



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Watañi lāntaṃ: Khotanese and Tumshuqese Loanwords in Tocharian

Dragoni, F.

Citation

Dragoni, F. (2023). *Watañi lāntaṃ: Khotanese and Tumshuqese Loanwords in Tocharian*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
doi:10.29091/9783752002430

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3635714>

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

Watañi lāntaṃ: Khotanese and Tumshuqese Loanwords in Tocharian

Federico Dragoni



Watañi lāntaṃ



BEITRÄGE ZUR IRANISTIK

Gegründet von Georges Redard, herausgegeben von Agnes Korn

Band 50

Watañi lāntam:

Khotanese and Tumshuqese Loanwords in Tocharian

Federico Dragoni

WIESBADEN 2023

DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG

Watañi lāntam:
Khotanese and Tumshuqese
Loanwords in Tocharian

Federico Dragoni

WIESBADEN 2023
DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG

This publication is part of the project
‘Tracking the Tocharians from Europe to China: a linguistic reconstruction’
with project number 276-70-028 of the research programme Vidi,
financed by the Dutch Research Council (NWO).



Cover images:

above: Tocharian A *w(a)tañi lāntam* ‘in (the tune of) the King of Khotan’
from the Tocharian fragment A 24 b5;

below: Old Khotanese *hvatänä rre* ‘the King of Khotan’ (nom. sg.)
from the main manuscript of the Book of Zambasta (Z 5.114),
now preserved in St. Petersburg.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten
sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

© 2023 Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden

ISBN: 978-3-7520-0690-2 (Print)

eISBN: 978-3-7520-0243-0 (E-Book)

<https://doi.org/10.29091/9783752002430>

www.reichert-verlag.de

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne
Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar.
Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen
und die Speicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.
Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier (alterungsbeständig – pH7, neutral)

CONTENTS

PREFACE	13
ABBREVIATIONS, SYMBOLS, CONVENTIONS.....	15
ABBREVIATIONS.....	15
SYMBOLS.....	16
REMARKS ON THE NOTATION OF PROTO-IRANIAN	16
1. INTRODUCTION	17
1.1. PRELIMINARIES AND AIMS	17
1.2. TOCHARIAN AND ITS CONTACT LANGUAGES.....	18
1.3. KHOTANESE AND TUMSHUQESE.....	18
1.4. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KHOTANESE AND TUMSHUQESE LOANWORDS IN TOCHARIAN	19
1.5. PREVIOUS STUDIES.....	20
1.6. KEY CONCEPTS AND METHODOLOGY	22
1.7. STRUCTURE OF THE ENTRIES IN §2.1. AND CHAPTER 5.....	24
2. KHOTANESE AND TUMSHUQESE LOANWORDS IN TOCHARIAN	27
2.1. LOANWORD STUDIES	27
(1) TB <i>añkwaş(t)</i> ‘Asa foetida’, LKh. <i>añguşda-</i> ‘id.’	27
TB <i>amäkşpänta</i> ‘wagon-master (?)’, LKh. <i>maşpa</i> ‘road’.....	29
(2) TB <i>ampa-</i> ‘to rot, decay’, LKh. <i>hañbva-</i> ‘fester’.....	34
TB <i>ampoño</i> ‘rottenness, infection’, LKh. <i>hañbva-</i> ‘fester’	35
(3) TA <i>ärt*</i> , OKh. <i>haða-</i> ‘envoy’	36
TB <i>armañik</i> ‘a kind of textile’	40
TB <i>aşām</i> A <i>āşām</i> ‘worthy’, OKh. <i>āşana-</i> ‘id.’	41
TB <i>as-</i> ‘to bring, fetch’, OKh. <i>hays-</i> ‘to drive, send’.....	41
(4) TB <i>uātano*</i> A <i>watam*</i> ‘Khotanese’, OKh. <i>hvatana-</i> ‘id.’	43
TB <i>ustamo*</i> ‘?’, OKh. <i>ustama-</i> ‘last’	61
(5) TB <i>eñcuwo</i> A <i>añcu*</i> ‘iron’, OKh. <i>hişşana-</i> ‘id.’	62
TB <i>eşpeşşe</i> ‘Boerhavia diffusa’, LKh. <i>aišta bā</i> ‘id.’	63
(6) TB <i>orşa</i> A <i>oräş*</i> (official title), OKh. <i>auräşşaa-</i> ‘councillor’	64
(7) TB <i>oş</i> ‘evil’, OKh. <i>oşa-</i> ‘id.’	66
TB <i>oskiye</i> A <i>oşke</i> ‘house’, LKh. <i>auskā-</i> ‘dwelling place’	68
TB <i>ausw-</i> ‘to cry’, Khot. <i>oys-</i> ‘to be angry’.....	70
TB <i>kañko/kañkau</i> ‘?’, OKh. <i>kañga-</i> ‘husk (of rice)’	71
TB <i>kattāke</i> A <i>kātak*</i> ‘householder’, OKh. <i>ggāṭhaa-</i> ‘id.’	72
(8) TA <i>katw-</i> ‘to ridicule’, Khot. <i>khan-</i> : <i>khamtta-</i> ‘to laugh’.....	72
(9) TB <i>kāmarto*</i> A <i>kākmart</i> ‘chief’, OKh. <i>kamala-</i> ‘head’	73
TA <i>kar</i> ‘only, just’, OKh. <i>karä</i> ‘at all’	74
TB <i>karäs</i> A <i>kāräs</i> ‘wilderness (?)’, OKh. <i>karäşşā-</i> ‘creeper’	74

TA <i>kāre</i> ‘sword’, OKh. <i>kāḍara-</i> ‘id.’	82
TA <i>kāltanik</i> ‘drum’, OKh. <i>ggātā’ka-</i> ‘bell’	83
(10) TB <i>kāswo</i> (name of a disease)	84
(11) TB <i>kātso</i> A <i>kāts</i> ‘belly, stomach, abdomen, womb’, LKh. <i>khāysāna-</i> ‘stomach’	85
(12) TB <i>kito*</i> (<i>ekita</i>) ‘help’, OKh. <i>ggīha-</i> ‘id.’	87
TA <i>k_uñās</i> ‘fight, conflict’, OKh. <i>gūrās-</i> ‘to quarrel’	92
(13) TB <i>kuñi-mot</i> ‘grape wine’, LKh. <i>gūrānai mau</i> ‘id.’	93
TB <i>kuñcit</i> ~ <i>kwāñcit</i> A <i>kuñcit</i> ‘sesame’, OKh. <i>kuṃjsata-</i> ‘id.’	94
TB <i>kurkamāṣṣe</i> ~ <i>kwārkamāṣṣi</i> ‘pertaining to saffron’, OKh. <i>kurkuma-*</i> ‘saffron’	96
(14) TAB <i>kurkal</i> ‘bdellium’, LKh. <i>gurgula-</i> ‘id.’	97
(15) TB <i>keto</i> ‘property, estate’, PTK <i>*gēḍa-</i> ‘id.’	98
(16) TB <i>keś</i> A <i>kaś</i> ‘number’, OKh. <i>haṃkhīs-</i> ‘to count’	100
(17) TB <i>koto*</i> ‘± crevice, hole in the ground, pit’, Khot. <i>gūha-</i> ‘faeces’	103
TB <i>kontso*</i> ‘?’, OKh. <i>ggamjsā-</i> ‘flaw’	105
TB <i>kompo*</i> ‘?’, OKh. <i>ggampha-</i> ‘plain’	106
TB <i>koro</i> ‘mule’, OKh. <i>*ggūra-</i> ‘wild ass’ or OKh. <i>khara-</i> ‘donkey’	106
TB <i>-kke, -kka, -kko</i> (suffix)	107
(18) TB <i>krañko</i> ‘chicken’, Khot. <i>krñga-</i> ‘id.’	109
TB <i>krak-</i> ‘to be dirty’	111
(19) TB <i>krāke</i> ‘dirt, filth’, Khot. <i>khārgga-</i> ‘mud’	112
(20) TAB <i>krāso</i> ‘torment’, LKh. <i>gr(r)aysa-</i> ‘torment’	113
(21) TB <i>cowo*</i> (in <i>cowai tārka-</i> ‘to rob’), LKh. <i>dyūka-</i> ‘robber’	118
TA <i>cospā</i> , Tq. <i>cazbā-</i> , Niya Pkt. <i>cozbo</i>	120
(22) TB <i>tāno</i> ‘seed, grain’, Khot. <i>dānā-</i> ‘id.’	122
TB <i>tapatriś</i> ‘trayastrīṣā’, OKh. <i>tāvatrīśa-</i> ‘id.’	122
(23) TB <i>tono</i> ‘silk (?)’, OKh. <i>thauna-</i> ‘cloth’	123
(24) TB <i>tvāñkaro</i> ‘ginger’, LKh. <i>ttuṃgara-</i> ‘id.’	125
(25) TA <i>twantaṃ</i> ‘reverence’, OKh. <i>tvamdanu</i> ‘id.’	127
(26) TB <i>twār</i> ‘?’, OKh. <i>ttuvare</i> ‘moreover’	128
TB <i>pañō*</i> ‘?’, OKh. <i>baña-</i> ‘bind’	129
TA <i>paṃ</i> (particle), OKh. <i>pana-</i> ‘each, every’	129
(27) TB <i>pātro</i> A <i>pātār</i> ‘alms-bowl’, Khot. <i>pātra-</i> , Skt. <i>pātra-</i>	130
(28) TAB <i>pānto</i> ‘friend, companion’, OKh. <i>pandāa-</i> ‘path’	130
(29) TB <i>paraka-</i> ‘to prosper, thrive’, OKh. <i>pharāka-</i> ‘more’	134
(30) TB <i>parso</i> A <i>pārs</i> ‘letter’, OKh. <i>pulsā</i> ‘to ask’	136
TA <i>pāśiṃ</i> ‘treasure (?)’, Khot. <i>pārgyiña-</i> ‘id. (?)’	139
(31) TB <i>pito</i> ‘price’, OKh. <i>piha-</i> ‘id.’	142
(32) TA <i>pissanik</i> ‘bhikṣusamgha’, LKh. <i>bi’samga-</i> ‘id.’	145
TB <i>peri</i> A <i>pare</i> ‘debt’	147
TB <i>mañkāra/mañkāre/mañkarāñcana</i> ‘old’, OKh. <i>maṃgāra-</i> ‘id.’	151
TB <i>mātār, mādār</i> A <i>mātār</i> ‘makara (sea-monster)’	152
TB <i>miṣ(ṣ)e</i> A <i>miṣi</i> ‘field, kṣetra’, Khot. <i>miṣ(ṣ)a-</i> ‘id.’	153
TB <i>mewiyo</i> ‘tiger’, LKh. <i>mūya-*</i> ‘id.’	156
(33) TB <i>mrañco</i> ‘black pepper (Piper nigrum)’, LKh. <i>mirimjsya-</i> ‘id.’	157
(34) TB <i>yolo</i> ‘evil, bad’, OKh. <i>yaula-</i> ‘falsehood’	158
TB <i>yauyek*</i> ‘?’, Khot. <i>yyauvaka</i> ‘butterfly (?)’	160

TB <i>rapaññe</i> ‘pertaining to the 12 th month’, Khot. <i>rrāhaja</i> - ‘id.’	160
TB <i>raso</i> ‘span’, Khot. <i>haraysa</i> - ‘extension, expanse’	165
(36) TB <i>warāñce</i> *, A <i>wāryāñc</i> * ‘sand’, Khot. <i>gurvica</i> - ‘grain (of sand)’	166
TB <i>wartto</i> , A <i>wärt</i> ‘forest’, OKh. <i>bāḍa</i> - ‘land’	168
TB <i>waṣāko</i> * ‘fear’, Bactr. <i>βiḷāyo</i> ‘bad’	168
TB <i>wicuko</i> ‘cheek, (jaw)bone’, PK * <i>wi-jwa-ka</i> - ‘id.’	169
(35) TB <i>wiñcaññe</i> ‘pertaining to a sparrow’, OKh. <i>biṃji</i> - ‘sparrow’	170
TB <i>wrāko</i> A <i>wrok</i> ‘pearl’, OKh. <i>mrāhā</i> - ‘id.’	171
TB <i>wrantso</i> * ‘against, opposite’, OKh. <i>varālsto</i> ‘towards’	172
(37) TAB <i>śāñcapo</i> ‘mustard’, OKh. <i>śśaśvāna</i> - ‘id.’	173
(38) TB <i>śāmpo</i> *, TA <i>śāmpām</i> * ‘haughtiness, conceit, pride’, OKh. <i>tcampha</i> - ‘disturbance, tumult’	174
(39) TB <i>śārko</i> * ‘song, singing’, A <i>tsārk</i> ‘±lute (?)’, Khot. <i>tcarkā</i> - ‘play’	176
TB <i>śito</i> ‘?’, OKh. <i>śśita</i> - ‘white’	179
(40) TB <i>śintso</i> * ‘?’, LKh. <i>śimjā</i> - ‘Zizyphus jujuba (?)’	180
TB <i>śka</i> , (A <i>škā</i> ?) ‘close by’, LKh. <i>śka</i> ‘?’	184
(41) TA <i>śrītātāk</i> , TB <i>śraddhatāk</i> ‘well-being’, OKh. <i>śśāratāti</i> - ‘id.’	185
(42) TB <i>śart</i> -, A <i>śārttw</i> - ‘to incite’, OKh. <i>śśarr</i> - : <i>śśuḍa</i> -* ‘to exhilarate’	186
(43) TB <i>śupākīñe</i> ‘enclosed farm’ pertaining to suppositories (<i>śpakīye</i>)	187
(44) TB <i>śpakīye</i> ‘suppository’, LKh. <i>śvakā</i> - ‘id.’	188
(45) TB <i>śāñ</i> , <i>śāñ</i> , A <i>śāñ</i> ‘artifice, expedient, means, method’, Khot. <i>saña</i> - ‘id.’	189
(46) TB <i>sanapa</i> - ‘to rub in, rub on, anoint, embrocate (prior to washing)’, Khot. <i>ysānāh</i> - ‘to wash’	189
TB <i>sanu</i> ‘danger’	192
TB <i>samākane</i> ‘cuirass (?)’	192
TB <i>sālyakko</i> * ‘?’	193
(47) TB <i>siñco</i> * ‘?’, LKh. <i>simjā</i> - (plant name)	194
TA <i>sisā</i> * ‘Sītā’, OKh. <i>siysā</i> -, LKh. <i>sijsā</i> - ‘id.’	195
TB <i>sumo</i> ‘libation (?)’, LKh. <i>ysūma</i> - ‘broth’	196
TAB <i>senik</i> ‘care, pledge’	197
TB <i>skawa</i> - ‘to lick’, Khot. <i>skau</i> - ‘to touch’	199
(48) TB <i>tsuwo</i> * ‘towards’	199
TB <i>tserēññ</i> - ‘to deceive’, Khot. <i>jsīr</i> - ‘id.’	200
2.2. REFERENCE LISTS	204
2.2.1. Reliable loanwords	204
2.2.2. Less reliable and doubtful loanwords	205
2.2.3. Rejected loanwords	207
2.2.4. Sogdian loanwords	208
2.2.5. Old Steppe Iranian loanwords	208
3. PHONOLOGICAL AND MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS AND CHRONOLOGY..	209
3.1. INTRODUCTION	209
3.2. CHRONOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION	209
3.2.1. Loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese	209
3.2.2. Loanwords either from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese	210

3.2.3. Loanwords from Pre-Khotanese	210
3.2.4. Loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese	211
3.2.5. Loanwords from Old Khotanese.....	211
3.2.6. Loanwords from Late Khotanese.....	212
3.3. PHONOLOGICAL CORRESPONDENCES	212
3.3.1. Vowels	213
3.3.2. Consonants.....	215
3.4. MORPHOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION ACCORDING TO TOCH. INFLECTIONAL CLASSES	219
3.4.1. Nom. sg. - \emptyset (no final vowel).....	219
3.4.2. Nom. sg. - <i>e</i>	219
3.4.3. Nom. sg. - <i>o</i> , obl. sg. - <i>a</i>	220
3.4.4. Nom. - <i>o</i> , obl. sg. - <i>ai</i>	221
3.4.5. Nom. sg. - <i>o</i> , obl. sg. - <i>o</i>	221
3.4.6. Nom. sg. - <i>a</i> , obl. sg. - <i>ai</i>	221
3.4.7. Only nom. sg. - <i>o</i> attested	222
3.4.8. Only final - <i>i</i> attested	222
3.4.9. Only TA (no corresponding TB form).....	222
3.4.10. On the borrowing path Khot. acc. sg. - <i>u</i> \rightarrow TB nom. sg. - <i>o</i>	223
3.5. LOANWORDS ACCORDING TO PART OF SPEECH AND GENDER.....	225
3.5.1. List of loanwords according to their part of speech	225
3.5.2. Commentary.....	226
3.5.3. Loanwords according to their gender	226
3.5.4. Commentary.....	227
3.5.5. Borrowing patterns of Tocharian verbs from Khotanese; borrowing patterns of nominal forms of the Khotanese verb into Tocharian.....	227
4. SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION	229
4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	229
4.2. LOANWORDS ACCORDING TO SEMANTIC FIELDS.....	229
4.2.1. Names of plants	229
4.2.2. Metals	230
4.2.3. Medical terms.....	230
4.2.4. Body parts and bodily functions	230
4.2.5. Food and drink	230
4.2.6. Nature.....	230
4.2.7. Animals	230
4.2.8. Clothing.....	230
4.2.9. Music	231
4.2.10. Administrative, political and economic terms.....	231
4.2.11. Moral qualities/actions	231
4.2.12. Buddhist terms.....	231
4.2.13. Grammatical terms.....	232

4.3. COMMENTARY	232
4.3.1. Materia medica	232
4.3.2. Administrative, political and economic terms	232
4.3.3. Moral qualities/actions	232
4.3.4. Buddhist terms	233
5. TOCHARIAN LOANWORDS IN KHOTANESE AND TUMSHUQESE	237
5.1. INTRODUCTION	237
5.2. TOCHARIAN LOANWORDS IN KHOTANESE	237
5.2.1. OKh. <i>puka</i> - ‘cubit’, TB <i>poko</i> * TA <i>poke</i> ‘arm’	237
5.2.2. OKh. <i>soläte</i> ‘snakes ?’, TA <i>salat</i> ‘hopping’	243
5.2.3. OKh. <i>hambälke</i> ‘?’, TB <i>ampläkätte</i> ‘uninvited, without permission’	244
5.2.4. LKh. <i>mukau-ka</i> - ‘pers. name’, TB <i>moko</i> ‘elder’	248
5.3. TOCHARIAN LOANWORDS IN TUMSHUQESE	249
5.3.1. Introduction	249
5.3.2. Tq. <i>p(a)laca</i> -, TB <i>pläce</i> (A <i>pläc</i>) ‘request (?)’	249
5.4. CONCLUSIONS	251
6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	253
6.1. SUMMARY	253
6.2. CONCLUSIONS	253
6.2.1. A new corpus of Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian	253
6.2.2. The different layers of Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian	254
6.2.3. What type of linguistic contact?	257
BIBLIOGRAPHY	259
BIBLIOGRAPHIC ABBREVIATIONS	259
REFERENCES	260
INDEX OF WORDS	289
Tocharian	289
Proto-Indo-Iranian	294
Iranian	294
Indo-Aryan	304
Proto-Indo-European	307
Hittite	308
Armenian	308
Ancient Greek	308
Latin and Romance	308
Proto-Celtic	308
Germanic	309
Old Church Slavonic	309
Lithuanian	309
Semitic	310
Turkic	310
Sino-Tibetan	310

INDEX OF LOANWORDS IN CHAPTER 3	313
INDEX OF PASSAGES	317
Tocharian	317
Khotanese	323
Tumshuqese	330
Avestan	330
Bactrian	330
Sogdian, Parthian, Middle Persian	330
Sanskrit	330
Gāndhārī	331
Pāli	331
Old Uyghur	331

TABLES

Table 1. <i>Asa foetida</i> from Proto-Iranian to Tocharian	28
Table 2. Words for ‘messenger’ in Tocharian and Old Uyghur	37
Table 3. Occurrences of < _u w> and < _u p> in Tocharian	55
Table 4. Initial < _u w> and < _u p> in Tocharian.....	56
Table 5. Different orthographies for the initial vowel of LKh. <i>aišta bā</i> ‘Boerhavia diffusa’ ...	63
Table 6. A new translation of the <i>Jīvakapustaka</i> passage containing the verb <i>grays-āñ-</i>	117
Table 7. The three hot substances in Tocharian B and Late Khotanese	157
Table 8. <i>na</i> and <i>ta</i> in TUMXUQ 002 and in the month name in a2.	163
Table 9. Khotanese, Tumshuqese and Tocharian calendars	164
Table 10. Stages of Khotanese and Tumshuqese together with their corresponding stages of Tocharian in chronological order with approximate dates.....	209
Table 11. Endings of the <i>a</i> -stems in Khotanese and their origin	223
Table 12. Comparison between the semantic fields used in this study and those in Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009).....	229
Table 13. Z 22.159 and Z 22.167 together with their Sanskrit parallels in the <i>Maitreya-</i> <i>vyākaraṇa</i> and in the <i>Maitreyāvadāna</i>	239
Table 14. Values of <i>puka-</i> in the <i>Maitreyavyākaraṇa</i> and in the <i>Maitreyāvadāna</i>	240
Table 15. Measures of the sacrificial post (Skt. <i>yūpa-</i>) in Tocharian and Old Uyghur.....	242
Table 16. Features of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian	255
Table 17. Features of Pre-Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian.....	256
Table 18. Features of Old Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian	256
Table 19. Features of Late Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian	257

PREFACE

This study was carried out within the project ‘Tracking the Tocharians from Europe to China: a linguistic reconstruction’ (project number 276-70-028) funded by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) under the guidance of Michaël Peyrot. This book is the result of a four-year PhD project at the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics (LUCL) under the supervision of Michaël Peyrot and Sasha Lubotsky. It represents a revised version of the PhD dissertation produced in this framework. A new chapter on Tocharian loanwords in Khotanese and Tumshuqese and the final indexes are amongst the most notable additions.

Initially, the project was focused on the historical phonology of Khotanese and Tumshuqese, and the linguistic contacts with Tocharian were relegated to an appendix. During the third year, however, it became clear that Tocharian had preserved many prehistoric loanwords from Khotanese and Tumshuqese that previous scholars had overlooked. When I realised that this new corpus of loanwords could be very significant for the study of Khotanese historical phonology, the research focus shifted to this group of loanwords. The title ‘*watañi lāntaṃ*’ refers to a Tocharian A tune name whose origin and meaning were unclear. In this study (§2.1. s.v. *„wātano**), I argue that it is possible to translate it as ‘in (the tune of) the King of Khotan’ and that the Tocharian B match of TA *wataṃ** ‘Khotan’ is TB *„wātano**.¹ Thanks to this interpretation, it is now clear for the first time that the name of Khotan was known to Tocharians and borrowed from Pre-Khotanese speakers.

Many people and institutions have contributed to this work during its five years of gestation. I am grateful to Leiden University and the LUCL for welcoming me as a staff member and supporting me throughout the various phases of the PhD trajectory. I am particularly grateful to Michaël Peyrot, who accepted me as part of his project and supervised the research activities that led to the completion of this volume. Sasha Lubotsky was always very helpful and encouraging in all matters Indo-Iranian and Indo-European. Mauro Maggi first taught me Khotanese and Iranian philology during my BA years at Sapienza. He has never ceased to offer his kind advice in the following years, granting me access to R.E. Emmerick’s unpublished notes, crucial for many sections of this study. I also feel very much indebted to Enrico Morano, who first aroused my interest in Middle Iranian languages and texts long ago. Nicholas Sims-Williams thoroughly read the final manuscript and made many important suggestions.

My thanks also go to the members of the defence committee (Gerd Carling, Mauro Maggi, Stefan Norbruis, Tijmen Pronk, Gijsbert J. Rutten, and Nicholas Sims-Williams) for their numerous comments and improvements. The reading notes and kind editorial assistance of Agnes Korn, who accepted the volume for publication in the series *Beiträge zur Iranistik*, were instrumental in giving the manuscript its final form. Finally, I am grateful to the *Indogermanische Gesellschaft* for awarding me the first prize for best dissertation of the year 2022.

¹ Tocharian A *w(a)tañi lāntaṃ* ‘in (the tune of) the King of Khotan’ can be read in its Brāhmī original from the manuscript A 24 b5 on the cover of this book. Beneath it, its Old Khotanese equivalent *hvatānā rre* ‘the King of Khotan’ (nom. sg.) from the main manuscript of the Book of Zambasta (Z 5.114) can be found as well.

It is, again, a challenging task to thank all the colleagues and friends who made this study possible. For space reasons, I must limit myself to only a handful of people. First and foremost, I am grateful to Chams Bernard, my colleague in the NWO project. His work on Old Steppe Iranian loanwords in Tocharian complements this study, and many of his ideas found their way into this work. The following colleagues (in alphabetic order) deserve a special mention: Kate Bellamy, Ruixuan Chen, Alessandro Del Tomba, Louise Friis, Athanaric Huard, Stefan Norbruis, Niels Schoubben, Xander Vertegaal, and Abel Warries. Finally, I would like to thank my parents and my brother for their continuous support.

ABBREVIATIONS, SYMBOLS, CONVENTIONS

ABBREVIATIONS

abl.	ablative	MSN	<i>Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka</i>
acc.	accusative	MSogd.	Manichaeen Sogdian
ag.n.	agent noun	nom.	nominative
all.	allative	NP	New Persian
arch.	archaic	OAv.	Old Avestan
Aśoka	<i>Aśokāvadāna</i>	OCh.	Old Chinese
Av.	Avestan	OE	Old English
Bactr.	Bactrian	OIA	Old Indo-Aryan
BHS	Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit	OKh.	Old Khotanese
BSogd.	Buddhist Sogdian	OSIr.	Old Steppe Iranian
caus.	causative	Oss.	Ossetic
Chin.	Chinese	ON	Old Norse
class.	classical	OUygh.	Old Uyghur
com.	comitative	Pa.	Parthian
D	Digoron (Ossetic)	PCelt.	Proto-Celtic
Dhp	<i>Dharmapada</i>	perl.	perative
EMC	Early Middle Chinese	PG	Proto-Germanic
fem.	feminine	Pkt.	Prakrit
Gandh.	Gāndhārī	PIIr.	Proto-Indo-Iranian
gen.	genitive	PIr.	Proto-Iranian
Germ.	German	PK	Pre-Khotanese
I	Iron (Ossetic)	pl.	plural
inf.	infinitive	prs.	present
instr.	instrumental	prt.	preterite
ipv.	imperative	PiŚ	<i>Piṇḍaśāstra</i>
JP	<i>Jivakapustaka</i>	PS	<i>Pradakṣiṇāsūtra</i>
JS	<i>Jātakastāva</i>	Psht.	Pashto
Khot.	Khotanese	ptc.	participle
Kurd.	Kurdish	ptc. nec.	participium necessitatis
KVāc	<i>Karmavācanā</i>	PTK	Proto-Tumshuqese- Khotanese
Lat.	Latin	Rāma	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>
Lith.	Lithuanian	Rk	<i>Ratnakūṭa</i>
LKh.	Late Khotanese	sg.	singular
LMC	Late Middle Chinese	Sgh.	<i>Saṅghāṭasūtra</i>
loc.	locative	Si	<i>Siddhasāra</i>
LW	loanword	Sh.	Shughni
m.	masculine	Skt.	Sanskrit
Mañj	<i>Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatārasūtra</i>	Sogd.	Sogdian
MBactr.	Manichaeen Bactrian	subj.	subjunctive
MCh.	Middle Chinese	Sudh	<i>Sudhanāvadāna</i>
mid.	middle	Sum	<i>Sumukhasūtra</i>
MMP	Manichaeen Middle Persian	Suv	<i>Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra</i>

tr.	transitive	Vim	<i>Book of Vimalakīrti</i>
transl.	translation	VkN	<i>Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra</i>
Tq.	Tumshuqese	voc.	vocative
Uv.	<i>Udānavarga</i>	YAv.	Young Avestan
V	<i>Widēwdād</i>	Yd.	Yidgha
Vajr	<i>Vajracchedikā</i>	ZMP	Zoroastrian Middle Persian
Ved.	Vedic	Z	<i>Book of Zambasta</i>

SYMBOLS

→	loanword from language A into → language B	*x	reconstructed form
[x]	phonetic form; restoration in a Khotanese text; uncertain reading in a Tocharian text; additions in the English translations.	x*	inferred form (e.g. nom. sg. of a lexeme of which only other case forms are attested)
x	morphological form	**x	wrong form
(x)	restoration in a Tocharian text	>	developed phonologically into
<x>	orthographic form	<	developed phonologically from
*x	restored (certain) form in quotations of Suv (cf. Suv I: xxx)	•	punctuation mark in a Tocharian manuscript (single dot)
///	the line starts or ends with a lacuna in a Tocharian text	:	punctuation mark in a Tocharian manuscript (double dot)
		.	punctuation mark in a Khotanese manuscript (single dot)
		:	punctuation mark in a Khotanese manuscript (double dot)

REMARKS ON THE NOTATION OF PROTO-IRANIAN

The notation of Proto-Iranian follows in the main lines Cheung (EDIV: xiii). Instead of Cheung's **u* and **i*, however, I use **w* and **y*. Further, instead of **s* and **z* < PIIr. **č* and **ǰ*, I use **č* and **ǰ*. As a convention, **ś* is used for the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese ancestor of the Old Khotanese (classical orthography) voiceless <śś> and **z* for that of the Old Khotanese voiced <śś>.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. PRELIMINARIES AND AIMS

This study investigates the linguistic contacts between Khotanese and Tumshuqese on the one hand and Tocharian A and B on the other. Its main objective is to detect and analyse the Tocharian lexicon of Khotanese and Tumshuqese provenance. The longest chapter (Chapter 2.) presents and discusses Tocharian lexical items possibly or probably borrowed from Khotanese and Tumshuqese and rejects several unlikely borrowing etymologies that have been proposed. The corpus determined in Chapter 2. is then subject to a phonological (Chapter 3.) and a semantic (Chapter 4.) analysis. Chapter 5. contains a preliminary assessment of the Tocharian component in the lexicon of Khotanese and Tumshuqese, and Chapter 6. summarises the results of the investigation.

The research questions that are at the basis of this study can be summarised as follows:

1. Is it possible to expand the corpus of Khotanese and Tumshuqese loanwords in Tocharian already known from the scientific literature?
2. What are the phonological and morphological features of these loanwords?
3. Is it possible to classify the loanwords chronologically? From which stages of Khotanese and Tumshuqese did the borrowing take place?
4. Which semantic areas of the lexicon were subject to borrowing from Khotanese and Tumshuqese?
5. Which type of linguistic contact took place between Tocharian and Khotanese and Tumshuqese?

Chapter 2. is concerned with the first research question, Chapter 3. with the second and the third, and Chapter 4. with the fourth. Chapter 6. summarises the most important conclusions and provides possible answers to the fifth question.

In chapters 4. and 5., and in the discussion of some of the lexical items in §2.1., I have sketched some possible socio-historical scenarios explaining the intensity and quality of language contact between Tocharian and Khotanese and Tumshuqese. It should be stressed that none of these scenarios has been sufficiently explored. Therefore, the historical conclusions summarised in Chapter 6. still have the character of hypotheses that await a more detailed investigation. It is hoped that such research may be carried out in the not-so-distant future, as it might reveal a great deal about the cultural history of the Tarim Basin.

After a brief introduction to the Tocharian languages (§1.2.) and Khotanese and Tumshuqese (§1.3.), this chapter defines the research problem (§1.4.) and offers an overview of the scientific literature on the subject (§1.5.). Further, it describes the methodology employed (§1.6.) and, finally, the structure of the entries in §2.1. and Chapter 5. (§1.7.).

1.2. TOCHARIAN AND ITS CONTACT LANGUAGES

‘Tocharian’ is the conventional designation of two extinct Indo-European languages once spoken in the northern part of today’s Xinjiāng Uyghur Autonomous Region in Northwest China. These two languages are referred to as Tocharian A (TA), originally from Agni/Yānqí (also called ‘East Tocharian’ or ‘Agnean’), and Tocharian B (TB), originally from Kuča (also called ‘West Tocharian’ or ‘Kuchean’). The designation goes back to the beginning of the 20th century when the first Tocharian manuscripts were unearthed from the sands of the Tāklamakan desert (Sieg and Siegling 1908).

The manuscripts written in Tocharian B can be dated approximately from the 5th to the 10th c. CE. Tocharian A is attested in manuscripts dating from the 7th to the 10th c. CE (Pinault 1989a: 7–10). Following the standard chronological periodisation by Peyrot (2008), Tocharian B can be divided into an archaic, a classical, and a late phase. Further, a ‘colloquial’ type is distinguished (Peyrot 2008: 190). As for Tocharian A, the language attested in the extant manuscripts seems to be more uniform. Ogihara (2014) has shown that, besides its use as a religious language, it was also employed as an administrative language in the monasteries. Both languages are written in the so-called ‘North-Turkestan’ variant of the Indian Brāhmī script.

Tocharian A and B are genetically related. It is possible to reconstruct their ancestor language, which is conventionally termed ‘Proto-Tocharian’ (PT). The dating of Proto-Tocharian is debated, but it can be estimated between the 10th and 5th c. BCE (see further §6.2.2.1.).

Language contact played an important role in the historical development of Tocharian. Neighbouring languages have left extensive traces in all language levels, i.e. phonology, morphology, and the lexicon. In prehistoric times, Tocharian was probably in contact with ‘Old Steppe’ Iranian (OSIr.), an otherwise unattested Old Iranian language (Peyrot 2018),² and with Uralic (Peyrot 2019). More recent contacts involve Old and Middle Chinese, Old Uyghur, Sogdian, Bactrian, and Parthian. With the expansion of Buddhism in the Tarim Basin, a significant part of the lexicon was borrowed from Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit and Middle Indic languages, chiefly Gāndhārī. The precise dating and extent of language exchange with Khotanese and Tumshuqese (see §1.3.) is unknown because no comprehensive studies are available. This work shows that Khotanese and Tumshuqese influence on Tocharian was much more intense than expected and spanned almost two millennia.

1.3. KHOTANESE AND TUMSHUQESE

Khotanese and Tumshuqese are two Middle Iranian languages once spoken in the southwestern and northwestern parts of today’s Xinjiāng Uyghur Autonomous Region in Northwest China. At the beginning of the 20th century, following their discovery, the two languages were named after the two cities Khotan (today’s 和田 Hétíán) and Tumshuq (today’s 图木舒克 Tūmùshūkè).

Khotanese is richly documented. The literature includes literary and religious (Buddhist) texts and many secular documents (Maggi 2009a). The oldest manuscripts are plausibly dated to the 5th c. CE on palaeographical grounds (Maggi 2016, 2022a) and the language may have

² The contact with Old Steppe Iranian is the subject of the PhD research of my colleague Chams Bernard (Leiden University), from whom I adopt this preliminary language label (see §1.5.)

been spoken roughly until the Qarakhanid conquest of Khotan at the beginning of the 11th c. CE. Two main stages of the language are conventionally distinguished: Old and Late Khotanese.³ In this work, I reconstruct a pre-stage which I term ‘Pre-Khotanese’ (PK). Whereas manuscripts written in Old Khotanese were mainly found within the Khotan area, Late Khotanese is also documented through manuscripts from the Dunhuang area, where a Khotanese community was residing. The extant manuscripts are either Chinese book rolls or Indian-type pustaka books. They are written in the southern variant of Turkestan Brāhmī (Dragoni 2017: 396). Old Khotanese is one of the most conservative Middle Iranian languages. It preserves six of the eight Proto-Iranian cases, shows traces of neuter gender, and has four moods (with traces of an injunctive).

Tumshuqese is known only from a handful of documents (Maue 2009) dated approximately to the 8th c. CE (Ogihara and Ching 2017: 467–69). As far as can be gathered from the scanty material, Tumshuqese was heavily influenced by Tocharian B. Traces of this influence can be found in the script, a northern variant of the ‘Turkestan Brāhmī’ also used for Tocharian, the lexicon, and the literature.⁴ The so-called ‘Fremdzeichen’, or ‘foreign signs’, are a particular feature of the Tumshuqese writing system. Some are original inventions, and some are shared with Tocharian, Sogdian, and Old Uyghur Brāhmī. The manuscript of the Tumshuqese *Karmavācana* (Emmerick 1985a) might be earlier than the rest of the documents, as only one of the Fremdzeichen (x_5) was used in this text. Still, no exact dating can be proposed with certainty.

The importance of Tumshuqese lies in the fact that it is genetically related to Khotanese, but it is far more conservative. As an example, one may compare Tq. *rorda-* ‘given’ and OKh. *hūḍa-* ‘id.’, both from PIr. **fra-brta-*. As in the case of Tocharian A and B, the comparison between Khotanese and Tumshuqese may allow the reconstruction of a common ancestor that I will term ‘Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese’ (PTK) following Peyrot (2018: 272–74).

1.4. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KHOTANESE AND TUMSHUQESE LOANWORDS IN TOCHARIAN

Why is it important to study Khotanese and Tumshuqese loanwords in Tocharian? In the first place, little is known about the linguistic prehistory of the Tarim Basin. The analysis of the loanword corpus may shed light on the age and significance of the first contacts between Khotanese and Tocharian. Through the comparative method (see Campbell 2020: 140–93), it is possible to reconstruct the pre- and proto-stages of Khotanese and Tumshuqese. This allows to establish whether the phonological features of the loanwords into Tocharian are to be dated to the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese period (see §1.3.) or to the historically attested stages. The relative chronology of the loanwords and a thorough semantic analysis may show precisely which parts of the lexicon were most extensively borrowed at what stage in the history of the languages under investigation.

³ This is only a conventional definition that must be refined in the future. Skjærvø (KMB: lxx), in addition to Old and Late Khotanese, distinguishes a Middle Khotanese stage.

⁴ If the identification of the language of the so-called ‘Formal Kharoṣṭhī’ fragments proposed in Dragoni, Schoubben, and Peyrot (2020: 357–58) is correct, it may be an earlier form of Tumshuqese. Significantly, the fragments were found as far east as Kuča, Šorčuq, and Tuyuq in the vicinity of Turfan, i.e. in Tocharian-speaking territory.

As loanwords can provide essential insights into the social interactions among different groups in the past (Epps 2015: 585–86), the analysis conducted in this study contributes to a better understanding of the dynamics of interactions among the population groups of the prehistoric Tarim Basin. The results of this analysis can be employed to address more complex questions related to power relations, language dominance, and ancient population movements in the Tarim Basin. Furthermore, the study of more recent loanwords may shed light on the same dynamics in historical times.

As an example, the results of this study deliver relevant material for the study of the spread of Buddhism among the people of the Tarim Basin by contributing to the ongoing discussions on the circulation of texts and ritual practices in the area. As many of the loanwords discussed here belong to the medical language, this study also contributes to the study of the circulation of medical knowledge in the Tarim Basin, both before and after the introduction of Ayurvedic texts and practices along with the spread of Buddhism in the region (Dragoni 2021). Medical loanwords from prehistoric stages of Tumshuqese and Khotanese shed new light on the Pre-Buddhist medical practices in the Tarim Basin. Determining the borrowing directions of medical terminology of Indic origin into the vernacular languages of the Tarim Basin, on the other hand, contributes to a better understanding of the main routes of circulation of Indian medical knowledge in the region.

On a different note, this study may also be considered a contribution to Tocharian and Khotanese lexicography. Although the Tocharian situation is slightly better than the Khotanese one (Pinault 2019, Emmerick and Maggi 2001), the lexicography of the two languages is still in the preliminary phase. As Bailey's dictionary (DKS, 1979) is outdated, Khotanese lacks a comprehensive, up-to-date lexicographical tool. Scholars must rely on the glossaries of the edited texts and combine them with the three volumes of *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese* (SVK I–III). On the Tocharian side, Adams' dictionary (DoT), Carling's first volume of the *Dictionary of Tocharian A* (DTTA), and the online *Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts* (CEToM) are the most important lexicographical tools available. However, as many texts in both languages are still unedited, it is often necessary to provide new translations of the text passages under investigation. A direct examination of the text passages in which a lexeme occurs is essential to determine its correct meaning and phonological shape. Thus, some of the results of this investigation can also be read as a contribution to the philological study of Tocharian, Khotanese, and Tumshuqese texts.

1.5. PREVIOUS STUDIES

The problem of the linguistic contact between Tocharian and Khotanese has always been inextricably connected to the problem of Iranian loanwords in Tocharian. A detailed analysis of previous studies on this subject is found in Bernard (2023: 12–14). Only the studies directly concerned with Khotanese and Tumshuqese will be examined in this context.

Hansen (1940) is the first attempt at a systematic overview of the Iranian loanwords in Tocharian. Fifty-one items are analysed and commented upon. In Hansen's view, twenty-seven lexemes can be traced back to Khotanese. This analysis is now outdated because of its lack of consideration of the Gāndhārī, Bactrian and Old Steppe Iranian influence on Tocharian: of his twenty-seven items, only four can now be considered as borrowed from Khotanese (see §2.1. s.v. *añkwaṣ(t)*, *pissañk*, *tvāñkaro*, *yolo*).

Cursory allusions to the Tocharian material can be found in some of H.W. Bailey's articles and, most notably, in the *Dictionary of Khotan-Saka* (DKS) and the *Prolexis to the Book of Zambasta* (KT VI).⁵ However, only one section of an article by H.W. Bailey deals exclusively with the contacts between Khotanese and Tocharian. In 'Recent work in "Tocharian"' (Bailey 1947: 149–50), the author briefly lists ten lexemes that, in his opinion, may have been borrowed from Khotanese. In this work, I show that only three of these ten items can be considered loanwords from Khotanese (see §2.1. s.v. *añkwaṣ(ṭ)*, *tvāñkaro*, *ṣpakīye*).⁶

Isebaert's (1980) unpublished dissertation is the only comprehensive monograph on Iranian loanwords in Tocharian. However, as for the Middle Iranian data, it is now outdated. Moreover, its continuous resorting to a general label of 'Middle Iranian' without specifying the donor language is problematic. A significant contribution that excluded a Khotanese origin for a group of Tocharian lexemes by arguing for a Bactrian provenance instead is Schwartz (1974). A solid confirmation of his hypothesis came from the recent discovery of the Bactrian documents (Sims-Williams 1997: 23). Other repertoires of loanwords are the more recent Tocharian A and B lexicographical works, i.e. Adams' dictionary of Tocharian B (DoT) and Carling's Tocharian A Thesaurus (DTTA).

Schmidt (1985) was the first scholar to recognise an ancient layer of Old Iranian provenance in the group of loanwords distinguished by the correspondence Ir. *a ~ TB e, TA a. Further studies (Pinault 2002: 245, Peyrot 2015, Peyrot 2018: 280, Bernard 2023) confirmed that this layer is to be attributed to an otherwise unattested Old Iranian language, possibly sharing some affinities with the 'Scythian' group of Iranian steppe dialects, hence the designation by Chams Bernard of 'Old Steppe Iranian'.

Tremblay (2005) challenged this hypothesis by identifying this Old Iranian layer with the ancestor of Khotanese and Tumshuqese, a reconstructed 'Old Sakan' (Tremblay 2005: 422). The main argument for this identification is his interpretation of the Tocharian word for 'iron', TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu**, which shows the exclusively 'Old Sakan' outcome *św of the Proto-Iranian cluster *čw and contains the Iranian vowel *a in the donor language. In my opinion, TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu** is more likely to contain an original *e in the donor language, the product of an early 'trajected umlaut' of original *a (see §2.1. s.v. *eñcuwo* and Peyrot, Dragoni, and Bernard 2022). Therefore, this word did not belong to the early layer of loanwords in which Old Iranian *a corresponded to TB e A a. Another argument against Tremblay's suggestion has been put forward by Peyrot (2018). His discovery that the Tocharian B word for 'mule', TB *etswe*, corresponds to PIr. *ačwa- 'horse' and does not show the palatal outcome observed in the Tumshuqese-Khotanese branch separates the Old Steppe Iranian loanwords from the Tumshuqese-Khotanese branch.

Without this older Old Steppe Iranian layer, the Khotanese loanwords into Tocharian amounted to no more than fifteen items, according to Tremblay's (2005) list. The Khotanese and Tumshuqese people were historically the oldest neighbours of the Tocharians, so the

⁵ Both in the *Dictionary* and in the *Prolexis*, the quotations of the Tocharian material are mostly cursory and without an in-depth analysis of the borrowing paths involved.

⁶ Bailey (1947: 150) concludes that 'The Annals of Khotan and the Krorayina documents show that the Khotanese had close connexions with the cities of Kashghar, Kuci, Argi and Krorayina in political matters. Linguistic interchange was inevitable.' However, it should be noted that, whereas allusions to Kashgar are pretty evident in the *Li yul lung bstan pa*, the same cannot be said about some alleged references to Tocharian-speaking towns in the North. Bailey's hypotheses on the origin of *er mo no* (KT VII: 18-9) and *o sku* (Bailey 1947: 147) need more detailed research.

number appeared to be very low. This observation constituted the starting point of this research. Two possible explanations exist for these data: either the intensity of lexical borrowing was minimal, or the corpus can still be enlarged through a more detailed analysis of the Tocharian lexicon. The first explanation considers that geographical proximity, even over a long period, does not always result in heavy borrowing from one language to another. It is entirely possible that language contact between Tocharian and Khotanese resulted only in very moderate lexical borrowing. This hypothesis may be backed by the fact that the majority of the already known Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian belong to the technical language of medicine (Dragoni 2021) and are part of the nonbasic vocabulary, the first to be borrowed in a situation of casual contact (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 77, Thomason 2010: 41).⁷ On the other hand, however, it can also be argued that centuries of proximity, if not more than one millennium, could have resulted in more intense contact. Given that the subject is understudied, more Khotanese loanwords may be found in the Tocharian lexicon.

1.6. KEY CONCEPTS AND METHODOLOGY

As outlined in the preceding section, this study was born out of the necessity to determine whether the corpus of Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian was limited to fifteen items. The first step of the investigation involved an in-depth critical assessment of the already-known corpus of Khotanese loanwords. This preliminary analysis aimed to determine which phonological features distinguished the already-known Khotanese loanwords from loanwords from other languages.

Based on this initial corpus of fifteen items, I could establish that the Tocharian B ending nom. sg. *-o* was quite widespread among loanwords from Khotanese.⁸ As a consequence, the focus of the research became a re-examination of all Tocharian B lexemes with nom. sg. *-o* and obl. sg. *-a* or *-ai* with unclear etymology. This methodology revealed a new set of prehistoric loanwords from Pre-Khotanese and the ancestor language of Khotanese and Tumshuqese. This study contains a detailed investigation of this new set of loanwords. In the analysis, only ca. half of the possible loanwords examined were classified as reliable. Many etymologies were rejected or considered doubtful (see §2.2.).

Before entering into the subject, some key concepts from current research on language contact need to be defined and explained.⁹ In this study, a *loanword* is defined as a word that entered the lexicon of a language at a certain point in its history as the result of a *borrowing* process (or *transfer*, *copying*, see Haspelmath 2009: 36). The term *borrowing* broadly refers to the transfer or copying process in which any linguistic feature of a language (the *donor* or *source language*) is transferred to another language (the *recipient language*).¹⁰ Following Haspelmath (2009: 50–51), I distinguish between two types of borrowing. If the borrowers are native speakers, one can speak of *adoption*. On the other hand, if they are non-native

⁷ On the problems connected with the notion of ‘basic’ vocabulary, see Tadmor, Haspelmath, and Taylor (2010).

⁸ I believe this ending can be interpreted as the Tocharian B adaptation of the Khotanese acc. sg. ending *-u* of the source form (see §3.4.3.2. and §3.4.10.).

⁹ For the possibility of applying modern language contact theories to the study of ancient languages, cf. the discussion in Boyd (2021: 91–94), focused on the ancient Near East.

¹⁰ Following a common habit in the scientific literature, I also use *borrowing* to refer metonymically to a borrowed element, i.e. a *loan* (Haspelmath 2009: 37).

speakers, the process is called *imposition*.¹¹ This distinction is not directly relevant to this study, as the type of contact investigated here involves most likely an adoption situation, i.e. native speakers of Tocharian borrowing from speakers of Khotanese and Tumshuqese (§6.2.3.).

Another important distinction is between *material* and *structural* borrowing (Haspelmath 2009: 39). This study is primarily concerned with lexical borrowing (i.e. *loanwords*), a type of material borrowing. Structural borrowing (e.g. *calques*) is not systematically investigated here. A loanword can undergo a process of *adaptation* in the recipient language, which may involve phonological, morphological, syntactic, or orthographic changes aimed at making the loanword fit better into the recipient language. If no adaptation process occurs, one should speak more precisely of a *foreignism* rather than a *loanword* (Haspelmath 2009: 41–42). An example of adaptation in the corpus analysed in this study is the Khotanese acc. sg. ending *-u*, adapted as nom. sg. *-o* in Tocharian B. As Tocharian B has no nom. sg. ending *-u*, the ending *-o* was chosen as its phonologically closest equivalent within the Tocharian B morphological system (see §3.4.10.).

As for the causes of borrowing, an important distinction can be made between *cultural* and *core* borrowings (Haspelmath 2009: 46–49). Cultural borrowings are loanwords for new concepts from the outside, whereas core borrowings duplicate existing words of the recipient language. It is common to refer to cultural borrowings as due to ‘necessity’ and to core borrowings as due to ‘prestige’ (see Carling *et al.* 2019).

Identifying a loanword is often a complex process. In the case of the present study, the procedure is even more difficult because it involves fragmentarily attested languages with no direct continuants in the present day (see §1.4.). Once a suspect pair of lexemes have been identified, the first step involves thoroughly examining the occurrences to determine their correct meaning and phonological shape.

The second step aims at excluding any alternative explanation to borrowing (Haspelmath 2009: 44). Therefore, the etymological proposals available in the literature for every Tocharian lexeme under scrutiny have been analysed according to the principles of the comparative method (Campbell 2020: 140–77) and the traditional check-list by Hoffman and Tichy (1980).

If, after this analysis, the Proto-Indo-European etymology of the Tocharian word appears impossible or highly uncertain, a preliminary borrowing path from Khotanese or Tumshuqese can be proposed.

The third step involves the examination of the proposed Khotanese and Tumshuqese source forms. Combining the comparative method with internal reconstruction (Campbell 2020: 194–209) allows the reconstruction of the linguistic stages of the Khotanese and/or Tumshuqese form before its historical attestation (PTK and PK, see chapter 3.). For a proposed borrowing path to be plausible, the phonological shape and the meaning of the Tocharian word should be compatible with at least one of the five linguistic stages of Khotanese and Tumshuqese considered in this study (PTK, PK, OKh., LKh. or Tq.).

The fourth step involves the determination of the *direction* of borrowing. In this study, the criteria listed by Haspelmath (2009: 45) have been adopted: a. morphological analysability in the donor language, b. signs of phonological adaptation in the recipient language, c. attestation of the lexeme in a language closely related to the donor language but spoken

¹¹ For a slightly different terminology, see Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 20–21).

outside the sphere of influence of the recipient language, d. semantic plausibility. The direction of borrowing may be difficult to establish in the case of a *Wanderwort*, i.e. ‘a borrowed word diffused across numerous languages, usually with a wide geographical distribution’ (Campbell and Mixco 2007: 220). However, as the concept of *Wanderwort* is extremely vague (De Vaan 2008a), I have tried to avoid its use as an explanatory device as much as possible. A special effort has been put into determining the most plausible borrowing directions, even if a lexeme does not reveal any recognisable Iranian etymology.

In §2.2., a classification of the examined items into three categories (reliable, less reliable/doubtful and rejected loanwords) is attempted. The checklist for the inclusion of an item into any of these three categories involves the following three criteria:

- Phonological correspondence.
- Semantic identity.
- Occurrence of the source form either in Khotanese or in Tumshuqese.

If a loanword satisfies all three criteria, it is placed in the first category (‘reliable loanwords’). Cases like TB *cowo** ‘robbing’ violate the third principle only superficially. For TB *cowo**, the Khotanese form is attested in a derivative with *ka*-suffix not present in Tocharian. It can be argued that a form without *ka*-suffix existed at the time of borrowing into Tocharian. This assumption is not problematic given the ample spread of the *ka*-suffix in Middle Iranian. Therefore, *cowo** has been classified as reliable.

The second category (less reliable/doubtful loanwords) contains all the etymologies that fully satisfy two of the above criteria but only partially the third one. For instance, cases like TB *konto** and TB *kompō** have an excellent phonological correspondence in an attested Khotanese lexeme, but their meaning in Tocharian is unclear. However, the contexts in which they occur may justify a translation very close to the meaning attested for the Khotanese words. In the case of TB *wicuko* ‘cheek, (jaw)bone’, the nominal formation is not attested in Khotanese. However, the verb from which it could be derived is attested, so the existence of this lexeme cannot be ruled out. Therefore, these etymologies cannot be rejected and are classified as doubtful. I have rejected all the etymologies that violate at least one of the abovementioned criteria.

1.7. STRUCTURE OF THE ENTRIES IN §2.1. AND CHAPTER 5.

§2.1. constitutes the central part of this work. In this section, I discuss items that I consider potential loanwords from Khotanese and Tumshuqese into Tocharian. This part is structured as a dictionary of borrowed lexical items. The lexemes are listed according to the Devanāgarī-based order customary in Tocharian studies (DoT: xii). Both the structure of the single entries and, by extension, the structure of this work as a whole follows the tradition of studies in the loanword corpus of the Hebrew bible (Ellenbogen 1962, Mankowski 2000, Noonan 2019). Each entry has the following structure:

- Tocharian occurrences
- Khotanese and/or Tumshuqese occurrences of the source form
- Discussion
- Results

If a lexeme is well-known and very well-attested or if its occurrences have already been treated in full in recent scientific publications, the Tocharian and/or the Khotanese or Tumshuqese lists of occurrences might be omitted if they do not bear any relevance to the discussion.

The discussion includes a critical assessment of the previous literature on the lexeme (when available) and an in-depth analysis of its phonology and semantics. The results briefly recapitulate the conclusions of the discussion and establish a borrowing scenario. A complete reference list of the examined lexical items is given in §2.2. Chapter 5. discusses potential Tocharian loanwords in Khotanese and Tumshuqese. Its entries are structured on the above mentioned model, but the list of Khotanese and Tumshuqese occurrences precedes the Tocharian one.

2. KHOTANESE AND TUMSHUQESE LOANWORDS IN TOCHARIAN

This chapter analyses Tocharian lexemes that I consider potential Khotanese and Tumshuqese loanwords. It is divided into two parts. §2.1. is a collection of ninety-nine loanword studies listed according to the Tocharian alphabetical order. Every entry lists the Tocharian and Khotanese/Tumshuqese occurrences of the lexeme, discusses the material and presents the results of each investigation. For a more detailed description of the structure of each entry, see §1.7. §2.2. contains a complete list of the examined lexical items classified into three categories (reliable, less reliable/doubtful and rejected loanwords).

2.1. LOANWORD STUDIES

(1) TB *aṅkwaṣ*(*ṭ*) ‘ASA FOETIDA’, LKH. *aṃguṣḍa*- ‘ID.’¹²

Tocharian occurrences

- *aṅkwaṣ* PK AS 2A a5, *aṅkwaṣ* PK AS 2A b2.¹³ Both forms appear in a list of ingredients belonging to the Tocharian bilingual (Sanskrit-Tocharian) fragments of the *Yogaśā-taka*. The Sanskrit equivalent is *hiṅgu*- ‘id.’¹⁴ in both cases (Tib. *shing kun*).
- *aṅwaṣṭ* PK AS 3B b5.¹⁵ The word appears again in a list of ingredients, although the text has yet to be identified. It was classified as a medical/magical text. The title of the section to which the text should refer is given in line b4 as *bhūtatantra* ‘Treatise against the demons’.

Khotanese occurrences

- In the *Siddhasāra*, it occurs in various orthographic shapes: *aṃguṣḍä* Si 19r4, 128r4, 130v2, *aṃgūṣḍa* 123r1, *aṃgūṣḍi* 126v4, *aṃgūṣḍi* 126r4, *aṃgūṣḍä* 10v1, 12v4, 123r5, 124v1, *agūṣḍä* 122r4, *aṃgauṣḍä* Si P 2892.82 and 127.
- In the *Jivakapustaka*: *aṃgūṣḍi* JP 56r4, *aṃgauṣḍa* 97r5, *aṃgauṣḍi* 52r1, 98r2, 98v2, 100v2, *aṃgauṣḍä* 61v5, 85v3, 104v5.
- In other medical fragments: *aṃguṣḍi* P 2893.219, *aṃguṣḍi* P 2893.165.¹⁶

¹² Numerals in round brackets before the title of some of the sections of this chapter refer to the numbers assigned to each reliable loanword in §2.2.1. and will be used throughout this work.

¹³ The text is not late but shows at least the secondary *wiralom* for Skt. *viḍa-lavaṇa*- ‘salt’ and *curm* for Skt. *cūrṇa*- ‘powder’.

¹⁴ On the Sanskrit word, probably an Iranian loanword, see KEWA III: 593 and EWA III: 538.

¹⁵ PK AS 3B is not an archaic text. For instance, it has later *sātke* ‘remedy’ (next to the original *saṃtke*) and later *klyiye* for *kliye*. However, it does have *cūrṇä* (for later *curm*, if *cūrṇä* is not a Sanskritism) and *aṅwaṣṭ*, which looks older because *-k-* is not written. This graphic phenomenon is associated with older stages but has no phonological relevance (Peyrot 2008: 178).

¹⁶ For the text of P 2893, see KT III: 82–93. A new edition by Silvia Luzziatti is in preparation.

Discussion¹⁷

The scholarly literature agrees on the Iranian origin of the Tocharian and the Khotanese word and posits a Proto-Iranian form **angu-jātu-*.¹⁸ This is interpreted as a compound of **angu-* ‘tangy, sour’ (Bailey 1957: 51) and **jātu-* ‘gum’ and is continued by New Persian *angu-žad*.¹⁹ From the occurrences in Late Khotanese medical texts, a Khotanese stem *aṃguṣḍa-* can be safely reconstructed as the original.²⁰

PIr. **jāt-* > Khot. *-ṣḍ-* is not a regular sound change in Khotanese. The regular outcome would have probably been ***angujsata-*, with PIr. **j-* > Khot. *-js-* (cf. OKh. *pajsama-* < PIr. **upa-jama-* [Suv II: 293]). The first step to obtaining the Khotanese form is a syncope of the *-a-* in ***ojsata-*, which would have caused secondary contact between ***js-* and ***t-*. This type of secondary contact, however, results in the cluster *-ysd-* and not *-ṣḍ-*, as shown by the formation of the 3sg. prs. mid. of type B verbs (SGS: 193), e.g. *dajs-* ‘to burn’, with 3sg. prs. mid. *daysdi* (SGS: 43), and *drjs-* ‘to hold’, with 3sg. prs. mid. *drysde* (SGS: 46). *-ṣḍ-* (/zɖ/) seems to point to secondary contact of original **-š-* (> **-ž-*) and **-t-*,²¹ e.g. *pyūṣ-* ‘to hear’, with 3sg. prs. mid. *pyūṣde* (SGS: 87).

As a direct derivation of *aṃguṣḍa-* from Proto-Iranian is problematic, it is preferable to interpret LKh. *aṃguṣḍa-* as a loanword from an Iranian language in which intervocalic **-j-* underwent fricativisation (> **-ž-*). This might be Sogdian, in which old **-j-* regularly yields *-ž-* (GMS: 42), or even Parthian, for which the exact sound change is attested (Durkin-Meisterernst 2014: 96). Although highly speculative, a Sogdian or Parthian form might also be at the origin of the irregular *-ž-* found in New Persian *angu-žad*, which alternates with a native form with *-z-* (*angu-zad*, see Hasandust 2015: I n° 525).

The dating of the syncope is crucial to determine whether the Tocharian form was borrowed directly from the unattested Sogdian (or Parthian, or another unknown Middle Iranian language of the area) cognate or from Khotanese. The attribution of the syncope to Khotanese is not problematic: *-a-* was first weakened²² to *-ä-* in an unstressed syllable (**angúžata-* > **angúžäta-*) and then lost. New Persian *angu-žad*, if borrowed from Sogdian or Parthian, might show that the unattested form had no syncope. These developments can be summarised as follows:

Proto-Iranian	> *Sogdian (or Parthian)	→ Khotanese	→ Tocharian
<i>*angu-jātu-</i>	> <i>*angu-žat</i> (or <i>*angu-žad</i>)	→ <i>*angúžata-</i> > <i>*angúžäta-</i> > <i>aṃguṣḍa-</i>	→ <i>añ(k)waṣ(t)</i>

Table 1. Asa foetida from Proto-Iranian to Tocharian

The Tocharian form points to a source language where syncope has already occurred. This may be identified with Khotanese, in which the loss of *-a-* is not problematic. More

¹⁷ This study has been published in Dragoni (2021).

¹⁸ See DKS: 1, Bailey (1957: 50) and Rastorgueva and Èdel'man (2000: 166).

¹⁹ See Hasandust (2015: I n° 525). Compounds with a different second member are also present, cf. *angu-yān* (Hasandust 2015: I n° 535) and *angu-dān* (Hasandust 2015: I n° 523), all meaning ‘Asa foetida’.

²⁰ For the Late Khotanese alternations *u* : *ū* and *u* : *au*, see Dresden (1955: 406 [4], [5]).

²¹ See in detail Maggi (2019).

²² On this type of weakening, see Emmerick (1989: 211).

questionable would be the possibility that the loss of *-a-* had already occurred in the unattested Middle Iranian antecedent. Therefore, the chance that the Tocharian form was borrowed directly from Khotanese is higher than the possibility that Tocharian borrowed from Sogdian or Parthian. Nevertheless, this second possibility cannot be excluded.

As for Tocharian, Iranian **-u-* was reinterpreted as *w + ə* and, more precisely, as *k^w + ə*, so that the word takes the form /ank^wəšt/. This inner-Tocharian phenomenon can be observed also for a series of other Tocharian medical terms (TB *kuñcit* ~ *kwāñcit*, *kurkamāšše* ~ *kwārkamāšši* and *kwarm* < Skt. *gulma-*).²³ Since the development of *u* to *u* ~ *wā* ~ *wa* can be explained within Tocharian, the form may be derived from Khotanese without any problem.²⁴ As already noted, the form *añwašt* with final *-t* is older than the form without *-t*, as *añkwaš* can be derived from the form with final *-t* by sound law (Peyrot 2008: 67).

Old Uyghur *'nk'pwš* (Röhrborn 1979: 145, HWA: 50), i.e. *angabuš*, probably via **anguwaš*, with no final *-t* as in Tocharian, and Chinese *ēwèi* 阿魏²⁵ share the same semivocalic element *-w-* and must be considered Tocharian loans.

Results

The history of the word²⁶ may be provisionally reconstructed as follows: Proto-Iranian **angu-jatu-* > *Sogdian (or *Parthian?) [**-j-* > **-ž-*] → Khotanese *aṃguṣḍa-* [**-žat-* > *-ṣḍ-*] → Tocharian *añ(k)waš(t)* [*-kwašt* < *-guṣḍ-*] → Chinese and Old Uyghur (independently).

TB *AMĀKṢPĀNTA* 'WAGON-MASTER (?)', LKH. *MAŠPA* 'ROAD'

Tocharian occurrences

- PKAS 12K b3 *amākṣpānta karpām lantāññai ytārine* 'O Wagenlenker, auf dem königlichen Weg sind wir abgestiegen.' (Couvreux 1954: 86)

Khotanese occurrences

- mašpa* IOL Khot S. 6.57²⁷ *cū aṣṭāga mašpa bvāri* 'who know the eight-membered path (*aṣṭāga-mārga*)' (Bailey 1974: 18). This passage allows the identification of LKh. *mašpa* with Skt. *mārga* 'path'. P 2741.120 *cu sūha:cū āna ḍyau-tcvjñā buri mašpa ṣi' ttattarām jsa bastalikā*²⁸ *ṣṭe*. 'That which is the road from Sūk-cū to Ḍyau-tcvinā, that

²³ This alternation has already been noted by Isebaert (1980: 73–75). Tremblay (2005: 438) claims that PIr. **angu-jatu-* has undergone a metathesis that resulted in **anguajt*, further adapted to Tocharian phonology in the form *añkwaš(t)*. However, this explanation can hardly be correct, because no vowel /a/ is present in the second syllable of the Tocharian form (the spelling <a> rather denotes /á/). See further s.v. *kurkamāšše*.

²⁴ See also Bailey (1957: 50 fn. 2).

²⁵ As noted by Samira Müller (p.c.), the first attestations of the Chinese word are from the Tang dynasty (see also Laufer 1919: 358–61). Accordingly, the Tocharian spelling squares with the reconstructed Middle Chinese form *ʔa-nɣjwjiH*. See further Baxter and Sagart (2014: 121) for the reconstruction of the second character.

²⁶ See further DoT: 7, Laufer (1919: 361), Bailey (1937: 913), Bailey (1946: 786), Henning (1965: 8) [= SelPap II: 604].

²⁷ Ch. 0048.57, see edition in KBT: 72.

²⁸ Instead of *basta likā*, see KS: 308.

is closed by the Tatars' (SDTV: 66), P 2783.32²⁹ *biṃda maśpa* 'on the road' (Emmerick Unpublished (a): [144c]), Or. 12637/19.1a1 *maśpa* (isolated word) 'road' (KMB: 126).

- *maśpya* P 2781.53 *saṃduṣṭa maśpya tsvā* 'Pleased she went on her way' (Emmerick Unpublished (a): [92c]), P 2783.31 *pātca naḍa maśpya tse* 'Next a man was going along the road' (Emmerick Unpublished (a): [144a]).
- *maśma* JS 25v1 *byaudāmdā maśma hvāha* 'They reached the broad highway.' (Dresden 1955: 437)
- *maśapa* Sudh 56 (Ch. 00266.68) *hārasta maśapa* 'The roads were overgrown.' (De Chiara 2013: 65)
- *māśpa* IOL Khot S. 47.3 *ttu māśpa rraṣṭā* 'That right road.' (KMB: 551)
- *magpa* Or. 12637/57.12 (isolated word, see KMB: 143).

Discussion

Bailey (1958: 46) was the first scholar to analyse the Tocharian B hapax *amākṣpānta* in PK AS 12K as a compound of which the first member is related to Greek ἄμαξα 'wagon', and the second to PIr. **pati*- 'lord'. The first member *amākṣ(a)*^o would be paralleled by Khot. *maś*^o in the compound *maś-pa*, which he derives from PIr. **amaxśya-pāda*- 'cart-path', hence 'road'.³⁰ This interpretation raises more difficulties than it solves because it is based on too many conjectures. Firstly, despite Adams' efforts,³¹ it seems that Greek ἄμαξα can hardly be etymologised within Indo-European, and it is instead to be considered a Pre-Greek loan because of the alternation ἄμακ-/ἄβακ- (Beekes 2010: 81–82). If Greek and Tocharian are to be kept apart, the Khotanese connection loses meaning without the Greek correspondence and seems far-fetched. Bailey's proposal would regard Khot. *maś*^o as the only cognate of the Greek word for 'wagon' outside Greek. If not a direct loanword, an unlikely possibility, Bailey's etymology should now be abandoned.³² Besides, the phonological correspondences would also be problematic, as no plausible explanation for the loss of initial *a*- in Late Khotanese and the different sibilants is available.

As suggested by Pinault in the context of the edition of PK AS 12K that he is preparing for publication together with Michaël Peyrot, it is possible that the word had a completely different meaning. TB *amākṣpānta* occurs in the context of a dialogue between the 'charioteer' (*kokaḷpānta*) and the *vidūśaka*, the buffoon.³³ Since the word is used in the vocative in direct speech, as an apostrophe to the *vidūśaka*, after the interjection *au*, Pinault

²⁹ Rāma, see KT III: 73.

³⁰ See DKS: 325. Previously, he had derived it from **amaxśya-pātā*-, cf. Bailey (1958: 46). The etymology is also reported without changes in Dočkalová and Blažek (2011: 320). See also Chen (2016: 199 fn. 27). For the preservation of *-p-* as a morpheme boundary, see Degener (1987: 63).

³¹ See Adams (1984) for a new Indo-European etymology, referring to further studies. Cf. also DoT: 20.

³² Consequently, the name of the Mathura satrap *Hagāmaśa*, appearing in numerous coin legends (Allan 1936: 183–84) and etymologised as **fraka-amaxśa*- (Harmatta 1994: 412), should probably be interpreted differently. An Indic origin is not likely, but an Iranian derivation is also not self-evident.

³³ PK AS 12K is part of a larger group of fragments narrating the life of the Buddha. This fragment retells the events concerning the *Mahābhiniṣkramaṇa* ('Great Departure'). See Couvreur (1953: 282–83) for a preliminary translation. The 'charioteer' is probably a reference to the legendary charioteer of the Buddha, Chandaka.

suggested that it could be another way to refer to the *vidūṣaka* himself.³⁴ He tentatively put forward the hypothesis that it may refer to his proverbial gluttony or his ugliness.³⁵

Since Bailey's connection of LKh. *maśpa* with TB *amākṣpānta* is problematic, the origin of the Khotanese word should be reconsidered. The attested forms all point to a stem *maśpa*-. In Late Khotanese, acc. sg. *-a*, nom. pl. *-a*, and loc. sg. *-ya* are all possible endings of *a*-stems (SGS: 252). The *-ä-* in *mäs̥pa* in IOL Khot S. 47 can be explained as an occasional assimilation of the vowel of the first syllable to the following palatal *ś*, as frequent in Late Khotanese manuscripts.³⁶ In *maśapa* (Sudh 56), an epenthetic vowel may have been inserted. This occurs very often in Late Khotanese, cf. LKh. *paśakāṣṭa* for LKh. *paskyāṣṭa* (OKh. *paskāyālsto* 'backwards', see SVK II: 80). The form *maśma* can be regarded as a scribal mistake for *maśpa*. The confusion between *m* and *p* is widespread in the manuscript of the *Jātakastava*.³⁷ It remains to explain *magpa* in Or.12637/57.12, occurring as an isolated word in a late document from the Khotan area. Given the similarity of the two akṣaras, this is probably just a mistake for *maśpa*, as tacitly recognised by Bailey (KT V: 230), followed by KMB: 143.³⁸

The etymology of *maśpa*-, however, remains obscure. The cluster *-śp-* is extremely rare in Khotanese. It is found only in the following words:

- LKh. *kharāśpa*- (Si 107r1; JP 93v2, 101v3), LW < Skt. *kharāśvā*- 'Carum roxburghianum'.
- OKh. *viśpasta*- (Sgh 23) 'comforted, secure', LW < Skt. *viśvasta*- (Canevascini 1993: 119). A previously unnoticed occurrence of this word can be found in IOL Khot 35/8 a2 (KMB: 254). In Late Khotanese, a derived *-ia*- abstract *viśpastia*- 'confidence' was formed (JS 20r3; Aśoka 6.8 [P 2958.104]).
- OKh. *biśpaḍā* (Suv 8.68; Z 16.14 etc.) 'first of all', derived from **biśśā-paḍā* with loss of internal unaccented *ā* and intervocalic *p* preserved in the presence of a morpheme boundary.
- OKh./LKh. *aśpara*- (Z 13.91; Or. 11344/12 b4; IOL Khot S. 13.29 etc.) was derived by Bailey (KT VI: 8) from **aśśa-para*- 'horse-fodder', with a development parallel to *biśpaḍā*. The meaning is certain, as evident from the following occurrences

³⁴ However, if *kokālpānta* is nom. sg. (subject of the verb *weṣṣām*), one would expect *amākṣpānta* to share the same second member (**pānta*) and be analysable as a nom. sg. as well. As there is no parallel for a nom. sg. in *-a* next to a voc. sg. in *-a*, the morphology remains unclear.

³⁵ PK AS 12K is part of a larger group of fragments narrating the life of the Buddha. This fragment retells the events concerning the *Mahābhiniṣkramaṇa* ('Great Departure'). See Couvreur (1953: 282–83) for a preliminary translation. The 'charioteer' is probably a reference to the legendary charioteer of the Buddha, Chandaka.

³⁶ I owe this explanation to Mauro Maggi (p.c.).

³⁷ Dresden (1955: 405 [9.6]) lists other six cases.

³⁸ If read *mag pa*, one may tentatively interpret it as a loanword from Tib. *dmag pa* 'soldier' or *mag pa* 'bridegroom, son-in-law'. Because of the economic and administrative nature of this kind of documents, the first proposal appears more justified, but it remains hypothetical. Tibetan official and military titles were borrowed into Khotanese, cf. Tib. *blon* 'minister' (Zhang 2016: 447) borrowed as *bulāni* (Or. 11258 a1) and *lunā* (Hedin 20 a2), with or without trace of Tibetan initial *b*. Words from the military and administrative spheres were travelling in both directions, as witnessed by Tib. *spa* 'military official', a Late Khotanese loanword occurring in Tibetan documents (Late OKh. *spāta*- > LKh. *spā*), on which see Emmerick (1985: 315).

(corresponding to the passages listed above): *ša nā ššu rrusa ašpari . vaska* ‘this was certainly not barley for horse-fodder’ (Emmerick 1968: 199), *paṃjsa šaṃga ašparā* ‘five *šaṃgas* of lucerne’ (KBT: 114), *hervī ašparā ni hauḍāṃdā* ‘they had given no fodder at all’ (KBT: 510). Alternatively, a *-ra* adjective derived in Khotanese from loanword from Gandh. *ašpa-* ‘horse’ (Burrow 1937: 21), meaning ‘(food) pertaining to the horses’ could be proposed. Because of *bišpaḍā*, however, Bailey’s derivation appears to be phonologically and semantically fine.

- LKh. *špaka-jšima* (hapax in P 2739.16), a compound whose first member is of unknown origin (Kumamoto 1993: 150). It occurs in an unclear passage: *bagalagvā šī špaka-jšima* ‘Among the *bagalagas* with white *špaka*-eyes’ (Kumamoto 1993: 149). Since the second member is a compound form of *tcei-man-* ‘eye’ and *šī* refers to the colour of the eyes, I would like to propose that *špaka* may refer to a living being possessing white eyes. If this is an animal, the closest connection may be with Skt. *śvaka-* ‘wolf’ (KEWA III: 402). In this case, the only possible source language is Sanskrit since intervocalic *-k-* was not lenited. If it had been borrowed from Gāndhārī, one would have expected ***špaga* or the like. *šp* can hardly point to a native Khotanese derivative of *šve* ‘dog’. *šī špaka-jšima* could be an ethnic attribute referring to the *bagalaga* people, who had ‘white wolf eyes’. Toponyms and ethnic names containing ‘wolf’ are frequently found in the Tarim Basin, cf. the name of the town of *birgaṃdara* in the Khotan area. In the absence of further parallels, however, the proposed solution remains tentative. Surely not to be read *šīšpaka* as in DKS: 401.
- *varāšpī* (Sum 926) is now to be read correctly as *varāšī*, a form of *varāś-* ‘to enjoy, experience’, following Emmerick (1998: 399) and superseding the difficult derivation implied by DKS: 378.
- *višpaśsarman-* (Z 23.38, 48, 142) is the Khotanese name of the god Skt. *viśvakarman*. *śś* in place of *k* of the Indic original has been explained by Leumann (1920: 175) as the result of contamination with the widespread personal name Skt. *viśvaśarman* (MW: 994). Leumann proposes that in later ‘popular’ Sanskrit, the name *viśvakarman* was already contaminated with the personal name. This is difficult to prove because examples of such cases could not be found. From the Khotanese point of view, one could think of a *-ma-* derivative of an alleged root OKh. *śśar-* ‘to serve’ (DKS: 397). However, this root has no parallels in other Iranian languages and was posited to explain OKh. *śśāraṇa-* ‘reverence, respect’ (Suv II: 345 and KS: 26) and LKh. *śerāka-* ‘servant’ (KS: 51). Although connected, the origin of these two words is still obscure. For OKh. *śśāraṇa-*, one could think of a loanword from a lengthened form of Skt. *śaraṇa-*, but the semantics do not perfectly correspond.

Additionally, the group *šph* is found in just one word:

- LKh. *ašphāṇḍa-* (Si 11r3; JP 82r4), of unknown origin. It translates Skt. *saptaparṇa-* (Si) ‘*Alstonia scholaris*’ and *saptacchada-* (JP) ‘id.’ It is quite certainly a loanword from another Iranian language. The group *šph* may point to *šf* in the donor language. A superficial similarity with the Sogdian (*šywšp-δn*) and Parthian

(šyṣṣ-d'n) words for 'mustard seed' may be noted, but no exact source form could be detected. Cf. also NP *isfand* 'wild rue'.

Based on these data, *śp* can be traced back either to Skt. *śv* or Gandh. *śp*, or it could have arisen through secondary contact of *ś* and *p* after syncope. *p* is preserved only in the case of a morpheme boundary.³⁹ Accordingly, as no suitable Indic source could be found, one should reconsider Bailey's hypothesis of a morpheme boundary between *ś* and *p* and analyse the word as a compound *maś-pa-* or **maśa-pa-*, if trisyllabic weakening to **maśāpa-* and syncope took place.

As for the first member, I propose a verbal root **maś-* may be involved. Regarding its etymology, the only possible candidate seems to be PIr. **maḥ-* 'to break' (EDIV: 272), which could have yielded OKh. **mays-*. With the addition of an **(a)ya-* suffix, the root may have taken the attested form *maś-*, with voiced *-ś-*. Is this root attested elsewhere in Khotanese? Previously, an attempt was made (Bailey 1958a: 522 and SGS: 119) to trace it in the Late Khotanese hapax *vameysāñā* (Si 135r1), rendering Tib. *dril ba* 'twisted', but subsequent research (SVK I: 111) has shown that this is instead to be interpreted as a Late Khotanese spelling for older **va-malys-* (PIr. **Hmarḥ-* 'to wipe, rub', EDIV: 180), with regular *a > e* as a consequence of the loss of *l* and occasional omission of the subscript hook. More recently, Emmerick (SVK III: 123) tentatively proposed that the OKh. hapax *maśāñā* in the *Ratnakūṭa* (IOL Khot 36/2 r4) could be traced back to this same verbal root. This is a ptc. nec. from a root *maś-* (< **mays-ya-*). Since IOL Khot 36/2 consistently uses the double orthographies *śś* and *ṣṣ* to indicate voiceless sounds, the reconstruction of a root *mays-* is certain.

The hapax *maśāñā* was translated as '(is) to be navigated' by Skjærvø (2003: 417). Emmerick's semantic link could be justified if one keeps in mind the sense of motion which verbs for 'to break' usually have (cf. Germ. *sich Bahn brechen* etc.) and which is also ultimately at the origin of the semantic development 'to break' > 'road'. However, a translation 'to navigate' is unjustified unless one argues that the Khotanese translator chose to interpret the Sanskrit text rather than translate it literally. The Sanskrit version has *samudānaya-* and the Tibetan *shyar bar byed pa*. The same Sanskrit verb is used elsewhere in the same text, and an occurrence of the same verbal form is found even in the preceding chapters of the Sanskrit version of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (§153-4). Following in the main lines Edgerton (BHSD: 573), who argues that this verb is consistently used in BHS for the simile of the boat, Silk (2010: 902) translates 'he must make ready', with reference to the boat of the Dharma (*dharmanau*). Thus, a more precise rendition of the Sanskrit original by the Khotanese translator would imply that the verb *maś-* should be translated as 'to make ready, prepare'.

The semantic connection with 'to break' seems, at best, very obscure. It must be noted, however, that under the same root **maḥ-*, Cheung (EDIV: 272) also lists Bajui (Shughni) *mōz-*: *mīzd* 'to make, form, build, prepare' (EVSh: 46). This connection is justified by the link to PIE **maǵ-* 'to knead' (LIV: 421), which could have been the source of English *to make*.⁴⁰ If this etymology is correct, the Bajui form may witness the preservation of the original semantics of the root. A peripheral language like Khotanese could have preserved the same archaic

³⁹ Otherwise, intervocalic *p* normally changes to /w/, noted as <v>.

⁴⁰ However, cf. the observations in Kroonen (2013: 350).

meaning. If this is correct, a translation ‘to prepare, make ready’ for the verb *maś-* would be more in line with the Sanskrit original and justified by its etymological connection.⁴¹

The discussion has recognised the existence of a root *maś-* in Old Khotanese with the meaning ‘to make ready, prepare’, translating Skt. *samudānaya-* ‘id.’ and deriving from PIr. **maj-* ‘to break (but also ‘to make’)’. This root may also be identified as the first member of the compound *maś-pa-* ‘road’. However, no suitable semantic connection with the attested meaning ‘road’ could be found. Therefore, the etymology of LKh. *maś-pa-* remains obscure.⁴²

Results

The derivation of the Tocharian B hapax *amäkspänta* is unclear. As meaning and phonology do not agree, an Iranian derivation from **amaxšya-pāda-* ‘cart-path’ is to be excluded altogether. The etymology of LKh. *maśpa-* ‘road’ is also obscure. The discussion has shown that it should be analysed as a compound *maś-pa-*. The first member could contain a root *maś-* (< **mays-ya-*). **mays-* could be linked with PIr. **maj-* ‘to break’, but also ‘to make’. The hapax *maśāña* in the *Ratnakūṭa* could also be connected to the same root, if translated as ‘to make, prepare’, in line with the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions, and assuming the preservation of the original meaning of PIr. **maj-* ‘(to make)’ attested in some peripheral modern Iranian languages. It is suggested that LKh. *śī śpaka-jšima* could be translated ‘with white wolf eyes’, with *śpaka* as a loanword from Skt. *śvaka-*.

(2) TB AMPA- ‘TO ROT, DECAY’, LKH. HAMBVVA- ‘FESTER’

Tocharian occurrences

- prt. ptc. nom. pl. f. THT 9 b7 *stastaukkauwa āmpauwa spärkauw= ere* : ‘swollen, rotten, void of colour’, parallel in THT 10 a3.

Discussion⁴³

Adams (DoT: 48) regards *ampa-* as a Middle Iranian loanword from the same root as OKh. *hambūta-*, NP *ambūsīdan*, etc. Malzahn (2010: 525) agrees with this interpretation but would

⁴¹ The substantive LKh. *māša-* ‘dwelling’ (DKS: 330) might share the same origin, but its different phonological shape (voiceless *ś* and long *ā*) cannot justify a connection with the same root. Bailey’s derivation is, at any rate, very dubious. His comparison with Oss. D *mæsug* ‘tower’ and the Pontic Greek ethnic name *Μοσσύνοι* is doubted by Brust (2005: 466), who concludes that this connection is still obscure. For now, it is safer not to set up unfounded hypotheses on the etymology of these substantives. The same warning is valid for Bailey’s connection with Ved. *majmán-*, which was considered ‘völlig entbehrlich’ by Mayrhofer (EWA II: 292). See Duan (2013: 308 fn. 2) for further possible connections.

⁴² If the second member contains a form of Khot. *pāa-* ‘foot’ (or *paa-*, see Hitch 2017: 499), one could tentatively compare the compound *maś-pa-* with French *marche-pied*, Italian *marcia-piede*, and English *foot-path*. The first member could be identified with an *a*-derivative *maša-* (< *maś-*) with the meaning ‘broken thing’. Derivatives of roots meaning ‘to break’ are often used in the sense of ‘road’. Besides Lat. (via) *rupta*, one could also compare ON *braut* ‘road’ (Falk and Torp 1910: 95), from the verb PG **breutan* ‘to break (open), bud’ (Kroonen 2013: 76), still preserved in the majority of the modern Scandinavian languages. This proposal, however, assumes yet another meaning for OKh. *maś-* not supported by bilingual evidence and should be considered with due caution.

⁴³ This and the following study have been published in Dragoni (2021).

instead take the word more specifically as a Khotanese loanword. If from Khotanese, one might envisage the possibility that the form has the aspect of a denominative formation from LKh. *haṃbva-* (< OKh. *haṃbūta-*, see s.v. *ampoño*), resulting in TB *amp(w)a-*. This verb can thus be traced back with a fair degree of certainty to Late Khotanese.

Results

The Tocharian B verb *ampa-* ‘to rot, decay’ can be analysed as a denominative formation based on a loanword from LKh. *haṃbva-* (< OKh. *haṃbūta-*). See further s.v. *ampoño*.

TB *AMPOÑO* ‘ROTTENNESS, INFECTION’, LKH. *HAṀBVA-* ‘FESTER’

Tocharian occurrences

- nom. sg. THT 510 b6 *ampoño*
- obl. sg. THT 503 a3 *ampoñai*
- gen. sg. PK AS 3A a1; a6; b1 *ampoñamtse*
- gen. sg. PK AS 3A a2 *ampoññamtse*. In this fragment, it is used consistently in the gen. sg. with *sāmtke* ‘remedy’. The text describes four remedies against an *ampoño*. All other occurrences are from medical texts as well.

Discussion

Adams’ second edition of his Tocharian B dictionary has the following statement s.v. *ampoño*: “A nomen actionis from *āmp-* ‘rot,’ q.v., from Khotanese *hambu-*, i.e., *hambu-* + the Khotanese abstract-forming suffix *-oña*” (DoT: 21). In Old Khotanese there is indeed a word *haṃbūta-* occurring in Z 5.16 and 5.18, two passages containing literary similes with medical terminology:

Z 5.16 <i>trāmu māñamdu kho hvq’ndä haṃbūtä haṃbaḍä ysūna cvī ye ālīva nitcana īndä samvī ttaṃdu hamārgya</i>	‘Similarly, in the case of a man’s fester full of pus, when one puts ointments on it on the outside, there is only so much alleviation of it.’ (Emmerick 1968: 99)
Z 5.18 <i>samu kho haṃbūvu bei’ttā . harbiśī āchai jīye . trāmu nairātma-hvanaina uysnori ysamtha jyāre</i>	‘Just as when one cuts open a fester all disease is removed for one, so through the doctrine of selflessness (<i>nairātmya</i>) births are removed for a being.’ (Emmerick 1986: 73)

haṃbūta- appears to be a past participle from the Proto-Iranian root **pauH-* ‘to stink, smell, rot’ (EDIV: 302), to which a preverb **ham-* has been added. In the corresponding stanzas of the *Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatārasūtra*, the word appears regularly as *ha(m)bu* in both occurrences, as one would expect in Late Khotanese. The second set of occurrences in the Late Khotanese medical text P 2893 (KT III: 82–93) at lines 184, 185 and 189 shows that the word is a technical term. It occurs in the spelling *haṃbva(’)-* (< *haṃbuva-* < *haṃbūta-*), always with the meaning ‘fester’.

The reference to ‘hambu’ in DoT: 21 seems to consider only one of the Late Khotanese forms, without commenting on the Old Khotanese one, which should be first compared with Tocharian. ‘hambu’ might also stand for **hambu-* and be a reference to the unattested present stem from which the past participle *hambūta-* is derived. The suffix *-ūña-/auña-* can be added to past or present participles but there is no example of the suffix being added directly to a present stem (KS: 159). If one were to add it to *hambūta-*, one would expect **hambūtauña-*, in line with the attested *hāmātauña-* (from the past ptc. *hāmāta-*) (KS: 164). The resulting intervocalic *-t-* seems to undergo strengthening rather than being lost altogether. One cannot exclude the possibility that intervocalic *-t-* was lost already in Khotanese. *-tt-* in the hapax *hāmātauña-* might be an example of ‘morphologische Verdeutlichung’ (KS: 162), a way to stress the presence of a morpheme boundary before the suffix.⁴⁴ One could interpret *ampoño* as the past ptc. LKh. *hambva-* to which the suffix *-auña-* has been added. This would confirm the hypothesis of a Late Khotanese origin of *ampoño*, as suggested by Adams (l.c.).

ampoño could still be a genuine Tocharian formation based on the verb TB *ampa-* (borrowed from LKh. *hambva-*, see s.v. *ampa-*). All the forms point to a nom. sg. *ampoño* or *ampoña**. Because of the palatalisation, *ampoña* would be the expected original form. THT 510b6, the only occurrence of *ampoño*, is usually classified as late, so the form might be interpreted as secondary for earlier *ampoña* (Peyrot 2008: 99–101). This form could be a derivative in *-eñña* from the root *ampa-* ‘to rot’, q.v. For the forms with single *-ñ-* for expected *-ññ-* one might compare the obl. sg. of *wseñña*, attested four times with a single *-ñ-* (IOL Toch 117 b4, Km-034-ZS-R-01 a7, PK AS 16.7 a4, IOL Toch 62 a3).

Because of the rule formulated s.v. *keś*, according to which unaccented *ham-* is dropped, and accented *ham-* is preserved as *am-* in TB, one should conclude that this second possibility is probably correct. If TB *ampoño* had been stressed on the first syllable, one should have expected ***<āmpoño>*.

(3) TA *ārt**, OKH. *HAḌA-* ‘ENVOY’

Tocharian occurrences

- nom. pl. A 66 a2 *śāwaṃ wārtskās ypeyāntwāṣ kakmuṣṣ ārtāñ lāñcāśśi* : ‘Envoys of the kings have come from all the great neighbouring countries.’ (DTTA: 47)
- gen. pl. A 66 b2 *tmāṣ mahendrasene wāl āmāsās kākkropurāṣ cesmāk ārtāśśi anaprā ypeyaṃ tpāssi wotāk ||* ‘Thereupon King Mahendrasena, having gathered all his ministers, ordered them to announce to the envoys in the country.’ (DTTA: 47)

Discussion

The translation of the Tocharian A substantive *ārt** as ‘envoy, messenger’ has a relatively long history in Tocharian studies. In the *Tocharische Grammatik* (TG: 2), the substantive is translated as ‘Freier’. As explicitly declared by the authors, a connection was sought with the verb TA *artā-* ‘to love, praise, approve, adopt’ (DTTA: 46). Hence the translation ‘suitor’. However, if one examines the two occurrences in the broader narrative context of A 66, this

⁴⁴ I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer of Dragoni (2021) for this suggestion.

interpretation is not self-evident. As it has already been noted (TG: 2), the verb *artā-* is used in the same fragment (A 66 a6) as a prt. ptc. nom. sg. fem. referring to Bhadrā, who is ‘loved’ by many suitors. Therefore, one could conceive of a translation ‘suitor (< ‘lover’). A possible connection with this verb is also contemplated by Carling (DTTA: 47) and had been upheld by Poucha (1955: 24 ‘proculus, sponsus’).

On the one hand, this translation could fit the context of A 66 a2, where the reference could be to the suitors of Bhadrā, coming from different kingdoms for the *svayaṃvara*. The gen. pl. *lāñcāśśi*, however, would be semantically difficult to explain. On the other hand, it is hard to accept that ‘suitor’ could fit A 66 b2, where the reference is to the royal envoys, a well-defined official position within the court. The usual *topos* of the description of the *svayaṃvara* in Indian literature typically involves the king father summoning his envoys to notify the neighbouring kingdoms that his daughter has reached the age of marriage, as in the Mahābhārata. As *dūta-* is the Sanskrit word for ‘envoy’, a compound *rājadūta-* ‘royal envoy’ may account for *ārtañ lāñcāśśi* in A 66 a2.

This could have been why Sieg (1952: 8–9) opted for a different interpretation (‘Werber’) in the first translation of the fragments of the Tocharian *Ṣaḍdanta-Jātaka*. Recently, fragments of a Tocharian B and Old Uyghur version of the *Ṣaḍdanta-Jātaka* have been identified (Peyrot and Wilkens 2017). As they correspond to this passage, this material provides multi-lingual evidence for a more precise interpretation of the semantic range of TA *ārt**. Table 2 lists the terms corresponding to TA *ārt** in the same passage in the three languages:

Tocharian B	Tocharian A	Old Uyghur
<i>ṣīto</i> IOL Toch 63 a1, b5; IOL Toch 1094 a1	<i>ārt*</i> A 66 a2, b2	<i>arkīš, yalavač</i> MIK III 1054 /r/18/, /21/

Table 2. Words for ‘messenger’ in Tocharian and Old Uyghur

The identification of TB *ṣīto* as ‘envoy’ was suggested by Ogihara (2013: 207–8) based on the solid evidence of a Chinese parallel. Pinault (2017: 138–48) argued for a possible Indo-European etymology. The word is also used in the corpus of Tocharian B documents (Ching 2010: 316–17).⁴⁵ The Old Uyghur terms are frequent words for ‘envoy, messenger’ in literary texts and documents (HWA: 63, 856). Thus, the meaning of TA *ārt** can be regarded as certain.

For semantic reasons, this identification excludes any connection with the verb TA *artā-* (cf. *supra*). Thus, a different etymological explanation is needed. Carling (DTTA: 47) cautiously suggests a possible ‘ultimate connection’ with the adverb TA *ārt* ‘over a distance’, but this is a hapax of unclear origin and meaning.⁴⁶ It is not self-evident that this could be the base for TB *ārt(t)e* TA *ārtak*, as possibly implied by DTTA: 47, since its meaning is likewise disputed. The phrases containing TA *ārt* and TB *ārt(t)e* TA *ārtak* were re-examined by Catt

⁴⁵ Its semantic field and the ending nom. sg. -o make this word a good candidate for a loanword from Khotanese, but I have not been able to identify any Khotanese source. A possibility would be to start from the past ptc. *hiṣṭa-* ‘sent’ (< **hāṣ-* ‘to send’ [*hei-* SGS: 154]), which could have undergone a word-initial metathesis after the loss of *h-* within Tocharian B (OKh. *hiṣṭa-* → TB **iṣto* > *ṣīto*). For the semantics, cf. Latin *missus* and the etymological discussion in Pinault (2017). However, the lack of a precise justification for this metathesis invites one to consider this proposal cautiously.

⁴⁶ In this context, the translation ‘envoy’ does not seem justified.

(2016). Based on a Sanskrit parallel for THT 197 a4, he convincingly argued that TB *ārt(t)e* and TA *ārtak* could be considered as related to the verb for ‘to love’ (cf. *supra*). He further admitted that the Tocharian A hapax TA *ārt* is of difficult interpretation and left it unexplained (Catt 2016: 31). Therefore, the hypothesis of a connection of *ārt** ‘envoy’ with the alleged adverb *ārt* cannot be safely justified and should now be abandoned. The semantic reasoning behind Carling’s connection would have been rather convincing, given such parallels as Skt. *dūta-*, for which cf. the adjective *dūra-* ‘far’.⁴⁷ Thus, TA *ārt** can be convincingly translated as ‘envoy’, but none of the proposed etymological explanations stands closer scrutiny.

Given the difficulties outlined above, it may be justified to hypothesise that TA *ārt** could be a loanword from a neighbouring language. In this case, Khotanese may offer a solution to the problem. One of the most frequent words for ‘envoy’ in this language is *haḍa-*. The word is already attested in Old Khotanese. It occurs in the following passage of the Book of Zambasta, where it seems to refer to an envoy of King Śuddhodana:

- Z 5.33 *āmācu hā haḍu hīṣṭe* ‘He (= the king) sent forth a minister as envoy.’ (Emmerick 1968: 103)

haḍa- indicates the same official position as *rājadūta-*, of which TA *ārt** could be a rendition. Bilingual evidence in Sgh 253.72 (Canevascini 1993: 110) confirms the equation with Skt. *dūta-*. As for the later occurrences, Bailey (KT VI: 380) further refers to the Late Khotanese bilingual ‘conversation manual’ (P 5538b.82), where *haḍa-* is translated by *rajsavarī*. Following Bailey, Kumamoto (1988: 69) identifies the source of *rajsavarī* as Skt. *rājadvārika-* ‘royal porter, emissary’ (MW: 873). *rajsavarī* is a regularly Khotanised Sanskrit form which underwent depalatalisation (*j > js*), *dv-* > *v-* and loss of intervocalic *-k-*. In Late Khotanese documents and official letters, the standard designation of the ‘(royal) envoy’ is *haḍa-*. Thus, the meaning of *haḍa-* is not problematic: the word covers the same semantic range as TA *ārt**.

While its meaning is assured, its etymology must be studied more carefully. Bailey’s (DKS: 447) proposal to interpret it as a participle from the Proto-Iranian verbal root **xar-* ‘to go, pass’ (EDIV: 444–45), frequent in Sogdian (*xr-*) but with no assured traces in Khotanese, is phonologically difficult. It cannot be derived from **xarta-* because this would have yielded **khaḍa-*, not the attested *haḍa-*. Another proposal by Bailey (DKS: 447 s.v. *haḍāa-* ‘day’) is that it could be the outcome of a zero grade **xrta-*. This is hardly acceptable because, even if one posits such a late date for the vocalisation of **r*, the outcome of word-initial **xr-* would have been invariably *gr-* in Old Khotanese (cf. *grūs-* ‘call’ < PIr. **xraus-*, SGS: 32). Both *haḍāa-* ‘day’ and *haḍa-* ‘envoy’ need a different explanation. As for *haḍa-*, two main directions of enquiry are possible. The first would trace back the initial *h-* to PIr. **h-*. In this case, however, **har-* ‘to guard, observe’, **har-* ‘to stretch, extend’ or **harH-* ‘to pay tribute; to barter, trade, exchange’ (meanings follow EDIV) do not offer suitable semantic connections.⁴⁸ A second option would be to consider also Proto-Iranian roots with initial laryngeal. One may propose a derivation from one of the two homophonous roots PIr. **Har-*¹ ‘to go to(wards),

⁴⁷ This connection, although very likely, is also ultimately unsure; see EWA I: 738.

⁴⁸ The root **harH-* shares some semantic similarities, but the meaning ‘to exchange, trade’ is not attested in Eastern Iranian.

reach’ or **Har*-² ‘to set in motion’. Words for ‘envoy, messenger’ are frequently formed to the participle of verbs of motion, cf. MP *frēstag*, Latin *missus*, French *envoyé*. It can be argued that PIr. **Harta*- may have yielded OKh. *haḍa*-.⁴⁹

Thus, I would propose a reconstruction *(*h*)*arda*- for Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese. The form has been reconstructed based on these assumptions:

1. Lacking clear Tumshuqese examples, the reconstruction of initial **h*- for Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese is not certain. Moreover, if Kümmel’s (2018) proposal is correct, there are cases in which Khot. initial *h*- can be traced back to a Proto-Iranian laryngeal. However, not every initial laryngeal yields *h*- in Khotanese, and its Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese reconstruction would be based only on the Khotanese evidence. Since the counterexamples are numerous and the material is difficult to evaluate, its presence in Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese cannot be established with certainty. The Tocharian evidence is of no help in the matter because initial *h*- could have been dropped during the borrowing process, especially if one attributes the loanword to a very ancient period.⁵⁰

2. Because of the Tumshuqese evidence for the development of the group **rt* > *rd*, it is justified to reconstruct a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese stage **rd*, as already suggested by Peyrot (2018: 273).

3. If one started from a form PIr. **Hṛta*-, Tocharian A /a/ would imply that the vocalisation of **r* was already of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese date. Since this is contradicted by several other cases (see s.v. *parso*, **ṣart*-) and by the very different outcomes of **r* in Khotanese and Tumshuqese (cf. Peyrot 2018: 273), it is safer to posit a source form PIr. **Harta*-.

4. Based on the Tocharian A form, TB **ārto* as the older word for ‘envoy’ can be reconstructed for Tocharian B; afterwards, Tocharian B lost **ārto* in favour of *ṣīto*.⁵¹

Results

None of the etymological proposals for TA *ārt** ‘envoy’ is satisfactory. Based on this investigation, I suggest that TA *ārt** is a loanword from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent of OKh. *haḍa*- ‘envoy’. The acc. sg. PTK *(*h*)*ardu* ‘envoy’ was borrowed as **ārto* in Proto-

⁴⁹ As for *haḍāa*- ‘day’, Skjærvø’s (2004: II 359) suggestion that it may derive from **fra-rta*- ‘dawned’ could be taken into consideration, but it needs to be explored in detail.

⁵⁰ A. Lubotsky (p.c.) suggests an alternative reconstruction PIr. **fra-Hṛta*- for Khot. *haḍa*-. However, even if Kümmel’s hypothesis proved not feasible, unetymological *h*- (‘prothetic’ according to Bailey) would be very frequent in Khotanese. A reconstruction **fra-Hṛta*- would be difficult to reconcile with TA *ārt**.

⁵¹ It may be argued that, based on TA *ārt**, one could reconstruct a Tumshuqese substantive **arda*-, borrowed only into Tocharian A in historical times. However, three arguments against this scenario can be listed. On the one hand, no loanwords from Tumshuqese have been detected so far in Tocharian. The direction of borrowing seems to have been from Tocharian B into Tumshuqese instead and not the opposite. This is likely due to sociolinguistic reasons and is connected with the political expansion of Kuča into the Tumshuqese-speaking areas. Tocharian B was then in a position of prestige over Tumshuqese. For geographical and political reasons, Tumshuqese loanwords are expected to be found in Tocharian B, not in Tocharian A. On the other hand, later loanwords from Tocharian B into Tocharian A usually maintain their final vowel. It would be arbitrary to argue that loanwords from Tumshuqese into Tocharian A regularly lost their final vowel as a consequence of the adaptation. Finally, it should be stressed that Tumshuqese is only imperfectly known and is attested only from a handful of manuscripts: it is dangerous to speculate on unattested Tumshuqese lexemes.

Tocharian. Tocharian B lost this lexeme (TB **ārto*) and favoured *ṣīto* ‘envoy’, while Tocharian A preserved it in its regular outcome *ārt**. The history of the word may be summarised as follows: PIr. **Harta-* > PTK *(*h*)*arda-* (OKh. *haḍa-*, Tq. *(*h*)*arda-*), acc. sg. PTK *(*h*)*ardu* → PT **ārto* (TB **ārto*, TA *ārt**).

TB *ARMAÑIK* ‘A KIND OF TEXTILE’

Tocharian occurrences

- nom. sg. SI B Toch 10 a2 *tseñai kem armañik piś cakām piś tsum pärkare wartstse trai cakām trai tsum* ‘*armañik* on a blue ground: five feet (and) five inches in length, three feet (and) three inches in width.’ (Ching 2010: 344)

Discussion⁵²

The hapax TB *armañik* occurs in the St. Petersburg fragment SI B Toch 10. Ching (2010: 344) tentatively proposed that *armañik* could be a kind of textile and put forward the hypothesis that it could have been borrowed from an Indo-Iranian language. The context suggests that it could be a kind of woven stuff, and the measures given in the document could fit a medium size rug, blanket, or covering.

Begmatov (2019: 17–18) proposed to connect the unclear Sogdian hapax *rm’nykh* in the mount Mugh document A-1 r9 (Livshits 2015: 120–24) with Tib. *a rmo ni ka* (see other spellings in DKS: 32). This is used to render *pāṇḍu-kambala* in *pāṇḍu-kambala-śilā*, i.e. the throne of Indra in the Trayastriṃśa. In the Mahāvīyutpatti (Sakaki 1916: n° 7127) Skt. *pāṇḍukambalaśilātalam* is translated by Tib. *armonig lta bu’i rdo leb*, lit. ‘stone endowed with (or resembling) *armonig*’. Bailey (DKS: 32) proposed that the word had an Iranian origin and reconstructed a possible Iranian form **armānika-* or **armaunika-* based on Tibetan. However, he was unsure about the precise borrowing directions. Begmatov (2019: 18) convincingly argued that the Tibetan form was borrowed from Sogdian. His reconstruction of the pronunciation of *rm’nykh* as /*ərmānika*/ agrees with Bailey’s first reconstruction.

I would like to suggest that TB *armañik* in SI P Toch 10 a2 may be a loanword from the same Sogdian form. The phonological shape of the Tocharian B word may be reconstructed as /*armañik*/. This identification provides an almost perfect phonological match. The loanword entered Tocharian at a relatively late stage. On the one hand, the secondary palatalisation *ni* > *ñi* is found only in late and colloquial texts (Peyrot 2008: 90–91). On the other hand, the absence of the final vowel agrees with the patterns observed for late loanwords from a Sogdian source into Tocharian B (Tremblay 2005: 437–39). This identification also fits the overall context of the Tocharian document under analysis. Even if the fragment contains many unclear hapaxes, it is clear that *armañik* should refer to a textile product.

Even though **armānika-* looks genuinely Iranian, I cannot explain its etymology. Bailey’s (DKS: 32) hypothesis of a root **Har-* (as in Khot. *haḍa-* ‘dress’ < **Har-ta-* (?), see DKS: 447) remains very speculative. The same can be observed about Bailey’s connection with Gāndhārī *arnavaji*, which should designate a type of cloth.

⁵² Even if the results of this discussion are more concerned with Sogdian, the Tibetan word was first discussed by H.W. Bailey in the *Dictionary of Khotan-Saka s.v. īmjīnai*.

Results

The Tocharian B hapax *armañik* in SI P Toch 10 a2 can be interpreted as a late loanword from Sogdian *rm'nykh* 'a type of textile'.

TB AṢĀM A ĀṢĀM 'WORTHY', OKH. ĀṢANA- 'ID.'

Discussion

Konow (SS: 118) and Bailey (1937: 914) noted the similarity between the two words. Weber (1985: 681) argued that the Tocharian and the Khotanese words could be Bactrian loanwords. The Bactrian word is now attested as *αζαβο* (Sims-Williams 2007: 188), interpreted as /ažān/ by Gholami (2014: 55) and derived from **arjyāna-* by Sims-Williams (l.c., following Henning 1937: 93).

Adams (DoT: 34) argued that the Tocharian form could be a loanword from Khotanese. This is hardly acceptable because of the accent of the Tocharian B form. If borrowed from Khotanese, it should have been accented on the first syllable as in Khotanese:⁵³ /āšan/, written **<āṣam>. TB *aṣām* A *āṣām* should instead be considered as a direct loanword from Bactrian. The shortening of *ā* in Khotanese remains puzzling.

The case of *orśa*, q.v., supports an inner-Khotanese solution. If the shortening happened within Khotanese, TB *aṣām* was borrowed from Pre-Khotanese, when the medial vowel was still long and carried the accent. This option can be discarded because of the lack of final vowel in Tocharian B, which points to a more recent borrowing (see §3.2.6.).

Results

Because of its accent, TB *aṣām* A *āṣām* cannot be considered a loanword from Khotanese. It should instead be regarded as a direct borrowing from Bactrian *αζαβο*.

TB AS- 'TO BRING, FETCH', OKH. HAYS- 'TO DRIVE, SEND'

Tocharian occurrences

- 1. 2sg. ipv. THT 91 a3 (*ke*)*r(cc)iyenne pāsa* || 'Bring die Kränze in den (Pa)last!' (Schmidt 2001: 321)
- 2. 2pl. ipv. THT 331 b5 *wentsi mā rittetär te ška pasāt tam ška pasāt* 'It is not proper to say "bring this here", "bring that here".' (Peyrot 2013: 697)
- a. 3sg. prs. THT 591 a4 *bhavāggārṣṣana kautatsy āṣṣām vajropame* 'To break the limits of existence, he brings (applies ?) the *vajropameya-samādhi*.'⁵⁴
- b. inf. all. THT 91 a1 (*ā*)*ntsesa watsālai premane war āṣṣis yakne yamaṣām* 'Auf der Schulter einen Schlauch (?) tragend, verhält er sich wie ein Wasserträger.' (Schmidt 2001: 321)
- c. inf. THT 281 a3 *tsānkowa krentaunaṣṣen aṣṣi preke* 'It is time to bring about the arisen virtues.'

⁵³ Only by positing initial accent could one account for the shortening of medial long *-ā-* in the Khotanese form.

⁵⁴ I am grateful to Athanaric Huard for this translation.

Discussion

As remarked by Peyrot (2013: 724), the meaning ‘to bring, fetch’ is mainly suggested by the two imperative forms (1. and 2.). The non-imperative forms of the verb (a., b. and c.)⁵⁵ occur in difficult contexts and do not help in determining the meaning. It seems that ‘to carry’ (THT 91) and ‘to bring about’ (THT 391) would be more suitable translations in those cases, and they may belong to another root. Krause (1952: 58) suggested that the two imperative forms might be derived from a verb *as-*, suppletive to TB *pər-* ‘to take’ (Peyrot 2013: 773). However, the etymology of this root is unclear.

Adams (DoT: 63–64) proposed to interpret it as a ‘verbalisation’ of the locative particle TB *ā* through the addition of *-s-* on the model of *wəs-* (< *wi* ‘away’ + *-s-*). As noted by Michaël Peyrot (p.c.), however, the root structure *-asa-* in the imperative forms *pāsa* [p-asá-ø] (with accent shift) and *pasāt* [p-asá-t] and the infinitive with *as-*, i.e. [as-ə-tsi] are difficult to connect with *as-*. Therefore, it is possible that 1. and 2. belong to a different root.

Van Windekens suggested an Iranian derivation (VW: 624, see also Tremblay 2005: 434). He put forward the hypothesis that the word was borrowed from a Middle Iranian form akin to Khotanese *hays-* ‘to drive, send’ (SGS: 148, < PIr. **Haf-* ‘to drive, lead’ [EDIV: 171–72]). Indeed, the Tocharian B verb cannot have been borrowed from Old Steppe Iranian. In this case, one would have expected TB ***ets-*. Therefore, if borrowed from Iranian, it must have been borrowed from a Middle Iranian source. Khotanese is the only attested Middle Iranian language in which the continuant of Proto-Iranian **Haf-* has an independent existence as a full-functioning verb without any attached preverb. The same root is attested in the Parthian, Middle Persian and Sogdian nominal formation *nyʹz*, formed with the preverb **ni-* (see EDIV: 171–72).⁵⁶

One may argue that TB *as-* is a late borrowing from Khotanese *hays-*. Whereas this hypothesis is not phonologically problematic – initial *h-* is retained only in later borrowings from Indic, not from Khotanese – it is not convincing from the semantic point of view. The Tocharian verb means ‘to bring’ and not ‘to lead, drive’. It is true, however, that imperatives are frequently borrowed as simple strengthening interjections and could develop an inflection of their own. A parallel may be sought in Turkish *haydi*, widely borrowed throughout the Balkan area. In Romanian, it developed a verbal-like paradigm (Gheorghe and Velea 2012: 143).

Results

In conclusion, the hypothesis that TB *as-* ‘to bring, fetch’ was borrowed from Khot. *hays-* ‘to drive, send’ is far-fetched but cannot be excluded. Possibly the phonetic similarities between the two roots are due to mere chance. On the whole, the connection seems weak.

⁵⁵ For the Tocharian A infinitive *āssi*, which may belong here, see Itkin and Malyshev (2021: 59).

⁵⁶ For another (neglected) hypothesis, see Emmerick (1977: 404). In a very short note, he suggests that the Tocharian verb may have been borrowed from Sogdian *ʾs-* ‘to take’ (DMSB: 22). Also in this case, however, the semantic correspondence is weak. Moreover, there are no other Tocharian verbs borrowed directly from a Sogdian verbal form to my knowledge.

(4) TB *uWĀTANO** A *WATAṂ** ‘KHOTANESE’, OKh. *HVATANA-* ‘ID.’

1. Introduction⁵⁷

The first historical notices of the existence of the reign of Khotan can be found in the *Shǐjì* 史記 and in the *Hànshū* 漢書. They report the mission of the Chinese envoy Zhāng Qiān 張騫 to the West during the second half of the 2nd c. BCE (Kumamoto 2009). At that time, Khotan was already an organised urban entity. Some centuries later, the fame of Khotan as an important centre of Buddhist studies and a significant commercial hub on the Silk Road was diffused in the whole of the Tarim Basin and beyond. In fact, the name of Khotan is attested in almost all neighbouring languages (Chinese, Tibetan, Niya Prakrit, Sogdian, and Old Uyghur). No mention of Khotan is found in the Tocharian sources. With such a wealth of historical sources, and given the geographical proximity of Tocharian speakers, the silence of the Tocharian documents seems at least quite odd.

In this section, I argue that the name of Khotan was known to Tocharian people and that it was directly borrowed from Khotanese speakers in the first centuries CE. Further, I propose that OKh. *hvatana-* ‘Khotanese’ was also borrowed into Bactrian in the same period. The discussion consists of the following parts:

§1. Introduction

§2. The name of Khotan in Khotanese and Tumshuqese

§3. Foreign names of Khotan and its people

§4. The name of Khotan in Bactrian: a new proposal

§5. Other forms of the name of Khotan

§6. The name of Khotan in Tocharian: a new identification

§7. Dating of the borrowing into Tocharian and Bactrian

§8. Conclusions and outlook

Appendix 1. Tocharian and Bactrian passages and linguistic forms examined

Appendix 2. On the Iranian etymology of the name of Khotan

2. The name of Khotan in Khotanese and Tumshuqese

The oldest form of the name of Khotan is to be identified as OKh. *hvatana-*. On the history of this identification in general, one may consult Konow (1914: 342), Leumann (1933–1936: VIII), Konow (1935: 799–801), KT IV: 1, Pelliot (1959: 408–25), Emmerick (1968: 88), KT VI: 431–32. The following sections examine the attested forms in Old Khotanese, Tumshuqese, and Late Khotanese.

2.1. Old Khotanese

Most Old Khotanese occurrences of the name of Khotan are found in the Book of Zambasta. In this text (Z), the following expressions containing the name of Khotan are found:

⁵⁷ This study was partially presented during the 231st online meeting of the American Oriental Society (March 2021). Given its considerable length, the structure of this section is different from the other entries: a division into subsections has been deemed necessary. A different version has been accepted for publication in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (Dragoni Forthc.a). I am grateful to Stephanie Jamison and the anonymous reviewers for commenting on an earlier version of the article.

- *hvatānā rre* (Z 5.114) ‘the Khotanese king’
- *hvatana* (Z 23.4) ‘the Khotanese (people)’
- *hvatāna kṣira* (Z 23.14, 15.9) ‘the Khotanese realm’
- *hvatanau* (Z 23.4 etc.) ‘in the Khotanese (language)’

The phonological development of *hvatana-* is outlined in Maggi (2009: 156): OKh. *hvatana-* > OKh. *hvatāna-* > LKh. *hvaṃna-* > LKh. *hvana-*. Maggi (2009: 157) also provides a useful statistic: here, the name occurs ten times, five times with weakening of the medial vowel (*hvatāna-*) and five times without (*hvatana-*). Another source for the oldest form *hvatana-* in Old Khotanese is found in the preface to the Khotanese version of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* (§0.17, see Suv I: 8). Another occurrence of *hvatana-* is found in a later manuscript from Dunhuang (P 2023.8, on which see Emmerick 1992: 38) where it could be an attempt of the scribe to confer to the text a more authoritative Old Khotanese appearance. This could show that the oldest form of the name was known to Khotanese speakers throughout the whole history of the language. The adjective *hvatam-kṣiraa-* ‘of the land of Khotan’, occurring in Suv 0.19, shows no weakening and syncope of the middle vowel *a* of the compound adjective **hvatana-kṣiraa-*.

Konow (1935: 799) claimed that also a shorter form *hvata-* may have existed in a compound *hvata-kṣira* (Leumann 1920: 176), but this reading has been rejected by Emmerick (SDTV I: 26). He convincingly argued that the first akṣara of *hvata-kṣira* cannot be read as *hva*.⁵⁸

2.2. Tumshuqese

The identification of the name of Khotan in the Tumshuqese documents is problematic. Konow (1935: 799) sought to recognise OKh. *hvatana-* in Tq. *hvaḍ₁na* (HL 8b6) and *hvaḍ₁ane* (HL 6.6–7). He proposed that this could be a relic of the ethnic name of the people who, coming from the north, first settled in the northwest of the Tarim Basin. This could well be possible, but it is not easy to prove.⁵⁹ In addition, the passages in which *hvaḍ₁na* and *hvaḍ₁ane* occur are obscure, and several alternative interpretations are possible.

Skjærvø (1987: 81) pointed out that the two occurrences may belong to an adjectival derivative of a stem *hvata-* or *hvataa-*, meaning ‘lord’. This is attested as *hvatā* in the KVāc (§5 and §9 in Emmerick 1985a: 10), where it could translate Skt. *bhagavato*. However, the Tocharian version upon which the Tumshuqese text was based has *ñem-klawissu* ‘der Erhabene’ (Schmidt 1988: 313, Schmidt 2018: II 88), so it is now clear that Tq. *nāma hvatā* is nothing but a calque of the Tocharian B form.⁶⁰ Consequently, *hvatā* in the KVāc has to be interpreted as a participle from the verb *hvan-* ‘to call’. Alternatively, Skjærvø (1987: 81) also proposed that *hvaḍ₁ane* could be interpreted as an infinitive from the same *hvan-*. The passages are as follows:⁶¹

⁵⁸ He tentatively proposes *cū*, but this reading is also problematic. The upper part of the akṣara could possibly be read as *ta*, but the lower part remains unclear.

⁵⁹ A different view on the migration route of the ancestors of the speakers of Khotanese and Tumshuqese is offered by Peyrot (2018: 274–77).

⁶⁰ See also Hitch (2020: 973).

⁶¹ The transliteration closely follows Maue (2009). The word division is tentative.

- HL 6.6-7 *ka še dād₁u ša pyewid₁a hvad₁ane parmañu yi aramnai*
- HL 8b6 [...] *u hvad₁na ye g₂i ka the/rtha ti/ni ramād₁a*.

No translation will be attempted here, as both passages are still obscure. It is sufficient to note that the context of the first passage favours an interpretation of *hvad₁ane* as deriving from the verb *hvan-*. In the same document (6.5), *dad₁i-hvana dād₁u hvañi* occurs. It was translated by Konow (1935: 811) as ‘sollte der Gesetzverkünder das Gesetz verkünden’. The phrases *dād₁u hvan-* and *dād₁u pyew-* are reminiscent of OKh. *dātu hvāñ-* (e.g. Z 13.109) ‘to proclaim the Law’ and *dātu pyūš-* (e.g. Z 13.120) ‘to hear the Law’.⁶² The uncertain *ti/ni ramā d₁a* in HL 8b6 could be read *nīramād₁a*, an inflected form of a verb **ni-rām-* ‘to throw down, overcome, suppress’ (cf. Pa. and MP *n(y)r’m-*, EDIV: 312). If *hvad₁naye* is an adjective meaning ‘belonging to *hvad₁na*’, it can be taken together with *kathē-*, which could be interpreted as the nom. or acc. pl. of a stem *kathā-* ‘town’ (cf. Khot. *kañthā-*). The text may allude to military operations against the ‘*hvad₁na*-towns’. Tq. *hvad₁na* may refer to Khotan and may be derived from a syncopated form of *hvatana-*. According to Konow, the name of the kingdom (*χšera-*) of Agni may also be attested twice in the same fragment (HL 8b5, 6). Still, the reading is not straightforward (Maue 2007: 229 fn. 30), and this proposal remains speculative. The overall meaning of the text is still obscure. Therefore, this study will not further consider the alleged Tumshuqese name of Khotan.

As it is now generally acknowledged, the Tumshuqese referred to their ruler as the *gūzdiyā rid₁e* (gen.-dat. sg.), i.e. ‘of/to the king of Gūzdik’ (Rong 2009, Maue 2004: 209). This is confirmed by the identification of the toponym Gūzdik with Chin. *Jùshǐdé* 据史德 and Tib. *gustik* (Rong 2009: 124). It is unclear whether this name was also used to refer to the name of the language or merely referred to the territory of Tumshuq.

2.3. Late Khotanese: Khotan as the ‘Golden Land’

A peculiar designation of the Khotanese kingdom found in later documents from Dunhuang is LKh. *ysarnai bāḍa* ‘Golden Land’ (Or. 8212/186.34, IOL Khot S. 21.34, P 2027.7, P 2786.197, P 2787.51, P 2958.127, P 4649.5 and 8). As it may also be attested in Tocharian B, referring to Khotan (see §6.1.1. in this section), a brief commentary is necessary.

LKh. *ysarnai bāḍa* is commonly believed to refer to Khotan proper, not to Dunhuang (Zhang and Rong 1984: 27). It has been tentatively proposed that this was adopted after Khotan regained its independence from Tibetan rule in the second half of the 9th c. CE (Zhang and Rong 1984: 27). There seems to be no consensus on the exact origin of this designation. Whereas Bailey linked it immediately to Skt. *suvarṇagotra-* and Tib. *gser rigs* ‘Golden Race’ (Bailey 1940: 602), Kumamoto (1982: 220) explicitly rejected this connection.⁶³ Zeisler (2010: 419–25) offers a survey of the Tibetan sources regarding *gser rigs* and the diffusion of this designation in the Tarim Basin. She concludes that it is to be identified with the Hunza region, which was probably connected to Khotan politically and geographically. LKh. *ysarnai*

⁶² It may be noted in passing that this would confer a distinguished Buddhist flavour to the text. This does not necessarily contradict Henning’s hypothesis (1936: 11–14) that this document concerns a Manichaean community.

⁶³ ‘A connection with the “Gold Country” of the “Gold Race (Suvarṇagotra)” [...] should not be sought here’.

bāḍa might be connected, but the precise directions of diffusion of this name are still obscure.⁶⁴

3. Foreign names of Khotan and its people

The territory of Khotan was known in the Tarim Basin under different names. Some of these can be ultimately traced back to OKh. *hvatana*-, or from one of the attested forms in the Khotanese text corpus. Other forms are the result of indirect borrowing processes within the Tarim Basin. In the following, I will attempt to reconstruct the main borrowing directions.

