's forgeries see Sims-Williams, 2000.

⁵⁶ Includes nos. 141-160.

preliminary report on H 142-144 (filed with no. 145), dated 23 November 1905.⁵⁷ The items concerning manuscripts consignments are:

142: R. E. V. Arbuthnot, Under Secretary, Government of India (GoI), Archaeology & Epigraphy (A&E), Simla, to Hoernle, 25 May 1903, forwarding manuscripts.

143: L. Robertson, Officiating Under Secretary GoI (A&E), Calcutta, to Hoernle, 7 January 1904, forwarding manuscripts with attached note of P. J. Miles,⁵⁸ Kashgar, dated 16 September 1903.

144: L. Robertson to Hoernle, 25 May 1904, forwarding further manuscripts "and some wood blocks."

147: J. H. Marshall, Director General of Archaeology, to Hoernle, 24 November 1905, forwarding, separately, "some ancient manuscripts from Kashgar." Also Hoernle's draft report.

148: Marshall to Hoernle, 30/31 March 1906, forwarding manuscripts, woodslips, and antiquities from Kashgar, with enclosed letter from Macartney, 17 January 1906.

149: Sten Konow⁵⁹ to Hoernle, 11 April 1907, forwarding, separately, 17 packets received from Macartney in Kashgar.

150: Konow to Hoernle, 17 April 1907, sending more antiquities arranged in 8 packets.

151: Konow to Hoernle, 26 January 1908, sending antiquities forwarded from Macartney.

152: Konow to Hoernle, 16 May 1908, forwarding 3 small packets "containing scraps of manuscripts" received from Macartney.

157:⁶⁰ J. Ph. Vogel to Hoernle, 1 June 1911, forwarding, separately, "some scraps" sent by the Indian Aksakal at Kucha to Kashgar.

Thomas 14 (**MSS Eur F 302/14**).

2.3.3 Correspondence received from Government of India, Home Dept. (A&E), 20 July 1905 to 22 March 1906, relating to Hoernle's preliminary report on consignments H 142-144 and its publication. Includes letter to Hoernle from John Marshall of 22 March 1906 promising that Macartney will be asked "to secure as many more similar MSS for us, as he can find" (**MSS Eur F 302/17**).

2.3.4 Letters from Stein, Pargiter, and Miss F. M. G. Lorimer of the Stein Collection, British Museum dated 16 December 1912 to ca. 5 February 1913 and associated tracings and papers concerning inscriptions from frescoes and miscellaneous pottery remains (Ta. i with its painted base Ta. 009, Kha. i.312, Kha. i.C.0096, Kha. i.C.0074, and 3 other inscriptions). Thomas 9 (**MSS Eur F 302/12**).

⁵⁷ See also MSS Eur F 302/17 for typed copy of the same date.

⁵⁸ Assistant for Chinese Affairs at Kashgar during Macartney's leave 1902-3.

⁵⁹ Konow at this time held the position of Government Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India.

⁶⁰ Hoernle renumbered this consignment H 156.

2.4 Correspondence on the division of the Stein collection

Although Stein's first expedition (1900-1901) was financed by the Governments of India, Bengal, and the Punjab with assistance from the Survey of India, in his initial application for funding, Stein had promised that at least some of the finds would be deposited in the British Museum.⁶¹ These were temporarily deposited in the British Museum in 1901, and Hoernle was invited to examine the material in Brahmi script and to advise on the eventual distribution between the Government of India (i.e., the India Office) and the British Museum. His report was submitted in 1907,⁶² though the final division did not take place until 1917.

Stein's second expedition (1906-8) was financed three-fifths by the India Office and two-fifths by the British Museum on the understanding that the objects recovered would be divided according to the same proportion.⁶³ Although the basis for a division had thus been made, the details were argued about over a prolonged period, however. The disagreement chiefly concerned the division of the Brahmi material. In 1914, it was suggested that, with a few exceptions, the India Office would have three-fifths of the Khotanese and Tocharian material, as well as all the Sanskrit and Prakrit.⁶⁴ In January 1915, it was agreed that it should have all the Khotanese and Tocharian and four-fifths of the Sanskrit and Prakrit material, while the remaining fifth would go to the Museum.⁶⁵ Hoernle was requested by Thomas (for the India Office) and Barnett (for the British Museum) to divide the Brahmi material between the two institutions along these lines. Unfortunately it was unclear where the India Office share was intended to go. According to a Despatch of 22 January 1915,⁶⁶ it was to be sent to India not later than April 1915, with the exception of "material such as Manuscripts and other Documents of which the preliminary investigation is not yet complete." Thomas, however, assured Hoernle, "The disposal of the India Office assignment need not cause you any hesitation, as regards the ultimate destination of the MSS., which will, no doubt, remain permanently in this Library."⁶⁷

Hoernle's first proposed distribution was submitted 21 August 1915.⁶⁸ The first two lists covered material from Stein's first expedition: the Sanskrit, Khotanese, and Tocharian manuscripts from Dandan Uiliq, Niya, and Endere (1.3.2); and the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Niya (1.3.1). A third list included all the Sanskrit and Khotanese manuscripts fragments from the second expedition.

