



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Watañi lāntaṃ: Khotanese and Tumshuqese loanwords in Tocharian

Dragoni, F.

Citation

Dragoni, F. (2022, April 13). *Watañi lāntaṃ: Khotanese and Tumshuqese loanwords in Tocharian*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3283437>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3283437>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

4. SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION

4.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims at classifying the Khotanese loanwords into Tocharian according to their semantic areas. Twelve different areas have been identified. The chapter is divided in two parts. The first part consists of lists according to semantic areas. The second part consists of a short commentary on the most important findings.

The semantic areas have been specifically designed for this study. This choice has imposed itself because of the nature of the material. In fact, many lexical items belong to the technical languages of Buddhism and Indian medicine, two categories that are not normally considered by linguists working on lexical borrowing. Nonetheless, it seems useful for future studies to link the semantic fields developed for this study with their closest equivalents in Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009: 7):

Semantic fields in this study	Semantic fields in Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009: 7)
Names of plants	Agriculture and vegetation (8)
Names of substances	Basic actions and technology (9)
Medical terms	≈ The body (4)
Body parts	The body (4)
Administrative, political and economic terms	Social and political relations (19) / possession (11) / law (21) / the modern world (23)
Moral qualities / actions	Emotions and values (16)
Clothing	Clothing and grooming (6)
Food and drink	Food and drink (5)
Nature	The physical world (1)
Animals	Animals (3)
Music	The modern world (23)
Buddhist terms	≈ Religion and belief (22)
Grammatical items	Miscellaneous function words (24)

4.2. LOANWORDS ACCORDING TO SEMANTIC AREAS (LIST)

4.2.1. NAMES OF PLANTS

1. subst. TB *aṅkwaṣ(t)* 'Asa foetida' ← LKh. *aṃguṣḍa-* 'id.'
2. subst. TB *kurkal* 'bdellium' ← LKh. *gurgula-* 'id.'
3. subst. TB *tāno* 'seed, grain' ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **dāno*, OKh. *dāno* 'id.'

4. subst. TB *tvāṅkaro* 'ginger' ← OKh. acc. sg. **tvāṅgarau* 'id.' (LKh. *ttuṅgara-*)
5. subst. *mrañco* 'black pepper' ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **mirindʿyu*, OKh. **miriṅjsyu* 'id.' (LKh. *miriṅjsya-*)
6. subst. TAB *śāṅcapo* 'mustard' ← PTK acc. sg. **śāṅzapu* (OKh. *śśāśvāna-*)
7. subst. TB *śintso* *'a species of tree' ← OKh. acc. sg. **śśiṅjso* (LKh. *śiṅjā-* 'id.')
8. subst. TB *siñco* *'plant name' ← OKh. acc. sg. **siṅjo* 'id.' (LKh. *siṅjā-* 'id.')

4.2.2. NAMES OF SUBSTANCES

1. subst. TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu* *'iron' ← PTK **hénśwanya-* (OKh. *hiśśana-*) 'id.'

4.2.3. MEDICAL TERMS

1. v. TB *ampa-* 'to rot, decay' ← LKh. *haṁbva-* (< OKh. *haṁbūta-*) 'fester'
2. subst. TB *kāswo* 'name of a disease' ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* 'quartan fever')
3. adj. TB *ṣupakūṇe* 'pertaining to suppositories' ← OKh. **ṣṣūvakūṇa-* 'id.'
4. subst. TB *ṣpakīye* 'suppository' ← LKh. *ṣvakā-* 'id.'
5. v. TB *sanapa-* 'to anoint, embrocate' ← PTK, PK **zanāf-*

4.2.4. BODY PARTS

1. subst. TB *kātso* A *kāts* 'belly, stomach, abdomen, womb' ← PK **k^hādāna-* 'stomach' (LKh. *khāysāna-*)
2. subst. TB *koto* *'excrement' ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **gūḍu* (OKh. *gūha-* 'id.')