3.1. The Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins

The earliest attestations of the name of Khotan are commonly believed to be found in the so-called ‘Sino-Kharoṣṭhī’ coins, which are also the earliest written local documentation extant from the Khotan area (Kumamoto 2022). However, the evidence is problematic, and it is possible that the toponyms on the coin legends do not represent the name of Khotan. Cribb (1984: 137 fn. 20, photos in Cribb 1985) proposed that the correct reading of the Kharoṣṭhī legends should be *yidi/yiti*. Given the fact that the Chinese character *yú* 于 also appears to be written on the coins and it is probably to be taken as short for *yúzhì* 于寘 ‘Khotan’ (also attested in the legends, see Group 12 and 13 in Cribb 1984: 134–35),⁶⁵ one should conclude that the current pronunciation of *yú* 于 when these coins were issued was reflected in the Kharoṣṭhī phonetic reading <yi>. Baxter and Sagart (2014: 260) reconstruct the following development for *yú* 于: OCh. **G^w(r)a* > Hàn Chin. *fiwa* > MCh. *hju*. This chronological development enables us to reconstruct a slightly more precise periodisation of the borrowing chronology of the name of Khotan into Chinese. If the dating of the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins proposed by Cribb is correct, these were issued between the 1st and the 2nd c. CE (Cribb 1984: 149–51). Thus, by that time, Hàn Chin. *fiwa* should already have acquired its Middle Chinese shape *hju*. Consequently, the date of borrowing of Khot. *hvatana*- in Chinese should be placed roughly between the first mission to Khotan of the Chinese delegation of Zhāng Qiān 張騫 (after 140 BCE, Kumamoto 2022) and the issue of the first Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins which bear the legend *yidi/yiti* (probably in the 1st c. CE).⁶⁶

However, the phonetic shape of the form found in the Kharoṣṭhī transcriptions on these coins shows a very late appearance. Whether the chronology implied squares with the materials known from Chinese reconstructions is questionable.⁶⁷ Moreover, this would point to an exceedingly early date of borrowing into Old Uyghur (*odon*, see §3.2. in this section), which is *per se* quite unlikely. Cribb (1984: 137 fn. 20) does not seem to take into consideration these inconsistencies when he quickly dismisses the problem by stating that ‘Whichever pronunciation was current at the time of the issue of the coins, there is no reason to doubt

⁶⁴ Noteworthy are the royal names of some of the earliest Kuchean kings, all containing an element *suvarṇa*- ‘golden’ (see Lévi 1913: 319–21). On *suvarṇa*-, see further §6.1.1.

⁶⁵ Apart from the place of finding, other arguments speak in favour of identifying the name of Khotan in the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins. However, the attempts to identify the royal names in these early coin legends with those attested in the Khotanese material have not yielded positive results (Enoki 1965: 242).

⁶⁶ This date would therefore constitute a *terminus ante quem* for the borrowing.

⁶⁷ Before Baxter and Sagart (2014), Pulleyblank (1991: 381) had reconstructed *wuā* for Early Middle Chinese.

that the Prakrit transliteration of the name of Khotan on the coins *yidi* or *yiti* closely resembles the Chinese transliteration of the same name.’ Moreover, it should be noted that also the second syllable *di/ti* does not square with the Chinese form. All of this means that the identification of *yidi/yiti* with the name of Khotan is very problematic, and it is necessary to consider the possibility that *yidi/yiti* represents a different toponym for the Khotan region.

3.2. Old and Middle Chinese

The earliest mentions of the name of Khotan in Chinese literary sources have been preserved in the *Shǐjì* 史記 and in the *Hànshū* 漢書, both composed during the 1st c. BCE – a dating which could suit the time range outlined above.

In the well-known chapter 123 of the *Shǐjì* 史記 (§123.2a), whose authenticity has been doubted various times,⁶⁸ the name is attested as *yúzhì* 于真.⁶⁹ The second character corresponds to Middle Chinese *tsyeH* (Baxter and Sagart 2014). Its first consonantal element is quite puzzling, but it could have been an expected rendition of the Khotanese original (Pelliot 1959: 408). In the *Hànshū* (Hulsewé 1979: 96), it has a more ‘regular’ correspondence with its Khotanese source, as it is given as *yútián* 于闐.⁷⁰ The second character is reconstructed as *den* by Baxter and Sagart (2014). *Yútián* 于闐 may have been borrowed into Old Uyghur as *odon* (Peyrot, Pinault, and Wilkens 2019: 79, see also Maue 2015: 505),⁷¹ attested various times in the 5th chapter of the biography of Xuánzàng 玄奘. In Brāhmī script, it is spelled as <otom> in U 5208 a8. It is noteworthy that *yútián* 于闐 was also ‘re-borrowed’ into Late Khotanese, as in later documents from Dunhuang one finds such forms as *yūttiyaina kūauhq* (P 2739.43), which neatly reflect a very recent pronunciation of Chinese *yútián guó* 于闐國.

The passage of the *Dà Táng Xiyù Jì* 大唐西域記 in which the name of Khotan is treated has been the object of numerous discussions (Pelliot 1959: 409), so it will not be considered here at length.⁷² Suffice it to say that Xuánzàng’s information on the current pronunciation of *hvatana-* in the Khotan area at his time agrees with the forms attested in the Khotanese corpus and provides a precise *terminus ante quem* (middle of the 7th c. CE) for the change *hvatāna-* > *hvaṃṇa-*. In the same passage, one also finds Xuánzàng’s statement that the *hú* 胡 people referred to Khotan with the name *huōdàn* 豁旦. Following Pulleyblank (1991: 135),⁷³ the initial sound may be reconstructed as *xw* for Early Middle Chinese. As already noted by Pelliot (1959: 411), this name may refer to the forms current among the Iranian people living in the Tarim Basin in Xuánzàng’s time.

3.3. Sogdian

As it happens, we know that Sogdians referred to Khotanese people with the adjective *xwōnyk*, which is attested in a late list (Ch/So 20166 c3) bearing the title *nβn’m’k*, literally ‘list of countries’ (Henning 1944: 10). Yoshida (1993: 151) argues for a very late date of the fragment (10th

⁶⁸ See La Vaissière (2005: 25 fn. 30) for further references.

⁶⁹ Cf. §3.1. for this name in the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins.

⁷⁰ It is also recorded as an ‘ancient’ name of Khotan by the later *Dà Táng Xiyù Jì* 大唐西域記.

⁷¹ See §3.1. for the chronological problems involved.

⁷² The first interpretation of this passage dates back to Lévi (1904: 560).

⁷³ Not in Baxter and Sagart (2014).

c. CE) and concludes that the list was intended as a didactic compilation aimed at instructing Manichaean scribes in Turfan.

This is not the only occurrence of the name of Khotan in Sogdian, as it is also attested twice in a small fragment of a document from the Hoernle collection (IOL Khot 158/5).⁷⁴ Significantly, it is a fragment of a letter sent from Khotan found in the Khotan area.⁷⁵ IOL Khot 185/5 b1 has *xwδn* and b4 *ʼxwδn*. Both occurrences confirm that the Sogdian name of Khotan had <δ> and <x> in the first syllable. Because of initial /xū/, one should probably argue either for a very early date of borrowing (early enough to undergo the same treatment as **hwa-* > *xū* in Sogdian (GMS: §238), or for a loanword from another Iranian language. This version of the name of Khotan cannot have been borrowed directly from Khotanese *hvatana-* in historical times.

3.4. Niya Prakrit

That the initial /xu/ or /xo/ for the name of Khotan was prevalent among Iranian peoples had been noted for quite some time. One only needs to compare the forms attested in modern Iranian languages, usually derived from NP *Xutan*. However, what has gone unnoticed is that the oldest attested form of the name after the problematic occurrences on the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins also points to a form with initial /xo/. The Niya documents mention Khotan and Khotanese people frequently. The form is *khotana-*. It is mainly attested in the loc. sg. *khotamna(m)mi* (e.g. CKD 14, 22, 135) or abl. sg. *khotamnade* (e.g. CKD 272, 283, 289). An adjective *khotaniya-* ‘of Khotan’ was also formed (e.g. CKD 30, 36, 86). The title *khotana maharaya* was borne by the king of Khotan. This titulature is attested in the famous tablet CKD 661, which was probably written in the Khotan area and displayed striking Khotanese features (Emmerick 1992: 2–3, Dragoni, Schoubben and Peyrot 2020: 344).⁷⁶ This points to the fact that the Prakrit administration of Khotan did not use the native Khotanese form *hvatana-* to refer to Khotan.

A development **hwa-* > *kho-* cannot be explained within Niya Prakrit. If, following Burrow (1935: 789), the personal name *khvarnarse* in CKD 661 has an element *khvar-* from a Middle Iranian source **xwar-* ‘sun’, one could surmise that Iranian *x* could be rendered with *kh*. Therefore, one should assume that the Iranian form implied by *khotana-* was more likely **xotana-* or **xodana-*, surely not **hwa-*. The interchange between <t> and <d> in intervocalic position is frequent in Niya Prakrit (Burrow 1937: 7–8), so the <t> cannot be used to reconstruct with certainty **t* or **d* in the Iranian form.

4. The name of Khotan in Bactrian: a new proposal

We have seen that the Niya form must have been borrowed from a neighbouring Iranian language, but *khotana-* cannot reflect a direct loanword from Khotanese *hvatana-* because of the initial syllable. If one excludes Sogdian, Khwarezmian, Middle Persian and Parthian for geographical and chronological reasons, Bactrian remains the only possible donor language.

⁷⁴ I am grateful to Zhang Zhan, who kindly drew my attention to this fragment during the 231st meeting of the American Oriental Society. On the history of the fragment, see Sims-Williams and Hamilton (1990: 11) and Zhang (2018: 30 fn. 10). For an edition of IOL Khot 158/5, see Yoshida (2010: 6).

⁷⁵ Other Sogdian documents from the Khotan area are published by Bi and Sims-Williams (2010, 2015).

⁷⁶ The same title is also to be found in CKD 214.

Based on the Niya form, a hypothetical Bactrian $*\chi(o/\omega)\delta\alpha\nu o$ or $*\chi(o/\omega)\tau\alpha\nu o$ may be reconstructed as a likely source form. This would also fit the data known from Bactrian historical phonology, as if it were theoretically issued from Old Iranian $*h\text{watana-}$. For this development, one may compare the outcome of Ir. $*h\text{wa-pa\theta ya-}$, Bactr. $\chi o\beta o$ (Sims-Williams 2007: 279),⁷⁷ and $oo\chi\omega\beta-$ ‘quarrel’ < $*wi-x\text{war\text{ša-}}$ (Sims-Williams 2007: 248).⁷⁸ Another possible reconstruction is Bactr. $*\chi o\alpha(\delta/\tau)\alpha\nu o$, as internal $-o\alpha-$ in Iranian loanwords in Gāndhārī is known to have been regularly adapted as $-o-$ (cf. Gandh. *kakhordi-* ‘witch’, for which cf. Av. *ka-x^varəda-*).⁷⁹

The natural question to ask at this point is whether the name of Khotan is attested in the extant Bactrian material. The result is negative, but this may be due to the scarcity of the sources at our disposal. However, a different candidate for the name of the Khotanese people is attested in two unexplained personal names possibly borrowed from OKh. *hvatana-*. These are $\beta\rho\eta\delta\alpha\gamma o \ o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\nu o$ in cm1, 25 (Sims-Williams 2007: 91) and $o\eta\lambda(o)-o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o$ in cm4 and cl4-5 (Sims-Williams 2007: 89). They were treated more recently again by Sims-Williams (2010: n° 105, 319, 328). The etymology was left unexplained. *o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o* is tentatively interpreted as “perhaps in origin a patr. formed from a name-component $*o\alpha\tau o$ ” (Sims-Williams 2010: n° 319). While stating the $*o\alpha\tau o$ has “no obvious Iranian etymology”, Sims-Williams further suggests that its origin could perhaps be sought in a participle $*wa\text{šta-}$ ‘driven’. Bactrian τ may indeed represent the outcome of an older $*\text{št}$. However, if *o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o* were to be taken as a patronymic, how should one interpret *o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\nu o*?

I want to put forward the proposal that *o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o* is a direct loanword from Khotanese *hvatana-* and that *o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\nu o* is its regular Bactrian obl. pl. Thus, $\beta\rho\eta\delta\alpha\gamma o \ o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\nu o$ would be ‘the Bredag of the Khotanese (people)’ and $o\eta\lambda(o)-o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o$ would be ‘Wel the Khotanese’. This would imply that $\beta\rho\eta\delta\alpha\gamma o$ was used in this case as a title (Sims-Williams 1999: 198–99). It is less likely, though not impossible, that it could also be a personal name, thus ‘Bredag (belonging) to the Khotanese people’. It is not by mere chance that *o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\nu o* and *o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o* occur in the same document (cm). If these were simply patronymics, we should conclude that Bredag and Wel belonged to the same family. This appears to be not very likely. $\beta\rho\eta\delta\alpha\gamma o \ o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\nu o$ is the addressee of the letter and was probably a person of high rank since the ruler of Rob, the sender of the letter, referred to him as a person of almost equal rank. $o\eta\lambda(o)-o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o$, on the other hand, seems to be a person of secondary importance. Since they belong to different social strata, they are unlikely to be related. The aim of the letter is not clear, but it seems that the ruler of Rob wished to ensure that no more horses were taken from surrounding people without his authorisation. The mention of $o\eta\lambda(o)-o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o$ could be explained if we surmise that he belonged to the same community of $\beta\rho\eta\delta\alpha\gamma o \ o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\nu o$, who was in charge in that period. The ruler of Rob may have addressed the $\beta\rho\eta\delta\alpha\gamma o \ o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\nu o$ because, because of his connection with $o\eta\lambda(o)-o\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o$, who was partly responsible for the horse theft, he could ensure that this practice stopped.

⁷⁷ One should note, however, that, apart from Bactr. $\chi o\beta o$ that appears in texts of all periods, the precise chronology of the change $\chi o\alpha- > \chi o-$ is not entirely clear (cf. Sims-Williams and De Blois 2020: 60 fn. 186).

⁷⁸ Thanks to Niels Schoubben’s (2021: 57 and his forthcoming dissertation) research work, the linguistic evidence for the influence of Bactrian on Niya Prakrit has now increased. The hypothesis of a Bactrian loanword would be in line with these recent discoveries.

⁷⁹ I owe this observation to Niels Schoubben.

If this is correct, it implies that these occurrences could be read as a reference to a community of Khotanese people present in Bactria around the date this letter was written. Thus, based on the Niya form, it may be surmised that the official geographical name of the Khotan region in Bactrian was $^{*}\chi(o/\omega)\delta\alpha\nu o / ^{*}\chi(o/\omega)\tau\alpha\nu o$ or, alternatively, $^{*}\chi\alpha(\delta/\tau)\alpha\nu o$. A secondarily borrowed ethnonym $\sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o$ could be established based on the analysis of two personal names. Since $\sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o$ may have been used to refer to Khotanese people living in Bactria who were possibly integrated into the local communities and were probably bilingual, it is not surprising that Bactrian borrowed their ethnic name without being aware of the actual geographical origin of these people, i.e. without making a connection with the toponym. Because of initial $\sigma\alpha-$ /wa/, $\sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o$ appears to be a direct borrowing from OKh. *hvatana-*. The fact that Bactrian speakers failed to identify OKh. *hvatana-* with their own name of Khotan implies that the Old Khotanese initial *hv-* was pronounced very differently at the time of borrowing. One could tentatively propose that it was a weak voiced aspiration, i.e. [h^w].

It is not surprising to find Khotanese-speaking communities in Bactria. As outlined above, contacts between Bactria and the Khotan region are documented at least since the 1st c. CE by the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins. These contacts likely involved movements of people in both directions as well.⁸⁰

5. Other forms of the name of Khotan

Another form borrowed directly from OKh. *hvatana-* is Tib. *'u-then* or *'u-ten*. It is well-attested in the *li yul lung bstan pa* (Emmerick 1967: 104). This text abounds in Khotanese loanwords and toponyms, so a direct Khotanese origin is very likely. The hypothesis of a direct borrowing from Khotanese is also confirmed by the use of the *'a-chung*, which is assigned the value [ɣ] by Hill (2009: 135).

Names of Khotan in foreign languages that do not have their ultimate origin in Khot. *hvatana-* are not treated here. For an overview, see Emmerick (1968: 89–90). For the confusion between Khotan and Kashgar in late Tocharian B, possibly after the Qarakhanid conquest of Khotan (11th c. CE), see Peyrot, Pinault, and Wilkens (2019: 68, 80).

6. The name of Khotan in Tocharian: a new identification

As can be gathered from the discussion above, the name of Khotan has yet to be identified in the Tocharian text corpus. Recently, Ogihara (*apud* Ching 2010: 249) considered the possibility that the name of Khotan could be attested in some late Tocharian B documents. However, he concluded that ‘the meaning of these words remains to be studied’. The difficulties implied by his interpretation were considered too severe, and, in his opinion, they could not enable a precise identification. These Tocharian B documents will be considered in detail in §6.2 (this section).

Besides this possible identification, Ogihara (l.c.) also put forward the preliminary hypothesis that the second member of the tune name *suwāññe* „*wātatane* in THT 108 b9 could contain the name of Khotan.

⁸⁰ I am grateful to Niels Schoubben for drawing my attention to the Tumshuqese inscription found in Drangtse (Ladakh). If one accepts Maue's (2016) identification, the inscription witnesses the presence of Tumshuqese travellers in the region. This could also have been the route Khotanese people took some centuries earlier to reach Bactria from the Khotan region.

In §6.1. I examine this and other related tune names in Tocharian B and A in detail and propose several new identifications. The issue of Tocharian initial *u*w-, relevant for the identification of the Tocharian B tune name and the forms in the documents, is dealt with in §6.3. Finally, in §6.4. I summarise the preliminary conclusions of the entire section.

6.1. Khotan in Tocharian A and B tune names

6.1.1. TB *suwāññe u*wātātane in THT 108 b9

The interpretation of the Tocharian B tune name *suwāññe u*wātātane (THT 108 b9) is uncertain. In the following, I argue that *u*wātātane should be read as *u*wātanane and could contain the name of Khotan. As for *suwāññe*, I propose that it could be a Tocharian adjective formed on the Gāndhārī word for ‘golden’, *suvaṃna-*.

Ogihara (*apud* Ching 2010: 249) tentatively suggested translating the tune name as ‘in pig’s *u*wātato*’. Should *suwāññe* be seen as a native Tocharian word, the most likely interpretation would be to analyse it as an adjective derived from TB *suwo* ‘pig’, cf. *swāññe weṃṣiye* ‘pig excrement’ in the medical text PK AS 3A b3 (DoT: 763). Peyrot (2018: 323), too, analysed *suwāññe* as a native Tocharian B adjective ‘of the pig’ but did not translate the second word. However, he did seem to imply that *u*wātātane should not be considered Tocharian, as he mentioned it as a tune ‘with a native first part’.

As for *u*wātātane, the nom. sg. could be reconstructed as *u*wātato*, as was already suggested by Ogihara. A word with a non-Tocharian appearance which exhibits a nom. sg. -o in Tocharian B is a likely candidate for a loanword from Old Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese. However, no possible source could be identified for *u*wātato*.⁸¹ In the first edition of the text, Sieg and Siegling (1953: 45 fn. 23) noted “Im Metrumsnamen kann statt *t* auch *n* gelesen werden,” which suggests that they were also unsure about the identification of *u*wātātane. Unfortunately, examining the original fragment to check the readings is impossible: its whereabouts are unknown, and no photos are available. Based on the authority of Sieg and Siegling, I suggest that a reading *u*wātanane instead of *u*wātātane is to be taken into serious consideration. Thus, it is possible to reconstruct a nom. sg. *u*wātano*. This satisfies the phonological criteria of a loanword from Old or Pre-Khotanese, and the initial accent of the Tocharian word neatly corresponds to the Old Khotanese acc. sg. *hvatānu*.

If this identification is correct, an alternative explanation for *suwāññe* is needed. It is hardly possible that the tune name could be translated as ‘in (the tune of) piggy Khotan’.⁸²

⁸¹ It is hardly possible that this could be traced back to a form of the perfect of the verb *hvañ-*, e.g. *hvatātā* in Z 2.82.

⁸² If we ‘translate’ it into Khotanese, we could obtain a compound ***hvatana-pā’saa-* ‘of the pig of Khotan’, but this is not attested within the Khotanese text corpus. One might explain the mention of this animal as a possible reference to the pig as the totemic animal of Khotan. Still, the Chinese and Tibetan sources seem to agree that the animal associated with the foundation of Khotan was the cow. This is also reflected in Skt. *go-stana-*, used to refer to Khotan (Emmerick 1968: 89). On the other hand, the pig is used in dating formulas employing the Chinese animal cycle, both in Khotanese and Tocharian (see THT 549 a5-6). Thus, a possible translation could be ‘(in the tune) of the Khotanese (year) of the pig’ or even ‘(in the tune of the year) of the pig of the Khotanese (king)’. This could be a reference to a Khotanese festivity or ritual celebrated in the year of the pig. However, this remains highly hypothetical.

No animal names seem to have been found within the attested Tocharian tune names listed by Peyrot (2018: 332–42). Therefore, it seems justified to seek another interpretation for *suwāññe*. *suwāññe* may be a Tocharian adjectival formation based on a loanword. If the donor language was Indic, one could identify two possibilities. On the one hand, one could connect it with Skt. *svāna*- (MW: 1283) or *svana* (MW: 1280) ‘sound, noise’. The verb *svan*- may also mean ‘to sing’, so it could be semantically associated with the tune names. However, it is questionable that initial *sv*- in Sanskrit could be represented by TB *suw*-, as this has no parallels.⁸³ TB *suw*- could more easily point to an initial *suv*- or *sup*- in a hypothetical Indic source. As mentioned in §2.3, the names of the early kings of Kuča contained an initial element Skt. *suvarṇa*- ‘golden’. These are attested with either initial *sw*- or *sv*-, but a personal name *suwarne** appears in THT 490.a2ii (Ching: 2010: 456), a loanword from Skt. *suvarṇa*-. Thus, the initial of Skt. *suvarṇa*- could be well-represented in *suwāññe*. However, the absence of *r* needs an explanation. In Gāndhārī, the regular outcome of the OIA cluster *rṇ* seems to be *ṇ(ṇ)* (see Salomon 2000: 87). Ignoring some historical spellings with *rṇ*, the forms attested in the Niya documents can be traced back to a single adjective *suvarṇa*- ‘golden’.

I propose to analyse TB *suwāññe* as a Tocharian B adjectival formation based on Middle Indic *suvarṇa*- ‘golden’. It could be argued that the adjective **suva(ṇ)ṇiya*- could have been the base of TB *suwāññe* in the Middle Indic source. However, since this is not attested, it is safer to consider it a Tocharian B formation. It is formally more convincing that *suvarṇa*- was first borrowed as TB **suwām* and a *-ññe* adjective was subsequently created on its basis. Thus, I propose to interpret the tune name *suwāññe-uwātānane* as ‘(in the tune) of golden Khotan’. A possible connection with LKh. *ysarnnai bāḍa* (cf. §2.3. in this section) may be envisaged, but its cultural implications should be studied more thoroughly.⁸⁴

6.1.2. Tocharian A tune names containing the name of Khotan

In view of this possible identification, a necessary question to be asked is whether other toponyms or ethnic names are attested within the corpus of Tocharian tune names or not. If the answer is positive, this could support the connection made above. It is generally acknowledged that the two Tocharian A tune names *ārśi-lāñcinaṃ* and *ārśi-ñiṣkramāntaṃ* contain the element *ārśi*, which may refer to the Tocharian A language. Peyrot (2018: 323) points out that the first name could be translated either as ‘[tune] of *Ārśi* kings’ or ‘*Ārśi* [tune] of kings’. This can indeed be interpreted as a compound formed by the substantive *ārśi* and the adjective *lāñci* ‘regal’ in the loc. sg., as usual in tune names (Peyrot 2018: 330–31). A similar compound is *ārśi-kāntu** ‘*Ārśi* language’. The second name could refer quite clearly to an *ārśi* variant of the tune *ñiṣkramānt*, which is otherwise known as an independent tune name in Tocharian A, B, and even in Tumshuqese (Maue 2007: 227–28). Thus, it seems perfectly possible that ethnic or language designations could appear in tune names.⁸⁵

⁸³ But *suv*- could appear as *sw*- or *sv*- in Tocharian B, as in the names of the Kuča kings. At any rate, *suv*- alternates with *sv*- already in Sanskrit, so it is probably not diagnostic in this case.

⁸⁴ Two personal names attested in three cave inscriptions recently published in Zhao and Rong (2020) share some formal similarities and deserve a commentary. These are *suwāññetsko** (Kz-225-YD-W-27), *suwāske* (Is-002-ZS-Z-02), and *suwāske* (Kizil WD-111-1). Possibly, *suwāske* could be taken as a diminutive of *suwo* used as a personal name with the meaning of ‘piglet’. *suwāññetsko** might contain the adjective TB *suwāññe* ‘golden’. For the semantics, cf. the Tocharian B personal name *kimña* ‘(woman) of *Kim*’, formed on the Chinese surname *Jīn* 金 ‘Gold’ (Ching 2010: 431).

Another tune name that unmistakably contains the Tocharian A word for ‘king’ (the substantive, in this case, not the adjective) in the loc. sg. is *watañi-lāntam* (A 24 b5, A 163 b2). The first element *watañi* is obscure (Peyrot 2018: 323). From a purely synchronic point of view, TA *watañi* could be interpreted as an *-i* adjective formed on a Tocharian A substantive whose nom. sg. may be reconstructed as *watam**. Because of *ārśi-lāñcinam*, it can be argued that the first element could contain a language or ethnic name. In this case, an identification with OKh. *hvatana-* suggests itself as very likely, both from the semantic and the phonological point of view. All the lines of argument pursued until now seem to point in this direction. *watañi-lāntam* could thus be translated as ‘(in the tune) of the king of Khotan’. Because of this new identification, it is now possible to interpret with more confidence the obscure tune name *watañinam* (A 71 b3, A 260 b2, THT 1464 b2). It can be analysed as the loc. sg. of the adjective *watañi* ‘of Khotan’. *watañinam* would be then ‘(in the tune) of Khotan’.

6.1.3. The correspondence TB *u*wātano* A *watam**

Now that both the Tocharian A and B versions of the name of Khotan have been identified as TB *u*wātano* A *watam**, it is necessary to comment on this new correspondence. It is unlikely that this ethnic name could be reconstructed for Proto-Tocharian. For a smooth reconstruction, one would expect the Tocharian A form to have been documented as ***wātam*. A loanword from Tocharian B into A would probably require the same TA form ***wātam*, perhaps with preservation of the final vowel. The most likely option is that they were independently borrowed into Tocharian A and B. The date of the borrowing should have been relatively early because the Tocharian A word is fully integrated within the morphology of the language. Moreover, Tocharian B may have had final *-o*, a feature of the loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese, or the oldest layers of Old Khotanese (see §3.4.).

A more precise dating of the borrowing into Tocharian will be attempted in §7. It is now the moment to turn to the problematic forms of the name of Khotan in late Tocharian B secular documents.

6.2. The name of Khotan in Tocharian B secular documents

The passages gathered by Ching (2010: 249) are as follows:

- 1. THT 2688.10 (c)o(ki)ś šalywe šaṅk *u*watanaṃs magālaše ša(ly)w(e) /// ‘[the oil/ghee for lamps] ...: one pint. Magālaše of [*u*wātane-people ?] ... [oil/ghee].’ (Ching 2010: 248)
- 2. THT 2709.2-3 /// ·w – – laṃṣānte ikām wi ikām še *u*wāta(ne) /// [l. 3] /// šeṣṣe ottār pokai še *u*wātane wi ya /// ‘(*u*wātane-people?) have worked, twenty-two. Twenty one [*u*wātane-people?] [l. 3] ...: by eight arms/limbs. One *u*wātane (?), two ...’ (Ching 2010: 271)

⁸⁵ In this respect, the Iranian Manichaean texts offer interesting parallels awaiting thorough treatment. Several tune captions occur in the extant manuscripts: MSogd. *pr t̰jyg’nyy* ”w’k ‘In the Tajik melody’ (M 339), MMP *swryg nw’g* ‘The Syriac melody’ (M 6950) and MMP *’yn pd swylyy zgr* ‘This in the Sogdian melody’ (BBB 462). See Sundermann (1993) and Brunner (1980: 352) on these captions.

- 3. THT 459.2 *co komtak* *u*watakas *yap wsāwa wi* /// ‘On the very same day, [I] gave barley to *u*wataka-people: two.’ (Ching 2010: 291)
- 4. THT 2761c.2 /// *ñi* *u*wātne *stare* /// ‘of me ... *u*wātne are.’

The occurrences of *u*wātane in sentences 1. and 2., although quite fragmentary, are not linguistically problematic. The contexts indicate that *u*wātane should be a substantive referring to a particular category of people. Given that the two documents are of very late date, I propose that this substantive in *-e* was formed in recent times to refer exclusively to Khotanese people and not to the geographical entity (B *u*watano A *watam*).

On the other hand, the two other occurrences in sentences 3. and 4 are difficult to interpret. If *u*watakas in sentence 3. could be read *u*wanakas, one could think of a *-ka-* derivative of LKh. *hvana-* ‘Khotanese’, but this cannot be proven or disproven with any certainty. Adams (DoT: 76) is inclined to interpret this word as possibly connected with *upātatse* (THT 4000 b7iii), but this hapax is also uncertain. As for the problematic *u*wātne (sentence 4.), one may think of a syncopated form of Khot. *hvatana-*, for which one may compare the uncertain Tq. *hvaḍḍna* (see §2.2. in this section). Given the fragmentary state of THT 2761c.2, however, this hypothesis remains very uncertain.⁸⁶

In conclusion, as far as the documents are concerned, the identification of the name of Khotan is very uncertain in sentences 3. and 4. As for sentences 1. and 2., it is more likely, but the fragmentary nature of the documents invites one to consider this hypothesis with caution.

6.3. On initial *u*w- in Tocharian

The initial digraph <*u*w> is a rare orthographic device in Tocharian, and it is difficult to assess its phonetic value. A complete overview of its occurrences and those of the related <up> is necessary.

This section is divided into three parts. §6.3.1. presents the occurrences, §6.3.2. analyses the data and concludes that the orthographic device should be relatively late, and §6.3.3. summarises the consequences of this analysis for the name of Khotan in Tocharian B.

6.3.1. Occurrences of <*u*w> and <up>

The precise value of initial <*u*w> in Tocharian is not straightforward and needs some comments. Table 3 lists the occurrences of <*u*w> and <up> in Tocharian A and B.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ Adams (DoT: 76) tentatively proposed to see in *u*wāṃtne (THT 429 b5) a loanword from Skt. *upānta-* ‘border, edge’. The passage is as follows: /// *entwemem* *u*wāṃtne *ynārki kauś kyāna amokāṣṣe* /// ‘thereupon, on the border *ynārki* above he fulfilled the artificial (?)’. If *u*wātne in sentence 4. were to be read as *u*wānte, one might have the same word in the nom. sg. here. Given that the context of both passages is not clear, however, all this remains very hypothetical.

⁸⁷ The data have been retrieved through a search in the CEToM database. The unclear occurrences treated in §6.2. are omitted here.

< _u w>		
Number	Manuscript	Occurrence
1	A 303 b1	TA <i>re_uwānt</i> (personal name)
2	THT 331 b1	TB <i>t_uwak</i> ‘this (emph.)’
3	THT 591 a4	TB <i>ñ_uwār</i> ‘by nines’
4	SI B Toch 11 a3	TB <i>u_uwāṣṣi</i> (personal name?)
5	SI B Toch 11 a4	TB <i>ā-_uw</i> ‘ewe’
6	THT 108 b9	<i>suwāññe-_uwātanane</i> (cf. <i>supra</i>)

< _u p>		
Number	Manuscript	Occurrence
7	A 212	TA <i>u_upādhyāy</i> ‘teacher’
8	PK DA M 507.8 ×2	TB <i>u_upādhyāyemś</i> TB <i>u_upādhyāyem ntse</i>
9	THT 1681	TB <i>u_upādhyāye</i>
10	YQ I.2 ×2	TA <i>u_upādhyā</i> ×2
11	YQ II.1	TA <i>u_upādhyāy</i>
12	THT 108	TB <i>u_upādhyāy(i)</i>
13	A 218	TA <i>u_upage</i> ‘Upaga’ (pers. name).
14	THT 17	TB <i>u_upāsakñeṣṣe</i> ‘pertaining to the laity (adj.)’

Table 3. Occurrences of <_uw> and <_up> in Tocharian

6.3.2. On initial <_uw> and <_up>

This section is devoted to the analysis of initial <_uw> and <_up>. The special case of the Tocharian A personal name *re_uwānt* (no. 1 above) is also discussed.

In Tocharian B, both digraphs are mainly attested in late texts. SI B Toch 11 and PK DA M 507.8 are late Tocharian B documents, and THT 108 and THT 17 exhibit several late linguistic features. The only manuscript that does not show any late feature is THT 1681, but because of its fragmentary character, it cannot be used for diagnostic purposes.

In Tocharian A, on the other hand, the situation is more complex. The digraph <_uw> is only attested in the personal name *re_uwānt* (A 303 b1). This occurrence is unique because it employs the digraph <_uw> also word-internally. If Tremblay’s (2005: 430) derivation is correct, however,⁸⁸ <_uw> is likely to represent the two different sounds of the Sogdian source *rywβnt(k)* if, as it seems likely, there was a morpheme boundary between *ryw* and *βnt(k)*. TA <w> was used for Sogd. β at least in the personal names of the *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka*, cf. *hkhuttem-wām* in A 303 a5, which is likely to have as putative source a Sogdian name **xwt’yn-β’m* (Tremblay 2005: 430, Lurje 2010: no. 1462). On the other hand, the occurrences of <up> in Tocharian A are exclusively found in *u_upādhyā* ‘teacher’, a loanword from Skt. *upādhyāya* ‘id.’, and in the personal name *u_upage*, borrowed from Skt. *upaga*-. In Tocharian A, the use of <_up> and <_uw> cannot be much older than that of their Tocharian B counterparts. Table 4 summarises the conclusions reached until now: the digraphs <_up> and <_uw> are only attested in loanwords and cannot be reckoned amongst the oldest orthographic devices of Tocharian.

⁸⁸ See also Lurje (2010: n° 1049).

	Tocharian A	Tocharian B
Initial < _u p>	<i>ṽpādhyā</i> ‘teacher’ (LW < Skt.) <i>ṽpage</i> ‘Upaga (pers. name)’ (LW < Skt.)	<i>ṽpāsakñeṣṣe</i> ‘pertaining to the laity (adj.)’ (LW < Skt.) <i>ṽpādhyāye</i> ‘teacher’ (LW < Skt.)
Initial < _u w>	Not attested	<i>ṽwāṣṣi</i> (pers. name, LW < Chinese?) ⁸⁹ <i>suwāññe-ṽwātānane</i> ‘In (the tune) of Golden Khotan’ (second member LW < Khot.)

Table 4. Initial <_uw> and <_up> in Tocharian

6.3.3. Consequences for the interpretation of TB *ṽwātano** ‘Khotan’

Having acknowledged the late character of <_uw>, two different hypotheses for its appearance in the name of Khotan in Tocharian B may be put forward. One could interpret <_uw> as standing for older **uw-*, much in the same way as <_up> stands for older *up-* in the Sanskrit source form (see §6.3.4. in this section), and reconstruct TB **uwātano*. If this reconstruction is taken seriously, the word should have entered Tocharian in a relatively old stage of Khotanese.⁹⁰ As Hitch (2016: 49) noted, the digraph <hv> denoted a single consonant already in Old Khotanese.⁹¹ This hypothesis may lend more credibility to Emmerick’s (1968: 89) derivation of *hvātana-* from a hypothetical **hu-wat-ana-* ‘very powerful’. This etymological explanation, however, is hindered by the fact that the meaning ‘to be able’, and hence ‘strong’, for PIr. **wat-*, which otherwise means ‘to inspire, be informed, acquainted’ in other Iranian languages (EDIV: 427), is attested in Khotanese only with the preverb **fra-* in the verb *hot-* ‘to be able’ (< **fra-wat-*) and in the derived adjective *hotana-* ‘strong’. It is questionable that Khot. *vat-* without preverb could have also meant ‘to be able’ (see Appendix 2).

As an alternative, it is also possible to consider initial <_uw> as a late Tocharian B spelling for an original TB **wātano*. It has plausibly been suggested that the akṣara *wa* originates in the independent vowel sign for *o* (Malzahn 2007: 260).⁹² Further, alternations such as *wnolme* ~ *onolme* in metrical texts point to a vocalic realisation of /w/ in early Tocharian B. One may surmise that the actual value of <w> was not distant from [w] in the early stages (Peyrot 2008: 89). Only in late colloquial texts, it alternates with <p>, so one could assume a later pronunciation [β] or [v]. The necessity of a digraph <_uw> to mark a pronunciation [w] in contrast with the current value assigned to <w> may have been felt only in a later period when the value of <w> was no more as clear as in the early period. A reconstruction **wātano* for Tocharian B would also agree with the initial of its Tocharian A match *watam**. The second explanation is more likely, given the etymological difficulties involved.

6.4. Preliminary conclusions

This section has examined some alleged occurrences of the name of Khotan in Tocharian. The conclusions reached are the following. TB *suwāññe ṽwātānane* should be read as *suwāññe*

⁸⁹ See Ching (2010: 432).

⁹⁰ This reconstruction is not in contrast with TA *watam**, cf. TA *wāsak* (LW < Pkt. < Skt. *upāsaka-*).

⁹¹ In the Book of Zambasta, syllables preceding <hv> count as a single mora.

⁹² First noted by Hitch (1983: 309–11).

„wātanane and could be interpreted as ‘In (the tune) of golden Khotan’. The tune name TA *watañi-lāntam* could be translated as ‘(in the tune) of the king of Khotan’, and the tune name TA *watañinaṃ* ‘(in the tune) of Khotan’. For the first time, a substantive TB „wātano* (<*wātano?) A *watam** can be reconstructed as the Tocharian name of Khotan. A thorough analysis of the occurrences of the Tocharian A and B digraphs <„w> and <„p> in initial position has established the late date of these orthographic devices. The Tocharian B name of Khotan „wātano* could represent a later orthography for an earlier *wātano.

7. Dating of the borrowing into Tocharian and Bactrian

If one compares the newly identified forms in Tocharian and Bactrian with the available material, the most striking features can be summarised as follows:

1. The initials agree with Chinese *yútián* 于阗, not with Sogdian, New Persian or Gāndhārī.
2. The middle consonant represents a dental stop, not a weakened fricative or a glottal stop.
3. The vowel of the middle syllable is rendered as /a/ in the Tocharian and the Bactrian forms.⁹³ There is no weakening to *hvatāna-*, as attested already in Old Khotanese.

From these data, it can be argued that the source of the borrowings into Tocharian and Bactrian is to be identified with Khot. *hvatana-*, the oldest documented form in Old Khotanese. The date of the borrowing should then be placed in the first centuries CE. This is based on the dating of the oldest Old Khotanese written sources to the 5th c CE. Since a form *hvatana-* is only attested as the oldest possible form in Old Khotanese and forms with weakening are attested in the same period, the 5th c. CE should be posited as *terminus ante quem*.⁹⁴

For Bactrian, the *terminus post quem* should be identified with the first documented contacts between Bactria and the Khotan area, the beginning of the 1st c. CE, based on the dating of the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins (cf. *supra*). In the case of Bactrian, two reasons prevent us from positing a precise date. On the one hand, the letters in which the name occurs are not dated. On the other hand, it is possible that migrant communities detached from their homeland preserved more archaic forms. The chronology of sound changes reconstructed for the Khotanese of the Khotan area may have been entirely different in a Khotanese community abroad.⁹⁵ Thus, one may place the date of the borrowing into Bactrian within the first five

⁹³ The Bactrian evidence is weaker, as <α> can also stand for /ə/.

⁹⁴ One may argue that the Bactrian and the Tocharian forms may reflect a ‘learned’ borrowing, possibly preserving an archaising form of the name that did not reflect the form in use among speakers. A possible argument against this option may be that the Tocharian and the Bactrian forms are not attested as the official geographical designation of Khotan in administrative documents. It occurs as an ethnonym in Bactrian and was possibly felt as a patronymic by Bactrian speakers. Still, there is no indication that they were aware of its connection with the Khotan area (cf. *supra*). In Tocharian, it is attested in tune names, i.e. in a literary context, where the link to actual political or geographical entities was not self-evident. The unclear occurrences in the late Tocharian B documents may reflect a similar context of fluid boundary between ethnic designations and personal names.

⁹⁵ It is impossible to determine whether this Khotanese community in Bactria was in contact with the Khotan area. Besides, it has yet to be discovered to what degree they still had command of Khotanese. Were they still bilingual, or were they wholly bactrianised?

centuries CE. This agrees with the date (458 CE) proposed for the document cm by Sims-Williams and De Blois (2018: 70).

It is more difficult to posit a *terminus post quem* for the borrowing into Tocharian. This cannot be traced back to Proto-Tocharian because of the Tocharian A form, but contacts between Tocharian and Khotanese seem to have taken place well before the first century CE (see §6.2.2.). The initial *u*w of the Tocharian B noun is also problematic because it could point to a later date of borrowing. However, if my suggestion is correct, the digraph could be a later addition of the copyists. One may reconstruct an earlier spelling **wātano* in agreement with Tocharian A. Thus, it seems safe to maintain the same time span identified for the borrowing into Bactrian. Because of the Chinese form preserved in the Shiji 史記 and in the Hànsū 漢書, which could be dated to the first century BCE, a *terminus post quem* for the Tocharian borrowing may even be posited one or two centuries before the first contacts with Bactria. I propose a time range 1st c. BCE – 5th c. CE for the Tocharian word.

The forms with initial /x/ attested in the other Iranian languages of the Tarim Basin go back to the official Bactrian designation of the Khotan area, as attested in the administrative documents in Niya Prakrit. It is impossible to determine the date of the borrowing into Bactrian precisely. However, one can be sure that it was borrowed before *oatavo* because it underwent the change **hwa- > χ(o/ω)-*.

A consequence for the phonological history of Khotanese is that at the time of borrowing into Tocharian and Bactrian, intervocalic *t* was still a dental stop. The Bactrian evidence shows that this was still pronounced [t] in the Pre-Khotanese of the first five centuries CE.

8. Conclusions and outlook

The main conclusions reached in this section can be summarised as follows:

- a. OKh. *hvatana-* was borrowed early into Bactrian, where it became **χ(o/ω)δavo* or **χ(o/ω)τavo*, either with the Bactrian change **hwa- > χo-*, or with adaptation of **hwa-* to *χ(o/ω)-*, if that sound change had already occurred. Alternatively, the source form might have been **χoa(δ/τ)avo* (see §4. in this section). The Bactrian form was used as the official administrative term for the Khotan region in the first centuries CE, as documented by Gandh. *khotana-*, which was borrowed from Bactrian. It is the source of the other Iranian terms for Khotan in the Tarim Basin and beyond. The substitution of Gandh. *khotana-* with OKh. *hvatana-* in the official administration probably reflects a political change.
- b. Another set of names for Khotan was borrowed directly from OKh. *hvatana-*. This set points to a weak word-initial aspiration in the Khotanese source, possibly [h^w], represented with a similar initial in Chinese and Tibetan, and dropped altogether in Tocharian and perhaps Bactrian when it was re-borrowed at a later stage.
- c. The name of Khotan in Tocharian can now be identified as TB *u*wātano* A *watam**. Both forms are attested in Tocharian A and B tune names. The date of the borrowing may be placed in the first centuries CE because of the rendering of the middle syllable as *-ta-* without weakening of *-t-* and *-a-*. The forms attested in late Tocharian B documents remain of uncertain interpretation. Still, two of them could point to the existence of a late Tocharian B substantive *u*wātane, derived from TB *u*wātano* in recent times to refer exclusively to Khotanese people, not to the geographical entity.

- d. Bactrian possibly borrowed the form *oatano* at a later date directly from Khotanese speakers. *oatano* is attested in personal names in two letters. The association with the Khotan region was not evident to Bactrian speakers because they did not connect it with the official name of the area in their language. Thus, *oatano* may be taken as referring to a community of Khotanese people in Bactria, probably bilingual and fully integrated within the social and political system of the region. Contacts between Bactria and Khotan have been documented since the 1st c. CE. It can be surmised that people were moving not only from Bactria to Khotan but also from Khotan to Bactria.
- e. The alleged Tumshuqese forms of the name are of unsure interpretation, so they cannot be profitably used for the discussion.
- f. The Khotanese pronunciation of the name of Khotan within the five centuries preceding its earliest attestations can be reconstructed as [ʰʷatana-].

Appendix 1. Tocharian and Bactrian passages and linguistic forms examined

Tocharian occurrences

- B *suwāññe-_uwātanane* THT 108 b9
- A *watañinaṃ*: A 71 b3; A 260 b2 *watañ(i)naṃ*; THT 1464 b2 *watañin(aṃ)*
- A *watañi-lāntaṃ*: A 24 b5 *w(a)tañi-lāntaṃ*; A 163 b2 *(watañi)-lāntaṃ*

Bactrian occurrences

- *βρηδαγο oatano* cm1, 25 (Sims-Williams 2007: 91)
- *οηλ(o)-oatano* cm4 and cl4-5 (Sims-Williams 2007: 89)

Appendix 2. On the Iranian etymology of the name of Khotan

Many different hypotheses on the origin of Khot. *hvatana-* have been put forward in the last century. Three main directions of research may be identified in the scholarly literature.

The first seeks to connect the name with the Proto-Iranian possessive pronoun **hwa*, from which an adverbial **hwatah* was derived (YAv. *xʷātō*, MP *xwad*, MSogd. *xwtyy*). This was suggested by the occurrence of the same adverb *hvatā* in Old Khotanese, which is clearly to be derived from **hwatah*. Already Konow (1935: 799), commenting on the alleged occurrence of the adjective in Tumshuqese, noted the following: ‘Seit dem Erscheinen von Leumanns ‘Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus’ wissen wir, daß die einheimische Bezeichnung für Kh. *hvatana-*, *hvatanaa-* war. Dies Wort kann selbstverständlich von dem Stamm in Kh. *hvatā* ‘von selbst’ hergeleitet werden und etwa ‘eigen, heimisch’ bedeuten, etwa wie Namen wie ‘Schweden’, ‘Schwaben’ usw. Aber von vornherein sind wir geneigt, es mit dem Namen Khotan zu verbinden und ‘khotanisch’ zu übersetzen.’ Konow’s idea can be summarised as follows: 1. Khotanese people defined themselves with the word *hvatana-*; 2. this word has an Iranian appearance and can be etymologised within Khotanese; 3. it can be most likely linked to the adverb *hvatā* ‘of itself’, so it could mean ‘native’ in Khotanese, cf. other similar cases in ‘Sweden’ and ‘Schwaben’; 4. it should be most likely linked with the name of Khotan.

There can be no doubt that points 1. and 4. are substantially correct, and no scholar has tried to argue against that since the publication of Konow’s article. Point 2. is questionable,

but it has been generally regarded as very likely. Indeed, there is always a chance that *hvatana*- is not an Iranian word, and it was adopted by Khotanese speakers from earlier non-Iranian inhabitants of the area, as is frequently the case with toponyms. Since it is possible to etymologise it within Iranian, however, it is worth exploring this possibility.

Konow's derivation from PIr. **hwatah* needs a revision. Konow himself (1936: 194), in an article published just one year later, seemed to be sceptical about it. He revised his 1935 statement as follows: 'The word *hvadana* can have been the designation used by the Iranians to denote themselves, perhaps derived from the pronoun *hva*, Skt. *sva*, which base is well-known to have been used for forming ethnic names. Because of the similarity in sound, it can subsequently have been applied to the country itself, instead of, or at the side of, the old form Khotan.' It has already been shown that Khotan cannot be the older form on linguistic grounds (cf. *supra*) and is likely to reflect a regular Bactrian adaptation of older **hw-*. However, one cannot but agree with Konow in identifying the Bactrian form as the earliest employed in the official administration. The transition from Gandh. *khotana-* to Khot. *hvatana-* is not to be read as a linguistic change but as a political one. It probably reflected a significant change in the ruling élite of the Khotan area. As for the Iranian etymology, Konow seems to reject a derivation from **hwatah* in favour of a more general connection only with the pronoun **hwa*.

Both these suggestions, i.e. from **hwa* or **hwatah*, are to be considered seriously. Both could easily explain the initial syllable, but it needs to be clarified how the finals should be interpreted. As already noted by Emmerick (1968b: 88), the first hypothesis would imply a suffix *-tana*. This suffix would be attested in Khotanese, but its mainly temporal function, just like Skt. *-tana*, is semantically unacceptable for our purposes. A derivation from **hwatah*, on the other hand, would be morphologically possible if one could compare similar *-na* formations based on adverbs as possibly attested in the case of *haman̄gga-* 'same' < **hamā-na-ka-* (KS: xxxiii), but a *-na* derivative of **hwatah* would have no parallels within Iranian.

A more substantial semantic obstacle to a derivation from **hwatah* comes from Skjærvø's (SVK III: 174–79) remarks on the meaning of *hvatā* in Khotanese. It seems likely that *hvatā* meant 'separately' in Old Khotanese and not 'own'. Thus, unless we are dealing with a modern secessionist movement, it is hardly convincing that its speakers could use an adjective with the meaning 'separate' as an endonym. It could be more likely an exonym, but since it would be perfectly transparent to Khotanese speakers, one cannot see an immediate semantic justification for its use.

The second etymological proposal is found in Emmerick (1968b: 89). He derives *hvatana-* from **hu-wat-ana-*, possibly an adjective meaning 'very powerful'. Formations with strengthening *hu-* are attested in Khotanese (cf. OKh. *huššiya-* 'very white' in Z 19.39), but, as already noted by Emmerick himself (1968b: 89), the fact that no form ***huvatana-* is attested casts serious doubt on the correctness of this reconstruction. Moreover, the meaning 'to be able' for PIr. **wat-*, which otherwise means instead 'to inspire, be informed, acquainted' in other Iranian languages (following EDIV: 427), is attested in Khotanese only with the preverb **fra-* in the verb *hot-* 'to be able' and in the derived *hotana-* 'strong'. It is questionable that Khot. **vat-* without preverb could have meant 'to be able'. Thus, Emmerick's proposal is not impossible phonologically (apart from the consistent *hv-* for **huv-*) but has substantial semantic difficulties.

Bailey (1982: 3) proposed that the name could mean 'lord', pointing to a possible connection with **hwa* and noting that, in many surrounding languages, words for 'lord'

contain this element, but no precise derivational path is suggested.⁹⁶ Thus, this proposal remains quite vague and, although semantically attractive, no exact equivalents justifying this formation could be found within Iranian.

As can be gathered from this summary, no satisfactory explanation of *hvatana-* is available, even though it shows a strikingly Iranian shape. In the following, I propose a preliminary solution to the problem, but I would like to stress that the proposal remains speculative.

If one accepts Konow's proposal of an initial PIr. **hwa-*, it is possible to recognise in the second element *°tana-* the well-known Iranian word for 'body, person, self', i.e. **tanū-*. In Khotanese, no *ū-* or *u-* declensions are found, as the tendency was to transfer these stems to the *a-* or *ā-* declensions (SGS: 250). If this is correct, it is possible to trace back the formation Khot. *hva-tana-* to the ancient idiom OAv. *x'a- tanu-*, YAv. *hauua- tanu-* 'own body/person' (De Vaan 2003: 702–3), for which cf. Ved. *svāyā tanvā* 'by/with myself (lit. by (my own) body, as a reflexive)' (Pinault 2001: 186). A formation *hva-tana-* has a solid history of Indo-Iranian date. Since Khotanese has preserved no trace of an independent **tanū-* in the lexicon, where 'body' is *ttaramdara-* (< **tanūm-dara-* with dissimilation, see Emmerick *apud* Degener 1987: 39), it can be argued that **tanū-* survived only in this fixed idiom of Indo-Iranian origin ('(belonging to our) own people'), which specialised as an ethnonym at a very early date in the history of Khotanese, when **tanū-* was lost as an independent word. The origin of *hvatana-* was no more transparent to Khotanese speakers in historical times.

TB *USTAMO** '?', OKH. *USTAMA-* 'LAST'

Tocharian occurrences

- abl. sg. THT 566 b7 *ustamameṇi ysā-yokä(ṇi)* /// 'From *ustama*, gold coloured.'

Discussion

The context of the fragment THT 566 b7 does not help determine the meaning of the hapax *ustamameṇi*, seemingly an abl. sg. of an unknown lexeme. Adams' (DoT: 77) translation 'last, utmost' was based on the tentative connection with Khot. *ustama-* 'id.' (cf. Av. *ustama-* 'id.'), translating Skt. *anāgata-* (Suv II: 249). Given the fragmentary state of the manuscript, it is difficult to prove or disprove this hypothesis.

THT 566 was edited by Athanaric Huard in his PhD thesis (Huard 2022: 441). He convincingly argued that what was previously read as *ustamameṇi* is better interpreted as *-ru stamameṇi*, with *stamameṇi* as abl. sg. of *stām* 'tree'. Consequently, the problematic suggestion of an alleged Khotanese loanword in Tocharian B cannot be upheld.

Results

Following a suggestion by Adams (DoT: 77), the hapax TB *ustamo** might be connected to OKh. *ustama-* 'last, utmost' by way of borrowing. However, as recently shown by Athanaric Huard, *ustamameṇi* should instead be interpreted as *-ru stamameṇi* '... from the tree'. Consequently, the hypothesis of a Khotanese loanword in Tocharian B does not stand closer scrutiny.

⁹⁶ A hypothetical **hwa-tāwana-* would not yield the expected Khotanese form.

(5) TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu** ‘IRON’, OKh. *hīśśana*- ‘ID.’

Discussion and results⁹⁷

Peyrot, Dragoni, and Bernard (2022) argue that TB *eñcuwo* and TA *añcu** ‘iron’ are borrowed from an older stage of OKh. *hīśśana*- ‘id.’ that contained the prefix **ham*-. According to the authors, the Tocharian lexemes were borrowed from a reconstructed PTK **henśwanya*-. This reconstruction is based on the following assumptions:

- a. Initial **h*- of the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese form was lost in the borrowing process, as it regularly happens in borrowings from Khotanese and from Iranian into Tocharian in general.
- b. PTK *-e*- in the first syllable is reconstructed as the intermediate stage after *y*-umlaut of *a* and before further raising to *ī*, as historically documented in the attested OKh. *hīśśana*-. For the reconstruction of this intermediate stage, see s.v. *keto*.
- c. That the group PTK *-nś-* could be adapted as *-ñc-* in Tocharian is further proven by the borrowing path of the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese ancestor of OKh. *śśaśvāna*- into TB *śāñcapo*, q.v. A more recent parallel is offered by TA *sañce* ‘doubt’, borrowed from Skt. *saṃśaya*- ‘id.’ This adaptation parallels *t*-epenthesis in Tocharian clusters like *ns* on the one hand and the palatalised counterpart *ñc* of *nk*, rather than *nś*, on the other.
- d. The preverb **ham*-, in the shape **hen*- → **en*-, was retained in Tocharian because it was stressed in Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese. The position of the stress in Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese can be reconstructed based on the umlaut, which only affects stressed vowels.
- e. Noteworthy for the reconstruction of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese is the Tocharian adaptation **św* of the Proto-Indo-Iranian cluster **ću*. This shows that in Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese the cluster was still palatal and contained **w*, and it demonstrates the early split of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese from Proto-Iranian.
- f. The final *-ya*- of the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese form has probably been taken over by analogy from other names of metals, cf. PIr. **jaranya*- ‘gold’ (Khot. *ysīrra*-).

As for the borrowing path, the authors argue that the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese word was first borrowed regularly as **eñcwañño* (or simply **eñcwañña*). Because of the striking similarity of these forms with the *-ññe* adjective *eñcwaññe* ‘out of iron’, it was possible to extract a substantive with an obl. sg. in *-a* (**eñcwa*). Since the most common corresponding nom. sg. ending of obl. sg. *-a* is *-o*, a substantive **eñcwo* was formed. The phonological correspondences between Tocharian A and B are regular: the lexeme may have been borrowed before Proto-Tocharian split into Tocharian B and A.

⁹⁷ For a thorough discussion of the matter, the reader is referred to the extensive treatment in Peyrot, Dragoni, and Bernard (2022). Here only the principal results concerning the borrowing path and the phonological reconstruction of the pre-stages of Khotanese and Tumshuqese are summarised.

TB *EŞPEŞŞE* ‘BOERHAVIA DIFFUSA’, LKH. *AISTA BĀ* ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- *eşpeşşe* THT 500-502 b9-10. Otherwise, the most frequent word for the Boerhavia diffusa is *punarṇap*, a loanword from Skt. *punarnavā-*, in PK AS 3A a5, W19 b1, W1 b4, W6 a6, W6 b5, W17 b5, W20 a5. Another hapax for the same plant is *wārścik*, a loanword from Skt. *vrścika-* in PK AS 3A a5.

Khotanese occurrences

- The Khotanese equivalent occurs various times in the *Siddhasāra* and the *Jivakapustaka*, mostly preceding *bāta*, *bāva*, *bā* ‘root’ (< *bāgā-*, see DKS: 274–75):
- *Siddhasāra*: *aiśca bāva* 100r4, *eśta bāta* 133r2, *eštā bā* 135v2, *e’šte bāta* 129v2, *e’šte bāta* 135v3, *aušta bāta* 9v5, *aušte bāta* 140r2, *au’šte bāta* 139r5, *au’štā bāta* Si P 2892.71.
- *Jivakapustaka*: *aišta bā* 49r1, *aišta bāva* 58v3, *aišta bā* 62v2, *aušta bā* 66r5, *iṃšta bā* 73r5, *iṃšta bāva* 77v3, *iṃšta bāva* 84r4, *āṃšta* 80v5, *iṃ’šta bāva* 79v2.
- In other medical texts: *u’štā bāva* P 2893.213.

Discussion⁹⁸

The Khotanese occurrences are attested in a puzzling series of different orthographies. Table 5 shows that such a vowel alternation in the first syllable is unprecedented and difficult to assess:

<i>iṃ-</i>	<i>āṃ-</i>	<i>ai-</i>	<i>e-</i>	<i>e’-</i>	<i>au-</i>	<i>au’-</i>	<i>u’-</i>	Total
1×	1×	4×	2×	2×	2×	2×	1×	15

Table 5. Different orthographies for the initial vowel of LKh. *aišta bā* ‘Boerhavia diffusa’

Only five occurrences show a back vowel (*au-*, *u-*). The rest point to a front vowel (*i-*, *ai-*, *e-*). Bailey’s explanation (DKS: 48) takes the forms with back vowels as original and posits a hypothetical **ā-vastyā-* (‘With ‘Avestan *avō* ‘herb’). This leaves the forms with front vowels unexplained. The subscript hook, occurring five times, might signal the earlier presence of a lost *-l-*, as in the case of OKh. *balysa-* and LKh. *ba’ysa-*, *be’ysa-*, *bi’ysa-*, *bai’ysa-*. Only a few occurrences of the word show a subscript hook. Also in the case of *ba’ysa-*, however, the subscript hook is often omitted (cf. the frequent *beysa* in the *Aparimitāyuhṣūtra*, for which see Duan 1992: 125).

Both front and back vowels in the Late Khotanese notation might also point to the loss of *-l-*, even if this is usually associated with fronting. The case of *hālsti-* ‘spear’, occurring in Late Khotanese both with initial *ha’o* and *hu’o* (DKS: 486), apparently shows that loss of *-l-* could also be associated with a back vowel in later stages of the language. For the Khotanese word for Boerhavia diffusa, a hypothetic Old Khotanese form **alšta* or **ālšta* can thus be reconstructed. **ālšta* could be further interpreted as an inflected form of a stem **ālsti-*, a variant of OKh. *hālsti-* (SGS: 288) without initial *h-* (< Plr. **Hṛšti-* ‘spear’, cf. Av. *aršti-* and

⁹⁸ This study has been published in Dragoni (2021).

OP *əršti-* ‘id.’). On whether initial *h-* is to be interpreted as an archaism (preservation of the Proto-Iranian laryngeal) or as a ‘prothetic’ *h-*, see Kümmel (2018).

The use of terms for ‘spear’ to describe plants, with reference to the oblong form of their leaves, is documented in Latin, where the adjective *lanceolātus* ‘lanceolate’ is used as a botanical term. Another parallel can be found in English *garlic*, from OE *gār-lēac* ‘spear-shaped leek’ (A. Lubotsky, p.c.). Since the leaves of the *Boerhavia diffusa* are not oblong or spear-shaped, the term may refer to the form of its roots. However, given the tentative nature of this explanation, the possibility that the word could be a loanword from an unknown language cannot be excluded.

Adams (DoT: 104) compares the Khotanese word with Tocharian *ešpešše*. The meaning is secured by the Khotanese and Sanskrit parallel (Maue 1990: 163 fn. 20). If *-šše* is an adjectival suffix, *ešpe°* closely resembles the Khotanese word. However, the correspondence TB *-šp-* ~ Khot. *-št-* has no parallels in the corpus analysed in this work. A possible explanation for the cluster *-šp-* is a Late Khotanese source form *aišta bā* (e.g. JP 62v2): LKh. *aišta* + **bā(ga)* > *aištābā* > *aištā* → TB *ešpe*. However, this leaves the Tocharian vocalism of the final syllable unexplained. It is unlikely that LKh. <ā>, which probably had the value /ɔ/ (Emmerick 1979: 245), could have been adapted as TB *-e*, as there are no valid reasons for a morphological adaptation.

Results

Overall, the comparison between the Tocharian B hapax *ešpešše* ‘*Boerhavia diffusa*’ and LKh. *aišta bā* ‘id.’ seems doubtful. The Khotanese form may be interpreted as the Late Khotanese outcome of an *h*-less form of *hālsti-* ‘spear’, cf. Lat. *lanceolātus*. If this was borrowed into Tocharian B from a later stage of Khotanese, one might envisage the possibility that *ešpešše* may be a *-šše* adjective based on *ešpe°* < LKh. *aišta-bā*.

(6) TB *ORŠA A ORÄŠ** (OFFICIAL TITLE), OKH. *AURÄŠŠAA-* ‘COUNCILLOR’

Discussion

The official title TB *orša A oräš** is of unknown origin. It is attested in both Tocharian A and B. In Tocharian A, it occurs in the introductory act of the *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka* and the colophon of act 26. In these occurrences, it is an official title borne by a certain Kulmäs, the benefactor who made possible the copying of the extant manuscripts of the *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka*:

- A 251 b6 (parallel A 252 b6) *kulmäs(s) or(ś)e(s) šokyākāl nanemāñcām* ‘[Für mich], den Orś(?) Kulmäs, [ist es] (zusammen mit) meiner (Frau) Nanemāñc der höchste Wunsch, ...’ (reconstruction and translation based on Schmidt 2002: 260–61)
- A 258 b3 /// (*säs postāk kulmäs o)ršess ākālā vaibhāṣikyāp āryacandres raritwu* ‘Nach dem Wunsch von Kulmäs Orś (ist dieses Buch) von dem dem Vaibhāsika Āryacandra gedichtet worden.’ (Geng, Laut, and Pinault 2004: 75)

As his wife Nānemañc had a Sogdian name (cf. Sogd. *nnym’nch*, Schmidt 2002: 264), Kulmäs might be an Iranian name, too. One could compare the Bactrian personal names

beginning with the element $\kappa\alpha\lambda$ - (of uncertain origin, cf. Sims-Williams 2010: 81), but an exact parallel for the second element *-mäs* is lacking.

In Tocharian B, the title is attested in many documents. It is usually placed *after* the proper name. With Cākare and Arśol, however, it was added *before* the name. The correct segmentation *orśa-cakare* instead of *or-śacakare* was first suggested by Schmidt (2002: 264). Later, it was also accepted by Ogihara and Pinault (2010: 186). More recently, one may also consult Ching and Ogihara (2013: 112). In the following, a list of occurrences of *orśa* in Tocharian B is given:

- TB *orśa c(c)āk(k)are* nom. sg. PK Bois A26, A49, B7, B25, B26, B31, B40, B45, B51, B65, B125, B134/142, B135, PK réserve 1517 B 3.2.
- TB *kṣemateworśa** all. sg. PK Bois B3 *kṣemateworśaiśco*, gen. sg. PK Bois B37 *kṣemateworśantse*.
- TB *laṃnkay orś(a)* THT 4000 b11v.
- TB *orśa arśol* THT 4001 b2.

The following paradigm of the substantive *orśa* may be reconstructed: nom. sg. *orśa*, obl. sg. *orśai*, gen. sg. *orśantse*, all. sg. *orśaiśco*. In A, only the gen. sg. *orśes* is attested. Ogihara and Pinault (2010: 186 fn. 39) reconstruct a nom. sg. *orśs** based on this form.

No etymology for *orśa* has been suggested yet. In the following, I propose that *orśa* is a loanword from OKh. *aurāśśaa*- ‘councillor’. The earliest occurrence of this word can be found in the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*:

- Suv 17.168 [ttī] **vā ttā saṃbatsara nāmāttamṇa aurāśśā āmāca kuṣṭa Jalavāhanā [harvaṣṣai bisa hā tsutāndā]* ‘And [then] these astrologers, interpreters of heavenly signs, officials, and ministers [went to] where Jalavāhana [the merchant son’s house (was)].’ (Skt. *atha te gaṇaka-mahā-mātrāmātyā yena Jalavāhanasya śreṣṭhi-putrasya grhaṃ tenopasaṃkrāntā*) (Suv I: 322–23)

The occurrence shows that *aurāśśā āmāca* translates Skt. *mahāmātrāmātyā*. The Sanskrit manuscripts of the Suv (I: 323) offer the following alternative readings: *mahāmātrā*, *mahāmātyā*. Thus, it is likely that the *aurāśśā āmāca* designate ministers of very high rank. As P.O. Skjærvø seems to suggest in his edition, *aurāśśā* and *āmāca* could also be regarded as two different titles. *aurāśśā* may be the translation of *mahāmātrā* ‘high official, prime minister’ (MW: 798), and *āmāca* may render Skt. *āmātyā*. This would suggest a dependence of the Khotanese translation on a Sanskrit version containing *āmātyā*. The translation ‘councillor’, noted by Skjærvø in the glossary (Suv II: 251), is based on the meaning of the etymologically related MMP **fr̥l*, MPa. *fr̥s* ‘teaching, instruction’. OKh. *aurāśśaa*- is to be derived from **ā-frās-(a)ya-ka-* (KS: 302). As already noted by Degener (l.c.), it is difficult to decide whether the word may be a *yaa*-derivative from the substantive *aurāsa*- ‘information, report’ or an *aa*-derivative from the verb *aurāśś-* (SGS: 20). In Late Khotanese documents, where *aurāsa*- is very frequent, one also finds a form *aurāśāka-* (KS: 45).

I propose that Khot. *aurāśśaa*- may have entered the Tocharian lexicon from the administrative jargon. This option has two phonological problems:

- a. the loss of the Khotanese medial long vowel in Tocharian B;
- b. the final *-a* of the nom. sg., where one should expect *-o* if from PTK, PK or OKh.

As for the second problem, I suggest that the borrowing took place from the Khotanese vocative, *-ā* for *aa*-stems (SGS: 297). A confirmation of this hypothesis may come from the fact that the title is only used with personal names in Tocharian. Assuming a loanword from Tumshuqese (cf. s.v. *ārt**) seems more arbitrary, as the word is not attested in Tumshuqese.

A possible approach to the first problem should involve the analysis of similar cases of trisyllabic shortening in Khotanese. The precise conditions of this change, however, still need to be clarified. Maggi (1992: 81 fn. 2) tentatively connects this phenomenon with the influence of the preverb that might have attracted the accent. The same explanation might also be invoked in the case of *orśa*. Besides, the absence of the medial vowel in *orśa* shows that the Khotanese form was accented on the first syllable. Alternatively, Alessandro Del Tomba (p.c.) suggests reconstructing a different formation **ā-fras-ya-ka-* > **aurāśśaa-*, with a short medial vowel. At any rate, the Tocharian form implies that, probably very late, the medial long *ā* was shortened to *a*. The short *a* may have been weakened to *ä*, which was lost in the end. The syncope can hardly be regarded as an inner-Tocharian development.

Results

The official title TB *orśa* A *orāś* is of unclear origin. The discussion shows that it may be a loanword from the Khotanese title OKh. *aurāśśaa-* ‘councillor’.

(7) TB *oś* ‘EVIL’, OKh. *ośa-* ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- PK NS 83 b5 *oś kakāmaṣ kleśānmants ra kc= āyit-me onwāññeṣṣe nemc= ekñi ñāktā 2 ||* ‘... [us] who have been led astray by the passions as it were. May you give us the riches consisting of eternity for sure, o lord!’ (CEToM, Pinault, Malzahn and Fellner eds.)
- THT 94 a2-3 [parallel] (*lkāskau śaiṣṣe tallānto o*)*ś kakamaṣ kleśanmats* ‘I see the miserable world [that] has been led astray by the Kleśas.’⁹⁹
- PK NS 36 and 20 b5 [parallel] *lkāskau śaiṣṣe tallānto (oś kakā)maṣ kleśanmaś*
- THT 213 b5 *traiy rākṣatsets oś kakāmau tallāu ///* ‘Unfortunate and led astray by three rakṣasas.’ (DoT: 132)

Discussion

The semantic range of *oś* was first determined by Couvreur (1964: 243 fn. 37), who noted that all contexts suggest a negative meaning ‘op een dwaalweg gebracht, misleid’ (‘led astray’) for the phrase *oś pār-*. *oś* occurs in Tocharian only with the verb *pār-* (suppletive stem *kama-*) in the expression *oś pār-* ‘to lead astray’. All occurrences of the phrase have either the *kleśas* or the *rakṣasas* as agents, both evil concepts suggesting a negative meaning for *oś*. Hilmarsson (1986: 64, 340), followed by Adams (DoT: 132) translated it as ‘falsely’ based on the idea that *oś* may be a borrowing from Khotanese *ośa-* ‘bad, evil’.

⁹⁹ For this and the previous occurrence, see Couvreur (1964: 243 fn. 37) and Schmidt (2001: 326 fn. 144). For another translation, which ignores *oś*, leaving it untranslated, see CEToM (Pinault and Malzahn eds.): ‘(I see the miserable world that) has been brought under the control of the Kleśas.’

The adjective *auśa-/ośa-* is well-attested in Old and Late Khotanese. The bilingual evidence from the *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* shows that it means ‘bad, evil’:

- = Skt. *pāpaka-* OKh. Suv 1.9 (manuscript Or.) *o ce vā auśu hūnu daiyā* ‘Or whoever sees an evil dream.’ (Suv I: 13) (Skt. *pāpakam paśyate svapnam*)
- = Skt. *duṣkṛta-* OKh. Suv 12.18 (manuscript Or.) *ttye anamdiśemate jsa ośānu adātyānu bvānānu. adāta huṣṣa tsindā bihiyu* ‘On account of his overlooking of evil, lawless ruins, lawlessness grows much greater.’ (Suv I: 241) (Skt. *duṣkṛtānām upekṣayā adharmo vardhate bhr̥ṣam*)
- = Skt. *aniṣṭa-* LKh. Suv 3.53 (manuscript P) *cu buri maṃ īde karma. tcaṃna vīvā hame ośā*. ‘All those karmas that I have, which may produce evil fruition.’ (Suv I: 51) (Skt. *yac ca me pāpakam karma aniṣṭa-phala-vāhakam*)

Noteworthy is the compound OKh. *ośatarāṇa-* ‘evil-doing’ (< *ośa-* + *karaṇa-*), occurring in Z 12.67, as opposed to *śśāragaraṇa-* ‘well-doing’ (< *śśāra-* + *karaṇa-*, Suv 12.15, see also KS: 28). Khotanese *auśa-/ośa-* is usually explained as a *ya*-derivative from the verb *oys-* ‘to be angry’ (KS: 301). From the same root, one may also list the *a*-derivative *oysa-* ‘anger’ (KS: 5) and the causative *auś-* : *auṣṭa-* ‘to anger’ (SGS: 20). The etymology of the verb *oys-* is not problematic. Bailey’s derivation (*apud* SGS: 20) from Proto-Iranian **ā-waǵ-* seems phonologically fine. As for the semantics, one may object that the reconstructed meaning of the Proto-Iranian root **waǵ-* is ‘to carry, drive’ (see EDIV: 429) and that the simplex *bays-* is attested in Khotanese in the sense of ‘to go (quickly)’ (SGS: 93). However, many other Iranian and Indo-European languages show that words for ‘anger’ are frequently derived from verbs of movement. One may compare Av. *aēšma-* ‘anger’, originally a derivative of the Proto-Iranian verbal root **HaišH-* ‘to set in motion’ (EWA I: 271), and, from the same root, Latin *īra* ‘id.’ (De Vaan 2008: 308–9).

To sum up, TB *oś* may be a loanword from Khotanese, as phonology and semantics suggest.¹⁰⁰ The lack of final vowel in the Tocharian form points to either an apocopated form from an original *ośo** or a borrowing from Late Khotanese. The scanty occurrences of the Tocharian word prompt us to consider both options cautiously.

It has been suggested (DoT: 132) that TB *ośonai*, attested three times in broken contexts, may belong to the same root of TB *oś*:

- IOL Toch 161 b4 /// – *cwī nī kalymisa ośonai palskone y. ///* ‘... of that by my direction, in the anger/evil (and) in the thought (= in the evil thought?) ...’
- IOL Toch 360 b5 /// *ośo(n)ai ///* [bilingual Sanskrit-Tocharian, no Sanskrit equivalent is extant]
- THT 535 b3 /// *ta • ośonai ///* [bilingual Sanskrit-Tocharian fragment; *-ta* is probably the end of the Sanskrit equivalent of *ośonai*]

The connection with TB *ścono* ‘hate’ and the interpretation of the word as an adverb meaning ‘out of enmity, hostility’ (Hilmarsson 1991a: 145) was based on Broomhead’s (1962:

¹⁰⁰ A similar conclusion, without attempting a periodisation, was independently reached by Del Tomba and Maggi (2021: 215).

166) interpretation of the passage in IOL Toch 161.¹⁰¹ He read [śon]ai. Adams (DoT: 132) convincingly argued that ś for older śc is a late and colloquial feature (see Peyrot 2008: 70–71) not expected for IOL Toch 161 (classical). Although the ink is partially faded, one can clearly distinguish the long right stroke of the *akṣara* <o> in the manuscript. The same word could be attested twice in two bilingual fragments (Sanskrit-Tocharian). However, the Sanskrit equivalents have not been preserved, and *ośonai* appears to be an isolated word. *ośonai* be tentatively interpreted as a loc. sg. (with *-nai* for *-ne* as a hypercorrect form, see Peyrot 2008: 59) of a substantive with obl. sg. in *-o*, meaning ‘evil’. The substantive may have had a nom. sg. *ośo** and be derived directly from Khot. *ośa-*. This interpretation is supported by their occurrence in IOL Toch 161 b4, immediately preceding the loc. sg. *palskone*. However, one cannot exclude that *ośonai* may be an obl. sg. in Gruppenflexion with *palskone* from an unattested nom. sg. *ośono**. This option is more acceptable.

It is unlikely that the same hypercorrect form with *ai* for *e* could be used in all three occurrences of the word. Final *-o* may point to a Khotanese loanword, but no clear Khotanese source for *ośono** has been identified. Therefore, the precise meaning and etymology of *ośono** remain uncertain.

Results

I tentatively propose that TB *oś* ‘evil’ may be a loanword from the Late Khotanese adjective *ośa-* ‘evil’. Due to the absence of final vowel, the borrowing may be dated to the Late Khotanese stage. *ośonai* remains unclear.

TB *OSKIYE* A *OŠKE* ‘HOUSE’, LKH. *AUSKĀ-* ‘DWELLING PLACE’

Tocharian occurrences

- obl. sg. TA *oške* A 220 b1 (*kl*)*orāṣ cam śñi oške lo* ‘Having led him away to his own house.’ (DTTA: 93)
- nom. sg. TB *oskiye* THT 108 a9 *tañ paiyneṣṣai saiym yāmskemntār*¹⁰² *oskiye* ‘Nous prenons refuge en la demeure de tes pieds.’ (Meunier 2013: 144)
- obl. sg. *oskai* THT 44 b6 *tswaiñ(e) ka yku päst kreñnt šamāññemeñ šañ oskai* ‘Just after having gone from the good monkhood into his house.’ (CEToM, Fellner ed.), THT 25 a1 *oskai* ‘home’ [isolated], PK AS 16.3 a5 *tumeñ sai(m) o(sk)ai (lamatsi) kälpāre* ‘Thereupon, these came to (reside) in a house as [their] refuge.’ (CEToM, Pinault and Malzahn eds.), IOL Toch 248 a5 *oskai wayāte-ne* ‘führte sie in [ihre] Behausung’ (Schmidt 1974: 329).

Khotanese occurrences

- P 2781.71 *katha biśā jñā būrvām . tvā rakṣa’ysām hīya auska . usthīyāmda hīna bīysāmja* . “We will swiftly destroy the city, the abode of the Rākṣasas.” They arrayed a terrible army.’ (Bailey 1940a: 567)

¹⁰¹ On this word, see Ogihara (2012: 172), who, based on suggestions by Pinault and Peyrot, translates it as ‘detestable, hateful state’.

¹⁰² Cf. Peyrot (2008: 156) for *-mnt-* instead of *-mtt-*.

- P 2782.26 *myām parši' vāvāra dimarāśā' niraṃdā hauda-raṃnī auski āśā'ṣṭā sa* 'In the midst of the pariṣad-assembly a dharmarājikā-stūpa emerged, the seven-jewelled mansion, rose to the sky.' (Bailey 1971: 2, DKS: 49)

Discussion¹⁰³

Two further occurrences of the word quoted by Bailey (DKS: 49) were convincingly explained by Skjærvø and Kumamoto as a spelling variant of the adverb *uska* 'up':

- IOL Khot S. 6.9 *u paruva auski vāstāña* 'And [must] place the orders on top of it.' (KMB: 485).
- P 2786.70 *hatca tcahaisyau kamacū-pavā bisā sūlyām jsā auska-vaṃdā* 'Together with 40 Sogdian slaves (lit. slave Sogdians) of Kan-Chou, (he was) on his way upwards (to China?).' (Kumamoto 1982: 122)

Since Emmerick's review of VW, the Tocharian word is generally assumed to be a loanword from a Khotanese source,¹⁰⁴ more precisely from Late Khotanese *auskā* 'dwelling place' (DKS: 49). The idea is reported again by Hilmarsson in his doctoral thesis,¹⁰⁵ and has made its way also in Tremblay's article on Iranian loanwords in Tocharian.¹⁰⁶ Adams (DoT: 133) was the first scholar to doubt this explanation. He reconstructed a Proto-Tocharian form **wost(ū)kai-*, explained as a *kā*-derivative of Proto-Tocharian **wostū* 'house'. He noted that 'the reduction of the heavy consonant cluster in the middle of the word must be independent in the two languages as it occurred after the change of **-st-* to *-št-* in TA.' Noting that the Khotanese word is only attested in the later stages of the language, he proposed that the Khotanese word could be a loanword from Tocharian and not *vice versa*.

Indeed, no Old Khotanese occurrences of this word have been preserved. It has already been noted that some of its Late Khotanese attestations have been explained away as Late Khotanese alternative orthographies of the adverb *uska* 'up'. In P 2782.26, it occurs with the verb *sarb-* 'to rise'. A collocation *uska sarb-* 'to rise up' is attested three times in the Late Khotanese *Rāmāyaṇa*:

- P 2783.44 *rahā sarba śakrrā hīvi* 'Śakra's chariot rises' (Bailey 1940a: 569)
- P 2783.43 *ha'sa sa uska* 'He rose up into the tower.' (DKS: 419)
- P 2783.53 *auska pyaurvā sa* 'up he mounted to the clouds.' (Bailey 1940a: 570)

I propose that the same collocation is found in P 2782.26. The adjective *hauda-raṃnī* 'seven-jewelled' could refer to *dimarāśā'*, as already pointed out by Degener (KS: 125–26):

- P 2782.26 *myām parši' vāvāra dimarāśā' niraṃdā hauda-raṃnī auski āśā'ṣṭā sa* 'In the midst of the *pariṣad*-assembly a seven-jewelled *dharmarājikā*-stūpa emerged (and) rose up to the sky.'

¹⁰³ This study was partially presented during the online conference *Tocharian in Progress* (Leiden University, Dec. 2020).

¹⁰⁴ Emmerick (1977: 403): 'It must surely be a loan-word from Khotanese *auska* 'dwelling place'.'

¹⁰⁵ Hilmarsson (1986: 70): '[...] surely loanwords from Iranian.'

¹⁰⁶ Tremblay (2005: 432) assumes a borrowing from '(Early) Late Khotanese'.

As for P 2781.71, there is no compelling reason to interpret *tvā rakṣa'ysām hīya* ‘that of the Rākṣasas’ as referring to a feminine substantive *auskā-*. The feminine demonstrative *tvā* could refer back to the preceding *katha* ‘city’, also feminine. *auska* can be regarded as an adverb in a collocation *uska būrv-* ‘to destroy up, smash up’. The orthography <auska> instead of <uska> is frequent in the same text. I propose the following translation for the passage in question:

- P 2781.71 *katha biśā jiñā būrvām . tvā rakṣa'ysām hīya auska* ‘We will utterly smash up the whole city, that of the Rākṣasas.’

The Tocharian word must be considered either inherited or borrowed from a third (Iranian?) language because LKh. *auskā-* ‘dwelling place’ is a ghost. This discovery confirms that the Proto-Iranian root **Hwah-* ‘to dwell, remain’ (EDIV: 202) has no attested continuants in Khotanese.

Results

As LKh. *auskā-* has proved to be non-existent, it cannot have been borrowed into Tocharian as TB *oskiye* A *oške* ‘house’.

TB *AUSW-* ‘TO CRY’, KHOT. *OYS-* ‘TO BE ANGRY’

Tocharian occurrences

- IOL Toch 2 b3 *kārene klāyā kwri auswann ot sa 4 empakwaccai mā pkwaly(e)* ‘If she should fall (= falls) into a ditch, then she will cry out: one should never put one’s trust in an unreliable one.’ (Malzahn 2010: 553)

Discussion

The reconstruction of the verb *ausw-* in Tocharian is based on a single occurrence. For another interpretation of *auswa* as a form of the preterite participle of *wās-* ‘to wear’, see Peyrot (2013: 823 fn. 862). However, should one follow Malzahn (2010: 553), the verb *ausw-* could be connected with the Khotanese verb *oys-* ‘to be angry’. *ausw-* might conceal an original **auso*, borrowed from the Khotanese infinitive *oysä* (cf. *parso* for a similar borrowing path). The initial diphthong *au-* may point to a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese source form because it could be a trace of the initial preverb **ā-* (PIr. **ā-waf-*, SGS: 20). The semantics ‘to be angry’ rather than ‘to cry out’ may fit the Tocharian B passage better:

- ‘If she should fall into a ditch, then she will be angry: one should never put one’s trust in an unreliable one.’

Results

The unsure Tocharian B verb *ausw-* might be interpreted as a loanword from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese antecedent of the infinitive of the Khotanese verb *oys-* ‘to be angry’.

TB *kañko/kañkau* ‘?’, OKH. *kañga-* ‘HUSK (OF RICE)’

Tocharian occurrences

- PK AS 3A b6 *kañko . śwatsi*¹⁰⁷ *tsäk . kapo(tsa yoka)l(l)e* ‘The *kañko*-food certainly (?) is to be drunk (?) with natron (*kāpota?*).’
- THT 169 a2 *ñakesa warñai tsālpelyñesai kañkau* ‘From now on, the *kañkau* regarding the redemption ...’

Discussion

TB *kañko/kañkau* occurs in two passages of uncertain interpretation. PK AS 3A refers to a substance that should be consumed with *kapota-* (natron?).¹⁰⁸ This unidentified medical text lists a series of remedies against the ‘third-day fever’ (*trice kaunaṣṣe kapillemtse*, b4-5). The remedy immediately preceding the occurrence of *kañko* describes how to crush a series of plants to be drunk with hot water. It is possible that the obscure sentence containing *kañko* could also refer to a solid edible to be crushed and drunk as a drug against the third-day fever. In this case, the suggestion made by Pinault, Malzahn and Peyrot, the editors of the CEToM page dedicated to this text, to connect *kañko* with Skt. *kañgu-* ‘*Panicum italicum*’ or *kañku-* ‘a variety of panic seed’ (CDIAL: n° 2605) is semantically appropriate. However, Sanskrit *u*-stems in the Tocharian medical lexicon preserve final *-u* of the Sanskrit source, cf. TB *akaru* for Skt. *agaru-* ‘*Aquilaria agallocha*’ and TB *priyañku* for Skt. *priyañgu-* ‘*Aglaia roxburghiana*’.

As a derivation from Sanskrit by way of borrowing is problematic, it seems justified to posit a loanword from a neighbouring language. Final *-o* points to a loanword from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese, where a suitable candidate may be found in *kaṃga-* (DKS: 50, SVK III: 38–39). In Late Khotanese medical texts, this lexeme indicates the ‘husk’ or skin of the rice. One may compare the following passage of the *Siddhasāra*:

- Si §3.4 *cu ṣi’ rrīysu cu kṣaṣṭyā haḍām jsa daśde’ cuai kaṃga haryāsa hame*. ‘As for that rice which ripens in sixty days whose husk becomes black (*asitas*).’ (Emmerick Unpublished)

If this tentative identification is correct, one should note the correspondence Khot. /a/ ~ TB /ä/ under the stress, which may be paralleled in *śarko**, q.v.

The form attested in THT 169 is of difficult interpretation. Even if final *-au* may stand for *-o* in late texts, the occurrence of a word for ‘skin’ or ‘husk (of rice)’ in the context is difficult to justify, and *kañkau* remains unexplained.

Results

TB *kañko* in PK AS 3A b6 is not an Indic loanword. I propose that it may be a loanword from OKH. *kaṃga-*. In medical texts, it refers to the ‘skin’ or ‘husk (of rice)’. The occurrence of *kañkau* in THT 169 remains unexplained.

¹⁰⁷ A more likely reading, instead of CEToM *cwassi* (M. Peyrot, p.c.).

¹⁰⁸ If not a mistake for *krañko* ‘chicken’. The context suggests a kind of plant (see *infra*).

TB *KATTĀKE A KĀTAK** ‘HOUSEHOLDER’, OKH. *GGĀṬHAA-* ‘ID.’

Discussion

There is no agreement on the origin of TB *kattāke A kātak**. Bailey (1937: 905) proposed that the word was borrowed from Khotanese *ggāṭhaa-* ‘id.’, a loanword from Gandh. *gahaṭha-* (*ghahaṭha-* in DhP 32, see Brough 1962: 123 and §43a). On Khotanese *ggāṭhaa-* and on Gandh. *-aha-* borrowed as *-ā-*, see Bailey (1946: 791–92). This proposal was supported by Pinault (1996: 23).¹⁰⁹

Tremblay (2005: 434) regarded TB *kattāke A kātak** as a direct borrowing from Gāndhārī because of the suffix *-ka-*. This suffix can be reconstructed for the Pre-Khotanese antecedent of OKh. *ggāṭhaa-*,¹¹⁰ but finds no parallel in the Khotanese of the historical period. As final *-e* could be interpreted as a feature indicating a late loanword (cf. s.v. *krāke*), I see no way to account for the presence of the suffix.¹¹¹

Results

Whether TB *kattāke A kātak** ‘householder’ was borrowed directly from Gāndhārī or from Khotanese *ggāṭhaa-* remains an open problem.

(8) TA *KATW-* ‘TO RIDICULE’, KHOT. *KHAN-* : *KHAMTTA-* * ‘TO LAUGH’

Tocharian occurrences

- A 28 a5 *ktuseñc-ām* ‘They ridicule him’ (cf. DTTA: 128), or (...) *k tuseñc-ām* ‘They kindle him/it.’ (Malzahn 2010: 553, adopted also in CEToM)
- A 232 b6 (*pru*) *ccamoñcās katuštār mācar p(ā)car kṣṣis pat : tarśonāsyō* ‘The beneficial ones he causes to be ashamed by tricks: mother, father, or the teachers.’ (DTTA: 128-9)
- A 7 b1 (*h*) *ai šokyo nu kakätwu tākā yaṃtrācāreṃ kṣṣinā* ‘O dear! I have been terribly ridiculed by the master mechanic!’ (cf. also Peyrot 2013: 283 and CEToM, Carling ed.)
- A 188 b3 *kakätwu tāpākyam* ‘Ridiculed in the mirror.’

Discussion

The etymology of the Tocharian A verb *katw-* ‘to ridicule’ is unknown, but its meaning is relatively secure and backed up by parallels (DTTA: 129). Some debate has been sparked by the correct interpretation of the root vowel. Based on the occurrence in A 28 a5, the manuals list a form *kätw-* (e.g. DTTA: 128). However, as noted by Malzahn (2010: 553), this is at variance with the evidence of the present *katuštār* in A 232 b6. Because of this form, Malzahn (l.c.), followed by Peyrot (2013: 740), sets up a root *katw-*. This is supported by a different interpretation of the passage in A 28 (cf. *supra*). Thus, TA *katw-* can be regarded as distinct

¹⁰⁹ See also DTTA: 110–11.

¹¹⁰ Cf. also Sogd. *k’rt’k* (Hansen 1936: 579).

¹¹¹ The reconstruction of a form ***ggāṭhāka-* seems an *ad hoc* solution.

from its alleged match TB *kätt-* and the substantive TA *katu* B *ketwe* ‘jewel, ornament’, previously connected to *katw-* by Hilmarsson (1996: 114).

Because of the final *-w* of the root, it seems attractive to seek its origin in a loanword from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. A possible source may be sought in the Khotanese past participle of the verb *khan-* ‘to laugh’ (PIr. **xand-*, EDIV: 442–43). A parallel for this borrowing path is offered by **ṣərt-*, q.v. The form can be set up as *khamtta-** (SGS: 25).¹¹² The semantic development involved ‘to laugh’ > ‘to ridicule’ is not problematic. As for the phonology, it can be surmised that the source form may have been an acc. sg. *khamttu** [‘kʰātu]. Because of the realisation of *aṃ* as a nasalised *a* – no trace of a separate nasal is visible in the Tocharian word – the borrowing may have taken place during the Old Khotanese stage. As for the formation of *khamtta-*, cf. Maggi *apud* Hitch (2016: 229 fn. 124) proposing a late formation from the present stem **xand-ta-*. A similar solution had been proposed by Bailey (DKS: 71, s.v. *khattāvihā*, < **xand-āta-*). As both proposals imply that the past participle was formed before the change **nd* > *n*, Bailey’s option seems less satisfactory because it would imply a younger formation. It can be surmised that **xand-ta-* > *khamtta-* instead of the expected participle ***xasta-* > ***khasta-* was formed to distinguish it from the homophonous *khasta-* ‘wounded’ (< **kha-*, SGS: 25).

Results

I propose that the verb TA *katw-* ‘to ridicule’ is connected to the past participle of the Khotanese verb *khan-* ‘to laugh’, acc. sg. *khamttu** [‘kʰātu]. The borrowing may have taken place during the Old Khotanese stage.

(9) TB *KĀMARTO** A *KĀKMART* ‘CHIEF’, OKH. *KAMALA-* ‘HEAD’

Discussion

For a comprehensive treatment of the previous literature on this word, see Bernard (2023: 55–58). Carling (DTTA: 108), following Pinault (2002: 263–64), regards it as a loanword from Bactr. *καμρδο*. This Bactrian word is attested only in one document (T, see Sims-Williams 2000: 98–105), and it was interpreted as a theonym (‘(the god) *καμρδο*’). It is also attested in the proper name *καμρδο-φαρο* (Sims-Williams 2007: 221). According to Sims-Williams (2007: 220), *καμρδο* would be the Bactrian outcome of PIr. **kamrda-* ‘head’, without the pejorative meaning of Av. *kamərəda-*.¹¹³ Hence *καμρδο* would be the ‘chief (god)’ in Bactrian (Sims-Williams 1997: 23).

As already noted by Adams (DoT: 149),¹¹⁴ the main difficulty with a Bactrian derivation is the vowel of the second syllable, /a/ in Tocharian. This cannot correspond to Bactr. *ι*, because Tocharian /ə/ would be expected. Because of the abstract *kamartāññe* ‘rulership’, it is possible to set up a nom. sg. *kāmarto** (DTTA: 108). A nom. sg. *kamārto** could also be possible, depending on the position of the stress in Khotanese. As a nom. sg. in *-o* points to a loanword from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese rather than Bactrian, I would like to suggest that the donor language may have been Khotanese. This also

¹¹² Cf. also the verb *bihan-* : *bihamtta-* < **wi-xand-* (SGS: 99).

¹¹³ The attested *-pδ-* would be late for regular **-pλ-* (see Sims-Williams 1997: 23 fn. 49 and Peyrot 2015).

¹¹⁴ Cf. also Peyrot (2015).

accounts for the vowel of the second syllable. The source form I identify with the acc. sg. of the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent of OKh. *kamala-*, **kamardu*, with early vocalisation of PIr. **r* > **ar*.

Results

TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ may have been borrowed from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese acc. sg. **kamardu* (> OKh. *kamala-*) ‘head’, rather than from Bactrian.

TA *KAR* ‘ONLY, JUST’, OKH. *KARĀ* ‘AT ALL’

Discussion

The precise function of the Tocharian A particle *kar* is not clear. Peyrot (2013: 286) tentatively suggested a meaning ‘merely, just, only’ which successively came to be used in contexts of ‘surprise’ or for events ‘contrary to expectation’. The Old Khotanese particle *karā* is often translated as ‘at all’ and is always used in negative contexts. One may compare the following examples from the Book of Zambasta:

- Z 2.121 *ne balysi hoto hve’ harbiśśu butte karā* ‘A man does not at all know all the power of a Buddha.’ (Emmerick 1968: 31)
- Z 3.62 *karā ne mārāre ne ne pātcu ysyāre karā* ‘They do not die at all. They are not born again at all.’ (Emmerick 1968: 63)

If borrowed into Tocharian A, the negative meaning of OKh. *karā* may have developed into the exclusive ‘only, just’.

On the phonological side, the loanword would not be problematic. However, as the meaning of the Tocharian word is not entirely settled and the word has already been etymologised within Tocharian,¹¹⁵ it is difficult to prove it. Moreover, the etymology of the Khotanese particle *karā* is not clear, and its alleged relation with *kāḍe* ‘very’ (DKS: 60) is not without difficulties.

Results

The Tocharian A and Old Khotanese particles *kar* and *karā* are very similar semantically and phonologically. The hypothesis of a borrowing of the Old Khotanese particle into Tocharian A, however, is problematic. Besides, there is an inner-Tocharian etymological alternative.

TB *KARĀŚ* A *KĀRĀŚ* ‘WILDERNESS (?)’, OKH. *KARĀŚŚĀ-* ‘CREEPER’

Tocharian occurrences

- TB loc. sg. PK AS 17F b3-4 (*saṃ*)*sā(r)ṣṣe c(e)_u karāśne lä(kle)ntasa lalāloṣ tākoym s(n)ai ā(ñmci)* : ‘In this forest of the (Saṃ)sāra being tired by the sufferings, may we become without self!’ (CEToM, Pinault and Malzahn eds.)

¹¹⁵ Hilmarsson (1996: 82–83) derived it from the two particles *ka* ‘only, just’ and *ra* ‘also, even’.

- TB loc. sg. PK NS 40 b1 /// – *k(a)rāšne salañcāntsa kem kruññaimpa tasem(ane)* /// ‘In the [artificial] forest (strewn) with (grains of) sandy soil, comparable to the ground of a hut ...’ (CEToM, Pinault and Malzahn eds.)¹¹⁶
- TB loc. sg. THT 212 a4 *saṃsārāṣṣe karāšne ce tetrikoṣā* • ‘Diese [Welt] in dem Saṃsāra-Urwald irregeleitete ...’ (Krause 1952: 177)
- TB loc. sg. THT 239 a2 + THT 3597 a7 *empe(le) karāšne seyi mīsa śawāre trikoṣ kess(a)* : ‘In the terrible wilds they ate the flesh of their own son, confused because of hunger.’ (Peyrot 2010: 152)¹¹⁷
- TA loc. sg. A 70 a3 *mā ontam ṇuk cwā sārki ymām kārāsaṃ ṣtare kaś wālyi* ‘Not in any way will I care about the hardship in the wilds if I follow you.’ (Peyrot 2013: 275)¹¹⁸
- TA loc. sg. A 98 a1 *ārwar kārāsaṃ* ‘Ready in the wilds.’
- TA loc. sg. A 321 a8 /// *ñ tāṣ kārāsaṃ* : ‘... wāre im Wald.’ (Carling 2000: 111)
- TA loc. sg. YQ I.5 b3 *hai tālo ṣokyo nu cam ypeṣiṃ kārāsaṃ ānāntāpā śol śawāṣṭ* ‘Hello, miserable one! You have lived in the forest of this land a life of endless misery.’ (Ji 1998: 41)
- TB obl. sg. THT 23 b2 (*āyor*) *sāle ste karāś ynūcam cem wnołmeṃtsā* ‘[the] gift is the basis for those creatures going into the wood.’ (CEToM, Fellner ed.)
- TB obl. sg. THT 118 b1 *wektse w(e)k tārkānaṃ ṇātke kārāś y(am)* ‘... laut entlässt er die Stimme, [wenn] er ...(?) in den Wald geht ...’ (Carling 2000: 111)
- TB obl. sg. THT 286 b6 (*mākt=ema*)*l(y)ai (pre)śyaine yku karāś wrocce (kālpau) yol[m]e kro(śc)e (warsa)* /// ‘(Wie) ein zur (heissen) Zeit in den grossen Wald Gegangener, einen Teich (mit) kaltem (Wasser) (erlangt habend), ...’¹¹⁹
- TA obl. sg. A 60 b6 *kus nu sām wrasom māka-ñātse kārāś kā(tkorāṣ)* ‘And who is the being who (having) cro(ssed) the jungle of many dangers ... ?’ (CEToM, Carling, Pinault, Malzahn eds.)
- TA obl. sg. A 155 b2 *tām śwāmām kārāś katkar* ‘Eating that, they crossed the wilds.’
- TA obl. pl. YQ II.8 a7 *kārāśāntwā wārtāntwaṃ ytāṣṭr oki tkaṃ ākāś caṣi* : ‘In jungles and woodlands are earth and sky adorned for him as it were.’ (Ji 1998: 107)
- TB abl. sg. THT 1552.e b1 /// *karāśmeṃ lyu* – /// ‘Going away (*lyucalñe?*)/ in order to go away (*lyutsi?*) ... from the wilds ...’
- TA gen. sg. A 372 b4 *saṃsā(r)ṣinām kārāś(i)s ane paryāye* ‘... in dem Saṃsāra-Wald, eine Wundertat ...’ (Carling 2000: 357)
- Deriv. TA *kārāśnu* ‘inhabitant of a jungle’ (DTTA: 115) TA 41 a1 *kārāśānw oki* ... ‘Like the inhabitant of the jungle ...’ (CEToM, Carling, Pinault, Malzahn eds.).
- TB nom. sg. (?) PD Bois B87 b4 *karāśo*. Ching (2010: 320) does not translate it. It is found in a ‘register of movables’.

¹¹⁶ Cf. also Pinault (2015a: 202).

¹¹⁷ The translation and the reconstructed text are based on the integration of both parallel manuscripts. For more details, cf. this discussion and the edition of the text by Peyrot (2010).

¹¹⁸ Cf. also Peyrot (2010: 156 fn. 56).

¹¹⁹ For the restorations and the translations, see Carling (2000: 111).

Khotanese occurrences

- OKh. nom. pl. fem. (*karāśśā-*) Suv 6.4.22 (manuscript Or.) *vicitre buśaṇīgye karāśśā *narāmīndā* ‘Various perfumed creepers will come out.’ (Suv I: 137) (Skt. *nānā-gandha-dhūpa-latā niścariṣyanti*)
- OKh. nom. pl. fem. Suv 6.4.39 (manuscript Or.) *tte vicitre buśaṇā paṭhute buvīgye karāśśā kṣatru *ganāre* ‘[They will] *place those various burnt perfumes, perfumed creepers, (and) umbrella(s).’ (Skt. *tāni nānā-gandha-dhūpa-latā-cchatrāṇi saṁsthāsyanti*)
- OKh. nom. pl. fem. Z 20.3 *karāśśā haṣpṛīye* ‘The creepers have blossomed.’ (Emerick 1968: 287)
- LKh. nom. sg. (pl. also possible) JS 5r2 *ā mīrāhīja karāśā āvā bora* ‘Or [like] a string of pearls, or snow.’ (Dresden 1955: 423)
- LKh. JS 20v1 *karāśi jsa bastādā hīya dasta* ‘You bound your own hands with the creeper.’ (Dresden 1955: 433)
- LKh. JS 37r3-4 *braṁmaṇuṁ haudva habasta kīḍye jsa . bu’yse khainuḍe kerāše tte jsaṁ hvaste* ‘The brahman bound them both with a withy; he struck them with a long, thorny creeper.’ (Dresden 1955: 444)
- LKh. IOL Khot S. 10.8 *ustā karāśa paiśkya u spūleka* = P 2025.15 *ustā karāśa paiśkyā u spūlka* ‘Twig, creeper, spike and bud.’ (DKS: 42)
- LKh. P 2956.26 *bachadā bahyq karāśq sūjañāṣṭa* = P 2025.45 *bachadā bahya . karāśā sūjañāṣṭa* ‘The tree’s creepers are embracing (?) one another.’ (DKS: 365)
- LKh. IOL Khot S. 10.29-30 *ūysdvīda karaśā jsa vīyārastū šūje* = P 2956.28 *aysdīda karāśau jsa vīyārastū šūje* = P 2025.46 *ūysdvīdi karāśau jsa vīyārastū šūje* ‘(The nubile young women) beat with withies one with another the virile youths.’ (DKS: 387)
- LKh. IOL Khot S. 10.10 *paijakya gvīthāre tta ma jsām hada karaśau* = P 2025.18 *paijamkya gvīthārā tta ma jsām hada karāśau* ‘The breasts expand, thus here the other creepers (?)’ (DKS: 96)

Discussion

As pointed out by Peyrot (2010: 156 fn. 56), the translation of the Tocharian word as ‘forest, jungle’ was initially based on the Sanskrit parallel to A 70 a3 (*Viśvāntarajātaka*) in Āryaśūra’s *Jātakamālā*,¹²⁰ containing the correspondent compound *vanavāsa* ‘living in the forest’. However, the translation ‘forest’ does not fit the passage of the Buddhastotra fragment (THT 239 a2 + THT 3597 a7). The passage refers to a terrible place where men are forced to eat their sons because of hunger. Therefore, Schmidt (1983: 273), followed by Peyrot (2010: 152), opted for a more general translation ‘Wildnis, wilderness’. It might be noted, again following Peyrot, and as already pointed out by Yoshida, that the Sogdian version of the *Viśvāntarajātaka* also alludes to *ḍxšt-* ‘plain, desert’ (315–16, 800, 813; see Benveniste 1946: 21, 52, 53). Moreover, the most frequent translation of Skt. *vana-* in the fragment A 70 and elsewhere appears to be TA *wärt* (B *wart(t)o*). In YQ II.8 a7 the obl. pl. *kārāśāntwā* occurs even together with the loc. pl. *wärtāntwaṁ* ‘in forests’. It is conceivable that the two substantives are in

¹²⁰ Cf. Sieg (1952: 43 fn. 6): *naiva ca khalu me deva vanavāso duḥkha iti pratibhāti*.

hendiadys with almost the same meaning. Despite this, it seems more probable that they designate two distinct places, i.e. ‘desert/wilderness’ and ‘forest’. A translation ‘wilderness’ also fits the other numerous occurrences of the word. Moreover, bilingual evidence from the MSN¹²¹ confirms the meaning ‘desert’ or ‘wilderness’ (OUygh. *öñ kürtük*, see HWA: 534).

This interpretation raises questions on the correctness of the traditional opinion on the origin of the Tocharian word. TA *kārās* is usually believed to have been borrowed from TB *karās*, a loanword from Khotanese *karāśśā*- ‘creeper’ (TEB II: 90; Adams 1999: 142; DTTA: 115). The Tocharian and the Khotanese words were first connected by Bailey (1947: 149), who thought they were just ‘similar in form’.¹²² Van Windekens was the first scholar to openly speak of borrowing, rejecting his previous Indo-European derivation (VW: 625).

Khotanese *karāśśā*- is well-attested both in Old and Late Khotanese. Although the entry in Bailey’s dictionary (DKS: 54) gives it as a masculine *a*-stem, the word is feminine (OKh. nom. pl. in *-ā* for *-e*), as had already been seen by Leumann (1933–36: 408).¹²³ Bilingual evidence (cf. *supra*) shows that it translates Sanskrit *latā*- ‘creeper’ (MW: 895) in the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*. Likewise, the occurrence in the Book of Zambasta must refer to a plant, as it is attested as the subject of the verb *haṣprīs*- ‘to bloom’. In Late Khotanese, like in Sanskrit, it also occurs in its figurative meaning of ‘slim, slender oblong object’, e.g. a ‘string of pearls’ (JS 5r2).

There is no doubt about the semantics of *karāśśā*-, but its derivation is problematic. Bailey (DKS: 54) proposed to derive it from a root *kar*- (‘base of words for branches’) to which a suffix *-āśśā*- was attached. However, such a suffix is attested elsewhere in Khotanese, and the suggestion of a root *kar*-, isolated within Khotanese, seems quite far-fetched. According to Bailey, this root would also be attested in four other words: *kīra*-, *kīḍa*-, *cakala*- and *sakala*-. For the first word, only two occurrences are listed in the dictionary (DKS: 60), of which one has already been explained otherwise by Emmerick.¹²⁴ The other occurs in the document of purchase Or. 6397/1.5:

- Or. 6397/1.5 *khuī bugura tā kīra kā’stā idā* ‘If Bugura has not sown *kīra* on it.’¹²⁵

kīra can hardly be rendered as ‘work’ and it remains unclear. One might argue that *kīra* might stand for *kera*-,¹²⁶ a *ya*-derivative¹²⁷ of the verb *ker*- : *kilsta*- ‘to plant’ (SGS: 23) meaning ‘what is to be planted (i.e. the seed)’. In this case, *kera*- would work as the internal object of the verb *ker*- in an expression meaning ‘to sow seed’:

¹²¹ Geng and Klimkeit (1988: 144).

¹²² See KT VI: 41. No mention of borrowing in DKS: 54.

¹²³ The possibility that it could be a feminine *i*-stem *karāsi*- or *karāṣi*- (Alessandro Del Tomba, p.c.) should also be considered. Still, no decisive proof can be obtained from the available occurrences.

¹²⁴ See SVK I: 17: *kīrā* for *kṣīrā* ‘resin’, a loanword from Skt. *kṣīra*-.

¹²⁵ KMB: 9. The ‘not’ in the translation is probably another reading of *tā* in the text. Indeed, the akṣara is faded and only the two dots on the top are clearly visible: it could be read as *tā* or *nā*. However, one cannot exclude alternative readings, so that the translation remains uncertain in this point. See *infra* for another reading.

¹²⁶ For the alternation *ī* ~ *e* in Late Khotanese, see Dresden (1955: 406 (7)).

¹²⁷ See KS: 297–98. The suffix *-ya*- can form abstracts from verbal roots and it is directly attached to the present stem. In the case of **kera*-, the palatalisation is not visible because *-e*- is already a front vowel.

- Or. 6397/1.5 *khuī bugura (n)ä kīra kă'stā idā* 'If Bugura has *not* sown *seed* on it.'

In a new edition of the document in question, Skjærvø (2017: 456–57) proposed the reading *khuī bugura sâ kara kă'stā idā* and the translation 'if Bugura has sown (at least as much as) one 'plot' of it'. He proposed that this could be an administrative formula (cf. Or. 6393/2.4-5 and SI P 103.17 1.5). The reading of *sâ* seems a very fitting restoration. Still, no explanation is offered for *kara* instead of *kīra*, where the *i*-diacritic is visible on top of the *ka*-akṣara. His reading is probably based on the analogy with the other two occurrences of the sentence, both showing *kara*. Whatever the exact translation of this *kara/kīra*, which remains relatively obscure, the possibility of a derivation from PIr. **karH*- 'to sow' cannot be ruled out.

Thus, of the four words allegedly containing the root *kar*-, one (*kīra*-) appears to be non-existent. We turn now to *kīḍa*-, of which two occurrences are extant in Late Khotanese:

- LKh. JS 37r3 *braṃmaṇuṃ haudva habasta kīḍye jsa* . 'The brahman bound them both with a withy.' (Dresden 1955: 444)
- LKh. Mañj P 4099.19-21 *khva ja vyehāra vaska tcahaura : tta prracā tcana padeda cakala gaysa kīḍā u auysama vyehāra tti byehi nauma 10 5* 'Since for the sake of a dwelling (*vihāra*) four things (are necessary): those (are) the causal factors due to which it is made (namely) wood, reeds, creepers, and clay. Then it would get the name 'dwelling (*vihāra*).' (Emmerick Unpublished (b))

Bailey identified the meaning of *kīḍa*- as 'creeper', basing himself on a possible Pāli parallel to the passage contained in the *Majjhima Nikāya*. The passage in the Pāli text runs as follows:

- *Majjhima Nikāya* 28 (*Mahāhatthipadopamasutta*):¹²⁸ *Seyyathā pi āvuso kaṭṭhañ-ca paṭicca valliñ-ca paṭicca tiṇaṇ-ca paṭicca mattikañ-ca paṭicca ākāso parivārito agāran-t'eva saṅkhaṃ gacchati evam-eva kho āvuso aṭṭhiṇ ca paṭicca nahāruñ-ca paṭicca maṃsañ-ca paṭicca cammañ-ca paṭicca ākāso parivārito rūpan-t'eva saṅkhaṃ gacchati.*
- 'Your reverences, just as a space that is enclosed by stakes and creepers and grass and clay is known as dwelling, so a space that is enclosed by bones and sinews and flesh and skin is known as a material shape.' (Horner 1964 I: 236)

The parallel is quite striking.¹²⁹ Both texts speak about four constituent elements of a dwelling, LKh. *vyehāra*- (Skt. *vihāra*-) and Pāli *agāra*- ('house'). However, the elements have slight differences in the two versions, so it is difficult to establish a one-to-one correspondence. The common elements would be, in Bailey's view, *cakala* (Pāli *khaṭṭha*- 'wood') and *kīḍa* (Pāli *valli*- 'creeper'). *gaysa* 'reed' and *auysama* 'earth', however, do not relate precisely to Pāli *tiṇa*- 'grass' and *mattikā*- 'clay'.

As the correspondence is imperfect, drawing conclusions on the semantic range of *kīḍa* based only on this parallel is dangerous. Besides, the other occurrence of *kīḍa* in the *Jātaka*-

¹²⁸ The text follows Trenckner (1888: 190).

¹²⁹ For the significance of this topos in the Book of Zambasta and Buddhist Sanskrit literature, see Chen and Loukota Sanclemente (2018: 146–53).

stava does not point unequivocally to a type of plant. The only semantic information conveyed by the passage is that *kīḍa* is an instrument with which the brahman binds or imprisons other people. There is no compelling reason for it to be a creeper. A possibility not envisaged by Bailey is that the word may be an Indic loanword. One may think about Skt. *kīla*-/khīla-, a well-attested word meaning ‘stake’.¹³⁰ If not originally Indic,¹³¹ the alternation *l* ~ *ḍ* is well-known in Khotanese, especially in Indic loanwords, cf. *kīḍaiśa*’ for Skt. *kīleśa*- in P 4099.81. As one can build a house with (wooden) stakes and bind someone to (or with) a stake,¹³² it seems that this translation fits the occurrences of *kīḍa* perfectly. Therefore, a new translation of the two passages may be proposed:

- LKh. JS 37r3 ‘The brahman bound them both with a **stake**.’
- P 4099.19-21 ‘Since for the sake of a dwelling (*vihāra*) four things (are necessary): those (are) the causal factors due to which it is made (namely) wood, reeds, **stakes**, and clay. Then it would get the name ‘dwelling (*vihāra*)’.

Consequently, Bailey’s derivation of the word from **karitaka*-, which he thought to be parallel to *ysīḍaa*- from **jaritaka*- (DKS: 60), seems to be unusually complicated, both semantically and phonologically, and can now be rejected.

Having thus excluded *kīra*- and *kīḍa*-, the alleged root *kar*- is, according to Bailey, also attested in *cakala*- ‘wood’. For this word, bilingual evidence is available in Old Khotanese:

- OKh. Sgh 199 [4] [*u*] **[tt]i *[r]o hamara gūsindā samu khau cakalā ttaramdarā* ‘[And also these] joints (of the body) are loosened. (Our) body is just like a piece of wood.’ (Skt. *aṅga-m-aṅgāni mucyaṃti kāṣṭhā iva acetanāḥ*) (Canevascini 1993: 80)

Although the Khotanese version of the Sanskrit text does not appear to be a word-for-word translation of the original, *samu khau cakalā* corresponds to Skt. *kāṣṭhā iva*. The word is further attested twice in the Late Khotanese *Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatārasūtra*:

- P 4099.20 *cakala gaysa kīḍā u auysama* ‘Wood, reeds, stakes and clay’ (cf. *supra*).
- P 4099.137-8 *sa khu daśta cā’yara beṣṭa haga’ja bāva vecettra cakala gaysa gītsarū gūla narmada cā’yau* ‘It is just as when a skilful magician’s pupil assembles various things (and) conjures up wood, reeds, gypsum, and clay by his magic powers.’ (Emmerick Unpublished (b))

I have omitted the occurrences in Late Khotanese documents where *cakala* seems to be a proper name.¹³³ In the form *cikala*-, it occurs several times in the *Siddhasāra*:¹³⁴

¹³⁰ See KEWA I: 216, EWA I: 453, CDIAL: n° 3202, SWTF II: 79. For Pāli *kīla*-, see Cone (2001: 696).

¹³¹ See CDIAL: n° 3202 for other similar phonetic shapes of the same word.

¹³² It may be noted that also a denominative verb from the substantive *kīla*- is attested both in BHS *kīlāyate*, °*ti* (BHSD: 184) and in Pāli *kīlati* (Cone 2001: 696) with the meaning ‘to fasten, bind’. Although this might be merely due to chance, the Pāli expression *kīla bandh-* recalls very closely the Late Khotanese phrase *kīḍye jsa habañ-* (< PIr. **fra-bandaya-*) in the *Jātakastava*.

¹³³ These are Or. 12637/78 1.2-3 (KMB: 163) and IOL Khot 23/14 b2 (KMB: 219).

- Si 10v5 (§2.5) *kāṇḍārya u vāttāka cikalā* ‘Kaṇṭakārikā and vārtākī **plants**.’
- Si 13r4 (§2.21) = Si 137v2 (§23.19) = Si 143v2 (§25.20) *kharā cikalā* ‘The khadira **plant** (catechu tree).’

These *Siddhasāra* occurrences show a more general use of *cakala-* in the meaning ‘plant’. It is unlikely that *cakala-* here refers to ‘tree’, as the *vārtākī-* (*Solanum indicum*), unlike the catechu tree, is not a tree. There is no parallel for *cakala-* in the Indian and Tibetan texts, so the word must be an addition to the Khotanese version.

Whereas the semantic range of *cakala-* is clear, the same cannot be said of its origin. Bailey (DKS: 97) tentatively proposed to see in it a ‘reduplicated **ča-kala-* to base *kar-*, *kal-* ‘part of trees’ or a ‘base **čak-* ‘pointed’’, for which he compared LKh. *cakurika-* ‘wood sorrel’. Both proposals are impossible from the phonological point of view because older **č-* would have yielded **tc-* in both cases. Moreover, it has been shown that LKh. *cakurika-* is an Indic loanword.¹³⁵ The phonetic appearance of the word does not seem Khotanese at all.¹³⁶ Its etymology remains unclear, and it cannot be excluded that it may have been borrowed from another language. *cakala-* cannot be used as an argument in favour of the existence of an alleged Iranian root **kar-* for plants or part of trees.

The fourth substantive, *sakala*, is also obscure. As it occurs as a hapax in the *Jivakapustaka* (97v4) where the corresponding Sanskrit text has **śatāhvā*¹³⁷ ‘*Peucedanum graveolens*’, it may be inferred that *sakala-* is a translation of Skt. *śatāhvā-*. However, as noted by Emmerick (1994: 37), the usual rendering of *śatāhvā-* in the *Jivakapustaka* is *śattapūṣpa-*, based on Sanskrit *śatapūṣpa-*, another name for the same plant. In the *Siddhasāra*, it is also translated as *bāta-ttī* (§21.11.19, §21.13.8, §21.32.3) but never as *sakala*. As the Sanskrit text of the *Jivakapustaka* is known to be highly corrupt (Emmerick 1994: 29) and correspondences between the Sanskrit and Khotanese texts are often blurred, it would not be surprising if *sakala* designated another type of plant. Bailey proposed to interpret *sa-kala* as a calque from Sanskrit *śata-pūṣpa-*. However, even if *sa-* can be taken as ‘hundred’, there is no way one can relate **kala* to *pūṣpa*, even with the help of an alleged root *kar-*. Therefore, *sakala* remains an obscure hapax that cannot be adduced in support of the existence of a root *kar-*.¹³⁸

The other alleged Iranian cognates quoted by Bailey (DKS: 54) include **kārəna-* in Av. *gao-kārəna-* and Oss. I *k’ala*, *k’aliw* D *k’ala*, *k’wala*, *k’alew*. Av. *gao-kārəna-*, the designation of a mythical tree in Zoroastrian cosmology (AIW: 480), has been explained otherwise by Klingenschmitt (1965: 31), who proposed to interpret it as a compound of Av. *gav-* ‘milk’ and

¹³⁴ There may be no need to separate the different sets of occurrences, as Bailey seems to do in the dictionary (DKS: 101). In addition to these occurrences, *cikala-* is further attested in two broken passages of difficult interpretation. These are IOL Khot 197/7.2 (KMB: 439) and IOL Khot 46/3.3 (KMB: 278). In the second occurrence, *cikala-* is translated by Skjærvø as ‘children’, probably with reference to Skt. *cikka-* ‘small’, for which cf. Maggi (1997: 65–66).

¹³⁵ From Skt. *cukrikā-*, see SVK I: 42–43.

¹³⁶ A word similar in form is LKh. *caukala-* ‘he-goat’. However, despite Bailey’s efforts (DKS 105) to demonstrate an Iranian origin, I suspect that the word may be another Indic borrowing (cf. Skt. *chagala-* and related forms in CDIAL: n° 4963).

¹³⁷ For MS *śanāhvā*, see KT I: 178.

¹³⁸ There are two other occurrences of *sakala* which have probably nothing to do with the plant. These are Or. 8211/1454 r1, tentatively translated as ‘in all’ by Skjærvø (KMB: 39) (cf. Skt. *sakala-* ‘whole’), and Or. 8212.162.13, probably part of a scribal exercise, omitted in the translation in KMB: 45.

PIr. **kṛna-* ‘resin, Harz’ (< PIIr. **kṛdna-*, ultimately connected with PG **harta-* ‘resin, pitch’, see Kroonen 2013: 212), meaning ‘Weihrauchbaum’. Despite the ingenuity of Bailey’s alternative explanation of the Avestan compound,¹³⁹ Klingenschmitt’s derivation is preferable. Further, the non-Indo-European appearance of the Ossetic word is quite striking. Abaev’s proposal that the word had entered Ossetic from a Caucasian language of the area (Abaev I: 617) seems very reasonable.

It is now clear that no root **kar-* exists within Iranian, as it would have as its continuant only Khotanese *karāśśā-*. The meaning ‘branch, part of trees’ of Bailey’s root **kar-* was mainly based, at an Indo-European level, on the comparison with Greek *κλάδος*. However, Greek *κλάδος* ‘branch, twig, sprout’¹⁴⁰ is no more considered a derivative of the Proto-Indo-European root **kelh₂-* ‘schlagen’, as per IEW: 546. Besides the fact that the semantic development would be problematic, Greek *κλάδος* and the Germanic (OE *holt*) and Slavic (OCS *klada*) words for ‘wood’ suggest a root **kld-* (Beekes 2010: 708–9) instead. Consequently, Bailey’s hypothesis of a root *kar-* for ‘part of trees’ cannot be justified.

This renders Tremblay’s (2005: 432) etymological proposal for Khotanese *karāśśā-* (< PIr. **kara-sθraia-* ‘scattering of twigs’) rather doubtful, as *kara*^o cannot be taken to mean ‘twig’. Besides, the evidence for PIr. **-sθr-* > Khot. *-ss-* is scanty, if not inexistent. The quoted development **wasθra-* > *hvāšša-* ‘grass’, expressly rejected by Bailey (KT VI: 436), would be the only example.¹⁴¹ Additionally, the semantic plausibility of the Benennungsmotiv ‘scattering of twigs’ to designate a creeper is doubtful.