Owing to an "unfortunate muddle" over the the interpretation of the terms of the division, however, Hoernle was asked to revise his settlement.⁶⁹ On 24 September, he sent a new list in

⁶¹ Wood, 2004, p. 91.

⁶² MSS EUR F 302/25: Letter from Thomas to Hoernle, 2 Nov. 1914.

⁶³ As reported to the Treasury, 20 Dec. 1907, by Maunde Thompson, Director of the Museum (Wood, 2004, p. 92).

⁶⁴ L 211/50: copy of letter from L. D. Barnett to Sir Frederic Kenyon, 21 Oct. 1914.

⁶⁵ MSS Eur F 302/25: Copy of proposed allocation of Stein Collection manuscripts agreed by Dr. Thomas and Dr. Barnett, 22 Jan. 1915.

⁶⁶ MSS Eur F 302/25: Despatch to India, Revenue, No. 8 of 22 Jan 1915, enclosed in a letter from Thomas to Hoernle, 27 Jan. 1915.

⁶⁷ MSS Eur F 302/25: Thomas to Hoernle, 11 March 1915.

⁶⁸ MSS Eur F 302/25: Hoernle's draft reply to Thomas' letter of 18 Aug. 1915.

⁶⁹ File L 211/50: Letter from Hoernle to Thomas 21/24 Sept. 1915.

which he had re-allocated material from the second expedition so that fragments of the same texts should remain together, and in which he had also modified his distribution of the first expedition material.⁷⁰ This revision met with little favour with Barnett, Keeper at the Museum, who, Thomas wrote,⁷¹ “has complained that the British Museum would by your arrangement receive chiefly worthless pieces & not a fair share of the good ones.” Hoernle was therefore asked to categorise the manuscripts as good, mediocre, or insignificant and to submit a new allocation, according to which four-fifths of each of the three categories would go to the India Office and one-fifth to the Museum. In his reply of 19 January, Hoernle pleaded for more time to evaluate the collection, pointing out that “Obviously, the value of a fragment depends not only on its size and condition, but much more on its contents.”⁷²

Hoernle’s final distribution list for the second-expedition Sanskrit materials was submitted on 17 April 1916. The 304 Sanskrit manuscripts were divided as follows:⁷³

	British Museum				India Office			
	good	medium	remain.	total	good	medium	remain.	total
Part I (Ch.)	3	0	0	3	8	4	1	13
Part II (F.)	0	0	2	2	1	4	5	10
Part IV (Kha.)	1	10	43	54	4	39	172	215
Part V	0	1	1	2	1	1	3	5
Totals	4	11	46	61	14	48	181	243

Although the proposed distribution was accepted by the British Museum and the India Office Library, it was not fully implemented until 1917.⁷⁴

2.4.1 Correspondence between Hoernle, Thomas, Librarian of the India Office, Miss Lorimer, of the Stein Collection, British Museum, and others concerning the division of the Stein collection between the India Office and the British Museum, 13 October 1914 to 19 October 1918. Thomas 17 (**MSS Eur F 302/25**).

2.4.2 File: “Dr Hoernle’s division of the Stein trouvailles” containing the other half of the correspondence above (2.4.1). It also includes Hoernle’s revised distribution list of Sanskrit and Khotanese manuscripts from Stein’s first and second expeditions, as well as his third and final distribution list of materials from the second expedition. (**L 211/50**).⁷⁵

⁷⁰ Copies of the revised list and also the final list are preserved in the file L 211/50 (see 2.4.2)

⁷¹ MSS Eur F 302/25: Thomas to Hoernle, 15 Jan. 1916.

⁷² L 211/50: Hoernle to Thomas, 19 Jan 1916.

⁷³ MSS Eur F 302/25: Copy of Hoernle to Thomas, 17 April 1916. Part III consisted of manuscripts from Mazar Tagh, of which there were no Sanskrit items.

⁷⁴ BL Archives/Minutes of Trustees for 13 Oct. 1917.

⁷⁵ Library file 211 of 1950, part of the India Office Records series L/R/9.

2.5 Correspondence on the publication of *Manuscript remains*

2.5.1 “Correspondence with the Clarendon Press and the India Office referring to my Central Asian Facsimile Volumes,” comprising notes and 14 letters, 3 May 1905 to 4 December 1912 (MSS Eur F 302/29).

2.5.2 Further correspondence mostly concerning publication of *Manuscript remains*, November 1912 to May 1916, including a register of contingent expenses and letters from:

Clarendon Press: 11 November 1912; 8 April 1914; 27, 29 March 1916; 19 April 1916, with Hoernle’s draft reply;⁷⁶ 3 May 1916; 6 May 1916; 13 May 1916.

Sylvain Lévi: 24 January 1914.

F. W. Thomas: on the proofs of his contribution, 22 February and 20 March 1916, with Hoernle’s draft reply.

George Grierson: 20 April 1916; 17 May 1916.