4.2.5. ADMINISTRATIVE, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC TERMS

1. subst. TB **ārto* TA *ārt* *'envoy' ← PTK acc. sg. **(h)árdu* (OKh. *haḍa-*) 'id.'
2. subst. TB *„wātano* *A *wataṁ* *'Khotanese' ← PK acc. sg. **hwatanu* 'id.'
3. subst. TB *orśa* A *orās* *'official title' ← OKh. *aurāśśa-* 'councillor'
4. subst. TB *kāmarto* *A *kākmart* 'chief' ← PTK acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala-* 'head')
5. subst. TB *kito* *'help' ← PK acc. sg. **gīḍu* 'id.' (OKh. *ggiha-* 'id.')
6. subst. TB *keto* 'property, estate' ← PTK acc. sg. **gēḍu* 'id.' (OKh. *giha-* 'help')
7. subst. TB *keś* A *kaś* 'number' ← PTK inf. **ham-xēži* (OKh. v. *haṁkhīs-*) 'to count'
8. subst. TB *cowo* *'robbing' ← PK acc. sg. **dyūwu* 'id.' (LKh. *dyūka-* 'robber')
9. subst. TAB *pānto* 'friend, companion' ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **pando*, OKh. *pando* 'path'
10. subst. TB *parso* A *pārs* 'letter' ← PTK inf. **pṛsu* (OKh. *pulsu*)
11. subst. TB *pito* 'price' ← PK acc. sg. **pīḍu* 'id.' (OKh. *piha-*)

4.2.6. MORAL QUALITIES/ACTIONS

1. subst. TB *oś* 'evil' ← LKh. *ośa*- 'id.'
2. subst. TB *krāso* 'vexation' ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **grazu*, OKh. *graysu* 'torment' (LKh. *gr(r)aysa*-)
3. v. TA *katw*- 'to ridicule' ← OKh. past ptc. *khamttu* **to laugh*'
4. v. TB *paraka*- 'to prosper, thrive' ← PTK, PK **farāka*- 'more' (OKh. id.)
5. subst. TB *yolo* 'evil' ← OKh. acc. sg. *yaulu* **falsehood*'
6. subst. TB *śāmpo* **TA śāmpām* 'haughtiness, pride' ← PTK acc. sg. *čamfu* 'violence, disturbance' (OKh. *tcaṃpha*-)
7. v. TB *ṣārt*- A *ṣārttw*- (PT **ṣārtw*-) 'incite' ← PTK past ptc. **ṣṛtu* 'id.' (OKh. *ā-ṣṣuḍa*-)
8. subst. *sāñ*, *ṣāñ*, A *ṣāñ* 'artifice, expedient, means, method' ← Khot. *saña*- 'id.'³⁸⁰

4.2.7. CLOTHING

1. subst. TB *tono* 'cloth' ← OKh. acc. sg. *thaunu* 'id.'

4.2.8. FOOD AND DRINK

1. subst. TB *kuñi(-mot)* 'grape wine' ← LKh. *gūrāñai* (*mau*) 'id.'

4.2.9. NATURE

1. subst. TB *krāke* 'dirt, filth' ← LKh. **grāga*- (OKh. *khārgga*- 'mud')
2. subst. TB *warāñce* **A wāryāñc* **sand*' ← PTK, PK **wirwica*- 'grain (of sand)' (OKh. *ggurvica*-)

4.2.10. ANIMALS

1. subst. TB *krañko* 'chicken' ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **kṛñgu*, OKh. *kṛñgu* 'id.'
2. subst. TB *wañc* **sparrow*' ← PTK, PK **winji* 'id.' (LKh. *biñji*-)

4.2.11. MUSIC

1. subst. TB *śarko* **song, singing*' ← PTK acc. sg. **čarko*, A *tsärk* ← PK acc. sg. **tsarko* (OKh. *tcarkā*- 'play, amusement')

³⁸⁰ According to Del Tomba and Maggi (2021: 217), the term was borrowed in a non-Buddhist context and only later was used to translate Skt. *upāya* only in Tocharian A. Therefore, I do not classify it within the Buddhist items. It is nevertheless possible that the fact that this technical meaning is only attested in Tocharian A may be connected with the Khotanese influence on the Tocharian A Buddhist vocabulary (see ch. 2. s.v. *sāñ*).

4.2.12. BUDDHIST TERMS

1. subst. TA *twantaṃ* 'reverence' ← OKh. *tvaṃdanu* 'id.'
2. subst. TB *pātro* A *pātār* 'alms-bowl' ← OKh. acc. sg. *pātru* 'id.'
3. subst. TA *pissaṅk* 'bhikṣusaṃgha' ← LKh. *bi'saṃga-* (OKh. *bālsaṃga-*)
4. subst. TA *śrīttātak* 'well-being' ← OKh. *śśāratāti-* 'id.'

4.2.13. GRAMMATICAL ITEMS

1. adv. TB *twār* '?' ← LKh. *tvarä* 'moreover' (OKh. *ttuware*)

4.3. COMMENTARY

The most important conclusion that may be drawn from the list above is that the twelve semantic areas that have been identified can be further reduced to four macro-areas:

1. *Materia medica* (names of plants, medical terms, body parts, nature, animals)
2. Administrative, political and economic terms (§4.2.5.)
3. Moral qualities/actions (§4.2.6.)
4. Buddhist terms (§4.2.12)

In the following, these four macro-areas are examined in more detail.