As an Iranian derivation for Khot. *karāśśā-* is problematic, it may not be out of place to envisage the possibility that the word may be a loanword. One may compare the Sanskrit root *karś-* ‘to be lean, thin’ (EWA I: 318–19) with the derived adjective *kṛśa-* ‘lean, thin’. One may tentatively suggest that the word was used to designate a creeper with reference to the ‘thinness’ of its branches, as opposed to the trunk of a tree. If this is correct, Khot. *karāśśā-* may be interpreted as a loanword from an Indo-Aryan language from the area, probably neither Sanskrit nor Gāndhārī, where the outcomes of *-r-* would have been different (one would expect a form akin to ***kriśa-*).

In Nuristani languages, the same Indo-Aryan root seems to have been borrowed to refer to the snake (Aškun *karaš*, Waigali *koš*).¹⁴² The Nuristani forms (especially the Aškun one) may provide the missing semantic and phonetic link between the Sanskrit forms and Khot.

¹³⁹ Bailey (1974a: 371) rendered the Avestan compound as ‘the plant with branch or stem [**karəna-* from the same alleged Iranian root *kar-*] reddish or yellowish [*gao*^o, which he derived from a root **gau-* used for colours, cf. OInd. *gaurá-* ‘weißlich, gelblich, rotlich’ (EWA I: 503)]’. However, *gva*^o in the *Siddhasāra* compound *gvā-ysirūm* has been explained otherwise by Emmerick (SVK II: 38–9). He sees in it merely a Late Khotanese orthography for OKh. *gūna-* ‘colour’.

¹⁴⁰ And perhaps *κλών*, see Kuiper (1956: 121), which was probably quoted in DKS: 54 without mentioning the source.

¹⁴¹ Proto-Iranian **(-)str-* is retained word-initially and intervocalically (cf. the verb *strañj-* ‘to stiffen’, with preverb *pastrañj-*, which could be, however, a recent formation, and the subst. *striyā-* ‘woman’). Sims-Williams (p.c.) convincingly suggests a development **wāstra-* > **wāśra-* > **wāšša-* with extrusion of *-t-* in the difficult consonant cluster *-str-* (see also EDP: 93).

¹⁴² CDIAL: n° 3441. Both forms may also be alternatively derived from *karša-* ‘dragging’ (Skt. *karṣ-* ‘to draw, pull’), with reference to the ‘dragging or trailing on the ground’ typical of snakes (CDIAL: n° 2905).

karāśśā.¹⁴³ One may compare English *creeper*, which can refer to *creeping* animals (such as snakes) or *creeping* plants. It is not to be excluded that we have to do with a Central Asian Wanderwort of Indo-Aryan origin.

Results

No root **kar-* for ‘part of trees’ exists in Iranian. Consequently, I propose that Khot. *karāśśā* ‘creeper’ is a borrowing from the same Indo-Aryan source as that implied by Aškun *karaś* ‘snake’. The root might be that of Skt. *karś-* ‘to be lean, thin’. The word was further borrowed into Tocharian A and B from Khotanese. The semantic development may be tentatively reconstructed as follows: ‘to be lean, thin’ (Skt.) > **‘thin, lean thing’* > ‘snake’ (Aškun) > ‘creeper’ (Khot.) > **‘forest’* > ‘wilderness’ (Toch.).¹⁴⁴ As no vowel is present in word-final position in Tocharian, I suggest that the dating of the borrowing should be placed after the Old Khotanese stage. As the semantic development involved in the borrowing path from Khotanese into Tocharian is complicated, it should be stressed that the hypothesis of a Khotanese borrowing into Tocharian remains tentative.

TA *kāre* ‘sword’, OKh. *kāḍara* ‘id.’

Discussion

On this word and TB *kertte* ‘sword’, see the comprehensive treatment by Bernard (2023: 32–35). According to a suggestion by Chams Bernard (l.c.), TA *kāre* ‘sword’ may be a direct borrowing from Khot. *kāḍara* ‘id.’ (DKS: 58). One may start from a form enlarged by a *ka*-suffix¹⁴⁵ that underwent weakening of the medial syllable, i.e. **kartaraka* > OKh. **kāḍaraa* > **kāḍāraa*. The nom. sg. in Old Khotanese may have been **kāḍārei*/**kāḍārai*. This form may have been borrowed into Tocharian A as **kāräre*. For the adaptation of an original *ṭ* as *r*, especially in Indic loanwords, cf. TA *kor* ‘10,000,000’ ← Skt. *koṭi*- (DTTA: 165). Through syncope of the unaccented medial *ā*, **kārärei* or **kārārai* may have yielded **kārre*, simplified to the attested TA *kāre*. Because of the loss of intervocalic *-k-*, the loanword cannot be dated before the Old Khotanese stage. Even if the borrowing seems reliable, the lack of other examples for the adaptation of Khotanese retroflexes in Tocharian invites one to consider this explanation with caution. Besides, reconstructing an unattested *aa*-stem **kāḍaraa* is not trivial.

Results

TA *kāre* ‘sword’ is assumed to be a borrowing from OKh. *kāḍara* ‘id.’ Starting from a Khotanese form enlarged by a *ka*-suffix, the following path may be reconstructed: **kāḍaraa* > OKh. nom. sg. **kāḍārei*/**kāḍārai* → TA **kāräre* > **kārre* > *kāre*. The borrowing may have

¹⁴³ As Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.) noted, this solution remains provisional because the internal long *-ā-* is still unexplained.

¹⁴⁴ For this last semantic development, cf. Skt. *kāntāra*- and *araṇya*-, both meaning ‘forest’ and ‘wilderness’. Another possible parallel may be sought in the possible relation between the two Proto-Germanic substantives **walpu-* ‘field, uncultivated area, wood’ (Germ. *Wald*, Kroonen 2013: 572) and the adjective **welþja-* ‘wild, uncultivated, untamed’ (Germ. *wild*, Kroonen 2013: 579).

¹⁴⁵ If borrowed from the nom. sg. *kāḍarā*, one would rather expect TA **kār*, with no final vowel.

taken place during or after the Old Khotanese stage. Lacking other examples for OKh. *t* → TA *r*, however, this explanation remains still tentative for the moment.

TA *kāлтаṅk* ‘DRUM’, OKh. *ggātā’ka-* ‘BELL’

Tocharian occurrences

- A 255 b7 *kāl(ta)ṅk klyoṣtār* ‘The drum is heard.’ (DTTA: 118)
- A 375 a5 *śertmām kāлтаṅk tasmām ṣṇi kotār kāmār kropant* ‘Crying (and) beating the drum, they gathered their family together.’ (cf. DTTA: 118)
- A 335 b9 *kāлтаṅky oki śla naweṃ me(yeñc)* ‘They trembled with roaring like drums.’ (DTTA: 118)

Discussion

Whereas its meaning is assured by bilingual evidence (Pinault 2008: 106),¹⁴⁶ the etymology of the Tocharian A substantive *kāлтаṅk* is unknown. Blažek and Schwarz (2015a: 12) proposed that it could be a loanword from OKh. *ggātā’ka-* ‘bell’, which they interpret as a further loanword from a diminutive of Skt. *ghaṇṭhā-* ‘bell’. This proposal, however, seems hardly acceptable for the following reasons:

- a. OKh. *ggātā’ka-* has no retroflex that could have been adapted in Tocharian as *lt*. OKh. *t* should have been rendered only by Tocharian *t*, not *lt*. The ideal source form for TA *kāлтаṅk* would be Khot. **gaṭaṅga-*. Moreover, because of *kāre* ‘sword’, q.v., Khotanese dental retroflexes were probably adapted as *r* in Tocharian A.
- b. The *t* in the Khotanese form seems to have the function of a hiatus filler, which, along with the subscript hook, may signal the loss of e.g. an old palatal sibilant (**ś > *ž > ∅*). The etymology of the Khotanese word is unknown.
- c. As a consequence of point b., it is difficult to assume that the Khotanese form is derived from Skt. *ghaṇṭhā-*.
- d. There may have never been a dental in the Khotanese form.
- e. The meanings of the Tocharian A and the Khotanese forms do not agree (‘kettledrum’ vs ‘bell’).

Thus, I would like to reject Blažek and Schwarz’s proposal. More attractive would seem to me a direct derivation of *kāлтаṅk* from Sanskrit by way of borrowing, if Skt. *-ṇṭ-* could be rendered as TA *-lt-*. The final part of the word, however, remains unexplained.

Results

TA *kāлтаṅk* ‘drum’ cannot be derived from OKh. *ggātā’ka-* ‘bell’ through borrowing.

¹⁴⁶ According to Pinault (l.c.), it should correspond to Skt. *duṇḍubhi-* ‘kettledrum’ in the parallel passage of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*.

(10) TB *KĀSWO* (NAME OF A DISEASE)

Discussion

An extensive discussion of this word and its possible Iranian etymology can be found in Bernard (2023: 140–47). The same word has also been discussed by Del Tomba (2020: 122–24). Additional bibliographical information can be found in Adams (DoT: 165).

Bernard (2023: 145), even though not excluding Del Tomba's Proto-Indo-European derivation of the Tocharian B lexeme, concludes that a substantive **kasū-* with the meaning 'scabies' can be reconstructed for Old Iranian and may even be traced back to a Proto-Indo-Iranian **kasčū-* (**kasčuH-*), if the comparison with Skt. *kacchū-* 'id.' is correct. The attested Av. *kasuuiš* would be an adjective meaning 'scabby'. What is less clear is the borrowing path from Old Iranian **kasū-* to TB *kāswō*. TB *kāswō* cannot be a loanword from Old Steppe Iranian because Iranian /a/ is here adapted as TB /a/ instead of /e/, so he posits a generic 'Middle Iranian' source form without specifying the precise source language. I argue that the source language may be identified with Pre- or Old Khotanese. In doing that, I also propose that the unexplained medical term LKh. *kasaa-* may be interpreted as a late continuant of the same PIr. **kasū-*.

In an attempt to reconstruct the prehistory of PIr. **kasū-* within the Tumshuqese-Khotanese branch, one could start by positing an unchanged PTK **kasū-*. Since no *ū*-stem declension has survived in Khotanese or Tumshuqese, two alternative scenarios may be reconstructed for the more recent history of the word in Pre- and Old Khotanese. The first possibility assumes the transfer of the substantive to *a-* or *ā-* stems, a well-attested morphological path dated at least as early as the Pre-Khotanese stage (SGS: 250). One may reconstruct an intermediate Pre-Khotanese form **kasa-* from PTK **kasū-*. A *ka*-derivative of **kasa-* is attested in the Late Khotanese *Jivakapustaka* (cf. e.g. JP 92r1, DKS: 57¹⁴⁷ and Konow 1941: 56). Here LKh. *kasaa-* seems to translate Skt. *jvara-* 'fever', in *cārthiṃ kaṣiṃ*, a rendition of Skt. *caturthaka jvara* 'quartan fever'. The most common translation of Skt. *jvara-* in Khotanese medical texts seems to be *ttavaa-* (DKS: 124, from PIr. **tap-* 'to warm up, heat', EDIV: 378–79). It is possible that the reference is not to the high temperature of the fever but to the itches and the skin eruptions or inflammations procured by a high fever.

However, neither **kasa-* nor **kasaa-*, can be the source of TB *kāswō*. A second possible development of PTK **kasū-* in the Tumshuqese-Khotanese branch may be envisaged. This entails the creation of a *ka*-derivative of **kasū-* that would have had the shape PTK **kasū-ka-* > PK **kasūwa-* > OKh. **kasūa-*. In Old Khotanese, this substantive would have followed the pattern of the *ūa*-declension (cf. *prūa-* 'fort' and *rrahamūa-* 'washerman'), for which see SGS: 327. If the *-k-* of the suffix was still an approximant in Pre-Khotanese, one could reconstruct a Pre-Khotanese acc. sg. **kasūwu* > OKh. **kasū* (SGS: 327). Therefore, I suggest that **kasūwu* may have been the source of TB *kāswō* by way of borrowing.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ Bailey's (DKS: 57) suggestion of a new root without any known Iranian cognate merely to explain *kasaa-* is hardly justifiable.

Results

Building upon the results of Bernard's (2023: 140–47) investigation on the possible Iranian origin of Tocharian *kāswo*, I suggest that the Tocharian B word may be derived from a Pre-Khotanese form acc. sg. **kasūwu*. Further, I tentatively put forward the hypothesis that LKh. *kasaa-*, a Late Khotanese medical word of uncertain origin, may be a *ka*-derivative of the same substantive PIr. **kasū-* after its transfer to the *a*-stem declension.

(11) TB *kātso* A *kāts* 'BELLY, STOMACH, ABDOMEN, WOMB', LKH. *khāysāna*- 'STOMACH'

Tocharian occurrences (only occurrences in medical texts cited)

- nom. sg. *kātso* W4 a4 *kātso sonopālya* 'L'abdomen est à oindre' (Filliozat 1948: 80), W14 a6 *ñoriya kātso orottsā tākaṃ* '[If] the lower abdomen is big',¹⁴⁹ W14 b1-2 *kātso (sono)palye* 'L'abdomen ... est à oindre' (Filliozat 1948: 83), W30 a5, W37 b3, IOL Toch 306 b5 (on the restoration, see Friis 2021: 13 fn. 23).
- perl. sg. *kātsasa* W14 b2.
- obl. sg. *kātsa* W27 b1 *mālkwersa kātsa sanāpalle* 'À appliquer en onctions au ventre avec du lait' (Filliozat 1948: 85), W29 b1 *kātsa sanāpatsi* 'oindre l'abdomen.' (Filliozat 1948: 86)
- loc. sg. *kātsane* W42 a5 *wrantse kātsane* 'in (case of) water-belly (= dropsy).'

Khotanese occurrences (only *Siddhasāra* and *Piṇḍasāstra* occurrences cited)

- loc. sg. Si §1.19 *cu śiṣāṃ ṣṭe, ṣi' khāysānya* 'As for phlegm (*kaphasya*), it is based (*sthānaṃ*) in the receptacle for (undigested) food (*āmāsayaḥ*).’ (Emmerick Unpublished)
- instr.-abl. sg. Si §24.7 *hasai khāysānai jsa uskyāṣṭā pārautta hame* 'One's swelling is based upwards (*upary*) from the receptacle of (undigested) food (*āmāsaya-*).’ (Emmerick Unpublished)
- In §9, §10-14 and §24-27 of the Late Khotanese *Piṇḍasāstra* (Luzziotti 2018–2019: 81), it is very frequent in the loc. sg. *khāysāna* 'in the stomach'.

Discussion

TB *kātso* TA *kāts* occur in medical texts and in fragments of religious, literary or doctrinal content in the Tocharian text corpus. Since I believe the word entered the Tocharian lexicon from the medical jargon (see §4.3.1.), only the occurrences in medical texts are listed above. An overview of the uses of *kātso* in literary texts is given by Carling (2000: 212–14). From her list, it is clear that the semantic range covered by *kātso*, both in Tocharian B and A, is that of German *Bauch*, i.e. 'stomach, belly, abdomen' and even 'womb' (see also DoT: 165).

¹⁴⁸ A borrowing from *khaysma-* 'abscess' (DKS: 72) appears less likely because of the imperfect correspondence Khot. *m* ~ Toch. *w*.

¹⁴⁹ The adjective *ñoriya* shows that the gender of *kātso* must have been feminine.

Several suggestions regarding its etymology were put forward in the last century. For an overview of the difficulties involved with each suggestion, see Adams (DoT: 165–66) and Del Tomba (2020: 124–25). Malzahn (2011: 99) likewise states that ‘for *kātso* ‘belly’ itself and for *kāswo* ‘(kind of) skin disease’, no undisputed etymologies are available’.

As an inner-Tocharian derivation appears problematic, *kātso* may be a loanword from a neighbouring language. In this case, Khotanese as a donor language (cf. the suspect nom. sg. in *-o* as a feature of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese and Old Khotanese loanwords) may deliver a suitable candidate. A frequent word in medical texts used to refer to the stomach or the abdomen is LKh. *khāysāna-*. As for the semantics, the occurrences show that it translates Skt. *āmāśaya-* lit. ‘receptacle (*āśaya*) for undigested food (*āma*)’. If Bailey’s etymology (DKS: 72) of *khāysāna-* (< **khāysa-dāna-*) is correct, the formation may have been parallel to Skt. *āmāśaya-*, with Khot. *khāysa-* ‘food’ corresponding to Skt. *āma-* and **dāna-* ‘container’ to Skt. *āśaya-*. For the early loss of intervocalic **-d-*, cf. *śśaśvāna-* ‘mustard (seed)’, possibly from **śśaśva-dānā-* (see s.v.).

In the case of a connection with Khot. *khāysāna-* by way of borrowing, the semantics is not problematic. The extension of the semantics of words for ‘stomach, belly’ to mean also ‘womb’ is not uncommon (cf. Skt. *kukṣi-*). However, some phonological details are still unclear and require more extensive analysis. Two problems may be identified. The first concerns the final TB *-o* and Khot. *-na*, the second is the Tocharian dental affricate, which does not find perfect correspondence in Khot. <ys> (/z/).

As in the case of TB *eñcuwo* borrowed from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent of OKh. *hiśśana-* and TB *śāñcapo* from that of OKh. *śśaśvāna-* (see s.v.), final *-o* in Tocharian B cannot correspond to the final acc. sg. *-nu* of the source form. Whereas for TB *śāñcapo* the problem can be solved by positing a source form without the second element **dānā-*, for TB *eñcuwo* a back-formation from an adjective **eñcuwaññe*, extracted from **eñcuwañño*, in its turn borrowed from a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese source form acc. sg. **henśwanyu*, has been suggested (Peyrot, Dragoni, and Bernard 2022). A back-formation may also be posited in the case of TB *kātso*. The most frequent form attested in Late Khotanese medical texts is the loc. sg. *khāysāña*. To a Tocharian ear, this may have sounded either as an adjective *katsāññe** ‘pertaining to the abdomen’ or as a nom. pl. *katsāñ* ‘abdomens’. Both possibilities may have led to a secondary nom. sg. in *-o*. This appears more likely because the nom. pl. *katsāñ* is the regular plural attested for TB *kātso*. A close parallel to this type of back-formation is the TA nom. pl. *kappāñ* ‘cotton’, formed to *kappās*, borrowed from a Middle Indic form *kappāsa-* and reinterpreted as an obl. pl. (DTTA: 100). The obl. sg. in *-a*, and therefore the fact that TB *kātso* belongs to the *kantwo*-type, may be justified by the existence of other medical terms (e.g. *kāswo*) or terms for body-parts (e.g. *kantwo*) in this declension type.

The correspondence TB <ts>, Khot. <ys> is difficult to justify. A possible solution may be proposed by acknowledging with Cheung (EDIV: 445) that the Proto-Iranian antecedent of Parthian *x’z-* ‘to devour’ and Khot. *khāys-a-* ‘food’ may be sought in PIr. **xād-s-*, i.e. the root **xād-* ‘to devour, eat, gorge’ enlarged with an *s*-suffix as perhaps in the case of Av. **ruuāz-* ‘to become joyous, rejoice’ and **ruuād-* ‘to be proud, haughty; to entertain, regale’ (Kümmel 2000: 623). The source form of TB *kātso* may have been still **k’ādāna-*, i.e. with a dental affricate (or, less likely, a cluster **ds*). I would like to suggest that the dating of the borrowing may be posited in the Pre-Khotanese stage, because of the early loss of intervocalic *-d-*. Theoretically, the fact that the word can be reconstructed for Proto-Tocharian can also be taken as an argument in favour of an earlier (Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese) dating. In this case,

however, the early loss of *-d-* is difficult to account for in such an early period.¹⁵⁰ Therefore, I consider the Tocharian A and B words independently borrowed into Tocharian A and B from Pre-Khotanese.

Results

As TB *kātso* A *kāts* ‘stomach, belly, abdomen, womb’ has no convincing etymology, I propose that it may be a loanword from the late Pre-Khotanese ancestor of LKh. *khāysāna-*, which translates Skt. *āmāśaya-* ‘stomach’ in Late Khotanese medical texts. The history of the word may be thus reconstructed as follows: Pre-PK **khād-s-a-dānā-* > PK **khād-āna-*, loc. sg. **khād-āna* (SGS: 252) → TB nom. pl. *katsāñ* (and, through back-formation, nom. sg. *kātso*, obl. sg. *kātsa*).

(12) TB *KITO** (*EKITA*) ‘HELP’, OKH. *GGĪHA-* ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- Phrase *ekita yam-* ‘to help’ PK AS 7H a2 *śesa śñasṣemmpa po se ñy ekita yamašare ce postakāśc paiykatsi ñiś yātkawa* ‘Avec tous mes proches qui m’ont apporté de l’aide pour ce livre, j’ai donné l’ordre de [l’]écrire’ (Meunier 2013: 173–74), THT 520 b5 *krenta wāntarwan= ekīta yāmṣeñca k_{us}(e)* ‘Whoever is helping in good things.’ (DoT: 80)
- Adjective *ekitatstse* ‘helpful’ in PK AS 17B a5 (*lāms*) *poysimñai pos= arwāre pyutkāṣṣām ekītatstse* ‘It realises the ... (work) of the Omniscient more readily and more helpfully than anything’ (CEToM, Pinault, Illés, Peyrot eds.), THT 82 b4 (*yā*)*t(a)lle ot tañ ste kr(em)t wāntarene ekītatstse nesti* ‘[Wenn es] möglich [ist], steht es bei dir, bei einer guten Sache hilfreich zu sein’ (Schmidt 2001: 311), THT 89 b1 (*e*)*kitatse śaulyñe* ‘... (nicht?) hilfreich, das Leben ...’ (Schmidt 2001: 319), IOL Toch 255 b2 *yo – s- (śau)mo yolo ekitatse mā(s)ketrā* ‘... the evil man is helpful’,¹⁵¹ obl. *ekitacce* THT 1116 b5 – – – (*pe*)*r(ā)k no wāntare ekītatce kā- ///* ‘(eine solche(?) ... glaub)würdige Sache aber (von dem?) hilfreichen Le(hrer?)’ (Schmidt 1986: 96), pl. *ekitacci* THT 338 a6 (*eki*)*tacci tākoycer ṣleṣṣi kenāṣṣi akaśāṣṣi wā(rttoṣṣi)* ‘... may you be helping, [you, the beings] of the mountain, of the earth, of the sky, [and] of the forest.’ (CEToM, Malzahn ed.)
- Substantive *ekīatsñe* ‘helpfulness, assistance’ B SI P/2 a5 *po pelaiṣnenta(ñts nesalñenta cāmpalñenta) ṣarm ekīatsñe okonta* ‘Les réalités, les capacités, la cause, le soutien, les fruits de toutes les qualités’ (Meunier 2015: 29 fn. 47), perl. plur. IOL Toch 64 a1 *ekīatsñentasa tarya sa ///* ‘To the supports, three ...’.

¹⁵⁰ If the form is rather to be analysed as *khāys-āna-*, with a different suffix, the hypothesis of an earlier borrowing from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese could be more easily defended. *khāys-āna-* may be a Khotanese participial formation meaning ‘the devouring (organ)’, with reference to the stomach (for the suffix *-āna-* attached also to active verbs in Khotanese, see KS: 78). For the semantics, A. Lubotsky (p.c.) suggests a possible parallel in Greek *γαστήρ* ‘belly, paunch, womb’ (< *γπάω* ‘to eat, gnaw’), for which see Beekes (2010: 262). This derivation, however, remains hypothetical for the moment.

¹⁵¹ CEToM, Peyrot ed. Peyrot (p.c.) further suggests to restore *yo(lo)s(a)* and translates ‘through evil (*yolosa*) a man is helpful to evil.’

Discussion¹⁵²

Tocharian B *ekita* has been variously discussed in the scholarly literature. Van Windekens (VW: 176) considered TB *ekita* as the acc. sg. of a reconstructed nom. sg. *ek-ito**, an *-ito* derivative (cf. TB *laukito*) of a base TB *ek-*. He inferred this base from TB *ekaññi* ‘possession’ and considered it a loanword from TA *ek* ‘fodder’. This suggestion is problematic and has been challenged a few times in the scholarly literature. On the one hand, the hypothesis of a loanword from Tocharian A into Tocharian B seems doubtful. On the other hand, as Carling (DTTA: 2) and Adams (DoT: 79–80) have shown, *ekaññi* is to be seen as related to TA *akämtsune* ‘possession, tenure’. Thus, as remarked by Adams (DoT: 80), the origin of *ek-* remains unknown. As for the formation, his hypothesis remains tentative, as no nom. sg. is attested. Moreover, the word could also be interpreted as an adverb.¹⁵³

ekita may be a loanword from a neighbouring language. In Khotanese, a frequent substantive meaning ‘help’ occurring already in the Book of Zambasta is the masculine substantive OKh. *ggiha(a)-*. This is traditionally interpreted as a nominal formation from the verb OKh. *ggih-* (KS: 5). Its etymology is unclear. Ernst Leumann, the first editor of the Book of Zambasta, interpreted it as a denominative in **-ya-* (**gah(a)y-*?) from OKh. *ggāha-* ‘verse’ and translated ‘loben, billigen’ (Leumann 1933–1936: 419). With the help of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*, Bailey clarified the semantics and proposed the meaning ‘to assist, help’, but concluded that ‘the base remains uncertain.’¹⁵⁴ Emmerick was likewise cautious and, following Bailey for the semantics, noted that the forms ‘imply **gaid-* or **gaiθ-*’ (SGS: 28–29). Some years later, Bailey (DKS: 84) proposed a problematic derivation from PIr. **awa-yat-* (EDIV: 214–15). Among the many phonological problems, it is unclear how the Proto-Iranian preverb **awa* should yield *ggi-* (the regular outcome is *va-*, see SGS: 241).

Skjærvø took note of the problem and, after having labelled Bailey’s etymology as ‘impossible’ (Suv II: 260), proposed a derivation of the substantive from PIr. **gaiθa-*. The verb he explained as a denominative form.¹⁵⁵ **gaiθa-* may be the masculine counterpart of PIr. **gaiθā-*, the well-known base of Av. *gaēθā-* ‘Wesen, Lebewesen, Welt’ (AIW: 476–79, Hintze 1994: 425) and OP *gaiθā-* ‘Vieh(besitz), Herde’ (Schmitt 2014: 178). From the Old Iranian meaning of ‘livestock, small cattle’, the semantics shifted towards ‘flock (of small cattle)’, as witnessed by Sogd. *γγδh* ‘flock’ (Gharib 1995: 180), MMP *gyh* ‘property, esp. flocks, herds’ (DMMP: 169) and Psht. *γéle* ‘flocks’ (EDP: 30). Only in Khotanese the meaning developed into ‘support, help’.¹⁵⁶ From the semantic point of view, if TB *ekita* is an Iranian loanword, it

¹⁵² This study was partially presented during the online conference *Tocharian in Progress* (Leiden University, Dec. 2020).

¹⁵³ Meunier (2013: 173): ‘L’étymologie de *ekita* est obscure; il s’agit peut-être d’un adverbe. Je n’ai pas trouvé d’emploi libre à confronter à cette locution.’ Del Tomba (2020: 109) is likewise cautious in the analysis of this word and concludes stating that ‘its origin and derivation are unclear’.

¹⁵⁴ KT VI: 71. He cautiously adds that ‘the initial *gg-*, the *-i-* are ambiguous, but the final consonant of the base will be a dental.’ The first identification is to be found in Bailey (1940a: 584).

¹⁵⁵ The long *-i-* of the participle *ggista-* (SGS 28), which one would otherwise expect to be short (zero grade), points to a denominative.

¹⁵⁶ A different meaning is to be noted for the Avestan compound *haδō.gaēθā-* ‘zum selben Hausstand gehörig; Hausgenosse’ (AIW: 1759). In other Middle Iranian languages there is a similar compound

should have been borrowed from Khotanese. Given the specificity of the semantic connotation of the Khotanese term compared to the rest of the Iranian material, it is necessary to examine the Khotanese occurrences more closely to determine the semantic range of the root.

The verb *ggih-* : *ggīsta-* ‘to help’ (SGS: 28–29) is widely attested, both in Old and Late Khotanese. The key to understanding the semantics is given by the bilingual evidence in Suv 12.47: *adātī rre hāmāte. o adātyānu pakṣā vaṣṭātā u gītte nā* ‘The king will become lawless, or he will side with lawless (people) and help them’ (Suv I: 247) (Skt. *adhārmiko bhaved rājā adharma-pakṣa-saṁsthitaḥ*). From the Sanskrit text, it is clear that the literal translation of *pakṣa-saṁsthita* ‘to take side’ is OKh. *pakṣa vaṣṭ-* and that *gītte* is added as a gloss to *pakṣa vaṣṭ-* with approximately the same meaning (‘to take side’ = ‘to help’). In the following, the other occurrences of the verb are listed:

- prs. 1sg. mid. OKh. Z 12.51 *u kari nā ggihā* ‘And I will not assist it at all.’ (Emmerick 1968: 173)
- prs. 3sg. mid. OKh. P 51.1 b1 *tta nā vātcu ggītte ku biśśā śamana hāmāre* ‘Then he so helps them that they all become monks’ (SDTV I: 42), LKh. Ch. 00275 27b2 *biśśā parī hālai gītī* ‘All helps the cause of deliverance’ (Emmerick Unpublished (c)), LKh. Hedin 7v8 *gītī* ‘He helps’ (KT IV: 86), P 4099.292 *gītte* ‘he helps’, OKh. IOL Khot 150/2 v5 *gītte* ‘He helps’ (KMB: 337). The prs. 3sg. is further attested in OKh. Z 12.114, 12.115, 19.74.
- prs. 3pl. mid. OKh. IOL Khot 163/1 v3 *ggihā[re]* ‘Are of assistance (?)’.¹⁵⁷
- prs. 3pl. act.(!) LKh. P 2022.39 *gīhidai* ‘They help.’ (SGS: 29)
- opt. 3sg. OKh. Z 13.86 *śā hā ggihīyā* ‘Would he help him?’ (Emmerick 1968: 198), Z 13.89 *balysā ttū māri ne ggihīya* ‘Māra would not help the Buddha in this.’ (Emmerick 1968: 198)
- ipv. 2sg. mid. OKh. Z 23.105 *ggihu aysuryau juštā* ‘Help fight the Asuras!’ (Emmerick 1968: 354), Z 24.435 *ttu mā ggihu* ‘Help me in this!’ (Emmerick 1968: 404)
- ipv. 2pl. mid. LKh. Or. 8210/S. 5212.3 *gīhyara vā caiga ttī jśā hva[ttā]na* ‘Help us, O Chinese as well as Khotanese!’ (KMB: 36), LKh. P 2781.103 = Rāma 79c *aḍarā vā gīhya:rā jse* ‘Help (me) to kill that one’ (Emmerick Unpublished (a)), P 2925.15.
- ipv. 2sg. act.(!) *prrañaisū ttravile jīyai ttā gīha* ‘Prašñaisū, knower of the three *piṭakas*, assist his life(?)!’ (KMB: 49)
- perf. tr. 3sg. LKh. IOL Khot S. 2.16 *ttīnā ysītha khva gīste* ‘If it helped her in this life’,¹⁵⁸ Si §0.8 *śi’ hā pā gīsti vinau mātsarā śīrkā* ‘He then helped without grudging, excellently’ (Emmerick 1983a: 21), IOL Khot 206/1.3 *śi’ buri uvaysaṁbatī jśāṁ ṣṣqāmañā gīstai* ‘He, for his part, helped him to be initiated in monkhood.’ (KMB: 454)
- perf. tr. 1sg. m. LKh. *Avalokiteśvaradhāraṇī* fol. 5r5 *ā vā haṁdarāṁ ggīste imā yuḍe* ‘Or I have helped others to do.’ (SDTV I: 239)

formed with **han-*. This was already noted by Gershevitch (1959: 267), who listed Khwar. *angēθ*, Pa. *h’mgyh* and the Aramaic loanword *hngyt* ‘having property in common; partner.’ On this matter, cf. also Hintze (2009: 173 fn. 9).

¹⁵⁷ The emendation is due to Skjærvø (2003: 412) and is probably based on Skt. *saṁvartamte*.

¹⁵⁸ Skjærvø (KMB: 483) translated ‘if it helps her in her life’ but the form cannot be interpreted as prs. 3sg.

- per. perf. tr. 1sg. m. LKh. *Avalokiteśvaradhāraṇī* fol. 16r1 *ā vā haṃdarām ggīstemä imä yuḍ[e* ‘Or I have helped others to do.’ (SDTV I: 246)
- perf. tr. 2sg. m. LKh. JS 36v1 *beśām tte tta gīstai khvaṃ āvaṃ sije* . ‘All of them you so assisted that their desire was realized.’ (Dresden 1955: 444)
- potential prs. 3pl. OKh. IOL Khot 153/4 r1 *ggīstu yīndā* ‘They can help.’ (KMB: 342)
- past ptc. LKh. Or. 8210/S. 5212.5 (= P 2925.16) *ttyai gīsta jsa maista baiysūsta bvīryau* : ‘By that help, you will obtain great *bodhi*.’ (KMB: 36)
- inf. LKh. Hedin 7r9 *śārū vā pastāṃda gīste* ‘You have condescended to aid me well’ (KT IV: 82).
- ptc. nec. OKh. Z 12.114-115 *ku bodhisatvā anandīśśāte hvā’ndāna puṣṣo kye ju puṇa yande ni ggītte śśārku kāḍe kho bodhisatvā . ggīhāṇu hvam’da puṇa . ārru anārru kuī handari ggītte hve* ‘When a Bodhisattva is completely indifferent with regard to a man who is acquiring merits (and) does not help him very well as a Bodhisattva should help with regard to a man’s merits, there is fault. There is no fault if another man helps him.’ (Emmerick 1968: 181)

As for the substantive *ggīha-*, the bilingual evidence is not as straightforward. In Old Khotanese, it is attested in manuscript Or. of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* in the instr. abl. sg.:

- Suv 1.15 *ttā hā tsīndā haṃtsa hīṇe jsa gīhāna bāryau* ‘Those will go there with army, *help, (and) vehicles’ (Suv I: 13) (Skt. *te ca tatropasaṃkramya sa-sainya-bala-vāhanāḥ*).

If *hīṇe* = *sainya* and *bāryau* = *vāhanāḥ*, one should conclude that *gīhāna* = *bala*. Skjærvø (Suv II: 98) suggests that the meaning in this passage might be that of ‘auxiliary troops’. It may be noted that Skt. *bala-* can also mean ‘military force, army’ (MW: 722). It is not impossible that the Khotanese word maintained its common Middle Iranian original meaning of ‘flock, group’ to designate a troop, i.e. an (armed) group of people. The word is further attested in Suv 3.58 in the Late Khotanese manuscript P:

- Suv 3.58 *cu drrātai aysmū kiṇa aśīdām hayunām gīhna* ‘Whatever (was done) because of a flighty mind, through company with evil friends.’ (Suv I: 51) (Skt. *cāpalya-citta-saṃkaṭe pāpa-mitrāgama-saṃkaṭena ca*)

In this case, *gīhna* seems to translate Skt. °*āgama* ‘company’ meaning ‘with the company’ or simply ‘with’. This bilingual evidence, however, is less decisive. It is known that the frozen instr. sg. *gīhna* is frequently used in Late Khotanese as a postposition meaning simply ‘with’ (cf. the occurrences below).¹⁵⁹ Further attestations of the substantive are:

- Only a stem *ggīhaa-* (with *ka-* suffix, KS: 17) occurs in Old Khotanese; see nom. pl. Z 23.102 *uhu nu hā ggīhā vāta sta* ‘You have been their helpers’ (Emmerick 1968: 354), acc. sg. Z 24.256 *kalā-yuggā ṣṣu . ttīyā māru ggīho nāte* . ‘The Kaliyuga then accepted Māra as helper’ (Emmerick 1968: 389), and nom. pl. IOL Khot 220/1 b1

¹⁵⁹ For *gīhna* as ‘with’, cf. also Dresden (1955: 472–73).

gīhā (context unclear, in a fragment of religious content). For the same stem in Late Khotanese, see nom. pl. P 4099.74 *gīhā* ‘Helpers, auxiliaries (in the retinue of the king).’¹⁶⁰ It also occurs in the wooden documents IOL Khot Wood 2 b1 *u bir-gaṃḍaraḷe gīhā* 5 ‘and five *auxiliaries from Birgaṃḍara’ (KMB: 559). It may be hidden behind the unclear IOL Khot Wood 3 b1-2 *phaṃnāḷe gīhā nau hālai* ‘And the *gīhās* in *Phaṃnai* (are) nine and a ‘half.’ (KMB: 560)

- *gīhāka-* seems to be attested only once in Late Khotanese; see IOL Khot 55/1 v1 *cu saidā gīhāka daivatta ṣai’ brāmiysätti* ‘As for the deity who helped (his) *siddhi*, (her) name was Brāmiysätti.’ (KMB: 293, cf. also KS: 46)
- More frequent in Late Khotanese is the stem *gīha-*, see nom. pl. P 4099.72, 73, 291 *gīha* ‘Helpers, auxiliaries’ (Emmerick Unpublished (b)). As already noted (cf. *supra*), the instr.-abl. sg. of *gīha-* is used very frequently in Late Khotanese as a post-position meaning ‘with’, see e.g. IOL Khot S. 10.293 *vyachada bāvaṇa gīhna vasva nairvaṇa parri* ‘They explain with the help of the *bhāvanā* the release of pure nirvana.’ (KMB: 493)

From the occurrences examined above, the key to understanding the peculiar Khotanese semantic shift may lie in the passage of the *Suvarṇabhāṣasottamasūtra* (Suv 1.15) where *gīha-* translates Skt. *bala-*. It may be argued that the Old Iranian meaning of ‘subsistence (i.e. cattle, property)’ was generalised to designate ‘strength’. From this general meaning of ‘strength’, the word took the sense of ‘military force’ (Skt. *bala-*) in Khotanese and was later used to designate ‘help’. This last semantic shift (‘military force’ > ‘help’) is paralleled e.g. by Latin *auxilium*, originally used in the plural (*auxilia*) in a military sense to designate ‘reinforcement’ troops and was later generalised as the common Latin word for ‘help’ (cf. *auxiliō esse, auxilium ferre*, for which see Ernout and Meillet 1979: 57–58). Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.) drew my attention to a parallel semantic development in Sogdian, where the frequent collocation MSogd. *z’wr ḍβr-* with the meaning ‘to help’ can be literally translated as ‘to give force’. Thus, the semantic development can be summarised as follows: Old Iranian ‘subsistence (cattle, property)’ > *‘force, strength’ > Khotanese ‘military force’ (transl. Skt. *bala-*, cf. Lat. *auxilium*) > ‘help’.

As for the Tocharian form, TB *ekita* can be easily interpreted as an adverbial formation construed with the Tocharian B prefix *e(n)-*. For the loss of *-n-* in the nasal prefix *en-*, see Hilmarsson (1991a: 195). This presupposes the existence of a substantive *kita** in the obl. sg., as required by an adverbial formation in *en-* + oblique. One cannot exclude other declension patterns,¹⁶¹ but the obl. sg. *kita** points in principle to a nom. sg. *kito** (*kantwo*-type). As shown by TB *tvāṅkaro* (q.v.), the *kantwo*-type declension pattern is frequent amongst loanwords from Khotanese.

As for the phonology, Tocharian *-t-* suggests that the word is an old loan from Pre-Khotanese that was borrowed before the change *-VθV- > -VhV- but after the monophthongisation of the diphthongs *-ai- and *-au- to *-i-* and *-ū-*. This is paralleled by TB *pito* (q.v.), which can be interpreted as a loanword from PK **pīθa-*.

¹⁶⁰ Mañj 61, see Emmerick (Unpublished (b)).

¹⁶¹ Notably, a nom. sg. *kita**. However, substantives with nom. sg. *-a* and obl. sg. *-a* are much less frequent, see s.v. *keto*.

Results

The investigation has established that TB *ekita* is a Tocharian adverbial formation based on an unattested *kito**, a borrowing from PK *c* (acc. sg. **gīθu*). The Tocharian evidence further confirms that the pre-form of Khot. *ggīha-* contained a dental obstruent and is of help in determining the Iranian origin of the Khotanese word, which may be sought in PIr. **gaiθa-*.

TA *K_UÑĀŚ* ‘FIGHT, CONFLICT’, OKH. *GŪRĀŚ-* ‘TO QUARREL’

Tocharian occurrences

- A 238 a3 *mar wac k_uñāś yāmiṃtār* ‘They would not do fight nor conflict.’ (cf. Thomas 1958: 293)
- A 353 a5 *mā k_uñāś ypamāñ(cs)ā* ‘Without making conflict.’
- A 375 b5 *arkāmnā(ṣṣ)ā(s su)krānāśśi lepśāśśi k_uñāś yāmā(s)* – – – ‘He fought with vultures and jackals of the cemetery.’ (cf. CEToM, Carling ed.; DTTA: 148; Malzahn 2014: 92–93)
- PK NS 1 b1 *kākmārtikās wrassaśśāl tñi wac k_uñāś lkātār k_ule ṣurmaṣ* ‘Because of the/a woman, fight and quarrel with ruler-beings are seen by you.’ (cf. CEToM, Pinault and Fellner eds.)

Discussion

The Tocharian A word *k_uñāś* is of uncertain etymology. Its meaning, however, can be established based on the bilingual evidence in the Tocharian A version of the *Pratimokṣasūtra* (A 353). There, *mā k_uñāś ypamāñ(cs)ā* seems to translate Skt. *avivadamānaiḥ* (Schmidt 1989: 106), from the Sanskrit verb *vi-vad-* ‘to contest, dispute, quarrel’ (MW: 986). Additionally, as noted by Carling (DTTA: 148), its occurrence in hendiadys with *wac* ‘fight’ is also a valid confirmation of the meaning ‘fight, dispute, quarrel’.

As no Indo-European etymology for this lexeme is available, I suggest a possible connection of the Tocharian A word with the Khotanese verb *gūrāś-* ‘to quarrel’ (SGS: 30). This proposal, although semantically unproblematic, has some phonological problems. According to Schwartz (1974: 399–400), the most likely origin of this verb is to be sought in **wi-brāz-(a)ya-*, from the root PIr. **braHj-* ‘to shine, set on fire, alight’ (EDIV: 21). The semantics are supported by CSogd. **br’z-* ‘to become angry’ (< ‘to be lit up’, cf. Sims-Williams 2016: 21). As in the case of *parso*, q.v., the Tocharian word may have been borrowed from an infinitive *gūrāśä*. As for the dating of borrowing, because of the initial *gu-* (< PK, PTK **wi-*), it can be confidently placed in the historical period (Old or Late Khotanese). Another argument in favour of this proposal may be sought in the fact that this same Khotanese lexeme has also been borrowed into Old Uyghur as *küräś-* ‘miteinander kämpfen’ (HWA: 444).

Whereas the semantics do not show any relevant problems, the correspondence TA *-VñV-* ~ Khot. *-VrV-* is unprecedented. It does not yet occur in other borrowings from Khotanese, where intervocalic *r* is regularly represented by *r* in Tocharian. Thus, this connection remains for the moment quite uncertain.

Results

The Tocharian A substantive *k_uñas* ‘fight, conflict’ may have been borrowed from Khot. *gūrās-* ‘to quarrel’. TA *k_uñas* may have been borrowed from the infinitive *gūrāsā* in the historical period (Old or Late Khotanese). However, since there is no convincing explanation for the correspondence TA *ñ* ~ Khot. *r*, this proposal remains uncertain.

(13) TB *KUÑI-MOT* ‘GRAPE WINE’, LKH. *GÜRĀÑAI MAU* ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- *kuñi-mot* IOL Toch 305 b1.
- *kuñi-*mot*¹⁶² W38 a6.
- *kuñi-motsa* W22 a3.
- Adjective *kuñi-motāṣṣe* W20 a4.

Khotanese occurrences:

- *gūra-* ‘grapes’ e.g. in *Siddhasāra* 12r2.
- *gūrāñai mau* ‘grape wine’ P 2895.29 (Paris Y, see KT III: 41 l. 29).

Discussion¹⁶³

Adams (DoT: 193) proposed that the first part of *kuñi-mot* ‘grape wine’ may derive from LKh. *gūrāñaa-* (KS: 142), adjective to *gūra-* ‘grapes’, with loss of the medial syllable. LKh. *gūrāñaa-* is an adjective formed with the suffix *-īnaa-* (PIr. **-ainaka-*). The long *-ī-* of the suffix was shortened to *-i-* or *-ä-* in unstressed position. This phenomenon may be part of a general tendency of vowel weakening before the nasal *-n-* already attested in Old Khotanese (KS: 136). For the adjective *gūrāñaa-*, therefore, a proto-form **gudrainaka-* may be reconstructed. If TB *kuñi* is derived from the adjective *gūrāñaa-*, one should reckon with a loan from Khotanese, after the shortening of the long *-ī-* of the suffix (already Old Khotanese) and the loss of intervocalic *-k-*: *kuñi* < *gūni* < *gūrñi* < LKh. *gūrāñai* (< PIr. **gudrainakah*).

At first sight, Adams’ suggestion might appear far-fetched. However, the occurrence of the adjective *gūrāñaa-* with *mau* ‘wine’ in the Late Khotanese lyrical poem contained in the manuscript P 2895 might back his hypothesis. Indeed, the parallel TB *kuñi-mot* ~ LKh. *gūrāñai mau* seems rather striking. The Tocharian B form would then be a partial calque, with TB *kuñi* < LKh. *gūrāñai* and TB *mot* for LKh. *mau*. It might be worth noting here that TB *mot* cannot have been borrowed from Sogdian, as stated by Tremblay (2005: 438).¹⁶⁴ The form *mwōy* quoted by Gershevitch (GMS: 408) from the Ancient Letter IV, l. 5, is now recognised to stand for ‘price’ (LW < Skt. *mūlya-*).

The occurrence of LKh. *gūrāñai mau* in a fixed phrase renders Ching’s (2010: 383) hypothesis of a possible connection with LKh. *gūñi* ‘bag, sack’ (DKS: 86), borrowed from Niya Pkt. *goni-* (Skt. *goñī-*), rather difficult. In fact, no **gūñi mau* has been detected in the Khotanese text corpus.

¹⁶² See Filliozat (1948: 78 fn. 1) for the emendation.

¹⁶³ This study has been published in Dragoni (2021).

¹⁶⁴ I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer of Dragoni (2021) for this suggestion.

Results

TB *kuñi-mot* may be interpreted as a compound of *kuñi* ‘pertaining to grape’, borrowed from the Late Khotanese adjective *gūrānai* ‘id.’, and *mot* ‘wine’. Because of the shortening and syncope of the original *ī in the Khotanese adjective, the word should have been borrowed in the historical period (Old Khotanese, or, more likely, Late Khotanese).

TB *KUÑCIT* ~ *KWĀNCIT* A *KUÑCIT* ‘SESAME’, OKH. *KUṂJSATA*- ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- TB *kuñcit* PK AS 3A a1; a3 (medical), PK AS 8C a7 (medical), THT 18 b5 (2×) (doctrinal), THT 3998 a3 (wooden tablet), W7 a6 (medical)
- TB *kuñcitā* THT 505 b2, THT 2676 b3
- TB *kwāñcitā* THT 1535.c b3 (literary)
- TB *kwāñcitša* adj. (?) THT 1535.e b3 (literary)
- TB *kuñcitāṣṣe* adj. ‘made from sesame’ IOL Toch 306 a5 (medical), PK AS 2B a6; b4, PK AS 2C b6, PK AS 3A a6, PK AS 3B a2; b1 (*Yogaśataka*), PK AS 9B b6 (medical), THT 364 b1, THT 2677.d b1 (literary), W10 a3; a4, W19 b3, W24 a3 (medical)
- TB *kuñcitāṣṣe* adj. THT 27 a8 (doctrinal), THT 497 b4; b9, W4 a4; b2, W6 b1, W21 b2, W23 a2, W27 a3; b3, W30 b4, W31 b2, W33 b2, W34 a4, W35 a5 (medical)
- TB *kuñcitāṣṣe* adj. THT 497 b5 (medical)
- TB *kuñcitāṣe* THT 2348.i b2 (literary), THT 2347.a a2, b3 (literary)
- The TB *-ṣṣe* adjective can refer to milk (*malkwer*), oil (*ṣalype*) or taste (*śūke*, only in THT 27, not medical).
- TA *kuñcitši* adj. ‘pertaining to sesame’ A 103 a5, A 152 a3, A 153 b6 (literary)
- TA *kuñcit* PK NS 2 a2 (medical)
- TA *kuñcitaśśāl* PK NS 3 b1 (medical)

Khotanese occurrences

- In Old Khotanese, the form is *kuṁjsata*- ‘sesame’, see Sgh 72.2, 73.1, 88.2.¹⁶⁵
- The most frequent form in Late Khotanese is *kuṁjsa*-, see Si 9v1, 16v2, 100r3, 101v2, 106r3, 132v3, 133r2, 142v1, 142v5, 143r1 (10x), Si P 2892.60; in other medical texts P 2893.35, 46, 48, 80, 89, 113, 120, 127, 131, 147, 158, 211, 218, IOL Khot. S. 9.2, 24, 31, 35, 40,¹⁶⁶ P 2781.29, in documents P 103.52 col. 2.1 (SDTV: 158). Without anusvāra (*kujsa*-), see Si 9r4, P 2893.247, 251, 255, 262, KT IV: 26.4, 5, P 103.26.1, *kāmjsa* in P 2893.235 and in the documents P 94.8.4 (SDTV: 98), P 94.23.4,7, P 95.6.2, P 96.4.2, P 96.4.3, P 97.3.2, P 98.6.5, P 98.7.1, P 103.5.2,7, P 103.5.4, P 103.5.8, *kājsa* in P 95.5.6, *kuṁjsa* in JP 95r3, *kuṁjsaṁna* P 2893.56.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁵ Numbers refer to the edition in Canevascini (1993).

¹⁶⁶ = Ch. 00265, see Skjærvø’s catalogue (KMB: 487). It is to be inserted between P 2893.91a and 91b, see Maggi (2008). Maggi (2018: 251 fn. 30) names the resulting medical text ‘Piṇḍaśāstra’. See further Luzziatti (2018–2019: 29–33).

¹⁶⁷ Not to be read *kuṁjsaṁna*, see Luzziatti (2018–2019: 45–46).

- The Old Khotanese adjective *kuṃṣatīnaa-*, 𐰽𐰺𐰍𐰪𐰭𐰏𐰤- ‘pertaining to sesame’ is to be found in Sgh 28.3, 28.4, 37.3, 73.1, 73.2, 74.2, 88.2, Śgs 3.14r3, 3.13v2; 4,¹⁶⁸ IOL Khot 34/2.a1, and IOL Khot 41/1.9.
- The Late Khotanese form of the same adjective is mostly *kuṃṣavīnaa-*: *kuṃṣavīnā* Si 139r2, 141r1, *kuṃṣavīnī* JP 97r2, 97v1, 96v4, 98r2, 98v2, 99v2, *kuṃṣavīnī* JP 99r4, 101v3, *kuṃṣavīnai* Si 15r1, 100v2, 101r3, 104v1, 109v5, 129v4, 130r2, 144r1, 156r1, 156r4, P 2893.165, *kuṃṣavīnai* P 2893.139; without anusvāra *kuṣavīna* Si 155r4, *kuṣavīna* Si 153v4, *kuṣavīnai* Si 128r2, 128r4, 130r3, 130r4, 131r2, 141r3, IOL Khot. S. 9.22, 110, P 2893.167, 256 *kuṣavīnai* Si 129r5, P 2893.179, *kuṣavīna* Si 141r2.
- *kuṃṣārgye* ‘sesame oil-cake’ in Si 9r5, P 2893.83.

Discussion¹⁶⁹

The most recent Tocharian lexicographical works consider the word a loan from Khotanese (DTTA: 148, DoT 193). This *communis opinio* is probably to be traced back to a note by Bailey (1937: 913). However, he does not state that the form was borrowed from Khotanese. He writes instead that the Tocharian B word represents ‘an older stage than Saka *kuṃṣata-*’. He derives the Khotanese form (DKS: 61) from a reconstructed **kuncita-* based on Skt. *kuñcita-*, even if this is used for another type of plant, the *Tabernaemontana coronaria*.¹⁷⁰ The Tocharian and Khotanese occurrences in the *Yogaśataka* and the *Siddhasāra* translate Skt. *tila-* ‘*Sesamum indicum*’, (KEWA I: 504), not *kuñcita-*.

Tremblay (2005: 440) considers it a borrowing from an unspecified ‘Middle Iranian’ source. If the form is Iranian, it is not easy to determine whether the Tocharian word derives from the proto-form **kuncita-*, probably at the origin of Sogdian *kwyšt’yc*,¹⁷¹ Khotanese *kuṃṣata-*, Old Uyghur *künčit*¹⁷² and Middle Persian *kwnc(y)t* (CPD: 52). For Psht. *kunjāla*, an Indian origin is preferred by Morgenstierne.¹⁷³ He extends his hypothesis to all Iranian forms, which he considers Indic loanwords. The Pashto form shares with Khotanese the voiced affricate and a different vowel in the second syllable instead of the expected *-i*.¹⁷⁴ Whereas the voiced dental affricate instead of the voiceless palatal is regular in both languages,¹⁷⁵ no satisfactory explanation for the different vowels is available.

¹⁶⁸ The numbering follows Emmerick (1970: 43–47).

¹⁶⁹ This study has been published in Dragoni (2021).

¹⁷⁰ See Böhtling and Roth (1855–1875: II 70). The word seems to be attested only in lexicographical works. Variants of the same lexeme used to designate other plants are *kuñcika-* ‘*Nigella indica*’ and *kuñci* ‘cumin’.

¹⁷¹ See Gharib (1995: 202). Henning (1946: 734) proposes the following: **kwyšt-* (if = sesame) = *kūišt* < **kūišt* < **kūiñt* < **kūñcit*. An orthographic explanation is preferred by Benveniste (1940: 180) (‘Est-ce une mauvaise graphie pour **kwnšt*?’). A form *kwync’* is also attested in P 29.9 (Sims-Williams and Hamilton 1990: 33), which seems to be phonetically closer to the forms occurring in the neighbouring languages. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer of Dragoni (2021) for this suggestion.

¹⁷² An old loan from Sogdian, according to Tremblay (2005: 440) (?).

¹⁷³ See Morgenstierne (1927: 33) and EDP: 39 ‘certainly’ old loanwords from Indo-Aryan (Skt. *kuñcita-*) into Pashto.

¹⁷⁴ C. Bernard (p.c.) draws my attention to Balochi *kunčat* (beside *kunčit* and *kunčīt*), quoted in Korn (2005: 192), showing the same vowel as Khotanese.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. OKh. *haṃṣaṣ-* < PIr. *ham-čāš-* (SGS: 139) and Pashto *anjór* < PIr. **han-čāra-* (EDP: 9).

Results

It is difficult to trace the history of the word. Since the Indic forms are of late attestation and only occur in lexica, it is dangerous to reconstruct a Proto-Indo-Iranian form. Tremblay's general label 'Middle Iranian' seems the safest solution.¹⁷⁶

TB *KURKAMÄŠŠE* ~ *KWÄRKAMÄŠŠI* 'PERTAINING TO SAFFRON', OKH. *KURKUMA*-* 'SAFFRON'

Tocharian occurrences

- *kurkamäšši* PK AS 3B b5, THT 497 b8, THT 498 a8, W4 b1; b4, W7 b3, W19 b5, W20 a5, W21 b4, W26 b4, W32 a4, W38 a5, W39 a3, W41 b3.
- *kwärkamäšši* W29 b1.
- Both occurrences are from medical texts. THT 2676 a3 *kurku(mä)* /// (at the end of the line) could also be restored as *kurku(mäšše)* (Peyrot 2014: 139 fn. 47).

Khotanese occurrences

- *kurkām* JP 97v3 and P 2893.62
- *kṛrkām* P 2893.57
- *kurkum* Si 10v2
- *kūrkaṃ* JP 108r5
- *kūrkaṃ* JP 105v1
- *kūrkaṃ* JP 44v1
- *kurkumīnā* [...] *prahaunā* 'saffron [...] garments' *Avalokiteśvaradhāraṇi* fol. 9r5 (SDTV 1: 241–42), < adj. *kurkumīnaa*- (KS: 141).

Discussion

It is not here the place to discuss the history of the word, which does not seem to be specifically Iranian and can be traced back in time up until Akkadian *kurkanū* and Greek *κρόκος*.¹⁷⁷

The basis for the Tocharian lexeme must have been provided by a form **kurkuma*-. As in the case of *aṅkwaṣ(t)* and *kuñcit* ~ *kwäñcit* (cf. the relative chapters), **ku* was reinterpreted in Tocharian as *k^w* + *a*, so that we obtain /k^wər^kə^wm/, further dissimilated to /k^wər^kə^m/. The dissimilated form **kurkām* is the basis from which the adjective was derived with accent shift (/k^wər^kə^m/ > /k^wər^kə^m°/). The tiny fragment THT 2676 belongs to one of the earliest Tocharian manuscripts (Peyrot 2014: 139, Malzahn 2007: 267) and has preserved the undissimilated form /k^wər^kə^wm/. Since all Indian forms (CDIAL: n° 3214, cf. Skt. *kuṅkuma*-) have a nasal instead of the expected *-r-*, it is more probable that the Tocharian word derives from Iranian.

Because saffron is known to grow in Persia (Laufer 1919: 320), a Middle Persian origin (ZMP *kwlkwm* (CPD: 52), NP *kurkum*¹⁷⁸) is suggested by Tremblay (2005: 437). Otherwise, the Middle Persian form might have reached Tocharian through Khot. **kurkuma*- (DKS: 63).

¹⁷⁶ On this word and on the Tocharian alternation *ku* ~ *kwä*, see further Bernard (2020: 52–54).

¹⁷⁷ A short summary with further references can be found in KEWA I: 219.

¹⁷⁸ See Hasandust (2015: IV n° 3955).

This reconstruction is confirmed by *kurkumīnaa*- attested in the *Avalokiteśvaradhāraṇi* (cf. *supra*). This is also the form that might be reconstructed for Old Khotanese based on the Late Khotanese occurrences.¹⁷⁹ No special phonetic feature can be attributed to Middle Persian proper.¹⁸⁰ Tremblay's proposal appears arbitrary, and a Middle Persian origin remains highly doubtful. It might be noted further that Sogdian *kwrkwnph*¹⁸¹ remains a less probable candidate because of the final labial plosive. An Iranian origin has also been suggested for Tib. *kur-kum* (Laufer 1916: 474).

Results

It seems safer to consider the Tocharian word as borrowed from a general 'Middle Iranian' context, without further specification.

(14) TAB *KURKAL* 'BDELLIUM', LKH. *GURGULA*- 'ID.'

Tocharian occurrences

- TB PK AS 8A b9 *kurkalä*
- TB PK AS 8C a5 *kurkalä tuñe* 'perfume of bdellium'
- TA PK NS 3 a3 *kurkal*

Khotanese occurrences

- Si §2.4 *gūrgūlā bu* 'perfume of bdellium'
- Si §24.12 *gurgula bu* 'id.'
- PiŚ §22.4 *gurgula bū* 'id.'

Discussion

Although a form *gulgulu*- exists in Late Vedic (MW: 360),¹⁸² Emmerick (1985: 303) decided nevertheless to take the Khotanese form *gurgula*- as a hyper-sanskritised form of Skt. *guggulu*-, more frequent in the medical literature. Luzzi (2018–2019: 66–67) prefers a direct derivation from Skt. *gulgulu*-. *guggulu*- is indeed more frequent in the medical jargon. Moreover, according to Potts *et al.* (1996), *guggulu*- is the original form, borrowed during the first half of the first millennium BCE from Akkadian *guhlu* 'id.'¹⁸³ Emmerick's option seems to be the safest solution.

Tocharian B *kurkal* may have been borrowed from LKh. *gurgula*-, as this is the only language with *-rg-* instead of Indic *-lg-*. Because of the absence of the word-final vowel in Tocharian B, the dating of the borrowing should be placed after the Old Khotanese period (cf. *añkwaṣ(t)*). The Tocharian B word was accented on the second syllable (/kurkál/). The vowel correspondence would be Khot. *u_u* → Toch. *u_ə*, exactly as in TB *kurkam*°, q.v. If one

¹⁷⁹ For the alternation *-ām/-ūm* and *u/ū*, frequent in Late Khotanese, see Dresden (1955: 406 [2] and [4]).

¹⁸⁰ I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer of Dragoni (2021) for this remark.

¹⁸¹ P 3.173, 271 (Benveniste 1940: 67 and 71).

¹⁸² The word is found in the *Atharvaveda* (book 19), both in the Śaunaka and in the Paippalāda recension. On these occurrences, see Potts *et al.* (1996: 298–301).

¹⁸³ I am grateful to A. Lubotsky for this reference.

considers the word a loanword also into Khotanese, one could assume that the accent of the Khotanese lexeme was also located on the second syllable, perfectly matching the Tocharian form.

Results

It is suggested that TB *kurkal* ‘bdellium’ may be a loanword from LKh. *gurgula-* ‘id.’. The dating of the borrowing may be placed after the Old Khotanese stage.

(15) TB *KETO* ‘PROPERTY, ESTATE’, PTK **GĒΘA-* ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- perl. sg./gen. sg. Ot. 19.1 a2-3 *ynaiymyāṣṣi ketasa cāneṃ kamānte yāltse piś kānte · tāy saṅkrāmiññai ketāntse* ‘(The people) of Ynaimya carried (here) the coins (produced in? / as the price of?) the field: one thousand five hundred. (The four limits) of this field belong to the monastery.’ (Ching 2010: 323)
- obl. sg. PK DA M 507.32 a11 *mākte saṅkrām wtetse keta mā ·ā ·kaṃ saṅkantse ayāto nesaññe mā karsnatār* ‘So that the monastery will not (lose?) estate again, (so that) the well-being of (my) *saṃgha* will not be spoilt.’ (cf. Ching 2010: 227)
- obl. sg. PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a105 *po puttewante keta pāst m· ///* ‘All the estate (that) Puttewante has ... away ...’ (cf. Ching 2010: 217)
- adj. *ketāṣṣe* HWB 74(4) a1 *utpat cāñi esalyi ketāṣṣi* ‘The revenue (of) coins pertaining to the estate inside the boundary.’ (Ching 2010: 311)

Discussion

The Tocharian B word obl. sg. *keta* ‘estate, property’ has been the object of several discussions. In this section, after discussing the previous literature, I will propose a possible reconstruction of the nom. sg. of *keta*. In the second part, I will suggest that the word may be a loanword from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese outcome of PIr. **gaiṑa-* ‘property’. The results of the investigation will be summarised in the third part.

On the nom. sg. of the Tocharian B obl. sg. *keta*

Only an obl. sg. *keta* may be extracted from the occurrences above. The identity of the final vowel of the nom. sg. needs to be clarified, and different proposals have been put forward. Whereas the *communis opinio* (TEB) wants to set up a nom. sg. *keta**, Malzahn (2011: 86 fn.9) suggested that the nom. sg. may have been *keto**. Her proposal is based on a derivation of the substantive from a Prakrit form *khetta-* ‘field’ (Skt. *kṣetra-*, cf. *infra*), first adapted as **ket*, as regular in Indic loanwords into Tocharian B. She speculates that a ‘by-form’ *keto** may have also existed, which could have entered the TB *-o/-a* declension. In support of this, she adduces the fact that at least four Buddhist Sanskrit loanwords into Tocharian B show a nom. sg. in *-o*:

- *karuno* ‘pity’ (THT 333 b7), *curmo* ‘powder’ (THT 2348e b2), *dhyāno* ‘meditation’ (THT 333 b6), *padārtho* ‘category’ (THT 182 a3; a4; b2) (cf. also the table in Malzahn 2012: 54–60).

Malzahn's hypothesis of a nom. sg. *keto** can hardly be defended. The four words may be probably explained away as cases of mobile *-o*. In the same prose text, one also finds *ke_uwco* (THT 334 a4) for classical *kauc*. As it is found quite frequently in the same text and also in originally Tocharian words, the final *-o* may have nothing to do with Buddhist Sanskrit terms or Tocharian inflectional patterns.

On the other hand, the classical assumption that an *-a/-a* declension type¹⁸⁴ existed in Tocharian B is also problematic. The only assured member would be *yasa* 'gold' (Malzahn 2011: 84), a word that might be interpreted as a loanword from Proto-Samoyedic (Peyrot 2019: 101). Apart from the unsure *śalna*, whose nom. sg. may have also ended in *-a* according to Malzahn (2011: 85), the other five members of this class (*pilta* 'leaf', *weta* 'fight', *śarka* 'song', *śāmpa* 'conceit' and *keta* 'estate') are all attested only in the obl. sg. Notably, I have shown that two of these five substantives (*śarka* and *śāmpa*) may be very old loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese and may have had a nom. sg. in *-o* (cf. s.v. *śarko** and *śāmpo**). It is difficult not to consider the option that also *keta* may be seen as a Khotanese loanword and may have had a nom. sg. *keto**.

In addition to these arguments, it seems that a form *keto* is attested in the Tocharian B magical fragment PK AS 8B:

- PK AS 8B a2 *suśākhne khadirāṣṣe ṣat twer(e)ne tsapanale kete ṇ(e)mtsa yāmām su keto māske(t)rā (kwri) sālkam mokṣa* 'In [the lunar mansion] Suśākha¹⁸⁵ a piece [thorn?] of khadira [wood] [= Acacia catechu] [is] to be crushed in the door, in whose name one does [that], this one will be destroyed. [If] one pulls [it] out, [it means] release [= Skt. *mokṣaḥ*].' (CEToM, Pinault and Malzahn eds.)

Adams (DoT: 204) tentatively proposed a meaning '± harmed, destroyed' or (n.) '± damage' (?) based on the context. Pinault and Malzahn (*apud* CEToM) tentatively connected this word to TA *kat* 'destruction, damage' (in the phrase *kat yām-*).¹⁸⁶ Whereas the connection of the Tocharian A word with *keta/kete* 'damaged' (DTTA: 97) is no more actual – the word has been recognised as *keta* 'estate' – the connection with *keto* is possible, but remains hypothetical. I would like to recognise in *keto* in PK AS 8B a2 the lost nom. sg. of *keta*. A translation 'property' fits very well the context of the fragments:

- 'In [the lunar mansion] Suśākha a piece of khadira [wood] [= Acacia catechu] [is] to be crushed in the door; in whose name one does [that], this one will be his property. [If] one pulls [it] out, [it means] release [= Skt. *mokṣaḥ*].'

Two additional arguments support this identification: a. the preceding line speaks about two spells 'to make subject living beings' (*onolmeṇ ekalmī yāmtsi* PK AS 8B a1), which is the same as 'making one his own property' (*keto*); b. the following indication ('[If] one pulls [it]

¹⁸⁴ On the members of this declension pattern, which could have been old plurals, cf. recently Del Tomba (2020: 198–99).

¹⁸⁵ For TB *suśākh* instead of Skt. *viśākha-* for the name of the 16th lunar mansion, cf. also OÜygh. *śuśak* (HWA: 658).

¹⁸⁶ The same derivation is proposed by Schmidt for the almost completely restored (*ke*)t(*omc*) in THT 1540 a+b a2, which he translates as 'hilflos' (Schmidt 2007: 325).

out, [it means] release [= Skt. *mokṣaḥ*]') is understandable only with the assumption that the preceding sentence may have entailed the submission of a man to one's own wish.

Therefore, I propose that the nom. sg. of *keta* 'estate, property' can be identified as *keto*, attested in PK AS 8B a2.

On the etymology of TB *keto*

As noted, a nom. sg. in *-o* may point to a loanword from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. I propose that TB *keto* was borrowed from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese outcome of PIr. **gaiθa-* (acc. sg. PTK **gēθu*), designating the livestock or the 'worldly' possessions in Old Iranian (hence 'property'). For the meaning 'property', one may compare MMP *gyh* (see a more detailed treatment of PIr. **gaiθa-* s.v. *kito**). Tocharian borrowed the same word twice, first from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, meaning 'property' and later from the Pre-Khotanese acc. sg. **gīθu* 'help' → TB *kito** 'help' (see s.v.). Noteworthy are the two different stages in the development of the Proto-Iranian diphthong **ai* > PTK **ē* > PK, OKh. **ī* and the preservation of the Old Iranian semantics before the development to 'help', attested in Old Khotanese.

Results

I suggest that the nom. sg. of *keta* 'estate, property' may be recognised in TB *keto*, attested in PK AS 8B a2. The new translation contributes to a better understanding of the text. It is proposed that TB *keto* may have been borrowed from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese acc. sg. **gēθu* 'property', the outcome of PIr. **gaiθa-*.

(16) TB *keś A kaś* 'NUMBER', OKh. *haṃkhīś-* 'TO COUNT'

Discussion

I propose that TB *keś* TA *kaś* was borrowed into Proto-Tocharian from a nominal form of the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent of the Old Khotanese verb for 'to count', i.e. OKh. *haṃkhīś-*. The first part of this investigation will assess the previous etymological proposals for TB *keś A kaś*. The second will be devoted to the analysis of the Khotanese vocabulary related to numbers and counting. The third will outline a borrowing scenario and address problems of chronology and reconstruction of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese.

Tocharian B *keś A kaś* 'number'

The meaning of the word is undisputed. As for its usage, the following phrases and derivatives can be identified (Hilmarsson 1991: 155–57):

- B *snai (yarm) keś A sne (yärm) kaś* 'without (measure and) number'
- B *keś tāttalñe* 'Samyak-saṃkalpa (right resolve)'
- A *kālymeyā kaś tā(lune)///* 'Samyak-saṃkalpa'
- B *keś weñ-* 'recite in order (?)'
- B *keś tās-* 'judge, consider, weigh'
- B *keś yam-* 'count'
- B *keś ak-* 'to pay attention to'

- B *kešne* (loc.) ‘in total (frequent in documents)’.
- A *kašaṃ y-* ‘to follow, lit. go in a row (loc.)’
- A *kašaṣi* (adj.) ‘pertaining to numbers’
- A *kašom* (adj.) ‘counted, counting’
- A *kašal* (adj./adv.) ‘together, conjoint, in conjunction’

TB *keš* TA *kaš* is the usual word for ‘number’ in Tocharian. TB *snai keš* TA *sne kaš* translate Skt. *asaṃkhyeya-* ‘innumerable (*a-saṃkhyā*, lit. ‘no (or without) number’, cf. also ZMP *a-marag*, *an-ōsmār*).

Duchesne-Guillemin (1941: 158) proposed the following etymology for *keš*: ‘B *keš* A *kaš* ‘nombre’ viennent de **q^wek(s)* ‘apparaître, voir, montrer’, (...) qui donne skr. *caṣṭe* (plur. *caṣṭate*) ‘apparaître, voir, regarder, etc.’, et plus particulièrement, en composition: ‘annoncer, montrer’, av. *čaṣte* ‘il enseigne’, m. ir. *čāšītan* ‘enseigner’ et surtout (...) av. *a-hq-xš-ta-* ‘innombrable’ (Bartholomae, s.v.) qui éclaire à souhait l’évolution sémantique de la racine en tokharien’. Other proposals are to be traced back on the one hand to Van Windekens (VW: 190), who reconstructed a PIE **kons-ti* from the root **kens-* ‘to say something, to speak in a solemn manner, etc.’ On the other hand, rejecting these previous proposals, Hilmarsson (1991: 158–59, 1996: 212) suggested that TB *keš* TA *kaš* could be derived from the Proto-Indo-European root **kas-/kos-* ‘in continuous sequence with, following upon’. He extracted a meaning ‘series, sequence’ from *keš* as attested in the phrase *keš weñ-* (cf. *supra*) ‘to recite in sequence’ and argued that the meaning ‘number’ could be a later, secondary development. As for the declension pattern, he reconstructed a **-ti* stem with nom. sg. **kešce* (or already *keše*), obl. sg. **keš* (type *meñe – meñ*, see Del Tomba 2020: 59). Since a nom. sg. *keš* is actually attested, Hilmarsson (1996: 137) is forced to admit a generalization of the oblique form, which ousted the original nom. sg. **keše*. On PIE **kas-/kos-*, see in detail Klingenschmitt (1975) and Beekes (2010: 760, 615).

Hilmarsson’s derivation is problematic. In Tocharian there is no trace of forms with *šc*; only *ś* is attested. This is at variance with what is known about the Tocharian B change *šc > ś* that appears to be exclusively late and colloquial (Peyrot 2008: 70). One should expect to find a *šc*-form in the earliest occurrences of *keš*, but no such form has been detected yet. Further, Hilmarsson’s derivation is semantically problematic.¹⁸⁷ The meaning ‘series, sequence’ can only be extracted from a single, late, and colloquial Tocharian B phrase. Every other occurrence of the word, both in A and in B, points to ‘number, counting’. Because *keš* cannot be forced into any known Tocharian declension pattern, and it always shows the same zero-ending with palatalisation, it could be a loanword. In the following subsection, it will be shown that a possible donor language may have been Khotanese.

‘Number’ in Khotanese

Because of the absence of the final vowel in the Tocharian lexeme, Old Steppe Iranian as a donor language can be safely excluded. Several economic terms in Tocharian were borrowed from Khotanese into Tocharian at a very early stage in the history of Khotanese, i.e. from Pre-Khotanese or even Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese. The most famous example is TB *pito*, q.v., borrowed from the Pre-Khotanese acc. sg. **pīθu*. It seems justified to analyse in detail the words for ‘number’ in Khotanese, in search of a possible source. The most plausible candidate

¹⁸⁷ It should be noted that also the previous etymologies (cf. *supra*) are semantically problematic.

is the Old Khotanese verb *haṃkhiysa*-* ‘to count’ (with ptc. *haṃkhiṣṭa*-), from which the subst. OKh. *haṃkhiysa*- ‘number’ (KS: 11), *haṃkhiysgyā*- ‘counting’ (KS: 207), the verb *haṃkhiś*- : *haṃkhiṣṭa*- ‘to count’ (SGS: 136) and the negative adjective *anaṃkhiṣṭa*- ‘unnumbered’ and *aha(m)khiysa*- ‘numberless’ were formed.

The underlying Proto-Iranian root is usually identified with **xaif*- ‘to rise, ascend; increase’ (EDIV: 440–41) and has no assured Old Iranian or Proto-Indo-European antecedents. The difficult hapax Av. *ahaxšta*- ‘innumerable’, which Leumann (1912: 31–32) first sought to connect with OKh. *anaṃkhiṣṭa*-, remains of uncertain interpretation (EDIV: 442). It is important to note that the meaning ‘to count’ is only attested in Khotanese, and only with the preverb *ham*-;¹⁸⁸ the Proto-Iranian root **xaif*- can be combined in Khotanese also with other preverbs, but the meanings are very different.

OKh. *haṃkhiś*-, TB *keś* A *kaś*

Among the possibilities listed above, the most likely source seems to be the verb *haṃkhiś*-. It is not necessary to comment on the correspondence Khot. *kh* ~ TAB *k* and Khot. *ś* ~ TAB *ś*. Three problems deserve a more detailed discussion: 1. the fate of the preverb *ham*-, of which no trace is visible in TB *keś*; 2. the absence of final -o, which is one of the features of the oldest Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian; 3. the vowel TB *e*.

1. The absence of the preverb *ham*- can be accounted for by examining other Khotanese loanwords derived from a source with initial *ham*-. These are *ampoño* ‘rottenness, infection’, *ampa* (v.) ‘to rot, decay’, *eñcuwo* ‘iron’ and possibly *keś* ‘number’. For *ampoño* and *ampa*- (q.v.), a margin of uncertainty was noted as for their origin: are both words derived from two different Late Khotanese sources (LKh. **haṃbvauña*- and LKh. *haṃbva*-, both < OKh. *haṃbūta*-) or is *ampoño* a Tocharian formation based on the verb *ampa*-, borrowed from Khotanese? To answer this question, it is necessary to examine *eñcuwo*, which is most likely borrowed from PTK **hénswanya*-, the ancestor of OKh. *hiśšana*- (cf. Peyrot, Dragoni, and Bernard 2022). The source of *keś* may be sought in a formation based on the verb *haṃkhiś*-, i.e. *haṃkhiśV** (more details below under 3.). The main difference between the source forms PTK **hénswanya*- and *haṃkhiśV** lies in the position of the accent. The following rule for the borrowing of the preverb *ham*- into Tocharian from Khotanese can be thus formulated: it is preserved under the accent and otherwise dropped without leaving any trace. A similar phenomenon may be observed for Wakhi, cf. the related verb *giz* : *gəzd*- ‘to get up’ < **ham-xaij*- (Steblin-Kamenskij 1999: 177). A similar rule seems to have been active also in a certain period of the history of Pashto (cf. *bán* ‘co-wife’ < **ha-páθnī*-, Cheung 2010: 118).¹⁸⁹ Returning to *ampoño*, the fact that this word was not accented on the first syllable in Tocharian excludes a direct derivation from a reconstructed LKh. **haṃbvauña*-.

It should be stressed that the new interpretation of TB *eñcuwo* and TB *keś* as loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese delivers crucial pieces of evidence on the history of the accentual system of Khotanese, a still imperfectly known topic in the linguistic history of this language. Even if limited, the information that can be extracted from these prehistoric loanwords confirms the hypothesis formulated by Nicholas Sims-Williams in a study of metre and

¹⁸⁸ The phonological and semantic similarity with Skt. *saṃkhyā*- ‘number’ (cf. especially the same preverb and the *kh* element) should be the object of more detailed research.

¹⁸⁹ I am grateful to C. Bernard for this reference.

stress in the Book of Zambasta.¹⁹⁰ In this study, he argues that the general tendency was to fix the stress on the verbal root, but ‘nominal derivatives of root with preverbs may be stressed on the prefix’. As an example, he quotes *pāljsāta-* ‘surrounded’ (Z 17.26) and *pāljsātā-* ‘garden’, which should have been stressed on the first syllable because of the weakening of the second vowel. Similarly, the infinitive PTK **ham-xězi* (see *infra*) maintained the stress on the root, and PTK **hěnswanyā-* was stressed on the prefix. As no verb **hamb(u)ν-* is attested in Khotanese, one could surmise that OKh. *hambūta-* ‘fester’ and LKh. *hambva-* ‘id.’ were regarded as nominal derivatives and were therefore stressed on the first syllable.

2. According to this rule, one should expect ***kešo* in Tocharian B. However, Tocharian B final *-o* is the adaptation of the acc. sg. ending of a Khotanese substantive. Since no derivative of the verb *hamkhīs-* is attested in Khotanese, a possible source form may be sought in an infinitive derived from the present stem, i.e. OKh. *hamkhīsā** (SGS: 218). In Proto-Iranian terms, this would reflect a formation **ham-xaijyay* (> PTK **ham-xězi* > OKh. *hamkhīsā**). It can be surmised that Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese final *-i* could have been borrowed into Tocharian as *-ə* after palatal, cf. the endings TB */-cə/*, */-ścə/*, */-ñə/* etc. Tocharian *i* was not suitable because it was probably felt as long (< **-əy*).

3. The vowel TB *e A a* is of the utmost importance to determine the dating of the borrowing. As this allows a reconstruction PT **e*, the borrowing can be dated with a fair degree of approximation to the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese stage (PIr. *ai* > PTK *ē* > PK and OKh. *ī*).

Results

Based on the discussion above, the history of the word may be reconstructed as follows: prs. inf. PIr. **ham-xaijyay* > PTK **ham-xězi*¹⁹¹ (OKh. v. *hamkhīs-*) → PT **keś(ə)* > TB *keś*, A *kaś*.

(17) TB *KOTO** ‘± CREVICE, HOLE IN THE GROUND, PIT’, KHOT. *GŪHA-*
‘FAECES’

Tocharian occurrences

- PK AS 7H b3-4 *waše reki no lāre yamantrā tuntse oko(sa) /// nma špä kotaiñ māsentrā* ‘But [if] they love slanderous speech, as a fruit of that ... (on the ground) appear (pebble)s (?) and pits.’ (cf. CEToM, Pinault, Malzahn, Peyrot eds.)
- THT 31 a2-3 *k_use yikne-ritañ sosoyoš weṃsyetsai ramt kotaisa yarkesa wikšeñcañ* ‘Those who, longing for the [right] way, are satisfied and like from a sewer keep away from veneration.’ (CEToM, Fellner ed.)
- THT 33 b6-7 *päklautkäšsat päst pälskonta weṃsyetsai ramt kotaimem* ‘Let [your] thoughts turn away [from it] as from this excrement sewer.’ (CEToM, Fellner ed.)
- THT 42 b5 *laute ka kalloy sāw weṃsyetsai kotaiśc om katoytr arwäre : šuwoy kat-kemane ālisa weṃsy= emntwe mīt śakk. ///* ‘She only needed the chance to find a sewer, she wanted to spread out there [and] gladly then eat the dung from the palm of [her] hand (like) honey and sugar ...’ (CEToM, Fellner ed.)

¹⁹⁰ See Sims-Williams (2022: 73–74).

¹⁹¹ There seem to be no elements to determine whether at this stage PIr. *x* was still *x* or had already undergone strengthening to become *kh*, as Tocharian *k-* could represent both *x-* or *kh-* in the source language. However, because of *sanapa-*, q.v., the fricative is more likely.

Discussion

It is not easy to establish the etymology and meaning of TB *koto**. With regard to the semantics, no exact bilingual evidence is available, even though Adams (DoT: 215) seems to imply that in the *Karmavibhaṅga* passage (PK AS 7H) *koto** could be the translation of Skt. *śvabhra-* ‘hole, pit’. The corresponding Sanskrit passage runs as follows:

- *piśunavacanasyākuśalasya karmapathasya vipākena pṛthivyām śarkara-kāṭhallyādīni duḥkhasaṃsparśādīni prādurbhavanti. tasyaiva karmaṇo vipākena jātivyasanā mitravyasanā bhavanti bhedyah parivāraś ca bhavati.* ‘La calomnie est un Sentier-d’Acte mauvais qui a pour conséquence l’apparition sur le sol de cailloux, de gravier, etc, de matières qui font mal quand on les touche; et en conséquence de cet Acte on a des dissentiments avec les amis, des dissentiments avec les parents, et tout l’entourage est disposé à la désunion’ (§LVI in Lévi 1932: 142).

The equation *koto** = *śvabhra-* seems to have been first suggested by Lévi (1933: 123), but the textual basis of his claim is not known to me. Sieg (1938: 38) is moderately optimistic (‘wohl mit Recht’) about this translation, although he notes that, if Lévi is correct, the Tocharian version may bear more resemblance with an alternative description of the same act extant in the Tibetan version (indicated with T in Lévi 1932). The Tibetan text quoted by Sieg runs as follows (in Lévi’s translation):

- ‘Si on renonce à la calomnie, grâce à la maturation de cet acte, des gorges et des précipices, et des moiteurs ou des vapeurs qui font vomir ne viennent pas à se produire.’ (Lévi 1932: 81).

If one were to take *koto** as corresponding to the ‘moiteurs ou vapeur qui font vomir’ rather than to the ‘gorges et précipices’, a connection with Khot. *gūha-* ‘faeces’ by way of borrowing may be envisaged. The Tocharian B nom. sg. in *-o** may suggest a borrowing from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. Because of the preservation of the dental *t* (← **ʒ*),¹⁹² the Old Khotanese stage can safely be excluded. The borrowing presupposes a source form PTK or PK **gūḍu* (acc. sg.). The vowel assimilation *u_o* > *o_o* has probably taken place within Tocharian B and is reminiscent of *o*-umlaut of schwa or **u* as in *klyomo* ‘noble’ < **kleumōn* and *okso* ‘ox’ < **uksōn*.¹⁹³

This already tentative explanation, however, is made even more difficult by the other three occurrences of the word. These show a phrase *wem̐syetsta koto**, usually translated as ‘sewer, latrine’ based on Lévi’s equation with Skt. *śvabhra-* (‘hole for the excrements’). TB *wem̐syetsta** is an adjectival formation built on TB *wem̐siye* ‘excrement’ and cannot be separated from TB *wem̐ts* ‘urine’. In medical texts, TB *wem̐siye* is the equivalent of Khot. *gūha-*, cf. PK AS 3A b3 *krāṅkaṇe wem̐siye* ‘chicken excrement’¹⁹⁴ and its equivalent LKh. *krrim̐gūha-* (< *krrim̐ga-gūha-*) ‘id.’ The expression may have meant ‘excrement’ or ‘faeces’, a hendiadys formed by an inherited (?) and a borrowed substantive.¹⁹⁵ I would also propose that this

¹⁹² Cf. the case of Khot. *pīha-* and TB *pito*, q.v.

¹⁹³ For this development, cf. also s.v. *cowo**.

¹⁹⁴ See also s.v. *kraṅko*.

expression may have been created within a medical environment. Therefore, *koto** may have entered the Tocharian lexicon from the medical jargon.

Results

The Tocharian B substantive *koto**, usually translated as ‘hole, pit’ based on a problematic equation with Skt. *śvabhra-*, may have been borrowed from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese acc. sg. **gūḡu*, the antecedent of Khot. *gūha-* ‘excrement, faeces’. The Tocharian word may also be translated as ‘excrement’ rather than ‘hole, pit’. Alternatively, a semantic shift ‘excrement’ > ‘hole for the excrements’ may have occurred within Tocharian. The word may have entered the Tocharian lexicon from the medical jargon.

TB *KONTSO** ‘?’, OKh. *GGAMJSĀ-* ‘FLAW’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 325 a1 *klyiye šamānentse asām nātkaṃ āmapi kontsaisa wat mant tsā ///*
‘If a woman knocks against the seat of a monk, or he [raises her up] by both ...
///’ (Ogihara 2009: 288)

Discussion

The meaning of the hapax *kontsaisa* in THT 325 a1 is unknown. Since the nom. sg. can be reconstructed as *kontso**, it may be a loanword from OKh. *ggamjsā-* ‘flaw’ or from its Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese antecedent. This would involve a later inner-Tocharian vowel assimilation *a_o > o_o*, for which cf. also s.v. *kompō** and *sanapa-* (prs. *sonop-*). The perlativ *kontsaisa* could be tentatively translated as ‘by mistake’. This would allow the following translation:

- ‘If a woman knocks against the seat of a monk, or he (will rise [*tsā(ñkaṃ)*]), *āmapi* (= by intention?) by mistake (= transgression)’.

The hapax *āmapi* is of unclear interpretation. Peyrot (2008: 58) suggested that it could stand for *āntpi* ‘both’,¹⁹⁵ but the phonological passages required by this interpretation are difficult. Because of this new interpretation of *kontsaisa*, a meaning ‘by intention’ may tentatively be suggested, even if the word remains obscure. It is noteworthy that OKh. *ggamjsā-* translates Skt. *doṣa-* (Suv II: 259). Here the reference may be to Skt. *duṣkṛta-*, which appears as a borrowing from Sanskrit in the same line (THT 325 a1 *duṣkär*) and is the general subject of this Vinaya fragment.

Results

The hapax *kontsaisa* (THT 325 a1) may be tentatively connected to OKh. *ggamjsā-* ‘flaw’ by way of borrowing from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. The resulting translation fits the overall context of the text.

¹⁹⁵ Alternatively, it may also be possible that the Tocharian word meant ‘pit for faeces’, by metonymy from a source form meaning ‘faeces’.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. earlier Sieg and Siegling (1953: 209).

TB *KOMPO** ‘?’, OKH. *GGAMPHA*- ‘PLAIN’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 588 a1 (*winamā*)*ññi pyapyai*cci *wawakāṣ po kompaino ayato eśnaisāñ* ‘Flowery pleasure-gardens abloom, all *kompaino* a pleasure to the eyes’ (cf. DoT: 216).

Discussion

The Tocharian B hapax *kompaino* is of unknown origin. As remarked by Adams (1999: 202, DoT: 216), the form may be analysed as a plural *kompaiṃ** (< *kompaiñ**, with mobile -o) and may point to a nom. sg. *kompo**.¹⁹⁷ Since a nom. sg. in -o may suggest an old loanword from Khotanese, I propose that *kompo** may be connected to the Old Khotanese substantive *ggampha*- ‘plain’ or ‘*yojana* (as a measure)’ (DKS: 79) by way of borrowing. The two meanings may both fit the Tocharian occurrence:

- ‘Flowery pleasure-gardens abloom, each *yojana*/plain (land) a pleasure to the eyes.’

For the assimilation *a_o* > *o_o* in Tocharian B, see also s.v. *kontso** and *koro*.

It is questionable that the Tocharian A substantive *kāmpo* ‘circle (?)’, of unknown origin and uncertain meaning (DTTA: 132), also belongs here. The semantics and the vowel of the first syllable are difficult to reconcile with TB *kompo**.

Results

The Tocharian B hapax *kompo** may be a loanword from the Old Khotanese acc. sg. *ggamphu* ‘*yojana*, plain’. The dating of the borrowing may be posited in the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese stage, as no features enable a more precise periodisation. It is difficult to include also TA *kāmpo* ‘circle (?)’ in this group of words.

TB *KORO* ‘MULE’, OKH. **GGŪRA*- ‘WILD ASS’ OR OKH. *KHARA*- ‘DONKEY’

Discussion

Pinault (2008: 392–93) established the meaning of TB *koro* as ‘mule’¹⁹⁸ and connected it to the substrate word **k^hara*- ‘donkey’ (Lubotsky 2001: 311).¹⁹⁹ Pinault’s (l.c.) interpretation involves analogy with *okso* ‘ox’ for the declension pattern and umlaut *a_o* > *o_o*.²⁰⁰

Because of the final -o, an alternative derivation from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese may be proposed. As the substrate word **k^hara*- is also attested in Khotanese as *khara*-, one might hypothesise a borrowing from Khotanese as **karo*, which

¹⁹⁷ Less likely, but also theoretically possible, is the hypothesis of a nom. sg. *kompaino*.

¹⁹⁸ Adams (DoT: 218) prefers ‘camel’, with reference to Gandh. *kori*. Should the connection with the Gāndhārī word and its meaning ‘camel’ be correct, the theory presented in this study cannot be considered valid anymore.

¹⁹⁹ On this connection, see also Bernard (2023: 216–18).

²⁰⁰ For a recent treatment of this word in connection with TB *kercao* ‘donkey’, see Bernard (l.c.).

developed into *koro* through umlaut (cf. *supra*). A widespread word for the ‘wild ass’, or ‘onager’ is PIr. **gaura-*, for which cf. MP *gōr* (CPD: 37), MSogd. *γwr* (DMSB: 90) and NP *gōr*. One may also compare Ved. *gaurá-* (EWA I: 503), designating another animal, the Bos gaurus. Since a direct borrowing from Sogdian would leave the final *-o* unexplained, I would suggest that the same word was present in Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, even if it is not attested in the Khotanese and Tumshuqese text corpus. The Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese source form for TB *koro* may have been an acc. sg. **gōru*. Both words (**k^hara-* and **gaura-*) are widely attested within Iranian and may have been easily borrowed into Tocharian from Khotanese. However, since the outcome of **gaura-* does not occur in Khotanese, a loanword from *khara-* appears more likely.

Results

It is suggested that TB *koro* ‘mule’ may be a loanword from the Khotanese acc. sg. *kharu* ‘donkey’ (→ TB **karo* > *koro* by umlaut). Alternatively, it may be a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese borrowing in Tocharian B from a reconstructed acc. sg. **gōru*. Although not attested in Khotanese, the word represents a widespread designation of the ‘wild ass’, or ‘onager’ in Iranian languages.

TB *-kKE*, *-kKA*, *-kKO* (SUFFIX)

Discussion

The most recent treatment of the Tocharian B suffixes *-kke*, *-kka*, and *-kko* can be found in Malzahn (2013: 112–14).²⁰¹ Since these suffixes are not frequently attested, it is difficult to establish their precise function and morphological behaviour. The suffixes are attached to substantives to form other substantives. Only one lexeme shows *-kke* attached to an adjective to form another adjective: TB *larekke** ‘dear’ (*lare* ‘id.’) occurring in the *Araṇemijātaka* (THT 85 a3) in the form of the voc. sg. m. *larekka*. The meaning of TB *naumikke** (< *naumiye* ‘jewel’) is not clear (DoT: 372 has ‘shining’, but see Pinault 2011 for a different proposal), and no base is attested for TB *malyakke* ‘youthful (?)’.

The function of these suffixes is twofold. Two examples show that they were used to form diminutives: TB *tanākko* ‘grain seed’, from *tāno* ‘corn of grain’ (see Peyrot 2018b: 257) and perhaps *naumikke** ‘little jewel’ (Pinault 2011: 182). The suffixes may have developed a ‘cari-tative’ connotation from the diminutive function, like in TB *appakke* ‘daddy’, from *āppo** ‘father’. On the other hand, as shown by the case of TB *yirmakka** ‘(female) treasurer, meas-urer’,²⁰² from *yarm* ‘measure’, the suffix *-kka* is used to form *nomina agentis*. The most wide-spread use of the suffixes, however, concerns personal names. A preliminary list of these names ending in *-kke* or *-kka* is given in the following list:

- *atakke*, *aṣtamikka*, *kuṃñcakke*, *koñikka*, *kotaikke* (or *konaikke?*), *korakke*, *capeśakke/capiśakke*, *ñwenakke*, *pällentakke*, *puttikka*, *purnakke*, *malakke*, *mäkkokke*, *yarekke*, *wärweśakke*, *wiśikke*

²⁰¹ Cf. also Pinault (2011: 180–83).

²⁰² This word is assumed to be of feminine gender based on the proper name with which it is combined (Malzahn 2013: 113).

Only two can be tentatively etymologised within Tocharian: *ñwenakke* (*ñuwe* ‘new (moon)’) and *pällentakke* (*pälle*_u ‘full (moon)’). According to Malzahn (2013: 113), the name *aṣtamikka* may be based on Skt. *aṣṭamī* ‘eighth (f.)’. Ching (2010: 432) recognises in *capeśakke* a suffixed form of the name *capeś* that she convincingly relates to Sogd. *cp’yš* ‘general’, on which see Yoshida (2004a: 130–32). For *puttikka*, I suggest a tentative connection with BSogd. *pwt(t)y* ‘Buddha’ (Lurje 2010: 313), to which a *ka*-suffix may have been added, either already in Sogdian or directly in Tocharian B.²⁰³ A Sogdian origin may also be tentatively proposed for *wärweśakke*, which I would connect with the element *wyrwys*^o in the Sogdian name *wyrwysprn* (Lurje 2010: 426). The Tocharian B palatal *ś*, however, is not expected. Likewise, *purnakke* may conceal the Sogdian adjective *pwrn* ‘full’, in the sense of ‘full (moon)’, for which one may compare the proper name *pällentakke* (cf. *supra*).

The Tocharian B proper name *mäkkokke*, attested in SI B Toch 12 a2, deserves a more detailed analysis. I suggest that *mäkkokke* is connected with the Khotanese name *mukauka* – as it occurs in IOL Khot Wood 6 b3, a wooden tablet found in Farhad-beg-yailaki containing a list of proper names. As the Khotanese name was probably /mu'koka-/, it provides a suitable source form for TB *mäkkokke* (/mäkkókke/). The final *-e* instead of the expected *-o* may be another example of inner-Tocharian morphological adaptation (cf. *kräke*). Thus, the name may have identified a person from Khotan. As for the etymology of the Khotanese name, Michaël Peyrot (p.c.) puts forward the hypothesis that it could be based on a loanword from TB *moko* ‘elder’. For the correspondence between Khotanese *u* and Tocharian B *o* in the first syllable, one may compare OKh. *puka* ‘cubit’, a loanword from TB *poko** ‘arm’ (KT VI: 197, Tremblay 2005: 444).²⁰⁴ Thus, TB *o* may have been adapted as OKh. *u* in borrowings from Tocharian B. The possibility that TB *moko* ‘elder’ could have been borrowed into Khotanese is further backed by the fact that TB *ktsaitstse* ‘old’ is found in the South of the Tarim Basin as a loanword into Niya Prakrit (*kitsayitsa*-, see Burrow 1937: 82).

The newly discovered correspondence TB *kk* ~ Khot. *k*, found in the proper name TB *mäkkokke*, allows a fresh examination of the origin of the suffixes *-kke*, *-kka* and *-kko*. It is difficult to posit an Indo-European origin for these suffixes. The ending nom. sg. *-o* supports a possible Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese origin. The diminutive function and its use in the formation of *nomina agentis* are comparable to its Proto-Iranian (and Khotanese) counterpart **-ka*-. In Khotanese, the *-k*- of this Proto-Iranian suffix is regularly lost in intervocalic position. The *ka*-suffix attested in Khotanese, productive in every stage of the language, may be better explained with Degener (KS: 181) as the product of a strengthening of the *ka*-suffix through another *ka*-suffix, i.e. **-ka-ka-* > **-kka-* > *-ka-*.²⁰⁵ A Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese stage **-kka-* may have been borrowed into Tocharian B as *-kko*. *-kke* and *-kka* may have been created later within Tocharian B: *-kka* may be the feminine counterpart of *-kko*, and *-kke* may have been a morphological adaptation used for adjectives and proper names.²⁰⁶

²⁰³ Alternatively, Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.) suggests comparing Pkt. *putti* ‘daughter’ (CDIAL: 468).

²⁰⁴ It is worth noting that the OKh. nom.-acc. pl. *puke* (Z 22.124) shows that *puka*- may have been originally neuter in Khotanese. It is tempting to explain the choice of the neuter gender in Khotanese as due to the Tocharian B ending *-o* of the source form *poko**, which could have been interpreted as the neuter nom.-acc. sg. ending *-u* by Khotanese speakers. On this issue, see in detail §5.2.1.

²⁰⁵ Alternatively, A. Lubotsky (p.c.) suggests a possible original **-ta-ka-* > **-tka-* > **-kka-* > **-ka-*.

Results

The Tocharian B suffixes *-kke*, *-kka*, and *-kko* may have been borrowed from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese suffix **-kka-* (< **-ka-ka-*) that yielded OKh. *-ka-*.

(18) TB *KRAŅKO* ‘CHICKEN’, KHOT. *KṚŅGA-* ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- nom. sg. THT 549 a5 *kukkuṭa* • *kraŋko* [Skt.] *kukkuṭa*, [TB] chicken.’ (Animals of the zodiac cycle, bilingual Sanskrit-Tocharian, cf. Lüders 1940: 741–42)
- com. sg. IOL Toch 127 a1 *postaññe kr(a)ŋkaiṃp(a)* • ‘Finally with a chicken.’ (CETOM, Peyrot ed.)
- nom. sg. IOL Toch 871 b3 /// • *krānk* /// ‘Chicken.’ (Isolated, context broken, see CETOM, Peyrot ed.)
- perl. pl. PK AS 16.8 a4 *śaŋki-y(o)kāṃ krānkaiṃtsa* ‘With chickens of the colour of a shell (Skt. *śaṅkha*-?).’
- adj. *krāṅkaññe* nom. sg. PK AS 3A b3 *krāṅkañe weṃṣiye* • ‘Chicken excrement.’ (CETOM, Pinault, Malzahn, Peyrot eds.)
- adj. *krāṅkaiññe* THT 1520 a3 /// [ge] *ma krāṅkaiññi śīmā[nta] śamiññe [pre] ge* – /// ‘... the roofs (?) pertaining to the chickens ...’ (Malzahn 2007: 274; for the text, see Peyrot 2014: 145)
- adj. *krāṅkaññe* W39 b3 • *krāṅkaññe yotsa laupe kā(tsa) yāmu* ‘With chicken broth [as] a salve [on] the treated stomach.’ (DoT: 554)
- adj. *krāṅkaññe* W14 b1 *smur krāṅkaññai maikisa kauc cañkesa kātso (sono)palya* ‘Smur with chicken broth high over the lap, the stomach [is] to be rubbed.’ (DoT: 737)

Khotanese occurrences

- In Old Khotanese, it occurs as *kṛṅga-* in the *Saṅghāṭasūtra*, see Sgh 51[2] *ne ne ju vara gyasta ne hva’ndā ne banhya o vā kṛṅga vara tto diśo daindā* ‘Neither devas, nor men, nor trees or cocks are (seen) there at all’ (Canevascini 1993: 24) (Skt. *na vṛkṣā na ca pakṣiṇaḥ janam cātra na paśyāma*), Sgh 214.1 *ttāte tcahaurebāstā kūla kṛṅga* ‘These twenty-four crores of cocks’ (Canevascini 1993: 88) (Skt. *te caturviṃśati pakṣiṇa-kukkuṭa-kotyō*), further Sgh 214.4, 214.7, 211.3 (*kṛṃgga*), *-iñā*-adj. Sgh. 168.5 acc. sg. *kṛṃggīnu [śūnu]* ‘[In the womb] of hens’ (Canevascini 1993: 69) (Skt. *kukkuṭa-yonyā*), Z 22.115 *samu hatārra brāhā kṛṅgi* ‘Only once would the cock rise up’ (Emmerick 1968: 307).
- In Late Khotanese, it is attested in the *Siddhasāra*; for the substantive, see Si 17r2 [§3.20.8] *krrimṅā hīya gūṣṭa* ‘The flesh of fowl’ (Tib. *bya gag gi sha*, Skt. *kurkuṭa*-), *-iñā*-adj. Si 148v4 [§26.30] *krrimṅiñe āha hivi dalai* ‘The shell of a fowl’s egg’ (Tib. *khyim byahi sgo ngahi shun lpags*, Skt. *dakṣaṇḍa-tvak*), Si 149r1

²⁰⁶ Given the prevalence of Sogdian loanwords among the Tocharian personal names listed above, one could also suggest a likely Sogdian origin for the suffix *-kke* (when used with proper names), as suggested by N. Sims-Williams (p.c.) with reference to the Sogdian suffix *-kk*.

[§26.31], Si 9r3 [§1.56.8], first member of the compound Si 142v4 [§25.11] *krrimḡūha* ‘Fowl dung’²⁰⁷ (Tib. *bya-gag ... rtug-pa*, Skt. *dakṣa-viḍ*).

- In the *Jivakapustaka* it occurs as *kṛimḡa* (JP 73v1), *krrimḡa* (JP 93r4) and *krraiga* (JP 52r4).
- Additionally, the word occurs in the Si and the JP as the first member of a compound meaning ‘anus’ (for the second member °*rūva-* ‘orifice’ see DKS: 367), a translation of Skt. *guda-* and Tib. *gzhang* or *rkub*. The reason why the compound ‘chicken-orifice’ should translate ‘anus’ remains to be investigated. The occurrences are Si 4v4 [§1.17] *krrimḡa-rūvya* (Tib. *gzhang*, Skt. *guda-*), Si 101r1 [§13.27] *krrimḡa-rūvai* (Tib. *gzhang*, Skt. *guda-*), Si 102r4 [§13.35] (Tib. *gzhang*, Skt. *guda-*), Si 103r1 [§13.39] (Tib. *rkub*, Skt. *guda-*), Si 121v4-5 *krremḡa-rūvya*, JP 56v4 *kṛaiga-rūvya*, JP 67r4 *kṛimḡa-rūviṃ*.
- Other occurrences are IOL Khot 159/6 b3 *krrim[ga]*, IOL Khot 193/9 *krrimḡa*, IOL Khot S. 2.39 *krraga*, BM OA 1919.1-1.0177.1-3 fol. 8 r1 *krriga*, KT II 45.1, 7, 63 *krrimḡä*, Or. 11252/1 r12 *krregä*, P 2893.163 *krremḡä*, P 2893.164 *krregä*, P 2893.165 *krremḡa*, P 2891.20 *krraigä*, M1 r1 *krraiga*.

Discussion

Thanks to bilingual evidence in Khotanese and Tocharian, it is possible to determine the semantic range of both words. They generally refer to ‘chicken’ or ‘hen’.

The origin of the Tocharian word is undisputed. It derives from a nasalised variant of the widely attested Proto-Indo-European onomatopoeic root **krek-*, **kerk-* (Greek *κρέξ* ‘ruff’ [Beekes 2010: 776], Ved. *kṛka-vāku-* ‘cock’ [EWA I: 388], Av. *kahrka-tāt-* ‘cock’ [AIW: 452] and NP *kark* ‘cock, partridge’). Adams (DoT: 229) noted that the same nasalised variant may occur in Germanic (cf. ON *hrang* ‘noise’).

Except for Khotanese, no Indo-European language once spoken in the proximity of the Tocharian-speaking area has a form with a nasal like Tocharian. It would be natural to explain the similarities between the Tocharian and the Khotanese form as due to contact. However, it is hard to establish the direction of borrowing. Adams (DoT: 229) states that the word is a Tocharian borrowing in Khotanese. Del Tomba (2020: 141 fn. 205) is more cautious and admits that both borrowing directions are possible. If the word had been borrowed into Khotanese from Tocharian, one would have expected the second voiceless *-k-* to be preserved as such and not to undergo voicing to *-g-*, as shown by OKh. *kṛiḡa-*. In Khotanese, at least in Indic loanwords, the cluster *-ñk-* remains unchanged and does not undergo voicing. One may compare the following cases:

- OKh. *ahaṃkārä mamaṃkāri* (Z 4.77) < Skt. *ahaṃkāra-*, *mamaṃkāra-*.
- OKh. *saṃkalpa* (Z 4.109) < Skt. *saṃkalpa-*.
- OKh. *saṃkāśi* (Z 23.135) < Skt. *saṃkāśa-*.
- LKh. *pāpaṃkārä* (JS 16r4) < Skt. *pāpamkāra-* (?).
- LKh. *dīpaṃkarä* (JS 23v1) < Skt. *dīpamkāra-*.
- LKh. *sūtrālaṃkārä-śāstri* (IOL Khot S. 5.6) < Skt. *sūtrālaṃkāra-śāstra-*.
- LKh. *pṛrabamkāra* (P 3513.24v2) < Skt. *prabhamkāra-*.

²⁰⁷ With haplogy. On the compound, see also Degener (1987: 32).

Khotanese word-formation shows that *-k-* after nasal could undergo voicing, both in primary and in secondary contact, cf. *haṃggār-* ‘to draw together’ (SGS: 137) < **ham-kāra-* and *haṃgga-* ‘total’ < **hama-ka-*. This supports a Tocharian derivation, but only if the borrowing occurred at an older stage, i.e. before Sanskrit loanwords began to be borrowed into Khotanese.

The opposite borrowing direction (Khotanese → Tocharian) appears unproblematic and involves the usual unvoicing of Khotanese *-g-*. The Tocharian nominative in *-o* would square with other known cases of Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian. As no Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese features can be detected, the dating of the borrowing is difficult to establish. Because of the ending *-o*, a *terminus ante quem* should be the Old Khotanese period. However, one should remember that such an onomatopoeic form may display phonological irregularities. Initial *kr-* does not immediately point to a native Khotanese formation, as one would expect **gr̥ṇga-*. Thus, one cannot exclude that the word was borrowed from another unknown language into Khotanese.

Archaeological findings suggest that the domestic chicken originated in South East Asia and only later spread westwards (Mallory 2015: 18). This may support the hypothesis that the word was borrowed from a neighbouring language into Tocharian.

Results

TB *krañko* and Khotanese *kr̥ṇga-* are probably related through borrowing. However, the direction of borrowing is difficult to determine. From the phonological point of view, borrowing from Khotanese into Tocharian seems more likely. TB *krañko* may have been borrowed from the Old Khotanese (or Pre-Khotanese, or Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese) acc. sg. *kr̥ṇgu*.

TB *KRAK-* ‘TO BE DIRTY’

Tocharian occurrences

- PK AS 7M b1 *sn(ai) peñyai (l)k(ā)ṣṣām̐ krākṣtrā ersna wāmpastrā* ‘He [= the old/ill person] does seeing without brilliance, [the eye sight] becomes blurred, it blurs [all] forms.’ (*Karmavibhaṅga*, see CEToM, Pinault, Malzahn, Peyrot eds.)

Discussion²⁰⁸

As reported by Adams (DoT: 229), the meaning ‘to be dirty’ for TB *krak-* was suggested by Peyrot (*apud* Malzahn 2010: 612) based on the substantive TAB *krāke*, q.v., a loanword from Late Khotanese, from which the verb is derived. The passage under examination justifies this interpretation because it refers to poor, blurred eyesight.

Results

The verb *krak-* ‘to be dirty’ is derived from *krāke* ‘dirt’, a loanword from Late Khotanese, within Tocharian.

²⁰⁸ This study has been published in Dragoni (2021).

(19) TB *KRĀKE* ‘DIRT, FILTH’, KHOT. *KHĀRGGA*- ‘MUD’

Tocharian occurrences

- A *krāke* nom. sg. (?) A 211 a1, a3, THT 2494 a2.
- A *krākeyāntu* nom. pl. THT 2401 a3.
- A *krākes* obl. pl. A 152 a4 (all literary texts).
- B *krāke*: nom./obl. sg. IOL Toch 262 b4 (literary), PK NS 49B a2 (doctrinal, *kar-mavibhaṅga*), THT 7 a7; b2 (doctrinal), THT 159 b6 (abhidharma), THT 221 b4 (literary), THT 334 b1 (Vinaya: here it may refer to sperm [Peyrot 2013: 694]), THT 388 a6, THT 408 b6 (both literary; in THT 408, it occurs in the expression *kleśanmaṣṣe krāke*, ‘the filth due to *kleśas*’), THT 522 a4 (doctrinal), THT 537 b5 (doctrinal), THT 1118 a3 (Vinaya: *snai krāke* ‘unstained’), THT 1192 a6 (literary: *cmelše krāke* ‘the filth pertaining to rebirth’), THT 1227.a a3 (literary: very fragmentary), THT 1258 a4 (literary), THT 2227 b1 (literary), W2 a6 (medical text: *ratre krāke* ‘the red filth’).
- B gen. sg. IOL Toch 4 a1 *kr(ā)ke(t)s(e)* (doctrinal).

Khotanese occurrences

- OKh. *khārggu* acc. sg. Z 19.53.
- OKh. *khārggā* nom. sg. IOL Khot 150/3 r4 (*Bodhisattva-compendium*, KMB: 337).
- OKh. *khārja* loc. sg. Z 5.90 (*kho ju ye viysu thamjāte khārja* ‘as one pulls a lotus out of the mud’).
- LKh. *khā’ja* loc. sg. P 4099.355 (*sa khu vaysa khā’ja sūrai* ‘just like the clean lotus in the mud’).
- LKh. *khā’je* loc. sg. Si 136v3, 136v4 (in both cases transl. of Skt. *kardama-*), P 4099.278 (*sa khu vaysa khā’je sūrai* ‘just like the clean lotus in the mud’).
- LKh. *khāje* loc. sg. P 4 12r4 (*Adhyardhaśatikā*, see SDTV I: 29).
- LKh. *khāji* loc. sg. P 4 12r4-5 (*Adhyardhaśatikā*, see SDTV I: 29).
- LKh. *kheja* loc. sg. (with further fronting of *-ā-*) JS 27v4.
- LKh. *khājaña* loc. sg. (see SGS: 262 for the ending) JS 23v2.

Discussion²⁰⁹

Van Windekens (1949) proposed that Tocharian B *krāke*²¹⁰ is borrowed from OKh. *khārgga-*. Isebaert (1980: §180) found the derivation unconvincing and suggested an Indo-European origin. His main criticism of Van Windekens’ proposal is based on morphological arguments. According to him, Middle Iranian loanwords never receive the masculine ending *-e*. Whereas Bailey’s Dictionary (DKS: 74) does not take note of the possibility of a loanword, Tremblay (2005: 433) returns to Van Windekens’ proposal and reports it without any further comment.

The Khotanese word is based on the Proto-Iranian root **xard-* ‘to defecate’²¹¹ to which the suffix *-ka-* has been attached (KS: 181), resulting in **xardaka-*. To obtain the attested

²⁰⁹ A different version of this study has been published in Dragoni (2021).

²¹⁰ The Tocharian A form is probably borrowed from Tocharian B.

²¹¹ See EDIV: 444. The verb is attested in Khotanese as *saṃkhal-* (SGS: 130) with preverb *saṃ-* instead of *ham-* due to Sanskrit influence, according to Emmerick (SGS: 242).

forms, one has to assume a series of metatheses that took place very early, at least earlier than the sound change *-rd-* > *-l-* in Khotanese: **xardaka-* > **xadra-* > **xadarka-*. This might have been the base for Yidgha *xəlar̥yo* (from a feminine **xadarkā-*, EVSh: 79) and Khotanese *khārgga-*, through loss of intervocalic *-d-* and voicing of *-k-*. An alternative possibility suggested by N. Sims-Williams (p.c.) keeps apart the Khotanese and the Yidgha developments and explains OKh. *khārgga-* as issued from **xardaka-* > **xardga-* > **xarga-*, with simplification (by extrusion of the middle consonant of the difficult group **-rdg-*) and compensatory lengthening. This solution avoids the complications of a series of phonological developments for the Khotanese form, even if they have to be posited to explain Yidgha *xəlar̥yo*.

Given the specificity of the formation, if the word is a loanword, it cannot have been borrowed but from Khotanese. Khotanese ‘mud’ refers to the same semantic fields of Tocharian ‘dirt’ and ‘filth’.²¹² A possibility to be discussed is whether the Khotanese form could have undergone another metathesis to become *krāke* in Tocharian. Since such metatheses are without parallels within Tocharian, it is more likely that the Tocharian word is based on a Khotanese variant form **grāga-*,²¹³ issued from *khārgga-* already in the Old Khotanese period. The survival of OKh. *grāma-* and *garma°* (in compounds) for ‘hot’ (PIr. **garma-*) documents these variants. Final *-e* may indicate the late date of the borrowing into Tocharian (cf. also *ešpe°*, another medical term), against nom. sg. *-o*, regular in Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese loanwords, but it remains difficult to explain.

Results

TB *krāke* can be analysed as a Late Khotanese loanword into Tocharian. The source form was an unattested variant **grāga-* of the frequent Khotanese substantive *khārgga-*, meaning ‘mud’ (Skt. *kardama-*). The Tocharian B nom. sg. in *-e* might be taken as an indication of the late date of the borrowing, but it remains problematic.

(20) TAB *KRĀSO* ‘TORMENT’, LKH. *GR(R)AYSA-* ‘TORMENT’

Tocharian occurrences

- A 66 a1 *tanāk šurmaš täš ñi krāso kakmu* ‘For this reason, torment has come to me.’ (cf. DTTA: 171)
- A 66 a4 *caš nāš krāso cu šurmaš pälsänkātsi* ‘In order to think about my torment for your sake.’ (cf. DTTA: 171)
- PK AS 17J b5 *nem(c)ek · – cwi maiyyane se cwi ypoytse krāso päst wikātär ||* ‘Certainly, ... by his power this torment of his country will disappear.’ (cf. Peyrot 2013: 666)
- PK NS 31 and 294 b6 /// *eṃške lānk-riṣṣi krāso tākañc kloš totka* : ‘... if some people of Lānkā town have brought torment²¹⁴ to you.’ (cf. also CEToM, Pinault, Fellner eds.)

²¹² As noted by M. Maggi (p.c.), Skt. *kardama-* covers the whole semantic spectrum, see MW: 258 ‘mud, slime, mire, clay, dirt, filth’.

²¹³ Or, rather, **khārgga-*, as the metathesis is likely to have happened *after* **xr-* > */γr-/* <gr> (N. Sims-Williams, p.c.).

²¹⁴ For the translation ‘torment’ here and in the examples above, cf. the discussion *infra*.

- THT 283.a b6 /// *pälyśalyñene ket krāso yäkt-añm {m}entsi* /// ‘... who in penance [has?] torment, feebleness, grief ...’
- THT 386 b4 /// *kaļšām krāso anaiktai* ‘He endures an unknown torment.’ (DoT: 231)
- THT 512 b1 /// *(te)ki mentsi krasonta proskai* /// ‘Sickness, grief, torments, fear.’ (DoT: 231)

Khotanese occurrences

- Sudh 286-7 *vašanaurau yakšau nāvau’ jsa ggrayse dūāha . gara kaicai raha’kšajsā jsa ggrayse strrahai’* ‘(It is) hurtful, dangerous because of guarding yakšas (and) nāgas, (there are) terrible mountain clefts, hard because of rakšasas.’ (De Chiara 2013: 127)
- Sudh 51 *grraysya harahausta ca pha patsyaua kšira* ‘Frightened (and) dispossessed, [pitiful, helpless^C] [Pmany (were) those who abandoned the country^P].’ (De Chiara 2013: 63)
- Mañj P 4099.308-9 *ttaña bađa haphāra hvāñe* [309] *ttu *grraysye²¹⁵ grrūsida satva tta hvañīda buna grraysye nā yakša graihyau baiysittai ā bu hvāñai salāva* ‘At that time he speaks nonsense. They call him tormented. Beings speak thus: “He is tormented by a Bhūta, has been seized by Nāgas, Yakšas, Grahās.”’ (Mauro Maggi, p.c.)
- Mañj P.4099.313 *vātta-paitta āchai gīhna nairarthā pyāstai salāva ttu māñadā habaśa satva āchainā štāra graysya* ‘Like this are all beings diseased, tormented.’ (Mauro Maggi, p.c.)²¹⁶
- JP 91v2 and v3 v. *grays-āñ-* (Konow 1941: 54–57, DKS: 92, not in SGS).²¹⁷

Discussion

The Late Khotanese adjective *gr(r)aysa-* is often translated as ‘wild’ (Bailey) or ‘terrible’ (De Chiara). Apart from Bailey’s proposal (DKS: 91–92), which could not stand closer scrutiny (see *infra*), no assured etymology has been found yet. In this discussion, I argue that the Khotanese word is connected with TAB *krāso* ‘vexation, torment’ through borrowing from Old Khotanese into Tocharian B. Firstly, the occurrences of TAB *krāso* and derivatives of the same noun are examined. The second section deals with the Khotanese occurrences of *grays(y)a-* and contains a proposal for a possible etymological connection. The third section focuses on the alleged occurrences of the verb *grays-āñ-* in the *Jivakapustaka*. In the fourth section, I clarify the borrowing path into Tocharian B.

TAB *krāso* and derivatives

The Tocharian B substantive *krāso*, borrowed into Tocharian A, is usually analysed as a deverbal noun from the verb TB *krasa-* A *krāšyññ-*. There is no bilingual evidence available

²¹⁵ For MS *grraysye*.

²¹⁶ This and the previous translation (Mañj 308-9 and Mañj 313) take into account the conclusions reached in the present study.

²¹⁷ See the discussion below for the two passages concerned and their translations.

for this verb. Still, a survey of the most important occurrences (DoT: 231, DTTA: 171) shows that a translation ‘to annoy, vex (tr.)’ or ‘be annoyed (intr.)’ is appropriate.

Peyrot (2013: 741 fn. 163) reconstructs PT **kras-* with the caveat that ‘with the few diverging forms from productive patterns no reconstruction is feasible.’ Van Windekens (1941: 45, VW: 234) first connected the verb with Lith. *grasà* ‘Drohen, Androhung, Strenge, strenge Zucht, Disziplin’ (LEW I: 166). This implies a connection with Lat. *frendō* and PG **grindan* ‘to grind’, but it is formally problematic (Hilmarsson 1996: 176) and has not been defended by any other scholar. Schmidt (1982: 371–72) argued for a relation with the Greek verb *κορέννυμι* ‘to satiate, fill, be satiated’ (Beekes 2010: 751), but, apart from the formal problems (Hilmarsson 1996: 176), it is difficult to see a semantic connection between the two forms.

The latest proposal was put forward by Hilmarsson (1991: 146, 1996: 177). It implies a connection with PG **hrōzjan* ‘to touch, move, stire (v.)’ and **hrōza-* ‘motile (adj.)’, which Kroonen (2013: 250) takes as a possible outcome of PIE **kroH-s-*. Verbs of movement frequently form the basis of words for ‘anger’ *vel sim.* (cf. e.g. Av. *aēšma-* ‘anger’, Khot. *oysa-* ‘id.’). The weak point of Hilmarsson’s suggestion is that ‘anger’ is not the central semantic connotation of *krāso*. In fact, ‘torment, grief, lament’ would fit all the available occurrences more precisely.

LKh. *graysa-* and *graysya-*

As outlined in the discussion above, no satisfactory etymology for TAB *krāso* has been found yet. Therefore, the hypothesis of a loanword may be considered seriously. Khotanese presents us with a suitable candidate. Late Khotanese has an adjective *gr(r)aysa-* occurring in the *Sudhanāvadāna* and in the *Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatārasūtra*. The occurrences in the *Sudhanāvadāna* were initially translated by Bailey (DKS: 91–92) as ‘wild’, having in mind a possible connection with OCS *groza* ‘horror’, Greek *γοργός* ‘fierce, terrible’ and PCelt. **gargo-* ‘rough’ (as per IEW: 353). This alleged root, however, has no parallels within the Indo-Iranian branch. Moreover, recent research has shown the inconsistencies of such a reconstruction. The OCS word is isolated within Slavic (Derksen 2008: 191), the Greek one is of uncertain interpretation (Beekes 2010: 283), and the Celtic adjective has been tentatively explained as an onomatopoeic word (Matasović 2009: 151). LKh. *gr(r)aysa-*, therefore, requires a new etymological analysis.