India Office Library: 6 May 1916.

(MSS Eur D 723/16-17).

2.5.3 On the possibility of publishing further volumes of *Manuscript remains*: Letters from Sophie Hoernle to F. E. Pargiter, 16 September 1919; from the Clarendon Press, 27 August 1920, and from F. W. Thomas, 7 September 1920 (MSS Eur F 302/29).

3 Notebooks containing transcriptions, manuscript descriptions, and published and unpublished papers

3.1 Hoernle’s notebooks and transcriptions of Sanskrit texts

3.1.1 Notebook “Transcription / of / Dr. Stein’s Brāhmī MSS. / Plates I-V.” Annotated “Ist consignment sent to Prof. Leumann on 28 Sept. 1907 / see his letter of 3 Oct. 1907 / Returned by him 13 January 1911.” Contains transcriptions of E.i.2, 4, 5, 39, 41-43. According to Pargiter,⁷⁷ this notebook was returned by Leumann together with 23 folios of revised transliterations. One of these is preserved, which contains transcriptions of ff. 3b, 4a, 4b of an unspecified text. The remainder, however, appear to be missing. Thomas 11b (MSS Eur F 302/48).

3.1.2 Folder labelled “Dr. Hoernle’s transcriptions of some Stein Sanskrit MSS.” Transcriptions of F.xii.7; Kha.i.89b, 92b, 102, 127b, 311a, 317; Kha.ix.1, 3, 15, 16a, b, 18,

⁷⁶ This detailed the amounts to be paid to his contributors. The suggested rate was 2 shillings per printed page.

⁷⁷ Pargiter, 1923, p. 555: “Envelope marked ‘Dr. Watanabe’s contribution, also my readings’; but inside is a copybook marked ‘Transcript of Dr. Stein’s Brāhmī MSS., Plates I-V,’ with a note ‘Sent to Prof. Leumann on 28 Sept., 1907. Returned by him 13 January, 1911,’ with 23 folios containing revised transliterations of the same.”

24; Kha.0011, 0014a, b. Includes some notes in French in a different hand (by Lévi?) on Kha.ii.1, 11, 12; Kha.viii.11⁷⁸ (MSS Eur F 302/20).

3.1.3 Transcriptions of Khora 005b; Kha.i.94.d; Kha.i.152; Kha.vi.2; Kha.ix.36; Kha.ix.42 (MSS Eur F 302/21).

3.1.4 A description and transcription of two Sanskrit palm-leaf manuscripts from Miran, M.II.0011 (Or.8212/60),⁷⁹ referred to by Hoernle, however, as Miran 31. Thomas 8 (MSS Eur F 302/22).

3.1.5 Notebook labelled at one end “Index to Dr Stein’s Brahmi MSS,” an index of Sanskrit words appearing in published photographs. At the other end is a similar index entitled “Index / Stein Manuscripts. / Non Sanskritic.” Thomas 22 (MSS Eur F 302/35).

3.1.6 Transcription of H 149.x.8 (MSS Eur F 302/46).⁸⁰

3.1.7 Transcription of H 149.53 (MSS Eur D 723/14).⁸¹

3.2 Sanskrit medical notebooks and vocabularies

3.2.1 Notebook labelled “Quotations from Medical Works in Commentaries” containing extracts from Caraka and other authors. Thomas 2 (MSS Eur F 302/4).

3.2.2 Notebook containing notes and drafts of a paper on the eye in Caraka, including attached letters to Hoernle from T. W. Rhys Davids dated 5 November [1903] and A. Berriedale Keith dated 24 November 1903. Thomas 2 (MSS Eur F 302/5).

3.2.3 Notes on various European medical works; “Relation of Mādhava to Suçruta, Vāgbhaṭa I and Vāgbhaṭa II;” notes and extracts from Sanskrit medical works. Thomas 2 (MSS Eur F 302/6).

3.2.4 Notebook containing a discussion of the schools of Mādhava, Suçruta, and Vāgbhaṭa I and II. Thomas 2 (MSS Eur F 302/10).

3.2.5 Paper headed: “I. Anatomy: the structure of the eye”; paper: “On the Ancient Indian Theory of the Structure of the Eye, and the Cataract”; a concordance comparing different works. Thomas 2 (MSS Eur F 302/7).

⁷⁸ The transcription of Kha.vii.11 is dated 21 Jan 1913.

⁷⁹ Stein, 1921, pp. 489, 539, and 1448, where it is wrongly labelled Mi (Ming-oi).

⁸⁰ See Manuscript remains, pp. 36-40.

⁸¹ *Prasādapratibhodbhava* (see Hartmann and Wille, 1992, p. 26).