4.3.1. MATERIA MEDICA

As outlined in Dragoni (2021), names of plants, medical technical terms, terms related to body parts, to natural elements and to animals may have entered Tocharian from Khotanese within the wider context of the exchange of medical knowledge. Thus, this set of terms can be easily included in the broader context of *Materia medica*.

This series of loanwords is of great importance for establishing the main routes of diffusion of medical knowledge in the Tarim basin. In fact, it seems that Khotanese acted as donor language from prehistorical times, when the nature of the contact must have been only oral, until historical times, when Khotan may have acted as mediator between Indian medical knowledge, travelling from the South, and the Tocharian speaking areas.

4.3.2. ADMINISTRATIVE, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC TERMS

A second important group of words concerns the macro-area related to administrative, political and economic terms (§4.2.5.). Except for one word (TB *orša* A *oräś*), which seems to have been borrowed from historical Khotanese, all the other items in this sub-list (ten) were borrowed in the prehistoric period. For a more detailed discussion of this group of words, see §5.2.2.1.

4.3.3. MORAL QUALITIES/ACTIONS

A surprising set of loanwords is represented by a group of words indicating moral actions and qualities (§4.2.6., seven words). I do not have a specific explanation for this fact, although I can put forward the hypothesis that it may point to a type of language contact much deeper than previously thought.³⁸¹

4.3.4. BUDDHIST TERMS

A small group of loanwords which deserves further analysis concerns the Buddhist terms (§4.2.12.). Except for one word (TB *pātro* A *pātār*), they are all attested only in Tocharian A and they were borrowed from Khotanese in the historical period. In the following, I would like to put forward the proposal that this set of loanwords may have been due to the presence of a Khotanese religious mission in the Tocharian A speaking area from the 5th c. onwards.

4.3.4.1. The Buddhist terms attested only in Tocharian A

The three Khotanese loanwords attested only in Tocharian A are *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’, *pissaiṅk* ‘bhikṣusaṃgha’ and *śrittātak* ‘well-being’. In Tocharian A, *twantaṃ* is used to translate the Buddhist phrase *pradakṣiṇī-kṛ-* ‘to circumambulate’. The same Buddhist phrase represents also the source of the peculiar use of *tvamdanu* in Old and Late Khotanese. Under the relevant section in ch. 2., I have argued that the source form of *pissaiṅk* can be identified with Late Khotanese *bi’saṃga-* ‘id.’ (OKh. *bālsaṃga-*), itself from an earlier compound **balysa-saṃga-* ‘buddha-saṃgha’ of Central Asian diffusion. The Khotanese source form of *śrittātak* ‘well-being’ can be identified as OKh. *śśāratāti-*, a frequent translation of Skt. *śrī* (see s.v.).³⁸²

As evident from the source forms and the uses of these three words both in Tocharian A and Khotanese, they were borrowed in a Buddhist context. According to their phonological shape, the dating of these three loanwords cannot be earlier than the Old Khotanese stage, with *pissaiṅk* apparently being borrowed directly from Late Khotanese. Thus, the peculiar distribution and semantics of these words strongly suggest direct contact between Tocharian A and Khotanese in the historical period in a Buddhist

³⁸¹ A. Lubotsky (p.c.) notes that the majority of the lexical items in this group have a negative connotation. Negative terms for moral qualities and actions may be frequently borrowed, cf. e.g. English *scorn*, *ridicule*, *torment* etc.

³⁸² While TA *ṣāñ* is used to translate Skt. *upāya*, a concept typical of Mahāyāna traditions (Del Tomba and Maggi 2021: 217), in Tocharian B the word has mostly a non-technical meaning. The word was probably first borrowed independently in TA and B in a non-Buddhist context, but the peculiar Tocharian A meaning of the word could nonetheless betray Khotanese influence only on Tocharian A.

context. Where and when could the contact have taken place? And in what circumstances? The next sections will try to provide an answer to these questions.

4.3.4.2. The Khotanese in Šorčuq

There are no external historical sources that allude to the presence of Khotanese speakers in the Tocharian A speaking territory within the period of attestation of Khotanese (ca. 5th-11th c. CE). No Khotanese presence can be ascertained from the Tocharian secular documents from the area and no proof of the existence of Khotanese communities in the Tocharian A speaking oases can be extrapolated from the Khotanese documents. Accordingly, there seem to be no historical data available in order to explain the apparent presence of Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian A alone.