I suggest that LKh. *gr(r)aysa-* is connected with the Proto-Iranian root **garj-* (**garz-* in Cheung’s notation, see EDIV: 111–12) ‘to lament, weep’. The meaning ‘to complain, torment’ is supported by Bactrian *γρζ-* ‘to complain’ (Sims-Williams 2007: 207), NP *gila* ‘complaint, lamentation’ and Oss. I *qast* ‘complaint, grief’ (EDIV: 112). Two forms are attested in Late Khotanese, one with a final *-ya-* (Sudh, Mañj) and one without (only Sudh), i.e. *gr(r)aysa-* and *gr(r)aysya-*.

Emmerick (*apud* KS: 248) explains *gr(r)aysya-* as the Late Khotanese outcome of an Old Khotanese participle **graysāta-*. Still, his etymological connection with Skt. *karj-* ‘to pain, torment’, a verb of uncertain origin (‘unklar’ according to Mayrhofer, cf. EWA III: 67), cannot account for the phonological shape of the Khotanese word, even if one admits the possibility of an Indic loanword. De Chiara (2014: 180) sought to explain *gr(r)aysya-* as an *ia*-adjective derived from *gr(r)aysa-* with the meaning ‘terrified, cruel’. However, it is hard to justify why the suffix *-ia-* did not cause palatalisation of /z/. *gr(r)aysa-* is tentatively explained by De Chiara (2014: 180) as an adjective, presumably from a verb *grays-** (the attested *grays-āñ-* is

quoted). *a*-derivatives from the present stem of Khotanese verbs may yield adjectives (KS: 3–4). Much more regularly, however, they yield substantives. Hence Degener's (KS: 5) hesitation in translating *gr(r)aysa-* as 'Schrecken' or 'schrecklich'.

In light of this etymological connection, one may examine this intricate question with new eyes. The existence of a verb **garys-* (< PIr. **garf-*), which became *grays-** by metathesis already in Old Khotanese, is now likely. For this type of metathesis, with or without previous lengthening, cf. PIr. **garma-* > OKh. *grāma-* 'hot'. Emmerick's synchronic explanation of *gr(r)aysya-* as an *-āta-* participle may be preferred for phonological reasons (cf. *supra*). One could reconstruct an Old Khotanese verb *grays-** 'to complain, torment' with a participle *graysāta-**, secondarily created instead of the regularly expected ***graṣṭa-*. The creation of this secondary past participle may be connected with the later initial metathesis. The original ***garys-* : ***garṣṭa-* was lost, and the newly created *grays-* was given a later, secondary past participle. The meaning of the participle would be 'tormented, afflicted'.

As for *gr(r)aysa-*, its low number of occurrences (only twice in the *Sudhanāvādāna*) might suggest a possible mistake for *gr(r)aysya-*. However, the readings are very clear and are supported by manuscripts C (Ch 00266) and P (P 2025), the most reliable branch of the *Stemma codicum* of the *Sudhanāvādāna* (De Chiara 2013: 9). The easiest way to account for *gr(r)aysa-* would be to interpret it as a nominal derivative of *grays-* and translate it as 'grief, torment' (substantive, not adjective). This translation fits very well the passage under analysis. The ending *-e* may stand for older *-ā* of the nom. sg. m. Therefore, I would like to propose the following translation for the passage: '(It is) a dangerous torment because of guarding yakṣas (and) nāgas; the mountain clefts (are) a hard torment because of the rakṣasas.' As Alessandro Del Tomba (p.c.) suggested, a nom. pl. ('dangerous torments') could also fit.

The Late Khotanese verb *grays-āñ-*

Having determined the existence of a Khotanese verb *grays-** (< PIr. **garf-*), it is necessary to investigate the two occurrences of the verb *grays-āñ-* derived from the same root through the addition of the causative infix *-āñ-*. The existence of the verb *grays-āñ-*, only attested in the *Jivakapustaka*, was first pointed out by Bailey (DKS: 92), who in KT I: 173 read a prs. mid. 3pl. *gr(r)aysāñāri* instead of restoring *gr(r)a[ha] ysāmñāri* with Konow (1941: 54, 56). The *Jivakapustaka* passage concerned (= IOL Khot 102/1v2) is translated anew in table 6. Konow and Bailey's translations are given for the sake of comparison.

Khotanese	My translation	Konow (1941: 55)	Bailey (DKS: 92)
Fol. 91v2 <i>cū tta hauda baysāmñi cū jsahira āna ṣika grraysāñāri</i>	As for the seven terrible [demon- esses] that make la- ment the child [is- sued] from the womb,	What are those 7 ter- rible ones who, seated in the abdo- men, produce grahas of the little ones;	What young ones in the womb are made to mis- carry,
Fol. 91v2-3 <i>khū ysā hami tī pharāka āchā biḍa grrahaja</i>	when [the child] is born, then he bears many diseases caused by demons (<i>graha-</i>).	when he is born, then he carries along many graha-born diseases;	when one is born then he bears many diseases caused by (demonic) <i>graha</i> -seizure.

Fol. 91v3 <i>ttyi</i> ○ <i>rrūṃ</i> <i>makṣāṃji jsa biśa jāri</i>	With the smearing of this oil, they all disappear.	through smearing of this fat they all dis- appear,	
Fol. 91v3 <i>tta būri</i> <i>baysāṃji cū jsahira āna</i> <i>ṣika grraysāñāri</i> .	All the terrible [demonesses] that make lament the child [issued] from the womb:	so many terrible ones, which, seated in the abdomen pro- duce grahas of the little ones:	what young ones in the womb are made to mis- carry
Fol. 91v3-4 <i>laṃbaudara</i> . <i>baṃba</i> . <i>bhūja laṃba-</i> <i>karṇa</i> . <i>prralaṃbaki la</i> ○ <i>basphija</i> : <i>labanāsā</i> <i>laṃbakiyāśa</i> .	(Skt.) <i>Lambodara</i> , <i>Lambabhūja</i> , <i>Lam-</i> <i>bakarṇa</i> , <i>Pralam-</i> <i>baka</i> , <i>Lambasphic</i> , <i>Lambanāsā</i> , <i>Lam-</i> <i>bakeśa</i> .	<i>lambodara</i> , <i>laba-</i> <i>bhuja</i> , <i>lambakarna</i> , <i>pralambaka</i> , <i>lambas-</i> <i>phija</i> , <i>lambanāsā</i> , <i>lambakeśa</i> ;	(so as to be possessed of hanging belly, arm, ear, hanging forward, with hanging rump, nose, hair,
Fol. 91v4 <i>haṃdara</i> <i>mimchāñāri haṃdara vā</i> <i>haṃtsa āchāṃ jsa</i> <i>ysyāñāri</i> .	Some [of the demonesses] cause miscarriage, others cause [the child] to be born with dis- eases.	some they cause to miscarry, others to be born with dis- eases.	some are made to mis- carry, others are brought forth with dis- eases.

Table 6. A new translation of the *Jivakapustaka* passage containing the verb *grays-āñ-*

A close analysis of the passage shows that Bailey's translation of *grays-āñ-* as 'to cause to go wild, to cause miscarriage', based on the hypothesis that it was used in hendiadys with *mich-āñ-* 'to cause to miscarry' (DKS: 92), cannot be upheld anymore. The connection of *grays-āñ-* with PIr **garj-* provides a more natural solution. Therefore, the verb *grays-āñ-* can now be translated as 'to make lament'.²¹⁸

TAB *krāso* as a loanword from Old Khotanese

As already outlined above, *krāso* is usually considered a deverbal noun from the corresponding verb TB *krasa-* A *krāṣyāññ-*. Contrarywise, I suggest that TB *krāso* was borrowed from the Khotanese acc. sg. *graysu*, and a denominal verb was formed based on *krāso* only after the borrowing occurred. Subsequently, TB *krāso* was borrowed into Tocharian A, and another denominal verb was created from the substantive. As remarked by Michaël Peyrot (p.c.), both

²¹⁸ As for the Sanskrit names in Fol. 91r3-4, the Sanskrit version has *mūkhūmaṇḍakā labodari labhattūja labakarṇi prrabalabakā labasīcajā labanāsā labiṇḍqṣī* (Fol. 89v2-3). *mūkhūmaṇḍakā* is only present in the Sanskrit text. Strikingly, it is the name of the 14th amongst the demons and demonesses that attack children in the Sanskrit *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī* (*mukhamaṇḍikā*-, see Maggi 1996: 125). The text was probably known in Khotan, as witnessed by some translated excerpts in Late Khotanese on a folio with depictions of the demons (Maggi 1996, 2009: 400, KMB: 583). The name of the same demoness is also attested in the Late Khotanese text as nom. sg. *mukhamaṇḍa* (8v, see Maggi 1996: 134–35). The same demoness also appears in the list of nine grahas mentioned by Suśruta (Wujastyk 2011: 260). Note that in the Sanskrit text all names are feminine, much like in the Khotanese fragment of the *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī*.

verbs follow productive patterns: that of Tocharian B could be denominal,²¹⁹ and that of Tocharian A certainly needs to be.

The main argument to take the verbs to be derived from the noun is that, as indicated by Peyrot (2013: 741 fn. 163), no Proto-Tocharian stem pattern can be reconstructed. The borrowing may be dated to the Old Khotanese period or immediately before to account for the final *-o* (not later than Old Khotanese) and the Old Khotanese metathesis **gar-* > *gra-*. The semantics do not seem to show any relevant problem.

Results

LKh. *gr(r)aysa-* ‘torment’ and *gr(r)aysya-* ‘frightening’ are best explained respectively as a substantive from a verb *grays-** and a participle **graysāta-* from the same verb. The verb *grays-āñ-* can be translated as ‘to make torment’ and analysed as a derivative of *grays-** through the addition of the causative infix *-āñ-*. The ultimate origin of *grays-** may be sought in PIr. **garj-* ‘to lament, weep’. LKh. *gr(r)aysa-* ‘torment’ was borrowed into Tocharian B during the early Old Khotanese period. Successively, the Tocharian B substantive was also borrowed into Tocharian A. Two denominal verbs were formed independently based on this substantive in Tocharian A and B.

(21) TB *COWO** (IN *COWAI TĀRKA-* ‘TO ROB’), LKH. *DYŪKA-* ‘ROBBER’

Tocharian occurrences

- PK DA M 507.32 a8 *taiseṃ terisa (c)owai carka* ‘He robbed in such a way.’ (cf. Ching 2010: 227)
- PK DA M 507.32 a9 *ñakta ce cowai carka tu mā pälskanaṃ* ‘Oh lord! What he has seized (lit. “robbed”), he does not think (about its value).’ (Ching 2010: 227)
- THT 17 b1-2 (parallel THT 15 a8) *aiśamñe spaktā(ṃ) ślek ompalskoññe cowai ram no tārkanam-ne*²²⁰ *pälskoṣṣana krentauna* ‘Reason, [eagerness] to serve, also meditation, the spiritual virtues he steals from them as it were.’ (Meunier 2013: 168)
- THT 22 a2-4 *tu yparwe w(e)ña ślok pudnäkte l(āntāśco) c(owai tār)k(a)n(aṃ) ś(aumo) kos (c)wi (rittetār tumem no a)l(y)ai(k) (c)owai tārkanam cowaicce : cowai tārkauca cowai tārkau mäske(tār 6)5 ṣñār ekñentasa soytsi lāñco mā campe(ṃ : co)wai tārkan(aṃ ypauna) k_u(ṣ)aino alyeñkäts* ‘Thereupon the Buddha spoke this strophe to the king: If it suits him the man will rob, (but then) others rob the one robbing, the robber becomes the one robbed. [65d] Of each of their own possessions kings are not able to be satiated, [so] they rob the (lands) [and] villages of others.’ (CEToM, Fellner ed.)
- THT 33 a4-5 *lyši no alyeñkāms cowai tārkanam* ‘Thieves rob them from others, too.’ (CEToM, Fellner ed.)
- THT 255 b3-4 *iślyäntse ṣṣertwentsā cowai kántwa tärkānam* ‘With the incitement of jealousy, they take away [his] tongue.’ (DoT: 724)
- THT 1859 a1 *cowai tārkanantrā* ‘[They] steal.’ (Huard 2020: 20–21, 25)
- THT 3596 b3 *cowai tārkanan* ‘They rob.’

²¹⁹ The only unclear point would be the *iya-* preterite in TB, for which I have no explanation at present.

²²⁰ For manuscript *tārkanam-ne*.

Discussion

TB *cowai* can only be found in the collocation *cowai tərka-* ‘to rob’. For the semantics, bilingual evidence is available from the occurrence in THT 22, a fragment of the Udānālāṅkāra that quotes *verbatim* Uv 9.9: *vilumpate hi puruṣo yāvad asyopakalpate | tato 'nye taṃ vilumpanti sa viloptā vilupyate* (Bernhard 1965: 172).²²¹ The correspondence Skt. *vi-lup-* ‘to seize, rob’ ~ TB *cowai tərka-* can thus be established. However, the origin of the word is debated, and no consensus has been reached about its etymology.

Adams (DoT: 277), after having recognised that the etymology is ‘uncertain’,²²² reports two proposals, one by Van Windekens (VW: 253) and another by Hilmarsson (personal communication to Adams). Whereas Van Windekens’ derivation can be discarded because it implies an unlikely borrowing from Tocharian A, Hilmarsson’s connection with the Germanic word for ‘thief’, **þeuba-*, should be considered seriously. A closer scrutiny reveals that this hypothesis is problematic. On the one hand, PG **þeuba-* is of unclear origin (Kroonen 2013: 539). On the other hand, it is questionable whether PIE **p* (> PG **b*) could yield Toch. *w* because this is a variant of *p* only in Late Tocharian B (Peyrot 2008: 90).

The possibility of setting up a nom. sg. *cowo** based on the seemingly frozen obl. sg. *cowai* supports the hypothesis of a loanword from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. A word for ‘robber’ in Late Khotanese is *dyūka-* (DKS: 166). It is attested in a Late Khotanese rendering of the Buddhist parable of the six senses, compared to six thieves in the Late Khotanese version (Bailey, l.c.). The Late Khotanese text (P 3513.20r2-3 [KBT: 56]), the first part of the simile, runs as follows:

- *ttyi herä prracaina cu maṃ kṣa 'idre tti ttrāṃmä māñāṃdä ṣṭāri khu ṣīṇa vyahera kṣa dyūka himārai* ‘For this reason, regarding the six senses, they resemble the six robbers in one *vihara*.’ (cf. also Bailey 1977: 155)

The same simile is also attested in Z 6.24:

- *ttarandari āvuī māñāndä rraysvai indriya trāma . kho ju hamāña āvuvo' ttāṣe' kṣāta ni ṣṣūjīye bvāre .* ‘The body is like an empty village. Like thieves in the same village, so the six senses do not perceive one another.’ (Emmerick 1968: 121)

Here ‘village’ substitutes ‘*vihāra*’, and the word for ‘thief’ is the more frequently attested *ttāṣe*’. The same terminology is also to be met with in the version of the simile contained in the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* (§5.7): *o kho ṣā āvū *tcamāña kṣāsa' ttāṣe' ā're*. ‘Or like that village in which six thieves dwell’ (Suv I: 77, cf. also §5.4). The Sanskrit version has here *grāma* for *āvū* and *caura* for *ttāṣe*’ (Suv I: 76).

Whereas the connection with *dyūma-* (DKS: 166) is hardly acceptable (KS: 94), this term for ‘robber’ should not be separated from OKh. *dyūla-* ‘deception’ (Z 4.5). According to Bailey, both substantives could be derived from the same root PIr. **dab-* ‘to deceive’ (EDIV: 42). As for the semantic development ‘to deceive’ > ‘to rob’, this is paralleled by Wakhi *ḍɨv(ɨ)y-* : *ḍovoyd-* ‘to steal’ < **dābaya-* (Steblin-Kamenskij 1999: 168). However, the precise

²²¹ ‘Es raubt ein Mensch soviel, wie ihm gefällt; dann nehmen’s ihm die anderen weg – der Räuber wird beraubt’ (Hahn 2007: 40). See also Thomas (1969: 315) and Penney (1989: 65–66).

²²² ‘Unclear’ also for Hilmarsson (1986: 38).

derivational path from Proto-Iranian to Khotanese is still unclear. Degener proposes a reconstruction **dab-yu-ka-* for *dyūka-* (KS: 47) and **dab-ya-la-* for *dyūla-* (KS: xxxiv). As no suffix *-yu-* is attested in Khotanese, I suggest that **dab-yu-ka-* should be corrected to **dab-ya-ka-(ka-)*. I explain the initial cluster *dy-* as the result of a metathesis: **dab-ya-* > **dawya-* > **daywa-* > **dyūa-*. This last development is paralleled by the Khotanese word for ‘demon’, i.e. OKh. *dyūa-* < PIr. **daiwa-*.

I propose that a form **dyūa-* ‘stealing’ may be identified as the source form of TB *cowo**, through the acc. sg. PK **dyūwu*. See s.v. *tsuwo** and *kāswo* for further adaptations of Khotanese *ua-*stems in Tocharian B. For the Tocharian B assimilation **u_o* > *o_o*, see s.v. *koto**. A form with an additional *ka-*suffix is attested in LKh. *dyūka-* ‘robber’ (cf. *supra*).²²³

Results

TB *cowai* is attested only in the collocation TB *cowai tərka-* ‘to rob’. As it can be analysed as a frozen acc. sg. from a nom. sg. *cowo**, I propose it may be a loanword from Pre-Khotanese. The source form is identified in the Pre-Khotanese acc. sg. **dyūwu*, from PIr. **dab-ya-* ‘stealing’ (cf. LKh. *dyūka-* ‘robber’).

TA *COŚPĀ*, TQ. *CAZBĀ-*, NIYA PKT. *COZBO*

Tocharian occurrences

- A 302 b8 (co)spā • śeri • kättum tarmots lārat (...)kiñ-ā elāk parno ākk-āc hkuttem-wām parnots nā(śi) ‘Cospā Śeri Qatun, the righteous Lārat [...] Elläg, the honorable Aq[.]āc, Xutēn-βām, the honorable la[dy ...]’ (Tremblay 2005: 429)
- A 303 b1 /// cospā wrāntār mākktotsi ślak re_uwānt n_unak oppal ‘Cospā Vryantar, Mākkot/ntsi as well as Rēw-βant and also Oppal.’ (Tremblay 2005: 429)
- IOL Khot Wood 65 sās kāt[ko] kāt[s-pra[c]ar Sokkocospā²²⁴ ‘This [is my/his/her?] deceased uterine brother Sokkocospā.’ (Ching 2019: 10)

Discussion

The Tocharian A title *cospā* occurs twice in the colophon of the fourth act of the Tocharian *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka* and once in a recently edited Tocharian A inscription on wood (IOL Khot Wood 65). Bailey was the first scholar to connect TA *cospā* with its Tumshuqese and Niya Prakrit equivalents. He also proposed the restoration (co)spā in A 302 (Bailey 1947: 149, 1949: 127). Different hypotheses on its etymology have been put forward. Whereas Bailey’s (1949: 127) derivation from the ‘satrap’ word (OP *xšaçaṇpāvan-* < **xšaṇra-pā-wan-*) is phonologically problematic, Henning’s (1936: 12 fn. 6) hypothesis has not met any criticism (Tremblay 2005: 429). Henning compared Tq. *cazbā-* with OAv. *cazdōṇghuuant-* (Y31.3 *cazdōṇghuuadabiiō*, Y44.5 *cazdōṇghuuantām*) and reconstructed a nom. sg. OIr. **čazdahwāh* > **čazdawāh* > **čazdwāh* > Tq. *cazbā-*.

Tremblay and Henning tacitly accept the irregular change implied by this derivation, in which PIr. *č* is not depalatalised to Tq. /ts/ but kept as /c/. The survival of the palatal without

²²³ An alternative solution may see a connection with a nominal form of the verb MSogd. *cf-* ‘to steal’ through borrowing. Sogdian loanwords, however, never receive the ending nom. sg. -o in Tocharian B.

²²⁴ Or *sokko cospā*.

apparent palatalisation triggers may suggest two alternative scenarios: a. If Henning's derivation is correct, the word may be a loanword into Tocharian A, Niya Prakrit and Tumshuqese from an unknown Iranian language; Tumshuqese, Khotanese and even Bactrian (Gholami 2014: 37) are excluded because of the initial palatal. b. The word may belong to an unknown, non-Iranian language of the area. The interpretation of OAv. *cazdōṇhūuaṇt-* is still uncertain,²²⁵ and the Tumshuqese word does not show any recognisable Iranian structure. Therefore, I suggest that the second option is more likely.

Another problem involves the exact provenance of the borrowing into Tocharian A. A Tumshuqese origin, as argued by Tremblay (2005: 430),²²⁶ is very likely for geographical reasons. However, at least one of the two names associated with *cospā* in the colophon (cf. *supra*) is Turkish.²²⁷ Moreover, the vocalism of *cospā* is difficult to evaluate. The first vowel is closer to Niya Prakrit, while the *ā* of the second syllable is puzzling. If the word is a loanword from Tumshuqese, the final *ā* may be interpreted as a Tocharian A adaptation of the Tumshuqese gen. sg. *-ā*. This proposal, however, appears entirely arbitrary because the Tumshuqese nom. sg. *cazba*, attested, for instance, in HL 1.3, points more likely to an *ā*-stem. Borrowing from the nom. sg. *cazba* is more justified.²²⁸

The word usage in Tocharian A is very different from that observed in Tumshuqese and Niya Prakrit. In these two languages, the term was part of the official language and denoted a specific administrative position. Contrarywise, the only three occurrences in Tocharian A in a colophon and in a wooden list of donors²²⁹ point to the fact that the word was taken over from a foreign language in strict connection with the proper name of the person bearing the title.

Results

TA *cospā*, Tq. *cazbā-* and Niya Pkt. *cozbo* likely reflect a borrowing from a fourth unknown language of the area. A native Khotanese, Tumshuqese or Bactrian derivation is probably to be excluded.

²²⁵ The etymology of the Old Avestan word was treated by Pirart (1984: 48), who proposed a connection with Ved. *cano-dhā-* 'gnädigt, geneigt' (EWA I: 528). This proposal has been explicitly rejected by Werba (1986: 356–57) and criticised by Tremblay (2005: 429 fn. 37). Another argument supporting the second scenario is the apparent absence of the word in Khotanese: if inherited, it would be strange to find it only in Tumshuqese and not also in Khotanese.

²²⁶ Tremblay further argues that the word has an ultimate 'Śaka' origin, but this is hard to prove with sufficient certainty.

²²⁷ The second name connected with the title *cospā* is *wrāntār*. Tremblay's (2005: 430) tentative comparison with PIr. **friya-* as attested in the Tq. name *brika*, of which *wrāntār* would reflect the comparative, i.e. a hypothetical Khot. **bryāntara-*, cannot stand closer scrutiny. The initial would have been probably *p* in Tocharian and not *w*. Moreover, there is no trace of the long *-ā-*.

²²⁸ For the long *ā*, cf. TB /a/ regularly represented by TA <ā> in Tocharian B loanwords in Tocharian A (Peyrot 2010a: 139).

²²⁹ On the connection between the colophons of the *Maitreyasamiti-nāṭaka* and this wooden inscription and their socio-historical context, see Ching (2019: 18–19). It should be noted that, at least in the first of the two colophons, *cospā* precedes the proper name. In IOL Khot Wood 65, it follows it.

(22) TB *TĀNO* ‘SEED, GRAIN’, KHOT. *DĀNĀ*- ‘ID.’

Discussion

A comprehensive treatment of TB *tāno* ‘seed, grain’ can be found in Peyrot (2018b: 257–59). Following Peyrot’s (2018b: 258) suggestion that the word may be a loanword from Iranian, I propose that it may be a borrowing from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese because of the final *-o*. The source form would be an acc. sg. *dāno*. A further specification of the chronology is not possible because of the lack of distinguishing features. Another argument supporting a Khotanese connection may be sought in the occurrence of a form *tanākko* enlarged with the suffix *-kko*, for which I proposed a Khotanese origin (see s.v.).²³⁰

Results

TB *tāno* ‘seed’ may be a loanword from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese acc. sg. *dāno* (OKh. *dānā*-). No further distinguishing features allow a more precise periodisation.

TB *TAPATRIŚ* ‘TRAYASTRIṂŚA’, OKH. *TTĀVATRĪŚA*- ‘ID.’

Discussion

TB *tapatriś* ‘trayastrimśa’ is attested in THT 99 a2, THT 70.a a6, PK AS 19.5 a2, PK AS 17F a3. In IOL Toch 80 a5 and perhaps in a3, an adjective *tavatriśāṣṣe*, with *v* in the second syllable, is attested.²³¹ The striking similarity with OKh. *ttāvatrīśa*- ‘id.’ was already noted by Adams (DoT: 296), who proposed that it may be a loanword from Khotanese. This Khotanese word, however, is attested in a series of diverse spellings. In the following, its Old Khotanese spellings are listed:

- Suv: 1.14, 6.4.29, 14.24 *ttāvatrīśa*-, 15.41 *ttāvatīśa*-, 2.71 *ttāvattīśa*-.
- Z: 2.85, 23.2 *ttāvatrīśa*-, 4.32, 4.11, 14.88, 14.92, 5.33, 22.255 *ttāvatrīśa*-.
- Sgh: 142.3, 204.2-3, 204.5 *ttāvatrīśa*-.

The most widespread form is OKh. *ttāvatrīśa*-. It is difficult to evaluate the other forms: are the different dissimilatory paths (*t_t*, *tr_t* besides the more frequent *t_tr*) an inner-Khotanese development, or are they based on a Middle Indic model? Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit has *trāyatrīṃśa*, *trāyastrīṃśa*, *trayastrīṃśa*, *trayatrīṃśa* (BHSD: 257). If it reflects a linguistic reality, BHS *trayatrīṃśa* may show a similar tendency to dissimilation under Middle Indic influence.

It must be stressed that *v* in *ttāvatrīśa*- categorically excludes a Gāndhārī source, as *VyV* > *VvV* is an ‘eastern’ development (cf. Pāli *tāvattīṃsa*-, von Hinüber 2001: 175). Besides, even if this change could be due to dissimilation as well, initial *tr*- in Gāndhārī does yield *t*- as in

²³⁰ Bernard (2023: 148–50) notes that an Old Steppe Iranian origin of TB *tāno* may not be wholly excluded. In fact, in his opinion OSIr. **dānā*- may have been borrowed as PT **tāna* and could have been later remade into *tāno*, on the model of *maiyyo*, for which cf. archaic TB *meyyā*.

²³¹ The same adjective with *p* occurs in PK AS 16.8 b4 as *tapatriśāṣṣi*.

Pāli (Baums 2009: 156). The Gāndhārī equivalent could be attested in CKM 244.73, but only the last syllable *śa* is visible on the manuscript. The form was restored as (*trae*)[*t*](*ri*)*śa* by Silverlock (2015: 659) based on other occurrences of *trae* (< *traya*- ‘3’) in the same manuscript. However, it is not to be excluded that Gāndhārī had adopted an eastern form akin to Pāli *tāvattiṃsa*- or Khot. *ttāvatriśa*-.²³² From Gāndhārī, the lexeme may have been borrowed into Khotanese and, later, it may have reached Tocharian. It is difficult to determine whether the Tocharian word was borrowed from Khotanese or Middle Indic. If from Khotanese, the absence of the final vowel points to borrowing from Late Khotanese. The lack of final vowel would also be regular if the word were borrowed from Middle Indic.

Results

It is difficult to determine whether TB *tapatriś* ‘trayastrimśa’ was borrowed from Khotanese or directly from a Middle Indic source. This Middle Indic source cannot be identified with native Gāndhārī for phonological reasons; it is still conceivable, though, that Gāndhārī itself had borrowed the word from an eastern dialect.

(23) TB *TONO* ‘SILK (?)’, OKH. *THAUNA*- ‘CLOTH’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 1105 a1 *tono wāsanma kleśanma eršeñc(ana)* ‘Seidengewänder, die Kleśas hervorrufen’ (Schmidt 1986: 73), a4 *tonom wāsanma ausormem* ‘Durch das Tragen von Seidengewändern.’ (Schmidt 1986: 74)
- PK DA M 507.22 a8 *wi tom 2. tono I[ndr.]- ///* ‘TWO pecks. tono (?) Indra-?’ (Ching 2010: 201)
- THT 259 b3 *tonokām* (obl. pl.?) [Context unclear]

Discussion

Schmidt (1980: 411) was the first scholar to connect TB *tono* with the Khotanese word *thauna*- ‘cloth’. This etymology is also reported by Adams (DoT: 329). The meaning of the Khotanese word is given by Bailey (DKS: 149) as ‘silk’ or ‘cloth’. Schmidt referred to the two occurrences in the Tocharian Karmavācanā in which *tono* is attested preceding *wāsanma* ‘clothes’ (cf. *supra*). For this reason, he proposed that *tono* was to be interpreted as referring to *wāsanma*, meaning ‘silk’ and not simply ‘cloth’. The phrase *tono wāsanma* would mean ‘silk-clothes’ (Schmidt 1986: 73–74). As some scholars have noted, this translation is problematic in several respects.

On the one hand, the Karmavācanā passage speaks of clothes prohibited to monks. If a hypothetical translation ‘silk-cloth’ is accepted, one should conclude that silk clothes were prohibited to monks, which is not what the tradition has transmitted.²³³ As noted by Ching (2011: 76), the passage in the document PK DA M 507.22 is too fragmentary to help establish

²³² The numeral ‘thirty-two’ is now attested twice, once with *-s-* (*dvastrīśa-* in the **bahubudhagasutra*) and once without (*duatristīśa-* in CKI 359). Unfortunately, the fact that both forms are attested cannot help determine the correct restoration of CKM 244.73. For these problems, see Salomon (2021: 371). I am grateful to N. Schoubben for this reference.

²³³ Silk is included in the list of permitted cloth materials, see Ching (2011: 76 fn. 44).

the meaning of *tono*. The context of the hapax *tonokām* – if correctly interpreted as obl. pl. < Khot. *thaunaka*-, although the declension pattern would be extremely rare – is also broken.

On the other hand, Khot. *thauna*- means more generally ‘cloth’, not specifically ‘silk’. In Old Khotanese, it translates Skt. *vastra*- in Sgh 29.4 *gyastūñāna thaunāna* ‘with a divine garment’ (Canevascini 1993: 12). In the *Suvarṇabhasottamasūtra* it translates Skt. *paṭa*- or *vastra*-, both generic terms for ‘cloth’ (Suv II: 277–78). The word is attested several times in the Book of Zambasta (Z 3.82, 4.96, 5.86, 22.209, 24.218) with the generic meaning of ‘cloth’. The same general semantic range seems to be attested for Late Khotanese. The two occurrences in the *Siddhasāra* (*thau* §24.31, §25.24) render respectively Skt. *vastra*- and *caila-paṭṭa*- and Tib. *ras* ‘cloth’ in both cases.

Bailey’s statement (DKS: 149, KT VI: 113) that the lexeme has the meaning ‘silk’ in Late Khotanese deserves a more detailed analysis. Bailey’s translation is based on the discovery that in a series of bilingual (Khotanese-Chinese) Late Khotanese documents,²³⁴ LKh. *thau* is translated by Chinese *shīchóu* 絨綉 ‘pongee made out of floss silk’.²³⁵ After the republication of some of these documents by Skjærvø in his catalogue (KMB), Yoshida has recently re-examined the problem. He has convincingly argued that the Khotanese equivalent of *shīchóu* 絨綉 is *pe’minai thau* ‘cloth made of floss silk’.²³⁶ When standing alone, *thau* would then be an abbreviated form of *pe’minai thau*, i.e. it would not mean ‘silk’ by itself, as stated by Bailey. Instead, it would maintain its original meaning of ‘cloth’.²³⁷ Further, Duan Qing (2013: 310–11) has suggested that the derived form LKh. *thaunaka*- should be interpreted as ‘a piece of silk brocade’, more precious and expensive than ‘woven floss silk’ (*pe’minai thau*). It is well possible that the *-ka*- suffix gave the word a more specialised meaning restricted to the economic language.

As for the etymology, the first hypothesis put forward by Konow (SS: 185) and Leumann (1933–36: 439) is still valid and is now recognised to be the standard one (cf. e.g. Suv II: 277–78). They derived the Khotanese word from PIr. **tāfna*-, a *-na*- formation based on the root **tāp*- ‘to twist, wind’ (EDIV: 389).²³⁸ The initial *th*- has been explained as arising through the transfer of aspiration from the second consonant,²³⁹ a case similar to *thatau* ‘swift’ < **tahau* < **taxwakam* (Sims-Williams 1983: 48).²⁴⁰ It seems that this transfer was relatively early. Also, the word occurs with an initial aspirate in Niya Prakrit *thavaṃṇa* (śa).²⁴¹ Because of the word-initial *th*-, the form is likely to be a Khotanese loanword. The original cluster **fn*- was

²³⁴ These are in the main Domoko C and D, Hedin 1, 13, 15, 16 and Or. 11344/4, cf. Yoshida (2004: 29).

²³⁵ Cf. KT IV: 53. For the translation, see Yoshida (2004: 29).

²³⁶ Against the usual etymological translation as ‘cotton’, see Yoshida (2004: 29), Yoshida (2008: 110), and Duan (2013: 309).

²³⁷ This was also noted by Ching (2010: 404–5).

²³⁸ The same *-na*- formation would be attested in NP *tafna* ‘web’; see Hasandust (2015: II n° 1517) for further references.

²³⁹ Cf. already Bailey (1945: 26–27). For the transfer of aspiration, see Sims-Williams (1983: 48–49) and Chen (2016: 198). I suspect that another word for ‘cloth’ in Khotanese, *prahauna*-, rather than be derived from the verb *prahaui*- (DKS: 255), could be analysed as **pra-thauna*- (< **para-tāfna*-), with retroflex *ṇ* due to the preceding *r*. However, the different declension patterns of *prahauna*- (nom. pl. *-e*) and *thauna*- (nom. pl. *-a*) invite one to consider this proposal cautiously.

²⁴⁰ According to Sims-Williams (l.c.), the intervocalic <ɬ> would indicate a hiatus between dissimilar vowels.

²⁴¹ The word occurs with and without the suffix **-ka*-, cf. Burrow (1934: 512) and Lüders (1936: 463–6).

probably simplified by inserting an epenthetic vowel *-a-*. If this is correct, the vocalisation *-āf-* > *-au-* would be very late. Since the Tocharian word shows a monophthongised *au* (> *o*), the dating of the borrowing may be placed in the Late Old Khotanese stage. The nom. sg. in *-o* does not allow a more recent dating.

It may be worth noting that OUygh. *ton* ‘cloth, garment’ has long been considered a loanword from Khotanese *thauna-* (cf. e.g. Gabain 1974: 372). This attribution probably originated from an idea by Schaeder, recorded in Lüders’ *Texilien im alten Turkistan* (1936: 466). Although some Turcologists have been more inclined to interpret it as a native Turkish word,²⁴² Wilkens (HWA: 730) considers it a borrowing from Tocharian or Khotanese.

Results

TB *tono* does not mean ‘silk’, but ‘cloth’ in general. This is confirmed by OKh. *thauna-* ‘cloth’, from which the Tocharian substantive can be derived through borrowing. Because of the monophthongisation *au* > *o* and the Tocharian B nom. sg. in *-o*, the loanword can be attributed to the late Old Khotanese stage. OUygh. *ton* is probably borrowed from Tocharian B or Khotanese *thauna-*.

(24) TB *TVĀÑKARO* ‘GINGER’, LKH. *TTUṂGARA-* ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- *twāñkaro* THT 497 a7; b5, PK AS 9B a4 (medical).
- *twāñkaro* PK AS 9B b2 (medical).²⁴³
- *tvāñkaro* PK AS 2A b2, PK AS 3B b5 (all *Yogaśataka*), PK AS 9A b7 (medical), THT 500-502 b7 (*Jivakapustaka*).
- *tvāñkaraimpa* (com. sg.) PK AS 2B a2.
- *tvāñkaracce* (obl. sg. m. of *tvāñkaratstse*) PK AS 2A a6 (medical).²⁴⁴

Khotanese occurrences

- *ttūṃgara* JP 78v4, 82v3, 88r2, 93v3, 98v2, 99r3, 99v2, 99v3, 101v2, 106v4, 109r5, 111v1, 112r4, 115r2, 115v5, 116r5.
- *ttūgara* JP 98r2
- *ttūṃgarq* JP 58v2
- *ttūṃgarä* JP 88r4, 106r4, 110r3, 111r1, 113r1, 115r5.
- *ttūgarä* JP 87r2
- *ttūṃgarāṃ* Si 130v5
- *ttūgarē* JP 57r4
- *ttūṃgarē* Si 146r2
- *tūṃgarē* Si 101v5

²⁴² See Clauson (1972: 512), Doerfer (1963–75 IV: 450) ‘gut und ursprünglich türkisch’, and Doerfer (1991).

²⁴³ Since the text has older forms, <a> for /á/ might be an archaic feature, rather than simply a mistake.

²⁴⁴ Since no phonetic explanation is available, <v> for <w> might simply signal that the word had a foreign association. For another view, see Malzahn (2007: 270).

Discussion²⁴⁵

Bailey (1937: 913) first proposed a connection between TB *tvāṅkaro* ‘ginger’ and LKh. *ttūṃgara-* ‘id.’ He noted the correspondence TB *-vā-* ~ Khot. *-u-* and compared TB *aṅkwaṣ(ṭ)* ~ Khot. *aṃguṣḍa-* without offering any further explanation. These two forms cannot be compared because TB *tvāṅkaro* contains /wá/ (<wā>), not /wá/ (<wa>) for /u/ as in *aṅkwaṣ(ṭ)* (see s.v.). Some years later, Bailey put forward another etymological proposal.²⁴⁶ He derived the Khotanese word from **tuwam-kara-*, with **tuwam*^o from the Proto-Iranian root **tauH-* ‘to be strong, swell’ (EDIV: 386). The Tocharian form may have preserved the Pre-Khotanese state of affairs and should be considered an ancient loan (Tremblay 2005: 428 and DoT: 343).

Bailey’s derivation implies a nominal form **t(u)v-a-* from the verb **t(u)v-* ‘to be strong’ (DKS: 144). This root is attested as a verb with the causative suffix *-āñ-* in LKh. *tv-āñ-* ‘to strengthen’ (SGS: 41). Several nominal forms from the same root can also be found as medical terms, e.g. LKh. *tv-āñ-āka-* ‘strengtheners’ (KS: 46)²⁴⁷ and LKh. *tv-āmā-* (< **tv-āmatā-*) ‘strengthening’ (KS: 94).²⁴⁸ The case ending of the first member of the compound may have been preserved in the nasal **-m-* before the second member **-kara-*, as in the case of the compound *dīraṃggāra-* ‘evil-doing’ (SVK I: 56, Degener 1987: 39).

This derivation is semantically problematic. *tv-a-* must be a substantive (KS: 1) meaning ‘strong one’, ‘strong thing’ or ‘fat’. The resulting compound could be approximately translated as ‘maker of strong (things or beings)’. Admittedly, such an attribute would suit a person, not a plant. An adjective as first member of the compound would be more fitting. This is possible starting from a form *tv-āna-*, an *-āna-* derivative (prs. ptc. mid., see KS: 78) from the root *tv-* that could have been issued from a proto-form **tvāna-kara-* ‘strong-maker’. This would yield OKh. **tvāmgarāa-*²⁴⁹ through syncope of internal unaccented *-a-*.

Both Old Khotanese reconstructed forms, **tv-aṃ-garaa-* and **tv-ām-garaa-*, may have been antecedents of the attested LKh. *ttūṃgara-*: both OKh. *tvā*^o and *tva*^o may result in LKh. *ttū*^o. For *tvā*^o > *ttū*^o, one may compare the possessive adjective OKh. *tvānaa-* ‘your’ (KS: 85) occurring in LKh. as *ttūnā* (IOL Khot S. 15.11). For *tva*^o > *ttū*^o, OKh. *tvaṃdanu* ‘reverence’ (SGS: 219) and its Late Khotanese counterpart *ttūda* (IOL Khot S. 6.27) can be compared. Both Old Khotanese reconstructed forms may have been borrowed into Tocharian B. There is no need to consider TB *tvāṅkaro* a Pre-Khotanese loanword. The evidence suggests that the word may have been borrowed from the Early Old Khotanese antecedent of LKh. *ttūṃgara-*.²⁵⁰

It might be worth noting that Tib. *li dong-gra*, translating Skt. *nāgara-* ‘ginger’ in the *Siddhasāra* (Emmerick 1985: 313 and Bielmeier 2012: 21–22) is also a Khotanese loanword. That the borrowing took place from Khotanese is made clear by the preceding *li*, which always refers to Khotan (Laufer 1916: 455 fn. 1).

²⁴⁵ This study has been published in Dragoni (2021).

²⁴⁶ First proposed *apud* Ross (1952: 15). See also DKS: 130.

²⁴⁷ This is used as a medical term to describe the properties of an ingredient, cf. Si 16v3-4 *cu mi’ña guṣṭa* [...] *tvāñāka* ‘As for sheep flesh, [...] it (is) a strengthener’.

²⁴⁸ Also a medical term, occurring in Si 144v1.

²⁴⁹ According to Degener (KS: 20), the second member **-garaa-* < **-kara-ka-* is only attested with *-ka-* suffix in Old Khotanese; the forms without it are all Late Khotanese.

²⁵⁰ Another argument in favour of a later dating of the borrowing is the spelling with *v* in Tocharian B, which may be an indicator of more recent loanwords and in any case is not expected in an old loanword.

Results

TB *tvāṅkaro* ‘ginger’ is a loanword from the Early Old Khotanese antecedent of LKh. *ttumgara(a)-* that can be reconstructed as **tv-ām-garaa-* or **tv-ām-garaa-*.

(25) TA *twantam* ‘REVERENCE’, OKh. *tvamdānu* ‘ID.’

Discussion

A connection between TA *twantam* and OKh. *tvamdānu* was first suggested by Konow (1945: 207–8). He interpreted TA *twantam* as a loanword from Khotanese. Phonologically, the correspondence is not problematic. As already noted by Pinault (2002: 250), the striking similarity between the usage of *twantam* and *tvamdānu* in Khotanese and Tocharian, where they are both employed to translate the Buddhist phrase *pradakṣiṇī-kṛ-*, supports this conclusion.

The Khotanese word was already recognised by Konow (SS: 52) to be an old infinitive in *-tanam* > *-tanu* that was added to a verb **tvan-* < PIr. **ati-(H)wandH-* ‘to cherish, praise’ (EDIV: 205). This derivation was supported by Emmerick (SGS: 219–20, with further references) and found its way even into Benveniste’s *Les infinitifs avestiques* (1935: 105). Phonologically, this would be entirely justified, cf. *tvāy-* ‘to convey across’ < **ati-Hwād-aya-* (SGS: 39, the simplex is *bāy-* < **Hwād-aya-*).²⁵¹ Skjærvø (Suv II: 276) is sceptical about this derivation, but does not suggest an alternative solution. The hypothesis of an archaism might seem unlikely from a geographic point of view. The infinitive of the type OP *-tanaīy* is not met with frequently outside Western Iranian, a problem already pointed out by Benveniste (l.c.). However, the same type of infinitive is attested in Tumshuqese, cf. KVāc *pātanāya* (§4) and *patoni* (§6) (Emmerick 1985a: 14).²⁵² The hypothesis of an archaism seems quite acceptable.

Noteworthy is the lack of a Tocharian B match for TA *twantam* (Pinault 2002: 250). I suggest that the lexeme was borrowed from Khotanese directly into Tocharian A.²⁵³ It is impossible to determine the date of the borrowing precisely. Because TA *twantam* belongs to the Buddhist lexicon, it should have been borrowed during the historical period from Old or Late Khotanese. The lack of final vowel in Tocharian A does not necessarily point to Late Khotanese, as it may also have been lost within Tocharian A. Because expressions with *twantam* in Tocharian A show a high level of standardisation, I propose to date the borrowing to the Old Khotanese period.

²⁵¹ As for the verb *tvan-**, the simplex is also attested as OKh. *van-*. As initial *v* clearly points to a loanword, it is difficult to follow Emmerick (SGS: 118) and Cheung (EDIV: 205) in considering this verb as Iranian. OKh. *van-* might be a borrowing from Central Asian Gāndhārī, where, as kindly pointed out to me by Niels Schoubben, *nd* > *n* also occurs very frequently (Burrow 1937: 17). However, as the verb *vand-* does not seem to undergo this change in Gāndhārī (Baums 2009: 670), I see two possible solutions: a. the Khotanese verb was borrowed *after* the Khotanese change of **w-* > *b-* but *before* the Khotanese change of **nd-* > *-n-*; b. there was a concurrent form *van-* in Gāndhārī, perhaps in a less formal register from the Khotan area. It should be stressed that, in support of option b., *-nd-* > *-n-* seems to be much more frequent in the Khotan Dharmapāda (cf. e.g. *vinadi* < *vindati* in Brough 1962: 98–99). Moreover, the Khotanese change **nd-* > *-n-* seems to be quite old, as Sanskrit loanwords in Khotanese do not seem to undergo such change. One may ask oneself whether this peculiar sound change, only attested in Gāndhārī within Middle Indic, was a result of contact with Khotanese, as probably implied by Baums’ (2015: 76) reasoning, or whether it was perhaps an areal feature (Niels Schoubben, p.c.).

²⁵² For possible Sogdian parallels, cf. also Sims-Williams (1989: 48).

Results

TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ is a loanword from OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’ Just like TA *pissaṅk*, q.v., the word may be part of a group of Buddhist words that were borrowed directly into Tocharian A from Khotanese.

(26) TB *twār* ‘?’, OKh. *ttuvare* ‘MOREOVER’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 91 b6 *tumeṃ candramukhe w(alo) ṣecakecce asāṇne ṣmemane twār ṣpā araṇemiṃ werpiśkacce cā(rkenta) ///* ‘Thereupon ki(ng) Candramukha, sitting on the lion-throne and for this reason (beholding?) the gardener Araṇemi (carrying) ga(rlands) ...’ (CEToM, Malzahn ed., cf. also Schmidt 2001: 322).
- IOL Toch 5 b2-3 *mā ṣṣe nta kca cmelane ṇem ra klyaussi kälpāwa twār ṣä postaṇṇe krentā kṣṣinta meṇkitse yolaiṇesa mā ṣṣe nta aṣkār śmāwa* ‘Not even once in the births have I got to hear (this) name, and therefore afterwards, lacking a good teacher, I have not once stood back because of evil’ (CEToM, Peyrot ed.).

Discussion

The meaning and etymology of TB *twār* are unknown. Adams (DoT: 343) translates it as ‘± consequently’ and derives it from the demonstrative pronoun *tu* enlarged with the distributive suffix *ar*. However, this formation has no parallel in Tocharian and the expected meaning ‘per this (?)’ or ‘each time this (?)’ does not fit the passages. Van Windekens’ suggestion of a loanword from Tocharian A (VW: 519) is also unlikely.

I propose that TB *twār* may be connected with OKh. *ttuvare* ‘moreover’ (Emmerick 1970: 122). Because of the absence of the final vowel in Tocharian B, I suggest that the borrowing occurred during the Late Khotanese stage (cf. LKh. *tvarā* in Vajr 1b2). According to Skjærvø, the form *ttuvare* may be derived from **ati-tar-* (Suv II: 143, PIR. **tarH-* ‘to cross over’ EDIV: 380-1).²⁵⁴ A translation ‘moreover’ fits the two Tocharian B passages:

- THT 91 b6 ‘Thereupon ki(ng) Candramukha, sitting on the lion-throne and, moreover, (beholding?) the gardener Araṇemi (carrying) ga(rlands) ...’
- IOL Toch 5 b2-3 ‘Not even once in the births have I got to hear (this) name, and, moreover, afterwards, lacking a good teacher, I have not once stood back because of evil.’

Results

TB *twār* may be an adverb borrowed from LKh. *tvarā* ‘moreover’ (OKh. *ttuvare*). Because of the lack of the final vowel, the borrowing occurred during the Late Khotanese period.

²⁵³ For other Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian A, see §4.3.4.1.

²⁵⁴ Bailey’s (DKS: 132) derivation from **ati-bar-* is probably better phonologically, but the semantics are not entirely satisfactory. Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.) suggests a more likely derivation from **ati-par-*, from the root **par-* ‘to go over, cross over’ (EDIV: 293–94).

TB *PAÑO** ‘?’, OKH. *BAÑA-* ‘BIND’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 554 a6 *pañai trenke cmelaṣṣe tne= klautkāsi (yatām ṣpā 12)* ‘(And they are able) to turn away from the clinging to existence and glory (12)’ (Peyrot 2013: 664). *pañai* is taken as a mistake for *peñyai* (Peyrot, l.c., fn. 53).

Discussion

The meaning and etymology of the Tocharian B hapax *pañai* in THT 554 a6 are unknown. Peyrot (2013: 664 fn. 53) takes *pañai* as a mistake for *peñyai* ‘glory’.²⁵⁵ However, one should first try to interpret the word without emending it. As *pañai* may be an obl. sg., its nom. sg. can be set up as *pañō** or *pañā**. The ending *-o* may point to a borrowing from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. In this case, a connection with the Old Khotanese verb *bañ-* ‘to bind’ (SGS: 92) may be envisaged. The source form may have been a substantive *baña-*, attested in Khotanese (DKS: 266).²⁵⁶ Therefore, I suggest the following translation for THT 554 a6:

- ‘And they are able to turn away from the clinging and binding to existence (12).’

Results

The Tocharian B hapax *pañō** might be a loanword from PK or OKh. *baña-* ‘binding’.

TA *PAM* (PARTICLE), OKH. *PANA-* ‘EACH, EVERY’

Discussion

The meaning and etymology of TA *pam* are unclear. Following the tentative meaning given by Thomas (TEB II: 113) of a general ‘intensive’ particle – he translates it as ‘completely (*vollständig*)’ – a tentative connection may be established with the Old Khotanese adjective and pronoun *pana-* ‘each, every’. However, it must be stressed that even if the correspondence would seem phonologically reasonable, the semantics of TA *pam* are unclear. Peyrot (2013: 279 fn. 186) explicitly rejects Thomas’ hypothesis but abstains from giving an alternative explanation. One should note that Peyrot’s (l.c.) suggestion that ‘the particle entails a certain type of reciprocity or distributivity’ may be connected with the prevalently distributive meaning of OKh. *pana-*.

Results

I propose a tentative connection between the Tocharian A particle *pam* and the Old Khotanese adjective and pronoun *pana-* ‘each, every’. The Tocharian A word might have been borrowed from Khotanese in the historical period.

²⁵⁵ The emendation was probably already implied by Sieg and Siegling (1953: 349 fn. 12), who commented the form with ‘Sic!’, thereby suggesting a mistake, and is reported also by Thomas (1979: 21).

²⁵⁶ Although its occurrence in Or. 12637/51 a2 is very uncertain, see KMB: 139 with different reading.

(27) TB *PĀTRO* A *PĀTĀR* ‘ALMS-BOWL’, KHOT. *PĀTRA-*, SKT. *PĀTRA-*

Discussion²⁵⁷

As Chams Bernard (p.c.) noted, the ending *-o* of the nom. sg. of TB *pātro* ‘alms-bowl’ (obl. sg. *pātrai*) excludes a direct borrowing from Skt. *pātra-* ‘id.’ It points to a borrowing from Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese *pātra-* (acc. sg. *pātro* Z 2.170). Previously, the word had been analysed as a loanword from Sogdian *p’ttr* (Hansen 1940: 152–53), impossible because of the nom. sg. ending *-o*, or from Skt. *pātra-* (Schwentner 1958: 57, DoT: 391).

Results

TB *pātro* ‘alms-bowl’ can be analysed as a loanword from OKh. (or PK) *pātra-* ‘id.’, itself borrowed from Skt. *pātra-* ‘id.’.

(28) TAB *PĀNTO* ‘FRIEND, COMPANION’, OKh. *PANDĀA-* ‘PATH’

Tocharian occurrences

- 1. nom. sg. A 14 a6-b1 || *pñi waste nām (p)ñ(i) – [1] – – – – ñkā – pñi pānto pñi tsārwañant nām* : ‘Virtue/merit is its protection [1], virtue/merit ..., virtue is its *pānto*, virtue is comforting him’ (CETOM, ed. Carling, based on Sieg 1944: 18).²⁵⁸
- 2. nom. sg. (?) PK AS 8C a3-4 // *māladanḍike kenekne piñkale – – [4] (pā)nto* • ‘A Māladanḍikā [is] to be painted on cotton cloth ... [4] [as] (*pā*)nto’ (CETOM, Pinault, Malzahn, Peyrot eds.).
- 3. nom. sg. (?) PK AS 9B b5 /// -s (*p)ā(nt)o sänwits* • || *karavirāṣṣa* ‘as *pānto* (?) for the *sänkwi* [disease],²⁵⁹ (the root) of oleander ...’ (CETOM, Pinault, Malzahn, Peyrot eds.).
- 4. nom. sg. (?) PK AS 9D b3 (*pānt)o sänmāṣṣeñca putna(k)e(śi)* ‘(as *pānt)o* (?) binding ... nard (?)’ (CETOM, Pinault, Malzahn eds.).
- 5. nom. sg. THT 29 a8 (*po spe)l(k)e pyāmtso warkṣāltsa ñiś yesām pānto* : ‘Exert all zeal energetically [with] me as your [pl.] *pānto*’ (Peyrot 2013: 373).
- 6. nom. sg. (as voc.) THT 229 b4 *läkle näkṣi säkw aiṣṣeñcai käṣṣi pānto* : ‘you, destroyer of sorrow, bestower of happiness, teacher, *pānto*!’
- 7. nom. sg. THT 281 b5 (*pelaikn)e pānto eñtsi šek su preke* ‘it (is) always the time to take the *pelaikne-pānto*’.²⁶⁰
- 8. nom. sg. THT 364 a5 /// (*weśe)ññaisa* (?) *pānto tākoy tne nervā(ñ) ///* ‘by the ... voice may he/it be *pānto* here (to?) the nirva(na)’.
- 9. nom. sg. THT 385 b4 • *pānto pārmañko ///* ‘*pānto* hope’.
- 10. nom. sg. THT 1252 b2 /// – *ntane pānto* :

²⁵⁷ I am grateful to C. Bernard, who drew my attention to this word.

²⁵⁸ Lane (1947: 50) had previously restored *pñi waste nām [pñ]i – [1] [pñi pārma]ñk [nām]* and translated ‘Merit is a refuge, merit is – – [1] merit is hope, merit (is) peace’.

²⁵⁹ Adams (DoT: 748) tentatively suggests a meaning ‘facial wrinkles (?)’, pockmarks (?)’ for this unclear word.

²⁶⁰ The restored (*pelaikn)e* is probably due to Thomas (1954: 735). Perhaps it was based on THT 2377.v a2 (11.). It is not in the first edition of the text (Sieg and Siegling 1953: 172).

- 11. nom. sg. THT 2377.v a2 (*pe*)*laikne pānto e* /// ‘... law ... *pānto*’.
- 12. nom. pl. THT 108 a6-7 *inte yes wesi pantañ* [7] *mahāśramanem kāṣṣim art-tastār ṣaṇ wrat lau tārkanacer wes ce āktike nesem* • ‘If you, our *pāntos*, recognise Mahāśramaṇa as your teacher [and] break [lit. give up] your own vow, why should we be amazed?’ (Peyrot 2013: 668).
- 13. obl. sg. PK AS 4B a5 (parallel M 500.1 b4-5) *pāntai källoym imeṣṣe tsirauwñeṣṣe sahāye mā ṇiś āri* : ‘may I obtain the *pānto* of awareness, may the companion of firmness not leave me!’ (CEToM, Pinault, Malzahn eds.).
- 14. obl. sg. IOL Toch 369 a2 /// *-ai ne pantai* – ///²⁶¹
- 15. perl. pl. THT 274 b4 *āyorṣṣe aiśāmñeṣṣe pantaintsā* ‘of gift (and) wisdom ... with the *pāntos*’.

Discussion

Tocharian B *pānto*, borrowed into Tocharian A as *pānto*, has been treated multiple times in the scholarly literature, but no definitive conclusion has been reached regarding its meaning and etymology. In this discussion, I will first seek to determine the precise semantic range of *pānto*. Subsequently, I will critically assess previous etymological explanations and propose a possible connection with OKh. *pandāa*- through borrowing.

On the meaning of TAB *pānto*

Among the occurrences listed above, only numbers 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, and 13 may help determine the meaning of *pānto*. 2, 3 and 4 are from medical texts, and the word has been restored based on very few traces in the fragments. 10, 11 and 14 are too fragmentary to be taken into consideration.

In 1, *pānto* is associated with TA *pñi* ‘puṇya’. In 5, the Buddha speaks and identifies himself as *pānto*. In 6, *pānto* seems also to refer to the Buddha, and it occurs after *kāṣṣi* ‘teacher’ in what appears to be a vocative. In 7, it refers to a positive person or thing that has to be taken at the right time. In this case, if the restoration is correct, it occurs after *pelaikne* ‘dharma’, as perhaps in 11. In 12, *pānto* is used in the nominative plural, referring to the two Kāśyapa brothers. It is used as a deferential address to the brothers, who are about to take refuge by their disciples. In the same fragment (a6), the disciples had addressed the Kāśyapa brothers with *„pādhyāy(i)* ‘teachers’ (cf. 6). In 13, *pānto* seems to be someone endowed with awareness (*imeṣṣe*) and whose company is to be wished for. Immediately after *pānto*, *sahāye* ‘friend, companion’ is used in the same passage. In 15, it is associated with gift and wisdom.

No bilingual evidence is available. However, the context of the passages helps determine the semantic range of *pānto*: it refers to a person, not to an abstract concept, and has an intrinsic positive quality. Based on the textual associations, its meaning can be thus assumed to be in the same range as ‘teacher’ (*kāṣṣi*, *upādhyāye*) and ‘friend, companion’ (*sahāye*).

The association with *sahāye* (Skt. *sahāya*-) in PK AS 4B is promising and deserves more extensive treatment. The fragment belongs to the Tocharian *Udānastotra*, a ‘collection of pious wishes resulting from the merit hopefully gained from writing each chapter of the Udānavarga’ (Peyrot 2016: 306). The occurrences of *sahāye*, a loanword from Skt.

²⁶¹ Given the archaic character of the fragment, *pantai* may stand for *pāntai*, but the context is fragmentary.

sahāya- ‘friend, companion’, are very limited in number in the Tocharian text corpus.²⁶² As a working hypothesis, I suggest that this rare occurrence of *sahāye* in PK AS 4B may be due to the presence of Skt. *sahāya*- in the original. As the *Udānastotra* is an original Tocharian composition, the passage in question could be a direct quotation or a paraphrase of a Sanskrit source. This is even more likely if one considers that the so-called ‘introduction II’ of the longer version of the Tocharian *Udānastotra* to which the text of PK AS 4B a5 belongs (Peyrot 2016: 319) has an unclear function and is extremely composite. Given the strong connection of the Tocharian *Udānastotra* with the Sanskrit *Udānavarga*, the quotation could have been taken from the *Udānavarga* itself. Chapter 14 of the *Udānavarga*, the so-called *Drohavarga*, has a passage containing *sahāya*- (§14.13) that helps interpret PK AS 4B a5. The stanza is about the famous *topos* of the necessity of finding a wise friend to associate with (see Salomon 2000: 158 for the wider textual dimensions of these two verses):

- *sa cel labhed vai nipakaṃ sahāyaṃ loke caran sādhu hi nityam eva | abhibhūya sarvāṇi parisravāṇi careta tenāptamanā smṛtāmā* | (Bernhard 1965: 211).
- ‘Findest du einen klugen Gefährten, der mit dir geht durch dick und dünn, gefestigt, klug und richtig lebend, dann folge ihm mit frohem Herzen, achtsam, und du wirst alle Schwierigkeiten überwinden.’ (Hahn 2007: 54)

Based on this parallel, I propose that the Tocharian passage is a paraphrase of the first verse. The following lexical correspondences can be established: *pāntai* and *sahāye* = *sahāya*-, *källoy*m = *labhate*, *imeṣṣe* = *nipaka*-, *tsirauwñeṣṣe* = *nitya*-. I suggest the following translation for PK AS 4B a5:

- 13. ‘May I find a wise friend! May the strong friend not abandon me!’

This yields a good argument for identifying *pānto* as a translation of Skt. *sahāya*-, as suggested by Sieg (1944: 18). He commented on the translation of *pānto* as ‘Gefährte’ in Tocharian A with ‘etwa = Skt. *sahāya*-.’ The reasoning behind this enigmatic comment remains obscure, but it may have been based on the occurrence of *pānto* next to *sahāye* in PK AS 4B. I could not justify Lévi’s (1933: 71) first tentative translation ‘paix’, for which cf. also Poucha (1955: 166).

It is now possible to translate also the other passages more precisely. A translation ‘friend, companion’ fits all the reliable occurrences of the word:

- 1. ‘Virtue/merit is its protection [1], virtue/merit ..., virtue is its friend, virtue is comforting him’
- 5. ‘Exert all zeal energetically [with] me as your [pl.] friend’
- 6. ‘You, destroyer of sorrow, bestower of happiness, teacher, friend!’
- 7. ‘It (is) always the time to take a Dharma-friend’²⁶³
- 9. ‘friend, hope’

²⁶² A preliminary search in CEToM identified only two other occurrences in Tocharian B in fragmentary contexts and one in Tocharian A.

²⁶³ A matter for future investigation may be the existence in Tocharian of a compound *pelaikne-pānto* that, according to the discussion above, may refer to Skt. *dharma-sahāya*- and could perhaps contribute to a better understanding of passage 7 (‘It is always time to take a *dharma-sahāya*- (?)’).

- 11. ‘Dharma-friend’
- 12. ‘If you, our friends, recognise Mahāśramaṇa as your teacher [and] break [lit. give up] your own vow, why should we be amazed?’
- 15. ‘of gift (and) wisdom ... with the friends’

On the etymology of TAB *pānto*

The etymology of *pānto* is likewise debated. Schmidt (1987: 289–90) interpreted it as the Tocharian outcome of the Indo-European word for ‘path’, implying a formation similar to PIIr. **pantaH-*. He was followed by Peters (2004: 267 fn. 5). Malzahn (2011: 95 fn. 31) convincingly rejected this proposal on phonological grounds (/a/ in Tocharian B would not be expected) and clarified the declension pattern of *pānto*, which should belong to the *okso*-type, (obl. sg. -ai, not -a,²⁶⁴ also followed by Del Tomba 2020: 140). She seemed further inclined to accept Hilmarsson’s (1986: 223) proposal of an **ōn*-derivative of an *nt*-participial formation from PIE **peh₂-* ‘to protect’. However, as remarked by Louise Friis (p.c.), it is noteworthy that no such stem is attested in Tocharian B. Instead, only a **-ske/o-* formation occurs in TB *pask-* A *pās-*. Although one could argue for an early lexicalisation of this root stem (Louise Friis, p.c.), this derivation remains difficult.

No satisfactory etymology has been proposed for TAB *pānto* so far. *pānto* could be a loanword from a neighbouring language. In this case, the nom. sg. in -o may point to Khotanese as a donor language. In Old Khotanese, the outcome of **pantaH-* can be found in *pan-dāa-* ‘way, path’. The peculiar declension pattern of OKh. *pan-dāa-* was treated by Emmerick (SGS: 308–10). Whereas in almost all cases the endings are those regularly expected for the polysyllabic *āa*-declension (from older **-āka-*), in the nom. sg. *pande* and the acc. sg. *pando*, the endings are those inherited, i.e. **-āh* > -e and **-ām* > -o. Thus, a borrowing from the acc. sg. *pando* could account for its phonological shape. The word maintains its masculine gender in Tocharian.

The semantic development ‘way, road’ > ‘companion’ deserves a more detailed analysis. As for the semantics of the Old Khotanese word, bilingual evidence shows that it translates Skt. *mārga-* (Canevascini 1993: 270). Various compounds with *pan-dāa-* are attested, cf. *panda-rāysa-* ‘guide’. Later -ka- derivatives of this word are frequent within Iranian, cf. Bactrian *πανδαγο* (Sims-Williams 2007: 251) ‘road’. In Ossetic, the -ka- formation *fændag* (Abaev I: 445–6) maintained the original meaning of ‘road’ and the simplex Oss. I *fænd*, D *fændæ* acquired the secondary semantic connotation of ‘intention, plan, wish’ (Cheung 2002: 61). It may be argued that this second meaning originated from an intermediate stage ‘support, advice’, so that the semantic path could be outlined as follows: ‘way’ > ‘advice, support’ > ‘intention’. This intermediary passage is documented by MP *pand* ‘advice’ (CPD: 64), which has also been preserved in New Persian. In Manichaean Middle Persian, *h’m-pnd* /hāmpand/ is ‘companion’ (DMMP: 174).²⁶⁵

²⁶⁴ She convincingly argued that *pantañ* in THT 108 (12 in the list above) should be taken as a hypercorrect form for an older *pantaiñ*. On the deviating late features of THT 108 see further s.v. *u-wātano**.

²⁶⁵ Independently of each other, Mauro Maggi and Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.) have proposed that TAB *pānto* may have been borrowed from an unattested OKh. **hampándāa-*, with the meaning ‘friend’ (cf. MMP *h’m-pnd*), with loss of the unaccented prefix **ham-* (see s.v. *keš*). This solution has the

The forms presented above show that, even if the meaning ‘friend’ for *pandāa-* is not documented in Khotanese, a similar semantic development (‘way’ > ‘advice’ > ‘advisor, friend’) is widely attested in different Middle and Modern Iranian languages of the area. Thus, one may assume the same developments also for Khotanese. Because of the final *-o* of the Tocharian form, a loanword from Sogdian (cf. MSogd. *pnd* [S *pnt*] ‘near [prep.], kinsman [subst.]’) can be safely excluded. Regarding the dating of the borrowing, the Old Khotanese period can be posited as *terminus ante quem*. It cannot be excluded that the borrowing occurred earlier (Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese period). Still, there is so far no feature in support of this assumption.

Results

Because of the possible identification of PK AS 4B a5 as a paraphrase of Uv §14.13, I propose that TAB *pānto* can be translated as ‘friend, companion (Skt. *sahāya-*)’, confirming Sieg’s (1944: 18) preliminary suggestion. As no etymology proposed thus far is satisfactory, I argue that *pānto* could be a loanword from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese *pando*, acc. sg. of *pandāa-* ‘path’. As for the semantic development ‘path, way’ > ‘support, advice’ > ‘friend, companion’, I suggest this also occurred in Khotanese, even if not directly attested. Similar developments in the Middle and Modern Iranian languages of the area support this scenario.

(29) TB *PARAKA-* ‘TO PROSPER, THRIVE’, OKH. *PHARĀKA-* ‘MORE’

Tocharian occurrences

- Bilingual evidence: inf. IOL Toch 106 b5 *parākatsi* = Skt. *vr̥ddhiṃ* ‘to prosper’ (Schmidt 1984: 152), caus. *parakāsk-* (agent noun) *parākāṣṣeṇca* = *hlādī*, Toch. ‘making prosper’, Skt. ‘rejoicing’ (Schmidt 2000: 226, Peyrot 2013: 769 fn. 400, see the discussion below for more details).
- Base verb *paraka-* impf. 2pl. THT 370 b5 *porośicer*, 3pl. THT 404 a4 *porośyem* (Schmidt 2000: 226, DoT: 380), abstract THT 177 b2 *parākālīe*.
- Caus. *parakāsk-* prs. ptc. THT 549 b3, THT 176 a7 *parākāskemane*.

Discussion

As already established by Schmidt (2000: 226), the base verb *paraka-* means ‘to prosper, thrive’ (Skt. *vr̥dh-*, cf. *supra*) and the causative *parakāsk-* ‘to make prosper, rejoice’ (Skt. *hlād-*).

advantage of simplifying the complex semantic development required by a borrowing from *pandāa-*. On the other hand, however, it is based on an unattested lexeme whose reconstruction is not trivial. Therefore, my preference goes to the hypothesis of a borrowing from Khot. *pandāa-*. An alternative option suggested to me by Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.) involves the reconstruction of a form with a prefix **ha-* instead of **ham-*. A similar formation with the same meaning is attested in the most frequent Khotanese word for ‘friend’, Khot. *hayūna-* (< **ha-yauna-*). This option is to be taken into consideration also in view of a possible derivation of Sogd. *pnt* ‘near [prep.], kinsman [subst.]’ from the same pre-form with regular loss of the prefix, but it remains tentative for the moment. As no other Sogdian loanword with final *-o* has been identified so far in Tocharian, the option of a direct borrowing from Sogdian seems also not ideal.

Adams (DoT: 380) gives ‘to prosper’ for the Grundverb and ‘to refresh’ for the causative, which appears to be a good compromise. It is difficult to attribute the secondary meaning ‘to comfort’ to the base verb (Peyrot 2013: 769).

TB *paraka-* belongs to a series of four verbs that are unique in Tocharian verbal morphology because of their trisyllabic structure. These are *kalaka-* ‘to follow’, *paraka-* ‘to prosper’, *walaka-* ‘to stay’, and *sanapa-* ‘to anoint’ (Peyrot 2013: 69). It is significant that for two of these verbs (*paraka-* and *sanapa-*) an extra-Tocharian origin has been proposed. Whereas for *sanapa-* a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese source may be posited with a high degree of certainty (cf. s.v. *sanapa-*), the same cannot be said for *paraka-*. Van Windekens’ hypothesis (VW: 635) about the origin of this verb cannot stand closer scrutiny, as already noted by Adams (1988: 402). He proposed that TB *paraka-* may have been borrowed from a reconstructed Middle Iranian form **para-ka-* (?), namely, in his own words, a *na*-less variant of the famous Av. *xʷarəṇō* (‘il constitue une trace d’une forme de l’ancien iranien **hvar-*, **xvar-* [...] sans suffixe en *-n-*’). If we follow Van Windekens’ proposal, the only ‘*na*-less variant’ of Av. *xʷarəṇō* within Middle Iranian with an initial labial is Khot. *phārra-* (DKS: 261). However, even if the semantics would not be problematic – but VW’s parallel with English *glad* is based on the older meaning attributed to the Tocharian verb – no *ka*-derivative of *phārra-* is attested within Khotanese. Moreover, the Old Iranian word had already been borrowed from Old Steppe Iranian in the form TB *perne* A *parām*. Thus, it is difficult to admit a more recent borrowing from another donor language for such a well-known concept.²⁶⁶

The origin of *paraka-* is still uncertain. It could be a loanword from a neighbouring language. The frequent Old Khotanese adjective *pharāka-* ‘many’ (KS: 193) may be a suitable candidate. This connection is not problematic on the phonological side, but it presupposes a non-trivial semantic change ‘many’ > ‘to multiply’ > ‘to prosper’. The meaning ‘to refresh’ or ‘to rejoice’ assigned to the causative could be a secondary, inner-Tocharian development.

As for the dating of the borrowing, *sanapa-* shows that this class of trisyllabic verbs was open to borrowing into the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese period. Thus, the Pre-Khotanese or Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese dating for *sanapa-* could also be posited for *paraka-*.

Results

As Van Windekens’ previous etymological proposal could not stand closer scrutiny, the verb TB *paraka-* ‘to prosper’ may be connected to the Old Khotanese adjective *pharāka-* ‘many’. This would entail a semantic development ‘many’ > ‘to multiply’ > ‘to prosper’. The meaning ‘to refresh’ or ‘to rejoice’ assigned to the causative would be a secondary, inner-Tocharian development. This verb may have been formed on an adjective borrowed from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese.

²⁶⁶ However, a double borrowing could not be excluded (cf. TB *kāmarto** ‘chief’ ← PTK and *melte* ‘pile’ ← OSIr.).

(30) TB *PARSO* A *PÄRS* ‘LETTER’, OKH. *PULSÄ* ‘TO ASK’

Tocharian occurrences

- B *parso* THT 65 a3 *kuse parso watkäṣṣām pai(katsi)* ‘Whoever orders a letter to be written’ (DoT: 384), THT 492 a2 *tākaṃ parso ette paiyka ška plāwa* ‘If [you have] the letter, sign [it] and send [it to me]!’ (Peyrot 2013: 346), THT 492 a3 *parso ly-wāwa-š plās aškār mā lywāsta* ‘I have sent you a letter, [but] you haven’t sent an answer’ (Peyrot 2013: 346), PK DA M 507.37 and .36 a26 *-me koroy taiṣis parso kā* /// ‘... Koroy ... a letter to the Great Commissioner ...’ (Ching 2010: 211), PK LC 25 a1 *šaryoy parso* ‘A letter to my love.’ (Ching 2010: 149)
- B *pārso* THT 389 b3 *sā kca pārso somp ślokā kca sa* – /// ‘She some letter, she over there some strophe ... (?)’, PK NS 58 b3 *• käryortaññe • pārso* ‘the merchant letter (?)’, THT 463 a5 *pārso ñatti cāneṃ wsāwa* ‘A letter to Ñ. (and) coins I have given.’ (cf. Thomas 1957: 141)
- B *pārsona* PK DA M 507.32 a6 *ñake Śiṅkunmeṃ pārsona yauyekānta klāstār* ‘Now, he (Puttisene?) has undertaken the official labor services (to deliver) letters from Śiṅku(n).’ (Ching 2010: 226)
- B *pārsanta* THT 206 b2 /// *pārsanta ṣem= akṣarsa ne* /// ‘Letters, one single akṣara (?)’²⁶⁷
- A *pārsant* A 403 a5 /// *pārsant p(e)kar* || ‘They wrote letters.’

Discussion

The etymology of TB *parso* A *pärs* is still debated. Two solutions have been proposed in the last century. The first proposal connects the word with the Tocharian verb B *pārša*- A *präsā*- ‘to sprinkle’ (for the verb, see Peyrot 2013: 774). The second considers it a loanword from Pre-Khotanese **parsa*-. In the following, I will analyse the two proposals in detail.

The first proposal goes back to an article by Van Windekens (1962: 343–44) and has been taken up multiple times in the literature (VW: 364–65, Pinault 2008: 378). Van Windekens sought to explain the semantics by comparing the adjective TB *pārsāntse* A *pārsānt* ‘resplendent, speckled’ (DoT: 402), a derivative of the same verb TB *pārša*- A *präsā*- ‘to sprinkle’. Close parallels for the semantic shift (‘to make speckled’ > ‘draw, write’ > ‘letter’) are delivered by the continuants of the Proto-Indo-European root **peik-* (LIV: 465), cf. Greek *ποικίλος* ‘varicolored’ and TB *pāyk*- A *pāyk*- ‘to write’. Although formally impeccable, this suggestion is semantically problematic. The main difficulty lies in the fact that the derivative of the same verb TB *pārša*- A *präsā*-, the adjective *pārsāntse*, already means ‘resplendent, speckled’. It is uncommon for two derivatives of the same verb to differ so much in their semantics. TB *parso* and A *pärs* need a new etymological interpretation.

Bailey (SDTV: 67, DKS: 224) connected the Tocharian word with LKh. *pa’sa*- ‘messenger’. This word occurs in late documents. Its meaning was established by Bailey (1964: 11–12). Since it occurs in the same context as LKh. *haḍa*- ‘messenger’, it should also cover the same semantics. To assess the validity of this hypothesis, it is necessary to reconsider the occurrences of *pa’sa*- in Late Khotanese. Bailey (DKS: 224) lists six occurrences:

²⁶⁷ If *pārsanta* stands for *pārsona*.

- 1. P 2898.12-13 *khu pa'sa kaje ra māṣti ma kamacū āvūṃ* 'When as messenger in the month *Kaja* (second spring month) I came here (*ma = mara*) to Kam-cū (Kan-ṣou)' (Text KT II: 117, translation DKS: 224).
- 2. P 2741.3 *khu vā ṇaṣā bīsā pa'sa mistye ysarrnīṃje jānave vī āṇa ysa kāmācū vāṣṭā ysarrnai parau nāteṃ*. 'When I, the humble servant, as envoy, received the Golden (= imperial) Order from the Great Golden Land to go to Kamcū' (Text KT II: 87, translation SDTV: 64).
- 3. Or. 12637/25 a1²⁶⁸ / (ś)irī maṃ āmāci pa'sa pastai '... Councilor rMāṃi?] Śirī here ordered the minister Sa in Pa'(?).' (KMB: 133)
- 4. Or. 12637/25 a4 āmāc[i] pa'sa vā (by)āta hamā / '... the *minister Sa in Pa'... shall recall ...'²⁶⁹
- 5. P 2786.60-62²⁷⁰ *ca ma pā tcau ttūau-ttau āstaṃna ṣacū bīsā haḍa tsvāṃda paisa hadyaja māṣtai haḍa ttiyāṃ hadara vya bīsai vā tcā yāṃ-yikā naumq šau ā mūtcaica māṣtai* 'Then those who left here as messengers (*pa'sa*) in Haṃdyaja (5th) month, (namely) Tcau Dutou (a Chinese surname plus title) and other envoys (*haḍa*) of Shazhou, among them one came back, Cā Yāṃ-yikā by name, in Mūtcaica (9th) month' (SVK II: 82).
- 6. = P 2786.146-149 *cq maṃ pā tcau ttu-ttau āstaṃ[na] ṣaca bīsā haḍa tsvāṃda pai'sq haṃdyaja māṣtai ttiyau vā hadara vya bīsai ra vā cā yāṃ-yikā naumq šau ā mūtcaicq māṣtai* (cf. *supra* for the translation).

In addition to Bailey's six occurrences, the word is attested twice in the corpus:²⁷¹

- 7. P 2925.49-50 *āṣkālakyau jsa jūdai auna ttraikṣa bīdai kāṣṭa : paisa pharāka hasta yai cau a ttara yaiṇinau* 'With tears, being alive, he found grievous sorrows. Many *paisa*²⁷² were better, that I would make (used to make?) there.' (cf. DKS: 111)
- 8. SI P 94.18 a1 *maṃ tta pa'sa āstaṃna* 'Those messengers remained here.' (SDTV I: 102)

The meaning 'messenger' could fit the context of 1, 2, 5, 6, 3, 4 point to a proper name and 7, 8 are still unclear. In 1, 5, and 6, *pa'sa*- precedes a month name. I explored the possibility that in these three cases *pa'sa*- could stand for *pā'sa* (*salya*) and be interpreted as a dating formula ('(the year of the) pig').²⁷³ However, no cases of dating formulae with omitted *salya* 'year' are

²⁶⁸ = M.T. 0460. In KMB: 133, Skjærvø reads *pa'sa* and interprets it as personal name + place name. However, the order of *pa'* and *sa* is uncommon and does not support his translation. It would be more natural to interpret *pa'sa* as the full name of the *āmātya*. Bailey (DKS: 224) read earlier *āmāci pa'sa pastai* (KT II: 198) and translated 'The *āmātya*-minister commanded the messenger.'

²⁶⁹ KMB: 133. DKS: 224 reads instead [*āmā*]c[i] *pa'sa*.

²⁷⁰ For P 2786.64 *pasakāṣṭa* and not *pasa kāṣṭa* see Kumamoto *apud* SVK II: 80-2.

²⁷¹ For *pa'siṇa*-, not a derivative of *pa'sa*-, see Skjærvø *apud* SVK III: 89.

²⁷² I tentatively assume that *paisa* could rather mean 'teacher' (OKh. *pīśaa*-) or 'work of art' (*pīśa*-, see SVK III: 94-96).

²⁷³ Cf. IOL Khot 165/1b 12 *pā'sā salya siṃjsīji māṣti 28mye haḍai* 'In the Year of the Pig, the 28th day of the month of Siṃjsījsa.' (*Amṛtaprabhadhāraṇī*, see KMB: 372)

found. Based on these occurrences, there is no compelling evidence that *pa'sa-* should mean 'messenger'. At best, one could argue that *pa'sa-* refers to some unknown official title.

Bailey's translation 'messenger' also involved some etymological speculations. He derived *pa'sa-* from a reconstructed OKh. **palsa-* that, in turn, he suggested to be from an older **parsa-*. The first mention of this derivation can be found in Bailey (1964: 11–12). This is not problematic on phonological grounds: OKh. *-l-* in clusters like *-ls-* could be lost and replaced by a subscript hook, while OKh. *-ls-* goes back to PIr. **-rs-*. However, his claim that **parsa-* is the only Iranian continuant of PIE **pelh2-(k)-* 'sich nähern' (LIV: 407) is less convincing. It seems to have been designed as an *ad hoc* explanation for the alleged meaning 'messenger'.

Overall, both etymological proposals show unsurmountable difficulties. As C. Bernard (p.c.) pointed out, it may be profitable to develop further Isebaert's (1980: 104) suggestion of a loanword from an Old Iranian form **pr̥sā-*. Isebaert's (1980: 104) reconstructed Old Iranian form is based on Skt. *pr̥cchā-* (MW: 645) and OAv. *frasā-* (Kellens and Pirart 1990: 270), a substantive meaning 'question, (lit.) asking'. As Isebaert (l.c.) already noted, the passage in THT 492 a3, mentioning both a 'letter' ('question') and an 'answer' (*plās*), may support this explanation. As for the phonology, an Old Iranian form akin to the Old Avestan one cannot have been the source of TB *parso* because its adaptation as a loanword from Old Steppe Iranian into Tocharian B would have been ***persa*.²⁷⁴

As a derivation from Old Steppe Iranian is difficult, the lexeme might be a loanword from Khotanese. In this language, *puls-* 'to ask' (SGS: 85) is the regular outcome of PIr. **pr̥sa-* with vocalisation of **r̥* as **ur > ul* because of the initial labial. The Tocharian B nom. sg. *-o* points to a borrowing from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. Since no substantive ***pulsā-* 'question' is attested in Old Khotanese, I propose that Tocharian B *parso* /*pārso*/ may be an adaptation of a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese infinitive based on the present stem. The regular present infinitive of *puls-* would be ***pulsā*. Tocharian speakers interpreted the final *-ā* as the marker of a nom. sg. and set up an acc. sg. in *-u* that they borrowed as a substantive with nom. sg. *-o*.²⁷⁵

This derivation is important for the reconstruction of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese. It may be argued that this language still had a vocalic **r̥* in its phoneme inventory.²⁷⁶ As for the semantics, PTK **pr̥su* was borrowed with the meaning of 'request' at a time when writing did not exist yet, and only afterwards it came to be used as 'letter'.

Results

Following a suggestion by C. Bernard (p.c.), I support Isebaert's (1980: 104) explanation of the etymology of TB *parso* A *pārs* 'letter'. Instead of Isebaert's source form **pr̥sā-* 'question', however, I suggest that the most likely source may be identified in PTK **pr̥su*. This form arose due to the reanalysis of an infinitive based on the present stem of the verb OKh. *puls-* 'to ask' (OKh. *pulsā*) as the nom. sg. of a substantive **pulsā-*, with acc. sg. **pulsu*.

²⁷⁴ For the adaptation of *ā*-stems in loanwords from Old Steppe Iranian, see Bernard (2023: 71).

²⁷⁵ A form *pulsu* is also attested in Old Khotanese, and Emmerick (SGS: 218) takes this ending as a variant spelling of the more frequent *-ā*. However, it is more likely that this *-u* is due to assimilation. On *nāju* in Z 4.18, another alleged occurrence of this ending, interpreted by Maggi (2009: 161 fn. 14) as a variant ending of the present infinitive, see Dragoni (Forthc.).

²⁷⁶ However, the possibility of a reconstruction PTK **pursu* with early vocalisation of **r̥* and PTK **u* borrowed as TB /*ə*/ cannot be entirely ruled out.

TA PĀŚIM ‘TREASURE (?)’, KHOT. PĀRGYIÑA- ‘ID. (?)’

Tocharian occurrences

- Nom. sg. A 333 b3 *arthis pāśinn oki nāntsu abhidharm-sāstrā* ‘The *abhidharma-sāstra* is like a treasure (or receptacle?) of meaning (Skt. *artha-kośa*-?).’²⁷⁷
- Nom. pl. A 74 a1 *neñci pāśināñ ypic ñemi(ntyuo)* ‘Sicherlich Gefäße voller Perlen.’ (Sieg 1952: 22)
- Obl. pl. A 63 a6 *rotkar pākār pāśinās* ‘They carried the treasures into the open’, A 57 a5 *pāsoñcsam elantyo pātstsāc pāśinās* ‘Put (pl.) treasures with gifts among the begging ones!’²⁷⁸
- Com. sg. THT 1412.i a2 *pāśina[śś](äl)* ‘with treasures’ (Itkin 2019: 143).

Khotanese occurrences

- In Old Khotanese, only one form with *-r-* is found: this is the loc. pl. in Z 22.135, tentatively translated as ‘garden’: *pārgyiñuvo spāte vicitra* ‘In the gardens will be variegated flowers’ (Emmerick 1968: 309).
- All other occurrences have only *-j-*: loc. pl. Z 22.156 *rrundā pājiñuvo* ‘*ttuviḍā*’ ‘He will bring them to the king’s treasures (*rājakośa* ?)’ (Emmerick 1968: 313), acc. sg. Z 24.512 *thu paro dritai balysqnu utāru hastamo pājiñu dātīmju aggañjso* ‘You have kept the noble Buddha-command, the best, faultless treasury of the Law (*dharmakośa*- ?)’ (Emmerick 1968: 419).
- The substantive occurs with *-j-* also in Late Khotanese Buddhist texts: nom./acc. pl. Suv 3.91²⁷⁹ *bīsivirā satva himāñde. spa-masve pājiñā tsāvi* ‘May the beings be noble sons, (their) hoards sufficient, rich’ (the Sanskrit version [Suv I: 59] has *kośāḥ* for *pājiñā*), nom./acc. pl. P 4099.139 *baśuñā pājeñā* ‘all kinds of treasures’ (Emmerick Unpublished (b)), loc. sg. P 4099.150-151 *ā khu {ā khu} artha spaśa carauna ttāra va pājañā śīya* ‘or as one sees objects with a lamp in a dark treasury at night’,²⁸⁰ P 3513.50r3 *ajāmja pājeñā ī bu’jsyām byauda* ‘may the inexhaustible treasury be [these things that are] possessed of virtues’ (Skt. *sarva-guṇair bhavi akṣaya-kośaḥ*) (Asmussen 1961: 21–22).
- Note two additional occurrences in the documents of the Hedin collection: Hedin 16.1-2 *cirāṃ naṃdakā ṣṣau qni sṃmi pājiñā ysārī haṃbā mūri hauḍā drrai ysārī* ‘Naṃdaka from Cira delivered 3000 (*mūrās*) in (strings of) 1000 *mūrās* into the treasury of ṣṣau An Sam’ (Zhang 2016: 252) and Hedin 19.13-14 *kṣvā auvā namaubudi ṣau qni sṃmi pājiñā mūri hauḍā ysārī haṃbā tcahau’si ys’cya* ‘Namaubuda in the Six Towns delivered into the treasury of Ṣau An Sam 40000 *mūrās* with (strings of) 1000 *mūrās*’ (Zhang 2016: 284).

²⁷⁷ Böhrtlingk and Roth (I: 110) give the compound *arthakośa-* as ‘Schatzkammer’ (?). No other occurrences in which *pāśim* translates precisely Skt. *kośa-* are available. Therefore, this translation remains uncertain.

²⁷⁸ For this and the previous translation, cf. CEToM, Carling, Pinault, Malzahn eds. Cf. also Schmidt (2004: 311) who has ‘Gefäße’ instead of ‘treasures’. The Sanskrit parallel suggests that *pāśim*, in this case, may translate Skt. *nidhi-* ‘store, hoard, treasure’ (MW: 548).

²⁷⁹ MS P, see Suv I: 58.

²⁸⁰ Emmerick Unpublished (b), superseding DKS: 228 and 439.

Discussion

Since Bailey's article 'Recent work in "Tokharian"' (Bailey 1947: 149), the connection between TA *pāśim* and Old Khotanese *pārgyiña-/pājiña-* seems to have been tacitly accepted (KT IV: 108, KT VI: 176, VW: 636, DoT: 193). To assess the validity of this proposal, it is necessary to re-examine all the occurrences of the word in the two languages. The first section analyses the etymology and meaning of TA *pāśim*. The second section examines *pārgyiña-* and *pājiña-* in Old Khotanese. The third section presents the results of the investigation.

TA *pāśim*

The meaning of *pāśim* is said to cover the semantic range of Sanskrit *kośa-* 'vessel, store-room, treasury',²⁸¹ but the equation TA *pāśim* = Skt. *kośa-* is not supported by bilingual evidence. Nevertheless, Bailey (1947: 149) and Poucha (1955: 168) quote it as the equivalent of Skt. *kośa-* without any textual reference. The correspondence might be based on the bilingual evidence available for Khotanese *pājiña-* (cf. *supra*). This assumption implies that the Tocharian was borrowed from Khotanese, so the reasoning is circular. The only hint at a possible Sanskrit equivalent is given by the passage contained in A 57. According to Schmidt (2004: 311), a parallel Sanskrit passage to A 57 has *nidhi-* 'store, hoard, treasure' (MW: 548).

Some scholars have attempted to consider the word as inherited. Poucha (1955: 168) connected TA *pāśim* with the PIE root **b^heg-* 'divide, distribute' (LIV: 65, Ved. *bhājati*, etc.). Although a formation **b^hōg- + 'in-* is unprecedented, this is not phonologically problematic, but the semantic problems involved make the derivation hardly acceptable. A derivation from the Tocharian verb A *pāś-* 'to beg' (Peyrot 2013: 668) is implied by Dietz's typescript notes (VTW: s.v.). He translated the word 'Bettelschale, Almosenschale, Gefäß' with a later, handwritten addition 'Schatz'. Further proof that he considered TA *pāśim* a derivative of *pāś-* 'to beg' is given by a second handwritten annotation pointing the reader to Skt. *pātra-*, the Buddhist alms bowl. A translation '*pātra*' fits the available occurrences. The meaning might have been generalised as 'receptacle' or 'container'. This fits the passages contained in A 333 and A 74.

OKh. *pārgyiña-/pājiña-*

The proposal of a native formation appears more convincing. Nevertheless, it is still necessary to examine the suggestion of a loanword from Khotanese.

pārgyiña-/pājiña- is problematic. First, the reconstruction of the original shape of the Khotanese word is not straightforward. Only one Old Khotanese occurrence has internal *-r-*. Bailey considers the form with *-r-* as the original one, thus implying loss of *-r-*. This is plausible, given that the loss of *-r-* before consonants is more frequent and well-attested. This development appears older than intrusive *-r-*, also attested.²⁸² However, given that the forms with *-r-* are limited to one, it cannot be excluded that *-r-* in *pārgyiña-* was also intrusive.

The derivation proposed by Bailey (DKS: 233) is impossible on phonological grounds. Earlier, Bailey (1939: 1058 and KT VI: 177) had dismissed Morgenstierne's etymology (< **pari-či-*) and proposed a problematic derivation from **pāri-°*. He returned to the old hypothesis in DKS: 233. Suv II: 302 (s.v. *pājini-*, although the occurrences in the Book of Zambasta point to a short *a*-stem) reports the etymology with long *-ā-* of KT VI: 177 with a

²⁸¹ MW: 314. SWTF: 168 has 'Behälter, Gehäuse; Hülle, (Schwert)scheide; Kiste, (Schatz)truhe'.

²⁸² See Dresden (1955: 408 (8) and (9)).

question mark. Bailey's reconstructed form **pari-činyā-* (from the Proto-Iranian root **čai-* 'to heap up, gather, collect'²⁸³) would have yielded ***palj(s)iñā-* (cf. the verb **paljsan-* < **pari-čana-*, cf. SGS: 76). Moreover, loss of *-l-* is usually indicated by a subscript hook. It does cause fronting, not lengthening, of the preceding vowel. The etymology of *pārgyiñā-* remains obscure.

As for the meaning, all occurrences fit the same semantic range as Sanskrit *kośa-*, the preferred Sanskrit equivalent of *pājiñā-* in the extant bilingual texts. The only exception is Z 22.135, for which a translation 'garden' has been proposed. This is also the only occurrence of *pārgyiñā-* (with *-r-*). Indeed, the loc. pl. *pārgyiñuvo'* cannot but indicate where the *spāte vicitra*, the 'variegated flowers', are situated. I explored the possibility that the occurrence in Z 22.135 might point to a word distinct from the usual *pājiñā-*. Mauro Maggi (p.c.) suggested a derivation from OKh. *pārra-* 'leaf', cf. the derivative *°vārgia-* occurring as a second member in the compounds *viysa-vārgia-* 'having lotus leaves' (Z 2.141) and *ysāra-vārgia-* 'having thousand leaves' (Z 3.80). According to Degener (KS: 122), *°vārgia-* is formed from *pārra-* 'leaf' by combining the suffixes *-aka-* and *-ika-*. In Proto-Iranian terms, the form could be reconstructed as **parnakika-* (> Pre-Khotanese **pārragiga-* > **pārragya-* > **pārgya-*; with intervocalic *p > v* when *°vārgia-* is the second member of a compound). To obtain *pārgyiñā-*, it would be necessary to add a third suffix *-iñā-* or *-ñā-*, but these suffixes mainly form adjectives from substantives (KS: 129 and 216). The derivation appears problematic unless one could accept the possibility of a substantivised adjective meaning 'having leaves'. In this case, one could argue that the word may refer to a tree or a bush on which flowers grow.²⁸⁴

A re-examination of Bailey's original etymology (< **pari-čai-*) may shed light on the problem. The phonological irregularities associated with a Khotanese derivation from this root are difficult. The formation is attested in neighbouring Eastern and Western Iranian languages, cf. MP *prcyn* 'wall, fence' and *przyn* 'shut in', both /parzīn/,²⁸⁵ Yidgha *paržīn* 'enclosure for sheep'.²⁸⁶ One should consider that the word might have entered Khotanese from another unattested Iranian language akin to Parthian, for which ***paržīn* may be reconstructed.²⁸⁷ This form may have also been the source of the Tocharian A word through loss of *-r-* and unvoicing of *-ž-*. It may also have been borrowed independently in Khotanese, where *-ž-* was defricativised, and the suffix *-ia-* was added. This is, however, very speculative and cannot account for *pājiñā-*.²⁸⁸

²⁸³ See EDIV: 26, quoting Khotanese *pārgyiñā-* under the same root.

²⁸⁴ As suggested by Sims-Williams (p.c.), it is also possible to take the final *-ñuvo'* as a loc. pl. ending of a substantive *vārgia-*. Even if no ending *-ñuvo'* is attested for the *ia-* stems, endings of the *n-* stems generally tend to spread to other declension patterns in Khotanese (see SGS: 269).

²⁸⁵ Although they are probably the same word, they are translated differently in DMMP: 278 (*prcyn* 'wall, fence') and DMMP: 283 (*przyn* 'shut in').

²⁸⁶ Wakhi *palč*, *parč*, quoted by Bailey under the same root in DKS: 233, is more likely to be derived from **parnačī-*, see Steblin-Kamenskij (1999: 256).

²⁸⁷ The same verb, with a different preverb, is attested in Pa. *wycyn-/wžyn-* 'to choose'/wižīn-/; see DMMP: 338.

²⁸⁸ Moreover, the occurrence in Z 24.512 would more easily point to a feminine *i-* stem *pājiñi-*, as kindly pointed out by Alessandro Del Tomba.

Results

Following Dietz (2013), TA *pāśim* may be considered a genuine Tocharian formation. With Mauro Maggi (p.c.), the hapax OKh. *pārgyiña-* may be analysed as an *-iña-* formation from *pārgya-** ‘having leaves’. At the moment, I cannot offer any solution regarding the etymology of OKh. *pājiña-* (or *pājiñi-*, = Skt. *kośa-*), which should be kept distinct from *pārgyiña-*.

(31) TB *PITO* ‘PRICE’, OKH. *PĪHA-* ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- nom.-obl. sg. *pito* IOL Toch 574 b3 /// *yo pito* 19 ‘... price 19’
- Ot. 12 a14 *pito ysāre kamāte* ‘He has taken wheat as the payment.’ (Ching 2010: 340)
- PK AS 7A a1 *saṅkaṣ(ṣ)e pito my(āska)* /// ‘He traded the price of the Saṃgha.’ (CEToM, Pinault, Malzahn, Peyrot eds.)
- PK AS 18A b5 *karyor pito yamaṣyentrā* ‘Used to do business [lit. selling and buying].’²⁸⁹
- PK DA M 507.5 b2 *pito cāneṃ wsāwa-ne* ‘I gave to him coins as the (milling) fee.’ (Ching 2010: 151)
- PK DA M 507.23 a10 *tunek pito masa* ‘Therein, the fee (of milling) has been spent.’ (Ching 2010: 197)
- PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a76 *ṣe pito piś(ār) cāñi takāre* ‘(Given) the price (per peck as) [five] (coins, the equivalent amount of) coins was.’ (Ching 2010: 215)
- PK LC 39 a2 *pito toromñe kälwāsta* ‘You obtained the price (and) the retribution.’
- THT 99 b3 *k_use tumtse pito kr_ui ksa* /// (kl)y(au)ṣtsi ‘What [would be] the price of it if someone (gave you the Law) to hear?’ (CEToM, Malzahn ed.)
- THT 100 a1 *mā ca(mpāt) c(e)_u pito rintsī* ‘You cannot afford the price.’ (Peyrot 2013: 365)
- THT 315 b3 *wastsitse pito wat* ‘Or the price of clothes.’ (DoT: 412)
- THT 337 a2 *ṣaḍvarginta karyor pito misko ailñe yamaṣyentrā* ‘The Ṣaḍvargikas were engaging in trade (lit. were doing buying, price, exchange, giving).’ (CEToM)
- THT 337 b3 *k_use ṣamāne karyor pito yamastrā* ‘If a monk engages in trade (lit. does buying and price).’ (CEToM)
- THT 1107 a5 *karyor pito yamalyñe* ‘Trade (lit. doing buying and price).’
- THT 1548.a a5 *pito pepr(utku)* ‘[When] the price is established.’ (Ogihara 2012a: 113)
- nom.-obl. sg. *pitto* THT 147.6 a1 *wsawā pitto* ‘I gave the *pitto* (price?).’
- nom.-obl. sg. *pito* IOL Toch 134 a1 (*cakra*)vā(r)tt(i) *lānte pelaikneṣṣe pito* ‘The price of the Law of a Cakravartin king’, IOL Toch 222 b2 *piś-kānte tinārānta pito* ‘The value of five hundred denarii’ (Ogihara 2009: 374), PK AS 18A a5 *k_use ṣamāne* (...) *karyor pito yamastrā* ‘If a monk does business (...) (lit. does buying and price)’ (cf. *supra*), PK NS 95 b2 *pito kārpaṣṣām* ‘He beats down the price’ (Ogihara 2009: 331–32).

²⁸⁹ CEToM, Pinault and Malzahn eds. Pinault (2008: 73) takes *karyor pito* as a doublet akin to Skt. *kraya-vikrayaḥ* ‘selling and buying’.

- all. sg. *pitoś* PK DA M 507.34 a26 *waltsasintse pitoś* ‘For the sake of paying the milling fee’ (Ching 2010: 461), PK DA M 507.38 a69 *waltsasintse pitoś* ‘in order to (pay) the fee of milling’ (Ching 2010: 167).
- perl. sg. *pītośa* THT 203 b4 = THT 204 a3 (parallel) *śaulānmaṣe pītośa ce p(e)rnerñe kraupatai* ‘Durch den Preis von Leben hast du diesen Glanz gesammelt’ (Schmidt 1974: 402), THT 1460.a a2 (*śwā*)*tsitse pītośa wat* ‘Or with the price of the food’ (Ogihara 2009: 211).
- perl. sg. *pītośa* IOL Toch 159 b5 *śaulanmaṣṣe pītośa* ‘By the price of life’, THT 1548.b b3 *kwri tu pītośa kārñāntrā* ‘If they buy it for [that] price’ (Ogihara 2012a: 113).

Khotanese occurrences

- In Old Khotanese, the form is *pīha-*, cf. nom. pl. *pīha* Z 15.127 *ne ni pīha busta hāmāre* ‘Their prices cannot be known.’ (Emmerick 1968: 243)
- Likewise, in Late Khotanese Buddhist texts, the form is *pīha-*. It occurs multiple times in the Late Khotanese *Aśokāvadāna*:²⁹⁰ gen.-dat. sg. §5.14.2 A *biśūṃ vā nva pīhi: pīrāthyarā*²⁹¹ ‘sell them all at a price!’, §5.15 A *biśūau nva pīha: pīrāmdā*²⁹² ‘they sold them all at a price’, §5.18.2 A *iḍāri kimalai biśi nva pīha: para yuḍāmdūṃ . u cu hvī: kamalai ṣṭe ttu āṃ nva pīha: ṣi’ yaśā āmāci ni parā īmdā*²⁹³ ‘All other heads we could sell at a price but, as far as the human head is concerned, the minister Yaśas cannot sell it at a price’, acc. sg. §5.17.3 A *tturi pīha: vī cu ṣi’ giṃde*.²⁹⁴ ‘At this price, who will buy it?’, gen.-dat. sg. also in JS 21r2 *jīvīji pīhā* ‘At the price of life’ (Dresden 1955: 434) and 25v4 *pīha udiśāyā śīrye ba’ysām dā* ‘As price for the good Law of the Buddhas’ (Dresden 1955: 437), and in the *Mañjuśrī-nairātmyāvatārasūtra* P 4099.130 *jīvīje pīhye jsa* ‘At the price of his life’ (Emmerick Unpublished (b)), IOL Khot 147/2 v4 *pīhi jsa ysīrrā nādā* ‘... they took (bought) the gold at the price’ (KMB: 331).
- The word is frequent in Late Khotanese documents: Or. 11252/15 b2 *vaña dva jūṇa pīha hauḍi yiḍeṃ* ‘Now, I already paid the price twice’,²⁹⁵ Or. 6397/1 (G.1).3 *pīha ve mūrā ysārā* ‘At the price of 1000 *mūras*’ (KMB: 9), IOL Khot 9/4 a1 *viśā’kānta pīha hauḍā hamā* ‘Viśā’kāntā paid the price’ (KMB: 179), P 2786.244 *ca vā pabauna yai ttu jairmāṃ stūrau vq pīhā hūḍāmda* : ‘As the price of (these) excellent (?) draft horses, they gave what had been reported’ (Kumamoto 1982: 131), Hedin 4.5 . *cī ra jsārā pīhya himāte ttī ra ṣi’ pī[hā] /// [. ru]sa ||* ‘However much the corn may be in price, so much this price (shall be for wheat and) barley’ (KT IV: 74).

²⁹⁰ For the numbering and the translations see Dragoni (2013–14). A = P 2958, B = P 2798 (parallel).

²⁹¹ B *biśū vā nva pīhi (pa)rāthyari*

²⁹² B *ba/śū\ dva pīha pīrāmdī*

²⁹³ B *iḍāri ki(ma)lai biśi nva pīha parā yuḍādū . u cu hva kamalai ṣṭe tta āṃ nva pīha: ṣi’ yaśi āmāci ni parā īdi*.

²⁹⁴ B */ . ttu\ri pīha vī cu ṣi’ gidi*.

²⁹⁵ Zhan (2016: 431) and KMB: 94. Skjærvø (KMB: 94) integrates *[p]īhai* also in Or. 11252/15 b3 and reads *[p]īhai paśūṃ* ‘I send as (?) price’.

- The *-ja-* adjective *pīha'ja-* ‘costly’ occurs in P 2024.45 *u šā jsā pvaica pīha'ja hūḍāṃdū* ‘And we gave one costly roll.’ (Kumamoto 1995: 233)
- With negative *a-* in P 2782.16 *raṃnā avihā* ‘priceless jewel (*ratana-*)’, JS 33r4 *raṃne aviha* ‘id.’, JS 14r2 *aviho raṃnyo* ‘with priceless jewels.’

Discussion

TB *pito* and Khot. *pīha-* cover the same semantic range. The word is used in stock phrases in Buddhist texts, probably derived from the same Buddhist Sanskrit model. The first parallel is the phrase meaning ‘at the price of life’, expressed in both languages by an adjectival formation (TB *-ṣṣe*, Khot. *-ja-*) based on the word for ‘life’ and the word for ‘price’:

- TB *śaulanmaṣṣe pītosa* IOL Toch 159 b5, THT 203 b4 (= THT 204 a3)
- LKh. *jīvīji pīhā* JS 21r2, P 4099.130

The second is represented by the reference to the price of the Law (*dharma*), expressed with slightly different constructions in the two languages, but always with TB *pito* Khot. *pīha-*:

- IOL Toch 134 a1 (*cakra*)*vā(r)tt(i) lānte pelaikneṣṣe pito* ‘The price of the Law of a Cakravartin king.’
- JS 25v4 *pīha udiśāyā śīrye ba'ysām dā* ‘As price for the good Law of the Buddhas.’

It is also striking that the word is used in documents with the same economic sense of ‘price’ (of goods, cf. Skt. *mūlya-*).

As for the Tocharian word, what seemed once a puzzling declension pattern has been recently clarified by Del Tomba (2020: 187–89). He was able to interpret all the *okso*-type forms in the paradigm of *pito* (*pītai*) as belonging to the substantive *ṣito* (obl. sg. *ṣitai*) ‘envoy’ (see s.v. *ārt**). TB *pito* behaves like a regular alternating noun of the *oko*-type.

Despite its genuine Tocharian declension pattern, however, the etymology of TB *pito* remains problematic. As TB *pito* and Khot. *pīha-* agree in meaning and share phonological similarities, it is possible that Tocharian borrowed from Khotanese. Indeed, dictionaries consider TB *pito* as a loanword from the antecedent of Khot. *pīha-*, PK **pīṣa-*. Initially, Bailey had taken the two words as cognates,²⁹⁶ but after the publication of the *Prolexis*, Van Windekens recognised TB *pito* as a loanword.²⁹⁷ Adams (DoT: 412) followed Van Windekens in taking TB *pito* as a loanword.

Despite Bailey’s efforts, deriving the word within Iranian seems difficult.²⁹⁸ His proposal of a root *pā-/pai-/pi-*, meaning ‘give over, pay’, is unprecedented and is not paralleled in

²⁹⁶ See KT VI: 196–97 and DKS: 242, with no mention of a borrowing. Before Bailey, Leumann (1933–36: 461) had interpreted the occurrence in the Book of Zambasta as loc. sg. from a base *paha-*, which he considered a loanword from Skt. *patha-* ‘way’.

²⁹⁷ See VW: 637. Tremblay (2005: 428) reports the same conclusion.

²⁹⁸ No Khotanese denominative verb based on *pīha-* exists. Bailey’s hypothesis that the 1 pl. of such a verb may be attested in the hapax *pāṃdu* (DKS: 229) in IOL Khot 45/4.3 (KMB: 277) is quite far-fetched, as recognised by Bailey himself (DKS: 229). Moreover, LKh. *pīha-* ‘hearth’ (DKS: 242) is to be interpreted otherwise; see SVK II: 171.

Iranian. MP *ābām*, NP *āwām* etc. are to be analysed based on the Proto-Iranian root **Hmai*⁻² (EDIV: 178) preceded by the preverb **apa*-.

The only possible comparison outside Iranian, also listed by Bailey in DKS, is Hittite *pai*- ‘to give’, if this is understood as a univerbation of the Proto-Indo-European root *h₂ei*- ‘to give’ with the preverb *pe* ‘away’. However, this verb has been recently explained otherwise by Kloekhorst (2006 and 2008: 615–16), who has shown that a derivation from the zero grade of Proto-Indo-European **h₁ep*- followed by an ablauting suffix **-oi/-i-* can be preferable.

The only comparable Iranian form is the Ossetic verb I *fidyn* D *fedun* ‘to pay’. Rejecting Abaev’s etymology (< **pati-dā*-), Cheung (2002: 189) suggests that the Ossetic forms may point to a proto-form **paida*-. He further argues that the verb might be a denominative based on **paida*-, and he compares the Khotanese and Tocharian forms without commenting on their etymology. This comparison, too, is not without problems. In fact, if the Proto-Iranian form had **-ǰ*-, this would have yielded Oss. *-t*-, and not *-d*-.²⁹⁹

Results

The word is a lexical formation isolated within East Iranian, only attested in Khotanese and Ossetic. From East Iranian, the word was borrowed into Tocharian. The phonological irregularities involved in reconstructing an Eastern Iranian proto-form and the lack of certain Iranian cognates might point to an independent borrowing from a third source both in Ossetic and Khotanese.

The final *-o* of the Tocharian B form points to a loanword from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. Because of TB *t* for Khot. *h* (< **ǰ*), Old Khotanese can be excluded. Because of *ī* in the first syllable, monophthongised from an original **ai* (cf. Ossetic), it is possible to determine that the borrowing into Tocharian can be dated to the Pre-Khotanese stage. Based on this evidence, it is also possible to attribute to the Pre-Khotanese period the preservation of the dental character of **ǰ*.

The history of the word may be reconstructed as follows: **paida*- ‘price’ → Oss. D *fedun* ‘to pay’; **paiǰa*- ‘price’ → PTK **pēǰa*- > PK *pīǰa*-, acc. sg. *pīǰu* → TB *pito*; PK *pīǰa*- > OKh. *pīha*-.

(32) TA *PISSAÑK* ‘BHIKṢUSAMGHA’, LKH. *BI’SAMGA*- ‘ID.’

Discussion

The first scholar to establish a connection between Tocharian A *pissañk* ‘bhikṣusamgha’ and LKh. *bi’samga*- ‘id.’ was Hansen (1940: 154). He proposed that TA *pissañk* may be a loanword from Khotanese. This derivation is also found in Bailey (1946: 771), who identified the source form in Late Khotanese *bi’samga*- (< OKh. *bilsamga*-). A more detailed discussion of these two words is contained in Bailey (1954: 9–10) and KT VI: 242. Isebaert (1980: 134–35) and Pinault (2015: 159) have also supported this derivation.

²⁹⁹ Cheung (2002: 21), cf. PIR. **paǰana*- > Oss. *fætæn* ‘wide’. A. Lubotsky (p.c.) suggests that, if one were to accept Abaev’s etymology and Kümmel’s (2018) hypothesis, the different dental in Khotanese (**ǰ*) might be due to an original **dH* (**pati-dHa*-). Based on this suggestion, a hypothetical development PIR. **pati-dHa-ya*- > **paǰaya*- > PTK **peǰa*- > PK *pīǰa*- > OKh. *pīha*- may be reconstructed.

This connection is not problematic and can be considered established.³⁰⁰ On the other hand, the etymology of the Khotanese word has not been given due attention. Bailey's (KT VI: 242) derivation from *bhikṣu-saṃgha-* has been accepted without critical evaluation (Tremblay 2005: 434, Suv II: 314). His suggestion (KT VI: 242) takes for granted a development *kṣ-* > *-xš-* > *-yž-* > *-ž-* > *-l-* (in front of *s*) that has no parallels either within Khotanese or Middle Indic. The most likely realisation of <*kṣ*> in Gāndhārī was [tʃ] (Baums 2009: 168), as discovered by Bailey himself (1946: 770–78). The *kh* in *bhikkhu*, beside the regular *bhikṣu*, should be explained as a loanword from another Middle Indic dialect (Allon 2001: 95, Salomon 2008: 124).³⁰¹ For Khotanese, a realisation [tʃ] for <*kṣ*> has been posited by Emmerick and Pulleyblank (1993: 37), explicitly rejecting Emmerick's previous hypothesis of a value [ɣ] (cf. also Emmerick 1992a: 155–56).³⁰² Should we consider it a direct loanword from Skt. *bhikṣusaṃgha-*, we should expect the preservation of *kṣ* as such, as shown by OKh. *bhikṣusaṃgha-* (Z 22.228, 24.652). Bailey's derivation cannot stand closer scrutiny, and OKh. *bilsaṃga-* needs a new analysis.

Initially, Bailey's suggestion also included other terms for 'bhikṣusaṃgha' in neighbouring languages. He analysed BSogd. *pwrnsk* as borrowed from *bhikṣusaṃgha-*. The difficult vowel *u* in the first syllable he explained from a Gāndhārī form with vowel assimilation *bhuṣu*^o (cf. *bhuṣusaṃgasya* in CKD 703, Brough 1962: 83). However, as already noted, it is difficult to justify his claim that Gandh. [tʃ] became BSogd. *r*, even when the hypothesis of an unprecedented dissimilation in front of *s* is accepted. It is not disputed that OUygh. *bursaṇ* (HWA: 202) is a direct loanword from Sogdian *pwrnsk* (l.c. and KT VI: 242). However, the derivation of Sogd. *pwrnsk* – and consequently of OUygh. *bursaṇ* – from Chin. *fó sēng* 佛僧 (LMC *fñjyt səṇ* EMC *but səṇ*, cf. Pulleyblank 1991: 99, 273), as *communis opinio* among turcologists (cf. HWA: 202), is problematic. This directly contrasts with Bailey's position, who explicitly stated that 'there is of course no **buddha-saṃgha-*' (Bailey 1982: 17).

This problem was recently addressed by Yoshida (1994: 372–73), who seemed inclined to follow Bailey's suggestion. According to him, there are no phonological obstacles to interpreting BSogd. *pwrnsk* as a loanword from Early Middle Chinese (i.e. before the change of EMC *b-* to *f-*). The main difficulty with a derivation from Middle Chinese would appear to be philological. No **buddha-saṃgha-* would be attested in Buddhist texts. Only a quick search in the Sanskrit version of some of the major Mahāyāna texts, however, found that the compound *bodhisattva-saṃgha-* has a considerable number of occurrences in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* and the *Gaṇḍavyūha Sūtra*. In the *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, a compound *bodhi-saṃgha-* occurs together with *bodhisattva-saṃgha-*, and in Kṣemendra's *Avadānakalpalatā* a compound *pratyekabuddha-saṃgha-* is found. Thus, a compound **buddha-saṃgha-* may have been formed in a Central Asian milieu.

³⁰⁰ The Tocharian A double *s* is not easily explained. It is possible that the loss of *l* in Khotanese resulted at first in a longer *s*, noted in Late Khotanese orthography by the subscript hook. In Tocharian A, this sound could have been represented by a double *s*.

³⁰¹ A dissimilation from this Middle Indic form *bik-saṃgha-* > *bilsaṃga-*, as proposed by Bailey (1954: 10, not in KT VI: 242), would be unprecedented.

³⁰² Hitch (2016: 48) further argues that in Old Khotanese, <*kṣ*> represented an unaspirated [tʃ], which became an aspirated [tʰ] only in Late Khotanese.

Further confirmation of these findings comes from Khotanese onomastics. Two frequent names in the Hedin documents are *saṃgabuda-* (e.g. Hedin 9.4)³⁰³ and *budasamga-* (Hedin 2, 4, 25, 26, 29). The second name is sufficient to justify a Central Asian compound **buddha-saṃgha-* as the ultimate source of BSogd. *pwrsk*. The same name is also attested in the Khotanese colophon of the Khotan manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* (von Hinüber 2015: 218) in the instr.-abl. sg. *budasamgāna* (Fol. 456 b8).

Keeping in mind these considerations on BSogd. *pwrsk*, it is now necessary to return to OKh. *bilsamga-*. In the Book of Zambasta, it occurs twenty-six times with *i* in the first syllable and six times with *ä*. In the manuscript Or. of the *Suvarṇabhasottamasūtra*, it is consistently spelt with *ä*, as *bälsamg(h)a-*. Because of the distribution in Old Khotanese texts, it is necessary to test the hypothesis that the form with *ä* may be the earliest. Starting from a form *bälsamga-*, I suggest that the Khotanese form may be derived from **balysa-samga-* ‘*buddha-saṃgha’. The phonological development may have been as follows: **bäl̥ysa-sám̥ga-* > **balysäsám̥ga-* > **balsám̥ga-* > *bälsám̥ga-*. In this case, the developments involved (assimilation of *-yss-* to *-s-*, weakening of unaccented *a*) may be explained within Khotanese historical phonology, without assuming unprecedented and unlikely sound changes. The later generalisation of forms with *i* in the initial syllable already in the Book of Zambasta may be due to analogy with the initial vowel of Skt. *bhikṣusamgha-*, of which *bälsamga-* is a frequent translation. The *i* vowel in TA *pissank* is not problematic because it was probably borrowed from Late Khotanese, where *i* and *ä* interchanged freely. Later, the form with *i* instead of the original *ä* was generalised.

Noteworthy is the lack of a Tocharian B match for TA *pissank*. As in the case of TA *twantam*, q.v., I propose that this specific set of Buddhist terms was borrowed only by Tocharian A speakers directly from Khotanese in the historical period. This phenomenon may be connected with a Khotanese religious mission in Tocharian A speaking areas from the 5th c. CE onwards (Maggi 2004: 186). On this problem, see further §4.3.4.

Results

TA *pissank* ‘bhikṣusamgha’ is usually considered a loanword from LKh. *bi’samga-* ‘id.’ This derivation is not problematic. The etymology of OKh. *bilsamga-* (> LKh. *bi’samga-*), as commonly accepted in the literature, on the other hand, is based on a phonological development from Skt. *bhikṣusamgha-* that cannot stand closer scrutiny. I suggest that the variant *bälsamga-* is original and can be analysed as a compound **balysa-samga-* ‘*buddha-saṃgha’. This compound was widespread in the Tarim Basin, as shown by BSogd. *pwrsk* and OUygh. *bursan*, both translating Skt. *bhikṣusamgha-*.

TB *PERI A PARE* ‘DEBT’

Tocharian occurrences

- B *peri* IOL Toch 92 a2 ///-*nam śaul peri tāseṃ* ‘... they put their lives in pledge.’ (Peyrot 2013: 432)

³⁰³ This name seems to be also attested in Gāndhārī, cf. *sagha[bu]dhasa* in CKI 197 and *saṃghabudhiṣa* in CKD 464. I am grateful to N. Schoubben for this reference.

- IOL Toch 116 b4 *ku(s) e cwī peri waipecce ce ·e* /// ‘Who ... his debt and possessions ...’
- IOL Toch 169 a5 /// *cai snai peri wa ·ñ· ·i* ‘They ... without debt ...’
- IOL Toch 187 a5 *ṛṇaṣeṣam peri lyipār* ‘ṛṇaṣeṣam (Skt.), ‘remaining debt’ (Toch.)’
- IOL Toch 258 a2-3 (*p*)*erisa te we(ñ)āsta kos tañ peri mā āyu tot ṣamāne mā ṣeske* ‘... on account of the debt you said this: “As long as I don’t give you the debt [back], so long the monk ... not alone ...”’ (Peyrot 2013: 710)
- PD Bois B97 a2 *perñiske ysāri peri cāk* ‘Perñiske, the wheat to be paid [lit. debt]: one picul.’ (Ching 2010: 321)
- PK Bois C1 b5ii *ṁmātsitse ysāre peri wsam* ‘We have given wheat to be paid to ṁMātsi*.’ (Ching 2010: 351)
- PK DA M 507.32 a10 *aṣkārsa ṣorye perisa eñku ṣe-ñ* ‘It is imposed on me as the *ṣorye-debt because of the violation (of contract?).’ (Ching 2010: 227)
- PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a32-33 *sañkantse perisa* ‘Because of the dues/debt (assigned to?) the saṃgha.’ (Ching 2010: 211)
- PK LC 11 a1 *snai peri pauśye karmo-* /// ‘without *peri*, the *pauśye* [shall be distributed (?)]’. (Ching 2010: 442)
- SI B Toch 9 a13 *ce śaiyye Raktakule perisa wāya* ‘Raktakule carried this śaiyye owing to (him) away.’ (Ching 2010: 316)
- SI B Toch 11 a4 *Paiytiñe Sutane perisa āuw wāya (orocce keme)sa śle yari* ‘Sutane of Paiyti, for sth. owed (to him), carried away a full-mouthed ewe, with a new-born (lamb).’ (Ching 2010: 348)
- THT 375 a5 /// (*śre*)*ṣṭhinmeṃ peri yāmmar* ‘If I borrow money from the distinguished [Priyadeva, my neighbour].’ (Peyrot 2013: 310)
- THT 462 a5 *otaṃk tukikāṃntse peri«sa» sarmwātsai Śīñkentse yap wsāwa* ‘Then, as the amount owing to Tukik*, I have given Śīñke the *sarmwātsa* barley.’ (Ching 2010: 290)
- THT 491 b5ii *sañkatepe ysāre peri towä* 5 ‘Sañkatepe: wheat to be paid, 5 pecks.’ (Ching 2010: 354)
- THT 1111 b2 *maṇi ketra ca peri nestä* ‘You are not indebted to anyone, are you?’ (CETom, Fellner and Illés eds.)
- THT 1335.a a7 /// *mce ksa peri* – ‘... any debt ...’
- THT 4000 b1i *et passim*:³⁰⁴ *lāpārñe carśole kuśāneṃ peri* 70-5 ‘Carśole of Lāpār (is) owing kuśānes: 74.’ (Ching 2010: 358)
- THT 4001 a8 *snai yakau snai peri ce – ka* ‘Without *yakau*, without (any)thing left to be paid. ...’ (Ching 2010: 360)
- A pare A 94 b5 *tāmyo pare mar yat-ñi mar kenāt-ñi smā(lokāṃ)* ‘Deshalb gib mir keine Schuld! Nenne nicht mich einen Lügner!’ (Schmidt 1974: 96)
- MY1.6 a6 *lyutñam pare tām skassu* ‘I will get out of [my] debts and be happy.’ (Peyrot 2013: 265)

³⁰⁴ *peri* is repeated at every line in what seems to be a list of debtors and debts to be paid, cf. Ching (2010: 358).