3.2.6 Book containing volume 3 of a vocabulary of the *Carakasamhitā*, labelled “Sthānas: Cikitsita portion, Kalpa, Siddhi / Cikitsita from *praśasta*.” Begun, according to a note on f. 1, on 20 October 1916 and finished 9 August 1918, only a week before Hoernle’s death. According to Pargiter,⁸² the other two volumes were: vol. 1: “Sthānas: sūtra, Nidāna, Vimāna portion—*Vimāna* up to *pānīya*”; vol. 2: “Sthānas: Vimāna, Śarīra, Indriya, Cikitsita portion—*Cikitsita* up to *praśamaya*; *Vimāna* from *pāpīyas*.” Both these volumes appear to be missing. Thomas 4 (MSS Eur F 302/37).

3.2.7 Box containing vocabulary slips of words in the *Siddhisthāna* section of the *Carakasamhitā*. The lid contains a signed note by Sophie Hoernle dated 16 November 1918: “Slips of the Siddhi Sthana of the Caraka Samhita on which my husband was working quite up to the last days. The rest of the vocabulary is finished and contained in 3 Mss vols.”

In a letter,⁸³ written just after Hoernle’s death, Sophie Hoernle wrote “My husband felt himself very much hampered by the want of a dictionary of medical terms in his studies on Ancient Indian Medicine + with his usual energy he set himself to make one. The Caraka-Samhita was written out in slips by a Pandit in India. I arranged the slips alphabetically for my husband to enter.” Thomas 4 (MSS Eur F 302/38).

3.2.8 Volume: “Vocabulary / to / Suśruta Samhitā / Sūtra-sthāna... Begun summer 1912. Ended 20. August 1915.” According to Sophie Hoernle,⁸⁴ “... a young Sanskrit student, a pupil of Professor Jolly did the slips + just finished before August 1914; ... only the first chapter has been done by my husband; the rest of the slips is in a bigish box with me.” Thomas 5 (MSS Eur F 302/40).

3.2.9 Two bundles from a box of vocabulary slips for the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* (see 3.2.8). One contains the consonants *s*, *ṣ*, *ś*, and the other the vowels *u*, *ū*, *i*, *ī*, etc., from *Cikitsitasthāna* “up to chapter XL pp. 556”⁸⁵ (MSS Eur F 302/42).

3.2.10 Volume containing an index to the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. Thomas 5 (MSS Eur F 302/41).

3.3 Hoernle’s notebooks and transcriptions of Khotanese texts

3.3.1 Three notebooks headed:

“Transcriptions,” containing the Khotanese documents: Or. 6392/1; Or. 6392/2; Or. 6393/2; Or. 6393/1; Or. 6394/1; Or. 6394/2 ; Or. 6395/2; Or. 6395/1; etc.⁸⁶

⁸² Pargiter, 1923, p. 554.

⁸³ MSS Eur F 303/89: Correspondence 1919-20 with Mrs Hoernle regarding disposal of Hoernle papers. Letter from Sophie Hoernle to F.W. Thomas, 20 Nov. 1918.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ This was transferred to the India Office Library in 1919 (MSS Eur F 303/89: letter to Thomas, 2 Apr. 1919: “I am glad I may send you the slips of the Suśruta Index before I go over to the States.”

⁸⁶ See Skjærvø, 2002.

“Notes” on the palaeography, grammatical forms, etc., of the Khotanese documents.

“Notes / Non-Sanskritic. Stein MSS.” with reference to D.III.7 and E.i. roll. Thomas 23 (MSS Eur F 302/47).

3.3.2 Small notebook labelled “Stein Manuscripts / Non-Sanskritic / Plate XVI / Wooden Tablets,” containing transcriptions of D.III.1 (plate XVI), 12 (plate XIII); D.IV.6 (plate XVI); D.V.3, 4, 8 (plate XVII); D.VI.6 (plate XVII); D.VIII.2 (plate XVIII); E.i. roll (plate XIV); Rawak 5.1.1901; N.xx.1.⁸⁷ Thomas 7, where his note “Leumann” presumably means that Hoernle had forwarded this notebook to him⁸⁸ (MSS Eur F 302/19).

3.3.3 Miscellaneous papers including a description and transcriptions of two folios of a palm leaf ms. from Dunhuang; a description of “The big Roll from the Temple Library,” Ch.c.001,⁸⁹ with a transcription of lines 1-774, 840-860. Thomas 15 (MSS Eur F 302/23).

3.3.4 Hoernle’s descriptions of the scroll Ch.73.xv.001 (Ch.00264a-c);⁹⁰ a description of the pothi Ch.83.vi.001 (Ch.00276).⁹¹ Thomas 6 (MSS Eur F 302/11).

3.3.5 Notebook containing loose sheets, described on the cover (Hoernle’s handwriting) as “Text and Translation and Notes to Siddha-Sāra-Śāstra in Cursive Gupta.” The contents, however, are:

Draft letters of 26 and 27 April 1910 to Cambridge University Library and the Asiatic Society of Bengal about manuscript copies of the *Aparimitāyuhṣūtra*.

“Rough list of Dr. Stein’s MSS., sent to me by Dr. Barnett.”