Nevertheless, despite the silence of the sources, I would like to put forward the hypothesis that the finding of a pustaka leaf (bi 33, formerly T III S 16³⁸³) belonging to an older version of the Book of Zambasta in Šorčuq, in the vicinity of Qarašahr, may point to the fact that a Khotanese religious community was active there. This was already suggested by Maggi (2004: 186), who argued that the fragment was brought to Šorčuq with a proselytizing purpose. This would mean that the leaf was meant to propagate Mahāyāna teachings in a predominantly non-Mahayanistic centre.³⁸⁴ As bi 33 can be palaeographically dated to the 5th-6th c. CE (Maggi 2004: 184), it is thus conceivable that a Khotanese religious mission was active in the Šorčuq area around the same period of time.

The manuscript bi 33 does not seem to be the only tangible proof of a connection between Šorčuq and Khotan. In fact, as noted by Sander (1991: 135 fn. 11, 2005: 134, 2012: 41-2), there are Sanskrit manuscripts from the same finding spot – the so-called ‘town cave’ – that can be palaeographically dated to the same period of bi 33. These exhibit strong southern features, both for their physical appearance (ductus and dimensions of the leaves) and their content (mostly Mahāyāna). From these data, it is difficult not to conclude with Sander (2012: 42) that ‘although the material is scanty, it points toward a cultural exchange between these two oases, which may have been facilitated by an ancient road along the rivulets of the Taklamakan desert from Qarašahr via Mazar Tagh to Khotan, a route probably used by Faxian.’

4.3.4.3. Excursus: other Khotanese materials found in Tocharian speaking areas

The uniqueness of bi 33 lies in the fact that, besides being probably the oldest extant Khotanese manuscript, it is also considered the only Khotanese manuscript found in a northern oasis (Maggi 2004: 184). However, a search into published Khotanese materials

³⁸³ The S in the signature should in this case stand for Š(orčuq).

³⁸⁴ Another argument in favour of this interpretation is that the manuscript to which bi 33 may have belonged probably contained only the more dogmatic parts of the Book of Zambasta (Maggi 2004: 186).

has yielded two more manuscript fragments which were found in the north, in the Kucha area. The first is known as P 1068 and the signature DA fd ('Duldur Aquur, fouilles diverses') makes clear that the finding place was Duldur Aquur, a site in the vicinity of Kucha. The formal ductus of this fragment, however, is surely much later than bi 33. P 1068 was edited by Bailey in KT V: 315 (n° 693) but, apart from this edition, I am not aware of any mention of this fragment in the secondary literature. The language is clearly Late Khotanese. As for the content, the first of the three incomplete lines which have been preserved seems to be of medical content. The second and the third line may belong to an unknown narrative text.

The second manuscript is an almost completely preserved *pustaka* leaf which bears the signature P 1311. Its *cote de trouvaille* 428 unmistakably refers to Qumtura, another site in the vicinity of Kucha (Pinault 2007: 171). Its formal ductus is also surely later than bi 33 and may be more or less of the same age as P 1068. The language seems to be (archaizing) Late Khotanese. The content is probably magical (Bailey 1955: 17) and seems to contain detailed instructions for the recitation of a *dhāraṇī*.

It is unfortunate that these two manuscripts, which surely deserve a more detailed study, do not allow to draw many historical conclusions, unlike bi 33. As they are both later than bi 33, however, I would like to put forward the hypothesis that they may have been brought to the Kucha area possibly during the time of the Four Garrisons, when Kuča, Qarašahr, Khotan and Kašgar where all united under Tang rule in the 7th-8th c. CE. These two texts may have traveled north along with the movement of soldiers from one garrison to the other. The increased mobility during this period may have favoured the circulation of such text of practical use (medical and magical). The presence of Khotanese soldiers in the Kucha area in the same period is further documented by Chinese military documents from Kucha (Rong 1992: 61). On possible southern influences from Khotan on Kucha Buddhist art of the same period cf. Zhu (2017).

4.3.4.4. Conclusions

Even if these fragments deserve a more detailed analysis, all the elements gathered in the discussion above may contribute towards a better understanding of the linguistic exchange between the southern and the northern oases in the second half of the first millennium CE. In particular, I argue that the presence of a Khotanese religious mission in Šorčuq may have influenced the Tocharian A Buddhist vocabulary. Thus, Khotanese may have directly contributed to the formation of the Tocharian A religious language. It is suggestive to think of the possibility that the Khotanese presence in Tocharian A speaking areas may have been also partly responsible for the difference in content between Tocharian A and Tocharian B literature. This, however, remains a matter for future investigation.