Discussion³⁰⁵

Besides some sporadic occurrences in doctrinal texts, TB *peri* is mainly attested in late economic documents. After examining the different occurrences, Ching (2010: 442) concludes that the meaning of TB *peri* is somewhat broader than previously thought and that 'it is better to consider it as a general term for something owing, rather than a specific notion such as private debts or commercial obligations.'

As for the etymology, one can identify at least three different proposals that have been put forward in the last hundred years (Peyrot 2008: 162–63):

- Loanword from OUygh. *berim* 'debt',
- Loanword from Iranian (specifically from Pre-Khotanese).
- Inherited Tocharian formation.

Stumpf (1990: 104) first proposed that *peri* could have been borrowed from Old Uyghur. He noted that the word occurred mainly in the late language and suggested it could be a loan from OUygh. *berim*, covering the same semantic range (Clauson 1972: 366). There are many problems associated with this etymology. The proposal does not account for the Tocharian A equivalent: the word can be reconstructed for Proto-Tocharian. As Peyrot (2008: 162) noted, Stumpf's derivation implies that the term was independently borrowed in Tocharian A and B, which is highly unlikely. The remarkable late distribution could be explained as a coincidence. One should not forget that the word belongs to a specialised semantic category. Besides, there is no easy explanation for the disappearance of *-m*, which would have been lost without leaving any trace.

The second hypothesis deserves more extensive treatment. The idea of a loanword from Iranian dates back to the early days of Tocharian studies, when Lévi and Meillet first identified the word as the translation of Skt. *ṛṇa-* 'debt' in the bilingual fragment IOL Toch 187 (cf. *supra*) and compared Av. *pāra-* 'debt'.³⁰⁶ In the last century, other Iranian forms have come to light. They belong to the same root **par-* 'to get even, equalise, commit oneself (to a legal obligation, contract)' (EDIV: 293) and share the same semantic range: Pa. *p'r* 'debt' (DMMP: 259), Sogd. *p'r* 'loan' (Henning 1948: 607 fn. 2), Bactr. *παρο* 'debt, obligations, loan, amount due' (Sims-Williams 2007: 252), Khot. *pāra-* 'debt' (KS: 9).

As for Khotanese, Bailey (KT IV: 56–7) examined two additional forms, *pīra* (IOL Khot 27/10 b3, see KMB: 230) and *peri* (Hedin 3.15), both hapaxes (KT IV: 22). These he tentatively derived from **parya-* and **pārya-* through the usual palatalisation rules active in Khotanese (*a > ī* and *ā > e*). The first form is particularly interesting from the Tocharian point of view, as it provides a possible Iranian source with a short *-a-* in the first syllable. As first noted by Van Windekens (VW: 635–6), a short *-a-* is required to explain both Tocharian B and A forms.³⁰⁷ Adams follows VW in choosing the Pre-Khotanese form with a short *-a-* (DoT: 425). He reconstructs Proto-Tocharian **peräi*, which he explains as deriving from **parya-* with loss of the final vowel and insertion of an epenthetic *-a-* to simplify the cluster *-ry-*. The Proto-

³⁰⁵ This study was partially presented during the online conference *Tocharian in Progress* (Leiden University, Dec. 2020).

³⁰⁶ Cf. Lévi and Meillet (1916: 159).

³⁰⁷ Tremblay (2005: 428) wants to derive the Tocharian forms from **pārya-*, through PK **peria-*. However, this does not account for the vocalism of TA *pare*.

Tocharian reconstruction would point more toward Iranian **paraya-* (?) than to **parya-*. This is problematic, and it is impossible to solve this problem by assuming the insertion of an epenthetic vowel.

Moreover, the Late Khotanese hapax *pīra*, the only form on which the reconstructed form **parya-* is based, could be interpreted otherwise. Skjærvø (*apud* SVK III: 90) noted that a broken passage is not the best place to look for a hapax and suggested the following tentative translation for IOL Khot 27/10 b3:

- / x *pīra pāḍā idā dasau vā thauna haura* ‘... (as soon as?) he has raised the (silk) *worms(?) give us ten cloths.’ (KMB: 230)

Also, the Late Khotanese hapax *peri* in the Hedin document 3 is of uncertain meaning. Lacking a better solution, Bailey’s translation ‘to be paid’ (< **pārya-*) is to be taken into consideration:

- *ci tte tta hārū-ṃ peri ṣṭāte puṣai vā hajṣema thyau* ‘No matter how much is to be paid to my officials, quickly send it all to me!’ (Zhang 2016: 160).

Previously, Bailey (KT IV: 67) had translated ‘what therefore is to be paid by me to the merchant, send it to him fully at once.’ On *hārūa-* ‘official’ and not ‘merchant’ in the documents, see Zhang (2016: 150–51). As for *peri*, Zhang (2016: 160) does not offer a new interpretation. Degener (KS: 301) is cautious and lists the words with three question marks. A connection with *pera-* (KS: 303) is problematic because its meaning and etymology are also obscure. I suggest that the Late Khotanese hapax *peri* may be connected with the well-attested *pāra-* ‘debt’ (cf. *supra*), of which it could be the loc. sg. Thus, I would like to propose the following translation of the passage under analysis:

- ‘What of it (*tte*) my official (*hārū-ṃ*) is thus (*tta*) in debt (*peri*), quickly send it all!’ = ‘Thus, what my official owes (to me), quickly send it all!’

The hapaxes *pīra-* and *peri* in Late Khotanese are to be interpreted as acc. sg. of *pīra-* ‘silk-worm’ and loc. sg. of *pāra-* ‘debt’. As do all other Old and Middle Iranian attestations, all Khotanese forms point to a root with long *-ā-*. The alleged Tumshuqese form *para-* (Konow 1935: 821) cannot be trusted for the vowel quantity because long and short vowels are not consistently noted in Tumshuqese. Moreover, the two occurrences of the word listed by Konow are dubious. The first (HL 2.9) is probably part of the verbal form *parathe* (< *parath-* ‘to sell’), so one is left with only one attestation. This is *parāñi* (HL 2.8), an alleged plural of *para-* that would take the ending of the *n*-declension. As Khot. *pāra-* behaves regularly, the explanation is speculative. This lexeme remains, therefore, difficult to interpret: there is no trace in Iranian of a form with short *-a-* necessary to explain the Tocharian words.

Of the three proposals formulated at the beginning, the third is the most probable. Indeed, the possibility that TB *peri* A *pare* is an inherited Tocharian word has been discussed in the literature. The first tentative explanation was offered by Schneider (1939: 253), who compared Gothic *fairina* ‘fault’. It must be noted that similar correspondences to that of TB *peri* A *pare* do exist and are not to be underestimated. As pointed out by Ringe (1996: 85–86), TB *leki* A *lake* ‘bed’ from the root PT **lāk-* ‘to lie (down)’ (Peyrot 2013: 813) is one of them.

There is no difficulty in deriving TB *peri A pare* from the root PT **pār-* with the meaning ‘to take’ (Peyrot 2013: 773).³⁰⁸

An inner-Tocharian derivation sheds light on the vocalism but is semantically problematic (see Ringe 1996: 86 and Peyrot 2008: 162). A formation PIE **b^hor-oi* could mean ‘thing carried, burden’, but the connection with ‘debt’ is unclear. This is why Ringe (1996: 86) proposed that the meaning ‘debt’ is due to the influence of the similar sounding Iranian words (cf. *supra*). It is known that TB *pār-* can also be translated as ‘to take’ (cf. Malzahn 2010: 707). One may not need Iranian influence if one recognises that a perfect semantic parallel can be offered by OUygh. *alim* ‘debt’ (lit. ‘a single act of taking’ < *al-* ‘to take’, cf. Clauson 1972: 145), frequent in hendiadys with *berim* ‘debt (due to be paid)’ < *ber-* ‘to give’ (cf. Clauson 1972: 366). For the hendiadys, cf. also Erdal (1991: 296).

Results

TB *peri A pare* cannot be derived from any pre-stage of LKh. *pīra-* or *pera-*, as the two Khotanese words are to be read as the acc. sg. of *pīra-* ‘silk-worm’ and the loc. sg. of *pāra-* ‘debt’. It is further proposed that the word may have a Tocharian origin.

TB MAÑKĀRA/MAÑKĀRE/MAÑKARĀNCANA ‘OLD’, OKH. MAṂGĀRA- ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- nom. sg. *mañkāre* SI B Toch 10 a4 *mañkāre sarkalyi mǎntātse še* ‘Old/Long *sarkalyi* watering can(?): one.’ (Ching 2010: 344)
- nom. sg. *mañkāra* PK DA M 507.39 and 43 a2 *yap masa cāk mañkāra ///* ‘Barley has been spent: one picul. The old (grains) ...’ (Ching 2010: 181)
- PK DA M 507.41 a5 *mañkāra āra šātre | ñwema(šše) ///* ‘The old (grains) ran out. (These are the items concerning) grains. | The new (grains) ...’ (Ching 2010: 184)
- PK DA M 507.41 b1 */// (ška)s«řä» meñantse -meñ mante sañkantse šešu mañkāra* ‘... by the [6th day] of the month, the old (barley) eaten by the saṃgha ...’ (Ching 2010: 183)
- nom. pl. *mañkarāncana* PK Bois C1 a2 *štalāštīnmeñ mañkarāncana āka warpāmtē cakanma* 264 ‘From the side of Štalāštī, we have received/gained old millet *āka*: 264 piculs.’ (Ching 2010: 350)
- PK Bois C1 a5-7 *še kešne āka mañkarāncana takāre cakanma* 357 *towa* 6 *ñwemaššana šaṇ cmalyana āka takāre cakanma* 452 *to(wa)* 9 *po še kešne ce mañkarāncana ce ñwemaššana āka cakanma* 810 *towa* 5 ‘In total, the old millet *āka* is: 357 piculs, 6 pecks. (a6) The new produced millet *āka* is: 452 piculs, 9 [pecks]. (a7) In [total], the old and the fresh millet *āka*: 810 piculs, 5 pecks.’ (Ching 2010: 350)

Discussion

mañkarāncana āka is opposed to *ñwemaššana āka*, which designates the ‘new’ *āka*-millet.³⁰⁹ This was the main reason why Ogihara (*apud* Ching 2010: 352) assigned to *mañkarāncana āka* the meaning ‘old’ *āka*-millet. The word is attested another four times, without the

³⁰⁸ On this class of abstract nouns, see Del Tomba (2020a: 28–29).

final *-āñca-* element, always in late Tocharian B documents. Ching and Ogihara agree that it should also denote an ‘old’ edible (grain or millet) in these occurrences. Ogihara (l.c.) convincingly assumes a borrowing from Khot. *maṃgāra-* ‘old’.

In this case, two problems remain to be solved. The first involves the declension pattern of the Tocharian B word. The occurrences do not allow the inclusion of the word in any known pattern. Moreover, the origin of the suffix TB *-āñca* is unknown. Phonologically, it could reflect the well-known Khotanese *-āṃgyā-* of a source form ***maṃgarāṃgyā*. Still, this formation is not attested in Khotanese, and none of the three *āṃgyā-* suffixes is usually added to an adjective without modifying its meaning (KS: 73–78).

The second problem involves the fact that Khot. *maṃgāra-* has no assured etymology. Bailey’s (DKS: 321) tentative proposal cannot stand closer scrutiny. He derives the adjective from **mara-kāra-*. Assuming with Bailey that *maṃgāra-* could be derived from **margāra-* by dissimilation is problematic. No root with a suitable meaning exists within Iranian (**mar-* ‘to die’, **marH-* ‘to rub, crush’, **marH-* ‘to block, hinder’ [meanings according to EDIV]). The same dissimilatory path of *maṃgāra-* may occur in *yaṃgāra-* ‘old’ (DKS: 321), but the etymology of this lexeme requires more detailed treatment.

Given these problems, whether TB *mañkāra* is a loanword from Khotanese into Tocharian B remains uncertain. I suggest that it may be an independent borrowing into Khotanese and Tocharian from a third, non-Indo-European substrate language of the area.

Results

Building upon a proposal by Ogihara (*apud* Ching 2010: 352), I suggest that the Tocharian B adjective *mañkāre/mañkāra/mañkarāñca* could be derived from OKh. *maṃgāra-* ‘old’ through borrowing. This solution shows two unsolved problems, i.e. the puzzling declension pattern of the Tocharian B adjective and the impossibility of analysing Khot. *maṃgāra-* in Iranian. Because of these problems, I propose that both terms were borrowed independently into Khotanese and Tocharian from an unknown substrate language of the area.

TB *MĀTĀR*, *MĀDĀR* A *MĀTĀR* ‘MAKARA (SEA-MONSTER)’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 295 b2-3 *t(e tve ke)sä māñ³¹⁰ ptesä srukälleşse mādār se pontām nuknañ pontāmntso akalkānta kārstoca* ‘Pay thus attention to this: this sea monster of death swallows all [and] is cutting off the wishes of all’ (CEToM, Peyrot ed.).
- THT 282 b4 *mātārā srukalyñeşse koyñ kakāyau tekişseñ kemeñtsa po treşşām śaişse* ‘Das Ungeheuer des Todes, den Rachen aufgesperret habend, zerkaut mit den Zähnen der Krankheit alles Lebendige [die Welt].’ (Hackstein 1995: 179)
- THT 1382.e *mātār* [isolated word].
- A 29 b1 /// – (*ā*)*rwar yāş mātāreñ şuñkañ pälkāc mātār tā* – /// ‘... (this ship?) is readily going into the [gaping] mouth of the sea monster. Behold the monster! ...’ (CEToM, Carling, Pinault, Malzahn, Peyrot eds.)

³⁰⁹ On TB *āka*, a type of millet whose etymology is still unclear, see Ching (2016: 50) and Peyrot (2018b: 253–54).

³¹⁰ For *māñt*.

- A 31 a1 *mātār sāmudraṃ tāk* ‘There was a sea monster in the ocean’ (CEToM, Carling, Pinault, Malzahn, Peyrot eds.)
- A 60 a1-2 *camāk camāk wlaluneši mātā(r) ///* ‘The monster of death (will swallow) [the bodily forms] one after the other.’ (cf. CEToM, Carling, Pinault, Malzahn eds.)

Discussion

The equivalent of Skt. *makara-* ‘sea-monster’ in Tocharian A is *mātār*, in Tocharian B *mādār* or *mātār*, and in OUygh. *madar*. These forms show a dental in place of the expected velar of the Sanskrit form. The Old Uyghur word may be considered a loanword from Tocharian (so HWA: 458). Bailey (1937: 915) regarded the Tocharian A and B equivalents as loanwords from a ‘khotanised’ variant of Skt. *makara-*. The Sanskrit velar was lenited to [ɣ] (attested in OKh. *magara-* ‘id.’ in Z 24.239) and was then lost, leaving a hiatus, [‘ma’ara-], substituted by a glottal stop [ʔ]. As <t> in Khotanese may indicate a glottal stop, together with <v> and <g>, Bailey (1937: 915) proposed that the Tocharian forms may be derived from an unattested Khot. **matara-*, the regular late Khotanese spelling of [‘maʔara-]. Since the source of the borrowing is a written form, this implies written contact.

This option needs to be explored further. First, it is hard to explain the Tocharian B variant *mādār* with a *d* instead of the expected *t*. In Khotanese, <t> can stand for a glottal stop, but <d> cannot. Tremblay’s (2005: 434) proposal that Skt. *makara-* passed through a stage ‘*mādara-*’ in Khotanese cannot be defended. Tocharian B <d> is better interpreted as a Tocharian variant orthography, perhaps a hypersanskritism (cf. the *v* in *tvāṅkaro*, for which see §2.1. s.v.): the forms with <t> are earlier. On the other hand, a form with <t> is not directly attested in Khotanese, and written contact does not seem to be frequent. For this reason, Bailey’s proposal remains uncertain. If correct, however, it could prove that Tocharian copyists could read and understand Khotanese written texts and knew the principles of Old Khotanese writing. As the word is attested in archaic Tocharian B (THT 295, 282), the word might have been borrowed from Old Khotanese. Because of the absence of a final vowel and the implied presence of a glottal stop in place of [ɣ], the borrowing can hardly be older than the late Old Khotanese stage.

Results

Bailey’s hypothesis that TA *mātār* and B *mādār*, *mātār* may derive from a ‘khotanised’ variant of Skt. *makara-* through written contact remains difficult to verify because of the isolation of this particular case.

TB *MIŞ(Ş)E A MIŞI* ‘FIELD, *KṢETRA*’, KHOT. *MIŞ(Ş)A-* ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- B *mīše* PK NS 13 and 516 b3 *šaṇ mīše yaikorme(ṃ)* ‘having removed (his) own field’, THT 73 b3 *kätkre wartse kele ywārśka mīše kare pe(rnettse)* ‘a deep, wide navel in the middle of the worthy field’ (DoT: 498) parallel to IOL Toch 89 /// *mīše kare pernettse* ‘of the worthy field’, PK NS 53 a5 *mīše (ra) c(ī).e* ‘like a field (is) ...’,³¹¹ B *mīše* IOL Toch 466 a1 (parallel to THT 73 b3) *k(e)le ywārśka mīše k(are)* ‘navel in the middle of the worthy field.’

- B loc.sg. *mīṣene* PK NS 53 a6 (*mī*)*ṣene lāms ramt yāmornṭa* ‘Comme le travail dans le champ [sont] les actes.’ (Pinault 1988: 115)
- B plur. *mīṣenta* PK AS 16.2 a4 *calle ṣ wesām mīṣenta* ‘we have to abandon (?) our fields.’ (Pinault 1989: 195 and Peyrot 2013: 661)
- B *mīṣṣe*³¹² PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a40-41 *cau werwyeś mīṣṣe eṅku ste ṣkas caka(nma)* ‘In order to (pay the tax on) the enclosed farm, a land is imposed: six [piculs]’ (Ching 2010: 212), THT 1468 a5 *mīṣṣe yirpo(n)t(a)ṣṣe* ‘field of meritorious services’ (DoT: 522).
- B *mīṣṣi* THT 294 b4 *yārpontaṣṣe ynamont mīṣṣi wi(nāskau) ///* ‘I honour the mobile field of meritorious services ...’³¹³
- A perl. *mīṣisā* YQ 1.23 [III, 4] a4 *mīṣisā kākmārtikām kṣatrapai kāk* ‘She called the overseer of the fields, the *kṣetrapati*.’ (Pinault 2003: 267)
- A *mīṣi* YQ 1.23 [III, 4] a5 *k(a)knu mīṣi tāṣ cam tu kāsū āneñci pleṣār* ‘(When) this field has become [...], then you work it well and carefully’; A 252 b4 (parallel A 251 b4) *ymatunt mīṣi sne lyutār | wināsam nāṣ śl=āñcālyi | pissāṅkṣim kro(p)* ‘I revere (*wināsam*) excellently (*sne lyutār*) the mobile field (*kṣetra* = *mīṣi*) of the *bhikṣusaṃgha* gathering (*krop*) with my hands put together (*śl=āñcālyi*).’³¹⁴
- *mīṣi* A 62 a1 *ymatunt mīṣi pissāṅkṣim | wināsamās mrāc (ṣpālyo)* ‘We worship (*wināsamās*) through (?) the mobile field (*kṣetra* = *mīṣi*) of the *bhikṣusaṃgha* (with) the head [and] (front of the head).’³¹⁵

Khotanese occurrences

- In Old Khotanese, it is attested both with double and single *-ṣ-*: as instr.-abl. pl. *māṣṣyau* in Z 17.26 *paljsatā uryānyau banhyo jsa māṣṣyau* ‘surrounded by gardens, trees, seed-fields’ (Emmerick 1968: 269), as acc. sg. in *Samghāṭasūtra* 43.6 *ttu māṣa byehāte balysāna* ‘reaches that Buddha-field [Skt. *buddhakṣetra*-]’ (Canevascini 1993: 20) and as loc. pl. *māṣvo* in *Samghāṭasūtra* 72.2 *tcūrvo dīvuo māṣvo* ‘in the field of the four continents [Skt. *caturṣu dvīpa-kṣetreṣu*]’ (Canevascini 1993: 32).
- In Late Khotanese, both variants are attested: nom. pl. *mīṣṣa* in Hedin 17.19 *ttrai vī mīṣṣa āstañqāñ u vyihāra padīmāñ u baṃhya kerqāñ* ‘on the third day the fields are to be tended, and *vihāras* to be built, and trees to be planted’ (Bailey

³¹¹ See Peyrot (2018b: 265). Pinault (1988: 115) had previously read *mīṣe (rapā)l(ñe)* and translated ‘labourer un champ’.

³¹² The variant with double *-ṣ-* seems to be a late feature. Both THT 1468, with late *aknāsaṃ* for *aknātsaṃ* (b5), and THT 294, with late *pācir* for *pācer* (b8), are to be classified as late. THT 294 is the only occurrence with final *-i* and may be a particular feature of this late manuscript only (cf. *pācir* for *pācer*).

³¹³ If *ynamont* is a late form for *ynamom*, obl. sg. of *ynamo* ‘going, mobile’. See the following footnotes for more detail.

³¹⁴ I am grateful to Athanaric Huard for this translation. Peyrot (2016a: 207) had previously translated ‘I revere the *ymatu* assembly with my hands put together, [and] the gathering of the monks’ community.’ The translation ‘assembly’ is no more acceptable (‘field’ would be preferred). *ymatunt* is to be taken as a participial formation from *y-* ‘to go’ meaning ‘going, mobile’, as translated by Peyrot and by Itkin [2019, 173 ‘идущий’], who lists for the word, among other uncertain occurrences, a possible nom. sg. *ymatuṣ* in THT 1475.d a3). A translation ‘going, mobile’ also fits the next occurrence of *ymatunt* in A 62 a1.

³¹⁵ See the previous footnote. For the reading *mīṣi* instead of *mīṣā*, cf. Itkin and Malyshev (2021: 65).

1953: 539) and loc. sg. *miṣa* in Or. 9268A c1 *hamya miṣa hamtsa kirā yanāda* ‘They shall work together in the same field’ (KMB: 68).

- Less certain are the occurrences of *mūṣa* (P 2024.46 and P 2027.16) and the corresponding adjective *mūṣijā* (P 2027.18). Bailey (1953: 539) initially thought they belonged here but later (DKS: 339) he considered the possibility that they should be taken together with *mūṣaka*- ‘clothes’.

Discussion

As a similar word also occurs in Niya Prakrit, Burrow (1937: 111) first proposed that the Niya Prakrit adjective *miṣi* could be compared with the second member of the Khotanese compound *ttumāṣa* (if derived from **tauxmamiṣi-*) attested in the *Sanḡhāṭasūtra* (§43.6). As was shown later (cf. Maggi *apud* SVK III: 69–70), the word is to be read correctly as *ttu māṣa* ‘this field (*kṣetra-*)’.

Burrow’s proposal was adopted by Bailey (1953: 538–39). He interpreted the lexeme as an *-s-* derivative from the Proto-Indo-European root **maǵ-* (LIV: 421), with no other continuants in Proto-Iranian. Later, he changed his mind (Bailey 1956: 36 and 1958) and connected it with the Proto-Iranian root **maif²-*, ‘to take care, foster’ (hence ‘to grow’), a root reconstructed by Cheung (EDIV: 261–62) only based on two rather dubious Avestan occurrences.

The original Khotanese form contained a voiceless /s/ because it never shows a subscript hook in Late Khotanese. One occurrence has even a double *ṣṣ*, probably reminiscent of classical orthography. The two occurrences in the *Sanḡhāṭasūtra* occur in two manuscripts (MS 10 and 22, see Canevascini 1993: 195 and 239) that preserve abundant traces of archaic orthography. There, *ṣ* and *ś* are mostly not doubled, and there is no distinction between voiced and voiceless variants in the manuscripts. Additionally, the classical orthography of the Book of Zambasta writes it consistently with double *ṣṣ*.

The connection with TB *miṣ(ṣ)e* A *miṣi* was first proposed by Bailey,³¹⁶ who interpreted the TA *mṣapantiṃ* as a compound whose first member *mṣa°* he compared to Khotanese *māṣṣa-*. In attributing the meaning ‘community’ to it, he followed Couvreur (1956: 71), who, reviewing Poucha’s dictionary, gave the translation ‘Gemeinde’. A double translation of TAB *miṣ(ṣ)e/i* both as ‘*kṣetra*’ and ‘community’ has survived in TEB (II: 126) and VW: 632–63, and it has survived until very recently, cf. Adams (DoT: 498). There is no necessity to maintain two distinct lexemes with two different meanings. Pinault (1988: 143 fn. 82 and 83) suggested that the word covers the semantic range of Sanskrit *kṣetra-* in Khotanese and Tocharian (see also Pinault 2002: 267).

As for TA *mṣapantiṃ*,³¹⁷ traditionally translated as ‘army-chief’, Bailey’s (1957a: 49–52) latest interpretation was challenged by Pinault (2008: 266), who interpreted it as a compound of *mṣa°* ‘*kṣetra-*’ and *°pantiṃ*, an *-iṃ* derivative of Middle Iranian **panti-* as in MMP *h’mṣpnd* ‘(travel) companion’. It is not easy to assume that a compound meaning ‘field-path’ could mean ‘army-chief’.

The connection with Sogdian *’mydry* suggested by Bailey is hardly acceptable, as this is to be interpreted as the name of the god Miθra (Tremblay 2005: 439). It is worth noting that, in addition to the occurrences listed above, an abstract noun *mṣapantune* is also attested in THT

³¹⁶ First in Bailey (1956: 35), then Bailey (1957a: 49–52) and Bailey (1958: 45–46).

³¹⁷ Occurrences: *mṣapantiṃ* A 6 b5, (*mṣapantiṃ* [restored]) A 10 a4, A 62 b4 *mṣapantiṃ*, A 62 b5 *mṣapantiṃ*, A 62 b5 *mṣapantiṃ*, A 118 b3 *mṣapantiṃ*, THT 2388 b1 *mṣapantiṃ*.

1590.e b2. Itkin, Malyshev and Wilkens (2017: 89), based on the Old Uyghur version, propose the meaning ‘heroism, steadfastness’ instead of ‘generalship’.

Results

Evaluating the precise directions of borrowing of this Tarim Basin culture word is problematic. As noted by Peyrot (2018b: 268–69), the Tocharian word cannot be considered inherited and must have been borrowed from another language independently in TA and B. It is not possible to reconstruct a single Tocharian proto-form. Niya Prakrit *miṣi* is most likely a borrowing. Khotanese might be the donor language. As no Iranian derivation is available for the Khotanese word and very few loanwords from Khotanese are found in Niya Prakrit, Khot. *miṣṣa-* might have been borrowed from another non-Iranian language of the area.

TB *MEWIYO* ‘TIGER’, LKH. *MŪYA*-* ‘ID.’

Discussion

The Tocharian B substantive *mewiyo* ‘tiger’ occurs in the bilingual calendar list (Sanskrit-Tocharian B, THT 549), and it corresponds to Skt. *vyāghra-* (Lüders 1933: 742). The word has been known since the early days of Tocharian studies.

As for its etymology, three proposals are found in the literature. Poucha (1931: 177) and Van Windekens (VW: 632) connected *mewiyo* with the Tocharian B verb *məyw-* ‘to tremble’. The semantic link, however, appears to be opaque. Lüders (1933: 742), following Müller (1907: 464), who had argued the same for Sogdian *myw* (cf. *infra*), proposed that TB *mewiyo* was borrowed from Chinese *māo* 貓 ‘cat’ (< MChin. *maew*, cf. Baxter and Sagart 2014: 296). All these words may have an onomatopoeic origin (see VW: 632), so it is not easy to verify this hypothesis. After having labelled the Chinese derivation as an ‘improbable connection’, Bailey (1937a: 929) proposed to see in the Tocharian word a loanword from Iranian without further specifying either the donor language or the borrowing path (see also DoT: 506).

According to Bailey (l.c.), the Khotanese and the Sogdian words may be traced back to a pre-form **mauya-*. However, it is difficult to assume a borrowing of TB *mewiyo* from Sogdian, Khotanese or Old Steppe Iranian. Final *-o* seems to point to Khotanese, excluding Sogdian and Old Steppe Iranian. But the adaptation of the diphthong with Ir. *a* corresponding to TB *e* is typical of an Old Steppe Iranian borrowing. Given these difficulties, I suggest that TB *mewiyo* is a loanword from the substrate language attributed to the inhabitants of the BMAC (Bactria-Margiana Archaeological Complex) where, according to Bernard (2023: 231), final *-o* and Ir. *a* ~ TB *e* are attested side by side and names of animals are frequent (cf. *kercapo* ‘ass, donkey’). The pre-form might have to be set up as **mawiya*. The Iranian forms may also have been borrowed from the same source.

Results

The Tocharian B substantive *mewiyo* ‘tiger’ has received a variety of interpretations during the last century. I propose that it may be a loanword from the substrate language of the BMAC people.

(33) TB *mrañco* ‘BLACK PEPPER (PIPER NIGRUM)’, LKh. *mirimjsya*- ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- *mrañco* THT 500-502 b7 (medical, see discussion)
- *mrañco* THT 1535.d b3 (isolated word, probably in a medical list)
- *mrañco* PK AS 3B b5 (with *pippāl* and *tvāñkaro*, same context as THT 500-502)
- *mrañco* IOL Toch 106 a5 (medicine/magic)

Khotanese occurrences (*Siddhasāra* and *Jivakapustaka*)

- In the *Siddhasāra*: *mirimjsya* Si §2.5, 2.18, 26.23, 26.29 (2×); *mirimjsya* §3.23.2, 26.79; *mīrijsya* 26.79; *mirijsya* §2.24, 3.23.1, 14.18, 24.11, 26.30; *merejsya* §15.22, 20.23, 22.11, 26.65; *miṛemjsya* §20.11; *mirejsya* §21.16, 21.36; *meremjsya* §21.12, 26.79.
- In the *Jivakapustaka*: *mīrimjsya* JP 93r3, 93v3, 96r2, 98v2, 99r4, 100r2, 101r4, 104v5, 105v1, 106r2, 107v2, 109r5, 112r5, 113r1, 113v2, 114r5, 115r1, 115r5, 115v5, 116v1; *mīrijsya* 100r3.

Discussion

As documented by bilingual evidence in both languages, TB *mrañco* and LKh. *mirimjsya*- refer to the black pepper (*Piper nigrum*). THT 500-502, as discovered by Maue (1990), contains the translation of a medical recipe that is also extant in Late Khotanese. In this passage, three spices are mentioned in the Tocharian and the Khotanese version, which are referred to as a group as *vyoṣa*, ‘the three “hot” substances (viz. dry ginger, long pepper, and black pepper)’ (MW: 1041) in the Sanskrit version:

Tocharian B	<i>mrañco</i>	<i>pipāl</i>	<i>tvā[ñkaro]</i>
Late Khotanese	<i>mīraijsa</i>	<i>papala</i>	<i>ttūṃgarā</i>

Table 7. The three hot substances in Tocharian B and Late Khotanese

In the *Siddhasāra*, LKh. *mirimjsya*- translates Skt. *marica*-, referring to the black pepper (Emmerick 1971: 373).³¹⁸ One can establish the meaning of *mrañco* based on trilingual evidence.

As for the phonological shape of the Khotanese word, a form *mirimjsya*- can be set up for Old Khotanese based on the extant occurrences. In the *Siddhasāra* and the *Jivakapustaka*, forms with *-i-* + nasal *-ṃ-* outnumber those with *-e-* and without nasal. It is possible that the *-i-* in the first syllable was an epenthetic vowel inserted to simplify the forbidden initial cluster **mr-* (cf. OKh. *māraha*- ~ *mīraha*- ‘pearl’ s.v. *wrāko*). The form may be reconstructed as **mrimjsya*-, borrowed into Tocharian B as *mrañco*.³¹⁹ The final *-o* of the Tocharian B form points to an old loan from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. Because of the lack of other distinguishing features, more precise dating of the borrowing is not possible.

³¹⁸ For other uses of LKh. *mirimjsya*-, see Emmerick (1971: 372–73).

³¹⁹ Otherwise, the vowel of the first syllable may have been lost within Tocharian B (Khot. *mirimjsyu* → TB /mərāñco/ > /mrāñco/).

The oldest mention of a connection between TB *mrañco* and LKh. *mirimjsya-* is to be traced back to a footnote in an article on the *Siddhasāra* by Emmerick (1971: 373 fn. 17).³²⁰ He noted that the Tocharian B form could be compared to the Khotanese because of the extra nasal, not present in any other language except Sogdian (*mr'ynck'*). Emmerick (1996: 52) convincingly proposed that the Sogdian and the Khotanese forms may have been borrowed from Skt. *marica-* through a Gāndhārī intermediary that he reconstructs as **mirimcikā*.³²¹ Old Uyghur *mirč* ~ *mirč* (HWA: 476) is certainly connected, as noted by Bailey (1954: 6), but it may have been borrowed directly from Skt. *marica-* instead of TB *mrañco* because of the absence of the second nasal.

It is difficult to assume that the source form of LKh. *mirimjsya-* was Skt. *marica-* because of the second nasal, consistently represented in Tocharian and Khotanese. An old adaptation of Skt. *marica-* would have yielded LKh. ***marijsa-*, with depalatalisation and voicing of Sanskrit intervocalic *-c-*,³²² not **mrimjsya-* or *mirimjsya-*. Emmerick's hypothesis of an unattested Gāndhārī intermediary seems to be the most appropriate solution. As it is impossible to etymologise **mrimjsya-* (nor Skt. *marica-*, see KEWA I: 588) in Indo-Iranian, I would like to suggest further that both forms go back to a substrate designation of the black pepper in Central Asia.

Results

TB *mrañco* and LKh. *mirimjsya-* are both used in medical texts to translate Skt. *marica-* 'black pepper (*Piper nigrum*)'. TB *mrañco* was borrowed from a PTK, PK or OKh. acc. sg. **mrimjsyu* (or *mirimjsyu*), the ancestor of the attested LKh. *mirimjsya-*. The Khotanese form may go back to a Central Asian substrate variant form of *marica-* with an additional nasal. Ouygh. form *mirč* ~ *mirč* is probably a direct loan from Skt. *marica-*.

(34) TB *YOLO* 'EVIL, BAD', OKh. *YAULA-* 'FALSEHOOD'

Discussion

A comprehensive discussion of the Tocharian B adjective and substantive *yolo* and its relation with Ouygh. *yavlak* and OKh. *yaula-* is found in Peyrot (2016b). After examining the Tocharian B word, he concludes that an Indo-European derivation is hardly acceptable. The Tocharian B word may have been borrowed from Khotanese *yaula-*, a loanword from Ouygh. *yavlak*.

The relation between TB *yolo* and OKh. *yaula-* is clear. Peyrot's conclusion is supported by the Tocharian B final *-o*, pointing to a direct borrowing from the oldest stages of Khotanese. As the Khotanese word has a nom. pl. in *-e* (*yaule*), the borrowing might have occurred from the nom. sg. nt. *-u* (< **-am*) instead of the acc. sg. But since such a nom. sg. does not seem to be attested in Old Khotanese, one would be forced to date the borrowing to the

³²⁰ Recently, cf. also Blažek and Schwartz (2015: 423–24).

³²¹ BSogd. *mr'ynck'*, on which see MacKenzie (1976: 11) and Sims-Williams *apud* Emmerick (1996: 52), does show an extra nasal, but it is most probably an approximate transcription of Chin. *móliànzhē* 摩練遮 and does not belong here. Besides, it cannot mean 'black pepper', as it is glossed in Sogdian by *nβr'yt k ryz-'kh βwt* 'it is pounded rice'.

³²² This depalatalisation in old Indic borrowings into Khotanese may be paralleled by Khot. *mijśāa-* 'marrow', which I propose to interpret as an old loan from Gāndhārī **mi[ja]* 'id.', cf. Pāli *miñja-*, Skt. *majjan-* (Glass 2007: 156).

prehistoric period (Pre-Khotanese or Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese). Because of the Khotanese diphthong *au* represented by TB *o*, it is hard to accept such an early dating. I propose to date the loanword to the Old Khotanese period.

The connection between OKh. *yaula*- and OUygh. *yavlak* ‘evil’ is less clear. Peyrot’s hypothesis is based on two premises. Because of the initial *y*-, OKh. *yaula*- should be considered a loanword from another language. On the other hand, OUygh. *yavlak* has solid inner-Turkish etymology (Peyrot 2016b: 331–32) that excludes borrowing into Old Uyghur from a third source. Still, the problem of the absence of other Old Uyghur loanwords in Old Khotanese casts doubts on this derivation.

An alternative explanation may seek a connection with Bactr. *ωλ*- ‘to fight’ (to Plr. **Hy-aud*-, EDIV: 176–77). The semantic developments may be summarised as ‘to fight’ > ‘to injure’ > ‘to deceive’. For the semantic closeness of ‘to deceive’ and ‘injure’, cf. Lat. *fraus* ‘harm, danger, deceit’ (De Vaan 2008: 240) and Skt. *drogh*- ‘trügen, betrügen, jemanden ein Leid antun’ (EWA I: 760). Thus, the history of the word may be reconstructed as follows: Bactr. **ωλο* ‘fight, quarrel’ > ‘harm, danger’ → OKh. *yaula*- ‘falsehood’ → TB *yolo* ‘evil’. OUygh. *yavlak* would be unrelated. The complicated semantic developments, however, cast doubts on this derivation.

Returning to the first proposal, one should address the problem of the apparent absence of Old Turkic loanwords in Old Khotanese. Some evidence of ancient contacts between Khotanese and Old Turkic might be dated to the early Old Khotanese stage. In fact, OUygh. *balto* ‘axe’ might have been borrowed from the OKh. acc. sg. *paḍu* ‘id.’ (HWA: 141), and OUygh. *küräš*- ‘miteinander kämpfen’ (HWA: 444) was certainly borrowed from OKh. *güräš*- ‘to quarrel’ (SGS: 30, see also s.v. *kuñās*). As these two items witness the existence of Early Old Khotanese – Old Turkic linguistic relations, it cannot be excluded that borrowing in the opposite direction (Old Turkic → Khotanese) took place.³²³ This would support Peyrot’s proposal of an Old Uyghur loanword into Old Khotanese.

Results

TB *yolo* was borrowed from the Old Khotanese acc. sg. *yaulu**.³²⁴ OKh. *yaula*- may be interpreted as an Old Turkic borrowing into Old Khotanese following Peyrot (2016b), with the caveat that it might be the only so far recognised Old Turkic loanword in Old Khotanese,

³²³ According to Bailey (KT VII: 104), traces of Turkish-Khotanese contacts pre-dating the first written attestations of the two languages may be detected in the tribal name Chin. *Āshīnà* 阿史那 (EMC ʔaʃi’na^h, Pulleyblank 1991), if this was borrowed from Khot. *āṣṣei’na*- ‘blue’ as an ethnic name (cf. *kōk* ‘blue’ in *Kōk Türk*). If this is an Iranian borrowing, it cannot come but from Khotanese because of *-xš- > -ṣṣ-. The name has also been found in a Runic inscription, in the text of the Karabalgasun inscription, and in that of the Bugut inscription written as ”šyn’s (Yoshida 2011: 80–81). Consequently, Bailey’s Khotanese derivation cannot be correct because Khotanese has no trace of *s*. But the Sogdian orthography could reflect Khot. **āṣṣināsa*-. A ‘colour’ suffix *-asa*- or *-āsa*-, probably distinct from the ‘animal’ suffix, also occurs in Khot. *haryāsa*- ‘black’ (KS: xxxiv), which could theoretically justify a form **āṣṣināsa*-.

³²⁴ As noted by Alessandro Del Tomba (p.c.), it is possible that the ‘Middle Khotanese’ occurrence of the lexeme in IOL Khot 165/1b 21 may point to a feminine stem *yaulā*-. However, the final *-a* might be due to the preceding *haṭha* (fem.).

TB *YAUYEK** ‘?’, KHOT. *YYAUVAKA* ‘BUTTERFLY (?)’

Discussion

After Ching’s (2010: 137–38) identification of the hapax TB *yauyek*, found in a late Tocharian B document, with Chin. *yáo yì* 徭役 ‘labour services, duty work’ (EMC *jiaw-jwiajk*, see Pulleyblank 1991: 361, 371), Adams’ (DoT: 557) uncertain connection with Khot. *yyauvaka* ‘butterfly (?)’ can be rejected. Bailey (DKS: 343) assigned the meaning ‘butterfly’ to this hapax in a late lyrical poem on a very tentative basis. Because of the initial *yy-*, it is certainly a loanword in Khotanese (from Sogdian?), but its meaning and origin remain unknown. Because the context is not that of a document, a derivation from Chin. *yáo yì* 徭役 can be excluded altogether.

Results

The Tocharian B word *yauyek** ‘labour service’ cannot be connected with the Late Khotanese hapax *yyauvaka*, whose meaning and etymology are unclear. It could be a Sogdian loanword into Khotanese, but a precise source form has not been identified yet.

TB *RAPAÑÑE* ‘PERTAINING TO THE 12TH MONTH’, KHOT. *RRĀHAJA*- ‘ID.’

Discussion

The Tocharian name of the 12th month, *rapaññe*, is of uncertain origin. Both a Chinese and a Khotanese etymology have been proposed. In section a., I argue that its origin is most likely Chinese. In section b., I suggest that the first month of the Tumshuqese and Khotanese calendar may also be derived from a Chinese source. In section c., I re-examine the Tumshuqese calendar based on these discoveries.

a. On the etymology of TB *rapaññe*

Adams (1999: 527) first proposed to interpret TB *rapaññe* (/rapáññe/) as an adjective derived from the noun *rāp**,³²⁵ a loanword from the Middle Chinese antecedent of Chin. *là* 臘 (EMC *lap*, cf. Pulleyblank (1991: 181)). Pinault (2008: 363–64) doubts this suggestion by arguing that the correspondence *l* ~ *r* is imperfect. He tentatively proposes a possible derivation from the Tocharian B verb *rapa-* ‘to plough, dig’ (with an agricultural connotation) or from the Pre-Khotanese antecedent of Khot. *rrāha-* ‘disease’. In his opinion, *rrāha-* is the base of the name of the Khotanese 12th month *rrāhaja-*. In the first scenario, one would expect ***rapaññe* (/rapáññe/) or perhaps ***rāpaññe* (/rápaññe/, if from the verbal noun *rāpalñe*). Moreover, as the Old Chinese antecedent of EMC *lap* is *r’ap*, following Baxter and Sagart’s (2014) reconstruction, one cannot exclude a direct borrowing from Old Chinese (early Han period?).³²⁶ With Lubotsky and Starostin (2003: 264), I interpret *rāp* as an Old Chinese borrowing into Tocharian B.

³²⁵ Now attested as such, see Ching (2010: 449–50).

³²⁶ There are other Old Chinese borrowings into Tocharian, e.g. *klu* ‘rice’ (Lubotsky and Starostin 2003: 262).

Pinault's suggestion that the Khotanese month *rrāhaja-* may be connected deserves more extensive analysis. Bailey (1982: 30) tentatively derived the Khotanese month name from the root Plr. **rap/f-* 'to help, assist, support' (EDIV: 314). However, the suggested semantic link ('ease (from the frost)' according to Bailey 1982: 30) is far-fetched. More attractive would seem Pinault's connection with the root **Hrab/f-* 'to attack, fight' (EDIV: 185) that lies at the origin of the Khotanese substantive *rrāha-* 'disease' (DKS: 362). The 12th month, therefore, would be the 'month of illness', a fitting *Benennungsmotiv* for the last month of winter. But it could also reflect a folk etymology.

Is the Khotanese month name derived from the same source as the Tocharian month? A derivation from OChin. *r^hap* would have probably yielded Khot. *rava-* because of **p > v* intervocalically. However, it is not to be excluded that the final *p* of the Old Chinese form may have been heard as an aspirate *ph* by speakers of Pre-Khotanese. In this case, intervocalic *ph* may have yielded *h* regularly. The long *ā* in the first syllable may have been due to folk etymology (cf. *rrāha-* 'disease').

b. On the etymology of the first month of the Khotanese and Tumshuqese calendar

In Dragoni (2020: 221–22), following a suggestion by Konow (1935: 798), I tentatively proposed that the first month of the Khotanese calendar, i.e. *cvātaja-*, may be connected with the Tumshuqese month name *tsvix₆āna-*, of uncertain origin and interpretation. As the etymology of both month names is unknown, I verify whether these terms can be derived from Proto-Iranian in section b.1. Since an Iranian etymology appears unlikely, I suggest that the name may be an old loanword from Early Middle Chinese in section b.2.

b.1. A tentative Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese reconstruction

Dieter Maue (p.c.) kindly drew my attention to the Late Khotanese hapax *cūvija-* (DKS: 104), phonologically similar to the Tumshuqese form. As *ū > vā* is more frequent in Late Khotanese than *vā > ū* (also occurring, cf. s.v. *tvāñkaro*), it could be surmised that the Old Khotanese form of the month name may have had a vowel *ū*. The intervocalic *t* in *cvātaja-* and *v* in *cūvija-* may be interpreted as hiatus fillers. In this case, the correspondence with Tq. *x₆*, to which I assigned a preliminary value [j], may suggest that the correct reconstruction of the second consonant was **y*. I would reconstruct the second vowel as *a*, as *i* in *cūvija-* is due to Late Khotanese trisyllabic weakening.

Therefore, one could reconstruct a form **cūya-ja-* for Old Khotanese – the adjectival suffix *-ja-* being directly comparable with Tq. *-ana-* in *tsvix₆āna-*. It is possible to reconstruct a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese form by comparing OKh. **cūya°* and Tq. *tsvix₆a°* ([tswija]). Assuming a secondary palatalisation **ts- > c-* due to the following *y* in the Old Khotanese name, the form to reconstruct is PTK **tsūya-*.

This reconstruction does not yield any beneficial results. A form **tsūya-* could formally be connected with the verb *tsū-* 'to go', but the semantic connection between this verb and the first month of the year is obscure.

b.2. A Middle Chinese connection

As an Iranian origin of Khot. *cvātaja-* and Tq. *tsvix₆āna-* is not defensible, the hypothesis of a loanword becomes more relevant. Since the correspondence Tq. *ts-* ~ Khot. *c-* is not regular, the two forms might have been borrowed independently from a third language.

As already seen in the case of *rapaññe*, Chinese seems to have exerted a certain degree of influence on the Tocharian calendar in pre-Tang times. I suggest that the name of the first month Khot. *cvātaja-* may be derived from the first month in the Chinese pre-Tang calendar, *zōuyyuè* 陬月 ‘(lit.) month of the corner’. This term is part of the ancient phenological designations of the months of the year, substituted by simple ordinal numbers in the Later Han period (Wilkinson 2000: 179). The Early Middle Chinese pronunciation of *zōuyyuè* can be reconstructed as *tsəw.ɲuat* or *tšuw.ɲuat*, according to Pulleyblank (1991: 422, 388). The second reconstruction neatly corresponds to Khot. *cvāta*^o, if the medial velar nasal was dropped, probably after having developed to *ɣ* (*-uwɲua-* > *-uwɣua-* > *-uwa-*, Khot. <*vā*>). The difference in the initial between Tumshuqese and Khotanese may be ascribed to the alternation between *ts* and *tš* noted for Chinese by Pulleyblank (l.c.).

This identification establishes that the original consonant in Khotanese noted by <*t*> and <*v*> may have been realised as [t]. Whereas *cūvija-* can be interpreted without problems as a Late Khotanese variant of an original *cvātaja-*, it is hard to reconcile the second syllable of the Tumshuqese form with that of Khotanese. One would expect <*d*₁> and not <*x*₆>. I tentatively propose that, like in the correspondence OChin. *r²ap* ~ Khot. *rrāha*^o, Chinese final *-t* may have been heard as an aspirate *-t^h* and may have undergone the same development as PIr. **9* in Tumshuqese. Trisyllabic weakening of *a* to *i* (**tsuwat^ha-* > **tsuwit^ha-*) may have created the conditions for the appearance of [j], noted by <*x*₆>.

Alternatively, as the Late Middle Chinese reconstruction of *yuè* 月 is *ɲyat*, i.e. *ɲuat* (Pulleyblank 1991: 388), with a front vowel, it is perhaps more likely that the Tumshuqese form reflects a later borrowing from the same source. The Late Middle Chinese source form for *tsvix₆āna-* may have been *tsəwɲyat*, with the same treatment of the nasal velar as in Khotanese (*-uwɲūa-* > *-uwɣūja-* > *-uwija-* > *-uwija-*, Tq. <*vix₆a*>). Two alternative explanations are available for the apparent absence of the final *-t* in the Tumshuqese form. One could think that the borrowing was so late that the final *-t* was not distinguishable. However, since in Late Khotanese LMC final *-t* was regularly represented by *rā* (Emmerick and Pulleyblank 1993: 34), and the Tumshuqese month name is attested at least two centuries before, this hypothesis is weak.

The first *na* akṣara of the Tumshuqese form may have to be read as *ta* (Konow (1935: 798). The reading would be *tsvix₆āta-* instead of *tsvix₆āna-*. This month name occurs thrice in Tumshuqese (Dragoni 2020: 221): HL 29.2, HL 24.1 and the newly found TUMXUQ 002.a.2. While the scribe did not distinguish between *na* and *ta* in the first two documents, it is unclear whether the third document there was a difference between the two akṣaras. In table 8, the akṣaras *na* and *ta* from TUMXUQ 002 have been gathered. It is hard to establish the distinguishing features of the two akṣaras. At first sight, the upper stroke of *ta* seems to be longer than that of *na*. But this is contradicted by the third, the seventh, and the eighth *na* in table 8. Another possible distinguishing feature may be the orientation, which seems to be slightly bent leftwards in *ta*. But this is again contradicted by the fifth *na* in table 8. *na* and *ta* were not consistently distinguished in this document. An additional argument supporting

this conclusion is that the first *na* in the Tumshuqese month name (see the picture in table 8) may have been influenced by the shape of the final *-ne*.

Therefore, a reading *tsvix₆āta-* is possible. The *t* instead of the expected *d₁* is another irregular correspondence due to borrowing.















<i>na</i>								
Line	a1	a1	a2	a4	a10	a10	a12	a17
<i>ta</i>								
Line	a3	a3	a4	a5	b3			
Month name								
	<i>tsvivix₆ānane</i> (a2)							

Table 8. *na* and *ta* in TUMXUQ 002 and in the month name in a2.

b.3. Preliminary conclusions

I propose that the different phonological shapes of the name of the first month of the year in Khotanese and Tumshuqese are to be explained due to independent borrowing from a Middle Chinese source in the two languages. The Khotanese form *cvātaja-* I derive from an Early Middle Chinese form, the Tumshuqese form, read as *tsvix₆āta-* with final *-ta* instead of *-na*, from a later Late Middle Chinese form of the same name.

c. The Tumshuqese calendar

If the correspondence Khot. *cvātaja-* ~ Tq. *tsvix₆āta-* ~ Chin. *zōuyuè* 陬月 is correct, this allows a more precise interpretation of the Tumshuqese calendar. The main consequence of this identification is that *tsvix₆āta-* has to be the first month. Previously, nearly nothing was known about the correct sequence of the Tumshuqese months. *ahve/arja(na)-*, the only other attested month name, had been taken by Konow (1935: 798) and Henning (1936: 11–12) as a loanword from Sogdian *xwrjn(ye)*, the name of the second month. Sims-Williams and De Blois (1996: 152) put forward the tentative hypothesis that this may be further related to the Bactrian month *αυρηζνο* (< **ahura-yazniya*?).

Table 9 shows that the Tumshuqese calendar employs only two month names,³²⁷ *ahve/arja(na)-* and *tsvix₆āta-*. The other months are designated with their corresponding ordinal number. This is reminiscent of the Tocharian calendar, according to which only the

³²⁷ The alleged month name *buzad₁ina* (HL 6.5) does not occur in any dating formula. Acknowledging the religious character of the document in which it appears, Henning (1936: 12) tentatively connected it with Skt. *uposatha-*, the month of fasting in the Manichaean tradition. If it were not for *māste* ‘month’ following the name, one could think of a connection with the day name Skt. *budhadina-* ‘Wednesday’ (MW: 734).

first (*naimaññe*), eleventh (*wärsaññe*), and twelfth month (*rapaññe*) receive a proper name. The other months are designated with an ordinal number. In Niya Prakrit and Chinese (after the later Han period, cf. *supra*), only ordinal numbers refer to months in dating formulas. On the other hand, all months have a name in the Khotanese calendar.

	Khotanese	Tumshuqese	Tocharian
1	<i>cvātaja-</i>	<i>tsvix₆āta-</i>	<i>naimaññe</i>
2	<i>kaja-</i>	<i>ahvarja(na)-?</i>	‘2 nd month’
3	<i>hamārīja-</i>	?	‘3 rd month’
4	<i>simjsimja-</i>	‘4 th month’	‘4 th month’
5	<i>hamdyāja-</i>	?	‘5 th month’
6	<i>rarūya-</i>	‘6 th month’	‘6 th month’
7	<i>ttumjāra-</i>	?	‘7 th month’
8	<i>bramkhaysja-</i>	‘8 th month’	‘8 th month’
9	<i>mutca’ca-</i>	?	‘9 th month’
10	<i>muñamja-</i>	‘10 th month’	‘10 th month’
11	<i>skarhvāra-</i>	<i>ahvarja(na)- ?</i>	<i>wärsaññe</i>
12	<i>rrāhaja-</i>	?	<i>rapaññe</i>

Table 9. Khotanese, Tumshuqese and Tocharian calendars

The similarities between the Tocharian and the Tumshuqese calendar are evident. As the Tocharian system may have influenced the Tumshuqese calendar, one would expect to find only the 1st, 11th and 12th month names in Tumshuqese. Consequently, the month *ahve/arja(na)-* may be only the 11th or the 12th. The 12th month name is not attested, but one could hypothesise that it was borrowed from the same Chinese source as TB *rapaññe* and, perhaps, Khot. *rrāhaja-*. If it is to be identified with the 11th month, one might envisage a possible connection with Khot. *skarhvāra-*, which I would interpret as derived from **skara-hvāra* ‘coal-taking’.³²⁸ Thus, instead of a loanword from Sogdian *xwrjn(ye)*, which would not preclude the possibility that this may not be automatically the second month also in Tumshuqese, it may represent an adjective **ā-hvara-ja-* with the meaning ‘pertaining to the taking (of the coal)’. The phonological similarity with the corresponding Tocharian month name *wärsaññe* is evident, but should be studied in more detail.

d. Results

The first section of this discussion has shown how the name of the 10th month in Khotanese (*rrāhaja-*) and Tocharian B (*rapaññe*) may be derived from the same Old Chinese (or very early Middle Chinese) month name. In the second section, I proposed that the Tumshuqese match of the 1st month *cvātaja-* may be *tsvix₆āta-* (so to be tentatively read instead of *tsvix₆āna-*). The Khotanese form *cvātaja-* I derived from the Early Middle Chinese ancestor of Chin. *zōuyuè* 陬月, and the Tumshuqese word from a later Late Middle Chinese form of the same name. In the third section, I suggested that the Tocharian calendar may have structurally influenced the Tumshuqese one. The Tumshuqese month *ahve/arja(na)-* may be

³²⁸ Bailey (1982: 30) proposed a connection with *skarba-* ‘rough, hard’, but the phonological developments involved are hardly acceptable.

identified with the 11th month and connected with the corresponding Khotanese month *skarhvāra-*.

TB *raso* ‘SPAN’, KHOT. *haraysa-* ‘EXTENSION, EXPANSE’

Discussion

The verb TB *rās-* A *rāsā-* ‘to stretch’ has a specific semantic connotation. It is only used with ‘arm(s)’ as an object in the phrase ‘to stretch one’s arm’. The more general verb is TB *pānn-* A *pānw-* ‘to stretch’. Given the specific semantics of TB *rās-* A *rāsā-* and the lack of a secure etymology for this verb, it might be a loanword.

In Old Khotanese, the verb *harays-* (SGS: 149, < PIr. **fra-Hraǵ-* [EDIV: 196]) is used in the same context of TB *rās-* A *rāsā-*, and it has the specific meaning of ‘to stretch out (one’s arm)’. This expression is frequent in Tocharian and Khotanese literature, and it is probably the adaptation of a Buddhist Sanskrit stock phrase. For instance, one may compare the following cases:

- A 315 a2 *aṣuk wsā-yokām poke rsorāṣ* ‘He stretched out his stout (?), golden-coloured arm.’ (cf. CEToM, Carling, Illés, Peyrot eds.).
- Sum §91 *hvaradau ysarra-gūnā bāysu haraṣṭe* ‘He stretched out his golden-coloured right arm.’ (Emmerick 1998: 418)

The Buddhist Sanskrit equivalent is found, for instance, in Sgh 225.1 *daṣṣiṇaṃ pāṇi-talaṃ prasārayati*. This phrase can be extended with ‘golden-coloured’ *vel sim*. As already noted, it is natural to think about a Khotanese loanword into Tocharian. The phonological correspondences, however, are not straightforward. Two problems may be identified: the inexplicable loss of accented initial *ha-* in the Tocharian verb and the difficult vocalism Toch. /ä/ ~ Khot. /a/. One could solve the second problem by positing a borrowing from the Old Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese antecedent of the Late Khotanese subst. *haraysa-* ‘expanse, extent’ (Emmerick 2002: 13) with trisyllabic weakening to **haräysa-* into TB *raso* ‘span’ – the verb could have been formed later from the noun *raso* – but the problem of initial *ha-* remains. Only *unaccented* initial *ham-* could be dropped in the borrowing process from Khotanese to Tocharian (see §2.1. s.v. *keś*). Even if the semantics may point to a relatively recent borrowing in a Buddhist context, the remaining phonological problems invite one to consider the possibility of a loanword with caution. On the other hand, one cannot exclude that PTK **hra-raza-* was borrowed as TB **/ráraso/* and developed later to **/ráso/* by haplology. In this case, however, the different vowel of the reconstructed Tocharian form (/a/ against the attested /ə/) cannot be easily explained.

Results

The verb TB *rās-* A *rāsā-* has a narrow semantic range that might point to a borrowing. In Old Khotanese, the same semantic range is covered by the verb *harays-*, which may also provide a fitting phonological correspondence. The problematic initial *ha-*, however, of which no trace is found in Tocharian, casts doubts on the correctness of this connection.

(36) TB *WARĀÑCE**, A *WĀRYĀÑC** ‘SAND’, KHOT. *GURVĪCA*- ‘GRAIN (OF SAND)’

Tocharian occurrences: TB *warāñce**

- com. sg. THT 552 b1 *kañkcene warāñcampa enesle* ‘like the sand of the Ganges’
- ? (restored) THT 566 b6 *aurtsai ysā-yokām waram(c) ///* ‘the broad, golden sand’ (DoT: 628)
- ? (isolated) THT 1450b a2 */// wārāñci ///* ‘sand (?)’ (DoT: 628).
- *ṣṣe*-adj. THT 142 a4 */// wārāñcāṣṣa māṣce ra kākāntār postām :* *///* ‘Like a fist of sand he scatters [it] afterwards.’
- *tstse*-adj. (restored) IOL Toch. 7 a3 */// (ma) (wara)ñcācce meltesa kāccillya* ‘It is (not) to be scoured (?) with sand and dung.’ (Peyrot *apud* CEToM)

Tocharian occurrences: TA *wāryāñc**

- com. sg. A 217 a2 (*sne kaś ?*) *sne y(ār)m wāryāñc(a)śś(āl tāskmām) ptā(ñāktāñ)* ‘(Without number ?) without measure, like [grains of] sand (are) the Buddhas ...’ (Michaël Peyrot, p.c.)
- com. sg. A 114 b4 */// p. wā(ryā)ñc(a)śśāl tāskmām āṣāni(kā)ñ ñāktāśś(i) pättāñāktāñ ṣ(me)ñcinās tre mañās nā* ‘... comparable to [grains of] sand, arhats, and divine Buddhas ... during the three months of the rainy (summer?) season ...’ (Michaël Peyrot, p.c.)

Discussion

The etymology of the word for ‘sand’ in Tocharian B and A is unknown. I propose that it may be a loanword from the ancestor of OKh. *gurvīca*- ‘grain (of sand)’. The discussion is divided into sections: a. ‘sand’ in Tocharian A and B, b. Khotanese *gurvīca*-, c. the borrowing path from Khotanese to Tocharian, d. results.

a. ‘Sand’ in Tocharian A and B

Following Adams (DoT: 628), the reconstruction of the phonological shape of the word is based on its attestation in THT 142, a fragment that can be classified as archaic. The manuscript to which THT 142 belongs consistently writes /ə/ as <ä> irrespective of the accent, so the vocalism of the first syllable can be reconstructed as /ǝ/. An additional argument for the position of the accent is the lack of syncope of the first syllable. If the accent were on the second syllable, one would have expected a development ***/wārāñce/ > **/wrāñce/*. The ending *-e** is set up based on the obl. sg. *warāñc** as can be inferred from the *ṣṣe*- and *tstse*-adjectives. Therefore, one can safely reconstruct a form *warāñce** for classical Tocharian B.

There are fewer attestations of the word in Tocharian A, where it occurs only in the com. sg., governed by *tāskmām* ‘comparable to’ in a fixed phrase. The form should be reconstructed with a nom. sg. *wāryāñc**. As noted by Couvreur (1956: 72), it is clear that *wāryāñc** is the Tocharian A match of Tocharian B *warāñce**. This correspondence shows at least two phonological problems. The vowels are radically different, and the extra *y* of the Tocharian A form is problematic. In the following, I argue that these apparent mismatches may be ascribed to borrowing. The word is a loanword from Khotanese *gurvīca*- ‘grain (of sand)’.

b. Khotanese *gurvīca*-

gurva- is attested with the meaning ‘grain’ in Late Khotanese medical texts. For bilingual evidence, one may consult the *Siddhasāra*, where it corresponds to Skt. *dhānā*- in §1.56 and to Skt. *lāja*- in §15.16. As for its etymology, Bailey (DKS: 88) gives two alternative explanations. The first interprets it as **wi-ruxta-* (> **wi-rūta-* > **wi-rūva-* > *gu-rva-*) ‘broken apart (i.e. in pieces)’, a participle from the Proto-Iranian root **rauǰ-* ‘to break, burst’ (EDIV: 318). The second connects *gurva*- with the West-Proto-Indo-European ‘gravel’ root **g^hreuh₂-* (Kroonen 2013: 188). Since no continuants of this root are found in Indo-Iranian, Bailey’s first option is likely correct, both from the semantic and the phonological point of view.

Given these premises, it is easy to see how Khot. *gurvīca*- may have been formed based on *gurva*- by adding the diminutive suffix *-īca-* (KS: 128). The meaning of Khot. *gurvīca*- was, therefore, ‘small grain’.

c. The borrowing path from Khotanese to Tocharian

I propose that TB *warāñce** and TA *wāryāñc* are borrowed from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese antecedent of OKh. *gurvīca*-. This implies the antiquity of the Tocharian A seemingly ‘intrusive’ *y* and of the Tocharian B vowels. A somewhat ‘hybrid’ post-Proto-Tocharian form can be thus reconstructed as **wāryāñce*. The Tocharian initial *wā*- neatly corresponds to the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese preverb **wi-*, as does the medial *-r-*. *y* may have arisen due to dissimilation of two consecutive *w* in a form PTK or PK **wirwīca-* > **wiryīca-*. To explain *ñ* and the unexpected final *-e*, I resort to analogy with other frequent words for earth-like elements, like *salañce* ‘saline ground’ (DoT: 742). Similarly, the second vowel of the Tocharian A word may be due to analogy with *wiskāñc* ‘mud, dirt’. The first vowel in Tocharian A remains unexplained. Because of these discrepancies, the date of the borrowing should be placed after the split of the two Tocharian languages.

The semantics and the usage of the words in Tocharian and Khotanese support this borrowing scenario. They are employed to translate the Buddhist stock phrase about the innumerability of the grains of sand (Skt. *vālukā*-) of the Ganges.³²⁹ Among the many examples, one may compare the following:

- TB THT 552 b1 *kañkcene warāñcampa eneśle* ‘like the sand of the Ganges’ (lit. ‘in the Ganges’)
- LKh. Vim 248 *khu jai gaga grruīcyau sye* ‘just as the grains of sand of the Ganges’ (lit. ‘just as the sands with [their] grains in the Ganges’).

d. Results

I argued that TB *warāñce** A *wāryāñc** may go back to a post-Proto-Tocharian form **wāryāñce*. This form I connected with the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese ancestor of OKh. *gurvīca*- ‘small grain (of sand)’, which could be reconstructed as **wirwīca*-.

The final *-ñce* of the Tocharian B word and the two vowels of the Tocharian A form may have been due to analogy with other terms for earth-like elements, like TB *salañce* ‘saline ground’ and TA *wiskāñc* ‘mud, dirt’.

³²⁹ On the compound TB *gaṅgavāluk* in the *Udānastotra* and its alleged Mahayanistic flavour, see Peyrot (2016: 322).

TB *WARTTO*, A *WÄRT* ‘FOREST’, OKH. *BĀḌA*- ‘LAND’

Discussion

The etymology of TB *wartto* A *wärt* ‘forest’ is unclear. The traditional connection with OE *worþ* ‘piece of land, farm’ and Skt. *vṛti*- ‘enclosure’ (VW: 56, DoT: 630) is semantically problematic. Adams (l.c.) is forced to surmise a semantic development ‘enclosure’ > ‘sacred enclosure’ > ‘sacred grove’ > ‘forest’, which appears unusually complicated.³³⁰ Because of the final -o in Tocharian B, it might be a loanword from Khotanese. Indeed, from the same root PIE **uer-*, Khotanese has *bāḍa*- (DKS: 276, Suv II: 312) in the meaning of ‘country, land’.

Two facts speak against a derivation of TB *wartto* from the ancestor of OKh. *bāḍa*-. On the one hand, OKh. *bāḍa*- presupposes a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent **warda*- (< PIr. **wṛta*- ?), with later compensatory lengthening, not ***wṛta*-, as TAB /ər/ may suggest. In this case, however, one may note that, as in the case of *kañko* and *śarko*, q.v., it seems that, before nasals and liquids, Khot. *a* may also be adapted as TB /ə/. On the other hand, the semantic difficulties are the same as those connected with a Proto-Indo-European derivation. Moreover, the Tocharian B declension pattern nom. sg. -o, obl. sg. -o, although attested (cf. TB *pito*), is not frequent in loanwords from Khotanese (see §3.4.). This option remains speculative.

Results

The etymology of TB *wartto* A *wärt* ‘forest’ is unclear. In the discussion, I consider the hypothesis that it may be a loanword from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent of OKh. *bāḍa*- ‘land’. From the phonological point of view, the derivation does not pose particular problems. However, the semantic difficulties involved make this derivation hardly acceptable.

TB *WAŠĀKO** ‘FEAR’, BACTR. *BIZAGO* ‘BAD’

Discussion

The hapax *wašāko** is attested in the loc. sg. *wašākane* in the Tocharian B – Old Uyghur bilingual U 5208 a14, for which cf. the edition and the commentary in Peyrot, Pinault and Wilkens (2019: 85). A meaning ‘fear, terror’ can be inferred from the Old Uyghur gloss *korkinčin äy(män)čin* ‘with fear and shame’. On this basis, the authors propose a tentative connection with an unidentified Iranian donor language. The original form may have been related to MSogd. *βj*-, BSogd. *’βz*- ‘bad’ (< PIr. **bazdya*-), OKh. *baśdaā*- ‘sin’ (< **bazdyakā*-).

It is difficult to identify the donor language. As Peyrot, Pinault and Wilkens (l.c.) noted, the Tocharian B sibilant *ṣ* could more likely reflect Sogdian /ž/ in *βj*- than Khot. *śd*. The initial *w* may also point to Sogdian rather than Khotanese if one takes TB <w> as representing [β] of the source form. But no loanwords from Sogdian with the ending -o have been identified so far.

In Middle Iranian, besides Khotanese, forms with a *ka*-suffix are attested in MSogd. *βjyk* /βəžīk/ and Bactr. *βiζayo* (Sims-Williams 2007: 203). The Bactrian form may provide a

³³⁰ A parallel may be sought in Dutch *tuin* ‘garden’ from PG **tūna*- ‘fenced area’ (Kroonen 2013: 526). However, forests are not usually delimited by fences.

suitable phonological match. Its occurrence in the Bactrian fragment written in Manichaean script as *βyžg* (Sims-Williams 2011: 248) confirms that <ζ> may have been pronounced as [ʒ] instead of [z], as also reported by Gholami (2014: 48). For the ending -o in borrowings from Bactrian cf. TB *koško* ‘pit, hole’, for which Bernard and Chen (2022: 24) reconstructed a Pre-Bactrian source form **kōškā*- (> Bactr. **κωβκο*). Nevertheless, a derivation from Bactrian *βιζαγο* is semantically problematic. The adjective ‘bad’ and the substantives ‘fear’ and ‘shame’ all share a common negative connotation, but they do not cover the same semantic range. Should one take the Old Uyghur translation more seriously, one could come up with at least two different solutions to the problem.

First, one could posit a connection with the Old Khotanese verb *vaś*- ‘to shun, avoid’. A derivative **vaśaa*- or **vaśāa*- may have meant ‘act of avoidance’, hence ‘fear’. A *ka*-suffix may have been attached to this derivative with no modification in the meaning,³³¹ obtaining a form **vaśāka*-. However, the different sibilant (TB *š*, Khot. *ś*) casts severe doubts on this derivation. Another solution involves the reconstruction of an unattested Bactrian substantive **βαζαγο*, a *ya*-derivative from the root PIr. **wāf*- ‘to respect’ (EDIV: 432–33), enlarged with a *ka*-suffix. This option remains tentative because this derivative is not attested in any other Iranian language.

A derivation from Bactr. *βιζαγο* ‘bad’ through borrowing remains the most reliable etymological explanation for TB *wašāko**.

Results

The etymology of the hapax TB *wašāko** ‘fear, terror’ is unknown. In the discussion, three possible derivations from Bactr. *βιζαγο* (MBactr. *βyžg*), Khot. **vaśāka*-, and Bactr. **βαζαγο* are examined. While the Bactrian derivation from *βιζαγο* seems phonologically quite fitting, Khotanese is rejected because of the different sibilants (TB *š*, Khot. *ś*). The reconstruction of a source form **βαζαγο* is not secure because of the lack of further Iranian parallels for this formation.

TB *wicuko* ‘CHEEK, (JAW)BONE’, PK **wi-jwa-ka*- ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- loc. sg. PK AS 2B a3 *krāñi wicūkaine* ‘[The pain is] in the neck [and] in the jaw.’ (CEToM Carling and Pinault eds.)
- nom. sg. IOL Toch 100 b2 /// *wcuko kemem̐ts witsa(ko)* /// ‘The jaw [is] the root of the teeth.’ (DoT: 669)
- obl. sg. IOL Toch 803 b2 /// (*mā*) *wcukai āline tāttā, os(ne šmalle)* /// ‘One should not sit in the house having put the cheek in the palm of the hand.’ (Ogihara 2009: 264)
- obl. sg. PK AS 7M a5 *kaklāyaš kemi laṃtse wcūkai-wāñcintsa* ‘The teeth have fallen out because of the feeble gums [lit. holding the jaw].’ (CEToM, Pinault, Malzahn, Peyrot eds.)
- nom. dual PK AS 13B b4 *wcūkane yailwa toṃ lānte šeckem̐ntse* ‘[His] two curved jaws [are] those of the lion king.’ (Wilkins, Pinault and Peyrot 2014: 12)

³³¹ Cf. *dandaa*- ‘tooth’ and *dandāka*- ‘id.’ (KS: 190).

- perl. sg. THT 85 a1-2 *tumem̐ uttare m(ñcu)šk(e) wcukaisa mātār lāntso eñku weṣān-neṣcā* ‘Thereupon prince Uttara while grasping [his] mother, the queen, by the chin speaks to her.’ (CEToM, Malzahn ed., cf. also Schmidt 2001: 314)

Discussion

According to Adams (DoT: 669), the meaning of the Tocharian B substantive *wicuko* is secured by the bilingual evidence offered by the *Yogaśataka*, which shows that it translates Skt. *hanu-* ‘jaw, cheek’. To my knowledge, apart from Van Windekens’ (VW 573) and Adams’ (1984a: 285) tentative explanations, which are phonologically problematic,³³² no etymological explanation of the term is available.

Because of the alternation *wic-* ~ *wc-*, an inner-Tocharian derivation can be safely excluded. Two other elements may indicate the extra-Tocharian origin and, more specifically, the Iranian (Khotanese) provenance of the borrowing. These are initial *wi-*, which could be equated with the Proto-Iranian preverb **wi-*, and final *-o*, pointing to a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese borrowing. A very suitable semantic and phonological match is found in the Khotanese root *°jv-* ‘to chew’ (PIr. **jyauH-*, see EDIV: 226), attested in Khotanese only with the preverb *ham-* (SGS: 138–39). It is thus possible to set up a hypothetical Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese **wi-jwa-ka-*, which could have been borrowed as TB *wicwako* or *wācwako** from an acc. sg. **wijwaku*.³³³ To explain the TB medial *u*, one should start from a reconstructed PK **wijwāka-*, which could have undergone weakening of the medial unaccented *-a-*. This form may have been borrowed as TB **wicwāko*. For the alternation TB *wā* ~ *u*, see s.v. *añkwaṣ(t)* ‘Asa foetida’. The jaws would then be ‘the chewing (organ)’.

As a working hypothesis, it may be surmised that Tocharian preserved an ancient word for ‘jaws’ in Khotanese. In the historical stage, **wi-jwa-ka-* was lost in favour of derivatives of PIr. **janu-* (cf. *(pa)ysaṇua(ka)-* KS: 192, DKS: 345).

Results

The subst. TB *wicuko* ‘cheek, jaw(bone)’ could be connected with a reconstructed Pre-Khotanese form **wi-jwāka-*, a *ka*-formation based on the Khotanese verb *°jv-* ‘to chew’.

(35) TB *wiñcaññe* ‘PERTAINING TO A SPARROW’, OKH. *BIṀJI-* ‘SPARROW’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 282 a7-b1 *t(a)l(lā_u) /// /// sn(ai) parwā lestaimeṃ tsāñkaṃ su kl(ā)y(aṃ) n(o) k(eṃ)tsa wiñcaññe śa(r)wa(r)ñ(e)sa tr(i)kṣä(ṃ) mäkt(e) palsk(o cwi)* – ‘If miserable ... without feathers [the young bird] rises from its nest and falls down on earth, then it misses *wiñcaññe* because of pride. Like the mind ...’ (Peyrot 2013: 676). Adams (DoT: 654) has ‘[if] without feathers he rises from [his] nest, he will fall to earth; so his spirit tricks [him] with a nestling’s pride.’

³³² The second edition of Adams’ dictionary does not mention either of these two proposals.

³³³ Noteworthy would be in this case the preservation of intervocalic *k*, which is otherwise borrowed as *w* (§3.3.2.2.j). From PK **-ka-ka-* one would rather expect TB ***wicukko* (see s.v. *-kke*, *-kka*, *-kko*).

Discussion

The Tocharian B hapax *wiñcaññe* is attested in the verse text found in THT 282. The sentence is part of a larger simile of a young bird that leaves its nest without knowing how to fly and falls onto the earth. Whereas Peyrot (2013: 676) leaves this hapax untranslated, Adams (2011: 37–38) suggests a possible explanation of *wiñcaññe* as ‘a denominal adjective to a noun meaning ‘nestling’’. Phonologically, <*wiñcaññe*> could be interpreted as /wiñcāññe/, with <a> for /ǎ/, remarkable in an archaic text as THT 282 where /ǎ/ is usually written as <ä>. He further derived this hypothetical *wañce** from a root PIE **wendh-* meaning ‘hair’. The Tocharian ‘nestling’ should be the ‘downy’ one.

Adams’ interpretation is well worth considering. However, no parallel for the questionable semantic path ‘downy’ > ‘nestling’ is offered, making this proposal problematic. Therefore, the hypothesis of a loanword from a neighbouring language should be examined. Khotanese may provide a good candidate for a possible source form. The text of the Late Khotanese *Siddhasāra* (§3.20.11, 25.11) has preserved the Khotanese word for ‘sparrow’ (Skt. *cakāṭa-*), *biñji-*. Bailey (DKS: 281) reconstructs a pre-form **winji-*. The reconstruction of an *i*-stem seems confirmed by the Late Khotanese palatal *j*, which preserved its palatal character because of the following *i* and was not depalatalised to *js*. Although with a different suffix, the word is well-known in Middle and Modern Iranian, cf. MP *winjišk*, NP *gunjišk* (CPD: 91). I suggest that the term was borrowed as *wañc** in the Pre-Khotanese or even Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese stage (cf. TB *keś* A *kaś* for the final), because of the retained initial *w-*, invariably changed to *b-* already in Old Khotanese. The source form may have been the nom. or acc. sg. PTK or PK **winji* (SGS: 290). I propose the following translation for the passage in THT 282 b1:

- ‘(If) the miserable (young sparrow) without feathers rises from its nest and falls down onto the earth, he is led astray because of the pride of (being a) sparrow.’

Results

The hapax TB *wiñcaññe* may be interpreted as a denominal adjective from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese pre-form of Late Khotanese *biñji-* ‘sparrow’, translating Skt. *caṭaka-* in the *Siddhasāra*. The reconstructed substantive may have been TB *wañc** ‘sparrow’, which could be connected with a reconstructed Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese nom. or acc. sg. **winji* through borrowing.

TB *WRĀKO* A *WROK* ‘PEARL’, OKH. *MRĀHĀ-* ‘ID.’

Discussion

As C. Bernard (p.c.) noted,³³⁴ it is impossible to consider TB *wrāko* A *wrok* ‘pearl’ as a loanword from OKh. *mrāhā-* ‘id.’, as often argued in the scholarly literature (cf. Tremblay 2005: 434). The main phonological problem is the initial *mr-*, which can hardly have been adapted as TAB *wr-*. Thus, Bernard concludes that the source of the Tocharian words may be sought in an unknown Middle Iranian language that underwent the change **mr-* > *vr-*. This

³³⁴ A study on this word by C. Bernard is in preparation. I thank him for sharing the results of his investigation with me.

unknown language may have been close to some Hindu-Kush languages that show a similar treatment of **mr̥-*.

The more frequent word for ‘pearl’ (cf. MP *murwārid*, Greek *μαργαρίτης*), from which the Tocharian and the Khotanese words are clearly derived, may be ultimately traced back to the Proto-Iranian word for ‘bird’, **mr̥ga-* (Beekes 2010: 905). Since the regular outcome of **mr̥ga-* is OKh. *mura-*, OKh. *mrāhā-* can hardly be a native Khotanese word (pace Bailey, DKS: 341). Moreover, the initial cluster *mr-* reflects a foreign Anlaut because it does not occur elsewhere in Khotanese. An epenthetic vowel *ä/i/ī* is frequently inserted between *m* and *r* to simplify this exotic cluster (cf. *mirāhā-*, *mārāhā-*, *mīrāhā-* in the *Suvarṇa-bhāṣottamasūtra* [Suv II: 326]).

Bernard notes that a form **mr̥āy-*, from which TB *wrāko* may be derived, is reflected in Yidgha *brāyiko* and Munjī *brayiko*, *brāyiko* ‘sparrow’. In my view, a competing form **mr̥āx-* may have existed beside **mr̥āy-*. As intervocalic *x* is known to develop to *h* in Khotanese, this form may easily have yielded the attested OKh. *mrāhā-*, if it was borrowed before the change **mr̥- > *br̥-* common to Yidgha and Munjī. The fact that the initial *mr̥-* is retained as such in Old Khotanese,³³⁵ however, points to a more recent borrowing, which is at variance with the antiquity of the change *-VxV- > -VhV-*. Therefore, this derivation is still problematic.

Results

TB *wrāko* A *wrok* ‘pearl’ cannot have been borrowed from OKh. *mrāhā-*. The Khotanese word may have been borrowed from the same unknown Middle Iranian Hindu-Kush source as the Tocharian word, but the details remain to be settled.

TB *WRANTSO* * ‘AGAINST, OPPOSITE’, OKh. *VARĀLSTO* ‘TOWARDS’

Discussion

The etymology of the Tocharian B adverb and postposition TB *wrantsai* has not been convincingly explained (DoT: 670). The final *-ai* may have been originally the oblique singular of a noun. If so, the nominative singular can be set up as *wrantso**, and the final *-o* may point to a borrowing from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. The required source form ***biraṃjsa-* is not attested in Khotanese. Based on the meaning, however, it is suggestive to think of a connection with the Old Khotanese postposition *varālsto* ‘towards’ (*vara* + suff. *-ālsto*, see KS: 111). The *l* in the difficult cluster *lst*, which does not occur in Tocharian, may have undergone a dissimilation to *n* due to the preceding *r*. The resulting cluster *nst* developed to *ntst* through *t*-epenthesis, and was subsequently simplified to *nts*. The first, unaccented *a* of *varālsto* underwent syncope. The developments may be sketched as follows: OKh. *varālsto* → TB **wransto* > **wrantsto* > *wrantso**. I must stress, however, the tentative character of this explanation. Even if correspondences of the type TB /ä/ ~ Khot. *a* have been found (cf. s.v. *kañko* and *śarko**), there is no instance of TB /ä/ ~ Khot. *ā*.

A formally more fitting solution connects the word with a reconstructed adverbial **upari-anč-am*. This form could have yielded Khot. ***viraṃjsu*, a suitable source for TB *wrantso**. For a similar formation in Khotanese, cf. the adjective *paraṃjsa-* ‘adverse’, from

³³⁵ Cf. Z 22.253. The fact that the word was bisyllabic in Old Khotanese is confirmed by its use at the end of a cadence of type A metre in Z 22.253 (‘HL’).

paranča-* (Suv II: 298). As *vīraṃjsu* does not occur in Khotanese, however, this proposal remains speculative.

Results

The Tocharian B adverb and postposition *wrantsai*, whose nom. sg. can be set up as *wrantso**, might be a borrowing from the postposition OKh. *varālsto* ‘towards’, through a Tocharian simplification of the difficult Khotanese cluster *lst*. Because of the complicated phonological passages involved, however, this explanation remains tentative. Alternatively, I propose a phonologically unproblematic connection with a reconstructed **upari-anč-am*. However, this form does not occur in the Khotanese and Tumshuqese text corpus.

(37) TAB *ŠĀŅCAPO* ‘MUSTARD’, OKh. *ŠŠAŠVĀNA-* ‘ID.’

Discussion

The identification of TAB *šāñcapo* with ‘mustard’ instead of ‘*Dalbergia sissoo*’ is due to Chen and Bernard (Forthc.).³³⁶ Their argument is based on a philological analysis of the occurrences of *šāñcapo* in Tocharian A and B. TAB *šāñcapo* is the Tocharian word for ‘mustard (seed)’ (Skt. *saṣapa-*) and is not a loanword from Skt. *śiṃśapā-* ‘*Dalbergia sissoo*’, as previously thought. Here only the most important results concerning the phonological reconstruction of the ancestor of Khotanese and Tumshuqese will be presented.

Results

Building upon the recent identification of TAB *šāñcapo* with ‘mustard (seed)’, it is possible to put forward the hypothesis that TB *šāñcapo*³³⁷ may have been borrowed from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese ancestor of OKh. *ššašvāna-*, i.e. PTK **śaNžapa-*. This reconstruction is based on the following arguments:

- The reconstruction of the nasal is supported by the parallel forms in New Persian, Parthian and Sogdian, on the basis of which Henning (1965: 44) reconstructed an Iranian pre-form **sinšapa-*. I suggest that it could have been dropped in front of the cluster *šv* after syncope of the medial syllable (see *infra*).
- For TB *-ñc-* corresponding to PTK *-nš-*, see the discussion s.v. *eñcuwo* (Results, point c.). This adaptation is parallel to *t*-epenthesis in Tocharian clusters like *ns* on the one hand and to the palatalised counterpart *ñc* of *nk*, next to the more regular *nš*, on the other.
- The cluster <*šv*> in Khotanese arose within Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese through weakening and subsequent syncope of the medial unaccented syllable: PTK **śanžapa-* > PK **śaNžäwa-* > OKh. /*śažwa*°/ <*ššašva*°>.

³³⁶ A preliminary version of the paper was orally presented during an online presentation with the title ‘A spicy etymology. On Tocharian B (and A) *šāñcapo*’ on 8 December 2020 at the online conference *Tocharian in Progress* (Leiden University).

³³⁷ The Tocharian A form was certainly borrowed from Tocharian B.

The ending *-āna-* is traditionally explained as due to a second element **dānā-* ‘seed’ that was probably added during the Pre-Khotanese period (DKS: 396). The borrowing into Tocharian would thus reflect a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese form without the second element **dānā-*. Since the only certain Old Khotanese occurrence of the word (Z 2.118) points to a masculine *a*-stem,³³⁸ it seems justified to infer that the second element was a masculine *°dāna-*, instead of a feminine *dānā-*, widespread in Iranian as the common word for ‘seed’. This *dāna-* is attested in Khotanese as the second member of compounds enlarged with a *ka*-suffix (*°dāna-ka-*) in at least two words, *pirānaa-* (< **pira-dānaa-*) ‘worm-seed’ and *jūṣḍānaa-* (< **jūṣḍa-dānaa-*) ‘musk-grain’, for which see Luzzi (2022: 238).³³⁹

- (38) TB *ŚAMPO**, TA *ŚAMPĀM** ‘HAUGHTINESS, CONCEIT, PRIDE’, OKH.
TCAMPHA- ‘DISTURBANCE, TUMULT’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 100 b6 *lauke tattārmeṃ laṃntuñeṃ yetweṃ amām śāmpa añcalī ṣarne yāmu* ‘Having set afar the ornaments of kingship, pride and arrogance, he put the hands in the *añjali* gesture.’ (cf. also DoT: 19)
- THT 138 a3 (*po ai*) *śāmñesa kekenoṣ snai śāmpā* ‘Provided with all wisdom without conceit.’ (cf. DoT: 683)
- IOL Toch 163 a4 *ñäkteññana klainantsä śāmpa* ‘The pride of divine women.’ (Broomhead 1962: 235)
- adj. *śāmpāsse* PKAS 7L a5 *jāmadagniññe su rāme śāmpāsse po neks(a) kṣatriy(ēṃ)* /// ‘Rāma, this haughty son of Jamadagni, killed all kṣatriyas’ (CETOM, Pinault, Malzahn, Peyrot eds.), THT 240 a2 *mā śāmpasse prakreñ=ci* ‘not haughty, ... (?)’
- adj. *śāmpāṣṣe* THT 575 b3 *śāmpāṣṣi erkatteśañ* /// ‘(those) haughty and quick to anger’ (DoT: 100), 9 *yk- ṣṣä ś(a)mpāṣṣeṃ mā k-* /// [isolated].
- TA instr. sg. A 329 b3 /// *āmām śāmpānyo* : ‘... pride and arrogance.’ (cf. THT 100 b6)

Discussion

The meaning of the substantives TB *śāmpa* and TA *śāmpām** is assured by their occurrences (A 329 and THT 100) in hendiadys with TB *amām* A *āmām* ‘pride, arrogance’, itself a borrowing from BSogd. *m’n* ‘power, authority’ (DoT: 19). Its etymology, however, is not clear. Van Windekens’ (VW: 473–74) connection with the Proto-Indo-European root **stemb^hH-* ‘sich stützen, sich stemmen’ (LIV: 595–96) can hardly be accepted because of the Tocharian development PIE **mb^h* > PT **m* (Malzahn 2011: 104, DoT: 683). Archaic and classical TB *ś* categorically excludes an old **st’* that should have developed to *śc*. Besides, the same verb is already attested in Tocharian as B *stāma-* A *štāmā-*.

³³⁸ The occurrence in SI P 45.3 2 (*śśāśvānā*) might also point to an *a*-stem, but, being isolated, it is not clear which case should represent.

³³⁹ An alternative explanation to a second member *°dāna-* may involve the suffix *-āna-*, an old adjectival suffix of the type seen in *ysāmāna-* ‘winter’ (KS: 85). The presence of other compounds with *°dāna-*, albeit enlarged with a *ka*-suffix, however, render this proposal less attractive.

The Tocharian B substantive *śāmpa* is only attested in the obl. sg. (see also Malzahn 2011: 87). As in the case of *śarko** and *keto*, q.v., a nom. sg. ending *-a** was traditionally set up (TEB I: 136).³⁴⁰ Alternatively, a nom. sg. as *śāmpo** is also possible.³⁴¹ In this case, I suggest that, as in the case of *śarko** and *keto*, *śāmpo** may be considered a loanword from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. The initial may show the same correspondence Khot. *tc-* ~ TB *ś* as in *śarko**, q.v., and the borrowing can be dated to the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese stage. The source form may be thus identified with OKh. *tcampha-* ‘violence, disturbance, tumult’ (KS: 6). Semantically, ‘haughtiness’ or ‘conceit’ may be viewed as a confused or ‘disturbed’ state of mind. The Old Khotanese substantive *tcampha-* is attested twice, once in Old Khotanese (Z) and once in Late Khotanese (JS):

- Z 24.414 *panā śśando tcamphā u dū māstā bajāṣṣā halahala hoḍa nā haṃbitta pāhatta* ‘In every place there are tumults and troubles, a loud din, cries: ‘Give it to them, pierce, strike!’ (Emmerick 1968: 403)
- JS 34v1 *dedrrāmye tcephine drro mestye ṣkalana . tcure-ysqña hīne cu hā kṣīrāṣṭe trramda* ‘With so great a tumult roared, with mighty noise, the four-divided army which entered into the land.’ (Dresden 1955: 442)

As for the etymology of *tcampha-*, Bailey (DKS: 136) sets up a root *tcamph-* ‘be disturbed, be violent’. In his opinion, this root could also account for the following formations:

- Except for *tcampha-*, the simplex seems only attested in the ptc. *tcautta-* (< *čafta-), for which Degener (KS: 251) gives a translation ‘behindert, geschadet’. Kumamoto (1986: 272) has ‘injured’, following Bailey (DKS: 136).
- + **pari*: v. *paltcīmph-*. Emmerick (SGS: 76) has the very general translation ‘to check’, Degener (KS: 49) prefers ‘eindämmen’. Subst. *paltcīmphāka-* ‘Eindämmer’ (KS: 49).
- + **niṣ*: v. *naltcīmph-*. Emmerick (SGS: 49) ‘to remove’, Degener (KS: 47) ‘unterbinden’. Subst. *naticiphāka-* ‘Vernichter’ (KS: 47). Subst. *ṇitcampha-* ‘Auflösung’ (KS: 7).
- + **wi*: adj. *bitcampha-*. ‘Verstört’ (KS: 10), ‘distressed, troubled’ (DKS: 283). + suff. *-ttāti-*: *bitcamphā-* (LKh.) ‘Verwirrung’ (KS: 281).
- + **awa*: verb *vatcīmph-* ‘to cast down (?)’ (DKS: 136).
- + **śa*: *śatcampha-* ‘außer sich, zerrütet’ (KS: 11). + suff. *-ttāti-*: *śatcamphā-* (LKh.) ‘Zerrüttung’ (KS: 282), ‘(mental) disorder’.

From the list above, it is clear that the semantics of the root *tcamph-* in Khotanese range from ‘be violent, destroy’ to ‘be in distress, confused, troubled’. As also reported by Cheung (EDIV: 344), it is hard to accept Emmerick’s (SGS: 49, 76) derivation from PIr. **skamb-* ‘to support, use as support’. The semantic connection between ‘support’ and ‘be violent, in distress’ is weak. The Proto-Iranian root **skamb-* is already attested in Khotanese as *ṣkīm-*:

³⁴⁰ Malzahn’s (2011: 103) hypothesis, after a suggestion by Pinault (2012: 198), that it may be an old *plurale tantum* does not change the fact that a Tocharian etymology for *śāmpa* is very difficult.

³⁴¹ The apparent mismatch with the final of Tocharian A *śāmpām** is explained by Malzahn (2011: 103) through analogy with *āmām* (cf. *supra*).

škaunda- ‘to create’ (SGS: 128), with the regular change **mb* > *m*. Further, it is hard to see how Khot. *ph* could have developed from **b*.

Because of these difficulties, I propose that Khot. *tcamph-* derives from the root set up by Cheung as PIr. *čap-* ‘to seize, attach, stick, strike’ (EDIV: 32).³⁴² It is possible that a secondary **čaf-* existed (cf. the root **kap/f-* ‘to (be)fall, strike (down)’ or ‘to split, cut, scrape, dig’, EDIV: 234–35). The Balochi (*čāmp-* : *čāmpit* ‘to snatch’) and Yaghnobi (*čūmf-* : *čūmfā* ‘to push (to)’)) forms support the existence of a nasal variant of the root that could be reconstructed as **čamf-*. This is the pre-form needed for Khot. *tcamph-*.

Results

TB *šāmpo** ‘haughtiness, conceit, pride’ may be a loanword from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent of OKh. *tcampha-* ‘violence, disturbance, tumult’. The Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese form may be reconstructed as **čamfa-*. As previous proposals on the etymology of Khot. *tcamph-* could not stand closer scrutiny, a new derivation from a nasal variant of PIr. **čap/f-* ‘to seize, attach, stick, strike’ is proposed.

(39) TB *šARKO** ‘SONG, SINGING’, A *TSÄRK* ‘±LUTE (?)’, KHOT. *TCARKĀ-* ‘PLAY’

Tocharian occurrences: TA *tsärk*

- YQ I.9 a2 /// – *šla tsärk karel* ‘(...) with musical instruments and laughter.’ (CEToM)³⁴³
- YQ I.9 b3 (*na*)*mo buddha rake karel tsärkaššäl ywār klyošäl tāk* ‘The words ‘Reverence to Buddha’ [namo buddha] were heard among laughter and music.’ (CEToM)
- A 318 a2 *ceš penu šome kropā-krop nāktaññ oki tsärk ts(...)* ‘These [ones], single group by single group, also (make) [lute] music like gods, (...)’ (Malzahn and Fellner 2015: 66)
- A 318 a6 *šomañ nu rpeñc kispar wic šomañ tsärk (...)* ‘Now some [women] play the *kispar wic*, others (play) the lute (...)’ (Malzahn and Fellner 2015: 66)
- A 126 a6 *nandenac tsärk yaš* ‘She does the lute(-playing) to Nanda’ (= she plays the lute, or sings for Nanda, cf. the similar collocation in Tocharian B).
- In compound with *rape* ‘music’: A 15 b1 *šilpavām penu tsärk-rape yāmluneyo (... akāmt)sune kropñāt* ‘Šilpavān, too, delighting the people with making music on [his] lute, gained property’ (CEToM, Carling ed.).

Tocharian occurrences: TB *šarko**

- Km-034-ZS-L-01 a6 *tane šikhim pañäktentse šarka ploriyaisa yarke yamašasta walo šait* ‘Ici, au Buddha Šikhin tu rendis hommage avec (de la musique de) flûte [et] luth; tu etais roi.’ (Pinault 1994: 179)
- PK AS 17A b1-2 *t(ane) ñak(e pūrvavedīd)v(ī)pn(e) mäs(k)eñca ñ(a)kt(e) pūrv(o)ttare ñem y. – š(ar)k(a) ploriy(ai)sa suppr(i)y(eñ ca)kravārttiñ lānt*

³⁴² The Khotanese root *cev-*, listed by Cheung (l.c.) under the same root, is to be taken as an Indic loanword, together with *cav-* (SVK I: 44).

³⁴³ Cf. also DTTA: 103: ‘with (lute-)music and laughter’.

wrantsai śem ‘Here now, the god who stayed in Pūrvavedīdvīpa, Pūrvottara by name, ... came with lute [and] *ploriya* [instrument] towards the cakravartin king Supriya.’ (CEToM, Pinault, Illés, Peyrot eds.)

- PK NS 399 a3 *māñcuške patarye ypoynē śem mañkālāntasa ploriyaṃ śarka(ntsa)* /// ‘The prince went to the country of the father with good omens, with flutes [and] lutes ...’ (CEToM, Pinault, Fellner eds.)
- THT 588 a2 /// *śarka ramt«ṭä» yamäskem tāñ«ṭä» klautsnaisāñ källaskēñ-c«ṭä» säkwä* ‘... sie machen gleichsam Musik und bringen deinen Ohren Lust.’ (Schmidt 1974: 390)
- IOL Toch 116 a1 *-pe śarka cāñcam-ne* ‘She pleases him [with] ... and song’ (maybe more likely a restoration (*tsai*)*pe śarka* ‘dance and song’ [Fellner *apud* CEToM, cf. KVāc] than the usual restoration (*ra*)*pe śarka*).
- THT 382 a1 /// *gandharvv(i) śark(a) yāmšyem* ‘... die Gandharven machten Musik.’ (Thomas 1957: 49)³⁴⁴
- THT 1104 a4 /// (*tsai*)*p(e)ṃ śarka ploriyaṃ yetwem lkātsi yale* ‘[Nor] shall you go to see (dances), singing (?), music (?) [and] shows [lit. ornaments] (?)’ (CEToM, Fellner, Illés eds.)

Discussion

The precise semantic connotation of TB *śarko** A *tsärk* is unclear. Previous translations oscillate between music in general (or singing) and a non-specified musical instrument, perhaps a lute. For TB *śarko**, it seems reasonable to assume with Schmidt (2018: 97) that in the passage of the *Karmavācana* contained in THT 1104 a4, (*tsai*)*p(e)ṃ śarka ploriyaṃ yetwem* may correspond to Pāli *naccagītavādanavisūkadassana* and Skt. *nṛtyagītavāditra*. If so, the correspondences are as follows: *tsaipeṃ* = Skt. *nṛtya-*, *śarka* = Skt. *gīta-*, *ploriyaṃ* = Skt. *vāditra-*. As it does not seem to be a perfect case of bilingual evidence – the Indic parallel occurs in a slightly different position in the *Karmavācana* – it is probably not necessary to give it too much credit. Still, no more precise evidence is available, so a translation ‘song, singing’ for TB *śarko** seems justified (DoT: 679).

For TA *tsärk*, I am hesitant to accept Pinault’s (1994: 189–91) suggestion that it could designate a ‘lute’ or another specialised plucking instrument. On the contrary, I suggest that TA *tsärk* may also mean ‘singing, song’ and may be the Tocharian A counterpart of TB *śarko**. This hypothesis is backed by the Old Uyghur parallel passages of the *Maitreya-samiti-nāṭaka* that offer *ır üni* ‘der Laut von Gesang’ (Geng and Klimkeit 1988: 105) for YQ I.9 a2 and [*i*]r *oyun* ‘[Ge]sang’ (Geng and Klimkeit 1988: 107) for YQ I.9 b3. The Old Uyghur terms refer to ‘singing, song’ rather than a particular musical instrument. These are the resulting translations:

- YQ I.9 a2 ‘(...) with singing and laughter.’
- YQ I.9 b3 ‘The words ‘Reverence to Buddha’ [*namo buddha*] were heard among laughter and singings.’
- A 318 a2 ‘These [ones], single group by single group, also sing like gods, (...)’
- A 318 a6 ‘Now some [women] play the *kispar wic*, others sing (...)’

³⁴⁴ With fn. 1: ‘Die genaue Bedeutung des mehrmals belegten *śarka* läßt sich nicht mit Sicherheit ermitteln.’

- A 126 a6 ‘She sings to Nanda.’
- A 15 b1 ‘Śilpavān, too, delighting the people with making music and singings, gained property.’
- Km-034-ZS-L-01 a6 ‘Here, you paid homage to the Buddha Śikhin with flute music and singing.’
- PK AS 17A b1-2 ‘Here now, the god who stayed in Pūrvavedidvīpa, Pūrvottara by name, ... came with singing [and] a flute towards the cakravartin king Supriya.’
- PK NS 399 a3 ‘The prince went to the country of the father with good omens, with flutes [and] singings ...’
- THT 588 a2 ‘... At the same time, they sing and bring pleasure to your ears.’
- IOL Toch 116 a1 ‘She pleases him [with] ... and singing.’
- THT 382 a1 /// *gandharv(i) śarka(a) yāṃṣyem* ‘... The Gandharvas sang.’
- THT 1104 a4 /// *(tsai)p(e)m śarka ploriyam yetwem lkātsi yale* ‘[Nor] shall you go to see (dances), singing, music (?) [and] shows [lit. ornaments] (?)’

In the following, I suggest that both lexemes could be related to LKh. *tcarkā*- ‘play, sport, delight’ through borrowing.

Khot. *tcarkā*- is attested in Old and Late Khotanese:

- LKh. Suv 3.23 *nahqryūnam tcarkām kiṇa* ‘Because of plays and games.’ (Skt. *krīḍa-rati-vaśāc caiva*)
- OKh. Suv 12.42 *cu ttā hāra kū jsa hatāro tcarke būsā khanei vātā u śśāra sasta ttā vā *araysūna amanāva pva’naviya. haysguṣṭanaviya u biśśūnyau *vyāvulyau *vyātulasta* ‘Whatever things from which formerly came play, pleasure, and laughter and (which) seemed good, those will be distasteful, unpleasant, fearsome, distressing, and fraught with all kinds of confusions.’ (Skt. *pūrva-ramyāṇi bhāvāni krīḍā-hāsyā-ratīni ca | sannāramyā bhaviṣyanti āyāsa-śata-vyākulāḥ* ||).

It translates Skt. *rati*- in Suv 3.23, and Skt. *krīḍa*- in 12.42. *tcarkā*- is frequently found in hendiadys with (*na*)*haryūna*- in Late Khotanese literature (Suv II: 115). Besides the attested meaning of ‘play, sport, amusement, delight’, a reference to music or singing may also have been present. A possible new etymology of *tcarkā*- supports this. I suggest that it could be derived from a palatal variant of PIr. **karH*- ‘to praise, celebrate’ (EDIV: 239), as attested in Sariqoli *čir*- ‘to sing, twitter, chirp’ (EVSh: 27). This Sariqoli verb was already tentatively derived from PIr. **karH*- by Morgenstierne (EVSh: 27). Bailey’s derivation of *tcarkā*- from the same root as Gr. *σκαίρω* seems doubtful because the Greek verb is of uncertain etymology (LIV: 556). The semantic development of *karH*- in Eastern Iranian may therefore be sketched as follows: OIr. ‘celebrate, praise’ > Sariqoli and PTK ‘to sing’ (→ TB *śarko** ‘singing, song’) > PK, OKh. *tcarkā*- ‘play, delight, amusement’ (→ TA *tcärk*). TB *śarko** could be seen as an old loanword from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese into Tocharian B. The word may have preserved its intermediate meaning of ‘to sing’ between OIr. ‘to celebrate, praise’ and OKh. ‘play, delight, amusement’. This intermediate stage has been preserved in Sariqoli.

If the assumed semantic development is accepted, this etymology sheds light on the problematic correspondence TA *ts-* ~ TB *ś-*. TB *śarko** could be a borrowing from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, with the initial *ś* reflecting PT **č*, an adaptation of PTK **č*. TA *tsärk* could

be borrowed from Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese in the historical stage when *č was depalatalised to *ts. The following two objections may be made:

- The correspondence Khot. *a* ~ TAB /ä/ is not perfect: although cases are found (cf. s.v. *kañko*), the overall conditions are unclear.
- As the semantics of TA *tsärk* is unclear, and it was borrowed from Old Khotanese in the historical period, it is not self-evident that it could also mean ‘song, singing’ as TB *śarko**.

A tentative solution to the second objection may be considering TA *tsärk* a loanword from Pre-Khotanese, not Old Khotanese. Even if it may appear artificial, one could surmise that in Pre-Khotanese the semantic range was the same as in Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese.

The semantic development ‘to sing’ > ‘play, amusement’ may have happened between the Pre-Khotanese and the Old Khotanese stage.³⁴⁵

Results

The etymology of TB *śarko** A *tsärk* is unclear. In the discussion, I propose that they may mean both ‘song, singing’. TB *śarko** may be a borrowing from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent of OKh. *tcarkā*-, which means ‘play, amusement’ due to a later semantic change, and TA *tsärk* may be a borrowing from its Pre-Khotanese antecedent.

TB *śīto* ‘?’, OKh. *śśīta*- ‘WHITE’

Discussion

The Tocharian B hapax *śīto* is attested in a very broken context in the fragment THT 623 b5. The word is clearly readable, but no meaning can be extrapolated from the context. Its etymology is likewise unknown. Because of the final -o of what seems to be a nom. sg., a very tentative connection with OKh. *śśīta*- ‘white’ (<PIr. *čwaita*-) can be put forward. In this case, because of the *t*, the borrowing should have taken place before the Old Khotanese stage (cf. s.v. „*wātano**), or through a written model.

Results

The Tocharian B hapax *śīto* may be a loanword from OKh. *śśīta*- ‘white’. Because of the difficulty in establishing the meaning of the Tocharian B word, the connection remains tentative.

³⁴⁵ An alternative solution may even consider the possibility that both TB *śarko** and TA *tsärk* were borrowed from the same Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent. The different adaptation of the initial may be due to the fact that Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese *č was already a sound between the Proto-Iranian palatal *č and the historically attested <tc> [ts]. Tocharian B speakers maintained the old palatal feature, while Tocharian A speakers lost it. This would imply that the word was borrowed after the Proto-Tocharian stage.

(40) TB *śINTSO** ‘?’, LKH. *śĪMJĀ*- ‘ZIZYPHUS JUJUBA (?)’

Tocharian occurrences

- perl. sg. THT 1540 a + b a2 *wār śintsaisa twe arts kaum spāktam yāmāṣṣīt* ‘Du versorgest sie bei(de) Tag für Tag mit Wasser [und] Futter.’ (Schmidt 2007: 326)
- obl. sg. THT 1540 a + b a3 *twe mā ṣāp śintsai (śā)w(ā)stā³⁴⁶ tū-läkleñ* ‘So daß du aus Schmerz darüber kein Futter zu dir nahmst.’ (Schmidt 2007: 327)
- obl. sg. THT 1540 a + b a3 *wālo preksa cī kā nai śintsai mā św(ātā)* ‘The King asked you: “Why are you not eating any food?”’ (Michaël Peyrot, p.c. Cf. also Schmidt 2007: 327)

Discussion

A Tocharian B substantive in the obl. sg. *śintsai* occurs thrice in THT 1540 a + b. As the word is of unclear origin, Schmidt opted for a generic translation ‘Futter’ in the first edition of the text, commenting that *śintsai* ‘scheint allgemein die feste Tiernahrung zu bezeichnen’ (Schmidt 2007: 326 fn. 37). Adams (DoT: 690) tentatively proposes a reconstruction ‘PIE *g^wih₃-nt-yeh_a’, comparing OCS *žito* ‘corn, fruits’ for the semantics (*Lebensmittel*). However, this proto-form should have yielded ***śāntso* (with *ih₃ > *ya), not the attested *śintso**. Adams’ derivation is probably based on Schmidt’s cautious translation. It is striking that a word with such a generic meaning should be only attested in this fragment. Therefore, the etymology and meaning of the obl. sg. *śintsai* remain uncertain.

The narrative context of TB *śintsai* is that of the so-called ‘Mātṛpoṣa Jātaka’, the story of the captured elephant that refuses any food in the king’s palace because he cannot care for his old parents anymore, left alone and helpless in the forest. In the end, the king, moved by the elephant’s behaviour, frees him and lets him return to his parents. The final scene takes place in the forest by a lotus pond. The elephant finds his mother blind by the pond. After he sprinkles her with water, she regains her sight. On the different sources of the story and the numerous discrepancies of the extant versions, see in detail Schlingloff (2000: 126) and Pinault (2009: 253–55). The fragmentary Tocharian version contains all the narrative nuclei of the other versions with only slightly different details. The Tocharian main character, for example, appears to be a female elephant rather than a male, which finds correspondence only in the *Mahāvastu*. Moreover, no mention is made of the blind mother. The reference is always to the two parents (*pacere*).

This is the only version of the story that mentions in detail the exact nature of the food given to the elephant. Elsewhere, the reference is only to ‘food and water’. As it is difficult to explain the obl. sg. *śintsai* in Tocharian (cf. *supra*), and the nom. sg. may be reconstructed as *śintso** (*okso*-type), the word may be a loanword from Khotanese (nom. sg. -o for the Khotanese acc. sg. -u). A possible source may be identified as LKh. *śīmjā*- (DKS: 399), the Zizyphus jujuba of Late Khotanese medical texts. The meaning and the etymology of this word in Khotanese are problematic. I will first seek to determine its precise semantic value in the Late Khotanese medical text corpus. Subsequently, I will discuss the etymology of the word, and

³⁴⁶ Schmidt (2007: 327) has (ś.)[w](ā)st[ā], but, following Peyrot (2012) the only possible restoration seems to be (śā)[w](ā)st[ā].

śimjā- will be compared to its related Iranian forms. In the last section, I will justify this new connection based on the Tocharian occurrences.

On the occurrences of LKh. *śimjā-* in Khotanese medical texts

In the Siddhasāra, LKh. *śimjā-* is attested nine times without *anusvāra* and five times with, in total fourteen occurrences. In ten out of fourteen occurrences, it occurs in a compound with *bara-*, the Late Khotanese outcome of OKh. *batara-*,³⁴⁷ an old loanword from Skt. *badara-* ‘Zizyphus jujuba’, with *t* for Skt. *d* as in Old Khotanese *pata-* ‘stanza’ (Skt. *pada-*). The occurrences of *bara-śimjā-* (§2.2, §2.3, §13.48, §3.22.8, §14.12, §14.18, §15.16, §22.12, §21.12, §26.55) translate Skt. *badara-*, *badarī-*, *bādara-* or *kola-* (Tib. *rgya shug*), all designations of the jujube tree (*Zizyphus jujuba*) or of its fruit. Interestingly, however, the four occurrences of *śimjā-* alone do not refer to the *Zizyphus jujuba*. In §2.20, *śimja* translates Skt. *dhava-* ‘*Anogeissus latifolia* Wall (axlewood)’. In the same passage (§2.20), there is a reference to a ‘second sort of *śimjā-*’ (*śe’ pacadā śimja*) that, based on the Sanskrit version, should refer to Skt. *śimśapā-* ‘*Dalbergia sissoo*’. In the following section, however, Skt. *śimśapā-* is translated by *śīśapā*, i.e. a direct loanword from Sanskrit. In §2.21 and §23.19, *śimjā-* alone likewise refers to Skt. *dhava-*.

From the occurrences, one could argue that *śimjā-* was the native Khotanese word for the jujube tree or its fruit. The compound **batara-śimjā-* may have been created in a learned environment (Si, perhaps already Vkn) to strengthen the association of the Khotanese name with the Sanskrit original, thereby conferring to it a higher status. Due to its superficial similarity with Skt. *śimśapā-*, LKh. *śimjā-* came to be also used for different varieties of trees only at a later date. In defining LKh. *bara-śimjā-* as a ‘tautological compound’, Luzziatti (2018–2019: 65) seems to imply a similar explanation. However, I will argue below that *śimjā-* did not refer specifically to the *Zizyphus jujuba* but to another type of tree.

On the alleged Iranian etymology of *śimjā-*

Bailey (1951: 933) first recognised the word as belonging to a larger group of Central Asian plant names. As for Middle Iranian, the word appears as *srinjad* or *sinjad* in the 16th chapter of the Bundahišn (Pakzad 2005: 217), containing a classification of plant species. Daryaei (2006–2007: 82) argues that the Middle Persian word may refer in this context not to the jujube tree but to the oleaster (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*), like NP *sinjad/sinjid* (Hasandust 2015: III n° 3118). Apart from the slightly different semantics, however, there can be no doubt that *śimjā-* belongs to the same group of words.

In Buddhist Sogdian, a related form refers to the fruit of the oleaster. A form *synkt°* can be extracted from the compound *synktškrδ’k* (*mry’k*) (SCE 321) that MacKenzie (1970: 70) interprets as meaning ‘the oleaster-fruit-piercing bird’ (the mynah bird) based on the Chinese version. In Manichaean Sogdian, the word is confirmed as *syngt°** (Manichaean orthography) and *synkt°** (Sogdian orthography) in the feminine adjective M *syngtync* S *synktync*, occurring in the two parallel texts M 1060 (r6) and So 10100m (v9), for which see Sims-Williams (2014: 72). The corresponding masculine adjective may be reconstructed as *synktyny°** (GMS: 160).

³⁴⁷ OKh. *batara-** in the adj. acc. sg. fem. *batariḡyo* (*batari(m)gyā-** KS: 146) is attested in Vkn 5.15.2 (Skt. *badara-*, Tib. *rgya shug*), see Skjærvø (1986: 243–4) and Emmerick (1983: 46). On the different meanings of LKh. *bara-* alone in the Siddhasāra, see Emmerick (1983: 46–7).

The Pashto form *sanjāla* (EDP: 74) also refers to the oleaster and Sh. *sizd*, Yd. *səziyo* may be possibly related (EVSh: 77). Doubtful seems Bailey's (DKS: 399) connection with Skt. *śīncatikā*-, the designation of an unknown plant species ('nicht klar', according to EWA III: 512). Outside Iranian, Khovar *šinjūr* (EDP: 74) has a word-initial palatal as in the Khotanese word.

The forms listed above clearly show irregular correspondences that exclude inheritance from Proto-Iranian. The alternation between palatal and non-palatal sibilant word-initially may indicate a non-Iranian origin, cf. the Indo-Iranian words for 'sand' and 'needle' (Lubotsky 2001: 302). The variety of sounds for the internal cluster (Sogd. /ng/, Khot. and MP /nj/, Psht. /ndz/, Sh. /zd/) is also unclear. It supports the hypothesis that we are dealing with a Central Asian Wanderwort, as in the case of the word for 'sesame', q.v. Bailey's (DKS: 399) connection with the 'thorn' word (cf. Oss. D *sindzæ*) is semantically attractive but cannot account for all the different forms.

Even with the caveat that it may be a Wanderwort, it is necessary to explain how LKh. *šinjā*- was formed. Based on the analysed Iranian forms, **sinjata*- and *singata*- can be reconstructed as the sources of the Iranian forms. **sinjata*- may have regularly yielded a form **sinjsata*- in Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese, which probably underwent secondary palatalisation of **si-* > **ši-* (cf., independently, the Khovar form) to result in **śsinjsata*-. This could have been further reduced to **śšinjsaa*- or **śšinjsā*- already in Old Khotanese or late Old Khotanese. I suggest that this form was the source of the borrowing into Tocharian B *śintso* (acc. sg. **šinjsō* → TB *śintso*).

To further explain the attested LKh. *šinjā*-, however, it is necessary to return to the Sogdian material adjective in *-ynyy*. The equivalent suffix in Khotanese is *-inaa*-, fem. *-imgyā*- (KS: 133). A similar adjective also existed in Old Khotanese as **śšinjsatīnaa*-. This may have yielded **śšinjseinaa*- already in Old Khotanese (cf. *āljsēinaa*- 'made of silver' < *āljsātīnaa*-, KS: 140). The feminine counterpart of this material adjective may have been **śšinjsatimgyā*- > **śšinjsimgyā*-.³⁴⁸ For this last development, cf. LKh. *ā'jsijā*- < OKh. *āljsatimgyā*-* 'made of silver (fem.)' (KS: 140). A secondary palatalisation **mjs* > *mj* may have occurred in front of *i*, as not infrequent in Late Khotanese. This resulted in LKh. **šinjimjā*-. Alternatively, assimilation to the following palatal may also have been possible. Haplology may have yielded the attested *šinjā*-.

As for the semantics, it is noteworthy that the meaning 'jujube tree' is not attested in any other language. This meaning in Khotanese occurs only in a compound with Skt. *badara*-. *šinjā*- might have originally indicated another tree in Khotanese, not the *Zizyphus jujuba*. Hence the necessity to associate *šinjā*- with Skt. *badara*- to further specify the precise reference to the jujube tree. This may also explain the fact that the occurrences of *šinjā*- alone refer to other species of trees. It is not possible to determine whether *šinjā*- indicated the oleaster also in Khotanese or another type of plant. However, it likely did not designate the jujube tree in Khotanese.

³⁴⁸ The phonological similarity with the name of the 4th spring month *simjsimja*- (DKS: 425) is noteworthy but requires more detailed investigation. At this point, an interpretation of *simjsimja*- as the '[month] of the *šinjā*-plant' seems to me quite attractive.

On TB *śintso** in THT 1540 a + b

If the identification of TB *śintso** as a loanword from a pre-form of LKh. *śimjā*- is correct, one should be able to justify its occurrence in the Tocharian version of the *Matṛpoṣa Jātaka*. As outlined above, no other known version of the story mentions the type of food the elephant refused. But *śintso** cannot be a generic term because it does not occur elsewhere in the Tocharian corpus. Schmidt's preliminary translation 'Futter' was probably based on this reasoning.

The science of keeping, nourishing and curing elephants had a significant diffusion in the Indian subcontinent. This is evident from such famous treatises as the *Mātaṅgalilā* of Nīlakaṇṭha (Edgerton 1931). The first allusions to the 'elephant-lore' can be traced back to the *Arthaśāstra*. This traditional knowledge likely found its way also to the Tarim Basin. Possibly, this may be linked to the ample diffusion of Ayurvedic medical texts in Central Asia in the first centuries CE.

In the *Mātaṅgalilā*, an entire chapter (§9) is devoted to the correct feeding of the 'newly caught' elephants captured from the forest. This reflects the situation of the main character of the *Matṛpoṣa Jātaka*. The *Mātaṅgalilā* (§9.3-4) states that 'thinking on the pleasure he formerly experienced in the jungles, [...] becoming excessively haggard from the hardships of the town, in a few days the newly caught elephant comes to death [...] he does not eat nor rest (or enjoy himself), nor does he recognise signs given him (by a driver); like a king exiled from his kingdom, he is a prey to anxiety and longing' (Edgerton 1931: 92-93). The dietary regimen of the newly caught elephant is described in more detail in §9.9: '(One shall feed them) stalks and bulbs of lotuses (*padma*) and (other) water lilies (*utpala*), plantains (bananas), edible lotus roots, *Trapa bispinosa*, *dūrvā* grass, *udumbara* (kind of fig), *Boswellia thurifera*, sugar cane, spikenard, banyan (leaves or fruits), bamboos etc. And the sprouts (or buds) and fruits of (two kinds of) figs (*Ficus infectoria* and *Ficus religiosa*), and wood-apples are always to be given to elephants, King of Aṅga, to ease their distress; also other sweet delicacies which they love' (Edgerton 1931: 94).

As the plant species to which LKh. *śimjā*- refers is not recoverable, it is hardly possible to search for a precise parallel in the Indian elephant treatises. What emerges from the passage above is that several species of trees are quoted as potential food for elephants (*Boswellia thurifera*, bamboo, banyan tree and various other types of fig trees). The tree indicated by LKh. *śimjā*- and TB *śintso** could be part of the dietary regimen of newly caught elephants.

Results

As Tocharian B *śintso** is of unclear origin, I propose interpreting it as a loanword from the Old Khotanese pre-form of LKh. *śimjā*-, used in the *Siddhasāra* to indicate the *Zizyphus jujuba*, the *Dalbergia sissoo* and the *Anogeissus latifolia* Wall. A reconstructed Old Khotanese acc. sg. **śśimjso* (nom. sg. **śśimjsā*-) was borrowed into Tocharian B as *śintso**. A comparison with the other Iranian and non-Iranian forms of this plant name shows that the word can hardly be considered inherited, as claimed by Bailey. Its original meaning in Khotanese cannot have been 'Zizyphus jujuba'. The attested Late Khotanese form *śimjā*- may be derived through haplology from the feminine form of a material adjective LKh. **śimjīmjā*-, from a reconstructed PK **simjsata*-. The occurrence of a specific plant name in the Tocharian version of the *Matṛpoṣa Jātaka* instead of a generic term for 'fodder' may be explained as due to contamination with the descriptions of the dietary regimens of newly caught elephants in

Indian elephant treatises. This veterinary knowledge may have entered the Tarim Basin with Ayurvedic treatises. Passages from the *Mātaṅgalīlā* are further compared to determine the precise plant species to which *śintso** may refer.

TB *śka*, (A *śkā* ?) ‘CLOSE BY’, LKH. *śka* ‘?’

Discussion

TB *śka* and TA *śkā* have been the object of numerous discussions. Peyrot (2008: 161), following Winter (1984: 117–18), is inclined to consider TA *śkā* as an unrelated form on phonological and semantic grounds. As a consequence, TA *śkā* would not be related to TB *śka*. In Tocharian B, *śka* has a peculiar distribution (Stumpff 1990: 104). It appears only in late and colloquial texts as a substitute for *ecce* (Winter 1984: 122). This is recognised to be an example of lexical change by Peyrot (l.c.).