Note (numbered no. 1 by Hoernle) on the Khotanese *Siddhasāra* (Ch.ii.002).⁹²

Notes and extracts (nos. 2 and 3) from the Khotanese *Aparimitāyuhṣūtra* (Ch.xlvi.0015).⁹³

Note (no. 8) on the Khotanese *Vajracchedikā* (Ch.xlvi.0012a).⁹⁴

Preliminary notes and extracts (nos. 6, and 7) from the Khotanese *Jivakapustaka* (Ch.ii.003).⁹⁵

Thomas 1 (MSS Eur F 302/8).

⁸⁷ See Skjærvø, 2002, except for N.xx.1 which has not been found. From photographs, it is doubtful whether it is written in Khotanese.

⁸⁸ Pargiter, 1923, p. 555, also mentions another note-book which appears to be missing: “Stein MSS. Sanskrit,” containing transcriptions of D.III.2 and 3 (plate XII); 4 (plate XI); 7 (plate XI); 8 (plate 10); D.IV.1 and 2 (plate XV); D.VI.1 (plate XVII).

⁸⁹ IOL Khot S 46. See Skjærvø, 2002, pp. 541-50.

⁹⁰ This number is given in Hoernle’s register of Stein’s scrolls (1.3.3). It is the Khotanese-Tibetan scroll IOL Khot S. 29, see Skjærvø, 2002.

⁹¹ IOL Khot 83, 84. see Skjærvø, 2002.

⁹² IOL Khot 116-137. See Skjærvø, 2002, p. 316.

⁹³ IOL Khot 60-64. See Skjærvø, 2002, p. 298.

⁹⁴ IOL Khot 57-59. See Skjærvø, 2002, p. 297.

⁹⁵ IOL Khot 87-110. See Skjærvø, 2002, p. 305. The cover of the notebook has been annotated (by Thomas?) in blue crayon “Prof Sten Konow.” Thomas had intended to send the work to Konow. This never happened, however, and Konow’s edition of the *Jivakapustaka* was published independently (see 3.4).

3.3.6 Hoernle's notes and transcriptions of the *Vajracchedikā* and the *Aparimitāyuhṣūtra*; transcriptions of the Sanskrit *Aparimitāyuhṣūtra* (mss. Asiatic Society of Bengal B 38 and Cambridge Add. 1277, 1385, 1623); Khotanese-Sanskrit vocabulary for these two texts (MSS Eur D 723/19).

3.4 The Khotanese *Jivakapustaka*

It is unfortunate that Hoernle's major work of his final years remained unpublished at the time of his death. This was an edition and translation of Ch.ii.003, the *Jivakapustaka*,⁹⁶ a composite medical treatise in Khotanese and corrupt Sanskrit. Hoernle had, in fact, published two extracts from it in 1917 (ff. 44aⁱ - 47bⁱⁱⁱ and 64a^{iv} - 65aⁱ, see 3.4.3), but his article was overlooked by later scholars until "rediscovered" by R. E. Emmerick in 1982.⁹⁷

According to a letter from Sophie Hoernle to Stein dated 20 March 1919, Hoernle was working on the final version a few days before his death, intending to send it to the Press for printing the next day.⁹⁸ In March 1919, F. W. Thomas tried to arrange for Hoernle's text to be edited by Konow, who, however, had insufficient time.⁹⁹ Due to the prohibitive costs of publishing the first volume of *Manuscript remains*, and, without a subsidy for a second volume, the edition "remained in abeyance in the custody of the Press."¹⁰⁰ In 1925, at Stein's request, Pargiter published a brief description of it in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, and in 1934, Thomas brought it to the attention of H. W. Bailey,¹⁰¹ who examined it, but was unsuccessful in locating it two years later when he began working on the Khotanese text.¹⁰²

Bailey and Konow, both without reference to Hoernle's earlier work, exchanged several letters on the *Jivakapustaka*,¹⁰³ so it is perhaps surprising that during the war, unknown to each other, they both published separate editions of it.¹⁰⁴ Bailey first heard of Konow's publication in May 1941,¹⁰⁵ by which time his own work was already in the press.¹⁰⁶ In 1945,

⁹⁶ Named by H. W. Bailey after the famous physician Jivaka whose name occurs at the beginning of the text.

⁹⁷ Emmerick, 1982.

⁹⁸ Bodleian Ms. Stein 85, f. 138: "... he finished the press-copy on the evening of the last day before he was taken ill, Nov. 8. He had been standing at his desk the whole afternoon & I can still see the pleased smile with which he turned to me, when I came into his room, to tell me, that he would write to the Press the next day, to find out, whether they could start setting up the Ms."

⁹⁹ Thomas to Konow 23 Mar 1919 (National Library of Norway: Morgenstjerne papers): "I am hoping to arrange to ask you to edit Hoernle's Vol II of his 'Buddhist Remains,' it is concerned with Khotani pieces only, & Hoernle left it ready for the press."

¹⁰⁰ Pargiter, 1925, p. 111.