Suppose TB *śka* is not to be connected with TA *śkā*. In that case, its isolation and distribution within late and colloquial Tocharian B make it a good candidate for late borrowing from a neighbouring language. Adams (DoT: 699) proposed to connect it with the Late Khotanese particle (or adverb) *śka* (DKS: 305). However, the semantics of the Late Khotanese particle is unclear, and it has very few occurrences. Its attestations are as follows:

- IOL Khot 166/1a 1-2 (= IOL Khot 165/1a 32-33) *śirka ma maṃ maraṇa burai śka* ‘It is nice for me here until death.’ (KMB: 370)
- Mañj (P 4099.124-5) *cu bure ī hvaṇḍvā sūha cakrravarttauṇa bure śka* ‘Whatever pleasure there may be among men, even world dominion perhaps.’ (Emmerick Unpublished (b))
- A third occurrence in the still unedited text of the so-called Khotanese *Amṛta-prabha-dhāraṇī* (IOL Khot 165/1b 12), in the line of the date (Emmerick 1992: 36) is uncertain and will be left out of the discussion.

The two occurrences clearly show that *śka* always occurs after LKh. *bure*, the Late Khotanese equivalent of Old Khotanese *buro*. In Old Khotanese, *buro* is an enclitic particle expressing indefiniteness, but it can also be used as a postposition meaning ‘until’ (cf. Suv 10.18), usually with the preposition OKh. *odä*.

I suggest that *bure* is a postposition with the meaning ‘until’ in the first occurrence, while it has an indefinite meaning in the second. In both cases, *śka* seems to strengthen *bure*, but it is difficult to determine its precise meaning. If one follows the etymological meaning ‘perhaps, even’ attributed to it by Bailey (DKS: 405), one should assume that LKh. *śka* derives from OKh. *aśka* ‘perhaps’, itself a contraction of *aśtā ka*, lit. ‘it is if’. However, the nine occurrences of *aśka* in Old Khotanese³⁴⁹ can hardly be connected to the usage of *śka* because it occurs at the beginning of a clause in seven of the nine occurrences. In the remaining two, it seems to act as an independent adverb with the meaning ‘perhaps’, not as a clitic. No Old or Late Khotanese example of *aśka* following *buro* exists. Thus, Bailey’s derivation is problematic.

aśka may have undergone a radical semantic change in Late Khotanese. In this case, the option that TB *śka* may be a borrowing from Late Khotanese should be considered in detail.

³⁴⁹ Sgh 199; Suv 3.69; Z 2.67, 2.131, 2.179, 19.16, 22.319, 23.34, 23.118.

The connection between LKh. *ška* and TB *ška* is problematic. If LKh. *ška* was an enclitic particle with a general strengthening value – a more precise function is difficult to extract from its occurrences – it could have been borrowed into late Tocharian B, where it began to be used with verbs of motion with a directional and deictic (?) meaning (Winter 1984: 119–20). On the other hand, TB *ška* might have been borrowed into Late Khotanese. However, the scarcity of Tocharian loanwords in Khotanese does not square with the high intensity of language contact necessary for such a loanword to be adopted by Khotanese speakers.

Another argument supporting a Late Khotanese borrowing into Tocharian is that both LKh. *ška* and TB *ška* are characteristic of the late colloquial language. The scarcity of attestations of *ška* in Late Khotanese may be due to its belonging to a spoken variety rather than the written, official language.

This hypothesis is only valid if one interprets *ška* as an independent word, an unlikely possibility. If one follows Degener (KS: 312) in interpreting *bureška/buraiška* as a single word with the same semantics as the postposition *buro* (cf. OKh. *brokyä*), LKh. *ška* should be considered a ghost word.

Results

Following a suggestion by Adams (DoT: 699), it is tentatively suggested that LKh. *ška*, an enclitic particle with strengthening meaning, may have been borrowed into late colloquial Tocharian B as TB *ška* ‘close by’. However, LKh. *ška* might be a ghost word.

(41) TA *ŚRITTĀTAK*, TB *ŚRADDHATĀK* ‘WELL-BEING’, OKh. *ŚŚĀRATĀTI*- ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

- A 270 a8 /// (*pācar*)-*mācräṣ śrittātak śasmāwā-m* ‘... from (father) and mother. I have established well-being for them.’ (Pinault 1997: 127)
- THT 292 a2 /// *śraddhatāksa lupštär ṣ po : ai* /// ‘By the śraddhatāk it is entirely smeared.’ (cf. the discussion)
- THT 412 b2 /// (*pātär mā*)-*tärṣṣe śraddhatāk śällatsi* ‘... in order to lay to rest the śraddhatāk of the parents.’ (cf. the discussion)

Discussion

The latest treatment of the Tocharian B and A words is found in Pinault (1997: 128–30). He argued that the Tocharian A hapax *śrittātak* might be translated as ‘happiness, well-being’. He identified TB *śraddhatāk* as the same word and proposed that it could be translated similarly. The Tocharian B word would be a hyper-Sanskritism brought about by folk etymology (cf. Skt. *śraddhā*- ‘faith’). According to Pinault (1997: 129), the two Tocharian B occurrences may be translated as follows:

- THT 292 a2 ‘Et il est submergé tout entier par la félicité.’
- THT 412 b2 ‘Pour rejeter le bonheur de père et mère.’

The weak point of these translations lies in the fact that one is forced to admit for the two verbs *lawp*- ‘to smear, sully’ and *ṣal*- ‘to throw (down)’ a metaphorical or figurative meaning

not frequently met with in Tocharian. Thus, I would side with Adams (DoT: 704), who suggests borrowing from a *ka*-derivative of Skt. *śrāddhadda*- ‘a donor at the ceremony honoring deceased relatives (Skt. *śrāddha*)’. The source he identifies as a hypothetical BHS **śrāddhadāka*-. This translation agrees with the general meaning of *lāwp*-, i.e. ‘to smear, sully’, with reference to a ritual action to be performed by the donor of the *śrāddha*-ritual. Moreover, it allows a more precise translation of *ṣāl*- as ‘lay to rest [of the dead]’ (DoT: 751).³⁵⁰ I propose the following translations:

- THT 292 a2 ‘by the donor of the *śrāddha*-ritual it is entirely smeared.’
- THT 412 b2 ‘... in order to lay to rest the *śraddhatāk* of the parents.’

While a translation ‘donor of the *śrāddha*-ritual’ fits the first occurrence, the second occurrence remains obscure because of its fragmentary attestation. TB *śraddhatāk* might not be related to the Tocharian A word, for which Pinault’s translation should be accepted.

Pinault (1997: 135–37) convincingly argued that the origin of TA *śrittātāk* might be traced back to a Khotanese borrowing. However, his hypothesis of a ‘croisement ancien’ of the two Khotanese abstracts *śśāḍā*- (< **śśāratākā*-) and *śśāratāti*- (KS: 275, 283) to account for the final *-ak* in Tocharian A cannot stand closer scrutiny. It implies a Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese dating for the borrowing, a chronological classification incompatible with the phonological shape of the rest of the word. Thus, I propose that the Tocharian A word is a loanword from OKh. *śśāratāti*- and that final *-ak* may be a later Tocharian addition. Borrowing from the acc. sg. *śśāratetu* is excluded because of the vowel of the suffix. It is more likely that TA *śrittātāk* may have been borrowed from the nom. sg. OKh. *śśāratātā*. As already noted by Pinault (1997: 136), contamination with Skt. *śrī*, of which OKh. *śśāratāti*- is a frequent translation, may explain the different initial syllable. Double *-tt-* seems not to be attested with this lexeme in Khotanese (*pace* DKS: 401, cf. Suv II: 36), but the suffix *-tāti*- frequently appears as *-ttāti*- with ‘phonologische Verstärkung’ (KS: 276).

Results

I propose that TA *śrittātāk* ‘well-being’ should be separated from TB *śraddhatāk*, which could have been borrowed from a *ka*-derivative of BHS *śrāddhadda*- ‘donor of the *śrāddha*-ritual’. Following a proposal by Pinault, TA *śrittātāk* may be interpreted as a loanword from the Old Khotanese nom. sg. *śśāratātā* ‘well-being’.

- (42) TB *ṣārt*-, A *ṣārttw*- ‘TO INCITE’, OKH. *ṣṣARR*- : *ṣṣUḍA*-* ‘TO EXHILARATE’

Discussion

The verb TB *ṣārt*- A *ṣārttw*- ‘to incite’, which can be reconstructed for Proto-Tocharian as **ṣārtw*-, is of uncertain etymology. The latest hypothesis on its origin is due to Adams (DoT: 717). He tentatively connects the verb with the Proto-Indo-European root **sred^h-*/*sret*- (as per IEW: 1001). This root, however, seems to be exclusive to Germanic and Celtic, and its Proto-

³⁵⁰ For this meaning of *ṣāl*-, cf. THT 559 a1-2: *orotsana erkenmasa en* – – *srukoṣāṃ ṣalāskemane ṣekaṃṇe tākaṃ* ‘When, moreover, laying to rest the dead in great cemeteries’ (DoT: 751).

Indo-European provenance is doubtful (Kroonen 2013: 484). No such root was recorded in LIV. Pokorny's Greek comparandum *ῥόθος* 'roar (of waves, of oars)' is taken as a Pre-Greek loanword by Beekes (2010: 1290). This verb has at least three nominal derivatives within Tocharian B, all with the meaning 'incitement, encouragement, instigation':³⁵¹

- *šartaššīññe* (DoT: 712)
- *šärtto** (obl. -*ai*, DoT: 715)
- *šertwe* (DoT: 724)

The possibility that the Tocharian verb could be a loanword from a neighbouring language should be investigated. The Old Khotanese verb *ššarr-* : *ššuda-** 'to exhilarate' (SGS: 129–30) may represent a perfect semantic match. Its meaning is secured by bilingual evidence in Śgs 3.6v1-2, where the Tibetan version has *sems zhum pa* 'discouragement' for the Old Khotanese abstract *a-šarr-āmatā-* (KS: 90, Emmerick 1970: 118). The past participle can be set up as *ššuda-* based on the adjective *ā-ššuda-* occurring in the Book of Zambasta (Z 20.8). The Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent of this form can be reconstructed as **šṛta-*. For the presence of **ṛ*, cf. Bailey (1958a: 543). The outcome *ur* < **ṛ*, however, requires an explanation. As there are no labial consonants in the vicinity of **ṛ*, I suggest that *u* may be due to vowel assimilation from the ancient neuter form in *-u* (< PIr. *-am*), as in the case of the past participle of the verb *yan-* 'to do', *yudu* (< **kṛtam*, see Emmerick 1989: 212).

I propose that PT **šərtw-* reflects a borrowing from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese antecedent of the past ptc. *ššuda-**, i.e. the acc. sg. or neuter nom. sg. **šṛtu*. *šärtto* and *šertwe* may be considered inner-Tocharian nominal derivatives of the verb.

Results

The verb TB *šərt-* A *šärttw-* 'to incite' has a perfect semantic and phonological match in the Old Khotanese verb *ššarr-* : *ššuda-** 'to exhilarate'. The acc. sg. or neuter nom. sg. PTK **šṛtu* may have been the source of the borrowing into PT **šərtw-*.

(43) TB *ŠUPĀKĪÑE* '(ENCLOSED FARM) PERTAINING TO SUPPOSITORIES
(*ŠPAKĪYE*)'

Tocharian occurrence

- HWB 74(4) a8 *olyškaṃtsa šupākīñe werwiyetse pautkeṣṣi cāñi piś-kāmnte* 'The coins as the land rent of the enclosed farm pertaining to **šupākī* in the area of Olyška: five hundred' (Ching 2010: 312).

Discussion

Ogihara (*apud* Ching 2010: 312) proposed that *šupākīñe* in HWB 74(4) (cf. *supra*) may be a *-ññe* adjective derived from TB *špakīye* 'suppository', a borrowing from Late Khotanese (see s.v.). *šupākīñe werwiyetse* would mean 'of the enclosed farm pertaining to medical preparates

³⁵¹ A matter for future investigations may be whether the tune name loc. sg. *šartanikaine* (Peyrot 2018a: 340), pointing to a nom. sg. *šartaniko**, may also belong here. Isebaert (1980: §81) connects this tune name with OKh. *šer-* 'to move' (DKS: 412), but the exact derivational path is unclear.

(suppositories, medicines)'. He admitted difficulties interpreting the final *i* before the adjectival suffix, which he solves by positing a formation from the oblique *-ai* (cf. s.v. *ṣpakīye*). However, the additional *u* in the first syllable remains difficult to interpret.

I suggest that the final element *-īñe* could reflect the Khotanese suffix *-īñā-* (KS: 129), forming denominal adjectives in Khotanese. The final *-e* of the Tocharian B form may be due to contamination with the Tocharian suffix *-ññe*, or, since it is still used as an adjective, the ending may have been subject to morphological adaptation. The additional *u* in the first syllable may be interpreted as a trace of the Old Khotanese antecedent of LKh. *ṣvakā-*, which can be reconstructed as **ṣṣūvakā-* (cf. s.v. *ṣpakīye*). Thus, the borrowing may be dated to the Old Khotanese stage, i.e. before *ṣpakīye*. This derivation strengthens Ogiwara's hypothesis that *ṣupākīñe* in HWB 74(4) may indeed refer to 'suppositories' or any similar medical preparation.

Results

I propose that *ṣupākīñe* in HWB 74(4) may be derived from an Old Khotanese form **ṣṣūvakīñā-*, an adjective meaning 'pertaining to suppositories'. This confirms the tentative meaning assigned to it by Ogiwara (*apud* Ching 2010: 312).

(44) TB *ṢPAKĪYE* 'SUPPOSITORY', LKH. *ṢVAKĀ-* 'ID.'

Tocharian occurrences

- *ṣpakīye* THT 510 b1, W15 b3 (2×), W38 b5, W39 b1.
- *ṣpakaim* W3 a3, W8 b4, W9 a3, W 10 a4, W34 b2, W42 b1 (all medical).
- All occurrences of the plural are attested together with *yamaṣṣāllona*, gerundive of *yam-* 'to make', e.g. in the phrase W3 a3 *ṣpakaim yamaṣṣāllona* 'suppositories are to be made'. This is paralleled by the Khotanese technical phrase with the same meaning *ṣvakiy padīmāñā* (e.g. Si 122r1, gerundive of *padīm-* 'to make').

Khotanese occurrences

- *ṣvaka* Si 121v5, 150v5.
- *ṣvakiy* Si 122r1, 122r3, 148v5, 149r4, 149v5, 151r1.
- *ṣvakiye* Si 121v5, 151r1 (2×), 151r2, 151r4, 151r5 (2×).
- All occurrences of *ṣvakā-* are from the *Siddhasāra*. It translates Skt. *varti-* 'suppository', *guḍikā-* 'pill', and Tib. *reng bu* and *ri lu* 'pastil').

Discussion

Bailey (1935: 137) was the first scholar to mention the lexeme. The striking correspondence with the Tocharian word was noted by him some years later (Bailey 1947: 149). Emmerick (1981: 221, SVK II: 147–48, DoT: 729) offered a treatment of its meaning and etymology. He established the meaning as 'suppository' against Bailey's 'pastil'. The source form he reconstructed as PIr. *xśaudakā-*, a formation from the root **xśaud-* 'to wash' (EDIV: 455).

Since the word is a specialised medical term, one should assume that the borrowing occurred when Indian medical texts were already circulating in the Tarim Basin. As it is attested only in the Late Khotanese *Siddhasāra*, the word was possibly borrowed from Late Khotanese.

It is not to be excluded that extensive Old Khotanese translations of medical texts existed. In this case, the Old Khotanese source form may be reconstructed as *ṣṣūdakā- or *ṣṣūvakā-, as intervocalic *-d-* might have been lost already in Old Khotanese (cf. OKh. *pāa-* < PIr. **pāda-*). The preservation of intervocalic *-k-* is noteworthy. The Tocharian word was borrowed from Late Khotanese because the most likely source of the Tocharian initial cluster *ṣp-* is LKh. *ṣv-* rather than OKh. *ṣṣūv-.

The possibility that the feminine ending *-iye* may have replaced an original *-o* could also be considered (see Peyrot 2008: 102–6). If so, OKh. *ṣṣūvakā- may have been borrowed first as TB *ṣpāko. However, the Tocharian B adjective *ṣupakīñe*, q.v., with retained *-u-* from Old Khotanese, renders this hypothesis less attractive.

Results

TB *ṣpakīye* can be interpreted as a Late Khotanese loanword into Tocharian B.

- (45) TB *sāñ*, *ṣāñ*, A *ṣāñ* ‘ARTIFICE, EXPEDIENT, MEANS, METHOD’, KHOT.
sāñā- ‘ID.’

Discussion

In a recently published article, Del Tomba and Maggi (2021) convincingly argue that TB *sāñ*, *ṣāñ*, A *ṣāñ* ‘artifice, expedient, means, method’ is a loanword from Khot. *sañā-* ‘id.’, a native Khotanese word (< PIr. **ścand-ya-*). Contrary to the opinion expressed by Tremblay (2005: 434), TB *sañjñā*, A *sañjñi* ‘perception, idea’ and Khot. *saññā-* (fem.) ‘id.’ are to be kept separate for phonological and semantic reasons and are best to be interpreted as loanwords from Gandh. *saññā* ‘id.’.

Because of the absence of a final vowel, it is possible to date the loanword to the Late Khotanese period (see §3.4.1.2.). Only 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. This state of affairs may be connected with the supposed Khotanese influence on Tocharian A Buddhist vocabulary (see §4.3.4.).

Results

As convincingly argued by Del Tomba and Maggi (2021), TB *sāñ*, *ṣāñ*, A *ṣāñ* ‘artifice, expedient, means, method’ is a loanword from Khotanese *sañā-* ‘id.’. The dating of the borrowing may be placed in the Late Khotanese period.

- (46) TB *sanapa-* ‘TO RUB IN, RUB ON, ANOINT, EMBROCATÉ (PRIOR TO WASHING)’, KHOT. *ysānāh-* ‘TO WASH’

Tocharian occurrences

- 3sg. prs. mid. *sonoptrā* W40 b3 *se ce ṣalype sonoptrā* ‘C’est cette huile qui est ointe.’ (Filliozat 1948: 88)
- 3sg. opt. mid. *sonopitār* PK AS 6B a6 *sonopitār liṣtītār wāstsanma krenta yäṣṣītār* ‘Anointing himself, washing himself, [and] wearing beautiful clothes.’

- prs. ger. *sonopälle* PK AS 8C b1 *partāktaññe pitkesa šarne s(o)nopäll(e)* ‘One has to smear both hands with spittle of viper (*Vipera russelli*)’, PK AS 9A b8 *se šälype mel(εm̃n)e (yānmā)ṣṣä«m» • tārne sonopälle* ‘This oil (reache)s the nos(trils). The crown of the head [is] to be anointed.’ See further THT 497 b1, THT 2677.d b2, W7 b5, W26 b3, W40 b2.
- subj. ger. *sanāpalle* W27 b1 *mälkwera kātsa sanāpalle* ‘À appliquer en onctions au ventre avec du lait’ (Filliozat 1948: 85). See also W35 a6, W39 a4, W41 b2.
- inf. *sanāpatsi* W4 b3, W14 a2, W29 b1, W34 a5.
- perl. *san(āpo)rsa* PK AS 8C b1 *san(āpo)rsa ka tweri rusenträ* ‘Just by smearing the doors will open.’
- All occurrences are from medical texts.

Khotanese occurrences

ysänāj-:

- 3sg. opt. OKh. Z 3.102 *kho ju ye ysänājä nei’ña uysnau ru samu* ‘As if one should bathe a being with nectar alone.’ (Emmerick 1968: 69)
- inf. OKh. Z 24.220 *tṭi akṣuttāndä pajsamä kädāna ysänājä* ‘then [they] began to bathe him to do him reverence’ (Emmerick 1968: 383).
- 3pl. prs. LKh. Suv 3.47 *ysinājide muhu ba’ysa. mu’sdī’je ūci jsa pvāškye* ‘May the Buddhas bathe me in the cool water of compassion.’ (Suv I: 49)

ysänāh-:

- 1sg. prs. LKh. P 2027.28 *ysināha*’ (< OKh. **ysänāhe*) ‘I wash (off myself?)’ (Kumamoto 1991: 65)
- 3sg. prs. LKh. JS 6v1-2: *tta khu ttaudāna haṃthrrī satvā viysām̃ji ysināhe* (< OKh. **ysināhātā*) ‘Just as a man tormented by heat bathes in a lotus pool’ (Dresden 1955: 424) and Sudh 373: *haḍai ṣṭām drai jünāka aharṣṭi ysināhe* ‘Because of that she bathes three times a day’ (De Chiara 2013: 151).
- part. nec. OKh. Suv 8.36: *ysänāhāñu* ‘He should bathe.’ (Suv I: 189)
- part. nec. LKh. Si 135v2 (as a medical term) *vameysqñä u ysināhāñq* ‘Must be massaged and bathed’ (Emmerick Unpublished), Sudh 235 and 233 (De Chiara 2013: 111, 139) and IOL Khot 160/4 v3 *u drrai jūna haḍe ysināhāña* ‘and three times a day one should wash’ (KMB: 359)
- 3pl. perf. tr. IOL Khot 147/1 r5 *haṃdāra ysinauttān[d]ä* ‘Some washed (themselves).’ (KMB: 331)
- past ptc. OKh. Suv 13.17 + *hu-* ‘well-’ *huysinauttī ttarandarä* ‘His body well-bathed.’³⁵²

haysñ-:

- 2sg. ipv. P 5538b.88 *rīmajsa pamūha ttai haysña* ‘Dirty clothes. Wash.’ (Kumamoto 1988: 69)
- 3sg. prs. OKh. Z 4.96 *o kho kädē rrīmajsi thauni kṣārä biśṣä haysñāte rrīma* ‘Or as when lye cleans all the dirt on a very dirty garment.’ (Emmerick 1968: 93)
- part. nec. LKh. as a medical term in Si 100r5 *haysñāña* ‘(a medicinal herb) is to be washed.’

³⁵² See Suv I: 261. See further Suv 1.9 and 6.3.16 with the same form.

- 3sg. perf. tr. m. OKh. Z 2.170 *pātro haysnāte* ‘He has washed the bowl’ (Emmerick 1968: 39), and Z 21.13 *kvi ye haysnāte kāḍe* ‘When one had washed it [the face] thoroughly’ (Emmerick 1968: 299), LKh. IOL Khot 75/4 b2³⁵³ *pā haysnātā* ‘He washed (his) feet’, IOL Khot 28/14 b3-4 *kamalā haysnā[te]* ‘He washed the head’ (KMB: 233).
- past ptc. LKh. adj. *haysnālika-* (KS: 309 < *haysnāta-* + suffix *-lika-*) ‘Washed (of clothes)’ in IOL Khot 140/1a6-7, 10, 11, 12.³⁵⁴

Discussion

The analysis of the occurrences shows that the three verbs had three different semantic specialisations in Khotanese: *ysānāj-* ‘to wash, bathe another person’, *ysānāh-* ‘to wash, bathe oneself’ and *haysn-* ‘to wash, clean a thing or a part of the body’. TB *sanapa-*, meaning ‘to anoint’, is close in meaning. *haysn-* can be derived from **fra-snā-ya-* (with past ptc. *haysnāta-* < **fra-snāta-*) and *ysānāh-* from **snāfyā-* (with past ptc. *ysinautta-* < **snāfta-*), but the derivation of Khotanese *ysānāj-* is not straightforward. The **k/g* increment hypothesised by Bailey (DKS: 351) and Emmerick (SGS: 113) seems arbitrary, and it is not attested in any other language (EDIV: 348).³⁵⁵ The voiced fricative at the beginning of the verb can be explained by the vicinity of *-n-*, so that a development **snā-* > **znā-* > **zōnā-* (<*ysānā*>) with the insertion of an epenthetic *-ā-* may be reconstructed.

Adams (1988: 402–3) proposed that TB *sanapa-* ‘to rub, anoint’³⁵⁶ could be derived from the Pre-Khotanese antecedent of Khotanese *ysānāh-* ‘to wash’, i.e. from the stage in which Proto-Iranian intervocalic **-f-* had still not shifted to *-h-*. Since no *-f-* exists in Tocharian, it could only result in TB *-p-*. The vocalism he explains by arguing that the Khotanese verb was borrowed first as **senāp-*, probably implying that the Khotanese vowel *-ā-* of the first syllable was pronounced as [e], i.e. a mid front vowel. This vowel, however, can be better interpreted as [ə] because it occurs as an epenthetic vowel in unstressed position (Emmerick 1979: 442). Whatever the interpretation of the first vowel, there is no need to postulate with Adams (1988: 403) a further metathesis (**senāp-* > /*sānep-*/) because, if the verb was borrowed as *senapa-*, *sanapa-* could be obtained through *a*-umlaut.

Results

In conclusion, Adams is correct in interpreting the word as a loanword from Iranian. *sanapa-* can only be derived from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese. These are the only Iranian languages showing a *-p-* increment to the root PIR. **snaH-* (EDIV: 348), no word-initial palatal³⁵⁷ and an extra epenthetic vowel in the first syllable.

³⁵³ = Ch.00275 (*Vajracchedikā*), see KMB: 302.

³⁵⁴ = Ch.cvi 001, see KMB: 321–22.

³⁵⁵ For a proposal concerning the etymology of this verb, see Dragoni (Forthc.).

³⁵⁶ See also Peyrot (2013: 159) and Malzahn (2010: 934). No mention of it in Tremblay (2005).

³⁵⁷ As New Persian *šināw* ‘swimming’, with derived verb *šināwīdan* ‘to swim’. I expect word-initial *š-* to remain unchanged in Tocharian, represented by *ṣ-*.

TB *SANU* ‘DANGER’

Tocharian occurrences

- obl. sg. THT 247 b2 *sanu maskākamñemeṃ tal(ā)nt śaiṃṣe sālkatāi* ‘Thou hast pulled the suffering world out of danger, difficulty, and darkness.’ (DoT: 738)
- loc. sg. THT 79 a6 *sanune kekamu nesau* ‘Ich bin ... (sehr) in Gefahr geraten.’ (Schmidt 2001: 305)
- THT 1442 b3 *sanu* [isolated word].
- abl. sg. PK NS 34 b2 *śaiṃṣe snūmeṃ slañkenträ* ‘They pull the world out of danger.’ (CETOM, Pinault and Fellner eds.)
- abl. sg. THT 1619.c b4 *snūmeṃ* [isolated word].
- nom. pl. THT 44 a6 *māka omp snūnma ent= ākn(atsañ yama)skenträ* ‘Many dangers (are) there where fools act.’ (DoT: 738)

Discussion

The etymology of the Tocharian B word *sanu* /sónu/ ‘danger’ is unknown (DoT: 738). No bilingual evidence for the meaning of this word is available. Should one accept a broader semantic range for the word, i.e. ‘trouble, ruin, injure, damage’, which would fit the occurrences, I would like to suggest that the substantive may be connected with the Proto-Iranian root **śaiH-* ‘to destroy; to take away, deprive of’ (EDIV: 462–63). In Khotanese, the verb is *ysän-* : *ysāta-* (SGS: 112). Specifically, the source form may have been a Khotanese nominal form derived from the present stem, e.g. a present infinitive *ysänä* (cf. s.v. *parso* and *keś* for the same borrowing path). The vowel of the first syllable fits the /ə/ of Tocharian B quite well. However, this derivation remains tentative because the Tocharian B final *-u* cannot be convincingly accounted for.

Results

It is suggested that TB *sanu* ‘danger’ might be a borrowing from a present infinitive OKh. *ysänä* (< *ysän-* ‘to take by force’).

TB *SAMĀKANE* ‘CUIRASS (?)’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 214 b2-3 *mālkau kreñcä samākane • empreṃ pilko warñai krentä okt pokaiñ(o) • ai(y)ś(a)mñeṣṣeṃ yepēṃ eñku waiyptār maśne : wiḡṣṇu nes= twe poyśiññeṣṣe po yukṣeñcai* ‘Having put on the good *samākane*, true insight, etc., [are] the eight good arms; seizing separately in the fists the weapons of wisdom, O Viṣṇu, thou art all knowing and all conquering.’ (cf. DoT: 739)

Discussion

The etymology and meaning of the hapax *samākane*, occurring in THT 214 b2, are unknown. Adams (DoT: 739) proposed that *samākane* may be a dual and tentatively translated ‘cuirass’

based on a connection with Khotanese *samuvā* ‘covering part’ (DKS: 420). The existence of this Khotanese word, however, is uncertain, and, according to Bailey, it occurs only twice in the Khotanese text corpus:

- JS 28r1 *gode nāma prrāṇe yai ysareguṃ che jsa . samuvā ūḍāṃde raṃṇau jse *pa-caḍena* . ‘The lizard you were *godha* by name with a golden-colored skin. Your scales [?] (*samuvā*) were well covered with precious stones.’ (Dresden 1955: 439)
- IOL Khot 171/1.5-6 *khvaṃ ye ī thvai bustī ū samū vā garśā khaste* ‘What I had today you knew it, and only *my throat was hurt(?)’ (KMB: 381)

The second occurrence has already been read differently (*samū* ‘only’ + particle *vā*) by Skjærvø in KMB. Likewise, the first occurrence of *samuvā* can be read as *samu vā*, obtaining the following translation:

- ‘You were a lizard, *godha* by name, with a golden-colored skin. In due course (**pa-caḍena* ?), they covered (you) only with precious stones.’

Thus, Adams’ Khotanese connection is based on a ghost word. If the form *samākane* could be interpreted as a dual, its nom. sg. could be set up as *samāko**, a good candidate for an old borrowing from Khotanese. However, I was not able to identify a suitable source form. Therefore, the origin and meaning of this Tocharian B hapax remain unclear.

Results

Adams tentatively interpreted the Tocharian B hapax *samākane* as a loanword from Khotanese *samūvā* ‘covering part’, hence ‘cuirass’. This connection has to be rejected because *samūvā* is a ghost word. The meaning and etymology of *samākane* remain unclear.

TB SÄLYAKKO* ‘?’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 1535.b b3 *sälyakkatse* ‘Pertaining to *sälyakko** [isolated].

Discussion

Given the predominantly medical character of the five fragments belonging to THT 1535 (a-e), the substantive at the base of *sälyakkatse* (*sälyakko**) could also be a medical term. As no Tocharian derivation can be suggested, I propose a connection with the Khotanese root *sal-* ‘to smear, rub’ (< PIr. **sard-*, cf. EDIV: 336). In Khotanese, this root is attested in the following derived lexemes:

- **pasal-* ‘to besmear’ < **apa-sard-*, attested with weakening of the initial vowel **a > i* in the verb *pisal-* (SGS: 78) and the abstract *pisalyāmā-* (KS: 97). The abstract may be rather from **apa-sard-aya-*, which could have yielded an Old Khotanese abstract **pīsalyāmatā-* (for *-ly-* cf. *esaly-* below). The alternation <i> ~ <ī> is trivial in Late Khotanese.

- **ā-saly-* ‘to besmear’ < **ā-sard-aya-*, attested with the usual palatalisation rule in the verb *esaly-* (SGS: 12). Noteworthy is the preservation of the *y* of the suffix after *l*.

A Khotanese form **silyaka-* can be set up based on the material discussed. **silyaka-* may have developed from PTK **serd(a)ya-kka-* > PK *silyakka-*. Because of the Tocharian suffix *-kko*, q.v., still with double *k* (KS: 181), the loanword can be traced back to the Pre-Khotanese stage. A Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese borrowing would have implied an *e* in the first syllable. The meaning of *silyakko** may have been that of ‘ointment’ (Germ. *Salbe*).

Results

The isolated hapax TB *sālyakko** may be a medical term. I suggest it is connected with the Khotanese verbal root *sal-** ‘to besmear’, attested as the base of several verbs in Late Khotanese medical texts. The source form may be individuated in a reconstructed acc. sg. PK *silyakku*, meaning ‘ointment’.

(47) TB *siñco** ‘?’, LKH. *siṃjā-* (PLANT NAME)

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 88 a1-2 *tumem durmukhe brāhmaṇe uttare«ṃ» sāmaṣkem kār wāṣṣai witsa-kaisa rāskare tso paṃ-ne siñcai ṣorpor ite – – (ya)mormem auntsante-ne ścīre makātsi* ‘Thereupon the Brahmin Durmukha jabs the boy Uttara sharply with a reed root. After they had (put?) a ... [piece of] cloth (?) (onto his eyes/legs?), they began to chase him hard’ (CETOM, Malzahn ed., based on Schmidt [2001: 316] and Pinault [2004: 259]).

Discussion

The unclear hapax *siñcai* occurs in one of the central episodes of the Tocharian B *Araṇemi-jātaka*, namely the punishment of Prince Uttara on behalf of the Brāhmin Durmukha. On the narrative, see in detail Schmidt (2001: 316). The upper right part of the fragment has now been lost so that today the first line (THT 88 a1) ends after the first akṣara *si* of *siñcai*. Without the possibility of checking the original, one can rely on Sieg and Siegling’s (1953: 25) first readings.

Pinault (2004: 259–60) suggested that *siñcai ṣorpor* could be translated as ‘(Brust-beere-)Dornen-Hose(n)’. The interpretation of *ṣorpor* as a piece of cloth seems assured, but its exact origin awaits a more detailed analysis (C. Bernard, p.c.). Such investigation will not be attempted here. But it is still necessary to comment on the etymology of *siñcai* because Pinault (2004: 259) derived it from a Prakrit form of the Sanskrit plant name *siñcatikā-*, possibly connected with LKh. *ṣiṃjā-* (see §2.1. s.v. *śintso**).

It is difficult to determine the original meaning of Skt. *siñcatikā-*. Its connection with the Iranian plant name and, ultimately, with Oss. D *sindzæ* ‘thorn’ (Abaev III: 201-2) is highly doubtful. In addition to that, Skt. *siñcatikā-* would have probably yielded **siñcadi(a)-* in Gāndhārī. Kim (2015: 35 fn. 22)³⁵⁸ sought to revise Pinault’s analysis of *siñcai* by reconstructing an ‘early Middle Iranian’ **sinčā-* based on the Ossetic form as the possible source of a

³⁵⁸ I am grateful to C. Bernard for this reference.

reconstructed nom. sg. *siñco**. As shown in §2.1. s.v. *śintso**, Tocharian B already had a word borrowed from the pre-form of LKh. *śimjā*-, so it is unlikely that *siñcai* was borrowed from the same source. One could argue that this could be a recent loanword from Late Khotanese. Still, the absence of the word-initial palatal sibilant and the possibility of setting up a nom. sg. -o render this hypothesis unlikely. A loanword from other Middle Iranian languages can also be safely excluded (cf. the list of forms given in §2.1. s.v. *śintso**).

Bailey (DKS: 425) registers another Late Khotanese plant name s.v. *simjau*, occurring in a manuscript of the Pelliot collection (P 2739.19). He translates it tentatively as ‘greyish plant (?)’, seeking a possible connection with a reconstructed colour adjective **saina*- that, in his view, should mean ‘grey’ (cf. OCS *sěrz* ‘grey’?). Since this explanation seems doubtful, I suggest that LKh. *simjau* could be interpreted as a variant form of the Late Khotanese plant name *śimjā*- without secondary palatalisation *s* > *ś*. I propose that this variant may have been present also in Old Khotanese. Given the unusual intricacy of this explanation, it may also be argued that the word was borrowed from another unknown language of the area. In any case, no matter what the exact origin of LKh. *simjau* is, TB *siñco** can be interpreted as a loanword from the acc. sg. of the plant name Khot. *simjā*- (*simjo*).

The context of *simjau* needs a more detailed analysis. Following Kumamoto’s (1993: 146–56) interpretation of P 2739, the text begins with several trials of the beginning of a formal letter. The main section of the text consists of a list of food items (*hviḍi pamarā* ‘food-report’), to which *simjau* seems to belong, and articles of cloth. The sentence in which *simjau* occurs runs as follows: *śau rraha: śīyi ttrihe: tte nvaīyi ūspurā palaijā . e’ysajā simjau dva dva bāgā*. The translation is difficult. A striking element is the phrase *dva dva bāgā*, probably taken from the learned medical jargon. In Si §27.12, *dva dva bāga* ‘two portions each’ translates Skt. *dvau dvau bāgau*. The copyist of this document, a scribal exercise, was familiar with the medical terminology. Another word that can be read is *ttrihe*:, to be identified with LKh. *ttrahā*- ‘radish’ (Skt. *mūlaka*-). It is tempting to interpret *śau rraha: śīyi ttrihe:* as *śau rraha: (ttrihe:) śīyi ttrihe:*, and translate ‘one (portion) of red radish and white radish’. *śīyi ttrihe:* could be Skt. *śveta-mūla*- and *rraha: ttrihe:* may be identified as Skt. *piṅga-mūla*-. The identification of these two items requires more detailed research. As for *palaijā*, it was already connected by Kumamoto (1993: 151) with *palaigā*, which translates Skt. *pālankya*- ‘Beta bengalensis (?)’ in Si §3.21.5. I cannot offer a satisfactory explanation for *e’ysajā*, but I tentatively suggest that it could be connected with the unclear *aysā’ya* in the *Pinḍasāstra* (e.g. in §14). It seems assured that the context of *simjau* strongly suggests identifying the word as a plant name.

Results

It is proposed that the Tocharian B hapax *siñco** is a loanword from the Old Khotanese antecedent of LKh. *simjā*-. The context of *simjā*-, although unclear, suggests that LKh. *simjā*- may be interpreted as a plant name.

TA *sīsā** ‘Sītā’, OKH. *sīysā*-, LKH. *sījsā*- ‘ID.’

Discussion

TA *sīsā**, Old Uyghur *siza* and Old Khotanese *sīysā*- are all names for the princess Sītā, Rāma’s wife in the Indian epic. They all show a sibilant in the second syllable as opposed to Skt. *t*. Bailey (1939: 465) was the first scholar to discuss the sibilant for Khotanese. The Tocharian

A comparandum was noted by Bailey (1940a: 560; cf. also KT VI: 362). In both publications, Bailey reconstructs Gandh. **siza* as the source of the Tocharian and the Khotanese forms. This reconstruction is problematic because intervocalic *t* does not yield Gandh. <s> [z]. It should yield [ð], written as <d> (Baums 2009: 137). The Khotanese form might be an adaptation of the Gāndhārī dental fricative [ð] (<d>) as [z] <ys>. In fact, Old Khotanese has no fricative *d* in its phoneme inventory.³⁵⁹ Old Khotanese may have borrowed the name of the princess Sītā from its Gāndhārī form.

It is difficult to determine whether Tocharian A borrowed from Old Khotanese or directly from Gāndhārī. The scholarly literature admits borrowing from Old Khotanese (Peyrot 2013: 633 fn. 46; Ji 1943: 287 fn. 2 could not decide about the source form). As for Old Uyghur *siza*, it was recognised as a possible loanword from Old Khotanese by Zieme (1978: 24). Wilkens (HWA: 617) leaves open the possibility of a loanword from Tocharian A. Zieme's (1978: 26) observations on further agreements between the Khotanese version of the Rāma story and the Old Uyghur one support a Khotanese origin for OUygh. *siza*. Noteworthy is that the form with sibilant is attested only in Tocharian A. Tocharian B has *sītañ* in IOL Toch 259 b4. The puzzling affricate found in the Late Khotanese Rāmāyaṇa (*sījsā-*) might be tentatively explained as an independent adaptation of Gandh. [ð].

The borrowing history of the name of the princess Sītā in the Tarim Basin may be summarised as follows: Gandh. *<*sida*> /siðā/ → OKh. *sīysā-* → Tocharian A *sīsā** and Old Uyghur *siza* (independently). If this reconstruction is correct, the Khotanese may have been responsible for transmitting the Rāma story in the Tarim Basin.

Results

The name of Rāma's wife, Skt. *sītā-*, was borrowed into Khotanese through an intermediary Gāndhārī form **sida*, with Gandh. [ð] (<d>) adapted as OKh. [z]. From Old Khotanese, the name was borrowed into Tocharian A *sīsā** and Old Uyghur *siza* independently.

TB *SUMO* 'LIBATION (?)', LKH. *YSŪMA-* 'BROTH'

Tocharian occurrences: TB *sumo*

- PKAS 8A b7-8 nom. sg. *puṣ«ṭā» nākṣātārne pākṇātrā iñcew ra tsa e«ka»lmī yāmtsi sumo pwa(rne) hom yamaṣāle – su ekalmī māsketrā* 'In the lunar mansion Puṣya [if] one intends to bring whomever under one's control, a *sumo* [is] to be put [lit. made] into the fire as an oblation [and] he will become subject.' (CETOM, Pinault, Malzahn eds.)

Tocharian occurrences: TB *smaññe* 'broth'

- IOL Toch 79 a4 /// (*tā*)*koy wāspā smaññe* /// 'May he be, the *wāspa* broth (?)' [quite uncertain]

³⁵⁹ An alternative solution may involve an original variant of the name **sithā-* with aspirate next to the usual *sītā-*. Intervocalic *th* yields Gandh. <s> [z]. However, this option remains doubtful because a variant *sithā-* is not attested. The possibility that Gandh. [ð] could also result in [z] is discussed by Brough (1962: 96) but explicitly doubted. *samughāṣa* (Skt. *samudghāta*) is tentatively explained by Baums (2009: 145) as a loanword from another Middle-Indo-Aryan dialect.

- IOL Toch 248 b6 *tane klu pete* • *tane smaññe pete* • ‘Give rice here! Give soup here!’ (Peyrot 2013: 348). Parallel: *sūpaṃ dehi*, see Peyrot (2013: 348).
- IOL Toch 1121 a3 /// *klusa smaññe wa(lanalle)* /// ‘Broth should (not) be concealed by rice’ (Ogihara 2011: 121). Parallel: Skt. *sūpa*- see Ogihara (2011: 120).
- THT 335 a5 *ñmetsi śwātsi smaññe* ‘To bend, to eat broth (?)’ [quite uncertain]

Discussion

The hypothesis that the TB *sawm*-, *smaññe*, and *sumo* are all related goes back to the respective entries in Adams’ dictionary (DoT: 762). Adams’ derivational path implies that *sumo* and *smaññe* could be derived from the verb *sawm*-. *smaññe* ‘broth’ was already derived from the same verb by Van Windekens (VW: 446). However, the Tocharian B verb *sawm*- is uncertain. This verb is only attested twice. According to Peyrot (2022), the two occurrences may be interpreted as containing different verbs.³⁶⁰ Therefore, this Tocharian verb seems to be a ghost.

To overcome these difficulties, I suggest that the hapax TB *sumo* was borrowed from Khot. *ysūma*- ‘broth’. LKh. *ysūma*- (DKS: 353) is frequent in Late Khotanese medical texts, where it translates Skt. *rasa*- ‘soup’ (Si §22.16). The Tocharian B nom. sg. could be a regular adaptation of a PTK, PK or OKh. acc. sg. **zūmu* (OKh. *ysūmu*). TB *sumo* could be translated more precisely as ‘broth’ or ‘soup’. A special broth could be put into the fire as an oblation (*hom*, PK AS 8A b7), probably in a magical context. Because of the final -o of the nom. sg., the hypothesis of a connection with Skt. *suma*- ‘kind of flower’ (Pinault and Malzahn *apud* CEToM) can be safely excluded. TB *smaññe* may be connected, but I cannot offer any proposal about its etymology.

Results

Rather than being derived from the verb TB *sawm*- ‘to trickle’, a ghost word, I propose that TB *sumo* could be a loanword from LKh. *ysūma*- ‘broth’.

TAB *senik* ‘CARE, PLEDGE’

Discussion

TAB *senik* reflects a word of Iranian origin that appears in almost all of the attested languages of the ancient Tarim Basin, cf. OKh. *ysīniya*- (variously attested also as *ysīniṭa*, *ysīniyā*, *ysīnī*, see Skjærvø 1991: 281), Pa. *zyn’yy/zynyh* (DMMP: 387), BSogd. *zyn’y*, Niya Pkt. *zeniḡa*- (Burrow 1937: 93) and TAB *senik* (DoT: 764–65). The Iranian origin of this group of words is not in doubt. Skjærvø (1991: 282) argued that the base may have been PIr. **jaini*- (cf. Av. *zaēni*- ‘vigilance’). Even the compound Pa. *zyny-xw’rg*, Sogd. *zynyh-xw’ry* ‘truce-breaker (= ‘he that eats what is entrusted to him’, see Henning 1946: 716)’ was calqued into Tocharian B *senik-śawa* A *senik-śo* (Pinault 2002: 272–73).

The borrowing directions of this word in the Tarim Basin need to be clarified. Isebaert (1980: §156), followed by Pinault (2002: 272), sets up a generic ‘Middle Iranian’ form **zēnik*

³⁶⁰ W42 b1 *slaiṅkālyā eše satkentampa šukāšālyā* ‘It is to be pulled out and together with medicines [it is] to be dangled (?)’ (DoT: 762, previously read *sumāšālyā*) and W 13 a6 *eśanene stamāššalle* ‘It is to be put in the eyes’ (DoT: 761 previously read instead *sumāššalle*). On these new readings and interpretations, see Peyrot (2022).

as the source of the Tocharian word. Adams (DoT: 765) tentatively derives it from the Pre-Khotanese ancestor of OKh. *ysīniya-*. Similarly, Tremblay (2005: 431) argues for a ‘Śaka’ borrowing into Tocharian, i.e. from a dialect akin to Khotanese, not from Khotanese itself. The absence of the final vowel safely excludes borrowing from a pre-stage of Khotanese. Besides, the presence of *k* in Tocharian but no longer in historical Khotanese requires a very early date of borrowing. As Sogdian and Parthian have no final *-k*, they cannot be the source of the Tocharian word. I suggest that TAB *senik* was borrowed from Niya Pkt. *zeniġa-*.

Suppose the Tocharian word was borrowed from Niya Prakrit. Which Iranian language was the Niya Prakrit word borrowed from? Tremblay (2005: 431) also suggested a ‘Śaka’ origin for Niya Prakrit. However, the inconsistency of this language label has already been discussed (see §2.1. s.v. *cospā*). An option that has not been investigated so far is the possibility of a Pre-Khotanese loanword in Niya Prakrit. This is indirectly supported by the occurrence of a puzzling form *ysenikāṃ* as an (almost) isolated word in a tiny Sanskrit fragment preserved in the British Library (Kh. i.120). The identification of *ysenikāṃ* as the ancestor of OKh. *ysīniya* is due to Skjærvø (1991). Decisive for establishing the Khotanese provenance of the word would be the digraph *ys*, which cannot point but to Khotan. The *e* would reflect a stage in which the diphthong **ai* had not shifted to *ī* yet. According to the system described in this study (§3.3.1.1.b), this stage would correspond to Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, where the vowel was *ē*. In Skjærvø’s interpretation, therefore, *ysenikāṃ* would be an ancient Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese loanword into Buddhist Sanskrit.

This hypothesis needs to be revised. A loanword from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese into Buddhist Sanskrit is chronologically impossible because the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese stage can be dated several centuries BCE (see §6.2.2.1.). Given the Southern provenance of the fragment, a loanword from Tumshuqese can be safely excluded. Skjærvø explains the *e* and the *k* in *ysenikāṃ* as archaic features, but he does not mention the final *-āṃ*. Is it to be seen as a Sanskrit case ending (acc.)? Or is it Khotanese? In this case, an ending *-āṃ* could be seen as a late form of the gen.-dat. pl. *-ānu*. This option, however, would not square with Skjærvø’s claim about the antiquity of the word. Because of these difficulties, I suggest another interpretation for *ysenikāṃ* in Kh. i.120. The fragmentary line runs as follows: *///6 ysenikāṃ sarvva nā///*. The numeral at the beginning of the line, immediately before *ysenikāṃ*, is suspect: *ysenikāṃ* may not belong to the Sanskrit text of the work copied by the scribe. It may be the beginning of a colophon, in which a Khotanese donor may have been mentioned with his proper name, *ysenikāṃ*. Judging from the following *sarvva*, this colophon may have been written in Sanskrit, not in Khotanese. A parallel for this type of colophons mentioning Khotanese donors with their proper names is provided by the Sanskrit colophons to the Khotan manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* (von Hinüber 2015: 229–30). The only difficulty with this interpretation is that no proper name *ysenikāṃ* has yet been found in the Khotanese text corpus.³⁶¹

Niya Pkt. *zeniġa-* can hardly be derived from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese through borrowing. The virtual absence of loanwords from prehistoric layers of Khotanese into Niya Prakrit does not support this derivation.³⁶² One should also note that *hinaza*

³⁶¹ Some resemblance with the frequent proper name *senili* (e.g. in Hedin 9.3) may be noted. If *senili* contains a suffix *-la-* (KS: xxxiv), a form **senika-* may show a *ka-* suffix instead. However, as no explanation for the initial is available, the resemblance may be superficial.

³⁶² For the difficulties involved in the traditional analysis of Niya Pkt. *thavaṃṇa(ġa)-*, see §2.1. s.v. *tono*.

in CKD 661 has <i> reflecting Khot. *ī*, not **ē* (< **ai*). Niya Pkt. *zeniġa-* should therefore be derived from another Iranian language. Niels Schoubben (p.c.) suggests a derivation from a conservative form of Bactr. *°ζινιγο* (with **ē* in the first syllable), attested as the second member of proper names (cf. Sims-Williams 2010: 85, 91, 109), but this possibility still awaits a thorough examination.

Results

TAB *senik* was borrowed from Niya Pkt. *zeniġa-*. The Iranian source of the Niya Prakrit form is still unclear, but a prehistoric stage of Khotanese can be safely excluded.

TB *SKAWA-* ‘TO LICK’, KHOT. *SKAU-* ‘TO TOUCH’

Tocharian occurrences

- THT 83 a3 /// (e)ñkormem kenīne lamästär-ne autsate-ne rupaške kantwas(a) skāwa(tsi) /// ‘... ergriffen habend, setzt er ihn auf seine Knie (und) begann, (sein) Gesichtchen mit der Zunge zu küssen’ (Schmidt 2001: 312).
- PK AS 15G b2 /// *sa skāwa – ta -e* /// [isolated].

Discussion

The Tocharian B verb *skāwa(tsi)* is usually interpreted as an infinitive from the verb *skawa-* with the meaning ‘to kiss’ (Peyrot 2013: 836, Malzahn 2010: 957). Following a suggestion by Van Windekens (VW: 640), Adams (DoT: 773) tentatively proposed that the Tocharian B verb may have been borrowed from OKh. *skau-* ‘to touch’ (< PIr. **skauH-*, EDIV: 347–48). As both phonology and semantics seem to agree, I do not see any reason to reject this etymology. Because of the lack of monophthongisation of the diphthong *au*, the borrowing may be dated to the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese stage. Since the Tocharian B word is a hapax, this suggestion remains entirely hypothetical.

Itkin and Malyshev (2021: 62–63) convincingly argued that the Tocharian A match of TB *skawa-* may be attested in the verbal form *skāwiṣ* (A 83 b2), interpreted as opt. 3sg. Further, they argue for a translation ‘to lick’ instead of ‘to kiss’, better fitting the available occurrences.³⁶³ This new translation is also closer to the meaning of the alleged Khotanese source form and renders the hypothesis of a loanword from Khotanese even more concrete.

Results

The Tocharian B verb *skawa-* ‘to lick’ may be a loanword from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese antecedent of OKh. *skau-* ‘to touch’.

(48) TB *TSUWO** ‘TOWARDS’

Discussion

A Tocharian B nom. sg. *tsuwo** can be set up based on the following attested forms, all showing a frozen obl. sg. in *-ai*:

³⁶³ On the semantics of this expression, widespread in Central Asia and beyond, see Maue 2017.

- *etsuwai* ‘towards, near to’ (DoT: 105)
- *tsuwai* ‘towards’ (DoT: 810)
- *tswaiññe* ‘directly’ (DoT: 814)

The traditional analysis of *tsuwo** connects the word with the verb TB *tsəwa-* ‘attach oneself to, stick to’ (Hilmarsson 1991a: 179). Although the derivation is phonologically unproblematic, the semantic changes involved (‘to attach oneself to’ > ‘towards’ ?) do not inspire much confidence. Because the final *-o* may point to an old borrowing from Khotanese, it is necessary to examine the possibility of a loanword. A suitable source form may be sought in a nominal derivative of the verb *tsū-* ‘to go’ (< PIr. *čyawa-, SGS: 42), a nomen actionis **tsūa-* ‘going’ < **tsūka-*. Even if this derivative is not attested in the Khotanese corpus, numerous other nominal derivatives occur within the language, cf. the nomen agentis *tsūka-* ‘goer’ (KS: 43). As in the case of *kāswo* and *cowo**, q.v., the acc. sg. in Pre-Khotanese may be reconstructed as **ts^hūwu* > OKh. **tsū*. Because of the long *ū* in Khotanese, represented by *u* in the Tocharian form, the date of the borrowing cannot be older than the Pre-Khotanese stage (PIr. acc. sg. *čyawakam > PTK *čōku > PK **ts^hūwu*). The lack of umlaut (*u_o* > *o_o*) may allow to date the borrowing after *cowo** and *koto**, q.v.

As for the semantics, the nomen actionis may have been grammaticalised very early. The grammaticalisation may have been based on frequent expressions like ‘going to [destination]’. From this usage, the word may have come to be used in the sense of ‘towards’. It should be noted that the verb ‘to go’ is very frequently subject to grammaticalisation processes in numerous languages (cf. the use of *going to* as a future marker in English).

Results

The adverb TB *tsuwai* and derivatives are formed based on a nom. sg. *tsuwo**. This form may have been borrowed from a PK nomen actionis **tsūa-* ‘going’, whose acc. sg. may have been **ts^hūwu*. The semantics may be explained through early grammaticalisation of the nomen actionis, which came to be used as an adverb meaning ‘towards’ from an expression like ‘going to [destination]’.

TB *TSEREÑÑ-* ‘TO DECEIVE’, KHOT. *JSĪR-* ‘ID.’

Tocharian occurrences

Several words are commonly believed to be formed from an alleged Tocharian verbal root *tser-** ‘to deceive’. These are the substantive *tserekwa* (pl.) ‘deception(s), deceit, illusion’ and the verb *tsereññ-* ‘to trick, deceive’. Additionally, two unclear words of similar phonetic appearance, *tseriteke* and *tsärtsäkwa* (pl.?), may also be included in the discussion.

tserekwa:

- IOL Toch 4 b4 *skeyem rano aikarem tserekwa lkāṣṣām* ‘He sees even the exertions as empty and as deceit.’ (CEToM, Peyrot ed.)
- IOL Toch 23 a4 *tserekwa* ‘deceit’ [isolated].
- IOL Toch 214 b4 *kete wa(sts)i – (w)sāwa snai tserekwa* ‘Whom I gave a garment without deceit.’ (cf. Broomhead 1962: 250)

- PK NS 54 b3 *saṃsārṣṣana tserekwa aiśamñesa anaiśai mā ritoṃtrā* ‘He should not desire the deceits of the Saṃsāra through accurate wisdom.’ (CEToM, Pinault, Malzahn, Fellner eds.)
- PK NS 56 b5 *(e)r(e)patempa : tasemane po pīs āntseṃ tserekwa ka kārsoṣ cai* ‘These ones have understood all the five skandhas comparable to the form as deception.’ (CEToM, Pinault, Malzahn eds.)
- THT 229 b1 *saṃsārṣṣana tserekwa snai lyiprā (ñās aiśi)mar* ‘May I know the delusions of the saṃsāra completely.’ (DoT: 631)
- THT 271 b2 *k_uce ñiś kāmmai tesa nauṣ larauwñesa arañcne po tserekwa* ‘Alle Trug[bilder], die ich früher aus Freude daran im Herzen trug.’ (Schmidt 1974: 364 fn. 7)
- THT 277 b2 *ṣaṃñ pālskauntse tserekwa ke(t)e* ‘To whom the delusions of his own thoughts ...’
- THT 496 a4 *sanai ṣaryompa śāyau karttse(ś) śāulu-wārñai snai tserekwa* ‘With the very beloved one I will live (for) good lifelong, without deceit.’ (CEToM, Fellner ed.)
- THT 1541.j b2 *toṃ tserekwa* ‘... these deceptions ...’
- adj. *tserekwatstse** obl. sg. THT 295 a6-7 *tserekwacce lāñwcene ṣāññāññeṣṣe akalksa : yokaiṣṣe śvāl nukowā k_use ce_u postāṃ mākoṃtrā* ‘[Only] who out of selfishness in deceptive carelessness has swallowed the bait of thirst might run after him.’ (CEToM, Peyrot ed.)

tsereññ-:

- prt. ptc. IOL Toch 205 a4 *lyuke tsetserñ(u)* ‘The light is led astray.’ (CEToM, Peyrot ed.)
- prt. ptc. PKAS 17K b4 *rāskr(e) takāsta (t)s(e)tserñu ste emparkre* ‘[Although] it has been trickery for long, you remained harsh.’ (CEToM, Pinault, Malzahn eds.)
- prt. ptc. THT 282 b3 *(su) palsko ṣaṇ tsetserñu triṣṣāṃ wāntre* ‘Having deceived his own mind he misses the object.’ (Peyrot 2013: 676)
- inf. PK AS 17A a3 *yāmorṣṣepi s-ltre«ṃ»tse memiskusa kektseñe wes tserentsi* ‘The body [is] disguised by the craftsman (?) of the deed to deceive us.’ (CEToM, Pinault, Illés, Peyrot eds.)
- prs. THT 11 b2 *ṣarm okone tserentrā (su t)n(e w)n(o)lm(eṃ)* ‘In cause and effect it deceives (here) the beings.’ (CEToM, Fellner ed.)
- prs. THT 23 b4 *yes no śakkeññi snai keś onolmeṃ tserentrā* ‘But you, the followers of Śākyā, deceive beings without number.’ (CEToM, Fellner ed.)
- prs. THT 100 b1 *puwarne yaptsi mapi tserentar-ñ* ‘You fool me [about] your entering the fire, don’t you?’ (Peyrot 2013: 365 fn. 467)
- prs. (?) THT 136 b8 *tāne ra tseren(tār?)* ‘Here he also deceives (?)’³⁶⁴
- THT 1250 a5 *(i)st(a)k ś(a)rsa tseremñentār-ñ*³⁶⁵ ‘Immediately he understood, “... They deceive me!” ...’

tsārtsākwa-:

- THT 282 b6 *tumeṃ kālpāskene-ne rserccī śāmna nakanma tsārtsākwa waṣe wentsi wāntre klanktsi* ‘Thus malevolent people get him to speak reproaches, deceptions (?), to lie, and to doubt thing[s].’ (DoT: 806)

tseriteke:

- THT 324 a3 *ṣamāne* : *tseriteke menākāccepi* /// ‘A monk, comparable with ...’ (Ogihara 2009: 406)

Discussion

While their semantics are settled, the etymology of *tserekwa* ‘deceit’ and *tserēññ-* ‘to deceive’ is unclear. The latest suggestion is due to Adams (DoT: 811), who interpreted *tserēññ-* as a denominative based on the root *tser-** ‘to deceive’ (cf. *tser-ekwa*). *°ekwa* in *tser-ekwa* remains unexplained, and the root *tser°* is derived from Khotanese *jsīr-* ‘to deceive’ through borrowing.

Khotanese *jsīr-* offers a perfect semantic match for *tser-**, but the phonological side of the problem needs to be investigated. Bailey (1960: 31) first suggested a connection between the two verbs, noting the phonological and semantic similarity in passing. Emmerick (SGS: 38) also noted the connection, but he could not advance any hypothesis on the ultimate origin of TB *tser-** because no assured etymology for OKh. *jsīr-* was available. Some years later, Bailey returned to the problem in his dictionary (DKS: 115–16) and suggested that the Tocharian form could be a loanword from Tumshuqese. In Tumshuqese, the digraph <ts> is sometimes used for the sound corresponding to Khot. /dz/ <js> (Cf. KVāc *tsenā-* and OKh. *jsīnā-* ‘life’). However, Bailey’s etymology of *jsīr-* from an alleged Iranian root **gai-* ‘to twist’ with an ‘*r*-increment’ cannot stand closer scrutiny, both from the semantic and the morphological point of view. Besides, it is now recognised that the use of the Tumshuqese digraph *ts* to represent a sound otherwise known from Khotanese to be voiced is a feature limited to the Tumshuqese Karmavācanā. As no voiced *js*-sound is present within the Tocharian B phoneme inventory, I expect both Khot. or Tq. /dz/ or /ts/ to be represented in Tocharian B with the digraph <ts>, a voiceless dental affricate. There is no compelling reason to consider the Karmavācanā digraph <ts> as representing a voiceless dental affricate. It could have been used to write both /dz/ and /ts/. This ambivalence is probably to be ascribed to a still defective orthography, a fact that confirms the common dating of the Tumshuqese Karmavācanā as the earliest Tumshuqese source in Brāhmī.

Maue and Ogihara (2017: 428) identify a candidate for a Tumshuqese cognate of Khot. *jsīr-* in the isolated verb *dzerāma* in HL 18d b4, a fragment belonging to the Tumshuqese version of the *Haṃsasvarāvadāna*.³⁶⁴ In light of the identification of the Tumshuqese Fremdzeichen *x₈* with /ts^h/ (= Khot. <ts>), however, this hypothesis cannot be upheld (Maue 2022).

The precise directions of borrowing still need to be determined. Lacking a convincing Iranian etymology for Khot. *jsīr-*, as already suggested by Van Windekens (VW: 532), the donor language might have been Tocharian. The borrowing might have occurred from Proto-Tocharian into Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese very early. In my view, however, an Iranian

³⁶⁴ Only the akṣara *na* is visible on the manuscript. No vowel diacritic was likely present on top of it, but one cannot exclude that another akṣara was written beneath *na*. *na* could be the beginning of another word, and *tserē* the word for ‘a measure of liquid volume’ (DoT: 810). Still, this word is only attested in Tocharian B late documents, and its appearance in a fragment of literary content is problematic.

³⁶⁵ This is the form quoted without source in TEB I: 217 and noted by Malzahn (2010: 998) without reference. See Ogihara (2012a: 188) for its reading and restoration.

³⁶⁶ The authors implicitly support the theory of a loanword from Tq. *dzer-* into Tocharian (Maue and Ogihara 2017: 427 fn. 49).

etymology for Tq. *dzer-* Khot. *jsīr-* (< PTK **jēr-*)³⁶⁷ is possible. This verb may have nothing to do with the Tocharian root *tser-** that I argue to have been possibly borrowed earlier from Old Steppe Iranian.

As for the Iranian origin of Tq. *dzer-* Khot. *jsīr-*, it is useful to revisit Emmerick's tentative suggestion (SGS: 38) of a pre-form PIr. **jaraya-*. This could be interpreted as a palatal variant of the Proto-Iranian root **garH-* 'to greet, call' (EDIV: 107). As an *aya-*formation should require **garaya-*, a *ya-*formation may be posited as the immediate antecedent of Khot. *jsīr-* (< **jarya-*). **jaraya-* may be attested in the Khotanese verb *ttājser-* < **ati-jāraya-* 'to speak with abuse' (SGS: 38).³⁶⁸ The preservation of the dental affricate, instead of the expected *j*, would be remarkable and may point to a very late date for the formation of the verb *ttājser-*. The comparison between Tq. *dzer-* and Khot. *jsīr-* confirms that it is possible to reconstruct for Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese an intermediate stage of the umlaut PIr. **a_y* > PTK **e* > OKh. <ī>, Tq. <e>.

The Tocharian root *tser-** could have been borrowed from Tumshuqese *dzer-* in the historical stage. Historical Khotanese and Pre-Khotanese can be safely excluded because of the vowel (Tocharian *e* requires **ē*, not *ī*), and Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese cannot be used because of the Tocharian initial dental affricate (not palatal, as would be expected from PTK). However, since no reliable loanwords from Tumshuqese have yet been found within Tocharian, an alternative explanation for the origin of Tocharian B *tser-** should be considered.

The analysis of TB *tser-** as a loanword from Old Steppe Iranian offers an attractive solution. Based on the correspondences established by Bernard (2023), a possible source form may be PIr. **jarH-*. This root is attested in Iranian and listed by Cheung (EDIV: 469) with the meaning 'to hurt, wound, anger (with words)'. Semantically, the clear negative meaning of 'vex, torment, speak in an offensive way' may have shifted to 'to deceive'. The Old Steppe Iranian connection may allow an explanation of *tser-eññ-* as denominative from a subst. OSIr. **dzara-*. A *ka*-enlargement of the same substantive may have been at the origin of a nom. sg. TB *tserke** (OSIr. **dzaraka-*), with pl. *tserekwa*³⁶⁹ (cf. *wāntare*, pl. *wāntarwa*).³⁷⁰

One is left with the hapaxes *tsārtsākwa* and *tseriteke*. In the case of *tsārtsākwa*, the meaning 'delusion, deceit' posited for *tserekwa* fits quite well, but formal differences remain. On the other hand, *tseriteke*, of uncertain meaning because of the fragmentary context, may be considered a borrowing from OSIr. **dzaritaka-*, a *ka*-derivative of the equivalent of Av. *zairita-* 'yellow', as seen in Khot. *ysīḍaa-* 'id.'. For further details on this derivation, see Bernard (2023: 134–36).

Results

TB *tsereññ-* 'to deceive' cannot be connected with Khot. *jsīr-* (PTK **jēr-*), and the assumption of a loanword from Tq. *dzer-* is difficult. I propose an explanation of *tsereññ-* as an Old Steppe Iranian loanword from the root PIr. **jarH-* (EDIV: 469) 'to hurt, wound, anger'. TB *tserekwa*

³⁶⁷ In the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese stage, the depalatalisation process of PIr. **č* and **j* had probably not started yet; see §2.1. s.v. TB *śarko* A *tsārk*.

³⁶⁸ For another view on this verb, see DKS: 127, where it is derived from **ati-čāraya-* and translated as 'overwhelm, surpass'. Emmerick (SDTV I: 247) opts for Bailey's interpretation and translates it as 'pass by'.

³⁶⁹ This interpretation implies that the plural was formed before the syncope **tsereke* > **tserke*.

³⁷⁰ Alternatively, the verb may be derived from the substantive; see Malzahn (2010: 998).

(nom. pl.) may be interpreted as a loanword from a *ka*-derivative of the same root. The Tumshuqese and Khotanese forms may be derived from a *ya*-formation of a palatal variant of PIR. *garH-* (EDIV: 107), **jarya-*. *tseriteke* may be an Old Steppe Iranian loanword from the equivalent of Av. *zairita-* ‘yellow’.

2.2. REFERENCE LISTS

The following lists group the results obtained in §2.1. They are intended for reference purposes. Four groups of items are distinguished: reliable loanwords (§2.2.1), less reliable and doubtful loanwords (§2.2.2) and rejected loanwords (§2.2.3). Additionally, one word is of Sogdian origin (§2.2.4), and two were classified as Old Steppe Iranian loanwords (§2.2.5.).

2.2.1. RELIABLE LOANWORDS

1. subst. TB *añkwaṣ(t)* ‘Asa foetida’ ← LKh. *aṃguṣḍa-* ‘id.’
2. v. TB *ampa-* ‘to rot, decay’ ← LKh. *haṃbva-* (< OKh. *haṃbūta-*) ‘fester’
3. subst. TB **ārto* TA *ārt** ‘envoy’ ← PTK acc. sg. *(h)*ārdu* (OKh. *haḍa-*) ‘id.’
4. subst. TB *wātano** A *wataṃ** ‘Khotanese’ ← PK acc. sg. **hwātānu* ‘id.’
5. subst. TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu** ‘iron’ ← PTK **héñswanya-* (OKh. *hiśśana-*) ‘id.’
6. subst. TB *orśa* A *orāś** (official title) ← OKh. *aurāśśa-* ‘councillor’
7. subst. TB *oś* ‘evil’ ← LKh. *ośa-* ‘id.’
8. v. TA *katw-* ‘to ridicule’ ← OKh. past ptc. *khaṃttu** ‘to laugh’
9. subst. TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ ← PTK acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala-* ‘head’)
10. subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* ‘quartan fever’)
11. subst. TB *kātso* A *kāts* ‘belly, stomach, abdomen, womb’ ← PK **k^hādāna-* ‘stomach’ (LKh. *khāysāna-*)
12. subst. TB *kito** ‘help’ ← PK acc. sg. **gīθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *gīha-* ‘id.’)
13. subst. TB *kuñi(-mot)* ‘grape wine’ ← LKh. *gūrāṇai* (*mau*) ‘id.’
14. subst. TB *kurkal* ‘bdellium’ ← LKh. *gurgula-* ‘id.’
15. subst. TB *keto* ‘property, estate’ ← PTK acc. sg. **gēḍu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *gīha-* ‘help’)
16. subst. TB *keś* A *kaś* ‘number’ ← PTK inf. **ham-xēzi* (OKh. v. *haṃkhīś-*) ‘to count’
17. subst. TB *koto** ‘excrement’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **gūḍu* (OKh. *gūha-* ‘id.’)
18. subst. TB *krañko* ‘chicken’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **kṛṇgu*, OKh. *kṛṇgu* ‘id.’
19. subst. TB *krāke* ‘dirt, filth’ ← LKh. **grāga-* (OKh. *khārgga-* ‘mud’)
20. subst. TB *krāso* ‘vexation’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **grazu*, OKh. **graysu* ‘torment’ (LKh. *gr(r)aysa-*)
21. subst. TB *cowo** ‘robbing’ ← PK acc. sg. **dyūwu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *dyūka-* ‘robber’)
22. subst. TB *tāno* ‘seed, grain’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **dāno*, OKh. *dāno* ‘id.’
23. subst. TB *tono* ‘cloth’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *thaunu* ‘id.’
24. subst. TB *tvāñkaro* ‘ginger’ ← OKh. acc. sg. **tvāṃgarau* ‘id.’ (LKh. *ttuṃgara-*)
25. subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’
26. adv. TB *twār* ‘?’ ← LKh. *tvarā* ‘moreover’ (OKh. *ttuvare*)
27. subst. TB *pātro* A *pātār* ‘alms-bowl’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *pātru* ‘id.’
28. subst. TAB *pānto* ‘friend, companion’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **pando*, OKh. *pando* ‘path’
29. v. TB *paraka-* ‘to prosper, thrive’ ← PTK, PK **farāka-* ‘more’ (OKh. *pharāka-*)
30. subst. TB *parso* A *pārs* ‘letter’ ← PTK acc. sg. **pṛsu* ‘request’ (OKh. *pulsā* ‘to ask’)

31. subst. TB *pito* 'price' ← PK acc. sg. **pīṣu* 'id.' (OKh. *pīha*-)
32. subst. TA *pissañk* 'bhikṣusaṃgha' ← LKh. *bi'saṃga*- (OKh. *bālsaṃga*-)
33. subst. *mrañco* 'black pepper' ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **mirindʷyu*, OKh. **mirimjisyu* 'id.' (LKh. *mirimjisyu*-)
34. subst. TB *yolo* 'evil' ← OKh. acc. sg. *yaulu** 'falsehood'
35. subst. TB *wañc** 'sparrow' ← PTK, PK nom. or acc. sg. **winji* 'id.' (LKh. *biṃji*-)
36. subst. TB *warāñce** A *wāryāñc** 'sand' ← PTK, PK **wirwica*- 'grain (of sand)' (OKh. *ggurvica*-)
37. subst. TAB *śāñcapo* 'mustard' ← PTK acc. sg. **śanzapu* (OKh. *śśaśvāna*-)
38. subst. TB *sāmpo** TA *sāmpām* 'haughtiness, pride' ← PTK acc. sg. *čamfu* 'violence, disturbance' (OKh. *tcampha*-)
39. subst. TB *šarko** 'song, singing' ← PTK acc. sg. **čarko*, A *tsärk* ← PK acc. sg. **tsarko* (OKh. *tcarkā*- 'play, amusement')
40. subst. TB *šinto** (a species of tree) ← OKh. acc. sg. **ššimjso* (LKh. *šimjā*- 'id.')
41. subst. TA *šrittātak* 'well-being' ← OKh. *ššaratāti*- 'id.'
42. v. TB *šort*- A *šarttw*- (PT **šartw*-) 'incite' ← PTK past ptc. **šrtu* 'id.' (OKh. *ā-ššuḍa*-)
43. adj. TB *šupakiñe* 'pertaining to suppositories' ← OKh. **ššūvakīña*- 'id.'
44. subst. TB *špakiye* 'suppository' ← LKh. *švakā*- 'id.'
45. subst. TB *sāñ*, *šāñ*, A *šāñ* 'artifice, expedient, means, method' ← Khot. *saña*- 'id.'
46. v. TB *sanapa*- 'to anoint, embrocate' ← PTK, PK **zənāf*-
47. subst. TB *siñco** (plant name) ← OKh. acc. sg. **siṃjo* 'id.' (LKh. *siṃjā*- 'id.')
48. subst. TB *tsuwo** 'going' (adv. *tsuwai* 'towards') ← PK acc. sg. **tsʰūwu* (OKh. *tsūka*-)

2.2.2. LESS RELIABLE AND DOUBTFUL LOANWORDS

49. v. TB *as*- 'to bring, fetch' ← OKh., LKh. *hays*- 'to drive, send'
[The relation between the two is weak.]
50. adj. (?) TB *ustamo* '?' ← PTK, PK, OKh. acc. sg. *ustamu* 'last'
[The Tocharian B word should rather be read as *-ru stamameṃ* '... from the tree'.]
51. subst. *ešpešse* 'Boerhavia diffusa' ← LKh. *aišta bā* 'id.'
[The phonological changes involved are difficult.]
52. v. TB *ausw*- 'to cry' ← PTK, PK *āuz*- (OKh. *oys*- 'to be angry')
[The Tocharian B word is a hapax of uncertain meaning.]
53. subst. TB *kañko* '?' ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **kaṃgo*, OKh. *kaṃgo* 'skin, husk (of rice)'
[The Tocharian B word is a hapax of uncertain meaning.]
54. subst. TB *kattāke* A *kātak** 'householder' ← OKh. *ggāṭhaa*-
[The word may have been borrowed from Gāndhārī.]
55. particle TA *kar* 'only, just' ← OKh. *karä* 'at all'
[The TA word already has a convincing Tocharian etymology.]
56. subst. TB *karās* A *kārās* 'wilderness' ← LKh. *karāśśā*- 'creeper' (OKh. id.)
[The semantic relation between the two is not convincing.]
57. subst. TA *kāre* 'sword' ← OKh. nom. sg. **kāḍārei*/**kāḍārai* 'id.'
[Other examples for OKh. *ṭ* → TA *r* are lacking]
58. subst. TA *kūñas* 'fight, conflict' ← OKh. *gūrās*- 'to quarrel'
[The correspondence TA *ñ* ~ Khot. *r* is difficult.]

59. subst. TB *kontso**‘?’ ← PTK, PK, OKh. acc. sg. *ggaṃjso* ‘flaw’
[The TB word is a hapax of uncertain meaning.]
60. subst. TB *kompō**‘?’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **gaṃ(ph/f)u*, OKh. *ggaṃphu* ‘plain’
[The TB word is a hapax of uncertain meaning.]
61. subst. TA *kāmpō**‘circle’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **gaṃ(ph/f)u*, OKh. *ggaṃphu* ‘plain’
[The semantic relation is not convincing.]
62. subst. TB *koro* ‘mule’ ← PTK acc. sg. *gōru* ‘wild ass’ or PTK, PK, OKh. *kharu* ‘donkey’
or BMAC
[Several options are possible.]
63. subst. TB *tapatriś* ‘trayastrīṃśa’ ← OKh. *ttāvatrīśa*- ‘id.’
[The word might have been borrowed from Gāndhārī.]
64. subst. TB *pañō* ‘?’ ← PK acc. sg. **bañu* OKh. *bañu* ‘bind’
[The TB word is a hapax.]
65. particle TA *paṃ* ← OKh. *pana*- ‘each, every’
[The meaning of the Tocharian word is uncertain.]
66. subst. TB *mātār*, *mādār* A *mātār* ‘makara (sea-monster)’ ← Khot. **matara*- ‘id.’
[The Khotanese word is not attested with the required orthography.]
67. TB *raso* ‘span’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *haraysa*- ‘extension, expanse’
[There is no trace of Khot. initial *ha*- in the Tocharian B word. If < PTK **hra-rasa*- with haplology, the vocalism is difficult.]
68. TB *wartto*, A *wärt* ‘forest’ ← PTK acc. sg. *wartu* ‘land’
[The semantic relation is not convincing.]
69. subst. TB *waśāko**‘fear’ ← OKh. acc. sg. **vaśāku* ‘id.’
[The Khotanese is not attested and has a different sibilant. A Bactrian derivation is more likely.]
70. subst. TB *wicuko* ‘cheek, (jaw)bone’ ← PK acc. sg. **wi-jwāku* (OKh. *°jv*- ‘to chew’)
[The word is not attested in Khotanese with the same preverb.]
71. postpos. TB *wrantso** ‘against, opposite’ ← OKh. *varālsto* ‘towards’ or PTK, PK **vīrañjsu* (< Plr. **upari-añc-am*)
[The first option is phonologically difficult; the second is a reconstruction with no outcome attested in Khotanese.]
72. adj. (?) TB *śīto* ‘?’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *śśītu* ‘white’
[The Tocharian B word is a hapax of uncertain meaning.]
73. particle TB *śka* ‘close by’ ← LKh. *śka* ‘?’
[The semantics are difficult.]
74. subst. TB *sanu* ‘danger, trouble’ ← OKh. inf. *ysänä* ‘to take by force’
[Final -u in Tocharian B is hard to explain.]
75. subst. TB *sālyakko** ← PK acc. sg. **sīlyakku* (LKh. **sal*- ‘to besmear’)
[The Tocharian word is a isolated hapax, although it surely is a medical term.]
76. subst. TA *sīsā**‘Sītā’ ← OKh. *sīysā*-
[The possibility that the TA word may have been borrowed from Gāndhārī still cannot be ruled out.]
77. subst. TB *sumo* ‘libation (?)’ ← OKh. acc. sg. **ysūmu* ‘broth’ (LKh. *ysūma*-)
[The Tocharian occurrences of the word are difficult.]
78. v. TB *skawa*- ‘to lick’ ← OKh. *skau*- ‘to touch’
[The Tocharian B verb is not well-attested, but the meaning is certain.]

2.2.3. REJECTED LOANWORDS

79. subst. TB *amākṣpānta* ‘wagon-master (?)’ and LKh. *maśpa-* ‘road’
[The two words have no relation.]
80. subst. TB *ampoño* ‘rotteness’ and LKh. acc. sg. **hambvauñu*
[The Tocharian B substantive is a Tocharian formation based on the TB verb *ampa-*.]
81. adj. TB *aṣām* A *āṣām* ‘worthy’ and OKh. *āṣana-* ‘id.’
[The two words are independent borrowings from Bactrian *αζαβο*.]
82. subst. TB *oskiye* A *oške* ‘house’ and LKh. *auskā-* ‘id.’
[The Late Khotanese form is a ghost word.]
83. subst. TA *kāltānk* ‘drum’ and OKh. *ggātā’ka-* ‘bell’
[The two words have no relation.]
84. subst. TAB *kuñcit* ‘sesame’ and OKh. *kumṣata-* ‘id.’
[The two words are borrowings from the same unidentified Middle Iranian source.]
85. adj. TB *kurkamāṣṣe* ‘pertaining to saffron’ and Khot. **kurkuma-* ‘saffron’
[The two words are borrowings from the same unidentified Middle Iranian source.]
86. subst. TA *cospā* (official title) and Tq. *cazbā-*
[The two words are most likely borrowings from a third non-Iranian source.]
87. subst. TA *pāṣim* ‘alms-bowl’ and Khot. *pārgyiña-* ‘treasure’
[The two words have no relation.]
88. subst. TB *peri* A *pari* and PK **pārya-*
[The Tocharian B word has a Tocharian etymology and the Pre-Khotanese word cannot be reconstructed.]
89. adj. TB *mañkāre/mañkāra/mañkarāñca* and Khot. *maṃgāra-*
[The two adjectives were independently borrowed from a third language.]
90. subst. TB *miṣ(ṣ)e* A *miṣi* ‘field’ and Khot. *miṣ(ṣ)a-* ‘id.’
[Most likely independently borrowed from a third unknown language.]
91. subst. TB *mewiyo* ‘tiger’ and PK **mauya-* ‘id.’ (LKh. *mūya-*)
[Most likely BMAC loanwords.]
92. subst. TB *yauyek* ‘labor service’ and LKh. *yyauvaka-* ‘butterfly’
[The two words have no relation.]
93. adj. TB *rapaññe* ‘pertaining to the 12th month’ and Khot. *rrāhaja-*
[The Tocharian B word is a borrowing from Chinese.]
94. subst. TB *wrāko* A *wrok* ‘pearl’ and OKh. *mrāhā-* ‘id.’
[The two words may have been independently borrowed from the same Middle Iranian Hindu-Kush source.]
95. subst. *samākane* ‘cuirass (?)’ and LKh. *samuvā* ‘scale (?)’
[The Late Khotanese word does not exist.]
96. subst. TAB *senik* ‘care, pledge’ and PTK *sēnika-*
[The Tocharian word is a borrowing from Gāndhārī.]
97. v. TB *tserēññ-* ‘to deceive’ and Khot. *jsīr-* ‘id.’
[The Tocharian B verb may have been borrowed from Old Steppe Iranian.]

2.2.4. SOGDIAN LOANWORDS

98. subst. TB *armañik* ‘a kind of textile’ ← Sogd. *rm’nykh* ‘id.’

2.2.5. OLD STEPPE IRANIAN LOANWORDS

99. adj. TB *tseriteke* ‘?’ ← OSIr. **dzaritaka-* ‘yellow’ (cf. Av. *zairita-*)
100. v. TB *tserke**, pl. *tsekwa* ‘deception(s)’ ← OSIr. **dzaraka-* (PIr. **járH-*)

3. PHONOLOGICAL AND MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS AND CHRONOLOGY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

This analysis is based on the corpus of forty-eight reliable etymologies determined in §2.2.1. This chapter has a fourfold aim. First, it aims at describing how Khotanese loanwords were adapted in Tocharian. Second, it seeks to determine a chronology of the loanwords based on these sound correspondences. Third, it attempts to combine the results obtained for the chronology with the morphological features of the Tocharian substantives. Further, it classifies the loanwords according to their part of speech and gender. The following stages are distinguished: Proto-Iranian (PIr.), Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese (PTK), Pre-Khotanese (PK), Old Khotanese (OKh.) and Late Khotanese (LKh.). The labels for the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese and Pre-Khotanese stages are provisional. The former is older than the latter (cf. §6.2.2.1. and §6.2.2.2.), but since the exact position of Tumshuqese is hard to establish for many features, forms posited for Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese may belong to a slightly earlier or later stage. Table 10 shows the stages of Khotanese and Tumshuqese used in this study, together with their corresponding stages of Tocharian in chronological order. For more information on the chronology, see §6.2.2.1.-4.

Approximate dates	Source language	Recipient language
1000-500 BCE	Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese	Proto-Tocharian, immediately before and after the split
500 BCE-400 CE	Pre-Khotanese	Pre-Tocharian A and/or B
From 5 th c. CE onwards	Old Khotanese	(Pre-)Tocharian A and/or Tocharian B
From 6 th to 7 th c. CE onwards	Late Khotanese	Tocharian A and/or B

Table 10. Stages of Khotanese and Tumshuqese together with their corresponding stages of Tocharian in chronological order with approximate dates

3.2. CHRONOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION

3.2.1. LOANWORDS FROM PROTO-TUMSHUQESE-KHOTANESE

3.2.1.1. Criteria

The following features have been taken for attribution of a loanword to this oldest group:³⁷¹

- Possibility to reconstruct the word for Proto-Tocharian: (5), (9), (16), (30), (42).
- TB *rt* ← PTK **rd* (OKh. *ḍ*): (3), (9).
- TB *e* ← PTK **ē*, *e* (OKh. *ī*), with **ē* < PIr. **ai* and **e* < PIr. **a_y*: (5), (15), (16).
- TB *-ñcw-* ← PTK **-nśw-* (< PIr. **-mćw-*): (37).

³⁷¹ Numerals refer to the serial number assigned to each reliable loanword in §2.2.1.

- TB /ər/ ← PTK *_g³⁷²: (42), (30).
- TB ś ← PTK *č (OKh. <tc> /ts/): (38), (39).

3.2.1.2. Loanword list

- (3) subst. TB **ārto* TA *ārt** ‘envoy’ ← PTK acc. sg. *(h)*árdu* (OKh. *haḍa-* ‘id.’)
- (5) subst. TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu** ‘iron’ ← PTK **hénśwanya-* (OKh. *hiśśana-* ‘id.’)
- (9) subst. TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ ← PTK acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala-* ‘head’)
- (15) subst. TB *keto* ‘property, estate’ ← PTK acc. sg. **gēḍu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *gīha-* ‘help’)
- (16) subst. TB *keś* A *kaś* ‘number’ ← PTK inf. **ham-xēzi* (OKh. v. *hamkhīs-* ‘to count’)
- (30) subst. TB *parso* A *pārs* ‘letter’ ← PTK acc. sg. **pṛsu* ‘request’ (OKh. *pulsā* ‘to ask’)
- (38) subst. TB *śāmpo** TA *śāmpām* ‘haughtiness, pride’ ← PTK acc. sg. *čamfu* ‘violence, disturbance’ (OKh. *tcampha-*)
- (39) subst. TB *śarko** ‘song, singing’ ← PTK acc. sg. **čarko* (OKh. *tcarkā-* ‘play, amusement’)
- (37) subst. TAB *śāncapo* ‘mustard’ ← PTK acc. sg. **śanžapu* (OKh. *śśaśvāna-*)
- (42) v. TB *šərt-* A *šərttw-* (PT **šərtw-*) ‘incite’ ← PTK past ptc. **šṛtu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ā-šṣuḍa-*)

3.2.2. LOANWORDS EITHER FROM PROTO-TUMSHUQESE-KHOTANESE OR PRE-KHOTANESE

3.2.2.1. Criteria

This group of loanwords does not show the presence or absence of any of the features listed in §3.2.1.1. Therefore, it is not possible to attribute them with certainty to the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese stage, although there is nothing that contradicts this either. At the same time, their phonological features could also allow an attribution to the Pre-Khotanese age. The presence of features typical of the prehistoric stages of the language (PTK and PK), however, does not permit a classification as historical Khotanese.

3.2.2.2. Loanword list

- (17) subst. TB *koto** ‘excrement’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **gūḍu* (OKh. *gūha-* ‘id.’)
- (29) v. TB *paraka-* ‘to prosper, thrive’ ← PTK, PK **farāka-* ‘more’ (OKh. *pharāka-*)
- (35) subst. TB *wañc** ‘sparrow’ ← PTK, PK nom. or acc. sg. **winji* ‘id.’ (LKh. *biñji-*)
- (36) subst. TB *warāñce** A *wāryāñc** ‘sand’ ← PTK, PK **wirwīca-* ‘grain (of sand)’ (OKh. *ggurvīca-*)
- (46) v. TB *sanapa-* ‘to anoint, embrocate’ ← PTK, PK **zanāf-*

3.2.3. LOANWORDS FROM PRE-KHOTANESE

3.2.3.1. Criteria

The following features have been taken for attribution to the Pre-Khotanese group. Some of them are compatible with an Old Khotanese origin as well. However, this list contains only

³⁷² See §3.3.1.1.d.

words that show at least one of these markers *and* a feature characteristic of PTK or PK that excludes an Old or Late Khotanese origin.

- TB *i* ← PK **ī* (PTK **ē*, OKh. *ī*, < PIr. **ai*): (11), (21).
- PTK intervocalic **-k-* reflected as TB *-w-*: (4), (48).
- Loss of intervocalic *d*: (10).
- TB *u**w-* ← PK **hw-*: (31).
- TA *ts-* ← PK **ts-* (OKh. *tc-*): (39).

3.2.3.2. Loanword list

- (4) subst. TB *u**wātano** A *watam** ‘Khotanese’ ← PK acc. sg. **hwátanu* ‘id.’
- (10) subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* ‘quartan fever’)
- (11) subst. TB *kātso* A *kāts* ‘belly, stomach, abdomen, womb’ ← PK **k^hād^sāna-* ‘stomach’ (LKh. *khāysāna-*)
- (12) subst. TB *kīto** ‘help’ ← PK acc. sg. **gīθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ggīha-* ‘id.’)
- (21) subst. TB *cowo** ‘robbing’ ← PK acc. sg. **dyūwu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *dyūka-* ‘robber’)
- (31) subst. TB *pīto* ‘price’ ← PK acc. sg. **pīθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *pīha-*)
- (39) subst. TA *sār^k* ← PK acc. sg. **tsarko* (OKh. *tcarkā-* ‘play, amusement’)
- (48) subst. TB *tsuwo** ‘going’ (adv. *tsuwai* ‘towards’) ← PK acc. sg. **ts^hūwu* (OKh. *tsūka-* ‘goer’)

3.2.4. LOANWORDS FROM PROTO-TUMSHUQESE-KHOTANESE, PRE-KHOTANESE OR OLD KHOTANESE

3.2.4.1. Criteria

No particular chronological markers could be distinguished for the items belonging to this group. As the ending nom. sg. *-o* excludes a Late Khotanese origin, these lexemes can be attributed to Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese.

3.2.4.2. Loanword list

- (18) subst. TB *krañko* ‘chicken’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **kr̥ngu*, OKh. *kr̥ngu* ‘id.’
- (20) subst. TB *krāso* ‘vexation’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **grazu*, OKh. **graysu* ‘torment’ (LKh. *gr(r)aysa-*)
- (22) subst. TB *tāno* ‘seed, grain’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **dāno*, OKh. *dāno* ‘id.’
- (28) subst. TAB *pānto* ‘friend, companion’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **pando*, OKh. *pando* ‘path’
- (33) subst. *mrañco* ‘black pepper’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **mirind^syu*, OKh. **mirimjsyu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *mirimjsya-*)

3.2.5. LOANWORDS FROM OLD KHOTANESE

3.2.5.1. Criteria

The main criteria for inclusion in this group are the following:

- Absence of features belonging to Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese.
- Nom. sg. ending -o.

3.2.5.2. Loanword list

- (6) subst. TB *orśa* A *orāś** (official title) ← OKh. *aurāśśa-* ‘councillor’
- (8) v. TA *katw-* ‘to ridicule’ ← OKh. past ptc. *khamttu** ‘to laugh’
- (23) subst. TB *tono* ‘cloth’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *thaunu* ‘id.’
- (24) subst. TB *tvāṅkaro* ‘ginger’ ← OKh. acc. sg. **tvāṅgarau* ‘id.’ (LKh. *ttuṅgara-*)
- (25) subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’
- (27) subst. TB *pātro* A *pātār* ‘alms-bowl’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *pātru* ‘id.’
- (34) subst. TB *yolo* ‘evil’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *yaulu** ‘falsehood’
- (40) subst. TB *śinto** (a species of tree) ← OKh. acc. sg. **śśimjso* (LKh. *śimjā-* ‘id.’)
- (41) subst. TA *śrittātak* ‘well-being’ ← OKh. *śśāratāti-* ‘id.’
- (43) adj. TB *ṣupakīṇe* ‘pertaining to suppositories’ ← OKh. **ṣṣūvakīṇa-* ‘id.’
- (47) subst. TB *siṅco** (plant name) ← OKh. acc. sg. **simjo* ‘id.’ (LKh. *simjā-* ‘id.’)

3.2.6. LOANWORDS FROM LATE KHOTANESE

3.2.6.1. Criteria

The main criteria for inclusion in this group are the following:

- Absence of features belonging to Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese.
- Nom. sg. other than -o.

3.2.6.2. Loanword list

- (1) subst. TB *aṅkwaṣ(ṭ)* ‘Asa foetida’ ← LKh. *aṅguṣḍa-* ‘id.’
- (2) v. TB *ampa-* ‘to rot, decay’ ← LKh. *haṃbva-* (< OKh. *haṃbūta-*) ‘fester’
- (7) subst. TB *oś* ‘evil’ ← LKh. *ośa-* ‘id.’
- (13) subst. TB *kuṇi(-mot)* ‘grape wine’ ← LKh. *gūrāṇai (mau)* ‘id.’
- (14) subst. TB *kurkal* ‘bdellium’ ← LKh. *gurgula-* ‘id.’
- (19) subst. TB *krāke* ‘dirt, filth’ ← LKh. **grāga-* (OKh. *khārgga-* ‘mud’)
- (26) adv. TB *twār* ‘?’ ← LKh. *tvarä* ‘moreover’ (OKh. *ttuware*)
- (32) subst. TA *pissañk* ‘bhikṣusaṃgha’ ← LKh. *bi’saṃga-* (OKh. *bālsaṃga-*)
- (44) subst. TB *ṣpakīye* ‘suppository’ ← LKh. *ṣvakā-* ‘id.’
- (45) subst. TB *sāñ, ṣāñ, A ṣāñ* ‘artifice, expedient, means, method’ ← Khot. *saña-* ‘id.’

3.3. PHONOLOGICAL CORRESPONDENCES

In this section, the major phonological correspondences are listed according to the different chronological layers. Only correspondences that are directly attested in the loanword corpus are listed here.

3.3.1. VOWELS

3.3.1.1. Loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese

- a) PIr. **a* > PTK **a* → PT **/a/*
(38) subst. TB *śāmpo** TA *śāmpām* ‘haughtiness, pride’ ← PTK acc. sg. *čamfu* ‘violence, disturbance’ (OKh. *tcampha-*)
- b) PIr. **ai* > PTK **ē* → PT **e*
(15) subst. TB *keto* ‘property, estate’ ← PTK acc. sg. **gēḍu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *gīha-* ‘help’) (16) subst. TB *keś* A *kaś* ‘number’ ← PTK inf. **ham-xēzi* (OKh. v. *hamkhīs-*) ‘to count’
- c) PIr. **a_y* > PTK **ě* → PT **e*
(5) subst. TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu** ‘iron’ ← PTK **hénśwanya-* (OKh. *hīśšana-*) ‘id.’
- d) PIr. **ṛ* > PTK **ṛ* → PT **ṛ*³⁷³
(30) subst. TB *parso* A *pārs* ‘letter’ ← PTK acc. sg. **pṛsu* ‘request’ (OKh. *pulsā* ‘to ask’) (42) v. TB *ṣart-* A *ṣārttw-* (PT **ṣartw-*) ‘incite’ ← PTK past ptc. **ṣṛtu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ā-ṣṣuḍa-*)
- e) PIr. **-am* > PTK **-u* → PT **-o*
(37) subst. TAB *śāñcapo* ‘mustard’ ← PTK acc. sg. **śanżapu* (OKh. *śśaśvāna-*)
- f) PIr. **-ām* > PTK **-o* → PT **-o*
(39) subst. TB *śarko** ‘song, singing’ ← PTK acc. sg. **čarko* (OKh. *tcarkā-* ‘play, amusement’)
- g) PTK **-i* → TAB *-ø*
(16) subst. TB *keś* A *kaś* ‘number’ ← PTK inf. **ham-xēzi* (OKh. v. *hamkhīs-*) ‘to count’

3.3.1.2. Loanwords from Pre-Khotanese

- a) PIr. **a* > PTK **a* > PK **a* → TB */a/*
(10) subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* ‘quar-tan fever’)
- b) PIr. **ā* > PTK **ā* > PK **ā* → TB */a/*
(11) subst. TB *kātso* A *kāts* ‘belly, stomach, abdomen, womb’ ← PK **k^hād^hāna-* ‘stomach’ (LKh. *khāysāna-*)
- c) PIr. **au* > PTK **ō* > PK **ū* → TB *u* or *o*³⁷⁴
(48) subst. TB *tsuwo** ‘going’ (adv. *tsuwai* ‘towards’) ← PK acc. sg. **ts^hūwu* (OKh. *tsūka-*)
(21) subst. TB *cowo** ‘robbing’ ← PK acc. sg. **dyūwu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *dyūka-* ‘robber’)
- d) PIr. **ai* > PTK **ē* > PK **ī* → TB *i*
(12) subst. TB *kito** ‘help’ ← PK acc. sg. **gīḥu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ggīha-* ‘id.’)
(31) subst. TB *pito* ‘price’ ← PK acc. sg. **pīḥu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *pīha-*)
- e) PIr. **-am* > PTK **-u* > PK **-u* → TB *-o*
(10) subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* ‘quar-tan fever’)

³⁷³ For TB *kāmarto** and TA *ārt** an earlier vocalisation **ṛ* has to be posited. My criterion for the reconstruction of **ṛ* for Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese is whether it has left a trace in Old Khotanese or not. Hence *parso* and **ṣartw-* can be used for the reconstruction of PTK **ṛ*.

- f) PIr. *-ām > PTK *-o > PK *-o → TB -o
 (39) subst. TB *šarko** ‘song, singing’ ← PTK acc. sg. *čarko, A *tsärk* ← PK acc. sg. *tsarko (OKh. *tcarkā*- ‘play, amusement’)

3.3.1.3. Loanwords either from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese

- a) PIr. *-i- > PTK, PK *-i- → TB -/ə/-
 (36) subst. TB *warāñce** A *wāryāñc** ‘sand’ ← PTK, PK *wirwica- ‘grain (of sand)’ (OKh. *ggurvica*-)
 b) PTK, PK *-i → TB /ə/ > TB -ø
 (35) subst. TB *wañc** ‘sparrow’ ← PTK, PK nom. or acc. sg. *winji ‘id.’ (LKh. *biñji*-)

3.3.1.4. Loanwords from Old Khotanese

- a) PK *a > OKh. a → TB /a/
 (43) adj. TB *šupakīñe* ‘pertaining to suppositories’ ← OKh. *ššūvakīña- ‘id.’
 b) PK *ā > OKh. ā → TB /a/
 (27) subst. TB *pātro* A *pātār* ‘alms-bowl’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *pātru* ‘id.’
 c) PK *au > OKh. <au> [o] → TB o³⁷⁵
 (23) subst. TB *tono* ‘cloth’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *thaunu* ‘id.’
 (34) subst. TB *yolo* ‘evil’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *yaulu** ‘falsehood’
 d) PK *-ū- > OKh. -ū- → TB -u-
 (43) adj. TB *šupakīñe* ‘pertaining to suppositories’ ← OKh. *ššūvakīña- ‘id.’
 e) PK *i > OKh. i → TB i
 (47) subst. TB *siñco** (plant name) ← OKh. acc. sg. *siñjo ‘id.’ (LKh. *siñjā*- ‘id.’)
 f) PIr. *-am > PTK, PK, OKh. *-u → TB -o, TA -ø
 (23) subst. TB *tono* ‘cloth’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *thaunu* ‘id.’
 (25) subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’
 g) PIr. *-ām > PTK, PK, OKh. *o → TB -o
 (40) subst. TB *śinto** (a species of tree) ← OKh. acc. sg. *śśiñjo (LKh. *śiñjā*- ‘id.’)

3.3.1.5. Loanwords from Late Khotanese

- a) OKh. a > LKh. a → TB /a/
 (1) subst. TB *añkwaṣ(t)* ‘Asa foetida’ ← LKh. *aṃguṣḍa*- ‘id.’
 b) OKh. ā > LKh. ā → TB /a/
 (19) subst. TB *krāke* ‘dirt, filth’ ← LKh. *grāga- (OKh. *khārgga*- ‘mud’)
 c) OKh. -u (< PIr. -am) > LKh. [ə] → TB ø, e³⁷⁶ TA ø
 (1) subst. TB *añkwaṣ(t)* ‘Asa foetida’ ← LKh. *aṃguṣḍa*- ‘id.’
 (19) subst. TB *krāke* ‘dirt, filth’ ← LKh. *grāga- (OKh. *khārgga*- ‘mud’)

³⁷⁴ Apparently by *o*-umlaut of *u* within Tocharian B (*u_o* > *o_o*). The items showing umlaut may possibly have been borrowed earlier.

³⁷⁵ This proves the early monophthongisation of OKh. *au* to *o*, borrowed into TB as *o*, as also shown by the evidence of the manuscripts.

3.3.2. CONSONANTS

3.3.2.1. Loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese

- a) PIr. **k* > PTK **k* → TB *k*
 (9) subst. TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ ← Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala*- ‘head’)
- b) PIr. **x*- > PTK **x*- → TB *k*-
 (16) subst. TB *keś* A *kaś* ‘number’ ← PTK inf. **ham-xēzi* (OKh. v. *hamkhiś*-) ‘to count’
- c) PIr. **č* > PTK **č* → TB *ś*
 (38) subst. TB *śāmpo** TA *śāmpām* ‘haughtiness, pride’ ← PTK acc. sg. *čamfu* ‘violence, disturbance’ (OKh. *tcampha*-)
 (39) subst. TB *śarko** ‘song, singing’ ← PTK acc. sg. **čarko* (OKh. *tcarkā*- ‘play, amusement’)
- d) PIr. **g* > PTK **g* → TB *k*
 (15) subst. TB *keto* ‘property, estate’ ← PTK acc. sg. **gēðu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *gīha*- ‘help’)
- e) PIr. **t* > PTK **t* → TB *t*
 (42) v. TB *šart*- A *šarttw*- (PT **šartw*-) ‘incite’ ← PTK past ptc. **šrtu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ā-šsuḍa*-)
- f) PIr. **ḡ* > PTK **ḡ* → TB *t*
 (15) subst. TB *keto* ‘property, estate’ ← PTK acc. sg. **gēðu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *gīha*- ‘help’)
- g) PIr. **p* > PTK **p* → TB *p*
 (30) subst. TB *parso* A *pārs* ‘letter’ ← PTK acc. sg. **pṛsu* ‘request’ (OKh. *pulsā* ‘to ask’)
- h) PIr. **f* > PTK **f/p*³⁷⁷ → TB *p*
 (38) subst. TB *śāmpo** TA *śāmpām* ‘haughtiness, pride’ ← PTK acc. sg. *čamfu* ‘violence, disturbance’ (OKh. *tcampha*-)
- i) PIr. **m* > PTK **m* → TB *m*
 (9) subst. TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ ← Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala*- ‘head’)
- j) PIr. **r* > PTK **r* → TB *r*
 (39) subst. TB *śarko** ‘song, singing’ ← PTK acc. sg. **čarko* (OKh. *tcarkā*- ‘play, amusement’)
- k) PTK **ś* → TB *ś*
 (37) subst. TAB *śāñcapo* ‘mustard’ ← PTK acc. sg. **śanzapu* (OKh. *śśāśvāna*-)
- l) PTK **š* → TB *ś*
 (42) v. TB *šart*- A *šarttw*- (PT **šartw*-) ‘incite’ ← PTK past ptc. **šrtu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ā-šsuḍa*-)
- m) PIr. **s* > PTK **s* → TB *s*
 (30) subst. TB *parso* A *pārs* ‘letter’ ← PTK acc. sg. **pṛsu* ‘request’ (OKh. *pulsā* ‘to ask’)
- n) PIr. **mčw*- > PTK **nśw*- → TB *-ñcw*-
 (5) subst. TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu** ‘iron’ ← PTK **hénśwanya*- (OKh. *hiśśana*-) ‘id.’

³⁷⁶ The only example of a Late Khotanese *ā*-stem among the loanwords into Tocharian (viz. *švakā*- ‘suppository’) shows a nom. sg. in *-īye* in Tocharian B (TB *špakiye*), which could be interpreted as an effort to maintain the feminine gender in the borrowed lexeme (see §2.1. s.v.).

³⁷⁷ As in the case of PIr. **x*, the Tocharian evidence for the pronunciation of this sound in Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese is not conclusive.

- o) PTK *-nž-* → TB *-ñc-*
(37) subst. TAB *šāñcapo* ‘mustard’ ← PTK acc. sg. **šanžapu* (OKh. *ššašvāna-*)
- p) PIR. **-rt-* > PTK **-rd-* → TB *-rt-*
(3) subst. TB **ārto* TA *ārt** ‘envoy’ ← PTK acc. sg. **(h)ārdu* (OKh. *haḍa-*) ‘id.’
(9) subst. TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ ← Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala-* ‘head’)

3.3.2.2. Loanwords from Pre-Khotanese

- a) PTK **k* > PK **k* → TB *k*
(10) subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* ‘quar-tan fever’)
- b) PTK **x* > PK **k^h-* (or still **x?*) → TB *k-*
(11) subst. TB *kātso* A *kāts* ‘belly, stomach, abdomen, womb’ ← PK **k^hād^hāna-* ‘stom-ach’ (LKh. *khāysāna-*)
- c) PTK **č* > PK **ts* → TA *ts*
(39) TA *tsärk* ← PK **tsarkā-* (OKh. *tcarkā-* ‘play, amusement’)
- d) PTK **g* > PK **g* → TB *k*
(12) subst. TB *kito** ‘help’ ← PK acc. sg. **gīθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ggīha-* ‘id.’)
- e) PTK **t* > PK **t* → TB *t*
(4) subst. TB *uwātano** A *wataṃ** ‘Khotanese’ ← PK acc. sg. **hwátanu* ‘id.’
- f) PTK **ǵ* > PK **ǵ* → TB *t*
(12) subst. TB *kito** ‘help’ ← PK acc. sg. **gīθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ggīha-* ‘id.’)
(31) subst. TB *pito* ‘price’ ← PK acc. sg. **pīḍu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *pīha-*)
- g) PTK **n* > PK **n* → TB *n*
(4) subst. TB *uwātano** A *wataṃ** ‘Khotanese’ ← PK acc. sg. **hwátanu* ‘id.’
- h) PTK **p* > PK **p* → TB *p*
(31) subst. TB *pito* ‘price’ ← PK acc. sg. **pīḍu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *pīha-*)
- i) PTK **r* > PK **r* → TB *r*
(39) TA *tsärk* ← PK **tsarkā-* (OKh. *tcarkā-* ‘play, amusement’)
- j) PTK **-VkV-* > PK **-VwV-* → TB *-VwV-*
(21) subst. TB *cowo** ‘robbing’ ← PK acc. sg. **dyūwu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *dyūka-* ‘robber’)
(10) subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* ‘quar-tan fever’)
(48) subst. TB *tsuwo** ‘going’ (adv. *tsuwai* ‘towards’) ← PK acc. sg. **ts^hūwu* (OKh. *tsūka-*)
- k) PTK **s* > PK **s* → TB *s*
(10) subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* ‘quar-tan fever’)
- l) PTK **čy-* > PK **ts^h-* → TB *ts-*
(48) subst. TB *tsuwo** ‘going’ (adv. *tsuwai* ‘towards’) ← PK acc. sg. **ts^hūwu* (OKh. *tsūka-*)
- m) PK **dy-* → TB *c-*
(21) subst. TB *cowo** ‘robbing’ ← PK acc. sg. **dyūwu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *dyūka-* ‘robber’)

- n) PK *-ds- → TB -ts-
 (11) subst. TB *kāts* A *kāts* ‘belly, stomach, abdomen, womb’ ← PK **k^hād^hāna*- ‘stomach’ (LKh. *khāysāna*-)
 o) PK *hw- → TB _uw-, TA w-
 (4) subst. TB _u*wātano** A *wataṃ** ‘Khotanese’ ← PK acc. sg. **hwátanu* ‘id.’

3.3.2.3. Loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese

- a) PTK, PK *j- → TB c
 (35) subst. TB *wañc** ‘sparrow’ ← PTK, PK nom. or acc. sg. **winji* ‘id.’ (LKh. *biṃji*-)
 b) PTK, PK *w- (> OKh. b-) → TB w-
 (35) subst. TB *wañc** ‘sparrow’ ← PTK, PK nom. or acc. sg. **winji* ‘id.’ (LKh. *biṃji*-)
 (36) subst. TB *warāñce** A *wāryāñc** ‘sand’ ← PTK, PK **wirwica*- ‘grain (of sand)’ (OKh. *ggurvica*-)
 c) PTK, PK *z- → TB s
 (46) v. TB *sanapa*- ‘to anoint, embrocate’ ← PTK, PK **zənāf*-

3.3.2.4. Loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese

- a) PTK, PK *d, OKh. d → TB t
 (22) subst. TB *tāno* ‘seed, grain’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **dāno*, OKh. *dāno* ‘id.’
 b) PTK, PK *-dzy-, OKh. -jsy- → TB -c-
 (33) subst. *mrañco* ‘black pepper’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **mirind^hyu*, OKh. **mirimjsyu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *mirimjsya*-)

3.3.2.5. Loanwords from Old Khotanese

- a) OKh. k → TB k
 (43) adj. TB *ṣupakīṇe* ‘pertaining to suppositories’ ← OKh. **ṣṣūvakīṇa*- ‘id.’
 b) OKh. kh → TA k
 (8) v. TA *katw*- ‘to ridicule’ ← OKh. past ptc. *khaṃttu** ‘to laugh’
 c) OKh. g → TB k
 (24) subst. TB *tvāṅkaro* ‘ginger’ ← OKh. acc. sg. **tvāṅgarau* ‘id.’ (LKh. *ttuṅgara*-)
 d) OKh. j → TB c
 (47) subst. TB *siñco** (plant name) ← OKh. acc. sg. **siṃjo* ‘id.’ (LKh. *siṃjā*- ‘id.’)
 e) OKh. js → TB ts
 (40) subst. TB *śintso** (a species of tree) ← OKh. acc. sg. **śśiṃjso* (LKh. *śiṃjā*- ‘id.’)
 f) OKh. ñ → TB ñ
 (43) adj. TB *ṣupakīṇe* ‘pertaining to suppositories’ ← OKh. **ṣṣūvakīṇa*- ‘id.’
 g) OKh. t → TAB t
 (41) subst. TA *śrittātak* ‘well-being’ ← OKh. *śśāratāti*- ‘id.’
 (25) subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’
 h) OKh. th → TB t
 (23) subst. TB *tono* ‘cloth’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *thaunu* ‘id.’
 i) OKh. d → TA t
 (25) subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’

- j) OKh. *n* → TB *n*
(23) subst. TB *tono* ‘cloth’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *thaunu* ‘id.’
- k) OKh. *p* → TB *p*
(27) subst. TB *pātro* A *pātār* ‘alms-bowl’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *pātru* ‘id.’
- l) OKh. *y-* → TB *y-*
(34) subst. TB *yolo* ‘evil’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *yaulu** ‘falsehood’
- m) OKh. *r* → TB *r*
(24) subst. TB *tvānkaro* ‘ginger’ ← OKh. acc. sg. **tvāmgarau* ‘id.’ (LKh. *ttuṃgara-*)
- n) OKh. *l* → TB *l*
(34) subst. TB *yolo* ‘evil’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *yaulu** ‘falsehood’
- o) OKh. *v* → TB *w, v, p*
(25) subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’
(24) subst. TB *tvānkaro* ‘ginger’ ← OKh. acc. sg. **tvāmgarau* ‘id.’ (LKh. *ttuṃgara-*)
(43) adj. TB *ṣupakīṇe* ‘pertaining to suppositories’ ← OKh. **ṣṣūvakīṇa-* ‘id.’
- p) OKh. *śś* → TB *ś*
(40) subst. TB *śintso** (a species of tree) ← OKh. acc. sg. **śśimjso* (LKh. *śimjā-* ‘id.’)
- q) OKh. *ṣṣ* → TB *ṣ*
(43) adj. TB *ṣupakīṇe* ‘pertaining to suppositories’ ← OKh. **ṣṣūvakīṇa-* ‘id.’
- r) OKh. *s* → TB *s*
(47) subst. TB *siṅco** (plant name) ← OKh. acc. sg. **simjo* ‘id.’ (LKh. *simjā-* ‘id.’)

3.3.2.6. Loanwords from Late Khotanese

- a) LKh. *k* → TB *k*
(1) subst. TB *aṅkwaṣ(t)* ‘Asa foetida’ ← LKh. *aṃguṣḍa-* ‘id.’
- b) LKh. *g* → TB *k*
(14) subst. TB *kurkal* ‘bdellium’ ← LKh. *gurgula-* ‘id.’
- c) LKh. *ñ* → TB *ñ*
(45) subst. TB *sāñ, ṣāñ, A ṣāñ* ‘artifice, expedient, means, method’ ← Khot. *saña-* ‘id.’
- d) LKh. *t* → TB *t*
(26) adv. TB *twār* ‘?’ ← LKh. *tvarä* ‘moreover’ (OKh. *ttuvare*)
- e) LKh. *b* → TAB *p*
(32) subst. TA *pissanik* ‘bhikṣusaṃgha’ ← LKh. *bi’saṃga-* (OKh. *bālsaṃga-*)
(2) v. TB *ampa-* ‘to rot, decay’ ← LKh. *haṃbva-* (< OKh. *haṃbūta-*) ‘fester’
- f) LKh. *r* → TB *r*
(19) subst. TB *krāke* ‘dirt, filth’ ← LKh. **grāga-* (OKh. *khārgga-* ‘mud’)
- g) LKh. *l* → TB *l*
(14) subst. TB *kurkal* ‘bdellium’ ← LKh. *gurgula-* ‘id.’
- h) LKh. *v* → TB *p, ø*
(44) subst. TB *ṣpakīye* ‘suppository’ ← LKh. *ṣvakā-* ‘id.’
(2) v. TB *ampa-* ‘to rot, decay’ ← LKh. *haṃbva-* (< OKh. *haṃbūta-*) ‘fester’
- i) LKh. *ś* → TB *ś*
(7) subst. TB *oś* ‘evil’ ← LKh. *ośa-* ‘id.’
- j) LKh. *ṣ* → TB *ṣ*
(44) subst. TB *ṣpakīye* ‘suppository’ ← LKh. *ṣvakā-* ‘id.’

- k) LKh. *s* → TB *s, ss*
(32) subst. TA *pissāṅk* ‘bhikṣusaṃgha’ ← LKh. *bi’saṃga-* (OKh. *bālsaṃga-*)
- l) LKh. *h-* → TB *ø*
(2) v. TB *ampa-* ‘to rot, decay’ ← LKh. *haṃbva-* (< OKh. *haṃbūta-*) ‘fester’
- m) LKh. *-bv-* → TB *-p-*
(2) v. TB *ampa-* ‘to rot, decay’ ← LKh. *haṃbva-* (< OKh. *haṃbūta-*) ‘fester’
- n) LKh. *-ṣḍ-* → TB *-ṣt-*
(1) subst. TB *āṅkwaṣ(t)* ‘Asa foetida’ ← LKh. *aṃguṣḍa-* ‘id.’
- o) LKh. *ṣv-* → TB *ṣp-*
(44) subst. TB *ṣpakīye* ‘suppository’ ← LKh. *ṣvakā-* ‘id.’

3.4. MORPHOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION ACCORDING TO TOCHARIAN INFLECTIONAL CLASSES

3.4.1. NOM. SG. -*ø* (NO FINAL VOWEL)

3.4.1.1. Loanword list

- (1) subst. TB *āṅkwaṣ(t)* ‘Asa foetida’ ← LKh. *aṃguṣḍa-* ‘id.’
- (7) subst. TB *oś* ‘evil’ ← LKh. *ośa-* ‘id.’
- (14) subst. TB *kurkal* ‘bdellium’ ← LKh. *gurgula-* ‘id.’
- (16) subst. TB *keś* A *kaś* ‘number’ ← PTK inf. **ham-xēzi* (OKh. v. *haṃkhiś-*) ‘to count’
- (35) subst. TB *wañc** ‘sparrow’ ← PTK, PK nom. or acc. sg. **winji* ‘id.’ (LKh. *biṃji-*)
- (45) subst. TB *sāñ, ṣāñ, A ṣāñ* ‘artifice, expedient, means, method’ ← LKh. *saña-* ‘id.’

3.4.1.2. Commentary

Items (1), (7) and (45) are loanwords from Late Khotanese. The absence of the final vowel probably reflects the general weakening and ultimate loss of final vowels that are typical of this stage of Khotanese (cf. e.g. SGS: 254).

In items (16) and (35), however, the absence of a final vowel is due to a word-final Khotanese vowel here noted as **-i* (see §2.1. for discussion), borrowed as Tocharian **ə*. It could have been lost regularly by the Tocharian A and Classical Tocharian B stages.

3.4.2. NOM. SG. -*E*

3.4.2.1. Loanword list

- (19) subst. TB *krāke* ‘dirt, filth’ ← LKh. **grāga-* (OKh. *khārgga-* ‘mud’)
- (36) subst. TB *warāñce** A *wāryāñc** ‘sand’ ← PTK, PK **wirwīca-* ‘grain (of sand)’ (OKh. *ggurvīca-*)

3.4.2.2. Commentary

The declension pattern of item (36) is due to later inner-Tocharian analogy (see §2.1. s.v. *warāñce*). The ending of *krāke* might be explained as a later inner-Tocharian morphological adaptation, but it remains unclear.

3.4.3. NOM. SG. -O, OBL. SG. -A

3.4.3.1. Loanword list

- (4) subst. TB *„wātano** A *watam** ‘Khotanese’ ← PK acc. sg. **hwátanu* ‘id.’
- (5) subst. TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu** ‘iron’ ← PTK **hénśwanya-* (OKh. *hīśśana-*) ‘id.’
- (9) subst. TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ ← PTK acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala-* ‘head’)
- (10) subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* ‘quartan fever’)
- (11) subst. TB *kātso* A *kāts* ‘belly, stomach, abdomen, womb’ ← PK **k^hād^sāna-* ‘stomach’ (LKh. *khāysāna-*)
- (12) subst. TB *kito** ‘help’ ← PK acc. sg. **gīθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ggīha-* ‘id.’)
- (15) subst. TB *keto* ‘property, estate’ ← PTK acc. sg. **gēθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *gīha-* ‘help’)
- (22) subst. TB *tāno* ‘seed, grain’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **dāno*, OKh. *dāno* ‘id.’
- (38) subst. TB *šāmpo** TA *šāmpām* ‘haughtiness, pride’ ← PTK acc. sg. **čamfu* ‘violence, disturbance’ (OKh. *tcampha-*)
- (39) subst. TB *šarko** ‘song, singing’ ← PTK acc. sg. **čarko*, A *tsärk* ← PK acc. sg. **tsarko* (OKh. *tcarkā-* ‘play, amusement’)

3.4.3.2. Commentary

With ten items, this is the most extensive class. As already noted (see §1.6. and §2.1. under each entry), I explain the frequent Tocharian B nom. sg. ending *-o* as an adaptation of the Khotanese acc. sg. ending *-u*, or, in rare cases, of the acc. sg. f. ending *-o*.

The nom. sg. in *-o* is shared by three classes of Tocharian substantives (*-o/-a*, *-o/-ai* and *-o/-o*) that contain loanwords from Khotanese. As the items that show a nom. sg. in *-o* were not borrowed later than the Old Khotanese stage, it follows that the ending nom. sg. *-o* was characteristic of loanwords from the Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese stage.

The *-o/-a* class includes only items borrowed from the prehistoric stages of the language, i.e. Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese and Pre-Khotanese. Since the *-o/-ai* class (see §3.4.4.) includes also items from Old Khotanese, the oldest loanwords from Khotanese were adapted as members of the *-o/-a* class. This chronological difference may correspond to the historical explanation of these two classes of substantives in Tocharian B by Del Tomba (2020: 154–59), according to which there was originally only one *-o/-a* class that split into an *-o/-a* and an *-o/-ai* class in Pre-Tocharian B. As a consequence, a *terminus post quem* for the borrowings included in the *-o/-ai* class, can be posited in the Pre-Tocharian B stage. It is to be noted that no Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese borrowings are included in this class. On the contrary, it seems that loanwords from Pre-Khotanese could be adapted as members of the *-o/-a* class (cf. *„wātano** and *kito**). Therefore, items (4) and (11) of the *-o/-ai* class, for which no clear features for classification as Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese could be identified, may be assigned to the Pre-Khotanese stage rather than to Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese.

3.4.4. NOM. -O, OBL. SG. -AI

3.4.4.1. Loanword list

- (17) subst. TB *koto** ‘excrement’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **gūḍu* (OKh. *gūha*- ‘id.’)
- (21) subst. TB *cowo** ‘robbing’ ← PK acc. sg. **dyūwu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *dyūka*- ‘robber’)
- (24) subst. TB *tvāṅkaro* ‘ginger’ ← OKh. acc. sg. **tvāṅgarau* ‘id.’ (LKh. *ttuṅgara*-)
- (27) subst. TB *pātro* A *pātār* ‘alms-bowl’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *pātru* ‘id.’
- (28) subst. TAB *pānto* ‘friend, companion’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **pando*, OKh. *pando* ‘path’
- (40) subst. TB *śinto** (a species of tree) ← OKh. acc. sg. **śśiṃjso* (LKh. *śiṃjā*- ‘id.’)
- (44) subst. TB *ṣpakiye* ‘suppository’ ← LKh. *ṣvakā*- ‘id.’
- (47) subst. TB *siṅco** (plant name) ← OKh. acc. sg. **siṃjo* ‘id.’ (LKh. *siṃjā*- ‘id.’)
- (48) subst. TB *tsuwo** ‘going’ (adv. *tsuwai* ‘towards’) ← PK acc. sg. **ts^hūwu* (OKh. *tsūka*-)

3.4.4.2. Commentary

No item from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese has been found within this group. Item 1 may be more likely Pre-Khotanese and item 5 Pre-Khotanese or Old Khotanese. This group of substantives was borrowed later than the -o/-a group (cf. also §3.4.3.2.).

3.4.5. NOM. SG. -O, OBL. SG. -O

3.4.5.1. Loanword list

- (20) subst. TB *krāso* ‘vexation’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **grazu*, OKh. **graysu* ‘torment’ (LKh. *gr(r)aysa*-)
- (30) subst. TB *parso* A *pārs* ‘letter’ ← PTK acc. sg. **pṛsu* ‘request’ (OKh. *pulsā* ‘to ask’)
- (31) subst. TB *pito* ‘price’ ← PK acc. sg. **pīḍu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *pīha*-)
- (34) subst. TB *yolo* ‘evil’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *yaulu** ‘falsehood’
- (37) subst. TAB *śāṅcapo* ‘mustard’ ← PTK acc. sg. **śānzāpu* (OKh. *śśāśvāna*-)

3.4.5.2. Commentary

This inflectional class includes both very old loanwords, (30) and (37), and loanwords from Old Khotanese (34). On the whole, however, it does not seem to have been a very frequent pattern. It is possible that items (20) and (30) were reanalysed as *palsko*-type deverbal abstract nouns. Item (34) may have been an ancient neuter, but this is questionable (see §2.1. s.v. *yolo*). It is unclear why items (31) and (37) were included in this class.

3.4.6. NOM. SG. -A, OBL. SG. -AI

3.4.6.1. Loanword list

- (6) subst. TB *orśa* A *orās** (official title) ← OKh. *aurāśśa*- ‘councillor’

3.4.6.2. Commentary

This category includes just one, recent borrowing. On the particular inflectional pattern of TB *orśa* A *orās* see the discussion in §2.1.

3.4.7. ONLY NOM. SG. -O ATTESTED

3.4.7.1. Loanword list

- (23) subst. TB *tono* ‘cloth’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *thaunu* ‘id.’
- (33) subst. *mrañco* ‘black pepper’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **mirind^zyu*, OKh. **mirimjsyu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *mirimjsya-*)

3.4.7.2. Commentary

The oblique case of these two substantives is not attested, so that it is not possible to know their original inflectional patterns. On the basis of the dating of item (23) to the Old Khotanese period according to other criteria (*au* > *o*), its obl. sg. would be expected to be in *-ai*.

3.4.8. ONLY FINAL -I ATTESTED

3.4.8.1. Loanword list

- (13) subst. TB *kuñi(-mot)* ‘grape wine’ ← LKh. *gūrāṇai (mau)* ‘id.’

3.4.8.2. Commentary

The unique ending *-i* of *kuñi* in *kuñi-mot* may be due to weakening of an original *-a-* in the Late Khotanese source form due its word-final position in the first member of a compound (see the discussion in §2.1. s.v.).

3.4.9. ONLY TA (NO CORRESPONDING TB FORM)

3.4.9.1. Loanword list

- (3) subst. TB **ārto* TA *ārt** ‘envoy’ ← PTK acc. sg. **(h)ārdu* (OKh. *haḍa-*) ‘id.’
- (25) subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvaṃdanu* ‘id.’
- (32) subst. TA *pissañk* ‘bhikṣusaṃgha’ ← LKh. *bi’saṃga-* (OKh. *bālsaṃga-*)
- (41) subst. TA *śrittātak* ‘well-being’ ← OKh. *śśāratāti-* ‘id.’

3.4.9.2. Commentary

Whereas item (3) was borrowed at an older date, probably from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese (see s.v.), and could be reconstructed also for Tocharian B, items (25), (32) and (41) are more recent loanwords attested only in Tocharian A, with no equivalent in B. In my view, it is not by chance that they are all Buddhist terms (see §2.1. s.v. *pissañk* and §4.3.4.).

3.4.10. ON THE BORROWING PATH KHOT. ACC. SG. *-u* → TB NOM. SG. *-o*

As noted in §3.4.3.2., I consider the Tocharian B nom. sg. ending *-o* as an adaptation of the Khotanese acc. sg. m. ending *-u* and of the acc. sg. f. ending *-o*. This identification is based on three main arguments:

- Loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese and Old Khotanese were adapted into three different morphological classes in Tocharian B (*-o*, *-a*; *-o*, *-ai*; *-o*, *-o*).
- *-u* and *-o* are phonetically similar.
- A parallel adaptation path can be observed for a group of Middle Iranian loanwords in Armenian.

The claim that it is the nom. sg. *-o* that was borrowed from Khotanese, and not the obl. sg. *-a* or *-ai*, is justified by the observation that *-o* is the only ending that is found in all three Tocharian morphological classes containing the oldest loanwords from PTK, PK or OKh. From the phonetic point of view, it is less likely that the obl. sg. *-a* was borrowed because, except for the voc. sg. and the nom. pl., no corresponding ending can be found in Khotanese (see table 11). Moreover, its explanatory value would be limited to the *-o/-a* class. Therefore, it seems justified to consider the Tocharian B nom. sg. ending *-o* as the borrowed ending.

Now the question of the source of the *-o* arises. As the majority of the Khotanese source words belong to the *a*-stems, the most natural assumption is that the source ending of TB *-o* should be sought in this nominal paradigm. Indeed, a look at the endings belonging to *a*-stems in Old Khotanese is sufficient to justify the proposed borrowing path phonetically:

	Singular	Plural
Nom.	<i>-ä/-i</i> < <i>*-ah</i> (SGS: 251–52)	<i>-a</i> , <i>-e</i> < <i>*-ā</i> , <i>*-āh</i> , etc. (SGS: 264, Del Tomba 2022)
Voc.	<i>-a</i> < <i>*-a</i> (SGS: 254)	<i>-yau</i> = instr.-abl. pl. (SGS: 265)
Acc.	<i>-u</i> < <i>*-am</i> (SGS: 255)	<i>-a</i> , <i>-e</i> = nom. pl.
Gen.-dat.	<i>-i</i> < <i>*-ahya</i> (Sims-Williams 1990: 278–79)	<i>-ānu</i> < <i>*-ānam</i> (Peyrot 2018c)
Instr.-abl.	<i>-āna</i> < <i>*-anā</i> (Sims-Williams 1990: 277–78)	<i>-yau</i> < <i>*-ābiš</i> (SGS: 268)
Loc.	<i>-i</i> < <i>*-ayā</i> (SGS: 260)	<i>-uvo</i> < <i>*-aišu</i> (Emmerick and Maggi 1991: 71)

Table 11. Endings of the *a*-stems in Khotanese and their origin

The only endings containing back vowels in the entire paradigm are the acc. sg., the voc. pl., the instr.-abl. pl., the gen.-dat. pl., and the loc. pl. Since the plural endings contain consonantal elements that have no correspondence in the Tocharian B ending *-o*, the only likely counterpart of the Tocharian ending is the Khotanese acc. sg. *-u*. As Tocharian B has no nominal class with nom. sg. *-u*, the ending was adapted to the phonetically nearest nom. sg. available, i.e. *-o*. As a parallel for this adaptation process one may quote TB *mālo* ‘type of wine’, which was borrowed from Pre-Bactrian **malu* ‘wine’ (cf. Bactr. *μαλο* ‘id.’ < **maδu-*).³⁷⁸

³⁷⁸ On this loanword see Bernard and Chen (2022: 17 with fn. 41) and Del Tomba (2020: 126).

The reconstruction of this state of affairs, as straightforward as it may seem, has nonetheless some problematic aspects. The chief difficulty appears how to justify a borrowing from the *accusative* case and not from the *nominative*. However, a very similar situation is found in a group of Middle Iranian loanwords in Armenian that were discussed by Korn (2013, 2021: 116). Already Olsen (1999: 860–61) in her treatment of the noun in Biblical Armenian pointed to the fact that a group of Iranian words belonging to the *a*- and *ā*-stems were borrowed as *u*- or *o*-stems into Armenian. The number of substantives involved is not small: Olsen (2005: 477–78) lists 20 *o*-stems and 11 *u*-stems borrowed from Iranian *a*-/*ā*-stems. Additionally, two Iranian *man*-stems were also borrowed as *u*-stems into Armenian. The possible justifications for this phenomenon have been variously discussed in the scholarly literature.³⁷⁹ Olsen (2005: 477–80), disagreeing with previous authors, put forward the hypothesis that these loanwords could show the preservation of word-final vowels in both languages. Thus, the problem would lie in the exact determination of the source of word-final *-u* (or *-o*) in the Middle Iranian source. The solution adopted by Olsen (l.c.) involves the analysis of this group of loanwords as borrowed from an Eastern Iranian language (Henning's 'Parnian'³⁸⁰) where the acc. sg. ending was *-u* (< **-am*, cf. Sogd. *-w*). Such an assumption, however, is difficult to justify and Korn (2013) has convincingly argued for its inconsistency on geographical and linguistic grounds. In the same article, Korn (l.c.) rather argues for an unattested Western Middle Iranian source of the loanwords in question. This unattested Western Middle Iranian dialect showed an acc. sg. in *-u*, the outcome of a Late Old Iranian ending **-əm* (< **-am*). The later remains of this ending can be seen in the Manichaean Middle Persian ending *-w* before some clitics, for which see in detail Sims-Williams (1981).

The Armenian situation offers a perfect parallel for the state of affairs in Tocharian B. In both cases, the source form implies an Iranian acc. sg. of *a*- or *ā*-stems that was adapted as an *u*- or *o*-stem (Armenian) or as a nom. sg. *-o* (Tocharian B). An additional element of agreement between the two situations is also the adaptation of final *-u* substantives not only as *u*-stems in Armenian, but also as *o*-stems, exactly as in the Tocharian B counterpart.

It is important to note that the adaptation of the Khotanese acc. sg. as nom. sg. *-o* in Tocharian B implies that the Khotanese final vowel *-u* was retained in Tocharian at the time of borrowing. This has consequences for the relative chronology of loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese as opposed to those from Old Steppe Iranian. The preservation of final *-u* anchors the loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese in a *later* stage than those from Old Steppe Iranian, where final *-u* underwent the same fate as Proto-Indo-European final *-u* and was lost (cf. TB *tsain* 'weapon' 'arrow' ← OSIr. **dʰainu*-).³⁸¹

Of the three arguments discussed in this section, the first concerns Tocharian B morphology, the second is a phonological one and the third describes a parallel situation with Middle Iranian loanwords in Biblical Armenian. Thus, three independent arguments concur to justify the proposed explanation of the source of final *-o* in Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese and Old Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian.

³⁷⁹ For a summary of the scholarly literature related to this issue before Olsen (1999, 2005) and Korn (2013), see Korn (2013: 74–75).

³⁸⁰ See Henning (1958: 93).

³⁸¹ See Bernard (2023: 78).

3.5. LOANWORDS ACCORDING TO PART OF SPEECH AND GENDER

3.5.1. LIST OF LOANWORDS ACCORDING TO THEIR PART OF SPEECH

3.5.1.1. Substantives

1. (1) subst. TB *añkwaṣ(ṭ)* ‘Asa foetida’ ← LKh. *aṃguṣḍa-* ‘id.’
2. (3) subst. TB **ārto* TA *ārt** ‘envoy’ ← PTK acc. sg. **(h)ārdū* (OKh. *haḍa-* ‘id.’)
3. (4) subst. TB *„wātano** A *wataṃ** ‘Khotanese’ ← PK acc. sg. **hwātanu* ‘id.’
4. (5) subst. TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu** ‘iron’ ← PTK **hénšwanya-* (OKh. *hiśšana-*) ‘id.’
5. (6) subst. TB *orša* A *oräš** (official title) ← OKh. *auräšša-* ‘councillor’
6. (7) subst. TB *oś* ‘evil’ ← LKh. *ośa-* ‘id.’
7. (9) subst. TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ ← PTK acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala-* ‘head’)
8. (10) subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* ‘quartan fever’)
9. (11) subst. TB *kātso* A *kāts* ‘belly, stomach, abdomen, womb’ ← PK **k^hād^sāna-* ‘stomach’ (LKh. *khāysāna-*)
10. (12) subst. TB *kito** ‘help’ ← PK acc. sg. **gīθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ggīha-* ‘id.’)
11. (13) subst. TB *kuñi(-mot)* ‘grape wine’ ← LKh. *gūrāñai* (*mau*) ‘id.’
12. (14) subst. TB *kurkal* ‘bdellium’ ← LKh. *gurgula-* ‘id.’
13. (15) subst. TB *keto* ‘property, estate’ ← PTK acc. sg. **gēḍu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *gīha-* ‘help’)
14. (16) subst. TB *keś* A *kaś* ‘number’ ← PTK inf. **ham-xēzi* (OKh. v. *hamkhīs-*) ‘to count’
15. (17) subst. TB *koto** ‘excrement’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **gūḍu* (OKh. *gūha-* ‘id.’)
16. (18) subst. TB *krañko* ‘chicken’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **krṇḡu*, OKh. *krṇḡu* ‘id.’
17. (19) subst. TB *krāke* ‘dirt, filth’ ← LKh. **grāga-* (OKh. *khārgga-* ‘mud’)
18. (20) subst. TB *krāso* ‘vexation’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **grazu*, OKh. **graysu* ‘torment’ (LKh. *gr(r)aysa-*)
19. (21) subst. TB *cowo** ‘robbing’ ← PK acc. sg. **dyūwu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *dyūka-* ‘robber’)
20. (22) subst. TB *tāno* ‘seed, grain’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **dāno*, OKh. *dāno* ‘id.’
21. (23) subst. TB *tono* ‘cloth’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *thaunu* ‘id.’
22. (24) subst. TB *tvāñkaro* ‘ginger’ ← OKh. acc. sg. **tvāṃgarau* ‘id.’ (LKh. *ttuṃgara-*)
23. (25) subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’
24. (27) subst. TB *pātro* A *pātār* ‘alms-bowl’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *pātru* ‘id.’
25. (28) subst. TAB *pānto* ‘friend, companion’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **pando*, OKh. *pando* ‘path’
26. (30) subst. TB *parso* A *pärs* ‘letter’ ← PTK acc. sg. **prsu* ‘request’ (OKh. *pulsä* ‘to ask’)
27. (31) subst. TB *pito* ‘price’ ← PK acc. sg. **pīḍu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *pīha-*)
28. (32) subst. TA *pissañk* ‘bhikṣusaṃgha’ ← LKh. *bi’saṃga-* (OKh. *bālsaṃga-*)
29. (33) subst. *mrañco* ‘black pepper’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **mirind^syu*, OKh. **mirimjsyu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *mirimjsya-*)
30. (34) subst. TB *yolo* ‘evil’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *yaulu** ‘falsehood’
31. (35) subst. TB *wañc** ‘sparrow’ ← PTK, PK nom. or acc. sg. **winji* ‘id.’ (LKh. *biñji-*)
32. (36) subst. TB *warāñce** A *wāryāñc** ‘sand’ ← PTK, PK **wirwīca-* ‘grain (of sand)’ (OKh. *ggurvīca-*)
33. (37) subst. TAB *śāñcapo* ‘mustard’ ← PTK acc. sg. **śanžapu* (OKh. *śśāśvāna-*)

34. (38) subst. TB *sāmpo** TA *sāmpām* ‘haughtiness, pride’ ← PTK acc. sg. *čamfu* ‘violence, disturbance’ (OKh. *tcampha*-)
35. (39) subst. TB *šarko** ‘song, singing’ ← PTK acc. sg. **čarko*, A *tšärk* ← PK acc. sg. **tsarko* (OKh. *tcarkā*- ‘play, amusement’)
36. (40) subst. TB *šinto** (a species of tree) ← OKh. acc. sg. **ššimjo* (LKh. *šimjā*- ‘id.’)
37. (41) subst. TA *šrittatak* ‘well-being’ ← OKh. *ššaratāti*- ‘id.’
38. (44) subst. TB *špakiye* ‘suppository’ ← LKh. *švakā*- ‘id.’
39. (45) subst. TB *sāñ*, *šāñ*, A *šāñ* ‘artifice, expedient, means, method’ ← Khot. *saña*- ‘id.’
40. (47) subst. TB *siñco** (plant name) ← OKh. acc. sg. **simjo* ‘id.’ (LKh. *simjā*- ‘id.’)
41. (48) subst. TB *tsuwo** ‘going’ (adv. *tsuwai* ‘towards’) ← PK acc. sg. **ts^hūwu* (OKh. *tsūka*-)

3.5.1.2. Adjectives

1. (43) adj. TB *šupakiñe* ‘pertaining to suppositories’ ← OKh. **ššūvakīña*- ‘id.’

3.5.1.3. Adverbs

1. (26) adv. TB *twār* ‘?’ ← LKh. *tvarä* ‘moreover’ (OKh. *ttuware*)

3.5.1.4. Verbs

1. (2) v. TB *ampa*- ‘to rot, decay’ ← LKh. *hambva*- (< OKh. *hambūta*-) ‘fester’
2. (8) v. TA *katw*- ‘to ridicule’ ← OKh. past ptc. *khamttu** ‘to laugh’
3. (29) v. TB *paraka*- ‘to prosper, thrive’ ← PTK, PK **farāka*- ‘more’ (OKh. *pharāka*-)
4. (42) v. TB *šərt*- A *šərttw*- (PT **šərtw*-) ‘incite’ ← PTK past ptc. **šrtu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ā-ššuda*-)
5. (46) v. TB *sanapa*- ‘to anoint, embrocate’ ← PTK, PK **zanāf*-

3.5.2. COMMENTARY

The majority of the loanwords are substantives (41 items from a total of 48). There is one adjective and one adverb, both borrowed from Khotanese in the historical period. Noteworthy is the presence of five verbs from very different semantic fields, a relatively high number that could in principle, but not necessarily, suggest a deeper linguistic contact (see e.g. Thomason 2001: 70).

3.5.3. LOANWORDS ACCORDING TO THEIR GENDER³⁸²

a) [m.] ← [m.]

- (3) subst. TB **ārto* TA *ārt** ‘envoy’ ← PTK acc. sg. **(h)ārdu* (OKh. *haḍa*-) ‘id.’
- (4) subst. TB *u_wātano** A *watañ** ‘Khotanese’ ← PK acc. sg. **hwātanu* ‘id.’
- (9) subst. TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ ← Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala*- head’)
- (28) subst. TAB *pānto* ‘friend, companion’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **pando*, OKh. *pando* ‘path’

³⁸² In this list, only the items for which the gender is known both in Khotanese and Tocharian have been included. The observations in §3.5.4. are based on a very restricted corpus because the gender of many of the examined loanwords is still unknown. Therefore, they should be taken with due caution.

- b) [f.] ← [m.]
- (10) subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa*- ‘quar-tan fever’)
 - (11) subst. TB *kātso* A *kāts* ‘belly, stomach, abdomen, womb’ ← PK **k^hād^hāna*- ‘stom-ach’ (LKh. *khāysāna*-)
 - (17) subst. TB *koto** ‘excrement’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **gūḍu* (OKh. *gūha*- ‘id.’)
 - (36) subst. TB *warāñce** A *wāryāñc** ‘sand’ ← PTK, PK **wirwīca*- ‘grain (of sand)’ (OKh. *ggurvīca*-)
- c) [f.] ← [f.]
- (22) subst. TB *tāno* ‘seed, grain’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **dāno*, OKh. *dāno* ‘id.’
 - (44) subst. TB *ṣpakīye* ‘suppository’ ← LKh. *ṣvakā*- ‘id.’

3.5.4. COMMENTARY

The analysis of the gender of the Tocharian words in relation to the gender of the Khotanese source form shows that, unless the word denotes a male person (§3.5.3.a), there is a preference for the feminine gender. It is telling that in four cases (§3.5.3.b) the word became feminine in Tocharian while the source form was masculine. In two cases (§3.5.3.c), the feminine gender of the source form is the same as in the borrowed item.

3.5.5. BORROWING PATTERNS OF TOCHARIAN VERBS FROM KHOTANESE; BORROWING PATTERNS OF NOMINAL FORMS OF THE KHOTANESE VERB INTO TOCHARIAN

3.5.5.1. Tocharian verbs

1. [v.] ← [past ptc.]
 - (2) v. TB *ampa*- ‘to rot, decay’ ← LKh. *haṃbva*- (< OKh. *haṃbūta*-) ‘fester’
 - (8) v. TA *katw*- ‘to ridicule’ ← OKh. past ptc. *khaṃttu** ‘to laugh’
 - (42) v. TB *ṣart*- A *ṣārttw*- (PT **ṣārtw*-) ‘incite’ ← PTK past ptc. **ṣrtu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ā-ṣṣuḍa*-)
2. [v.] ← [prs. stem]
 - (46) v. TB *sanapa*- ‘to anoint, embrocate’ ← PTK, PK **zanāf*-
3. [v.] ← [adj.]
 - (29) v. TB *paraka*- ‘to prosper, thrive’ ← PTK, PK **farāka*- ‘more’ (OKh. *pharāka*-)

3.5.5.2. Nominal forms of the Khotanese verb in Tocharian

1. [subst.] ← [prs. inf. -ā]
 - (16) subst. TB *keś* A *kaś* ‘number’ ← PTK inf. **ham-xězi* (OKh. v. *haṃkhīs*-) ‘to count’
2. [subst.] ← [inf. -tanam]
 - (25) subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’

3.5.5.3. Commentary

Tocharian verbs were mostly borrowed from a Khotanese past participle (see §3.5.5.1. 1.). Noteworthy is the preservation of the Khotanese final vowel *-u* of the acc. sg. of the past

participle even in Tocharian verbal morphology. The only other non-finite form of the Khotanese verb that was borrowed into Tocharian is the present infinitive. For the consequences of the presence of five verbs among the reliable loanwords, see §6.2.3

4. SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION

4.1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

Semantic fields as used in this study	Semantic fields in Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009: 7)
Names of plants	Agriculture and vegetation (8) ³⁸³
Metals	Basic actions and technology (9)
Medical terms	≈ The body (4)
Body parts and bodily functions	The body (4)
Food and drink	Food and drink (5)
Nature	The physical world (1)
Animals	Animals (3)
Clothing	Clothing and grooming (6)
Music	The modern world (23)
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)
Buddhist terms	≈ Religion and belief (22)
Grammatical terms	Miscellaneous function words (24)

Table 12. Comparison between the semantic fields used in this study and those in Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009)

4.2. LOANWORDS ACCORDING TO SEMANTIC FIELDS

4.2.1. NAMES OF PLANTS

1. (1) subst. TB *an̥kwaṣ(ṭ)* ‘Asa foetida’ ← LKh. *aṃguṣṭa-* ‘id.’
2. (14) subst. TB *kurkal* ‘bdellium’ ← LKh. *gurgula-* ‘id.’
3. (22) subst. TB *tāno* ‘seed, grain’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **dāno*, OKh. *dāno* ‘id.’

³⁸³ Numbers in brackets refer to the serial numbers of the semantic fields in Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009: 7).

4. (24) subst. TB *tvāṅkaro* 'ginger' ← OKh. acc. sg. **tvāṅgarau* 'id.' (LKh. *ttuṅgara-*)
5. (33) subst. *mrañco* 'black pepper' ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **mirind^zyu*, OKh. **mirimjsyu* 'id.' (LKh. *mirimjsya-*)
6. (37) subst. TAB *śāṅcapo* 'mustard' ← PTK acc. sg. **śāṅzapu* (OKh. *śśaśvāna-*)
7. (40) subst. TB *śintso** (a species of tree) ← OKh. acc. sg. **śśimjsso* (LKh. *śimjā-* 'id.')
8. (47) subst. TB *siñco** (plant name) ← OKh. acc. sg. **siṃjo* 'id.' (LKh. *siṃjā-* 'id.')

4.2.2. METALS

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

4.2.3. MEDICAL TERMS

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

4.2.4. BODY PARTS AND BODILY FUNCTIONS

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

4.2.5. FOOD AND DRINK

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

4.2.6. NATURE

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

4.2.7. ANIMALS

1. (18) subst. TB *krañko* 'chicken' ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **krīṅgu*, OKh. *krīṅgu* 'id.'
2. (35) subst. TB *wañc** 'sparrow' ← PTK, PK nom. or acc. sg. **winji* 'id.' (LKh. *biṃji-*)

4.2.8. CLOTHING

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

4.2.9. MUSIC

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

4.2.10. ADMINISTRATIVE, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC TERMS

1. (3) subst. TB *ārto* TA *ārt** ‘envoy’ ← PTK acc. sg. *(h)*ardu* (OKh. *haḍa*- ‘id.’)
2. (4) subst. TB *wātano** A *watam** ‘Khotanese’ ← PK acc. sg. **hwātanu* ‘id.’
3. (6) subst. TB *orśa* A *orās** (official title) ← OKh. *aurāśša*- ‘councillor’
4. (9) subst. TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ ← PTK acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala*- ‘head’)
5. (12) subst. TB *kito** ‘help’ ← PK acc. sg. **gīθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ggīha*- ‘id.’)
6. (15) subst. TB *keto* ‘property, estate’ ← PTK acc. sg. **gēθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *gīha*- ‘help’)
7. (16) subst. TB *keś* A *kaś** ‘number’ ← PTK inf. **ham-xēzi* (OKh. v. *hamkhiś*-) ‘to count’
8. (21) subst. TB *cowo** ‘robbing’ ← PK acc. sg. **dyūwu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *dyūka*- ‘robber’)
9. (28) subst. TAB *pānto* ‘friend, companion’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **pando*, OKh. *pando* ‘path’
10. (30) subst. TB *parso* A *pärs* ‘letter’ ← PTK acc. sg. **pṛsu* ‘request’ (OKh. *pulsä* ‘to ask’)
11. (31) subst. TB *pito* ‘price’ ← PK acc. sg. **pīθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *pīha*-)

4.2.11. MORAL QUALITIES/ACTIONS

1. (7) subst. TB *oś* ‘evil’ ← LKh. *ośa*- ‘id.’
2. (20) subst. TB *krāso* ‘vexation’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **grazu*, OKh. **graysu* ‘torment’ (LKh. *gr(r)aysa*-)
3. (8) v. TA *katw*- ‘to ridicule’ ← OKh. past ptc. *khamttu** ‘to laugh’
4. (29) v. TB *paraka*- ‘to prosper, thrive’ ← PTK, PK **farāka*- ‘more’ (OKh. *pharāka*-)
5. (34) subst. TB *yolo* ‘evil’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *yaulu** ‘falsehood’
6. (38) subst. TB *śāmpo** TA *śāmpām* ‘haughtiness, pride’ ← PTK acc. sg. *čamfu* ‘violence, disturbance’ (OKh. *tcampha*-)
7. (42) v. TB *šart*- A *šärttw*- (PT **šartw*-) ‘incite’ ← PTK past ptc. **šrtu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ā-šsuḍa*-)
8. (45) subst. TB *sāñ*, *šāñ*, A *šāñ* ‘artifice, expedient, means, method’ ← Khot. *saña*- ‘id.’³⁸⁴

4.2.12. BUDDHIST TERMS

1. (25) subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’
2. (27) subst. TB *pātro* A *pātār* ‘alms-bowl’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *pātru* ‘id.’
3. (32) subst. TA *pissañk* ‘bhikṣusaṃgha’ ← LKh. *bi’saṃga*- (OKh. *bālsaṃga*-)
4. (41) subst. TA *śrītātak* ‘well-being’ ← OKh. *śśāratāti*- ‘id.’

³⁸⁴ According to Del Tomba and Maggi (2021: 217), the term was borrowed in a non-Buddhist context and was used to translate Skt. *upāya*- ‘skillful means’ only later, and only in Tocharian A. Therefore, I do not classify it as a Buddhist term. 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 §2.1. s.v. *sāñ* and §4.3.4.1.).

4.2.13. GRAMMATICAL TERMS

1. (26) adv. TB *twār* ‘?’ ← LKh. *tvarä* ‘moreover’ (OKh. *ttuvare*)

4.3. COMMENTARY

The most important conclusion that can be drawn from the list in §4.2. is that the twelve semantic fields that have been identified can be further reduced to four macro-areas:

- Materia medica (names of plants, medical terms, body parts and bodily functions, nature, animals)
- Administrative, political and economic terms (§4.2.10.)
- Moral qualities/actions (§4.2.11.)
- 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 and bodily functions, to natural elements and to animals may have entered Tocharian from Khotanese within the wider context of 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. It appears that Khotanese acted as donor language since prehistoric times, when the nature of the contact must have been only oral, until historical times, when Khotan may have acted as intermediary between Indian medical knowledge, travelling from the South, and the Tocharian speaking areas.

4.3.2. ADMINISTRATIVE, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC TERMS

A second group of words concerns the macro-area related to administrative, political and economic terms (§4.2.10.). Except for one word (TB *orśa* A *oräs*), an official title that seems to have been borrowed from historical Khotanese, all other items in this category (ten) were borrowed in the prehistoric period. For a more detailed discussion of this group of words, see §6.2.2.1.

4.3.3. MORAL QUALITIES/ACTIONS

Another set of loanwords is represented by a group of words indicating moral actions and qualities (§4.2.11., seven words). I can put forward the hypothesis that these words may point to a type of language contact much deeper than previously thought. As noted by A. Lubotsky, the majority of the lexical items in this group have a negative connotation. Negative terms for moral qualities and actions are frequently borrowed, cf. English *scorn*, *ridicule*, *torment*, etc.

4.3.4. BUDDHIST TERMS

A small group of loanwords that deserves further analysis concerns Buddhist terms (§4.2.12.). Except for one word (TB *pātro* A *pātār* ‘alms-bowl’), they are all attested only in Tocharian A and they were borrowed from Khotanese in the historical period. In the following, I propose 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. CE onwards.

4.3.4.1. The Buddhist terms attested only in Tocharian A

The three Buddhist loanwords attested only in Tocharian A are *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’, *pissaṅk* ‘bhikṣusaṃgha’ and *śrittātāk* ‘well-being’. TA *twantaṃ* is used to translate the Buddhist phrase *pradakṣiṇī-kṛ-* ‘to circumambulate’. This phrase also represents the source of the peculiar semantic range of *tvamdanu* in Old and Late Khotanese. In the relevant section in §2.1., I have argued that the source form of *pissaṅk* can be identified with Late Khotanese *bi’saṃga-* ‘id.’ (OKh. *bālsaṃgga-*), itself from an earlier compound of Central Asian diffusion **balysa-saṃga-* ‘buddha-saṃgha’. The Khotanese source form of *śrittātāk* ‘well-being’ can be identified as OKh. *śśāratāti-*, a frequent translation of Skt. *śrī-* (see §2.1. s.v. *śrittātāk*). Traces of Khotanese influence on Tocharian A alone may be also found in TA *ṣāñ*, employed as a translation of Skt. *upāya-*, a concept typical of Mahāyāna traditions (Del Tomba and Maggi 2021: 217). Tocharian B *sāñ*, *ṣāñ* has mostly a non-technical meaning. Therefore, it was first borrowed independently in TA and B in a non-Buddhist context. The peculiar semantic development of the Tocharian A word betrays later Khotanese religious influence on Tocharian A alone.

As evident from the source forms and the uses of *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’, *pissaṅk* ‘bhikṣusaṃgha’, and *śrittātāk* ‘well-being’ 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 *pissaṅk* apparently being borrowed 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 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 historical sources that allude to the presence of Khotanese speakers in the Tocharian A speaking territory in 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. There seem to be no historical data explaining the presence of Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian A alone.

Despite the silence of the sources, the finding of a *pustaka* leaf (bi 33, formerly T III Š 16) belonging to an older version of the Book of Zambasta in Šorčuq, in the vicinity of Qarašahr, points 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 proselytising purpose, with the aim to propagate Mahāyāna teachings in a predominantly non-Mahayanistic centre. 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). As bi 33 can palaeographically be dated to the 5th-6th c. CE (Maggi 2004: 184), it is conceivable that a Khotanese religious mission was active in the Šorčuq area around this 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: 41–42), there are Sanskrit manuscripts from the same finding spot – the so-called ‘town cave’ – that can be palaeographically dated to the same period as bi 33. These exhibit many features pointing to a provenance from the Khotan oasis, 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 the *pustaka* leaf bi 33 lies in the fact that, besides being probably one of the oldest extant Khotanese manuscripts, the scholarly literature mentions it as the only Khotanese manuscript found in a northern oasis (Maggi 2004: 184). However, a search into published Khotanese materials has yielded three more manuscript fragments found in the north, in the Kuča area.

The first is known as P 1068 and the signature DA fd (‘Duldur Aqur, fouilles diverses’) makes clear that the finding place was Duldur Aqur, a site in the vicinity of Kuča. 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 literature. The language is clearly Late Khotanese. As for the content, the first of the three incomplete lines that have been preserved seem to contain a very fragmentary medical text. The second and the third line might belong to an unknown narrative text.

The second manuscript is an almost completely preserved *pustaka* leaf bearing the signature P 1311. Its *cote de trouvaille* 428 refers to Qumtura, another site in the vicinity of Kuča (Pinault 2007: 171). Its formal ductus is also later than bi 33 and it may be of the same age as P 1068. It is written in (archaising) Late Khotanese and contains a portion of the text known as *Raśmivimalaviśuddhaprabhādhāraṇī* (or simply *Kalparāja-sūtra*). The identification of this text, together with a handful of other fragments from the London and St. Petersburg collections, is due to Yoshida (1997: 568, 2004: 27–28). P 1311 was recently published again by Duan (2019: 54–58) together with a Chinese translation as part of §7 of her edition of the Khotanese version of the *Raśmivimalaviśuddhaprabhādhāraṇī*. On this text and its extant Chinese and Tibetan versions see further Chen (2012: 276–78) and Silk (2021: 60–61). None of these authors comments on the finding place of P 1311. I suggest that the exceptional finding of a fragment of the Khotanese version of the *Raśmivimala- viśuddhaprabhādhāraṇī* in the Kuča area may be connected with the translation activities of Śikṣānanda and Mitraśānta, the monks of Khotanese and Tocharian origin respectively who were responsible for the two Chinese translations (Chen 2012: 276) around the beginning of the 8th c. CE. One of the manuscripts of the Khotanese *Raśmivimalaviśuddha-prabhādhāraṇī* (Or. 6402B/2.1, see KMB:

24) is preserved with a colophon mentioning the *dānapati* Maṃdūsa. The same person is mentioned in Or. 6397/1 (G. 1) (ll. 2, 5, 7, see KMB: 9), dated to the second half of the 8th century (786, see Skjærvø 2017: 455). P 1311 does not belong to the same manuscript as Or. 6402B/2.1, but it could have been produced in the same years.³⁸⁵

The third fragment is preserved in London and it is known under the signature Or. 12637/41 (previously Jigdalīq I.i.02). It is part of a group of manuscripts from a place identified as Jigdalīq, in the Kuča area,³⁸⁶ that were presented to Stein during his third expedition (Sims-Williams 2018: 280). Preliminary editions by the hand of Bailey and Skjærvø are to be found in KT V: 296 and KMB: 136, where a translation of the Khotanese part is also attempted. In 2017, a more detailed study of the fragment was published by Hartmann and Chen (2017). According to them, this half-preserved pustaka leaf contains a portion of a Sanskrit-Khotanese bilingual of Triratnadāsa's *Guṇāparyantastotra*, a famous verse text probably composed in the 5th c. CE (Hartmann and Chen 2017: 212). As noted by Hartmann and Chen, this fragment shows many idiosyncratic features. Although the palaeographic and textual evidence seem to suggest that the fragment was imported from the Khotan area,³⁸⁷ its graphical arrangement, alternating between Sanskrit and Khotanese often within the same line, is much more reminiscent of Sanskrit-Tocharian bilinguals and it is not found in the Khotan area. Although the precise circumstances under which the manuscript was produced are still unclear, it may be suggestive to imagine that it was conceived in a multicultural milieu that enabled the encounter and mutual influence of different scribal habits.

As the three fragments are later than bi 33, I propose that they were brought to the Kuča area during the time of the Four Garrisons, when Kuča, Qarašahr, Khotan and Kašgar were 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. In this respect, it is relevant to remind the reader that the presence of Khotanese soldiers in the Kuča area in the same period is documented by Chinese military documents from Kuča (Rong 1992: 61). Therefore, the increased mobility during this period may have favoured the circulation of such texts.

4.3.4.4. Conclusions

The elements gathered in the discussion above contribute to a better understanding of the linguistic exchange between the southern and the northern oases in the second half of the first millennium CE. I argue that the presence of a Khotanese religious mission in Šorčuq may have influenced the Tocharian A Buddhist vocabulary. 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.

³⁸⁵ The significance of these findings for the textual history of the *Raśmivimalaviśuddhaprabhādhāraṇī* and for the connections between Khotan and Kucha in the 7th-8th c. CE will be explored in more detail in the future.

³⁸⁶ The precise location of Jigdalīq in the Kucha area is still problematic, see the discussion in Peyrot (2008: 228).

³⁸⁷ Despite the popularity of this text genre in the Tocharian-speaking oases, no manuscripts of the *Guṇāparyantastotra* have been found in the North. On the contrary, Sanskrit fragments of the same work were unearthed in the Khotan area (Hartmann and Chen 2017: 213).

5. TOCHARIAN LOANWORDS IN KHOTANESE AND TUMSHUQESE

5.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims to evaluate the Tocharian lexical influence on Khotanese and Tumshuqese. It is divided into three sections. The first section contains an analysis of the only Tocharian loanword in Khotanese (OKh. *puka*- ‘arm-span’), and it discusses another less sure loanword (OKh. *solāte* ‘snakes (?)’) proposed in the scholarly literature. It is also argued that a previously unexplained Old Khotanese lexeme (OKh. *haṃbālke*) and a Late Khotanese personal name may also be loanwords from Tocharian. The second section discusses the only Tocharian loanword in Tumshuqese (Tq. *p(a)laca*- ‘request, pleading’) and clarifies its juridical context both in Tumshuqese and Tocharian. A conclusion summarises the most important results of this chapter.

5.2. TOCHARIAN LOANWORDS IN KHOTANESE

5.2.1. OKH. *PUKA*- ‘CUBIT’, TB *POKO** TA *POKE* ‘ARM’³⁸⁸

Khotanese occurrences

- Z 22.124 *dātāna kāḍe tcarṣuva hvq’ndū daśyo baśdyau jsa pathīya vaysnā mājo puku vīri . tcaholsā puke māsta hāmāre* ‘Very brilliant in appearance will men be, having refrained from the ten evils. With respect to our *puka* today, they will be forty *pukas* tall.’ (Emmerick 1968: 307)
- Z 22.159 *stunai sāñīndi nāga-rāja māstu kāmjani ysīrri . kṣasu puke hvāha ysāru bulysa harbiśśa ratanyau vūḍa .* ‘The Nāga-kings will rise up a tall pillar of *kāñcana*-gold to him. It will be sixteen *pukas* broad, a thousand tall all covered with jewels.’ (Emmerick 1968: 313)
- Z 22.167 *haṣṭāte māje puke vīri ttarandarna uskyālstu dvāsu puke śśāmāña hvāhā pārja kiḍe hvāha briyūna .* ‘He will be according to our *pukas* [cubits] eighty *pukas* tall in body, twelve *pukas* broad in face. He will be very broad in chest, lovely.’ (Maggi 2022: 325)

Tocharian occurrences (only referring to a unit of measurement)

- THT 41 b4-5 *lnaskemane mokocmeṃ yentem lkāṣṣām : ywārtsa tāna kwāñcītṣai kwāñcit yarm wat : prāri raso pokai wat lauке ykuwa* ‘He sees the winds emerging from the big toe, half a sesame-seed or a [whole] sesame-seed in measure, [the length of] one finger, one span or one arm having come [out].’ (CETom, H. Fellner ed.)

³⁸⁸ This study was partially presented during the workshop *Tocharian and Iranian in the Tarim Basin and Beyond* (Leiden, June 2022).

- THT 1120 a5-b1 /// (mä)k(te) tā kem̐ šikonta(sa) – -i akāś wat pokai(nesa) – – ‘(Wie es nicht möglich ist,) diese Erde (mit) Schritten (auszumessen) oder den Luftraum (in) Klabbern [wtl. (mit den beiden) [ausgebreiteten] Armen] (auszumessen).’ (Schmidt 2018: 82)

Discussion

OKh. *puka-* occurs five times in Old Khotanese. It is exclusively attested in the 22nd chapter of the Book of Zambasta, containing the famous story of the future Buddha Maitreya. As it does not occur in any commercial document, *puka-* was not used as a unit of measurement in everyday life. The meaning of OKh. *puka-* was first determined by Leumann, who translated it as ‘Elle’ (‘cubit’) (Leumann 1919: 83, 90, 91). The same translation is maintained in Leumann’s later edition of the Book of Zambasta (1933–36: 256, 262, 264). As no justification for this is given in Leumann’s works, I suppose his interpretation was suggested to him by comparing the Sanskrit version(s)³⁸⁹ of the Maitreya story. Therefore, it seems worthwhile to examine them more closely to assess the validity of the translation ‘cubit’.

The story of the future Buddha Maitreya is known from (at least) two Sanskrit versions:

- the so-called *Maitreyāvadāna*, found in the third chapter of the *Divyāvadāna* proper (ed. Cowell and Neil 1886: 55–66, transl. Rotman 2008: 119–33).
- the so-called *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, preserved in the Calcutta manuscript (MvyC, Lévi 1932a), in the Nepal manuscript (MvyK, Ishigama 1989), in a more fragmentary version from Gilgit (MvyG, Majumdar 1959), and one small fragment in the Schøyen collection (Hartmann 2006). The four versions have the same structure but display minor variants (see Hartmann 2006: 7–8).

Two of the three passages from the Book of Zambasta quoted have a clear correspondence in the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*. Only the measurements contained in the second of these two Zambasta passages can be found in the *Maitreyāvadāna*. Table 13 summarises the relations among the versions. In another passage of the *Maitreyāvadāna* (see *infra*), the same measures for the sacrificial post (*yūpa*) occur. The units of measurement seem to be the same.

Book of Zambasta	<i>Maitreyavyākaraṇa</i>	<i>Maitreyāvadāna</i>
Z 22.159 <i>stunai sāñīndi nāga-rāja māštu kām̐jani ysīrri . k̐sasū puke hvāha ysāru bulysa harbiśśa ratanyau vūḍa .</i>	MvyC 51 <i>tataḥ śaṅkho mahārājo yūpam ucchrāpayīyati ṣoḍaśavyāmaṣṭāram ūrdhvaṃ vyāmasahasrakam</i>	Div 3 (Cowell and Neil 1886: 56) <i>icchasi tvam ānanda yo 'sau yūpa ūrdhvaṃ vyāmasahasraṃ tīryak ṣoḍaśapravedho nānāratnavicitro divyaḥ sarvasauvarṇo [...] taṃ draṣṭum</i>

³⁸⁹ Apparently, only the version contained in the *Divyāvadāna* was known to Leumann in 1919.

‘The Nāga-kings will rise up a tall pillar of <i>kāñcana</i> -gold to him. It will be sixteen <i>pukas</i> broad, a thousand tall all covered with jewels’ (Emmerick 1968: 313).	‘Ensuite le roi çankha fera dresser un pilier large de seize coudées, haut de mille coudées’ (Lévi 1932a: 393).	‘Ānanda, do you want to see a sacrificial post that is one thousand arm-lengths high, sixteen bow-shots across, variegated with many jewels, divine, and made entirely of gold?’ (Rotman 2008: 120)
Z 22.167 <i>haṣṭāte māje puke vīri ttarandarna uskyālstu dvāsu puke śśāmāña hvāhā pārja kiḍe hvāha briyūna</i> .	MvyC 49 <i>samucchrayeṇa hastāśītis tasya kāyo bhaviṣyati vistāraṇ viṃśahastāni tato ’rdham mukhamanḍalam</i>	–
‘He will be according to our <i>pukas</i> [cubits] eighty <i>pukas</i> tall in body, twelve <i>pukas</i> broad in face. He will be very broad in chest, lovely’ (Maggi 2022: 325).	‘Une taille de quatre-vingts longueurs de main, une largeur de vingt mains, le disque du visage moitié moins’ (Lévi 1932a: 393).	–

Table 13. Z 22.159 and Z 22.167 together with their Sanskrit parallels in the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* and in the *Maitreyāvadāna*

Div 3 (Cowell and Neil 1886: 59) <i>gaccha tvaṃ viśvakarman rājño mahāprañādasya niveśane divyaṃ maṇḍalavāṭaṃ nirmiṇu yūpaṃ cocchrāpayordhvaṃ vyāmasahasraṃ tiryak ṣoḍaśapravedhaṃ nānāratnavicitraṃ sarvasauvarṇaṃ iti tato viśvakarmaṇā devaputreṇa mahāprañādasya rājño niveśane divyo maṇḍalavāṭo nirmito yūpaś cocchritaḥ ūrdhvaṃ vyāmasahasraṃ nānāratnavicitro divyaḥ sarvasauvarṇaḥ</i>	“Go, Viśvakarman, to the palace of King Mahāprañāda. Create a divine circular garden with your magic, and erect there a sacrificial post that is one thousand arm-lengths high, sixteen bow-shots across, variegated with many jewels, and made entirely of gold.” Then the divinely born Viśvakarman magically created a divine circular garden and there erected a sacrificial post that was one thousand armlengths high, variegated with many jewels, divine, and made entirely of gold.’ (Rotman 2008: 123)
---	--

It is noteworthy that the other versions of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* that are extant (MvyG and Mvy K) present us with slightly different measures in the case of Maitreya’s body. Table 14 summarises the data gathered so far.

The most obvious observations that can be drawn from this comparison concern the different units of measurement employed in the Sanskrit versions. Whereas the Book of Zambasta uses *puka-* in every instance, the Sanskrit has *vyāma-* ‘fathom’, *hasta-* ‘cubit’ and *pravedha-* ‘bowshot (?)’, a term that only occurs in these Divyāvadāna passages.³⁹² The translation of Khot. *puka-* as ‘cubit’ cannot be entirely supported by the Sanskrit versions because the evidence is contradictory.

³⁹⁰ Rotman (2008: 120 and 414 fn. 367) translates it as ‘bow-shot’. Previously, Edgerton (BHSD: 387) had suggested that it may be interpreted as ‘breadth’ (cf. *udvedha-*, *āvedha-*) with an implied *vyāma-* (the Tibetan translation has only ‘dom’ *vyāma-* in all instances, see Rotman 2008: 414 fn. 367), but the Tocharian A and Old Uyghur versions (cf. *infra*) point decisively to ‘bow-shot’.

Book of Zambasta		<i>Maitreyavyākaraṇa</i> and <i>Maitreyāvadāna</i>
Z 22.159		
<i>puka</i> :- width 16, height 1000	MvyC: <i>vyāma</i> - MvyG: <i>vyāma</i> - MvyK: <i>vyāma</i> - Div 3: <i>vyāma</i> - (height), <i>pravedha</i> - (width)	MvyC: width 16, height 1000 MvyG: width 16, height 1000 MvyK: width 16, height 1000 Div 3: width 16, height 1000
Z 22.167		
<i>puka</i> :- height 80, width (of the face) 12	MvyC: <i>hasta</i> - MvyG: <i>hasta</i> - MvyK: <i>hasta</i> -	MvyC: height 80, width (of the body) 20 MvyG: height 50, no information on breadth ³⁹¹ MvyK: height 80, width (of the body) 20

Table 14. Values of *puka*- in the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* and in the *Maitreyāvadāna*

I could not verify whether Leumann's 1919 translation of *puka*- as 'Elle (cubit)' was based on its etymology.³⁹² At any rate, Leumann could not have considered a connection with Tocharian A *poke* 'arm' in his later edition of the Book of Zambasta because Konow first proposed it in 1945 (Konow 1945: 210). Konow's initial proposal took the Tocharian word as a loanword from Khotanese. Two years later, Van Windekens (1947: 307) convincingly argued that the Khotanese word was a loanword from Tocharian because the Tocharian word has a clear Indo-European etymology. Bailey thoroughly considered Konow's hypothesis (and not Van Windekens') in the *Prolexis* (KT VI: 197) without providing etymological details. In the *Dictionary* (DKS: 242), however, he proposed an unlikely Indo-European etymology.³⁹³ It was not considered further in the scholarly literature. Both overviews of the Khotanese language compiled by Emmerick (1989, 2009)³⁹⁴ quote the word as the only Tocharian loanword in Khotanese, following Van Windekens' convincing analysis. Because of the Tocharian connection, a translation 'cubit' is not incorrect, but, lacking any further clue on the value of this unit of measurement, probably too precise. As the Tocharian word clearly means 'arm', I propose translating Khot. *puka*- as 'arm-span', without further specification.

The hypothesis of a loanword from Tocharian seems widely accepted, and it is not doubted here. However, the phonology of the loanword and its borrowing path have not been discussed in the scholarly literature. In the following, I examine the semantics of the Tocharian word, determine the most likely borrowing path from Tocharian into Khotanese, and discuss the phonological details. In the end, I formulate some hypotheses on the socio-cultural context of the borrowing.

As for the semantic range of *puka*-, there is no bilingual evidence available for meanings other than the most frequent 'arm', but the two occurrences listed above confirm that the word was used as a unit of measurement, in the singular as 'arm-span' and in the dual as 'fathom'. As remarked by Ching (2010: 382 with fn. 17), TB *poko** might also occur as a unit

³⁹¹ *hastāḥ pañcāśad ucchrāya tasya kāyo bhaviṣyati*
visṛtāś ca tato 'rddhena śubhavarṇasamucchrayaḥ (Majumder 1959: 15)

³⁹² More probably, it was based on the later Pāli and Chinese versions.

³⁹³ As also remarked by Adams (DoT: 434), Bailey's connection with Greek *πυγών* 'cubit' (Beekes 2010: 1254) cannot be upheld.

³⁹⁴ Cf. also Tremblay (2005: 444)

of measurement in the documents, but the passages in which it is attested are of uncertain interpretation (THT 2709, THT 2711), so this hypothesis cannot be fully verified.

The next problem involves the identification of the source of the loanword in Khotanese. Since Van Windekens (1947: 307), it is usual to consider Khot. *puka-* as a loanword from TA *poke* (Emmerick 1989, 2009).³⁹⁵ Accepting this derivation, however, would force one to imagine that the nom. sg. TA *poke* was borrowed into Old Khotanese as a nom. pl. *puke*, from which a stem *puka-* was later extracted. For the first syllable, the correspondence Toch. *o* ~ OKh. *u* is not problematic. It is also found in the Khotanese personal name *mukauka-* (see §5.2.4.). On the other hand, the back-formation is possible but unusually complicated. Because of the established correspondence Toch. *o* ~ OKh. *u*, the Tocharian B nom. sg. *poko** could have been borrowed into Old Khotanese as a nom. sg. *puku**, following the model of the numeral *ysāra-* ‘1000’ for its declension (nom. sg. *ysāru*, nom. pl. *ysāre*, *puke*).³⁹⁶ Given that we are dealing with a unit of measurement, it is not unlikely that the declension pattern of *puka-* may have been modelled on that of *ysāra-*. In Z 22.159 (cf. *supra*), *ysāra-* occurs together with *puka-*. Therefore, I suggest that OKh. *puka-* was borrowed from the Tocharian B nom. sg. *poko** and not from TA *poke*.³⁹⁷

As for the semantics, it is frequent for units of measurement to be subject to borrowing. In Khotanese itself, of the twelve measures listed by Skjærvø in KMB: lxxvi-lxxvii, six are loanwords from multiple sources (Gāndhārī, Chinese and Tibetan). As *puka-* does not occur in commercial documents, however, we cannot conclude that the term had been adopted in the everyday language through daily contact in the market-place. Another argument against this hypothesis can be gathered from the fact that Khotanese already has a word for ‘fathom’. In the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*, the hapax *nvāska*^o translates Skt. *vyāma-* and Tib. ‘dom’ in §4.12. The word occurs as the first member of a compound *nvāska-masi* ‘of the measure of a fathom’, referring to the width of the rays emanating from the Buddha. As for its derivation, some debate has been sparked by the fact that OKh. *nvāska-* can be traced back to **ni-bāju-ka-*. Since this form does not occur in any other Iranian language, where the most widespread lexeme is formed with a preverb **wi-* rather than **ni-* (Avestan *vi-bāzu-* ‘fathom’,³⁹⁸ BSogd. *wβʷz* ‘id.’,³⁹⁹ Psht. *wāzā*⁴⁰⁰), Sims-Williams (1983a: 359), followed by Emmerick (SVK II: 76), proposed to emend it to **gvāska-* (< **wi-bāju-ka-*). Skjærvø (Suv II: 292) does not seem inclined to accept the emendation.

As Old Khotanese already had a native Iranian word for ‘fathom’, the exclusive occurrence of *puka-* in the Book of Zambasta may point to a loanword from Tocharian in a learned religious context. Because it occurs exclusively in the chapter about Maitreya, it seems

³⁹⁵ Tremblay (2005: 444) does not decide between TA and B as the source of the borrowing.

³⁹⁶ However, one should note that as convincingly argued by Del Tomba (2021: 167 fn. 5), Emmerick’s claim (SGS: 253) that substantives other than numerals with nom. sg. *-u* could have existed cannot be defended any more.

³⁹⁷ During the Leiden workshop *Tocharian and Iranian in the Tarim Basin and Beyond*, Nicholas Sims-Williams kindly suggested the possibility that borrowing from TA *poke* cannot be excluded, as the substantive is always attested in the plural (hence *poke* nom. sg. → *puke* nom. pl.). However, one should account for the problematic back-formation also in this case.

³⁹⁸ See V 7.34, V 9.2. See Henning (1942: 236) and Bivar (2020) for the meaning.

³⁹⁹ See GMS: 34 and MacKenzie (1976: 53).

⁴⁰⁰ EDP: 94.

worthwhile to examine the extant Tocharian versions of the *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka* to verify whether the same measures of the Zambasta passages are attested.

In the list of 32 *lakṣanas* occurring in A 213 a2 + YQ II.4 b8, TA *kaṣ* is used to translate Skt. *vyāma-*.⁴⁰¹ Confirmation of the bilingual evidence comes from the frequent compound TA *kaṣ-swāñcem** ‘a ray which is a fathom wide’ (DTTA: 107).⁴⁰² This compound translates the same Buddhist Sanskrit stock phrase with Skt. *vyāma-* as OKh. *nvāska-masi bā’yi-* in Suv 4.12 (cf. *supra*).⁴⁰³ Notably, TB *keṣe* A *kaṣ* is a loanword from Old Steppe Iranian.⁴⁰⁴ The equivalent of Skt. *vyāma-* and TA *kaṣ* in Old Uyghur is usually *kulač* (HWA: 421), a term of uncertain etymology (Clauson 1972: 618).

It is not easy to locate exact parallels for the Zambasta passages in any published fragment of the Tocharian *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka*. However, the description of the sacrificial post (Skt. *yūpa-*), corresponding to the second of the Zambasta passages listed above, is found at the beginning of the unpublished Tocharian A fragment A 301. This fragment was tentatively assigned by Pinault (1999: 200) to the 12th act, but its precise place in the narrative is still unclear. Luckily, an Old Uyghur parallel from the Hami version is available. Both the Tocharian A and the Old Uyghur versions of the passage containing the measures of the sacrificial post were treated by Pinault (2004: 258):

A 301 a1 (TA)	Maitrisimit Hami (OUygh.)
(wält ka)ṣas tāprā śāk śākpi pār-ra-krase wärsā ñemiṣi(nāṃ) pyākāṣ wleṣāt ‘Er machte/schuf einen juwelen-Pfosten, (tausend) Klafter hoch, sechzehn Pfeilschüsse breit.’ (Pinault 2004: 258)	üstün edizi miñ k[ulač] altı yegirmi bu- rañ torkı sıruk etdi ‘He made a post a thousand fathoms in height and 26 ⁴⁰⁵ bowshots in width.’

Table 15. Measures of the sacrificial post (Skt. *yūpa-*) in Tocharian and Old Uyghur

Several conclusions may be drawn from the new data above. First, Tocharian A shows *kaṣ* and not *poke*, as one could have expected from the Zambasta passage. TA *kaṣ* is only used for the height of the sacrificial post. The width is reckoned in *pār-ra-krase*, i.e. ‘bowshots’ (Peyrot 2013: 461), a unit of measurement found only in the *Maitreyāvadāna*, not in the *Maitreya-vyākaraṇa*. The Tocharian and Old Uyghur interpretations of the hapax *pravedha* can now contribute to a better understanding of the *Divyāvadāna* passage (cf. *supra*). Furthermore, the consequences of this observation could be quite significant for the history of the transmission of the Maitreya story in Central Asia. It is hoped that further research, taking into examination also the Chinese and Tibetan versions, will be able to identify a possible historical scenario for this remarkable lexical affinity between the *Maitreyāvadāna* and the Tocharian A *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka*.

In conclusion, it is difficult to identify and secure proof of contact between Khotanese and Tocharian in the context of the different versions of the story of the future Buddha Maitreya. In an unpublished conference paper, Kumamoto (2009a) tried to sketch the *Stand der*

⁴⁰¹ *kos-ne kaṣyo [tā]preṃ kapaśiñño* ‘with his body [height] equal to his arm span’ (cf. Ji 1998: 85, DTTA: 107). I found the first mention of this correspondence in the *Tocharische Grammatik* (TG: 205 fn. 1).

⁴⁰² Cf. A 22 a5, A 60 b4, A 217 b5.

⁴⁰³ Old Uyghur has *kulačča yaruk* (HWA: 421), e.g. in Tekin (1980: 52).

⁴⁰⁴ For a thorough treatment of this word and its Iranian derivation, see Bernard (2023: 35–36).

⁴⁰⁵ Note the slightly different measure in the Old Uyghur translation.

Forschung and outlined the first conclusions of a preliminary comparison of the different versions of the story in Central Asia. He concluded that ‘the Khotanese version occupies a place that bridges the Sanskrit texts and the hugely expanded Tocharian-Uigur versions’ without commenting on possible agreements between Tocharian and Khotanese. In my opinion, the lexical evidence of OKh. *puka-*, borrowed from TB *poko** only in the context of the Maitreya story, may be taken as a significant indication that contacts between Tocharian and Khotanese did happen during or before the phase of composition of the Book of Zambasta (4th/5th c. CE?). As the Maitreya story became so popular in Tocharian A, I believe it is not by chance that one finds traces of Tocharian influence on the Book of Zambasta precisely in the Maitreya chapter. The materials at our disposal do not allow us to fully justify the assumption that the Khotanese composer of the 22nd chapter of the Book of Zambasta might have employed a lost Tocharian (B?) version of the Maitreya story dating back to the 4th-5th c. CE with *poko** instead of *keše*. However, tentative as it may be, this conclusion might not be so far removed from the actual state of affairs: only further research will be able to prove or disprove these hypotheses.

Results

OKh. *puka-* ‘arm-span’, the name of a unit of measurement in the 22nd chapter of the Book of Zambasta, can be considered a loanword from TB *poko** ‘arm’, itself used as a measure in several instances. The reasons behind the exclusive occurrences of OKh. *puka-* in the Zambasta chapter containing the Maitreya story might be traced back to Tocharian influences during or before the phase of composition of the Book of Zambasta. However, further research is needed before proposing a comprehensive historical scenario for the transmission of the Maitreya story in Central Asia.

5.2.2. OKH. *SOLĀTE* ‘SNAKES ?’, TA *SALAT* ‘HOPPING’

Khotanese occurrences

- OKh. Z 20.33 *birgga pahīya śvāna rrūvāsa biśśū solāte byū’ta banālsuvo’ ttranda puṣṣo* ‘All the wolves, dogs, jackals fled. The snakes (and) the owls went right into their holes in the trees.’ (Emmerick 1968: 291)

Discussion

OKh. *solāte* is attested only once in Z 20.33. The passage contains a list of the animals that swiftly escape at the appearance of the Buddha guiding his disciples into a cemetery. Leumann (1933–36: 540) glosses it as ‘eine Tierart’ (Leumann). Bailey (KT VI: 367) suggests a translation ‘living creature, snake’ based on Z 2.45. This passage is part of a longer description of another cemetery:

- Z 2.45 *huṣka vara banhya ku rrūva auṅgyo jsa ā’re pacaṣṭa . banāsuto śśaysde pharāka kyau kamale nitcana dijsāre .* [46] *birgga rrūvāsa nuvaindā śvānā śśūjātena juvāre suṭṭṭha rrāysīndi u ṣṣundā byū’va kāḍe māstu najsīndi* ‘There are dry trees there, where intestines hang attached to the branches. In the tree-holes are many snakes, which

hold their heads out. [46] Wolves (and) jackals howl. Dogs fight with one another. Vultures scream, and ravens, owls cry out very loudly.’ (Emmerick 1968: 19)

In the two passages, both snakes (Z 2.45) and *solāte* (Z 20.33) are hiding in tree-holes (*banā(l)sa-*): the parallel seems relatively straightforward and should be taken into account. As for the morphology, a plural *solāte* points to a stem *solāta-* or *solātā-*. Because of the adjective *biśśā*, one should prefer a masculine stem *solāta-*. As for the etymology, Bailey (KT VI: 367, DKS: 429) suggested a connection with Tocharian A *salat* ‘flying (animal)’, a verbal adjective from the verb TA *sāl-* ‘to fly, arise’.⁴⁰⁶ The two words cannot be considered inherited cognates and Arm. *sof* ‘to crawl, creep; to move smoothly on, steal, glide’ is not a loanword from Iranian (EDAIL: 582–83).

On the other hand, the possibility of a Tocharian loanword into Khotanese should be thoroughly considered. *solāta-* may be traced back to an original **solata-* by trisyllabic weakening. According to Malzahn (2022: 256), the Tocharian B match of TA *salat* could be reconstructed as **salāte*, a form close to the Khotanese one. In this case, the problems lie in the vocalism and the morphology. I could not find any example for the colouring of *a* before *l* in Tocharian or Khotanese, but this phonetic change is not unusual. More difficult would be the assumption of a back-formation. Maintaining TB **salāte* as the alleged source form, one is forced to assume that a Tocharian B nom. sg. in *-e* could have been borrowed first as a nom. pl., from which an *a*-stem was subsequently extracted. The accent represents another problem: the trisyllabic weakening in Khotanese is incompatible with the Tocharian B accent on the medial syllable. Furthermore, if the Khotanese word designated a creeping animal, it was semantically incompatible with a root meaning ‘to fly’.

Results

As an Iranian origin for *solāte* seems hardly possible,⁴⁰⁷ the etymology of this Old Khotanese hapax, designating a creeping animal, remains for the moment highly problematic.

5.2.3. OKH. *HAṂBĀLKE* ‘?’, TB *AMPLĀKĀTTE* ‘UNINVITED, WITHOUT PERMISSION’⁴⁰⁸

Khotanese occurrences

- OKh. Z 4.114 *cvī ye haṁbā’lke yanāte o yā vā pvā’nāte hūña . kho ju tte haṁbālke ne kei’tā o pva’ṇa cīyā biysendā* [115] *ttrāmu māñamdu ce saña mulysdā hajvattete jsa ārsta avāyā ju karā nā pvai’ttā cu vara dukha cu ye vā ysaiye* [116] *cu ye ysādā hāmāte cu mīḍe cu ye gveysdā ysāštāna haṁtsa hūni māñanda paysānāna samu vikalpa jaḍānu* ‘If one performs terrible deeds to one or terrifies one in a dream, just as one does not think about these terrible deeds or frights when one wakes up, [115] similarly

⁴⁰⁶ A recent treatment of this verbal root in Tocharian is found in Malzahn (2022).

⁴⁰⁷ A tentative derivation from PIr. **sard-* ‘to smear, rub’ (EDIV: 336) may be suggested, but the problem of the vocalism remains. Moreover, even if the semantics are not so far-fetched for a creeping animal, the formation is puzzling (a recent past participle in *-āta-*?).

⁴⁰⁸ This study was partially presented during the workshop *Tocharian and Iranian in the Tarim Basin and beyond* (Leiden, June 2022).

one who has expedients, compassion full of wisdom, is not at all afraid of Apāya, the woes here when one is born, [116] when one becomes old, when one dies, when one is separated (or) with an enemy. One should recognize them as resembling a dream, as merely the *vikalpas* of the ignorant.’ (Emmerick 1968: 97)

- LKh. Sudh 406 *habvakya yada drauma kaidara rai* (C)/ *haṃbvekye yaṃde drrāma kaidharā re* (A) ‘Druma, the king of the *kinnaras*, will commit cruelties.’ (De Chiara 2013: 159)
- LKh. Sudh 414-15 *avamāva baida daṇḍa-karama niśāve ttrakṣa* [415] *habvakya pajarūna salāva* (C) ‘He imposed on him unlimited punishments, harsh cruelties, abusive words.’ (De Chiara 2013: 159)
- LKh. (?) Or.11252/4v.6-7 *hvāṣṭe va [+ haṃ]bā’ki yanāre* ‘The Masters fear ... for you.’ (Zhang 2016: 226)

Tocharian occurrences

- IOL Toch 127 a2-3 *dhanike ṇem ṣamāne ♦ ajātaśatruñ lānte amplākātte or kamāte ♦* ‘A monk named Dhanika took away wood of the king Ajātaśatru without permission.’ (Ogihara 2009: 285)
- IOL Toch 246 a4-b1 *se ṣamāne – saṅkantse pelaiykneṣṣe wāntare wātkau tākaṃ amplākātte parra tseṅketār pāyti* 70-7 ‘If a monk, when a matter of law is being decided by the community, stands without permission, Pāt. 77.’ (Ogihara 2009: 245)
- IOL Toch 246 b2 (= IOL Toch 899 b1, cf. Ogihara 2009: 63) *se ṣamāne kātkoṣ preke amplākātte kwaṣaine yinmaṣṣāṃ pāyti* 80 ‘If a monk enters into a village when the time has passed without permission, Pāt. 80.’ (Ogihara 2009: 245)
- MIK III 4048 a2 *amplākāmṭte*⁴⁰⁹ *pārnā-sim mā pralle ste* ‘It is not to be taken out of the boundary without permission.’ (Ogihara 2014: 114)
- IOL Toch 108 a2 *amplākātte mā rittetār-me o(stameṃ lantsi)* ‘Ohne um Erlaubnis gefragt zu haben ziemt es sich nicht für euch(, aus dem Haus zu gehen).’ (Hackstein 1995: 115)
- PK AS 12D a5 *plākāllec āmp(l)ā(kā)(t)t(e) ksa nesāṃ śāk_usemp= eneśle 1 ||* ‘Together with alcohol, someone is without agreement/permission inclined towards agreement.’ (Michaël Peyrot, p.c.)

Discussion

The meaning and etymology of OKh. *haṃbālke* are uncertain. Bailey (KT VI: 394, DKS: 462) renders the two occurrences in the Book of Zambasta with ‘fear, terrible deeds’. As explicitly stated by him, this translation is only based on the context: *haṃbālke* occurs with the substantive *pva’na-* ‘fear’ and the verb *puva’d-* ‘to fear’. The hypothesis that *haṃbālke* may be used in hendiadys with *pva’na-* with the same meaning brings him to reconstruct an original **haṃbāyakā-*, a *-kā-* enlargement of an alleged Khotanese substantive *bāya-** ‘fear’, for which he compares *baya-* ‘fear’ (DKS: 269–70). The *-l-* he explains as ‘intrusive’. He compares the Old Khotanese participle *bva’lsta-* ‘mounted’, attested in the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* (see Suv II: 323) instead of the regular *bva’sa-* from a present *bu’vad-* ‘to mount’ (SGS: 102).

⁴⁰⁹ The anusvāra is puzzling, but it could just be a mistake.

This derivation appears now obsolete for two reasons. First, Khot. *baya-* ‘fear’ is a loanword from Buddhist Sanskrit, as convincingly shown by Emmerick (SVK II: 100). Therefore, the Proto-Iranian root **baiH-* ‘to fear’ is not represented in Khotanese (see EDIV: 3). Additionally, the assumption of ‘intrusive’ *-l-* is not warranted. The ‘intrusive’ *-l-* of the participle *bva’lsta-* ‘mounted’ can be explained as analogical to *byalsta-*, past participle of *byals-* ‘to overcome’ (so Skjærvø in Suv II: 323) or as a hypercorrection induced by the subscript hook, which can also signal the loss of an *-l-* in a consonant cluster (cf. *be’ysa-* < *balysa-* ‘Buddha’). Both explanations exclude any connection between Bailey’s reconstructed **hambāyakā-* and *hambālke*.

Another etymological proposal was put forward by Degener (KS: 198). She tentatively derived the substantive from the Proto-Iranian root **part-* ‘to fight, struggle’ (EDIV: 298) and assigned the meaning ‘Grausamkeit’. With Degener, one could then reconstruct a form **ham-part-kā-*. This derivation is also problematic. It is difficult, although not impossible, to accept that the cluster *-rtk-* developed to *-lk-*. To be sure, Bailey already proposed this development (KT VI: 252–53, DKS: 298) to explain the unclear hapax *bulke* occurring in Z 7.17. As this is the only other Khotanese word in which the cluster *-lk-* occurs, the problem deserves a more extensive analysis. As for the meaning of *bulke*, Bailey convincingly argued that it should be translated as ‘net’. Its occurrence with *drauka-* in the same Zambasta passage may suggest that the two Khotanese words render the Buddhist Sanskrit compound *keṣaṇḍuka-* ‘hair-net’ (BHSD: 193).⁴¹⁰ The proposed etymon would imply a reconstructed **wrt-kā-* ‘twisted thing (> net)’, allegedly from the Proto-Iranian root **wart-* ‘to turn’ (EDIV: 423–24). Because of the derivation of *bilga-* ‘kidney’ from **wrdka-* (DKS: 289, cf. Av. *vərəḍka-*), the development might be taken into consideration. The labial vowel in *bulke* instead of the expected *-i-* before dentals (and velars) as the outcome of vocalic **r* in Khotanese (Emmerick 1989: 211–13), however, renders Bailey’s proposal hardly acceptable.⁴¹¹ Consequently, the Old Khotanese hapax *bulke* cannot support Degener’s derivation of *hambālke* from **ham-part-kā-*.

Although its negative meaning seems certain, the etymology of OKh. *hambālke* still awaits an explanation. Given the difficulties in explaining the unusual cluster *-lk-* in Khotanese, as already noted by Cheung (EDIV: 3),⁴¹² it is not to be excluded that the Old Khotanese lexeme is a loanword. I propose that a suitable source form could be found in the Tocharian B adverb *amplākätte* ‘uninvited, without permission’ (DoT: 21–22). This adverb is formed from the verb TB *plak-* ‘agree, ask permission’ preceded by a privative prefix (Hilmarsson 1991a: 88–94). Its meaning is further secured by its consistent appearance in Vinaya prescriptions (see occurrences 1–3 above and Ogiwara 2009: 246). In Old Khotanese, the loanword underwent a thorough process of phonological adaptation:

⁴¹⁰ Z 7.17 *cu hūṇa saittā kho ju ṣā vara nistā karā yāva ne draukā ne vā jā bulke ttāmāra* 7 ‘As what appears in a dream is not really there, while there are no hairs, no nets (when there is) eye-disease.’ (Emmerick 1968: 129)

⁴¹¹ Besides, Sims-Williams (2022) convincingly argues that Leumann’s reading *jā(m)bulke* (or *jambulke*) is more correct from a syntactic point of view. Should one follow his hypothesis, a form *jambulke* could be interpreted as a loanword from an Indic source with initial *jambu*^o. Although several alternatives are possible (e.g. Skt. *jambudikā-*, which, according to Edgerton [BHSD: 238] should designate a kind of vessel), a parallel would be needed in order to establish the precise origin of the lexeme.

⁴¹² ‘An Ir. origin of Khot. *hambālka* ‘fear’ is also suspect, considering the strange consonant cluster *-lk-*’.

- TB initial /am/ was reanalysed as the frequent Khotanese preverb *ham-*. This is backed by the high number of verbs (and nominal formations) beginning with *hamb-* (twelve items in SGS: 142–44). Accordingly, initial *h-* was added.⁴¹³
- TB *-p-* underwent voicing after *ham-*, cf. OKh. *hambīr-* ‘to be filled’ < **ham-parya-* (SGS: 143).
- As no cluster *-bl-* is possible in Khotanese, the resulting difficult **-bla-* (from TB /plá/) underwent a metathesis, resulting in **-bal-*. Subsequently, the vowel in **-bal-* was lengthened to *-bāl-* before a consonant cluster.
- TB final /ətte/ was first borrowed into Khotanese as *-āte* and reduced to *-e*. This is a regular development in the transition between Old and Late Khotanese, but forms with *-e* are already found in Old Khotanese (SGS: 199). An alternative solution, suggested by Mauro Maggi (p.c.), may involve a development °*kätte* > °*kte* with loss of unstressed vowel and cluster simplification.

The adaptation process in Khotanese can thus be summarised as follows: TB *amplākätte* → PK **hamblakäte* > **hambalkäte* > OKh. **hambālkäte* > OKh. *hambālke*.⁴¹⁴ The optional subscript hook in the Book of Zambasta can be explained as a hypercorrect form (cf. *supra*). The stress pattern of the Tocharian B word (/amplākätte/) seems to have been maintained in Khotanese. The adaptation of the Tocharian B lexeme might indicate that the borrowing occurred some time before the Old Khotanese period, in the late Pre-Khotanese stage.

The meaning ‘without permission’ seems to fit the two occurrences in the Book of Zambasta perfectly:

- ‘If one acts without permission towards one (= performs an act without permission) or terrifies one in a dream, just as one does not think about these (acts) without permission or frights when one wakes up, [115] similarly one who has expedients, compassion full of wisdom, is not at all afraid of Apāya, the woes here when one is born [...].’

The reference would be here to acts contrary to Buddhist law. If the recipient of this portion of text can be identified with the monastic community, it cannot be out of place to surmise that *hambālke* may refer to actions against the Vinaya prescriptions. Because the Tocharian B lexeme appears to be a technical term used almost exclusively in Vinaya texts, I suggest that the word entered Khotanese in a monastic context. Religious loanwords from Khotanese are not rare in Tocharian: it is not impossible to imagine that the exchange was mutual and that Khotanese borrowed some religious terms from Tocharian.

The Zambasta passage allows the identification of a new collocation with the meaning ‘to act without permission’, formed by the verb *yan-* ‘to do’ (mid.) and a substantive or adverb. Similar collocations are frequent in Khotanese and may also require the middle voice as in the case under examination, cf. *śśāru yan-* (act.) ‘to do good’, but *byāta yan-* (mid.) ‘to remember’ and *āysda yan-* (mid.) ‘to watch over, protect’.

⁴¹³ For the inverse process, i.e. Khotanese initial *ham-* adapted as *am-* in Tocharian B, see s.v. *ampoñō* and *ampa-*.

⁴¹⁴ Or, alternatively: TB *amplākätte* → PK **hamblakte* > **hambalke* > OKh. **hambālke* > OKh. *hambālke*.

⁴¹⁵ The demonstrative *tte* (for *tṭä* or *tṭätä*, see Del Tomba 2021: 172) would imply *kīre* ‘acts’.

Having thus determined the meaning and etymology of *hambälke* in Old Khotanese, it is now necessary to examine more closely the less clear occurrences of the word in Late Khotanese. Degener's suggestion (KS: 198) to identify the hapax *habvakya-* in Sudh 406 and 415 with OKh. *hambälke* was followed in the edition by De Chiara (2013: 159), who tentatively translated it as 'abuse, threat, cruelty'. As for the meaning, the context would safely allow a translation 'without permission'. The occurrence of LKh. *habvakya-* in a collocation with *yan-* in the middle voice (*hambvekye yaṃde* 3sg. prs. mid. in Sudh 406) strengthens the hypothesis of Degener's identification with OKh. *hambälke*. For *bva* instead of OKh. *bā* in the manuscript tradition of the *Sudhanāvadāna*, cf. the nom.-acc. pl. *bveyi* (A) / *bveya* (CP) 'rays' (OKh. *bā'yi-* 'ray'). Since a lost *-l-* has to be accounted for here, the reading of manuscript C can be considered the most conservative. One could reconstruct a form **hambvekye* for the *Sudhanāvadāna* because the loss of *-l-* in Late Khotanese often implies the fronting of the preceding vowel. The following translations for Sudh 406 and 414-5 can be suggested:

- LKh. Sudh 406 *habvakya yada drauma kaidara rai* (C) / *hambvekye yaṃde drrāma kaidharä re* (A) 'Druma, the king of the *kinnaras*, will act without permission'.
- LKh. Sudh 414-5 *avamāva baida daṇḍa-karama niśāve ttrakṣa* [415] *habvakya pajarūna salāva* (C) 'He imposed on him unlimited punishments, harsh acts without permission, abusive words'.

Another Late Khotanese occurrence of *hambälke* to be examined concerns a document of the London collection (Or.11252/4v) recently edited by Zhang (2016: 225–28). His suggestion to restore a form [haṃ]bā'ki on line 6 seems very convincing. A portion of the left tail of the akṣara *ha* is partly visible, and the occurrence of [haṃ]bā'ki with the following *yanāre* (3sg. prs. mid.) is a good argument supporting the identification of a collocation *hambälke yan-* (mid.) also in this secular document. The resulting translation runs as follows:

- 'The Masters are acting without permission ... towards you.'

All Late Khotanese occurrences support the suggested translation of *hambälke* as 'without permission'.

Results

Old Khotanese *hambälke* can be interpreted as a loanword from TB *amplākätte* and translated 'without permission'. Several other occurrences of the word in the Late Khotanese *Sudhanāvadāna* and the secular document Or.11252/4v can be identified and support this interpretation. The adaptation of the loanword can be taken as an indication of its relative antiquity. The borrowing may have occurred in a Buddhist monastic milieu during the late Pre-Khotanese stage or the early Old Khotanese period.

5.2.4. LKH. *MUKAU-KA-* 'PERS. NAME', TB *MOKO* 'ELDER'

Khotanese occurrences

- IOL Khot Wood 6 b3 *budaśudä* . | *mukaukä* . | (KMB: 561)

Discussion and results

A personal name LKh. *mukauka-* is attested in the wooden tablet IOL Khot Wood 6. It is very similar to the Tocharian B personal *mākkokke*, occurring in SI B Toch 12 a2. For a more extensive treatment of these two personal names, see s.v. *-kke*, *-kka*, *-kko*. Here it should only be noted that the Late Khotanese personal name could have been based on a loanword from TB *moko* ‘elder’ extended with a *ka*-suffix, and showing the already familiar correspondence Khot. *u* ~ TB *o*. Further, the Tocharian B name can be taken as referring to a Khotanese person, as it seems to have been borrowed from LKh. *mukauka-*.

A further argument in favour of a Tocharian origin of the Late Khotanese personal name is that the same wooden tablet, a list of people organised in three columns on the *recto* and on two columns on the *verso*, may have preserved other Tocharian names. In fact, *cāpašurei* (nom. sg. of *cāpašuraa*?) in IOL Khot Wood 6 a1 bears some resemblance with the Tocharian B personal name *capeś* (LW < Sogd. *cp’yš* ‘general’). Further, *pukācā* in IOL Khot Wood 6 b2 could be an extended form of TB *poko** ‘arm’ (see s.v.), but more convincingly resembles the personal name *pākāñc**, attested in the cave inscription Kz-222-ZS-R-02.2 (Zhao and Rong 2020: 172). Alternatively, one may also think of TB *pakaccām* ‘a kind of invitation or supply’ (Ching 2010: 466), frequent in Tocharian documents.

5.3. TOCHARIAN LOANWORDS IN TUMSHUQESE⁴¹⁶

5.3.1. INTRODUCTION

The only assured Tocharian loanword in Tumshuqese is Tq. *p(a)laca-* ‘request (?)’. Since this word is fully integrated into Tumshuqese nominal morphology, it can be safely regarded as a loanword. This is not the case for some other words of Tocharian origin that occur in the extant Tumshuqese manuscripts: *kapci* ‘fingerprint’ (Ogihara and Ching 2017: 455) and the tune names *niškramā<n>tne*, *orocce-naumntaišne* and *käryortañe* (Maue 2007) should be considered as foreign words. They were probably borrowed more recently and will not be considered in this investigation.

5.3.2. TQ. *P(A)LACA-*, TB *PLĀCE* (A *PLĀC*) ‘REQUEST (?)’

Tumshuqese occurrences

- HL 1.14 ***placa***: *šu nu bā placa ma chid₁u ta ro rendu kte bištama* ‘Now, there⁴¹⁷ (?) should be no arguments about this. Thus it shall be as we establish (?)’.
- HL 3.5 ***palaci***: *ki šu maranu bisanu pasunu palaci hampā pandamid₁i* ‘If someone makes a *hampa*-appeal (counter claim?) on account of these houses and cattle.’
- HL 3.6 ***palaci***: *ki šu palaci hampā pandamid₁i* ‘if someone makes a *hampa*-appeal.’
- HL 3.7 ***palaca***: *šu nu bā palaca ma chid₁u ta ro rendu kte me ne añi pre rorama* ‘Now, there⁴¹⁸ should be no arguments about this. Thus it shall be, that we do not give (them?) one after another.’⁴¹⁹
- HL 4.11-12 ***palaca***: *šu bā palaca ma chid₁u* ‘Now a *bā* (?) appeal should not go out.’

⁴¹⁶ Translations from Tumshuqese without mention of the sources are my own.

⁴¹⁷ *bā* remains unexplained.

- TUMXUQ 001.a.15 **placa**: *ṣu yi ṣe placa ma chid₁u* ‘There should be no arguments about this.’ (Ogihara and Ching 2017: 464)
- TUMXUQ 002.a.9-10 **palaci**: *ma g₁i re[nd]u mye Cesumkyā † puri dud₁a † brād₁e howa ki marye śindaye awale palaci pandamid₁i* ‘There should be no son, daughter, brother [nor] sister of me Cesumāki who argues(?) over this piece of real estate(?)’ (Ogihara and Ching 2017: 465)
- TUMXUQ 002.a.16 **palaca**: *ṣu yi palaca ma chid₁u* ‘There should be no arguments about this.’ (Ogihara and Ching 2017: 465)
- TUMXUQ 003.a.15 **placa**: *ṣu yi ṣe placa ma chid₁u* ‘There should be no arguments about this.’ (Ogihara and Ching 2017: 466)
- TUMXUQ 004.a.11: **placa**: *ṣu yi ṣe placa ma chid₁u* ‘There should be no arguments about this.’ (Ogihara and Ching 2017: 467)

Tocharian occurrences (only in documents)

- PK LC 11 a3 (*pre*)*kṣallene cimpa ṣe plāce ṣey-ne* ‘There was his reply (regarding) to the questioning together with you.’ (Ching 2010: 146)
- PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a97 *ta[k]ane sã_u plāce star-me* ‘Therefore this is our request.’ (Ching 2010: 216)

Discussion

Tq. *palaca-* is attested ten times only in the contracts. It occurs in two frequent collocations with the verbs *ch-* ‘to go’ and *pandam-* ‘to do, make (?)’ that appear to belong to the legal jargon. As for the morphology of the word, the occurrences suggest a stem *p(a)laca-*. In most occurrences (seven out of ten), the word appears as *p(a)laca*, possibly the acc. pl. of an *a*-stem. The remaining three occurrences show final *-i*, hardly to be regarded as a nom. sg. As for HL 3.5 and HL 3.6, final *-i* may be due to weakening if *palaci-hampā* is interpreted as a compound (< **p(a)laca-hampā*). This explanation, however, cannot account for the third occurrence of *palaci* in TUMXUQ 002.a.9-10. The distribution of *palaca* and *palaci* may depend on the different verbs of the collocation. With *ch-*, one finds only *p(a)laca*, and with *pandam-*, only *p(a)laci*. One could speculate that the collocation with *pandam-* required a nom. sg. and that with *ch-* governed an acc. pl. An example supporting this hypothesis may be found in HL 14.3 (DTA TS 39, Skjærvø 1987: 89) *uṣtani pandamad₁a*, if *uṣtani pandam-* is to be tentatively interpreted as a collocation meaning ‘to encourage’ (lit. ‘to do spirit?’).⁴²⁰

The phonology of the substantive does not point to an Iranian origin. Already Konow (1935: 820) proposed to interpret it as a loanword from Tocharian B *plāce* ‘word, (idle) talk, speech; reply’ (DoT: 458). The phonology does not pose particular problems: an epenthetic vowel *-a-* was inserted to simplify the initial foreign cluster *pl-*, not occurring in Tumshuqese. In two cases, the word occurs without the extra vowel, as in the Tocharian B source. This observation is significant for the dating of the borrowing. If both forms (with and without *-a-*) were present in the language during the same period, the word might have entered Tumshuqese relatively recently. One may also argue that the documents with *pl-* were written

⁴¹⁸ *bā* again not explained.

⁴¹⁹ For *añi pre*, see Dragoni (2021: 221).

⁴²⁰ Since the context of the Tumshuqese collocation is unclear, this explanation remains speculative.

before those with *pal-* or in a different geographic area. However, this evidence alone can hardly be used to establish a relative chronology of the Tumshuqese contracts. Besides, no other external elements indicate that TUMXUQ 001 and TUMXUQ 003 were written in a geographical area or time much removed from the other contracts. It cannot be excluded that an epenthetic vowel was inserted at the time of borrowing from Tocharian, and syncope occurred only later. Complex initial clusters are not infrequent in Tumshuqese, cf. *tshari* < *tsahari* ‘4’ (Khot. *tcahora* ‘id.’).

An important feature emerging from this discussion is that the Tocharian B nom. sg. *-e* was adapted as the Tumshuqese nom. sg. *-i* belonging to the *a*-stems. As for the meaning of the Tumshuqese word, it is based on the context: no bilingual evidence is available (Ogihara and Ching 2017: 458 fn. 22). According to Ching (2010: 224), in Tocharian B documents, the word may have had the meaning of ‘formal request or pleading’, and it may have been part of the juridical jargon. This meaning fits the context of the Tumshuqese contracts, where the two collocations with *p(a)laca-* state a formal condition for closing a contract.

5.4. CONCLUSIONS

The results of the investigation carried out in this chapter show that Tocharian loanwords in Khotanese and Tumshuqese are limited to three items:

- OKh. *puka-* ‘arm-span’ ← TA *poke* or TB *poko** ‘arm’
- OKh. *hambälke* ‘without permission’ ← TB *ampläkätte* ‘id.’
- Tq. *p(a)laca-* ‘request, pleading’ ← TB *plāce* ‘id.’

In addition to these lexemes, the Late Khotanese personal name *mukauka-* may be analysed as a *ka*-suffixed form of **muku°*, a loanword from TB *moko* ‘elder’.

As shown in the case of OKh. *hambälke*, future research may discover new Tocharian loanwords in Khotanese and Tumshuqese.⁴²¹ It is nevertheless clear that lexical borrowing from Tocharian was limited. The dominant borrowing direction was Khotanese → Tocharian. In the case of Khotanese, the two loanwords can be dated to the early Old Khotanese stage and were borrowed in a learned context, probably in a Buddhist monastic milieu. As for Tumshuqese, the only loanword discovered so far entered the language relatively recently, as shown by the still imperfectly standardised orthographies. The numerous Tocharian foreign words (tune names etc.) in Tumshuqese were not integrated into the morphology of the language. They should be considered the product of more recent Tocharian influence.

⁴²¹ Since our knowledge of Tumshuqese is still imperfect, more Tocharian loanwords in Tumshuqese will be found in the future as well.

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1. SUMMARY

This study investigated the linguistic contacts between Tocharian A and B and Khotanese and Tumshuqese. The first chapter ('Introduction') located the study in its scientific context and explained the methodology. The second chapter ('Loanword Studies') aimed at determining a corpus of Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian. Of the 100 analysed items, I classified 48 words as reliable loanwords, 30 as doubtful/less reliable, I rejected 19 possible correspondences, and I classified 3 items as borrowed from Sogdian and Old Steppe Iranian.

Chapter 3. ('Phonological and morphological analysis; determination of the chronology') analysed the corpus of 48 reliable loanwords as determined in Chapter 2. It established the main phonological correspondences that govern the adaptation of Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian; it determined an internal chronology (PTK, PK, OKh., LKh.); it analysed the morphological data of the Tocharian substantives; it listed the loanwords according to their part of speech and gender. Chapter 4. ('Semantic Classification') determined the semantic fields of the loanword corpus and drew some historical conclusions from the material. Chapter 5. examined five potential Tocharian loanwords in Khotanese and Tumshuqese and classified three as reliable, one as less reliable and one as unreliable. This chapter summarises the most important findings.

6.2. CONCLUSIONS

Most of the results that emerged from this study are of a linguistic nature. I briefly summarise these in the following and attempt to contextualise my findings chronologically and historically.

6.2.1. A NEW CORPUS OF KHOTANESE LOANWORDS IN TOCHARIAN

The main result of this study concerns the volume and quantity of language exchange between Khotanese and Tocharian. The discovery of a previously unnoticed group of Khotanese loanwords, documented in this study, has shown that Khotanese exerted a much stronger influence on Tocharian than previously imagined. According to the scientific literature, the loanwords from Khotanese into Tocharian recognised previously amounted to at most fifteen items. In contrast, the items I classify as reliable now total forty-eight (cf. §2.2.1.). In many cases, the new interpretation of these Tocharian words based on Khotanese has contributed to a better understanding of the history of the Tocharian words themselves and of the textual passages in which they are attested, which in some cases have received new interpretations (cf. the case of *pānto* 'friend' or *u^hwātano** 'Khotanese', q.v.).

The newly discovered loanwords constitute a new corpus. As a result, some old loanword proposals were rejected (see §2.2.3.). Another series of proposals were not rejected, but phonological or semantic issues did not allow their inclusion into the group of reliable loanwords (see §2.2.2.). The number of analysed Tocharian words now amounts to ca. one hundred.

The corpus was subsequently analysed from different perspectives. The most important result in this respect is that it is possible to classify the loanwords on chronological grounds. Based on the new corpus, one can distinguish between two different prehistoric layers of Khotanese and Tumshuqese, Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese and Pre-Khotanese (see §3.2.). This corpus is highly significant for reconstructing the linguistic history of Khotanese and Tumshuqese. So far, no other language has been shown to contain so many loanwords from Khotanese.

6.2.2. THE DIFFERENT LAYERS OF KHOTANESE LOANWORDS IN TOCHARIAN

The main conclusion concerning the phonological and morphological analysis (see §3.3. and §3.4.) is twofold. First, it has been established that loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese and Old Khotanese mostly took the nom. sg. *-o* ending in Tocharian. This is an important feature that, together with the correspondence TB /a/ ~ Khot. *a*, allows for the first time a clear distinction between Tocharian and ‘Old Steppe Iranian’ loanwords. This Old Iranian language is the source of the characteristic loanwords with Proto-Tocharian **e* for Old Steppe Iranian **a*. I argue that the Tocharian ending *-o* is an adaptation of the Khotanese acc. sg. *-u* (§3.4.10.).

Second, this study has shown that the most frequent Tocharian declension pattern for the prehistoric loanwords is nom. sg. *-o*, obl. sg. *-a* (the so-called ‘*kantwo*-type’ of Tocharian B nominal inflexion). Loanwords exhibiting this declension pattern are to be attributed to Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese or Pre-Khotanese (see §3.4.).

In the following, I summarise the main features of the different layers of loanwords from Khotanese and Tumshuqese into Tocharian, and I attempt to contextualise them chronologically and historically.

6.2.2.1. Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese

The main historical conclusion that can be drawn from the newly discovered material concerns the dating of the first contacts between Tocharian and the ancestor of Khotanese and Tumshuqese and, as a consequence, the dating of the arrival of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese speakers in the Tarim Basin. The discovery of a group of words that must have been borrowed around the Proto-Tocharian age speaks for the presence of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese speakers in the Tarim Basin long before historical Khotanese. Although this topic still needs a more detailed study, this was already suggested by Peyrot (2018: 275–77), who argued on archaeological grounds that the arrival of the Tumshuqese-Khotanese people in the Tarim Basin could be dated around the year 1000 BCE. The data gathered in this study tend to confirm this hypothesis.

The lexemes borrowed from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese are predominantly associated with the administrative, political and economic spheres. This suggests that the ancestors of the historical Khotanese and Tumshuqese people that came into contact with Tocharians were sedentary, and their social organisation was strictly hierarchical. Moreover, they probably engaged in commerce and travelled around the region. If the hypothesis of the identification of the Ākêtālā/Aqtala culture with Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese speakers is correct

(Peyrot 2018: 275–77, Mallory 2015: 25),⁴²² the oldest items in this group (‘envoy’, ‘chief’, ‘property, estate’, ‘number’, ‘letter’) may have been borrowed from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese-speaking people inhabiting the urban sites of this culture in the first half of the first millennium BCE. Due to its position halfway between the northern and the southern oases, the site of Ĵumbulaq Qum, one of the most significant sites belonging to the Ākètālā/Aqtala culture (Debaine-Francfort and Idriss 2001: 120–36, Peyrot 2018: 275), might be a good candidate. On the possible western (‘Scythian’) connections of this site, cf. Debaine-Francfort and Idriss (2001: 156–58).

An important argument supporting an early dating of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese contacts with Tocharian is the Tocharian word for iron, TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu**. In this study, it has been shown that this word was borrowed from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese (see §2.1. s.v.). Thus, it seems likely that Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese speakers introduced iron in the Tarim Basin. Since the first iron finds in Xīnjiāng date from the early 1st millennium BCE, it is reasonable to posit a similar date for the first contacts between Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese and Tocharian.⁴²³ Consequently, it is possible that the first Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese speakers entered Xīnjiāng in the same period.

Phonology	Word attested in TA and B and reconstructable for Proto-Tocharian. TB <i>rt</i> ← PTK * <i>rd</i> (OKh. <i>ḍ</i>) TB <i>e</i> ← PTK * <i>ē</i> , <i>e</i> (OKh. <i>ī</i>), with * <i>ē</i> < PIr. * <i>ai</i> and * <i>e</i> < PIr. * <i>a_y</i> TB <i>-ñcw-</i> ← PTK * <i>-nśw-</i> (< PIr. * <i>-mśw-</i>) TB / <i>ər/</i> ← PTK * <i>ɣ</i> TB <i>ś</i> ← PTK * <i>č</i> (OKh. < <i>tc</i> > / <i>ʈs/</i>)
Morphology	The majority of the items shows nom. sg. <i>-o</i> , acc. sg. <i>-a</i> . Two items have nom. sg. <i>-o</i> , obl. sg. <i>-o</i> . No items with nom. sg. <i>-o</i> , obl. sg. <i>-ai</i> .
Semantics	Mostly administrative, political and economic sphere.
Dating	ca. 1000-500 BCE. Items reconstructed for Proto-Tocharian: probably borrowed immediately before its break-up. Other items: probably borrowed immediately after this date. No precise date can be given for the break-up of Proto-Tocharian, but a date in the range of ca. 1000-500 BCE seems likely.

Table 16. Features of Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian

6.2.2.2. Pre-Khotanese

No elements allow precise dating for the beginning of the Pre-Khotanese period. Since the *terminus ante quem* for the split of Proto-Tocharian is probably 500 BCE, and, as I show in this study, several Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese lexemes were borrowed into Proto-Tocharian, Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese cannot be later than this date. Thus, the Pre-Khotanese period can be situated between 500 BCE and the age of the first Od Khotanese written attestations (5th c. CE). Obviously, these two dates are to be taken respectively as a broad *terminus post quem* and *ante quem*.

⁴²² The hypothesis is backed by the alleged western connection (Scythian or Saka) of the Ākètālā/Aqtala culture by contrast with the ‘painted pottery’ sites (Francfort 2001: 228–29).

⁴²³ An in-depth discussion of these problems is found in Peyrot, Dragoni, and Bernard (2022).

An important phonological feature of the Pre-Khotanese layer of loanwords is TB *i* ← PK **ī* (< PTK **ē* < PIr. **ai*) against PT **e* ← PTK **ē* (< PIr. **ai*), which characterises Pre-Khotanese against Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese loanwords. Cases like TB *pito* ‘price’ and *kito** ‘help’ show *i* < PIr. **ai* against PTK **ē* but cannot be classified as being from Old Khotanese because of the preserved intervocalic dental TB *-t-* ← PK *-ʒ-* (> OKh. *-h-*). This points to another linguistic stage distinct from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese and Old Khotanese.

At this stage, words belonging to the administrative, political and economic spheres continued to be borrowed, but the number of loanwords from the medical domain increased considerably. It is significant that, probably during the first centuries of the Common Era, the ethnonym of the Khotanese people (OKh. *hvatana-*) was borrowed into Tocharian A and B (see s.v. *u**wātano**). The archaic appearance of this loanword suggests that Tocharian borrowed the term directly from Pre-Khotanese speakers, not from a later literary source.

Phonology	TB <i>i</i> ← PK * <i>ī</i> (PTK * <i>ē</i> , OKh. <i>ī</i> , < PIr. * <i>ai</i>) PTK intervocalic <i>-k-</i> reflected as TB <i>-w-</i> . Loss of intervocalic <i>d</i> . TB <i>u</i> <i>w-</i> ← PK * <i>hw-</i> TA <i>ts-</i> ← PK * <i>ts-</i> (OKh. <i>tc-</i>)
Morphology	The majority of the items shows nom. sg. <i>-o</i> , obl. sg. <i>-a</i> . Two items have nom. sg. <i>-o</i> , obl. sg. <i>-ai</i> .
Semantics	Administrative, political and economic sphere and medical terms.
Dating	ca. 500 BCE-400 CE. With the exception of TB <i>kātso</i> (see §2.1. s.v.), no items can be reconstructed for Proto-Tocharian.

Table 17. Features of Pre-Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian

6.2.2.3. Old Khotanese

The beginning of the Old Khotanese period coincides with the first Old Khotanese written attestations (5th c. CE). One of the earliest Khotanese manuscripts has been found in Šorčuq, a northern town where Tocharian A was spoken (Maggi 2004: 184).⁴²⁴ On the presence of a Khotanese-speaking Buddhist religious mission in Tocharian territory, see §4.3.4. Loanwords from Old Khotanese into Tocharian belong primarily to the medical and religious (Buddhist) sphere. This points to written contact in a learned milieu.

Morphologically, a significant feature is the absence of words showing nom. sg. *-o*, obl. sg. *-a*. The most common pattern seems to be nom. sg. *-o*, obl. sg. *-ai* (§3.4.3.2.).

Phonology	Absence of PTK or PK features (see §6.2.2.1. and §6.2.2.2.), but nom. sg. ending <i>-o</i> .
Morphology	Prevalence of items with nom. sg. <i>-o</i> , obl. sg. <i>-ai</i> .
Semantics	Mostly medical and Buddhist terms.
Dating	From the 5 th c. CE onwards.

Table 18. Features of Old Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian

⁴²⁴ Linguistic contact in the Old Khotanese stage, however, was not limited to the Šorčuq area. Old Khotanese loanwords are also found in archaic Tocharian B (cf. e.g. *yolo*).

6.2.2.4. Late Khotanese

As Old Khotanese has been transmitted to us chiefly as a written religious language, early forms of what we call Late Khotanese may have been spoken during the same period. Hence the very cautious dating of Late Khotanese loanwords into Tocharian from the 6th to 7th c. onwards. Xuánzàng observed that in the area of Khotan OKh. *hvatana*- ‘Khotanese’ was already pronounced like LKh. *hvaṃna*- in the 7th c. CE (see §2.1. s.v. *uwātano** and Emmerick 1987: 42). This may back the tentative dating proposed above. In §4.3.4.3., I have shown that two manuscript fragments written in Late Khotanese were found in the Kuča area. I propose that they were brought to Kuča during the age of the Four Garrisons (7th-8th c. CE), when Kuča, Qarašahr, Khotan, and Kašgar were united under Chinese rule. The movement of troops may have favoured knowledge exchange between the north and the south of the Tarim Basin.

Loanwords from Late Khotanese are far less numerous than loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese and Old Khotanese. Loanwords from Late Khotanese mostly show no vowel word-finally in the nom. sg. instead of the ending *-o* characteristic of the older stages. This may be due to the Late Khotanese weakening and loss of final vowels (see §3.4.1.). The loanwords from Late Khotanese are primarily technical terms belonging to the medical sphere. It is significant that a line of one of the two Late Khotanese manuscripts found in the Kuča area may contain fragments of a medical recipe (see §4.3.4.3.).

Phonology	Absence of PTK, PK and OKh. features and no nom. sg. ending <i>-o</i> .
Semantics	Mostly medical terms.
Dating	From the 6 th to 7 th c. CE onwards.

Table 19. Features of Late Khotanese loanwords in Tocharian

6.2.3. WHAT TYPE OF LINGUISTIC CONTACT?

Before this study, only fifteen Tocharian lexical items were recognised as borrowed from Khotanese and Tumshuqese. The majority of them were technical terms. This could fit a ‘casual’ contact situation, the first category in the borrowing scale elaborated by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 74–76, see §1.5.).⁴²⁵ However, the analysis of the data gathered in this study suggests that the linguistic contact between Tocharian and Khotanese can be classified as the initial stage of ‘slightly more intense’ contact, the second category in Thomason and Kaufman’s (l.c.) borrowing scale.

The fact that Khotanese and Tumshuqese influence on Tocharian was more intense than previously suspected is shown by several indicators. First, the direction of borrowing was almost exclusively from Khotanese and Tumshuqese (and their ancestors) into Tocharian. In Chapter 5, I have shown that the number of reliable Tocharian loanwords in Khotanese and Tumshuqese is limited to three lexemes against the forty-eight reliable items of Khotanese and Tumshuqese origin found in Tocharian. The second indicator concerns the semantics of the loanwords. Even though most of the borrowings are content words, there are traces of function words (see TB *twār* ← LKh. *tvarä* ‘moreover’) and possibly some suffixes (see §2.1.

⁴²⁵ See also Thomason (2001: 70–71, 2010: 41).

s.v. *-kke*, *-kka*, *-kko*).⁴²⁶ Moreover, the presence of five verbs among the borrowings (§3.5.5.) indicates more intense language contact since, at least in synthetic languages, verbs are much more difficult to borrow than nouns (Tadmor 2009: 61–3).

The examined material suggests that the contact situation of Tocharian and Khotanese can be best described in terms of *adoption* rather than *imposition* (see §1.6.). No Khotanese or Tumshuqese influence has been detected in the phonology or the syntax of Tocharian, the two areas most affected in an imposition situation (Haspelmath 2009: 50).

Another important conclusion of this study concerns the periodisation of the linguistic contacts between Tocharian and Khotanese. Tremblay (2005: 444) suggested that ‘the language with the most durable influence [on Tocharian] is undoubtedly Khotanese (and its kins), a fact which indicates that Tocharian and Khotanese were already neighbouring in c. 500 BC.’ As explained in §1.5., this suggestion is not supported by Tremblay’s data because most of the items that he classifies as loanwords from ‘Old Sakan’ were most likely borrowed from Old Steppe Iranian, an unattested Old Iranian language in contact with Proto-Tocharian (Bernard 2023). However, the new loanword corpus analysed in this study fully justifies Tremblay’s conclusion. The new material shows that most of the lexemes were borrowed in prehistoric times, mainly from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese and Pre-Khotanese.

The semantic fields of prehistoric borrowing primarily concern the administrative, political and economic spheres, as well as medicine. This points to the fact that the ancestors of Khotanese and Tumshuqese were culturally dominant in these domains. Buddhist and medical terms were prevalent among the lexemes borrowed in the Old and Late Khotanese stages. This suggests that Khotanese played a significant role in disseminating Buddhist knowledge into the Tarim Basin (see §4.3.). In this respect, an intriguing result of this study that awaits a more extensive investigation is the continuity of contact in the medical domain before and after the introduction of Ayurvedic knowledge into the Tarim Basin (§4.3.1.).

⁴²⁶ On the borrowability of content words vs. function words cf. Tadmor (2009: 59–60).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ABBREVIATIONS

Abaev	Abaev 1958–1989
AIW	Bartholomae 1904
AzI	Klingenschmitt 2005
BHSD	Edgerton 1953
BBB	Henning 1937
CDIAL	Turner 1962–1985
CEToM	<i>A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts</i> , https://cetom.univie.ac.at/
CPD	MacKenzie 1971
DKS	Bailey 1979
DMMP	Durkin-Meisterernst 2004
DMSB	Sims-Williams and Durkin-Meisterernst 2012
DoT	Adams 2013
DTTA	Carling, Pinault and Winter 2009
EDAIL	Martirosyan 2009
EDIV	Cheung 2007
EDP	Morgenstierne 2003
EVSh	Morgenstierne 1974
EWA	Mayrhofer 1992–2001
GMS	Gershevitch 1954
HWA	Wilkens 2021
IEW	Pokorny 1959
KEWA	Mayrhofer 1956–1980
KBT	Bailey 1981
KMB	Skjærvø 2002
KS	Degener 1989
KT	Bailey 1945–1985
LIV	Rix <i>et al.</i> 2001
LEW	Fraenkel 1955–1965
MW	Monier-Williams 1899
SDTV	Bailey 1968
SDTV I	Emmerick and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja 1995
SCE	MacKenzie 1970
SelPap	Henning 1977
SGS	Emmerick 1968a
SS	Konow 1932
Suv I-II	Skjærvø 2004 I-II
SVK I-III	Emmerick and Skjærvø 1982, 1987, 1997
SWTF	Waldschmidt and Bechert 1972–
TEB I	Krause and Thomas 1960
TEB II	Thomas 1964
TG	Sieg, Siegling and Schulze 1931
VTW	Dietz 2013
VW	Van Windekens 1976

REFERENCES

ABAEV, Vasily I.

1958-1989 *Istoriko-ètimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka. Tom I-IV* [= Historical-etymological dictionary of the Ossetic language. Vol. I-IV], Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, repr. Moskva 1996.

ADAMS, Douglas Q.

1984 'Greek (*h*)*ámaksa* 'wagon-chassis' and Its Cognates', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 97.2, 230–32.

1984a 'Tocharian A *śiśāk*, B *šecake*, and the Proto-Indo-European Word for 'Lion'', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 97.2, 284–86.

1988 'The formation of Tocharian B *kalāk*- 'to follow,' *parāk*- 'to rejoice,' *sanāp*- 'to anoint,' and *walāk*- 'to dwell,' with some observations on the development of Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Tocharian', in Yoël L. Arbeitman (ed.), *A Linguistic happening in memory of Ben Schwartz: Studies in Anatolian, Italic, and other Indo-European languages*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 401–10.

1999 *A dictionary of Tocharian B*. (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 10) Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi.

2011 'Three additions to the Tocharian B aviary', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12, 33–43.

2013 *A dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and greatly enlarged*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi.

ALLAN, John

1936 *Catalogue of the coins of ancient India*. London: Trustees of the British Museum.

ALLON, Mark

2001 *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras. The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 12 and 14*. (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, Volume II) Seattle – London: University of Washington Press.

ASMUSSEN, Jes P.

1961 *The Khotanese Bhadracaryādeśanā: text, translation, and glossary, together with the Buddhist Sanskrit original*. (Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser udgivet af Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabskabernes Selskab 39.2) København: Munksgaard.

BAILEY, Harold W.

1935 'Iranian Studies, V', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 8.1, 117–42.

1937 'Ttagara', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 8.4, 883–921.

1937a 'Hvatanica', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 8.4, 923–36.

1939 'The Rāma story in Khotanese', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 59.4, 460–68.

1940 'Ttāgutṭa', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10.3, 599–605.

1940a 'Rāma II', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10.3, 559–98.

1945 'Asica', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1945[1946], 1–38.

1945–1985 *Khotanese Texts*. Vol. 1 (1945); vol. 2 (1954); vol. 3 (1956) [vols. 1–3, 2nd ed. 1969 in one volume; repr. 1980]; vol. 4 (1961) [repr. with corrections 1979]; vol. 5 (1963) [repr. with corrections 1980]; vol. 6 (1967); vol. 7 (1985). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1946 'Gāndhārī', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11.4, 764–97.

1947 'Recent work in "Tokharian"', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 46.1, 126–53.

1949 'Irano-Indica II', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 13.1, 121–39.

1951 'Irano-Indica IV', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 13.4, 920–38.

1951a *Khotanese Buddhist Texts*. (Cambridge Oriental Series n° 3) London: Taylor's Foreign Press.

1953 'Ariaca', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 15.3, 530–40.

- 1954 'Madu, A Contribution to the History of Wine', in Shigeki Kaizuka, Tōru Haneda and Harold W. Bailey (eds.), *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun-Kagaku-Kenkyusyo, Kyoto University*. [vol. 1] Kyoto: Nissha, 1–11.
- 1955 'Buddhist Sanskrit', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 87.1–2, 13–24.
- 1956 'Iranian *miṣṣa*, Indian *bīja*', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 18.1, 32–42.
- 1957 '*Dvāra matinām*', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 20.1, 41–59.
- 1957a 'Adversaria Indoiranica', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 19.1, 49–57.
- 1958 'Miṣṣa Suppletum', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 21.1, 40–47.
- 1958a 'Arya', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 21.3, 522–45.
- 1960 'Arya, II', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 23.1, 13–39.
- 1961 'Arya, III', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 24.3, 470–83.
- 1964 'Saka miscellany', in *Indo-Iranica: mélanges présentés à Georg Morgenstierne à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 470–83.
- 1968 *Saka documents. Text volume*. (Corpus inscriptionum Iranicarum, 2: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian period and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, 5) London: Lund – Humphries.
- 1971 *Sad-dharma-puṇḍarikā-sūtra, the summary in Khotan Saka*. (Occasional paper 10) Canberra: The Australian National University, Faculty of Asian Studies.
- 1974 'The *Pradaśiṇā-sūtra* of Chang Tsiang-kuin', in Lance S. Cousins, Arnold Kunst and Kenneth R. Norman (eds.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I. B. Horner*. Dordrecht: Reidel, 15–18.
- 1974a 'The range of the colour *zar-* in Khotan Saka texts', in Philippe Gignoux and Ahmad Tafazzoli (eds.) *Mémorial Jean de Menasce*. Louvain: Impr. orientale, 369–74.
- 1977 '*Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra*', in Lewis R. Lancaster (ed.) *Prajñāpāramitā and related systems: Studies in honor of Edward Conze*. (Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 1) Berkeley: Regents of the University of California, 153–62.
- 1979 *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1981 *Khotanese Buddhist Texts. Revised Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1982 *The Culture of the Sakas in Ancient Iranian Khotan*. (Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 1) Delmar: Caravan Books.
- BARTHOLOMAE, Christian
- 1904 *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- BAUMS, Stefan
- 2009 *A Gāndhārī Commentary on Early Buddhist Verses: British Library Kharoṣṭhi fragments 7, 9, 13 and 18*. PhD dissertation, University of Washington.
- 2015 Review of Habata 2007, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 58, 71–78.
- BAXTER, William H. and Laurent SAGART
- 2014 *Old Chinese: A New Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- BEEKES, Robert S.P.
- 2010 *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. With the assistance of Lucien van Beek. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 10) Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- BEGMATOV, Alisher
- 2019 'Commodity terms in the languages of Central Eurasia: new interpretations from Mugh document A-1', *Studia Iranica* 48.1, 7–27.
- BENVENISTE, Émile
- 1935 *Les infinitifs avestiques*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve.
- 1940 *Textes sogdiens*. (Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale 3) Paris: Geuthner.
- 1946 *Vessantara Jātaka. Texte sogdien, édité, traduit et commenté*. Paris: Geuthner.

BERNARD, Chams

- 2020 'Some plant and animal names in Gavruni', in Romain Garnier (ed.), *Loanwords and Substrata*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 148) Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 27–61.
- 2023 *Like Dust on the Silk Road. An investigation of the Earliest Iranian loanwords and of possible BMAC borrowings in Tocharian*. PhD dissertation, Leiden University.

BERNARD, Chams and CHEN Ruixuan

- 2022 'A Fall into the Pit. Remarks on Tocharian B *koško, koškiye*', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 65, 1–31.

BERNHARD, Franz

- 1965 *Udānavarga. Band I: Einleitung, Beschreibung der Handschriften, Textausgabe, Bibliographie*. (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 10) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

BI Bo and Nicholas SIMS-WILLIAMS

- 2010 'Sogdian Documents from Khotan, I: Four Economic Documents', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130.4, 497–508.
- 2015 'Sogdian Documents from Khotan, II: Letters and Miscellaneous Fragments', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 135.2, 261–82.

BIELMEIER, Roland

- 2012 'Ginger: a Khotanese Loanword in modern Purik-Tibetan', in Cristina Scherrer-Schaub (ed.), *Old Tibetan studies dedicated to the memory of R.E. Emmerick: proceedings of the tenth seminar of the IATS, 2003*. (Brill's Tibetan studies library 10.14) Leiden – Boston: Brill, 21–27.

BIVAR, A.D.H.

- 2020 'Weights and Measures i. Pre-Islamic Period', in *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*. Consulted online on 19 July 2022 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2330-4804_EIRO_COM_10392 First published online: 2020.

BLAŽEK, Václav and Michal SCHWARTZ

- 2015 'Prehistory of Tocharian *yāstaci* 'Juniper' in the Perspective of Historical Phonetics', *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 43.3–4, 423–431.
- 2015a 'Tocharian A *koprānk* 'antelope, deer'', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 16, 9–16.

BÖHTLINGK, Otto von and Rudolph von ROTH

- 1855-1875 *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* (7 vols.). St. Petersburg: Eggers.

BOYD, Samuel L.

- 2013 *Language Contact, Colonial Administration, and the Construction of Identity in Ancient Israel: Constructing the Context for Contact*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

BURROW, Thomas

- 1934 'Iranian Words in the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 7.3, 509–13.
- 1935 'Iranian Words in the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan – II', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 7.4, 779–90.
- 1937 *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BROOMHEAD, J. W.

- 1962 *A textual edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kuchean manuscripts, With transliteration, translation, grammatical commentary and vocabulary*. Diss. Cambridge. 2 vols.

BROUGH, John

- 1962 *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. (London Oriental Series 7) London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

BRUNNER, Christopher

- 1980 'Liturgical Chant and Hymnody Among the Manichaeans of Central Asia', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 130, 342–68.

BRUST, Manfred

- 2005 *Die indischen und iranischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 118) Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

CAMPBELL, Lyle

- 2020 *Historical linguistics: an introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

CAMPBELL, Lyle and Mauricio J. MIXCO

- 2007 *A glossary of historical linguistics*. Salt Lake City : University of Utah Press.

CANEVASCINI, Giotto

- 1993 *The Khotanese Saṅghāṭasūtra. A critical edition*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik 14) Wiesbaden: Reichert.

CARLING, Gerd

- 2000 *Die Funktionen der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

CARLING, Gerd, Sandra CRONHAMN, Robert FARREN, Elnur ALIYEV, Johan FRID

- 2019 'The causality of borrowing: Lexical loans in Eurasian languages', *PLoS one* 14.10, e0223588.

CARLING, Gerd, Georges-Jean PINAULT and Werner WINTER

- 2009 *A Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A. Volume 1: Letters a-j*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

CATT, Adam Alvah

- 2016 'Tocharian B *ārt(t)e* and Tocharian A *ārtak*', in Dieter Gunkel, Stephanie W. Jamison, Angelo O. Mercado and Kazuhiko Yoshida (eds.), *Vina diem celebrent. Studies in Linguistics and Philology in Honor of Brent Vine*. Ann Arbor – New York: Beech Stave Press, 23–34.

CHEN Huayu

- 2012 'Newly Identified Khotanese Fragments in the British Library and Their Chinese Parallels', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Series 3, 22.2, 265–79.

CHEN Ruixuan

- 2016 Review of De Chiara 2013 and 2014, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 59, 187–215.

CHEN Ruixuan and Chams BERNARD

- Forthc. 'A Spicy Etymology. Remarks on Tocharian AB *śāñcapo*', in *Studia Indica: Gedenkschrift for Professor Duan Qing (1953-2022)*.

CHEN Ruixuan and Diego LOUKOTA SANCLEMENTE

- 2018 'Mahāyāna Sūtras in Khotan: Quotations in Chapter 6 of the Book of Zambasta (I)', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 61, 131–75.

CHEUNG, Johnny

- 2002 *Studies in the Historical Development of the Ossetic Vocalism*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik 21) Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- 2007 *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 2) Leiden – Boston: Brill.

- 2010 'Selected Pashto Problems I: The Accent in Pashto', *Persica* 23, 109–21.

CHING Chao-jung

- 2010 *Secular documents in Tocharian: Buddhist economy and society in the Kucha region*. PhD thesis, Paris, École Pratique des Hautes Études.
- 2011 'Silk in Ancient Kucha: on the Toch. B word *kaum** found in the documents of the Tang period', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12, 63–82.
- 2016 'On the names of cereals in Tocharian B', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 17, 29–64.
- 2019 'An Agnean inscription found by Aurel Stein at the Shorchuk Ming-öi (Yanqi) kept in the British Library', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 19, 1–26.

CHING Chao-jung and Hirotoshi OGIHARA

- 2013 'A Tocharian B Sale Contract on a Wooden Tablet', *Journal of Inner Asian Art and Archaeology* 5, 101–127.

CLAUSON, Gerard

- 1972 *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon.

CONE, Margaret

- 2001 *A Dictionary of Pāli. Part 1: a–kh*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.

COUVREUR, Walter

- 1953 'Het leven van de Boeddha volgens de Tochaarse bronnen', in *Handelingen van het twintigste Vlaams Filologencongres, Antwerpen, 7–9 april 1953*, 275–91.
- 1954 Review of Krause 1952, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 208, 79–92.
- 1954a 'Koetsjische literaire fragmenten uit de Berlijnse verzameling (naar aanleiding van Sieg & Siegling's Tocharische Sprachreste)', in *Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis, Handelingen VIII*, 97–117.
- 1956 'Bemerkungen zu Pavel Pauchas Thesaurus linguae tocharicae dialecti A', *La Nouvelle Clio* 8, 67–98.
- 1964 'Nieuwe Koetsjische fragmenten van het Aranemijātaka', *Orientalia Gandensia* 1, 237–49.

COWELL, Edward B. and Robert A. NEIL

- 1886 *The Divyāvadāna: a Collection of Early Buddhist Legends*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CRIBB, Joe

- 1984 'The Sino-Kharosthi Coins of Khotan: Their Attribution and Relevance to Kushan Chronology', Part 1, *Numismatic Chronicle* 144, 128–52.
- 1985 'The Sino-Kharosthi Coins of Khotan: Their Attribution and Relevance to Kushan Chronology', Part 2, *Numismatic Chronicle* 145, 136–49.

DARYAEE, Touraj

- 2006–2007 'List of Fruits and Nuts in the Zoroastrian Tradition: An Irano-Hellenic Classification', *Nāme-ye Irān-e Bāstān* 6.1–2, 75–84.

DEBAINE-FRANCFORT, Corinne and Abduressul IDRIS

- 2001 *Keriya, mémoires d'un fleuve: Archéologie et civilisation des oasis du Taklamakan*. Suilly-la-Tour: Findakly.

DEGENER, Almuth

- 1987 'Khotanische Komposita', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 48, 27–69.
- 1989 *Khotanische Suffixe*. (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien herausgegeben vom Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets an der Universität Hamburg 39) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

DE CHIARA, Matteo

- 2013 *The Khotanese Sudhanāvadāna*. (Beiträge zur Indologie 48) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- 2014 *The Khotanese Sudhanāvādāna. Commentary.* (Beiträge zur Indologie 48.2) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- DEL TOMBA, Alessandro
- 2020 *The Tocharian gender system. A diachronic study.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, Leiden University and Rome University La Sapienza.
- 2020a 'The development of PIE *o₁ in Tocharian', *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 93.1-2, 21–34.
- 2021 'Genus alternans in Khotanese? A synchronic analysis of the agreement classes', in *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 106.2, 164–95.
- 2022 'Avestan -ā^hhō, Young Avestan -ā̌, Old Khotanese -e and the development of the Old Iranian i- and u-stems in Khotanese', *Studi e saggi linguistici* 60.1, 111–172.
- DEL TOMBA, Alessandro and Mauro MAGGI
- 2021 'A Central Asian Buddhist Term. Remarks on Khotanese *sañā-* and Tocharian B *sāñ*, A *ṣāñ*', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 64, 199–240.
- DERKSEN, Rick
- 2008 *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon.* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 4) Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- DIETZ, Rudolf
- 2013 *Vorarbeiten zu einem Sanskrit-Tocharischen Wörterbuch.* (Typoscript, last known version 2013).
- DOČKALOVÁ, Lenka and Václav BLÁŽEK
- 2011 'On Indo-European roads', *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 39/3–4, 299–341.
- DOERFER, Gerhard
- 1963-1975 *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen.* 4 vols. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- 1991 'Chinese Turkestan viii. Turkish-Iranian Language Contacts', in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, Vol. V, Fasc. 5, 481–84.
- DRAGONI, Federico
- 2013-2014 *The Khotanese Aśokāvadāna. Critical Edition, Translation, Commentary and Glossary.* BA thesis, Sapienza University of Rome.
- 2017 'Chotanisch-buddhistische Manuskriptologie', in L. Paul (ed.) *Handbuch der Iranistik, Band II.* Wiesbaden: Reichert, 394–402.
- 2020 'The Tumshuqese Year of the Goat and the *Fremdzeichen* x₆', *Journal Asiatique* 308.2, 215–223.
- 2021 'Materia medica Tocharo-hvatanica', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 84.2, 295–319.
- Forthc. 'Washing, bathing, and soaking: on Proto-Iranian *snaH- in Khotanese'.
- Forthc.a 'In the Tune of the King of Khotan': the Name of Khotan in the Tarim Basin and Beyond', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 143.2, 289–308.
- DRAGONI, Federico, Niels SCHOUBBEN and Michaël PEYROT
- 2020 'The Formal Kharoṣṭhī script from the Northern Tarim Basin in Northwest China may write an Iranian language', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 73.3, 335–73.
- DRESDEN, Mark J.
- 1955 *The Jātakastava or 'Praise of the Buddha's former births': Indo-Scythian (Khotanese) text, English translation, grammatical notes and glossaries.* (Transactions of the American Philological Society, n.s. 45.5) Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.
- DUAN Qing
- 1992 *Das khotanische Aparimitāyuhṣūtra: Ausgabe, Übersetzung, Kommentar und Glossar.* (Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik. Dissertationen 3) Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler.