¹⁰¹ Thomas to Bailey 26 June 1934 (Ancient India & Iran Trust, Cambridge: Bailey correspondence): "There is one volume which Dr. Hoernle actually prepared for the press. &, if I could find a scholar prepared to edit it, I would try to arrange for its publication here. I proposed it to Konow years ago, but he has not yet been able to find time," and 25 Aug 1934: "Dr. Hoernle's big ms. was for a long time with the Press: it is now in my possession."

¹⁰² Bailey, 1945, p. viii.

¹⁰³ Bailey to Konow 2 Mar 1940 (National Library of Norway: Morgenstjerne papers): "I am busy now with the bilingual medical text in Codices Khotanenses."

¹⁰⁴ Bailey, 1938, pp. 71-141; 1945, pp. 135-96 Konow, 1941

¹⁰⁵ Telegram from Konow to Bailey received 29 May 1941 (Ancient India & Iran Trust, Cambridge: Bailey correspondence): "Hope you are well and do not object my editing medical bilingue."

¹⁰⁶ See Bailey's review in *BSOAS* 10 (1942), pp. 1021-23.

after the war, Konow wrote to Bailey "I hope that you did not resent my publishing the medical text, and even dedicating it to you. When we were invaded by the Germans I simply had to find some work which might help me to evade always thinking of our devilish enemies."¹⁰⁷ In fact the two editions complemented each other to some extent. Bailey transcribed both the Khotanese and Sanskrit texts, but without any interpretation, whereas Konow edited and translated the Khotanese version into English, but only cited the Sanskrit version in the Khotanese-English vocabulary.

In contrast, however, Hoernle's edition included the Khotanese text, English translation, the Sanskrit version, and a reconstructed Sanskrit text, with frequent references to the medical texts of Caraka and others. The introduction contained sections on palaeography, the language of the Sanskrit text, scribal peculiarities, and a description of the Khotanese language, grammar, and script.

Hoernle's edition was brought to the attention of R. E. Emmerick in 1987 by Matsuda Kazunobu.¹⁰⁸ Emmerick subsequently wrote about it in several articles,¹⁰⁹ but Hoernle's contribution still remains to be evaluated.

3.4.1 Folder labelled "Rough copy / 1, Introductory Remarks. / 2, Edition, up to fol. 72a / An Ancient Medical MS. from Eastern Turkestan." An edition and translation of the Khotanese *Jivakapustaka*, Ch.ii.003, as far as folio 72 (**MSS Eur D 723/21**).

3.4.2 Notebook labelled "An Ancient Medical Manuscript from Turkestan / Ch.ii.003 / Press copy / Introductory Remarks, pp. 30 / Edition, up to fol. 72a, pp. 88." A final version of Hoernle's edition (**MSS Eur D 723/22**).

3.4.3 Corrected proof copy of "An ancient medical manuscript from Eastern Turkestan," for publication in *Commemorative essays presented to Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar*, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1917, pp. 415-432 (**MSS Eur D 723/23**).

3.4.4 Three bundles of slips "Khotanese Vocabulary / Complete," with a smaller bundle of addenda and a bundle labelled "Sanskrit Vocabulary / Selected words." A vocabulary for the Khotanese *Jivakapustaka* (Ch.ii.003) (**MSS Eur F 302/39**).

3.5 Notebooks by other scholars

3.5.1 Folder labelled "Dr. Barnett's Contribution to the First Volume" containing transcriptions of the Sanskrit *Saddharmapundarikā* (SB 112, 114). In 1911, Hoernle sent these two fragments to Lüders and offered to forward him Barnett's readings.¹¹⁰ The notebook also

¹⁰⁷ Konow to Bailey 9 Sept 1945 (Ancient India & Iran Trust, Cambridge: Bailey correspondence).

¹⁰⁸ Matsuda, 1987, p. 113, where, however, it is described as a translation of the *Siddhasāra*.

¹⁰⁹ Emmerick, 1992a, pp. 42-3; 1992b, 1994, and 1997

¹¹⁰ Letter preserved in Staatsbibliothek Berlin. For a transcription, see Wille, 2000, pp. 137-138.

contains a transcription of *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (SA 2) and a transcription of Cambridge University Library Ms. Add.1633. Thomas 21 (MSS Eur F 302/30).

3.5.2 Notebook containing transcriptions by Leumann (unsigned) of some of the Sanskrit fragments which had been sent originally to Thomas. At this stage Leumann (and Watanabe?) had only identified f. 5 of the *Ratnarāśīsūtra* (SA 17), and the ending of the *Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra* (SB 87). The other fragments were ff. 4 (SA 1), 28, 162 (SA 4), 45 (SA 5), 94 (SA 7), 20 (SA 10), and 106 (SB 2) of unspecified texts (MSS Eur D 723/18).

3.5.3 Leumann's revision of Thomas' contribution: loose sheets containing a preliminary note, note for the printer, and edition of SA 1, 3, 4, and 5 (MSS Eur F 302/50).

3.5.4 Folder labelled "Dr. Watanabe's Paper" containing "Preliminary Report of the Studies / on / Khotan Fragments collected by Dr. Stein and Dr. Hoernle / K. Watanabe, Ph.D.," extensively revised by Hoernle, who received it in June 1909 (see section on **other collaborators**). The report consists of an introduction (ff. 1-5) followed by identifications and comparisons of the Sanskrit texts with other versions (ff. 6-57).

Most of the identified fragments were edited, with full acknowledgement, by Hoernle in his section "Miscellaneous fragments" (*Manuscript remains*, pp. 1-84). The others were:

Dharmapada (H 148.x.18, 28)

Hastikakṣya (H 150.vii.18)

Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (H 150.vii.2, 3, 4, 8, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 25, 27, 34, 35, 37, 40)¹¹¹

Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvatārajñānālokālaṃkārasūtra (E.i.2 etc.)¹¹²

Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra (H 150.vii.22,¹¹³ 39¹¹⁴)

Upasenāsūtra (H 149.x.11)

Vajracchedikā (H 150.vii.32)¹¹⁵

The following works were also identified, but with incomplete or incorrect signatures: *Pratītyasūtra*; fragment of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*; *Ratnaketusūtra*; *Sūryagarbhasūtra*; *Anantamukhanirhāradhāraṇī*.

Thomas 11c (MSS Eur F 302/49).

4 Miscellaneous

4.1 Notebook labelled "Materials for / Palaeographic Note on ā / for / my first volume" (MSS Eur D 723/20).

¹¹¹ See Watanabe, 1912, for all of these except H 150.vii.4, 37 (Wille, 2000, p. 69). H 150.vii.17, however, is Khotanese (IOL Khot 152/6, see Skjærvø, 2002).

¹¹² See Wille, 2005, no. 74.

¹¹³ See Wille, 2005, no. 75.

¹¹⁴ H 150.vii.39, however, is a fragment of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*. This must be an error for H 150.vii.38 (Wille, 2005, no. 78).

¹¹⁵ Wille, 2005, no. 79.

4.2 Lectures on Indian Epigraphy and Palaeography, presented to the British Museum by Mrs. Hoernle, 8 October 1920 (**BL Mss. Add 40002**).

4.3 Notes on miscellaneous subjects: list of the oldest Indian manuscripts known to exist; outline of the history of numeration; a note on the Śaka and Vikrama eras; letter dated 4 August 1909 from J[ohn] F[aithfull] Fleet; and a note on the date of the three Faridpur inscriptions presented to the British Museum by Mrs Hoernle (**BL Mss. Add 40003**).

4.4 7 miscellaneous tracings for plates, some for Hoernles article “The ‘Unknown languages’ of Eastern Turkestan. II.”¹¹⁶ Thomas 10 (**MSS Eur F 302/32**).

4.5 Proofs of 15 plates from Stein’s *Ancient Khotan*. Thomas 18 (**MSS Eur F 302/33**).

4.6 Three loose papers: a printed map from *Ancient Khotan*; a letter from Hoernle to Prof. T. W. Rhys Davids, 1 February 1903, on the *Vajracchedikā*; and a photo of a cave site sent by Charles Nouette of the Pelliot Mission. Thomas 22 (**MSS Eur F 302/34**).

Conclusion

Hoernle’s papers are an essential contribution to the history of Central Asian Studies at the beginning of the twentieth century, in particular the study of Khotanese and Sanskrit. His unpublished work on medical texts, notably the Khotanese *Jivakapustaka* (3.4), which lacks a proper edition, deserves close scrutiny. Even Leumann and Watanabe’s identifications of Sanskrit texts (2.1.2, 3.5.4) may contain unnoticed but useful information. Their main importance, however, lies in the information provided on the history of the collections. Hoernle’s papers supply answers to many previously unresolved problems, and it should be possible, on the basis of his lists and registers, to reconstruct a detailed history of the Central Asian Hoernle manuscript collections.

¹¹⁶ Hoernle, 1911.

Bibliography and Bibliographical Abbreviations

- Bailey, Harold W., 1945. *Khotanese Texts I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, Harold W., 1938. *Codices Khotanenses: India Office Library CH. ii 002, CH. ii 003, CH. 00274*, ed. with an intro. by H. W. Bailey, *Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Majoris* 2. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard.
- Emmerick, Ronald E., 1982. "Hoernle and the Jivaka-Pustaka," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 45, p. 343.
- 1992a. *A guide to the literature of Khotan: second edition thoroughly revised and enlarged*, *Studia Philologica Buddhica. Occasional Paper Series III*, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- 1992b. "The Svastika antidote," *Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society* 2, pp. 60-81.
1994. "The Mahāsauvarcalādi ghee," in *Memoriae munusculum: Gedenkband für Annemarie v. Gabain*, ed. Klaus Röhrborn und Wolfgang Veenker, *Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica*, Bd. 39. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 29-42.
1997. "The Mahāsauvarcalādi Ghṛta in Hoernle's unpublished edition of the 'Jivakapustaka,'" *Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society* 5, pp. 76-81.
- Grierson, George A., 1919. "Augustus Frederic Rudolf Hoernle," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 114-24.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe and Klaus Wille, 1992. "Die nordturkistanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften der Sammlung Hoernle (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, II)," *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen II*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 9-63.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf, 1891. "Remarks on birch bark ms.," in *Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1891 [pub. 1892], pp. 54-65
1893. "The Weber mss.: another collection of ancient manuscripts from Central Asia," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 62, pt. I, 1893 [pub. 1894], pp. 1-40.
- 1893-1912. *The Bower Manuscript: facsimile leaves, Nagari transcript, romanised transliteration and English translation with notes*. Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1893-1912.
1897. "Three further collections of ancient manuscripts from Central Asia," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 66, pt. I, pp. 213-60; repr. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1897.
1899. "A report on the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia, part I," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 68, pt. I, extra no.
1901. "A report on the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia, part II," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 70, pt. I, extra no. 1, 1901 [pub. 1902].
1902. *Facsimile reproduction of Weber Mss., part IX, and Macartney mss., set I: with Roman transliteration and indexes*. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
1910. "The 'unknown languages' of Eastern Turkestan [I]," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 834-38; 1283-1300.
1911. "The 'unknown languages' of Eastern Turkestan. II," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 449-77.
1917. "An ancient medical manuscript from Eastern Turkestan," in *Commemorative essays presented to Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, pp. 415-32; repr. as *R.G. Bhandarkar commemoration volume*, Delhi: Bharatiya Pub. House, 1977.
- Konow, Sten, 1941. *A medical text in Khotanese: CH. ii 003 of the India Office Library; with translation and vocabulary*. Oslo: Dybwad.
- Leumann, Ernst, 1907. "Über die einheimischen Sprachen von Ostturkestan im frühern Mittelalter. Erster Teil: Der Gang der Forschung und ihre augenblickliche Gesamtlage," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 61, pp. 648-58.
1908. "Über die einheimischen Sprachen von Ostturkestan im frühern Mittelalter. Zweiter Teil: Von der arischen Textsprache," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 62, pp. 83-110.
1920. *Buddhistische Literatur: nordarisch und deutsch. I. Teil: Nebenstücke*, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 15. Leipzig: Im Kommissionsverlag von F.A. Brockhaus; repr. Liechtenstein, Kraus Reprint, 1966.

- Manuscript remains*. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle. *Manuscript remains of Buddhist literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916.
- Matsuda, Kazunobu, 1987. "New Sanskrit fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra in the Stein/Hoernle Collection: a preliminary report," *The Eastern Buddhist* 20 (new series), pp. 105-114.
- Ol'denburg, S. F., 1892. "Kashgarskaja rukopis' N. F. Petrovskago" (N. F. Petrovsky's manuscript from Kashgar), *Zapiski Vostochnago otdieleniia Imperatorskago russkago arkheologicheskago obshchestva* 7, 1892 [pub. 1893], pp. 81-82 with 1 plate.
- Pargiter, F. E., 1923. "Dr. Hoernle's ms. papers," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 551-58.
1925. "The late Dr. Hoernle's mss.," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 110-11.
- Sims-Williams, Ursula. 2000. "Forgeries from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library's Hoernle and Stein collections," *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 14, 2000 [pub. 2003], pp. 111-29.
2004. "Augustus Frederic Rudolf Hoernle," *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 12, pp. 418-20.
- Skjærvø, Prods Oktor, 2002. *Khotanese manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library: a complete catalogue with texts and translations*; with contributions by Ursula Sims-Williams, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, II/V, Texts 6. London: British Library.
- Stein, M. Aurel, 1907. *Ancient Khotan: detailed report of archaeological explorations in Chinese Turkestan*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
1921. *Serindia: detailed report of explorations in Central Asia and westernmost China*, 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wang, Helen, 1998. "Stein's Recording Angel – Miss F. M. G. Lorimer," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 8 (series 3), pp. 207-28.
- Watanabe, Kaikyoku, 1912. "Uten hakken no Daibon-hannya danpen" (Fragments of the larger Prajñāpāramitāsūtra from Khotan), *Shūkyōkai* 8, part 6; repr. in *Kogetsu Zenshū*, vol. 1. Tokyo, 1933, pp. 539-54.
- Wille, Klaus, 1996. "Die Hoernle-Fragmente in der Turfan-Sammlung (Berlin)," in *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang*, ed. Ronald E. Emmerick et al., Berichte und Abhandlungen, 1. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, pp. 385-408.
2000. *Fragments of a manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra from Khādaliq*. Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series, 3. Tokyo: Soka Gakkai.
2005. "Some recently identified Sanskrit fragments from the Stein and Hoernle collections in the British Library, London (1)," *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 8, 2004 [2005], pp. 47-79.
- Wood, Frances, 2004. "Aurel Stein, the British Museum and the India Office," in *The Silk Road: trade, travel, war and faith*, ed. Susan Whitfield. London: British Library, 2004, pp. 91-96.