- 2013 'Were Textiles used as Money in Khotan in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries?', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* Series 3, 23.2, 307–25.
 - 2019 于阗语无垢净光大陀罗尼经 [Yutianyu Wugou jingguang datuoluonijing, A scroll of Khotanese Raśmivimalaviśuddhaprabhā nāma Dhāraṇī]. (梵文贝叶经与佛教文献系列丛书 Series of Sanskrit manuscripts and Buddhist literature 6) Shanghai: 中西書局 [Zhongxi shuju].
- DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN, Jacques
- 1941 'Tocharica', *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 41, 140–83.
- DURKIN-MEISTERERNST, Desmond
- 2004 *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. (Dictionary of Manichaean Texts 3) Turnhout: Brepols.
 - 2014 *Grammatik des Westmitteliranischen (Parthisch und Mittelpersisch)*. (Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Klasse 850, Veröffentlichungen zur Iranistik 73, Grammatica Iranica, Band 1) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- EDGERTON, Franklin
- 1931 *The Elephant-Lore of the Hindus. The elephantsport (Mātāṅga-lilā) of Nīlakaṇṭha translated from the original Sanskrit with introduction, notes and glossary*. New Haven (Conn.): Yale University Press.
 - 1953 *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit grammar and dictionary*. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University.
- ELLENBOGEN, Maximilian
- 1962 *Foreign words in the Old Testament: their origin and etymology*. London: Luzac.
- EMMERICK, Ronald E.
- 1967 *Tibetan Texts concerning Khotan*. (London Oriental Series 19) London: Oxford University Press.
 - 1968 *The Book of Zambasta, A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism*. (London Oriental Series 21) London: Oxford University Press.
 - 1968a *Saka Grammatical Studies*. (London Oriental Series 20) London: Oxford University Press.
 - 1968b 'Names from Central Asia', *Central Asiatic Journal* 12.2, 88–91.
 - 1968c 'Khotanese metrics', *Asia Major* 14, 1–20.
 - 1970 *The Khotanese Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra*. (London Oriental series 23) London: Oxford University Press.
 - 1971 'On Ravigupta's Gaṇas', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 34.2, 363–75.
 - 1973 'Khotanese metrics again', *Asia Major* 18, 137–53.
 - 1973a 'Commodianus and Khotanese metrics', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1973, 138–52.
 - 1977 Review VW, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 40.2, 402–4.
 - 1979 'The vowel phonemes of Khotanese', in Béla Brogyányi (ed.), *Studies in diachronic, synchronic, and typological linguistics: Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on the occasion of the 65th birthday*. (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science 4.2) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 239–50.
 - 1980 'r/n stems in Khotanese', in Manfred Mayrhofer, Martin Peters and Oskar E. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 166–72.
 - 1981 'The case against *ṣun*-'', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 86, 212–22.
 - 1983 'Some more loanwords in Khotanese', *Die Sprache* 29.1, 43–49.
 - 1983a 'Some remarks on translation techniques of the Khotanese', in Klaus Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker (eds.) *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien: Vorträge des Hamburger Symposiums vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981*. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas uralo-altaica 16) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 17–26.

- 1985 'Tibetan loanwords in Khotanese and Khotanese loanwords in Tibetan', in Gherardo Gnoli and Lionello Lanciotti (eds.), *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci Memoriae Dedicata*. (Serie orientale Roma 56.1) Roma: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 301–17.
- 1985a *The Tumshuqese Karmavācanā text*. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1985, Nr. 2) Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- 1986 'Ruki' in Khotanese?', in Rüdiger Schmitt and Prods O. Skjærvø (eds.), *Studia Grammatica Iranica*. (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft. Beiheft 13, neue Folge) München: Kitzinger, 71–81.
- 1987 'The Transition from Old to Late Khotanese', in *Transition Periods in Iranian History. Actes du Symposium de Fribourg-en-Brisgau (22–24. mai 1985)*. (Les cahiers de Studia Iranica 5) Paris: Association pour l'Avancement des Études Iraniques, 33–42.
- 1989 'Khotanese and Tumshuqese', in Rüdiger Schmitt (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 204–29.
- 1992 *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan. 2nd ed. thoroughly rev. and enlarged*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- 1992a 'The Dunhuang MS. Ch 00120: its importance for reconstructing the phonological system of Khotanese', in Alfredo Cadonna (ed.) *Turfan and Tun-huang: the texts: encounter of civilizations on the Silk route*. (Orientalia venetiana 4) Florence: Olschki, 145–170.
- 1994 'The Mahāsaṃvarcalādi Ghee', in Klaus Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker (eds.) *Memoriae munusculum, Gedenkband für Annemarie v. Gabain*. (Veröffentlichungen des Societas Uralo-Altaica 39) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 29–42.
- 1996 'A Khotanese monastic account book', in Ronald E. Emmerick et al. (eds.) *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang: Vorträge der Tagung 'Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung', veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.-12.12.1994)*. (Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Berichte und Abhandlungen. Sonderband 1) Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 51–65.
- 1998 'The Khotanese *Sumukhasūtra*', *Indologica Tauriniensia* 23-24, 387–421.
- 2002 'Hunting the hapax: Sir Harold W. Bailey (1899-1996)', in Nicholas Sims-Williams (ed.) *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples*. (Proceedings of the British Academy 116) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–17.
- 2009 'Khotanese and Tumshuqese', in Gernot Windfuhr (ed.) *The Iranian Languages*. London: Routledge, 377–415.
- Unpublished *Unpublished Edition of the Late Khotanese Siddhasāra*.
- Unpublished (a) *Unpublished Edition of the Late Khotanese Rāmayaṇa*.
- Unpublished (b) *Unpublished Edition of the Late Khotanese Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatārasūtra*.
- Unpublished (c) *Unpublished Edition of the Late Khotanese Vajracchedikā*.
- EMMERICK, Ronald E. and Mauro MAGGI
- 1991 'Thoughts on Khotanese *e* and *o*', in Ronald E. Emmerick and Dieter Weber (eds.) *Corolla Iranica. Papers in honour of Prof. Dr. David N. MacKenzie on the occasion of his 65th birthday on April 8th, 1991*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 67–73.
- 2001 'A new historical and etymological dictionary of Khotanese', in Carlo G. Cereti and Mauro Maggi (eds.) *Middle Iranian Lexicography. Proceedings of the Conference held in Rome, 9-11 April 2001*. Roma: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 227–34.
- EMMERICK, Ronald E. and Edwin G. PULLEYBLANK
- 1993 *A Chinese Text in Central Asian Brāhmī Script*. (Serie Orientale Roma 69) Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

EMMERICK, Ronald E. and Prods O. SKJÆRVØ

1982 *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese I.* (Veröffentlichungen der iranischen Kommission 12) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

1987 *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese II.* (Veröffentlichungen der iranischen Kommission 16) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

1997 *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese III.* (Veröffentlichungen der iranischen Kommission 27) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

EMMERICK, Ronald E. and Margarita I. VOROB'ËVA-DESJATOVSKAJA

1995 *Saka Documents, Text Volume III: The St. Petersburg Collections.* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, Vol. V Saka) London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

ENOKI, Kazuo

1965 'The so-called Sino-Kharosthi coins', *East and West* 15.3/4, 231–76.

EPPS, Patience

2015 'Historical linguistics and socio-cultural reconstruction', in Claire Bower and Bethwyn Evans (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. London–New York: Routledge, 579–97.

ERDAL, Marcel

1991 *Old Turkic word formation, A functional approach to the lexicon.* (Turcologica 7) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

ERNOUT, Alfred and Antoine MEILLET

1979 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, 4^{me} edition. Troisième tirage, par Jacques André. Paris: Klincksieck.

FALK, Hjalmar and Alf TORP

1910 *Norwegisch-Dänisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

FILLIOZAT, Jean

1948 *Fragments de Textes Koutchéens de Médecine et de Magie*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve.

FRAENKEL, Ernst

1955–1965 *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Heidelberg–Göttingen: Winter/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

FRANCFORT, Henri-Paul

2001 'The cultures with painted ceramics of south Central Asia and their relations with the north-eastern steppe zone (late 2nd–early 1st millennium BC)', in Ricardo Eichmann and Hermann Parzinger (eds.) *Migration und Kulturtransfer: Der Wandel vorder- und zentralasiatischer Kulturen im Umbruch vom 2. zum 1. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend*. Bonn: Habelt, 221–35.

FRIIS, Louise S.

2021 'Tocharian B agent nouns in *-ntsa* and their origin', *Indo-European Linguistics* 9.1, 1–25.

GABAIN, Annemarie von

1974 *Altürkische Grammatik*. (Porta Linguarum Orientalium 15) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

GENG Shimin and Hans-Joachim KLIMKEIT

1988 *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit. Teil I: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. In Zusammenarbeit mit Helmut Eimer und Jens Peter Laut.* (Asiatische Forschungen 103) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

GENG Shimin, Jens-Peter LAUT and Georges-Jean PINAULT

- 2004 'Neue Ergebnisse der Maitrisimit-Forschung (II): Struktur und Inhalt des 26. Kapitels', *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 19, 29–94.

GERSHEVITCH, Ilya

- 1954 *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
 1959 *The Avestan hymn to Mithra*. (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 4) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GHARIB, Badr al-Zamān

- 1994 *Sogdian dictionary: Sogdian-Persian-English*. Tehran: Farhangian.

GHEORGHE, Mihaela and Adina VELEA

- 2012 'Control acts in Romanian', in Stanca Măda and Răzvan Săftoiu (eds.) *Professional Communications across Languages and Cultures*. (Dialogue Studies 17) Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 135–67.

GHOLAMI, Saloumeh

- 2014 *Selected Features of Bactrian Grammar*. (Göttinger Orientforschungen: III. Reihe: Iranica, Neue Folge 12) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

HABATA, Hiromi

- 2007 *Die zentralasiatischen Sanskrit-Fragmente des Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* (Indica et Tibetica 51), Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

HACKSTEIN, Olav

- 1995 *Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensstambildungen des Tocharischen*. (Historische Sprachforschung, Ergänzungsheft 38) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

HAHN, Michael

- 2007 *Vom rechten Leben: Buddhistische Lehren aus Indien und Tibet*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Weltreligionen.

HANSEN, Olaf

- 1936 'Sakische Etymologien', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 8.2/3, 579–81.
 1940 'Tocharisch-iranische Beziehungen. Ein Beitrag zur Lehnwortforschung Ostturkestans', *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 94, 139–64.

HARMATTA, János

- 1994 'Languages and scripts in Graeco-Bactria and the Saka kingdoms', in János Harmatta (ed.), *History of civilizations of Central Asia. Vol. II: The development of sedentary and nomadic civilizations: 700 B.C. to A.D. 250*, Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

HARTMANN, Jens U.

- 2006 'Maitreyavyākaraṇa' in Jens Braarvig (ed.), *Buddhist manuscripts Band 3*. (Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection; Bd. 7) Oslo: Hermes Publ., 7–9.

HARTMANN, Jens U. and CHEN Ruixuan

- 2017 'Eine khotanische Bilingue aus Triratnadāsaś Guṇāparyantastotra', in *Zur lichten Heimat, Studien zu Manichäismus, Iranistik und Zentralasienkunde im Gedenken an Werner Sundermann. Herausgegeben von einem Team „Turfanforschung“*. (Iranica 25) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 211–220.

HASANDUST, Mohammad

- 2015 *Farhang-e rise-šenahī-ye zabān-e fārsi* [The Etymological Dictionary of Persian] (5 vols.). Tehran: Academy of Persian Language and Literature.

HASPELMATH, Martin

- 2009 'Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues', in Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor (eds.) *Loanwords in the Worlds' Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 35–54.

HASPELMATH, Martin and Uri TADMOR

- 2009 'The Loanword Typology project and the World Loanword Database', in Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor (eds.) *Loanwords in the Worlds' Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–34.

HENNING, Walter B.

- 1936 'Neue Materialien zur Geschichte des Manichäismus', *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 90, 1–18.
- 1937 'Ein Manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch', *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1936, 10, Berlin [= SelPap I, 417–558].
- 1940 *Sogdica* (James G. Furlong Fund, Vol. XXI) London: The Royal Asiatic Society [= SelPap II, 1–68].
- 1942 'An Astronomical Chapter of the Bundahishn' in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 3, 229–48.
- 1946 'The Sogdian Texts of Paris', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11.4, 713–40 [= SelPap II: 231–58].
- 1948 'The Date of the Sogdian Ancient Letters', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 12.3–4, 601–15 [= SelPap II: 315–30].
- 1958 'Mitteliranisch', in *Handbuch der Orientalistik*. (1. Abteilung, 4. Band [Iranistik], 1. Abschnitt [Linguistik]) Leiden – Köln: 1958, 20–130.
- 1965 'A grain of mustard', *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, Sezione linguistica* 6, 29–47 [= SelPap II: 597–618].
- 1977 (M. Boyce et al. eds.) *Selected Papers, I–II*. (Acta Iranica, 2. sér, 14–15; Hommages et Opera Minora, V–VI) Téhéran – Liège: Brill.

HILL, Nathan

- 2009 'Tibetan <ḥ> as a plain initial and its place in Old Tibetan phonology', *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 32.1, 115–40.

HILMARSSON, Jörundur G.

- 1986 *Studies in Tocharian phonology, morphology and etymology with emphasis on the o-vocalism*. Diss. Leiden.
- 1991 'Tocharian etymological notes 1–13', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 5, 137–83.
- 1991a *The nasal prefixes in Tocharian, A study in word formation*. (Tocharian and Indo-European Studies, Supplementary Series 3) Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- 1996 *Materials for a Tocharian historical and etymological Dictionary*. Edited by Alexander Lubotsky, Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir. (Tocharian and Indo-European Studies, Supplementary Series 5) Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.

HINTZE, Almuth

- 1994 *Der Zamyād Yašt*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik 15) Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 2009 'Disseminating the Mazdayasnian Religion. An Edition of the Avestan Hērbedestān Chapter 5', in Werner Sundermann, Almuth Hintze and François de Blois (eds.) *Exegisti Monumenta. Festschrift in Honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams*. (Iranica 17) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 171–90.

VON HINÜBER, Oskar

- 2001 *Das ältere Mittellindisch im Überblick*. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasien 20) Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- 2015 'Three Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra Manuscripts from Khotan and Their Donors', *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 18, 215–34.
- HITCH, Douglas A.
 2016 *The Old Khotanese Metanalysis*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Harvard University.
 2017 'Old Khotanese type A stems in -a- and -e-', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 80.3, 491–523.
 2020 Review of Schmidt 2018, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 140.4, 971–74.
- HOFFMAN, Karl and Eva TICHY
 1980 "'Checkliste" zur Aufstellung bzw. Beurteilung Etymologischer Deutungen', in Manfred Mayrhofer (ed.), *Zur Gestaltung des Etymologischen Wörterbuches einer Grosscorpus-Sprache*. Wien: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 46–52.
- HORNER, Isaline B.
 1954 *The collection of the Middle length sayings: Majjhima-Nikāya*. 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society.
- HUARD, Athanaric
 2020 'The end of Mahākāśyapa and the encounter with Maitreya – Two Leaves of a Maitreya-Cycle in Archaic TB', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 20, 1–82.
 2022 *Recherches sur les textes de méditation en tokharien*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris.
- HÜBSCHMANN, Heinrich
 1897 *Armenische Etymologie*. Lipsia: Breitkopf & Hartel.
- HULSEWÉ, A. F. P.
 1979 *China in Central Asia. The Early Stage: 125 B.C.–A.D. 23*. Leiden: Brill.
- ISEBAERT, Lambert
 1980 *De Indo-Iraanse Bestanddelen in de Tocharische Woordenschat*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Leuven.
- ISHIGAMI, Zen'ō
 1989 'Neparu bon Maitreyavyākaraṇa [The Nepalese version of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa], in インド哲学と仏教——藤田宏達博士還暦記念論集 [*Indo tetsugaku to bukk'yō: Fujita kōtatsu hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū* Indian philosophy and Buddhism – Hiroshi Fujita's 60th birthday commemorative collection], 295–310.
- ITKIN, Ilya B.
 2019 *Ukazatel' slovoform k neopublikovannym toxarskim A tekstam iz sobranija berlinskoj biblioteku*. Moscow: Oriental Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- ITKIN, Ilya B. and Sergej MALYSHEV
 2021 'Notae Tocharicae: apālkāts, pārsā(n)ts, letse et autres addenda et corrigenda–4', *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 2021.3, 47–75.
- ITKIN, Ilya B., Sergej MALYSHEV and Jens WILKENS
 2017 'THT 1590: Tocharian A Hariścandravadāna', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 18, 83–93.
- Ji Xianlin
 1943 [Hiän-lin Dschi], 'Parallelversionen zur tocharischen Rezension des Puṇyavanta-Jātaka', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 97, 284–324.
 1998 *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nātaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China. Transliterated, translated and annotated by Ji Xianlin in collaboration with Werner Winter*,

Georges-Jean Pinault. (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 113) Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

KELLENS, Jean and Eric PIRART

1990 *Les textes viel-avestiques. Volume II: répertoires grammaticaux et formes*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

KIM, Ronald

2015 'An explosive etymology', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 16, 25–50.

KLINGENSCHMITT, Gert

1975 'Altindisch *śasvat-*', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 33, 67–78. [AzI: 149–58]

1965 '√*kṛd* 'harzen' im Indoiranischen', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 18, 29–33. [AzI: 13–16]

2005 *Aufsätze zur Indogermanistik. Herausgegeben von M. Janda, R. Lühr, J. Matzinger, und S. Schaffner*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin

2006 'Hittite *pai-/pi-* 'to give'', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 111, 110–19.

2008 *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*. (Leiden Indo-European Dictionary Series 5) Leiden – Boston: Brill.

KONOW, Sten

1914 'Khotan Studies', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 46.2, 339–53.

1932 *Saka Studies*. (Oslo Etnografiske Museum, Bulletin 5) Oslo: Oslo etnografiske museum.

1935 'Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt', *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1935*, 20, 770–823, 8 pls.

1936 'Notes on the Sakas', *Indian Culture* 2, 189–98.

1941 *A Medical Text in Khotanese. Ch. ii 003 of the India Office Library: with Translation and Vocabulary*. Oslo: I Kommissjon Hos Jakob Dybwad.

1945 'Notes concerning Khotanese', *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 13, 199–224.

KORN, Agnes

2005 *Towards a Historical Grammar of Balochi. Studies in Balochi Historical Phonology and Vocabulary*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik 26) Wiesbaden: Reichert.

2013 'Final Troubles: Armenian Stem Classes and the Word-end in Late Old Persian', in Pavel Lurje and Sergei Tokhtas'jev (eds.) *Commentationes Iranicae Vladimiro f. Aaron Livschits nonagenario donum natalicium*. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 74–91.

2021 'Contributions to a relative chronology of Persian. The non-change of postconsonantal *y* and *w* in Middle Persian in context', *Indo-European Linguistics* 9, 85–127.

KRAUSE, Wolfgang

1952 *Westtocharische Grammatik, Band I, Das Verbum*. Heidelberg: Winter.

KRAUSE, Wolfgang and Werner THOMAS

1960 *Tocharische Elementarbuch, I, Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.

KROONEN, Guus

2013 *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 11) Leiden – Boston: Brill.

KUIPER, Franciscus B.J.

1956 'The etymology of ἄνθρωπος', in Heinz Kronasser (ed.) *Mnēmēs Charin. Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer 2. Mai 1866 – 9 März 1956*. Wien: Verlag der Wiener Sprachgesellschaft, vol. 1, 211–26.

KUMAMOTO, Hiroshi

- 1982 *Khotanese official documents in the tenth century*. PhD Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- 1988 'A Sanskrit-Khotanese conversation manual for Central Asian travelers', *Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies* 28, 73–82.
- 1991 'Some Khotanese Letters in Verse', *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 12, 59–80.
- 1993 'More Khotanese Letters and Verses', *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 13, 145–84.
- 1995 'Miscellaneous Khotanese Documents from the Pelliot Collection', *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 14, 229–57.
- 2022 'Khotan ii. History in the Pre-Islamic Period', in Prods O. Skjærvø, Alain Cariou, Hiroshi Kumamoto, Eric Schluessel, Mauro Maggi and Ciro Lo Muzio, "KHOTAN", in *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*. Consulted online on 17 October 2022 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2330-4804_EIRO_COM_365009 First published online: 2022
- 2009a 'The Maitreya-samiti and Khotanese', Unpublished draft of a talk read at the *Symposium franco-japonais : «Interactions et translations culturelles en Eurasie» («Dynamic Interactions of Cultures in Eurasia»)*, jointly held by the University of Tokyo and l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, in Paris, December 12–13, 2002.

KÜMMEL, Joachim

- 2000 *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen: eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 2018 'The survival of laryngeals in Iranian', in Lucien van Beek, Alwin Kloekhorst, Guus Kroonen, Michaël Peyrot, Tijmen Pronk, Michiel de Vaan (eds.), *Farnah. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky*. Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press, 162–72.

LANE, George S.

- 1947 'The Tocharian Puṇyavantajātaka: Text and Translation', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 67.1, 33–53.

LAUFER, Berthold

- 1916 'Loan-Words in Tibetan', *T'oung Pao* 17.1, 403–552.
- 1919 *Sino-Iranica. Chinese Contributions to the History of Civilization in Ancient Iran*. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.

LA VAISSIÈRE, Étienne de

- 2005 *Sogdian Traders: A History*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik, Section 8, Central Asia, vol. 10) Leiden – Boston: Brill.

LEUMANN, Ernst

- 1912 *Zur nordarischen Sprache und Literatur: Vorbemerkungen und vier Aufsätze mit Glossar*. Straßburg: Trübner.
- 1919 *Maitreya-samiti: das Zukunftsideal der Buddhisten: die nordarische Schilderung in Text und Übersetzung nebst sieben andern Schilderungen in Text und Übersetzung: mit einer Begründung der indogermanischen Metrik*. Straßburg: Trübner.
- 1920 *Buddhistische Literatur nordarisch und deutsch, 1: Nebenstücke*. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 15.2) Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- 1933–36 *Das nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus. Text und Übersetzung*. Aus dem Nachlaß hrsg. von M. Leumann. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

LEVI, Sylvain

- 1904 'Notes chinoises sur l'Inde: IV. Le pays de Kharoṣṭra et l'écriture kharoṣṭrī', *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 4, 543–79.
- 1913 'Le "tokharien B", langue de Koutcha', *Journal Asiatique* 11^e série 2, 311–80.

- 1932 *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* (la grande classification des actes) et *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa* (discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga), Textes sanscrits rapportés du Népal, édités et traduits avec les textes parallèles en sanscrit, en pali, en tibétain, en chinois et en koutchéen. Paris: Leroux.
 - 1932a 'Maitreya le Consolateur', in *Études d'orientalisme publiées par le musée Guimet à la mémoire de Raymonde Linossier*. Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux, 355–402.
 - 1933 *Fragments de textes koutchéens, Udānavarga, udānastotra, udānālamkāra et karmavibhaṅga, Publiés et traduits avec un vocabulaire et une introduction sur le «tokharien»*. (Cahiers de la Société Asiatique 2) Paris: Imprimerie nationale.
- LEVI, Sylvain and Antoine MEILLET
- 1916 'Notes sur le Koutchéen', *Mémoires de la société de linguistique de Paris* 19, 158–62.
- LIVSHITS, Vladimir A.
- 2015 *Sogdian epigraphy of Central Asia and Semirech'e*. (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, Vol. III Sogdian) London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- LOUKOTA SANCLEMENTE, Diego
- 2020 'A New Kharoṣṭhī Document from Kucha in the Hetian County Museum Collection', in Xiao Li (ed.) *Non-Han Literature Along the Silk Road*. (Silk Road Research Series 1) Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- LUBOTSKY, Alexander
- 2001 'The Indo-Iranian substratum', in Christian Carpelan, Asko Parpola, Petteri Koskikallio (eds.) *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations. Papers presented at an international symposium held at the Tvärminne Research Station of the University of Helsinki 8-10 January 1999*. (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran toimituksia 242) Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura, 301–17.
- LUBOTSKY, Alexander and Sergei STAROSTIN
- 2003 'Turkic and Chinese loan words in Tocharian', in Brigitte L.M. Bauer and Georges-Jean Pinault (eds.) *Language in time and space. A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the occasion of his 80th birthday*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 257–69.
- LÜDERS, Heinrich
- 1933 'Zur Geschichte des ostasiatischen Tierkreises', in *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* 1933/17, 998–1022 [Lüders 1940: 727–50].
 - 1936 'Textilien im alten Turkistan', in *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Nr. 3*. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften.
 - 1940 *Philologica Indica. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag am 25. Juni 1939 dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- LURJE, Pavel B.
- 2010 *Personal names in Sogdian texts*. (Iranisches Personennamenbuch 8, Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 808, Iranische Onomastik) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- LUZZIETTI, Silvia
- 2018-2019 *Il Piṇḍasāstra: saggio di edizione con traduzione, commento e glossario di un testo āyurvedico cotanese*. Unpublished MA thesis, Università La Sapienza, Rome.
 - 2022 'Lexical Notes on the Khotanese Piṇḍasāstra', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 65, 227–48.

MACKENZIE, David Neil

- 1970 *The 'Sūtra of the causes and effects of actions' in Sogdian*. (London Oriental Series 22) London: Oxford University Press.
- 1971 *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 1976 *The Buddhist Sogdian texts of the British Library*. (Acta Iranica 3rd series, vol. 10) Leiden: Brill.

MAGGI, Mauro

- 1992 *Studi sul sistema accentuale del cotanese*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Naples, Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- 1996 'A Chinese-Khotanese Excerpt from the Mahāsāhasrapramardanī', in *La Persia e l'Asia centrale. Da Alessandro al X secolo. Atti del Convegno internazionale (Roma, 9-12 novembre 1994)*. (Atti dei convegni Lincei 127) Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 123–37.
- 1997 *Pelliot Chinois 2928: A Khotanese Love Story*. (Serie Orientale Roma 80) Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente.
- 2008 'A Khotanese Medical Text on Poultices: Manuscripts P 2893 and IOL Khot S 9', *Traditional South Asian Medicine* 8, 77–85.
- 2009 'Annotations on the Book of Zambasta, I', in Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Christiane Reck and Dieter Weber (eds.) *Literarische Stoffe und ihre Gestaltung in mittelliranischer Zeit: Kolloquium anlässlich des 70. Geburtstages von Werner Sundermann*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik 31) Wiesbaden: Reichert, 153–71.
- 2009a 'Khotanese Literature', in Ronald E. Emmerick and Maria Macuch (eds.) *The literature of pre-Islamic Iran: companion volume I to A history of Persian literature*. (A history of Persian Literature 17) London: I.B. Tauris, 330–418.
- 2016 'The manuscript T III S 16: its importance for the history of Khotanese literature', in Barbara Meisterernst (ed.) *The Silk Roads, vol. 4: Silk Road culture: languages, art, material culture, archaeology*. (Critical concepts in Asian studies) London: Routledge, 110–26.
- 2018 'Bits and bites: the Berlin fragment bi 43 and Khotanese **druṣ-*', *Annual report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 22, 247–60, plates 4–5.
- 2019 'Morphology of the Khotanese Verbs in -Vṣ-', *Linguistica e Filologia* 39, 43–62.
- 2022 'Two Khotanese Etymologies: *parrama-* and *pūhei'tā*', in Alberto Cantera, Maria Macuch and Nicholas Sims-Williams (eds.) *The Reward of the Righteous. Festschrift in Honour of Almut Hintze*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 355–402.
- 2022a 'Some remarks on the history of the Khotanese orthography and the Brāhmī script in Khotan', *Annual report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 25, 149–72.

MALLORY, James P.

- 2015 *The Problem of Tocharian Origins: An Archaeological Perspective*. (Sino-Platonic Papers 259) Philadelphia: Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations (University of Pennsylvania).

MAJUMDER, Prabhas Chandra

- 1959 *Ārya Maitreya-vyākaraṇam*. Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press.

MALZAHN, Melanie

- 2007 'The most archaic manuscripts of Tocharian B and the varieties of the Tocharian B language', in Melanie Malzahn (ed.) *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Heidelberg: Winter, 255–97.
- 2010 *The Tocharian verbal system*. (Brill's studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 3). Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- 2011 'Speaking on tongue – the Tocharian B nouns with an oblique singular in -a', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12, 83–110.

- 2012 'Now you see it, now you don't - Bewegliches -o in Tocharisch B', in Olav Hackstein and Ronald Kim (eds.), *Linguistic developments along the Silk Road: Archaism and Innovation in Tocharian*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 33–82.
- 2013 'Of demons and women – TB *yakša*- and oppositional feminine forms in Tocharian', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 14, 105–21.
- 2014 'Tocharian A *śorki* "fear" and two other TA scary words', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 15, 87–94.
- 2022 'Tocharian *säl*- 'fly, throw'—Unsafe at Any Speed', in Laura Grestenberger, Charles Reiss, Hannes A. Fellner and Gabriel Z. Pantillon (eds.) *Ha! Linguistic Studies in Honor of Mark R. Hale*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 249–62.

MALZAHN, Melanie and Hannes FELLNER

- 2015 'Lifting up the light: *tläś* and *lkäś* in Tocharian A', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 16, 61–79.

MANKOWSKI, Paul V.

- 2000 *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew*. (Harvard Semitic Studies 47) Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

MARTIROSYAN, Hrach

- 2009 *Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, Vol. 8) Leiden: Brill.

MATASOVIĆ, Ranko

- 2009 *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 9) Leiden – Boston: Brill.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred

- 1956–1980 *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (4 vols.). (Indogermanische Bibliothek. 1. Abt., Sammlung indogermanischer Lehr- und Handbücher. 2. Reihe: Wörterbücher) Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- 1992–2001 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (3 vols.). (Indogermanische Bibliothek. 1. Abt., Sammlung indogermanischer Lehr- und Handbücher. 2. Reihe: Wörterbücher) Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

MAUE, Dieter

- 1990 'Das Mahāvaidehikamḡṛtaṃ in Tocharisch B', *Historische Sprachforschung* 103, 159–65.
- 1996 'Zu den uigurischen und iranischen Brāhmī-Handschriften der Berliner Turfanfunde', in R.E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, I. Warnke and P. Zieme (eds.) *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang: Vorträge der Tagung 'Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung', veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.-12. 12.1994)*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 211–20.
- 1997 'A Tentative Stemma of the Varieties of Brāhmī Script along the Northern Silk Road', in Shirin Akiner and Nicholas Sims-Williams (eds.), *Languages and Scripts of Central Asia*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1–15.
- 2004 'Konows Zeichen Nr. 10', in D. Durkin-Meisterernst, S.-Chr. Raschmann, J. Wilkens, M. Yaldiz and P. Zieme (eds.) *Turfan Revisited. The First Century of Research into the Arts and Culture of the Silk Road*. (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 17) Berlin: Reimer, 208–12.
- 2007 'Tumshukische Miszellen I. Beobachtungen zur Metrik', in Maria Macuch, Mauro Maggi and Werner Sundermann (eds.), *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan*. (Iranica 13) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 225–38.

- 2009 *Corpus of Tumshuqese fragments: Introduction, Handlist, Transliteration*. Available online at <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/iranica/tumshuq/handlist.pdf>.
- 2015 *Alttürkische Handschriften Teil 19. Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift Teil 2*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- 2016 'Tumshukische Miszellen / Miscellanea Tumšucica IV', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 17, 109–32.
- 2017 'Lesefrüchte / legendi fructus 4', Originalveröffentlichung.
- 2022 'The special sign Konow no. 3. A new approach to Tumshukese dental affricates', paper delivered during the workshop 'Tocharian and Iranian in the Tarim Basin and Beyond' (Leiden University, 23–24 June 2022).
- MAUE, Dieter and Hirotoshi OGIHARA
- 2017 'Tumshukische Miszellen III. 3. Tumshukese Dental Affricates', in *Zur lichten Heimat, Studien zu Manichäismus, Iranistik und Zentralasienkunde im Gedenken an Werner Sundermann. Herausgegeben von einem Team „Turfanforschung“*. (Iranica 25) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 421–32.
- MEUNIER, Fanny
- 2013 'Typologie des locutions en yām- du tokharien', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 14, 123–86.
- 2015 *Recherches sur le génitif en tokharien*. PhD dissertation, Paris.
- MONIER-WILLIAMS, Monier
- 1899 *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages. New edition, greatly enlarged and improved*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MORGENSTIERNE, George
- 1927 *An etymological vocabulary of Pashto*. (Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskapsakademi i Oslo. II, Historisk-filosofisk Klasse 3) Oslo: Dybwad.
- 1974 *Etymological vocabulary of the Shughni Group*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik 6) Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 2003 *A new etymological vocabulary of Pashto. Compiled and edited by J. Elfenbein, D.N. MacKenzie and Nicholas Sims-Williams*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik 23) Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- MÜLLER, Friedrich W.K.
- 1907 'Die "persischen" Kalenderausdrücke im chinesischen Tripiṭaka', *Sitzungsberichten der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 25, Berlin, 458–65.
- OGIHARA, Hirotoshi
- 2009 *Researches about Vinaya-texts in Tocharian A and B*. PhD Dissertation, Paris (ÉPHÉ).
- 2011 'Notes on some Tocharian Vinaya fragments in the London and Paris collections', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12, 111–44.
- 2012 'A fragment of the Bhikṣu-prātimokṣasūtra in Tocharian B', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13, 163–80.
- 2012a 'Tokarago B "Avadāna shahon" ni tsuite [The "Avadāna manuscript" in Tocharian B]'. *Tōkyō Daigaku Gengogaku Ronshū [Tokyo University Linguistic Papers]* 32, 109–243.
- 2013 'Tocharian fragment THT333 in the Berlin collection', *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 33, 205–17.
- 2014 'Fragments of secular documents in Tocharian A', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 15, 103–29.
- OGIHARA, Hirotoshi and CHING Chao-jung
- 2017 'Some Observations on the Tumshuqese Documents Newly Published in China', in *Zur lichten Heimat, Studien zu Manichäismus, Iranistik und Zentralasienkunde im Gedenken an Werner*

- Sundermann. Herausgegeben von einem Team „Turfanforschung“. (Iranica 25) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 453–82.
- OGIHARA, Hirotoshi and Georges-Jean PINAULT
 2010 ‘Un fragment de planchette de bois en tokharien B’, *Journal Asiatique* 298.1, 173–202.
- OLSEN, Birgit A.
 1999 *The noun in Biblical Armenian. Origin and word-formation—with special emphasis on the Indo-European heritage*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
 2005 ‘On Iranian dialectal diversity in Armenian’, in Gerhard Meiser and Olav Hackstein (eds.) *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel: Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 473–81.
- PAKZAD, Fazlollah
 2005 *Bundahišn. Zoroastrische Kosmogonie und Kosmologie. Band I: Kritische Edition*. (Ancient Iranian Studies Series 2) Tehran: Centre for the Great Islamic Encyclopaedia.
- PELLIOT, Paul
 1959 *Notes on Marco Polo, I*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve.
- PENNEY, John H.W.
 1989 ‘Preverbs and Postpositions in Tocharian’, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 87.1, 54–74.
- PETERS, MARTIN
 2004 ‘On some Greek *nt*-Formations’, in John H. W. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European perspectives. Studies in honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 266–76.
- PEYROT, Michaël
 2008 *Variation and change in Tocharian B*. (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 15) Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi.
 2010 ‘Notes on the Buddhastotra Fragment THT3597 in Tocharian B’, *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 25, 143–70.
 2010a ‘Proto-Tocharian Syntax and the Status of Tocharian A’, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 38.1–2, 132–46.
 2012 ‘Tocharian ‘eat’ and the strong imperfect in Tocharian A’, in Olav Hackstein and Ronald I. Kim (eds.) *Linguistic Developments along the Silk Road: Archaisms and Innovation in Tocharian*. (Multilingualism and History of Knowledge 2) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 85–119.
 2013 *The Tocharian Subjunctive. A Study in syntax and verbal stem formation*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
 2014 ‘La relation entre la chronologie du Tokharien B et la paléographie’, *Eurasian Studies* 12, 121–47.
 2015 ‘Tocharian Language’, in: *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*, consulted online on 17 October 2022 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2330-4804_EIRO_COM_11716 First published online: 2020 First print edition: 20150727
 2016 ‘The Sanskrit Udānavarga and the Tocharian B Udānastotra: a window on the relationship between religious and popular language on the northern Silk Road’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 79.2, 305–27.
 2016a ‘Further Sanskrit–Tocharian bilingual Udānavarga fragments’, *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 17, 153–211.
 2016b ‘Language contact in Central Asia: On the etymology of Tocharian B yolo ‘bad’’, in Bjarne Simmelkjær Sandgaard Hansen, Benedicte N. Whitehead, Thomas Olander and Birgit A. Olsen (eds.) *Etymology and the European Lexicon*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 329–35.

- 2018 'Tocharian B *etswe* 'mule' and Eastern East Iranian', in Lucien van Beek, Alwin Kloekhorst, Guus Kroonen, Michaël Peyrot, Tijmen Pronk, Michiel de Vaan (eds.) *Farnah. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky*. Ann Arbor – New York: Beech Stave Press, 270–83.
- 2018a 'A Comparison of the Tocharian A and B Metrical Traditions', in Olav Hackstein and Dieter Gunkel (eds.) *Language and Meter*. (Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 18) Leiden: Brill, 319–45.
- 2018b 'Tocharian Agricultural Terminology: Between Inheritance and Language Contact', in Guus Kroonen, James P. Mallory, Bernard Comrie (eds.) *Talking Neolithic: Proceedings of the workshop on Indo-European origins held at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, December 2–3, 2013*. (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 65) Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 242–77.
- 2018c 'On the East Iranian Genitive Plural Ending', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 61.2, 118–30.
- 2019 'The deviant typological profile of the Tocharian branch of Indo-European may be due to Uralic substrate influence', *Indo-European Linguistics* 7, 72–121.
- 2022 'Notes on Tocharian A *o(k)* 'snake', A *oram* and B *sorromp* 'down', B *ošno*, B *nanāmo* 'recognising', B *pāwe*, and B *†səwm-* 'trickle', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 21, 163–177.
- PEYROT, Michaël and Jens WILKENS
- 2017 'Weitere Parallelen in Tocharisch B zur altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā: Mahendrasena- und Ṣaḍdanta-Avadāna', in *Zur lichten Heimat, Studien zu Manichäismus, Iranistik und Zentralasienkunde im Gedenken an Werner Sundermann. Herausgegeben von einem Team „Turfanforschung“*. (Iranica 25) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 683–710.
- PEYROT, Michaël, Federico DRAGONI and Chams BERNARD
- 2022 'The spread of iron in Central Asia: Linguistic evidence from Khotanese and Tocharian'. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 85.3, 403–22.
- PEYROT, Michaël, George-Jean PINAULT and Jens WILKENS
- 2019 'Vernaculars of the Silk Road – a Tocharian B–Old Uyghur bilingual', *Journal Asiatique* 307.1, 65–90.
- PINAULT, Georges-Jean
- 1988 'Le Pratityasamutpāda en Koutchéen', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 2, 96–165.
- 1989 'Une version Koutchéenne de l'Aggañña-sutta', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3, 149–220.
- 1989a 'Introduction au tokharien', *LALIES* 7, 3–224.
- 1994 'Une nouvelle inscription koutchéenne de Qumtura: Légende de scènes bouddhiques de Praṇidhi', *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 11–12 (1993–1994), 171–220.
- 1996 'The rendering of Buddhist terminology in Tocharian', *Dūnhuáng Tǔlǔfān yánjiū—Journal of the Dunhuang and Turfan Studies* 1 [1995], 9–35.
- 1997 'Nouvelle lecture du fragment A 270 du *Maitreyasamiti-Nātaka*', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 7, 121–41.
- 1998 'Economic and administrative documents in Tocharian B from the Berezovsky and Petrovsky collection', *Manuscripta Orientalia* 4.4, 3–20.
- 1999 'Restitution du *Maitreyasamiti-Nātaka* en Tokharien A: Bilan provisoire et recherches complémentaires sur l'acte XXVI', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 8, 189–240.
- 2001 'Védique *tanú-* et la notion de personne en indo-iranien', *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris* 96.1, 181–206.
- 2002 'Tocharian and Indo-Iranian: relations between two linguistic areas', in Nicholas Sims-Williams (ed.) *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples*. (Proceedings of the British Academy 116) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 243–84.

- 2004 'Zum Tocharischen in der Turfanforschung', in Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst *et al.* (eds.) *Turfan revisited—The first century of research into the arts and cultures of the Silk Road*. (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 17) Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 256–63.
 - 2007 'Concordance des manuscrits tokhariens du fonds Pelliot', in Melanie Malzahn (ed.), *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Heidelberg: Winter, 163–222.
 - 2008 *Chrestomathie tokharienne, textes et grammaire*. (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris 95) Leuven – Paris: Peeters.
 - 2009 'Elephant Man. Sur le nom de l'éléphant en tokharien', in Nalini Balbir and Georges-Jean Pinault (eds.), *Penser, dire et représenter l'animal dans le monde indien*. Paris: Champion, 447–98.
 - 2011 'Let Us Now Praise Famous Gems', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12, 155–220.
 - 2015 'The formation of Buddhist languages, as exemplified by the Tocharian evidence', in Melanie Malzahn, Michaël Peyrot, Hannes Fellner and Theresa-Susanna Illés (eds.) *Tocharian Texts in Context. International Conference on Tocharian Manuscripts and Silk Road Culture, June 25–29th, 2013*. Bremen: Hempen, 159–85.
 - 2015a 'The legend of the unicorn in the Tocharian version', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 38, 191–222.
 - 2017 'Current issues in Tocharian etymology and phonology', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 18, 127–64.
 - 2019 'Surveying the Tocharian B Lexicon', *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 114.2, 91–97.
- PIRART, Éric
- 1984 'Gâthique *cazdōnghuuaṇtəm*', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 27, 48–49.
- POKORNY, Julius
- 1959 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- POTTS, Daniel T., Asko PARPOLA, Simo PARPOLA and John TIDMARSH
- 1996 'Guḥlu and Guggulu', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 86, 291–305.
- POUCHA, Pavel
- 1931 'Tocharica', *Archiv Orientální* 3, 162–88.
 - 1955 *Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A*. (Institutiones Linguae Tocharicae, Pars I). Praha: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství.
- PULLEYBLANK, Edwin G.
- 1991 *Lexicon of reconstructed pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- RASTORGUEVA, Vera S. and Džoj I. ÈDEL'MAN
- 2000 *Ètimologičeskij slovar' iranskix jazykov* [Etymological Dictionary of Iranian languages]. Vol. 1: a-ā. Moskow: Vostočnaja literatura.
- RINGE, Donald
- 1996 On the chronology of sound changes in Tocharian, Volume 1, From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Tocharian. (American Oriental Series 80) New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- RIX, Helmut *et al.*
- 2001 *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben, Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. (2nd ed. by M. Kümmel and H. Rix) Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- RÖHRBORN, Klaus
- 1979 *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien. Lieferung 2 agriglan- - anta*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

RONG Xinjiang

- 1992 于阗在唐朝安西四镇中的地位 [Yútián zài táng cháo ānxī sì zhèn zhōng dì dìwèi. The position of Khotan in the period of the Four Garrisons], *西域研究* [Xīyù yánjiū] 3, 56–64.
- 2009 ‘The name of the so-called ‘Tumshuqese’ language’, *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 19 [2005], 119–27.

ROSS, Alan S.C.

- 1952 *Ginger, a loan-word study*. Oxford: Blackwell.

ROTMAN, Andy

- 2008 *Divine stories: Divyāvadāna. Part 1*. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications.

SAKAKI, Ryōzaburō

- 1916 *Mahāvvyutpatti*. Kyoto: Suzuki gakujutsu zaidan.

SALOMON, Richard

- 2000 *A Gāndhārī Version of the Rhinoceros Sūtra. British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5B*. (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 1) Seattle – London: University of Washington Press.
- 2008 *Two Gāndhārī Manuscripts of the Songs of Lake Anavatapta (Anavatapta-gāthā). British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 1 and Senior Scroll 14*. (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, Volume 5) Seattle – London: University of Washington Press.
- 2021 ‘New Biographies of the Buddha in Gāndhārī (Studies in Gāndhārī Manuscripts 3)’, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 44, 355–401.

SANDER, Lore

- 1991 ‘The earliest manuscripts from Central Asia and the Sarvāstivāda mission’, in Ronald E. Emmerick and Dieter Weber (eds.), *Corolla Iranica: Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. David Neil MacKenzie on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday on April 8th, 1991*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 133–50.
- 2005 ‘Remarks on the Formal Brāhmī script from the Southern Silk Route’, *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 19, 133–44.
- 2012 ‘Early Prakrit and Sanskrit Manuscripts from Xinjiang (second to fifth/sixth centuries C.E.): Paleography, Literary Evidence, and Their Relation to Buddhist Schools’, in John R. McRae and Jan Nattier (eds.), *Buddhism across boundaries*. (Sino-platonic Papers 222) Philadelphia: Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations (University of Pennsylvania).

SCHLINGLOFF, Dieter

- 2000 *Vol. I, Interpretation*. (Ajanta – Handbuch der Malereien / Handbook of Paintings, Vol. I) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

SCHMIDT, Klaus T.

- 1974 *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. PhD, Universität Göttingen.
- 1980 ‘Zu Stand und Aufgaben der etymologischen Forschung auf dem Gebiete des Tocharischen’, in Manfred Mayrhofer et al. (eds.) *Lautgeschichte und Typologie: Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Wien, 24.-29. September 1978*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 394–411.
- 1982 ‘Spuren tieferer set-Wurzeln im Tocharischen Verbalsystem’, in Johann Tischler (ed.), *Serta indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 363–72.
- 1983 ‘Vorläufige Bemerkungen zu den in der Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin neu gefundenen tocharischen Handschriftenfragmenten’, in Fritz Steppat (ed.), *XXI. deutscher Orientalistentag, vom 24. bis 29. März 1980 in Berlin, Vorträge*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 271–79.

- 1984 'Bericht über das Project eines Sanskrit-tocharisches Wörterbuchs', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 97, 148–53.
- 1985 'Zu einigen der ältesten iranischen Lehnwörter im Tocharischen', in Ursula Pieper and Gerhard Stickel (eds.) *Studia Linguistica Diachronica et synchronica*. Berlin – New York – Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter, 757–67.
- 1986 *Fragmente eines buddhistischen Ordinationsrituals in westtocharischer Sprache. Aus der Schule der Sarvāstivādins. Text, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen und Indizes*. Habilitation.
- 1987 'Zu einigen Archaismen in Flexion und Wortschatz des Tocharischen', in Wolfgang Meid (ed.) *Studien zum Indogermanischen Wortschatz*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 52) Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 287–300.
- 1988 'Ein Beitrag des Tocharischen zur Entzifferung des Tumšusakischen', *Altorientalische Forschungen* 15.2, 306–14.
- 1989 *Der Schlußteil des Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins. Text in Sanskrit und Tocharisch A verglichen mit den Parallelversionen anderer Schulen*. (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 13) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 2000 'Wie zuverlässig sind unsere tocharischen Textausgaben? Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Editionen der *Tocharischen Sprachreste, Sprache B*, von E. Sieg, W. Siegling und W. Thomas und einigen weiteren westtocharischen Textstellen', *Die Sprache* 39, 224–38.
- 2001 'Die westtocharische Version des Aranemi-Jātakas in deutscher Übersetzung', in Louis Bazin and Peter Zieme (eds.) *De Dunhuang à Istanbul, Hommage à James Russel Hamilton*. (Silk Road Studies 5) Turnhout: Brepols, 299–327.
- 2002 'Bemerkungen zum Einleitungsteil des osttocharischen *Maitreyasamitināṭaka*', in Mehmet Ölmez and Simone-Christiane Raschmann (eds.) *Splitter aus der Gegend von Turfan. Festschrift für Peter Zieme*. (Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi 35) Istanbul – Berlin: Şafak Matbaacılık, 257–64.
- 2004 'Indo-Tocharica. Die Bedeutung anderssprachiger Parallelversionen für die Erschließung des tocharischen Schrifttums', in Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Simone-Christiane Raschmann, Jens Wilkens, Marianne Yaldiz and Peter Zieme (eds.) *Turfan Revisited. The First Century of Research into the Arts and Culture of the Silk Road*. (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 17) Berlin: Reimer, 310–12.
- 2007 'THT 1540', in Melanie Malzahn (ed.) *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Heidelberg: Winter, 321–39.
- 2018 *Nachgelassene Schriften: 1. Ein westtocharisches Ordinationsritual. 2. Eine dritte tocharische Sprache: Lolanisch*. By Klaus T. Schmidt. Edited by Stefan Zimmer. (Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 24) Bremen: Hempen.

SCHMITT, Rüdiger

- 2014 *Wörterbuch der altpersischen Königsinschriften*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

SCHNEIDER, Karl

- 1939 'Beiträge zur Wortkunde des Tocharischen', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 66, 249–53.

SCHOUBBEN, Niels

- 2021 'Accent sign matters. The Niya Prakrit grapheme <ḱ> and its connection to Bactrian <ḡ>', *Journal Asiatique* 309.1, 47–59.

SCHWARTZ, Martin

- 1974 'Irano-Tocharica', in Philippe Gignoux and Ahmad Taffazzoli (eds.) *Mémorial Jean de Menasce*. Louvain: Imprimerie orientale, 399–411.

SCHWENTNER, Ernst

- 1958 'Ein zentralasiatisches Wanderwort', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 75, 57.

SIEG, Emil

- 1938 'Die Kutschischen Karmavibhaṅga-Texte der Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (zu Prof. Sylvain Lévi's Ausgabe und Übersetzung)', *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 65, 1–54.
- 1944 *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen I*. Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1943, Nr. 16. Berlin.
- 1952 *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II, Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Werner Thomas*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1951, Nr. 1. Berlin.

SIEG, Emil and Wilhelm SIEGLING

- 1908 *Tocharisch, die Sprache der Indoskythen. Vorläufige Bemerkungen über eine bisher unbekannte indogermanische Literatursprache*. Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Jahrgang, 915–34.
- 1953 *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B, Heft 2, Fragmente Nr. 71–633. Edited by Werner Thomas*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

SIEG, Emil, Wilhelm SIEGLING and Wilhelm SCHULZE

- 1931 *Tocharische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

SILK, Johnathan A.

- 2010 'Test Sailing the Ship of the Teachings: Hesitant Notes on Kāśyapaparivarta §§153–154', in Eli Franco and Monika Zin (eds.) *From Turfan to Ajanta: Festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the occasion of his eightieth birthday*. 2 vols. Bhairahawa, Rupandehi: Lumbini International Research Institute, 897–924.
- 2021 'A Brief Introduction to Recent Chinese Studies on Sanskrit and Khotanese (Chiefly Buddhist) Literature', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 64, 51–64.

SILVERLOCK, Blair A.

- 2015 *An Edition and Study of the Goṣiga-sutra, the Cow-Horn Discourse (Senior Collection scroll no. 12): An Account of the Harmonious Aṇarudha Monks*. PhD dissertation, University of Sidney.

SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas

- 1981 'Notes on Manichaean Middle Persian Morphology', *Studia Iranica* 10, 165–76.
- 1983 'Chotano-Sogdica', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 46.1, 40–51.
- 1983a Review of SVK I, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 46.2, 358.
- 1989 Review of SVK II, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 32, 46–53.
- 1990 'Chotano-Sogdica II: Aspects of the development of nominal morphology in Khotanese and Sogdian', in Gherardo Gnoli and Antonio Panaino (eds.) *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies, part 1: Old and Middle Iranian Studies*. Rome: Istituto italiano per il medio ed estremo oriente, 275–96.
- 1997 *New light on ancient Afghanistan: the decipherment of Bactrian*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- 1999 'A Bactrian deed of manumission', *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 5, 191–211.
- 2000 *Bactrian documents from Northern Afghanistan. I: Legal and Economic Documents*. (Studies in the Khalili collection 3) Oxford: Nour Foundation in assoc. with Azimuth eds. and Oxford University Press.
- 2007 *Bactrian documents from Northern Afghanistan. II: Letters and Buddhist texts*. (Studies in the Khalili collection 3) London: Nour Foundation in assoc. with Azimuth eds.
- 2010 *Bactrian personal names*. (Iranisches Personennamenbuch 7, Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 806, Iranische Onomastik) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- 2011 'Remarks on the phonology of the Manichaean Bactrian fragment', in Elena K. Molčanova (ed.) *Leksika, ètimologija, jazykovye kontakty. K jubileju doktora filologičeskix nauk, professora Džoj Iosifovny Èdel'man*. Moscow: Tezaurus, 244–51.
- 2014 'A Manichaean Sogdian hymn in two scripts', in Zhang Xiaogui, Wang Yuanyuan, and Yin Xiaoping (eds.) *San yi jiao yanjiu: Lin Wushu xiansheng gu xi ji nian lunwenji* [Research on three foreign religions: Festschrift for Mr Lin Wushu on his 70th birthday]. Lanzhou: Lanzhou daxue chubanshe, 64–76.
- 2016 *A dictionary: Christian Sogdian, Syriac, and English*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik 41) Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 2022 *The Book of Zambasta: Metre and stress in Old Khotanese*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik 49) Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas and François DE BLOIS
- 1996 'The Bactrian Calendar', *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 10, 149–65.
- 2018 *Studies in the Chronology of the Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan*. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 505, Veröffentlichungen zur Iranistik 83) Wien: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas and James HAMILTON
- 1990 *Documents turco-sogdiens du IX^e-X^e siècle de Touen-houang*. (Corpus inscriptionum Iranicarum. Part II Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia. Vol. 3 Sogdian) London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas and Desmond DURKIN-MEISTERERNST
- 2012 *Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian*. (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum: Subsidia 7) Turnhout: Brepols.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Ursula
- 2018 'Manuscript collectors and collections from the Southern Silk Road', *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 21, 273–89.
- SKJÆRVØ, Prods O.
- 1986 'Khotanese fragments of the Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra', in Eivind Kahrs (ed.), *Kalyāṇa-mitrārāgaṇam. Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson*. Oslo: Norwegian University Press, 229–60.
- 1987 'On the Tumshuqese Karmavācanā text', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 119.1, 77–90.
- 1991 'Ysenikām', in Lambert Isebaert (ed.), *Studia Etymologica Indoeuropaea Memoriae A. J. van Windekens (1915-1989) dicata* (Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta 45), Louvain: Peeters, 281–84.
- 2002 *Khotanese Manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library*. (Corpus inscriptionum Iranicarum, pt. 2: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, vol. 5: Saka, Texts 6) London: The British Library.
- 2003 'Fragments of the Ratnakūṭa-sūtra (Kāśyapaparivarta) in Khotanese', in Carlo G. Cereti, Mauro Maggi, and Elio Provasi (eds.) *Religious Themes and Texts of Pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia. Studies in Honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday on 6 December 2002*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik 24) Wiesbaden: Reichert, 409–20, with pls. 11–12.
- 2004 *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras: the Khotanese Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*. Vol. I: *The Khotanese Text with English translation and the Complete Sanskrit Text*. Vol. II: *Manuscripts, Commentary, Glossary, Indexes*. (Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures, 60 and 61. Central Asian Sources V and VI) Cambridge, MA: The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University.

- 2017 'Khotanese Land Purchase Deeds', in Enrico Morano, Elio Provasi, and Adriano V. Rossi (eds.) *Studia Philologica Iranica. Gherardo Gnoli Memorial Volume*. (Serie Orientale Roma, nuova serie, vol. 5) Rome: ISMEO, 455–67.
- STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ, Ivan M.
 1999 *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' vaxanskogo jazyka* [Etymological Dictionary of the Wakhi Language]. Sankt-Peterburg: Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie.
- STUMPF, Peter
 1990 *Die Erscheinungsformen des Westtocharischen, Ihre Beziehungen zueinander und ihre Funktionen*. (Tocharian and Indo-European Studies, Supplementary Series 2) Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- SUNDERMANN, Werner
 1993 'An early attestation of the name of the Tajiks', in Wojciech Skalmowski and Alois Van Tongerloo (eds.) *Medioiranica: proceedings of the International Colloquium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 21st to the 23rd of May 1990*. (Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta 48) Leuven: Peeters, 163–73.
- TADMOR, Uri
 2009 'Loanwords in the world's languages: Findings and results', in Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor (eds.) *Loanwords in the Worlds' Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 55–75.
- TADMOR, Uri, Martin HASPELMATH and Bradley TAYLOR
 2010 'Borrowability and the notion of basic vocabulary', *Diachronica* 27.2, 226–46.
- TEKIN, Şinaşı
 1983a *Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule. 1. Teil: Transliteration, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen*. (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients, Berliner Turfantexte 9) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- THOMAS, Frederick W.
 1930 'Tibetan Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan. IV: The Khotan Region', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 62.1, 47–94.
 1951 *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan. Vol. II. Documents*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- THOMAS, Werner
 1954 'Die Infinitive im Tocharischen', in Johannes Schubert and Ulrich Schneider (eds.), *Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller, Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 701–64.
 1957 *Der Gebrauch der Vergangenheitstempora im Tocharischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 1958 'Zum Gebrauch des prohibitiven mar bzw. mā im Tocharischen', *Central Asiatic Journal* 3, 289–308.
 1964 *Tocharisches Elementarbuch, II, Texte und Glossar*. Heidelberg: Winter.
 1969 'Zur tocharischen Wiedergabe der Sanskrit-Verba des Udānavarga', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 83, 290–322.
 1979 *Formale Besonderheiten in metrischen Texten des Tocharischen: Zur Verteilung von B tane/tne „hier“ und B ñake/ñke „jetzt“*. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und der Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1979, Nr. 15) Wiesbaden: Steiner.

THOMASON, Sarah G.

2001 *Language Contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

2010 'Contact Explanations in Linguistics', in Raymond Hickey (ed.) *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 31–47.

THOMASON, Sarah G. and Terrence KAUFMAN

1988 *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

TREMBLAY, Xavier

2005 'Irano-Tocharica et Tocharo-Iranica', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 68.3, 421–49.

TRENCKNER, Vilhelm

1888 *The Majjhima-nikāya, edited by V. Trenckner, vol. I*. London: Oxford University Press.

TURNER, Ralph L.

1962-1985 *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London – New York: Oxford University Press.

DE VAAN, Michiel

2003 'Old Avestan *xʷa-* and Young Avestan *hauua-* 'own'', in *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft; 17.-23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 699–708.

2008 *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. (Leiden Indo-European Dictionary Series 7) Leiden – Boston: Brill.

2008a 'On Wanderwörter and Substrate Words in Etymological Research', in Marijke Mooijart and Marijke van der Wal (eds.) *Yesterday's Words: Contemporary, Current and Future Lexicography*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 199–207.

VAN WINDEKENS, Albert-Joris

1941 *Lexique étimologique des dialectes tokhariens*. (Bibliothèque du Muséon 11) Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon.

1949 'Études iraniennes et tokhariennes I–II', *Muséon* 62, 125–50; 261–74.

1962 'Recherches sur le vocabulaire tokharien', *Orbis* 11.1, 342–6.

1976 *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes, volume I: La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. (Travaux publiés par le Centre International de Dialectologie Générale de l'Université Catholique Néerlandaise de Louvain 11) Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale.

WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst and Heinz BECHERT

1972- *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

WEBER, Dieter

1985 'Khotansakisch *āšana-* 'wert, würdig'', in *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*, II. (Acta Iranica 25) Leiden: Brill, 675–81.

WERBA, Chlodwig

1986 'Ghost-Words in den Gāthās', *Die Sprache* 32 (Festgabe für Manfred Mayrhofer), 334–64.

WILKENS, Jens

2021 *Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen. Altuigurisch – Deutsch – Türkisch*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

WILKENS, Jens, Georges-Jean PINAULT and Michaël PEYROT

- 2014 'A Tocharian B parallel to the legend of Kalmāṣapāda and Sutasoma of the Old Uyghur Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 67.1, 1–18.

WILKINSON, Endymion

- 2000 *Chinese History: A Manual. Revised and Enlarged.* (Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series 52) Cambridge (Massachusetts) – London: Harvard University Press.

WINTER, Werner

- 1984 *Studia Tocharica, Selected writings, Ausgewählte Beiträge.* Poznan: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

WUJASTYK, Dominik

- 2011 'Miscarriages of justice: demonic vengeance in classical Indian medicine', in John R. Hinnels and Roy Porter (eds.) *Religion, Health and Suffering.* London – New York: Routledge, 256–75.

YOSHIDA, Yutaka

- 1993 'ソグド語の Nāfnāmak 「国名表」の 2・3 の読みについて [Sogudo-go no nāfnāmak kokumei hyō no 2, 3 no yomi ni tsuite. Some new readings of the Nāfnāmak in Sogdian]', *Bulletin of the Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan* 36.1, 151–53.
- 1994 'ソグド文字で表記された漢字音 [Sogudo moji de hyōki sareta kanji-on. Chinese in Sogdian script]', 東方学報 京都 [tōhōgaku-hō kyōto. Eastern Studies] 66, 271–380.
- 1997 Review of SDTV I, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 60.3, 567–69.
- 2004 Review of KMB, *Kōbe gaidai ronsō* 55.7, 27–28.
- 2004a 'Some Reflections about the origin of čamūk*', in Takao Moriyasu (ed.) *Papers on the pre-Islamic documents and other materials unearthed from Central Asia*, Kyoto: Hōyū shoten, 129–35.
- 2008 'On the taxation system of Pre-Islamic Khotan', *Acta Asiatica* 94, 95–126.
- 2010 '新出のソグド語資料について - 新米書記の父への手紙から: 西巖寺橘資料の紹介を兼ねて - [Shinshutsu no sogudo-go shiryō ni tsuite - shinmei shoki no chichi he no tegami kara saigon-ji tachibana shiryō no kekkai wo kanete. On newly discovered Sogdian materials – Beginning from a Letter by a New Scribe to his Father, together with an introduction of the Tachibana Materials in Saigonji]', 京都大学文学部研究紀要 [Kyōto daigaku bungakubu kenkyū kiyō] 49, 1–24.
- 2011 'Some new readings in the Sogdian version of Karabalgasun Inscription', in Mehmet Ölmez, Erhan Aydın, Peter Zieme and Mustafa S. Kaçalin (eds.) *Ötüken'den İstanbul'a Türkçenin 1290 Yılı (720–2010).* İstanbul: Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür ve Sosyal İşleri Daire Başkanlığı Kültür Müdürlüğü, 77–86.

ZEISLER, Bettina

- 2010 'East of the Moon and West of the Sun? Approaches to a Land with Many Names, North of Ancient India and South of Khotan', *Tibet Journal* 34/35 (3/2), 371–463.

ZHANG Zhan

- 2016 *Between China and Tibet: A Documentary History of Khotan in the Late Eighth and Early Ninth Century.* Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Harvard University.
- 2018 'Sogdians in Khotan', *The Silk Road Journal* 16, 30–43.

ZHANG Guangda and RONG Xinjiang

- 1984 'Les noms du royaume du Khotan', in Michel Soymié (ed.) *Contributions aux études de Touen-Houang, volume III.* (Publications de l'école française d'extrême-orient 135) Paris: École française d'extrême-orient, 23–46.

ZHAO Li and RONG Xingjiang (ed.)

2020 龟兹石窟题记 [Cave Inscriptions in Ancient Kucha]. Shanghai: Zhongxi Book Company.

ZIEME, Peter

1978 'Ein uigurisches Fragment der Rāma-Erzählung', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 32, 23–32.

INDEX OF WORDS

Numbers refer to the pages. Bold numbers signal a more extensive treatment of the lemma in the text. The index registers not only single words, but also phrases and collocations. The order of the lemmata follows the scientific conventions in the respective languages.

Abbreviations: B(uddhist), C(hristian), M(anichaeae), S(ogdian), Z(oroastrian). The order of the languages is the following:

- Tocharian (A, B, Proto-Tocharian)
- Proto-Indo-Iranian
- Iranian (Proto-Iranian, Avestan, Old Persian, Old Steppe Iranian, Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese, Khotanese, Tumshuqese, Sogdian, Khwarezmian, Bactrian, Parthian, Middle Persian, New Persian, Ossetic, Pashto, Balochi, Kurdish, Wakhi, Shughni, Yidgha-Munji, Sariqoli, Yaghnobi)
- Indo-Aryan (Vedic, [Buddhist Hybrid] Sanskrit, Gāndhārī, Pāli, Other Middle Indic, Khowar); Nuristani (Aškun, Waigali)
- Proto-Indo-European
- Anatolian (Hittite)
- Armenian (Classical Armenian)
- Greek (Ancient Greek)
- Italic (Latin, French, Italian)
- Celtic (Proto-Celtic)
- Germanic (Proto-Germanic, Gothic, Old Norse, Old English, German, Dutch)
- Balto-Slavic (Old Church Slavonic, Lithuanian)
- Semitic (Akkadian, Aramaic)
- Turkic (Old Uyghur, Modern Turkish)
- Sino-Tibetan (Chinese, Tibetan)

TOCHARIAN

Tocharian A

*añcu** 21, **62**
āmām 174, 175 fn. 341
*art** **36–40**, 66, 144, 213 fn. 373
art 37, 38
artā- 36, 37
artak 37, 38
artañ lāñcāśśi 37
*ārśi-kāntu** 52
ārśi-lāñcinam 52, 53
ārśi-niškramāntam 52
āṣām **41**
apage 55, 55 Tab. 3, 56 Tab. 4

apādhyā 55 Tab. 3, 55, 56 Tab. 4
ek 88
*orās** **64–66**
oṣke **68–70**
kākmart **73–74**
kātak **72**
kat (yām-) 99
katu 73
katw- **72–73**
kappāñ 86
kar **74**
kārās **74–82**

kāre **82–83**
kāltānk **83**
kaś **100–103**
kaśaṃ y- 101
kaśaṣi 101
kaśom 101
kaśal 101
kaş 242
*kaş-swāñceṃ** 242
kāts **85–87**
kāmpo 106
kālmeyā kaś tā(lune) 100
k_uñās **92–93**, 159
kuñcit **94–96**
kuñcitṣi 94
kurkal **97–98**
kor 82
krāṣäyññ- 114, 117
krāso **113–118**
cospā **120–121**, 198
twantaṃ **127–128**, 147, 233
pātār **130**, 233
paṃ **129**
pānto **130–134**, 253
parāṃ 135
pare **147–151**
pās- 140
pāśiṃ **139–142**
pās- 133
pānw- 165
päyk- 136
pārs **136–138**
pārsānt 136
pārra-krase 242
pissānk 20, 128, **145–147**, 233
poke **237–243**, 251
pñi 131

Tocharian B

āka 151, 151 fn. 308
akaru 71
aknātsaṃ 154 fn. 312
anikwaş(t) 20, 21, **27–29**, 96, 97, 126, 170
atakke 107

prāsā- 136
plāc **249–251**
mātār **152–153**
miṣi **153–156**
mṣapantiṃ 155, 155 fn. 317
mṣapantune 155–156
rape 176
rāsā- **165**
re_uwānt 55, 55 Tab. 3
lake 150
wac 92
watañinaṃ **53**, 57, 59
w(a)tañi lāntaṃ 13, 13 fn. 1, **53**, 57, 59
*wataṃ** 13, **43–61**, 53
wāryāñc **166–167**
wāsak 56 fn. 90
wärt 76, **168**
wäl 37
wiskāñc 167
wrāntār 121 fn. 227
wrok **171–172**
śāñcapo **173–174**
śāmpāṃ **174–176**
škā **184–185**
śrittātak **185–186**, 233
ṣāñ **189**, 233
ṣärttw- **186–187**
ṣtāmā- 174
saṃjñi 189
salat **243–244**
säl- 244
*sīsā** **195–196**
senik **197–199**
senik-śo 197
sne (yärm) *kaś* 100
hkhuttem-wām 55
tsärk **176–179**, 203 fn. 367

āntpi 105
appakke 107
*āppo** 107
amāṃ 174, 175 fn. 341
āmapi 105

amäkšpänta **29–34**
ampa- **34–35**, 36, 102, 247 fn. 413
ampoño **35–36**, 102, 247 fn. 413
amplākätte **244–248**, 251
ärt(t)e 37
armañik **40–41**
ašām **41**
aštamikka 107
as- **41–42**
ā_uw 55 Tab. 3
imešše 131, 132
upātātse 54
u_ppādhyāye 55 Tab. 3, 56 Tab. 4, 131
u_ppāsakñešše 55 Tab. 3, 56 Tab. 4
u_wwātakas **54**
u_wwātane **54**, 58
*u_wwātano** 13, **43–61**, 133 fn. 264, 179,
 220, 253, 256, 257
u_wwātne **54**
u_wwamñtne 54 fn. 86
u_wwāšši 55 Tab. 3, 56 Tab. 4
ustamo **61**
ekaññi 88
ekita **87–92**
ekita yam- 87
ekitatstse 87
ekitatsñe 87
ecce 184
eñcuwo 21, **62**, 86, 102, 173, 255
eñcwaññe 62
e(n)- (prefix) 91
ešpešše **63–64**, 113
etsuwai **199–200**
etswe 21
okso 104, 106, 133, 144, 180
onolme ~ wñolme 56, 99
orśa 41, **64–66**, 232
orśa arśol 65
orśa-cakare 65
oś **66–68**
ośonai **67–68**
oś pār- 66
oskiye **68–70**
ausw- (?) **70**
kañko **71**, 168, 172, 179
kañkau **71**

kattāke **72**
kamartāññe 73
kāmarto **73–74**, 135 fn. 266, 213 fn. 373
karās **74–82**
karuno 98
karyor pito 142 fn. 289
kalaka- 135
kāswo **84–85**, 86, 120, 200
kātso **85–87**, 256
kätt- 73
källoym 132
käšši 131
*kito** **87–92**, 100, 220, 256
kimña 52 fn. 84
kuñi-mot **93–94**
kuññcakke 107
kuñcitäšše 94
kuñcit ~ kwāñcit 29, **94–96**, 96
kurkamäšše ~ kwärkamäšši 29, **96–97**
kurkal **97–98**
keto 62, 91 fn. 161, **98–100**, 175
ketwe 73
kercapo 106 fn. 200, 156
kertte 291
keš 36, **100–103**, 133 fn. 265, 165, 171,
 192
keš ak- 100
keš tättalñe 100
keš tās- 100
kešne 101
keš yam- 100
keš weñ- 100
keše 242, 243
kokälpänta 30, 31 fn. 34
koñikka 107
kotaikke, konaikke 107
*koto** **103–105**, 120, 200
*kontso** 24, **105**, 106
*kompo** 24, 105, **106**
korakke 107
koro 106, **106–107**
koško 169
kauc, ke_uwco 99
-kke, -kka, -kko **107–109**, 122, 170 fn.
 333, 194, 249, 258
krak- **111**

- krāke* 72, 108, 111, **112–113**
krañko 71 fn. 108, 104 fn. 194, **109–111**
krasa- 114, 117
krāso **113–118**
krāñka(i)ññe 109
krāñkañe weṃṣiye 104
kliye 27 fn. 15
klu 160 fn. 326
klyomo 104
kwarm 29
*kṣemateworśa** 65
ktsaittse 108
gaṅgavāluk 167 fn. 329
capeś 108, 249
capeśakke, capiśakke 107, 108
curm 27 fn. 13, 27 fn. 15, *curmo* 98
cowai tərka- **118–120**
*cowo** 24, 104 fn. 193, **118–120**, 200
ñ_uwār 55 Tab. 3
ñuwe 108
ñwenakke 107, 108
ñwemaṣṣana āka 151
ñem-klawissu 44
ñoriya 85 fn. 149
tanākko 107, 122
tāno 107, **122**
tapatriś **122–123**
tāskmāṇ 166
t_uwak 55 Tab. 3
tono **123–125**, 198 fn. 362
tonokāṇ 124
tono wāsanma 123
trice kaunaṣṣe kapilleṃtse 71
tvāñkaro 20, 21, 91, **125–127**, 153, 157
 Tab. 7, 161
twār **128**, 257
duṣkār 105
dhyāno 99
naimaññe 164, 164 Tab. 9
*naumikke** 107
naumiye 107
pakaccāṇ 249
pācer 154 fn. 312, 180
*pañō** **129**
pātro **130**, 233
padārtho 98
pānto **130–134**, 253
paraka- **134–135**
parso 39, 70, 92, **136–139**, 192, 213 fn.
 373
palsko 68
pask- 133
*pākāñc** 249
pənn- 165
pəyk- 136
pər- 42, 66, 151
pərsa- 136
pərsāntse 136
*pälle_u** 108
pällentakke 107, 108
pito 91, 101, 104 fn. 192, **142–145**, 168,
 256
pipāl 157 Tab. 7
pilta 99
puttikka 107, 108
punarṇap 63
purnakke 107, 108
peṇyai 129
peri **147–151**
perne 135
pelaikne 131, 132 fn. 263
*poko** 108, 108 fn. 204, **237–243**, 249, 251
priyañku 71
plak- 246
plāce **249–251**, 251
plās 138
*ploriyo** 177
bhūtatantra 27
mañkāra, mañkāre, mañkarāñcana **151–**
 152
mātār, mādār **152–153**
malakke 107
mālo 223
malkwer 94
malyakke 107
mākkokke 107, 108, 249
məyw- 156
miş(ş)e **153–156**
meñe 101
melte 135 fn. 266
mewiyo **156**
maiyyo, meyyā 122 fn. 230

moko 108, **248–249**, 251
mot 93, 94
mrañco **157–158**, 157 Tab. 7
y- 154 fn. 314
yam- 87, 100, 188
yamaṣṣällona 188
yarm 100, 107
yarekke 107
yasa 99
*yirmakka** 107
yolo 20, 87 fn. 151, **158–159**, 221, 256 fn. 424
*yauyek** **160**
ynamo 154 fn. 313
ymatuṣ, ymatunt 154 fn. 314
*rāp** 160
rapa- 160
rapaññe **160–165**
rapalñe 160
raso **165**
räs- 165
*lare, larekke** 107
laṃṃkay orśa 65
ləwp- 185, 186
leki 150
laukito 88
*warāñce** **166–167**
wart(t)o 76, **168**
walaka- 135
*waṣāko** **168–169**
wastsi 123
wāntare 203
wärweśakke 107, 108
wärsčik 63
wärsaññe 164, 164 Tab. 9
wəs- 42, 70
wicuko 24, **169–170**
wiñcaññe **170–171**
wiralom 27 fn. 13
wiśikke 107
weta 99
wemšiye 51, 104
*wemṣyetstse** 104
*wemṣyetsa koto** 104
wemts 104
weṣṣām 31 fn. 34

wrāko 157, **171–172**
*wrantsai, wrantso** **172–173**
wṣeñña 36
šāñcapo 62, 86, **173–174**
šampāṣṣe 174
*šāmpo** 99, **174–176**
*šarko** 71, 99, 168, 172, 175, **176–179**, 203 fn. 367
šalna 99
šito **179**
*šinto** **180–184**, 194
šūke 94
ška **184–185**
šcono 67
šraddhatāk **185–186**
šartaṣṣiññe 187
šartanikaine 187 fn. 351
*šärtto** 187
šalye 94
šito 37 Tab. 2, 37, 37 fn. 45, 39, 40, 144
šupākīñe **187–188**, 189
šart-* 39, **186–187
šäl- 185, 186, 186 fn. 350
šertwe 187, 195
šorpor 194
špakiye 21, 187, 188, **188–189**, 215 fn. 376
-ṣṣe 64
sāñ, šāñ **189**, 231 fn. 384, 233
sañce 62
sanapa- 103 fn. 191, 105, 135, **189–191**
sanu **192**
saṃjñä 189
sāmtke 27 fn. 15, 35
samākane **192–193**
salañce 167, 175
sahāye 131, 132
*sālyakko** **193–194**
sawm- 197
siñcai šorpor 194
*siñco** **194–195**
sītañ 196
sumo **196–197**
suwāññe „wātatane” **50–52**, 56, 57, 59
*suwāññetsko** 52 fn. 84
suwāške 52 fn. 84

suwo 51, 52 fn. 84
sušākh 99 fn. 185
senik **197–199**
senik-šawa 197
skawa- **199**
smaññe **196–197**
stām 61
stāma- 174
snai (*yarm*) *keś* 100
swāññe weṃṣiye 51
hom 197
tsārtsākwa 200, 201, 203

Proto-Tocharian

**keś(ə)* 103
**kras-* 115
**pər-* 151

PROTO-INDO-IRANIAN

**kasćuH-* 84
**pantaH-* 133

IRANIAN

Proto-Iranian

**ačwa-* 21
**amaxšya-pāda-* 30, 34
**amaxšya-pātā-* 30 fn. 30
**angu-ĵatu-* 28, 28 Tab. 1, 29, 29 fn. 23
**apa* 145
**apa-sard-* 193
**arĵyāna-* 41
**ati-bar-* 128 fn. 254
**ati-čāraya-* 203 fn. 368
**ati-(H)wandH-* 127
**ati-Hwād-aya-* 127
**ati-ĵāraya-* 203
**ati-par-* 128 fn. 254
**ati-tar-* 128
**awa* 88, 175
**awa-yat-* 88
**ā-frās-(a)ya-ka-* 65, 66
**ā-sard-aya-* 194
**ā-waj-* 67, 70

tsəwa- 200
tsirauwñešše 132
*tsuwai, tsuwo** 120, **199–200**
tseriteke 200, 202, **203**, 204
tsere 202 fn. 364
tserekwa 200, 201, **202–203**
*tserekwatstse** 201
tsereññ- **200–204**
tsain 224
tsaipeṃ 177
tswaiññe 200

**lak-* 150
šartw-* **186–187, 213 fn. 373

**kṛdna-* 81

**bazdya-* 168
**baiH-* 246
**braHj-* 92
**čafta-* 175
**čai-* 141
**čap/f-, *čamf-* 176
**čyawa-* 200
**čyawakam* 200
**čwaita-* 179
**dab-* 119
**dabya-* 120
**dābaya-* 119
**dānā-* 174
**daiwa-* 120
**fra-bandaya-* 79 fn. 132
**fra-brta-* 19
**fra-Hrta-* 39 fn. 50
**fra-Hraĵ-* 165
**fraka-amaxša-* 30 fn. 32

- *fra-snāta*- 191
**fra-snā-ya*- 191
**fra-wat*- 56
**friya*- 121 fn. 227
**gaiθā*- 88, 92, 100
**garH*- 203, 204
garj*- **115–118
**garma*- 113, 116
**gaura*- 107
**gudrainaka*- 93
**ham*- 35, 62, 102–103
**hama-ka*- 111
**ham-čaš*- 95 fn. 175
**han-čāra*- 95 fn. 175
**ham-kāra*- 111
**ham-parya*- 247
**ham-xaij*- 102, 103
**ha-páθnī*- 102
**har*-¹ 38
**har*-² 38
**harH*- 38, 38 fn. 48
**hwa* 59–61
**hwa-paθya*- 49
**hwatah* 59, 60
**Haj*- 42
**Har*-¹ 38–39
**Har*-² 39
**Harta*- 39, 40
**HaišH*- 67
**Hr̥šti*- 63
**Hr̥ta*- 39
**Hmarj*- 33
**Hwah*- 70
**Hmai*-² 145
**Hrab/f*- 161
**Hwād-aya*- 127
**Hyaud*- 159
**janu*- 170
**jaranya*- 62
**jarH*- 203, 204
**jaraya*- 203
**jarya*- 203, 204
**jāraya*- 203
**jaiH*- 192
**jaini*- 197
**jaritaka*- 79
**jyauH*- 170
**.ka* 108
**kamr̥da*- 73
**kap/f*- 176
† **kara-sθraia*- 81
**karH*-¹ 178
**karH*-² 78
**kasū*- 84, 85
**kṛna*- 81
**maiṣ*-² 155
maj*- **33–34
**maðu*- 223
**mar*- 152
**marH*-¹ 152
**marH*-² 152
**mṛga*- 172
**ni* 42, 241
**ni-bāju-ka*- 241
**ni-rām*- 45
**niš* 175
**pati*- 30
**pati-dHa-ya*- 145 fn. 299
**pati-dā*- 145
**par*-¹ 149
**par*-² 128 fn. 254
**para-tāfna*- 124 fn. 239
**paranča*- 173
**pari* 175
**pari-čai*- 140, 141
**parnačī*- 141 fn. 286
**part*- 246
**paθana*- 145 fn. 299
**pāda*- 189
**pauH*- 35
**pṛsa*- 138
**pṛsā*- 138
**rap/f*- 161
**rauṣ*- 167
**sard*- 193, 244 fn. 407
**skamb*- 175
**skauH*- 199
**snāfta*- 191
**snāfya*- 191
**snaH*- 191
**tanū*- 61
**tap*- 84

**tarH*- 128
 **taxwakam* 124
 **tauH*- 126
 **tāfna*- 124
 **tāp*- 124
 **upa-ja-ma*- 28
 **upari-anč-am* 172, 173
 **waj*- 67
 **wart*- 246
 **wašta*- 49
 **wat*- 56, 60
 **wāj*- 176
 **wi* 92, 167, 170, 175, 241
 **wi-bāju-ka*- 241
 **wi-ruxta*- 167

Avestan

aēšma- 67, 115
aršti- 63
ahqxšta- 101, 102
uruuād- 86
uruuāz- 86
kamərəða- 73
kahrka-tāt- 110
ka-xʷarəða- 49
xʷa- tanu- 61
xʷarənō 135
xʷātō 59
gaēθā- 88

Old Persian

əršti- 64
gaiθā- 88

Old Steppe Iranian

**dānā*- 122 fn. 230
 **dʷainu*- 224

Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese

gēṣa*- **98–100
 **gōra*- 107
 **gūṣa*- 104, 105
 **ham-xézi* 103
 *(*h*)*arda*- **39–40**

**wi-xand*- 73 fn. 112
 **wi-xwarša*- 49
 **wṛdka*- 246
 **xand*- 73
 **xar*- 38
 **xard*- 112
 xardaka*- **112–113
 **xarta*- 38
 **xād(-s-)* 86
 **xaif*- 102
 **xraus*- 38
 **xšaṣra-pā-wan*- 120
 **xšaud*- 188
 **xšaudakā*- 188

gao-kərəna- 80, 81 fn. 139
gav- 80
cazdōṇhhuuant- **120–121**
pāra- 149
frasā- 138
vərəḍka- 246
vi-bāzu- 241
zaēni- 197
zairita- 203, 204
haḍō.gaēθā- 88 fn. 156
hauua- tanu- 61

-*tanaiy* 127
xšaçaṣpāvan- 120

**dʷara(ka)*- 203
 **dʷaritaka*- 203

**hen*- 62
 **henšwanya*- 62, 86, 102, 103
 **jēr*- 203
 kamarda*- **73–74
 *-*kka* 108, 109

**pṛsu* 138, 138 fn. 275

**ṣṛtu* 187

**śaNzapa-* 173–174

Pre-Khotanese

**dyūwa-* 120

**gīḍa-* 92, 100

**gūḍa-* 104–105

**kasūwa-* 84–85

**-kka* 108, 109, 107 fn. 333

**khādāna-* 86–87

Khotanese

aṃguṣṭa- 27–29, 126

anaṃkhiṣṭa- 102

aysā'ya 195

aviha- 144

aśka 184

aśtā ka 184

aśpara- 31–32

aśphāṇḍa- 32–33

aśarrāmatā- 187

-āsa 159 fn. 323

ahaṃkāra- 110

aha(ṃ)khīysa- 102

-āṃgyā 152

-āna 87 fn. 150, 126, 174 fn. 339

āmāca- 65, 137 fn. 268

āysda yan- 247

āljsātīnaa-, *-īṃgyā*, *ā'jsijā-* 182

āljsēinaa- 182

-ālsto 172

āvua- 119

āṣaṇa- 41

āṣṣuḍa- 187

āṣṣei'ṇa- 159 fn. 323

-īca 167

-īña 109, 141, 142, 188

-īnaa, *-īṃgyā* 93, 182

-ūña-, *-auña-* 36

uska 69–70

uska būrv- 70

uska sarb- 70

ustama- 61

e'ysajā 195

**winji-* 171

**wirwica-* 166–167

**pīṭha-* 91, 101, 144–145

**silyakka-* 193–194

**tśūwu* 200

**wijwāka-* 169–170

**winji-* 171

**wirwica-* 166–167

esaly- 193–194

aista bā 63–64

odā 184

oys- 67, 70

oysa- 67, 115

ośa- 66–68

ośataraṇa- 67

auysama 78

aurāśś- 65

aurāśśaa- 64–66

aurāśāka- 65

aurāsa- 65

auś- : *auṣṭa-* 67

† *auskā-* 68–70

-ka(-ka) 107–109

kaṇga- 71

kaja- 164 Tab. 9

kaṃthā- 45

kamala- 73–74

karāśśā- 74–82

karā 74

kasaa- 84–85

kāḍara- 82–83

kāḍe 74

kīḍa- 77, 78–79

kīḍaiśa' 79

kīḍye jsa habaṇ- 79 fn. 132

kīra- 77–78, 79, 247 fn. 415

kuṃjsata-, *kuṃjsa-* 94–96

kuṃjsatīnaa-, *kuṃjsavīnaa-* 95

kuṃjsārgyā- 95

*kurkuma-** 96–97

- kurkumīnaa*- 96, **97**
ker- : *kilsta*- 77
kṛṅga- **109–111**
krrimṅarūva- 110
krrimṅūha- 104, 110, 110 fn. 207
kṣīra- 77 fn. 124
khattāvīhā 73
khad- : *khasta*- 73
khan- : *khaṁtta*- **72–73**
khaysma- 85 fn. 148
khara- **106–107**
kharaśpa- 31
khāysa- 86
khāysāna- **85–87**
khārgga- **112–113**
ggamjsā- **105**
ggampha- **106**
gaysa- 78
°garaa- 126, 126 fn. 249
garma^o 113
ggāṭhaa- **72**
ggāha- 88
ggīh- : *ggīsta*- 88 fn. 155, **88–90**
ggīha(a)- **87–92**
gīhāka- 91
ggāta'ka- **83**
gurgula- **97–98**
gurva- 167
gurvīca- **167**
gūñi 93
gūna- 81 fn. 139
gūra- 93
gūrāś- **92–93**, 159
gūrāṇai mau **93–94**
gūha- **103–105**
gr(r)aysa- **113–118**
graysāñ- **113–118**
gr(r)aysya- **115–116**
grāma- 113, 116
grūs- 38
gvā-ysirūṁ 81 fn. 139
cakala-, *cikala*- 77, 78, **79–80**
cakurīka- 80
cav- 176 fn. 342
cārthiṇ kasim 84
cāpaśurei 249
cūvija- 161, 162
cev- 176 fn. 342
caukala- 80 fn. 136
cvātaja- **161–165**
-ja 161
jaṁbulke, jā(ṁ)bulke 246 fn. 411
jūṣḍānaa- 174
jsinā- 202
jsīr- **200–204**
ṇitcampha- 175
ttaramdara- 61
ttavaa- 84
-t(t)āti 175, 186
ttāvatriśa- **122–123**
ttāṣe' 119
ttājser- 203
ttuṁgara- **125–127**, 157 Tab. 7
ttuṁjāra- 164 Tab. 9
†ttumāṣa 155
ttuvare, tvarā **128**, 257
*tcamph-** : *tcautta*- **174–176**
tcampha- **174–176**
tcarkā- **176–179**
tcahora- 251
tcei'man- 32
ttrahā- 195
tvaṁdanu 126, **127–128**, 233
tvāñ- **126**
tvāñāka- 126
tvānaa- 126
tvāmā- 126
tvāy- 127
tsū- 161, 200
tsūka- 200
thatau 124
thauna- **123–125**
thaunaka- **124**
dajs- 28
dandaa-, *dandāka*- 169 fn. 331
dātu pyūṣ- 45
dātu hvāñ- 45
°dāna- 174, 174 fn. 339
dānā- **122**, 174
dimarāśä' 69
dīpaṁkara- 110
dīraṁggāra- 126

drjs- 28
dyūa- 120
dyūka- **118–120**
dyūma- 119
dyūla- 119, 120
drauka- 246
dva dva bāgā 195
natciphāka- 175
*naltcīmph-** 175
(na)haryūna- 178
nāju 138 fn. 275
nvāska-masi 241
nvāska-masi bā'yi- 242
pakṣa vaṣṭ- 89
pajsama- 28
paḍa- 159
pata- 181
padim- 188
padimāñā- 188
pana- **129**
panda-rāysa- 133
pandāa- **130–134**
papala 157 Tab. 7
(pa)ysaṇua(ka)- 170
paramjsa- 172
palaigā, palaijā 195
paljsata- 103
paljsātā- 103
paltcīmph- 175
paltcīmphāka- 175
pa'sa- **136–138**
pa'siñā- 137 fn. 271
paskäyālsto 31, 137 fn. 270
pastramj- 81 fn. 141
pāa-, paa- 34 fn. 42, 189
pājiñā- **139–142**
pātra- **130**
pāṃdu 144 fn. 298
pāpaṃkāra- 110
pāra- **149–151**
pārā- 141
pārgyīñā- **139–142**
pā'sa (salya) 51 fn. 82, 137
pirānaa- 174
pisal- 193
pisalyāmā- 193

pīra- **149–151**
pīsa- 137 fn. 272
pīsaa- 137 fn. 272
pīha- 104 fn. 192, **142–145**
†pīha 144 fn. 298
pīha'ja- 144
puka- 108, 108 fn. 204, **237–243**, 251
pukācā 249
puls- **136–138**
pulsu 138 fn. 275
pu'vad- 245
pe'mīnai thau **124**
pera- 150
peri **149–150**
pyūṣ- 28
prrabamkāra- 110
prahauṇa- 124 fn. 239
prahauy- 124 fn. 239
prūa- 84
pva'ña- 245
pharāka- **134–135**
phārā- 135
bagalaga- 32
bañ- 129
bañā- **129**
batara-, bara- 181, 181 fn. 347
batarimgyā- 181 fn. 347
banā(l)sa- 244
baya- 245, 246
bays- 67
bara-sīmjā- 181
balysa-, be'ysa- etc. 63, 147, 246
baśdaā- 168
bāga-, bāta-, bāva-, bā 63
bāḍa- **168**
bāta-ttī 80
bāy- 127
bā'yi- 248
bāraa- 90
bitcampha- 175
bitcamphā- 175
biñji- **170–171**
biśśa- 244
biśpaḍā 31, 32
birgaṃdara- 32
bilga- 246

bi'saṃga-, *bilsaṃga-*, *bālsaṃg(h)a-* **145–147**, 233

bihan- : *bihaṃtta-* 73 fn. 112

budasamga- 147

buro, *bure* 184, 185

bureška, *buraiška* (?) 185

bulāni 31 fn. 38

bulke 246, 246 fn. 411

bu'vad- : *bva'sta-* 245

byals- : *byalsta-* 246

byāta yan- 247

braṃkhaysja- 164 Tab. 9

brokyä 185

bva'lsta- 245

bhikṣusaṃgha- 146

magara- 153

maṃgāra- **151–152**

mamaṃkāra- 110

maš- **33–34**

mašāña **33–34**

mašpa- **29–34**

māša- 34 fn. 41

mičhāñ- 117

mijsaā- 158 fn. 322

miriṃjsya- **157–158**

miš(š)a- **153–156**

mukauka- 108, 241, **248–249**, 251

mukhamanḍa- 117 fn. 218

muñamja- 164 Tab. 9

mutca'ca- 164 Tab. 9

mura- 172

*mūya-** **156**

mūšaka- 155

mau 93

mrāha-, *mirāha-* 157, **171–172**

yan- 187, 247, 248

yūttyaina kūauhq 47

yaula- **158–159**

yyauvaka **160**

ysamgara- 152

ysarnai bāḍa 45, 52

ysāra- 241

ysāra-vārgia- 141

ysän- : *ysāta-* 192

ysänāj- **190–191**

ysänāh- **189–191**

ysāmāna- 174 fn. 339

ysīḍaa- 79, 203

ysīniya-, *ysīnīta-*, *ysīnī* **197–199**

ysīrra- 62

ysūma- **196–197**

ysenikām **198**

rrahamūa- 84

rarūya- 164 Tab. 9

rrāha- 160, 161

rrāhaja- **160–165**

°rūva 110

-la 120, 198 fn. 361

-lika 191

lunä 31 fn. 38

vatcīṃph- 175

van- 127 fn. 251

varāš- 32

**va-malys-* 33

vameysāña 33

varālsto **172–173**

vaš- 169

vā 193

°vārgia- 141

viysa-vārgia- 141

višpašsarma- 32

višpasta- 31

višpastia- 31

vyehāra- 78

ša- 175

šattapūšpa- 80

šatcampha- 175

šatcamphā- 175

ššar- 32

ššasvāna- 62, 86, **173–174**

ššāraṇa- 32

ššāḍaā- 186

ššāragaraṇa- 67

ššāratāti- **185–186**, 233

ššāru yan- 247

šīṃjā- **180–184**, 195

ššīta- **179**

šīsapa- 181

šērāka- 32

ška **184–185**

špaka-jsīma 32, 34

šve 32

şşarr- : *şşuda*-* **186–187**
şşüvakā-*, *şşüdakā-* 188, **189
şşüvakiña-* **188
şer- 187 fn. 351
şkim- : *şkaunda-* 175–176
şvakā- 188, **188–189**, 215 fn. 376
sakala- 77, **80**, 80 fn. 138
saña- **189**
†samuvā **193**
samū 193
saṃkalpa- 110
saṃkāśa- 110
saṃkhal- 112 fn. 211
saṃgabuda- 147
saṃñā- 189
sarb- 69
sal-* **193–194**
siṃjā- **194–195**
siṃjsiṃja- 164 Tab. 9, 182 fn. 348
sījsā- **195–196**
sīysā- **195–196**
sūtrālaṃkāṛā-śāstra- 110
senili 198 fn. 361
solāte 237, **243–244**
skarba- 164 fn. 328
skarhvāra- 164, 164 tab. 9, 165
skau- **199**
straṃj- 81 fn. 141
striyā- 81 fn. 141
spāta, *spā* 31 fn. 38
haṃkhīysa- 102
haṃkhīysgyā- 102
haṃkhīś- : *haṃkhīṣṭa-* **100–103**
haṃgga- 111
haṃggār- 111
haṃjv- 170
haṃjsaṣ- 95 fn. 175
haṭhṭhā- 159 fn. 324
haḍa- **36–40**, 136
haḍa- ‘dress’ 40
haḍāa- 38, 39 fn. 49

Tumshuqese

añi pre 250 fn. 419
-ana 161

haṃdyāja- 164 Tab. 9
habvakyā- 248
ham- 35, 36, 102, 112 fn. 211, 170, 247,
 247 fn. 413
hamamṅga- 60
hamārīja- 164 Tab. 9
haṃbālke 237, **244–248**, 251
haṃbālke yan- 247, 248
haṃbir- 247
haṃbūta-, *haṃbva-* **34–36**, 102, 103
hayūna- 134 fn. 265
hays- **41–42**
haysñ- : *haysnāta-* **190–191**
haysnālīka- 191
harays- 165
haraysa- **165**
haryāsa- 159 fn. 323
haṣprīs- 77
hārūa- 150
hāmāta- 36
hāmāttauñā- 36
hālsti- 63, 64
hāṣ- (*hei*-) 37 fn. 45
hīnā- 90
hīśśana- **62**, 86, 102
hīṣṭa- 37 fn. 45
huysānautta- 190
huśśīya- 60
hūḍa- 19
hot- 56, 60
hotana- 56, 60
hauda-raṃñi 69
hvañ- 51 fn. 81
hvatana-, *hvatāna-*, *hvana-* etc. **43–61**,
 44, 256, 257
hvataṃ-ḱṣīraa- 44
hvatanaū 44
hvatā 59, 60
hvatānā rre 13 fn. 1, 44
hvāṣṣa- 81, 81 fn. 141
hviḍi pamarā 195

ahverja(na)-, *ahverja(na)-* **163–165**, 164
 Tab. 9

orocce-naumntaišne 249
 kapci 249
 kārȳortaṇe 249
 cazbā- **120–121**
 ch- 250
 gūzdiyā rid₁e 45
 tsenā- 202
 tsvix₆āna-, tsvix₆āta- **161–165**
 tshari, tsahari 251
 dād₁u hvan- 45
 dād₁u pyew- 45
 dzer- 202, 202 fn. 366, **203–204**
 dzerāma 202
 nāma-hvatā 44
 niškramā<n>tne 249
 patoni 127

Sogdian

*angu-žat 28, 28 Tab. 1
 B ”m’n 174
 ”šyn’s 159 fn. 323
 M ”s- 42 fn. 56
 C ’br’z- 92
 B ’mydry 155
 M βj-, B ’βz- 168
 M βjyk 168
 cf- 120 fn. 223
 cp’yš 108, 249
 δxšt- 76
 M γwr 107
 γyδh 88
 B k’rt’k 72 fn. 110
 kwync’[95 fn. 171
 kwyšt’yc 95, 95 fn. 171
 kwrkwnph 97
 myw 156
 B mr’ynck’ 158, 158 fn. 321
 M n’βn’m’k 47
 B nβr’γtk ryz-’kh 158 fn. 321
 nnym’nch 64
 ny’z 42
 B p’ttr 130

Khwarezmian

angēθ 89 fn. 156

pandam- 250
 para- 150
 parath- 150
 parāñi 150
 p(a)laca- 237, **249–251**
 pātanāya 127
 buzad₁ina 163 fn. 327
 brika 121 fn. 227
 māste 163 fn. 327
 rorda- 19
 hampā 250
 hvad₁na **44–45**, 54
 hvad₁ane **44–45**
 hvan- 44, 45
 χšera- 45

p’r 149
 M pnd, S pnt 134, 134 fn. 265
 M pr t’jyg’nyy ”w’k 53 fn. 85
 B pw(t)ty 108
 pwrn 108
 B pwrsnk **145–147**
 rm’nykh **40–41**
 rywβnt(k) 55
 M syngtync, S synktync 181
 B synktškrδ’k (mrγ’k) 181
 šywšp-δn 32
 B wβ”z 241
 wyrwysprn 108
 xr- 38
 M xwδnyk **47–48**
 xwδn’, xwδ’n **47–48**
 xwrjn(yc) 163, 164
 *xwt’yn-β’m 55
 M xwtyy 59
 -ynyy 182
 M z’wr δβr- 91
 B zyn’y 197
 B zynyh-xw’ry 197

Bactrian

αζανο 41
αυρηζνο 163
**βαζαγο* 169
βιζαγο, *Μ βυζγ* 168–169
βρηδαγο 49
βρηδαγο οατανανο 49, 59
γιρζ- 115
οζιτιγο 199
καμυρδο 73–74
καμυρδο-φαρο 73

**κωρκο* 169
ιωλ- 159
μαλο 223
οατανο, *οατανανο* 49–50, 59
σηλ(ο)-οατανο 49, 59
οοχωρ- 49
πανδαγο 133
παρο 149
χοβο 49, 49 fn. 77

Parthian (Manichaean)

ʿfr's 65
h'mgyh 89 fn. 156
ny'z 42
n(y)r'm- 45
p'r 149

šyfs-d'n 33
wycyn-, *wžyn-* 141 fn. 287
x'z- 86
zyn'yy, *zynyh* 197
zyny-xw'rg 197

Middle Persian

ābām 145
M ʿfr'h 65
amarag 101
anōšmār 101
M ʿyn pd swylly zgr 53 fn. 85
čāšīdan 101
frēstag 39
M gyh 88, 100
gōr 107
M h'mpnd 133, 155
Z kwnc(y)t 95

Z kwlkwm 96
murwārīd 172
M ny'z 42
M nyr'm- 45
pand 133
M prcyn, *przyn* 141, 141 fn. 285
srinjad, *sinjad* 181
M swryg nw'g 53 fn. 85
winjišk 171
xwad 59

New Persian

ambūsīdan 34
angudān, *anguyān* 28 fn. 19
anguzad, *angužād* 28
āwām 145
gila 115
gōr 107
gunjišk 171

isfand 33
kark 110
kurkum 96
sinjad, *sinjid* 181
šināwīdan 191 fn. 357
tafna 124 fn. 238
Xutan 48

Ossetic

I fænd, *D fændæ* 133
I fændag 133

I fætæn 145 fn. 299
I fidyn, *D fedun* 145

I *k'ala*, *k'alīw*, D *k'ala*, *k'wala*, *k'alew* 80
D *mæsug* 34 fn. 41

Pashto

anjór 95 fn. 175
bán 102
ýele 88

Balochi

čāmp- : *čāmpit* 176

Wakhi

ḍiv(ɪ)y- : *ḍovoyd-* 119
giz- : *gəzd-* 102

Shughni

sizd 182

Yidgha-Munjī

brayiko, *brāyiko*, *bräyiko* 172
paržin 141

Sariqoli

čir- 178

Yaghnobi

čūmf- : *čūmfta* 176

INDO-ARYAN

Vedic

kṛka-vāku- 110
gulgulu- 97
gaurá- 81 fn. 139, 107
cano-dhā- 121 fn. 225

(Buddhist Hybrid) Sanskrit

anāgata- 61
aniṣṭa- 67
aṣṭamī 108
aṣṭāṅga-mārga- 29

D *sindzæ* 182, 194
I *qast* 115

kunjōla 95
sənjāla 182
wāzā 241

kunčāt, *kunčit* 95 fn. 174

palč, *parč* 141 fn. 286

mōz- : *mīzd* (Bajui) 33–34

səziyo 182
xəlaryo 113

bhājati 140
majmán 34 fn. 41
svāyā tanvā 61

araṇya- 82 fn. 144
arthakośa- 139 fn. 277
asaṃkhyā 101
asaṃkhyeya- 101

ahaṃkāra- 110
āgama- 90
āma- 86
āmātya- 65, 137 fn. 268
āmāsaya- 86, 87
āvedha- 239 fn. 390
āsaya- 86
utpala- 183
udvedha- 239 fn. 390
upaga- 55, 55 Tab. 3, 56 Tab. 4
upādhyāya- 55
upānta- 54 fn. 86
upāya- 189, 231 fn. 384, 233
upāsaka- 56 fn. 90
uposatha- 163 fn. 327
ṛṇa- 149
kaṅku-, *kaṅgu*- 71
kacchū- 84
karj- 115
kardama- 112, 113, 113 fn. 212
karś- 81, 82
karṣ- 81 fn. 142
karṣa- 81 fn. 142
kāntāra- 82 fn. 144
kāpota- 71
kāṣṭha- 79
kīla-, *khīla*- 79
kīlāyate 79 fn. 132
kukṣi- 86
kuṅkuma- 96
kuṅcika- 95 fn. 170
kuṅcita- 95, 95 fn. 173
kuṅcī 170
kurkuṭa- 109
keṣoṇḍuka- 246
koṭi- 82
kola- 181
kośa- 139, 139 fn. 277, 140, 141, 142
kṛśa- 81
kraya-vikrayaḥ 142 fn. 289
kṛīḍa- 178
kleśa- 66, 79
kṣīra- 77 fn. 124
kṣetra- 98, 153–156
kharāśvā- 31
gīta- 177

guggulu- 97
guḍikā- 188
guda- 110
gulma- 29
goṇī- 93
go-stana- 51 fn. 82
grāma- 119
ghanṭhā- 83
cakaṭa- 171
caturthaka jvara 84
cikka- 80 fn. 134
cukrikā- 80 fn. 135
cūrṇa- 27 fn. 13
caila-paṭṭa- 124
caura- 119
chagala- 80 fn. 136
jambuḍikā- 246 fn. 411
jvara- 84
tila- 95
traya- 123
trayastrimśa, *trāyatrīmśa*, *trāyastīmśa*,
trayatiṃśa 127–128
dakṣa-viḍ 110
dakṣāṇḍa-tvak 109
dīpaṃkara- 110
duṇḍubhi- 83 fn. 146
duṣkṛta- 67, 105
dūta- 37, 38
dūra- 38
drogh- 159
dvau dvau bāgau 195
dharma- 144
dharma-nau 33
dharma-sahāya- 132 fn. 263
dhava- 181
dhānā- 167
nāgara- 126
nitya- 132
nidhi- 139 fn. 278, 140
nīpaka- 132
nṛtya- 177
pakṣa-saṃsthita 89
patha- 144 fn. 296
pada- 181
padma- 183
pāṇḍu-kambala-śilā-tala- 40

- pātra-* 130, 140
pāpaka- 67
pāpaṃkāra- 110
pālaṅkya- 195
piṅga-mūla- 195
puṇya- 131
punarnavā- 63
puṣpa- 80
prcchā- 138
pratyekabuddha-saṃgha- 146
pradakṣiṇī-kṛ- 127, 233
prabhaṃkāra- 110
pravedha- 239, 240 Tab. 14
priyaṅgu- 71
badara-, *badarī-*, *bādara-* 181, 181 fn.
 347, 182
bala- 90, 91
buddha-kṣetra- 154
budhadina- 163 fn. 327
buddha-saṃgha-* **146–147, 233
bodhi-saṃgha- 146
bodhisattva-saṃgha- 146
bhagavato 44
bhikṣu-saṃgha- **145–147**
bhūta-tantra 27
makara- **152–153**
majjan- 158 fn. 322
mamaṃkāra- 110
marica- **157–158**
mahābhiniṣkramaṇa 30 fn. 33
mārga- 29, 133
mukhamaṇḍikā- 117 fn. 218
mūlaka- 295
mūlya- 93, 144
yūpa- 238, 242, 242 Tab. 15, 250
yojana- 106
rati- 178
rasa- 197
rājadūta- 37, 38
rājadvārika- (*rajsavarī*) 38
latā- 77
labhate 132
lāja- 167
vana- 76
varti- 188
vastra- 124
vāditra- 177
vārtākī- 80
vālukā- 167
vāhana- 90
viḍa-lavaṇa- 27 fn. 13
vidūṣaka- 30, 31
vilup- 119
vivad- 92
viśākha- 99 fn. 185
viśvakarman 32
viśvaśarman 32
viśvasta- 31
vihāra- 78, 119
vṛti- 168
vṛdh- 134
vṛścika- 63
vyāghra- 156
vyāma- 239, 239 fn. 390, 240 Tab. 14,
 241, 242
vyoṣa- 157
śatapūṣpa- 180
śatāhvā- 80
śaraṇa- 32
śiṃśapā- 173, 181
śraddhā- 185
śrāddha- 186
śrāddhada- 186
**śrāddhadāka-* 186
śrī- 233
śvaka- 32, 34
śvabhra- 104, 105
śveta-mūla- 195
sakala- 77, 80 fn. 138
saṃkalpa- 110
saṃkāśa- 110
saptaparṇa- 32
saptacchada- 32
samudānaya- 33–34
samudghāta- 196 fn. 359
samyak-saṃkalpa- 100
saṃkhyā- 102 fn. 188
sarṣapa- 173
saṃvartaṃte 89 fn. 157
saṃśaya- 62
sahāya- **131–132**, 134
siṅcatikā- 182, 194

sītā- 196, 196 fn. 359
suma- 197
suvarṇa- 46 fn. 64, 52
suvarṇagotra- 45, 45 fn. 63
sūtrālaṃkāra-śāstra- 110
sūpa- 197
sainya- 90
sva 60

Gāndhārī

arnavaji 40
aśpa- 32
kakhordi- 49
kitsayitsa- 108
kori 106 fn. 198
khotana- 48, 58
khotana maharaya 48
khotaniya- 48
khvarnarse 48
gahaḥḥa- 72
goni- 93
cozbo **120–121**
trae 123
(trae)[t](ri)śa 123

Pāli

agāra- 78
kappāsa- 86
kīla- 79 fn. 130
kīla bandh- 79 fn. 132
kīlati 79 fn. 132
khaṭṭha- 78
khetta- 98

Khowar

šinjur 182

Nuristani

karaš (Aškun) 81

PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN

**b^heg*- 146
**b^hor-oi* 157

svan- 52
svana- 52
svayaṃvara- 37
svāna- 52
hanu- 170
hasta- 239, 240 Tab. 14
hiṅgu- 27
hlād- 134

thavaṃna(ḡa)- 124, 198 fn. 362
duatriśa-, *dvastrīśa*- 123 fn. 232
bhikṣu, *bhikkhu* 146
bhukṣusaṃgasya **146**
°mi[ja] 158 fn. 322
yidi, *yiti* (?) **46–47**
vinadi 127 fn. 251
samughaṣa 196 fn. 359
saṃṇa 189
**sida* 196
suvaṃna- **51–52**
zeniḡa- **197–199**
haḡāmaṣa 30 fn. 32
hinaza 198

tāvattiṃsa- 122
putti 108 fn. 203
mattikā- 78
miñja- 158 fn. 322
tiṇa- 78
valli- 78

koṣ (Waigali) 81

**g^hreuh₂*- 174
**h₁ep*- 151

**h₂ei*- 145
 **kelh₂*- 81
 **kld*- 81
 **krek*-, **kerk*- 110
 **kas*-, **kos*- 101
 **kens*- 101
 **kroH-s*- 115

HITTITE

pai- 145

ARMENIAN

soł 244

ANCIENT GREEK

ἄμαξα 30
 γαστήρ 87 fn. 150
 γοργός 115
 γράω 87 fn. 150
 κλάδος 81
 κλών 81 fn. 140
 κορέννυμι 115
 κρέξ 110

LATIN AND ROMANCE

Latin

auxiliō esse, *auxilium ferre* 91
auxilium 91
fraus 159
frendō 115

French

envoyé 39

Italian

marciapiede 34 fn. 42

PROTO-CELTIC

**gargo*- 115

**mag*- 155
 **peh₂*- 133
 **peik*- 136
 **pelh₂-(k)*- 138
 **stemb^hH*- 174
 **uer*- 168

pe 145

κρόκος 96
 μαργαρίτης 172
 Μοσσύνοικοι 34 fn. 41
 ποικίλος 136
 πυγών 240 fn. 393
 ρόθος 187
 σκαίρω 178

īra 67
lanceolātus 64
missus 37 fn. 45, 39
(via) rupta 34 fn. 42

marchepied 34 fn. 42

GERMANIC

Proto-Germanic

breutan* 34 fn. 42grindan* 115**harta-* 81**hrōza-* 115**hrōzjan* 115**tūna-* 168 fn. 330**peuba-* 119**walpu-* 82 fn. 144**welþja-* 82 fn. 144

Gothic

fairina 150

Old Norse

braut 34 fn. 42*hrang* 110

Old English

gār-lēac 64*holt* 81*worþ* 168

English

creeper 82*footpath* 34 fn. 42*garlic* 64*glad* 135*to make* 33*to ridicule* 232*to scorn* 232*to torment* 232

German

Bauch 85*Lebensmittel* 180*Salbe* 194*Schwaben* 59*Schweden* 59*sich Bahn brechen* 33*Wald* 82 fn. 144*wild* 82 fn. 144

Dutch

tuin 168 fn. 330

OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC

groza 115*sěřъ* 195*klada* 81*žito* 180

LITHUANIAN

grasà 115

SEMITIC

Akkadian

guhlu 97*kurkanū* 96

Aramaic

hngyt 89 fn. 156

TURKIC

Old Uyghur

al- 151*alim* 151*angabuš* 29*arkıš* 37 Tab. 2*balto* 159*ber-* 151*berim* 149, 151*bursaŋ* **146–147***[ɪ]r oyun* 177*ır üni* 177*korkinčin äy(män)čin* 168*kök* 159 fn. 323*kulač* 242*kulačča yaruk* 242 fn. 403*künčit* 95*küräš-* 92, 159*madar* 153*mirč, mirč* 158*odon* 46, 47*öŋ kürtük* 77*siza* **195–196***šušak* 99 fn. 185*ton* 125*yalavač* 37 Tab. 2*yavlak* **158–159**

Modern Turkish

haydi 42

SINO-TIBETAN

Chinese

Āshǐnà 阿史那 159 fn. 323*ēwèi* 阿魏 29, 29 fn. 25*fó sēng* 佛僧 146*huōdàn* 豁旦 47*jīn* 金 52 fn. 84*jùshǐdé* 据史德 45*là* 臘 **160–161**, 162*māo* 貓 156*móliànzhē* 摩練遮 158 fn. 321*shīchóu* 絀紬 **124***yáo'yì* 徭役 **160***yú* 于 **46–47***yuè* 月 **162***yútián (guó)* 于闐(國) **47**, 57*yúzhì* 于寘 46, 47*zōuyuè* 陬月 **162–165**

Tibetan

kur kum 97*rkub* 110*khyim byahi sgo ngahi shun lpags* 109*gustik* 45

rgya shug 181, 181 fn. 347
dril ba 33
'dom 239 fn. 390, 241
bya gag gi sha 109
bya gag... rtug pa 110
sbyar bar byed pa 33
mag pa 31 fn. 38
dmag pa 31 fn. 38
gzhang 110
'u then, 'u ten 50
ras 124
ri lu 188

reng bu 188
li dong gra 126
blon 31 fn. 38
shing kun 27
gser rigs 45
sems zhum pa 187
spa 31 fn. 3
a rmo ni ka 40
armonig lta bu'i rdo leb 40
er mo no 21 fn. 6
o sku 21 fn. 6

INDEX OF LOANWORDS IN CHAPTER 3

The relevant subsections of Ch. 3 in which the words are discussed are listed after the respective loanwords. Progressive numbers refer to the reference list of reliable loanwords in §2.2.1.

1. subst. TB *aṅkwaṣ(t)* ‘Asa foetida’ ← LKh. *aṃguṣḍa-* ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.6.2, 3.3.1.5.a, 3.3.1.5.c, 3.3.2.6.a, 3.3.2.6.n, 3.4.1.1, 3.4.1.2, 3.5.1.1
2. v. TB *ampa-* ‘to rot, decay’ ← LKh. *hambva-* (< OKh. *hambūta-*) ‘fester’
§§ 3.2.6.2, 3.3.2.6.e, 3.3.2.6.h, 3.3.2.6.l, 3.5.1.4, 3.5.5.1.1
3. subst. TB **ārto* TA *ārt** ‘envoy’ ← PTK acc. sg. **(h)ārdu* (OKh. *haḍa-*) ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.2.1.p, 3.4.9.1, 3.4.9.2, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.3.a
4. subst. TB *„wātano** A *wataṃ** ‘Khotanese’ ← PK acc. sg. **hwātanu* ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.3.1, 3.2.3.2, 3.3.2.2.e, 3.3.2.2.g, 3.3.2.2.o, 3.4.3.1, 3.4.3.2, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.3.a
5. subst. TB *eñcuwo* A *añcu** ‘iron’ ← PTK **hénśwanya-* (OKh. *hiśśana-*) ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.1.1.c, 3.3.2.1.n, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1.1
6. subst. TB *orśa* A *orāś** (official title) ← OKh. *aurāśśa-* ‘councillor’
§§ 3.2.5.2, 3.4.6.1, 3.5.1.1
7. subst. TB *oś* ‘evil’ ← LKh. *ośa-* ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.6.2, 3.3.2.6.i, 3.4.1.1, 3.4.1.2, 3.5.1.1
8. v. TA *katw-* ‘to ridicule’ ← OKh. past ptc. *khamttu** ‘to laugh’
§§ 3.2.5.2, 3.3.2.5.b, 3.5.1.4, 3.5.5.1.1
9. subst. TB *kāmarto** A *kākmart* ‘chief’ ← PTK acc. sg. **kamardu* (OKh. *kamala-* ‘head’)
§§ 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.2.1.a, 3.3.2.1.i, 3.3.2.1.p, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.3.a
10. subst. TB *kāswo* (name of a disease) ← PK acc. sg. **kasūwu* (LKh. *kasaa-* ‘quartan fever’)
§§ 3.2.3.1, 3.2.3.2, 3.3.1.2.a, 3.3.1.2.e, 3.3.2.2.a, 3.3.2.2.j, 3.3.2.2.k, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.3.b
11. subst. TB *kātso* A *kāts* ‘belly, stomach, abdomen, womb’ ← PK **k^hād^hāna-* ‘stomach’ (LKh. *khāysāna-*)
§§ 3.2.3.1, 3.2.3.2, 3.3.1.2.b, 3.3.2.2.b, 3.3.2.2.n, 3.4.3.1, 3.4.3.2, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.3.b
12. subst. TB *kito** ‘help’ ← PK acc. sg. **gīθu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ggīha-* ‘id.’)
§§ 3.2.3.2, 3.3.1.2.d, 3.3.2.2.d, 3.3.2.2.f, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1.1
13. subst. TB *kuñi(-mot)* ‘grape wine’ ← LKh. *gūrāṇai (mau)* ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.6.2, 3.4.8.1, 3.5.1.1
14. subst. TB *kurkal* ‘bdellium’ ← LKh. *gurgula-* ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.6.2, 3.3.2.6.b, 3.3.2.6.g, 3.4.1.1, 3.5.1.1
15. subst. TB *keto* ‘property, estate’ ← PTK acc. sg. **gēḍu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *gīha-* ‘help’)
§§ 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.1.1.b, 3.3.2.1.d, 3.3.2.1.f, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1.1
16. subst. TB *keś* A *kaś* ‘number’ ← PTK inf. **ham-xēzi* (OKh. v. *hamkhīs-*) ‘to count’
§§ 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.1.1.b, 3.3.1.1.g, 3.3.2.1.b, 3.4.1.1, 3.4.1.2, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.5.1.1
17. subst. TB *koto** ‘excrement’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **gūḍu* (OKh. *gūha-* ‘id.’)
§§ 3.2.2.2, 3.4.4.1, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.3.b
18. subst. TB *krañko* ‘chicken’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **kṛṇḡu*, OKh. *kṛṇḡu* ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.4.2, 3.5.1.1

19. subst. TB *krāke* ‘dirt, filth’ ← LKh. **grāga*- (OKh. *khārgga*- ‘mud’)
 - §§ 3.2.6.2, 3.3.1.5.b, 3.3.1.5.c, 3.3.2.6.f, 3.4.2.1, 3.5.1.1
20. subst. TB *krāso* ‘vexation’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **grazu*, OKh. **graysu* ‘torment’ (LKh. *gr(r)aysa*-)
 - §§ 3.2.4.2, 3.4.5.1, 3.4.5.2, 3.5.1.1
21. subst. TB *cowo** ‘robbing’ ← PK acc. sg. **dyūwu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *dyūka*- ‘robber’)
 - §§ 3.2.3.1, 3.2.3.2, 3.3.1.2.c, 3.3.2.2.j, 3.3.2.2.m, 3.4.4.1, 3.5.1.1
22. subst. TB *tāno* ‘seed, grain’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **dāno*, OKh. *dāno* ‘id.’
 - §§ 3.2.4.2, 3.3.2.4.a, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.3.c
23. subst. TB *tono* ‘cloth’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *thaunu* ‘id.’
 - §§ 3.2.5.2, 3.3.1.4.c, 3.3.1.4.f, 3.3.2.5.h, 3.3.2.5.j, 3.4.7.1, 3.5.1.1
24. subst. TB *tvāṅkaro* ‘ginger’ ← OKh. acc. sg. **tvāṅgarau* ‘id.’ (LKh. *ttumgara*-)
 - §§ 3.2.5.2, 3.3.2.5.c, 3.3.2.5.m, 3.3.2.5.o, 3.4.4.1, 3.5.1.1
25. subst. TA *twantaṃ* ‘reverence’ ← OKh. *tvamdanu* ‘id.’
 - §§ 3.2.5.2, 3.3.1.4.f, 3.3.2.5.g, 3.3.2.5.i, 3.3.2.5.o, 3.4.9.1, 3.4.9.2, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.5.1.1
26. adv. TB *twār* ‘?’ ← LKh. *tvarā* ‘moreover’ (OKh. *ttuvare*)
 - §§ 3.2.6.2, 3.3.2.6.d, 3.5.1.3
27. subst. TB *pātro* A *pātār* ‘alms-bowl’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *pātru* ‘id.’
 - §§ 3.2.5.2, 3.3.1.4.b, 3.3.2.5.k, 3.4.4.1, 3.5.1.1
28. subst. TAB *pānto* ‘friend, companion’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **pando*, OKh. *pando* ‘path’
 - §§ 3.2.4.2, 3.4.4.1, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.3.a
29. v. TB *paraka*- ‘to prosper, thrive’ ← PTK, PK **farāka*- ‘more’ (OKh. *pharāka*-)
 - §§ 3.2.2.2, 3.5.1.4, 3.5.5.1.1
30. subst. TB *parso* A *pārs* ‘letter’ ← PTK acc. sg. **pṛsu* ‘request’ (OKh. *pulsā* ‘to ask’)
 - §§ 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.1.1.d, 3.3.2.1.g, 3.3.2.1.m, 3.4.5.1, 3.4.5.2, 3.5.1.1
31. subst. TB *pito* ‘price’ ← PK acc. sg. **pīḍu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *piha*-)
 - §§ 3.2.3.1, 3.2.3.2, 3.3.1.2.d, 3.3.2.2.f, 3.3.2.2.h, 3.4.5.1, 3.4.5.2, 3.5.1.1
32. subst. TA *pissāṅk* ‘bhikṣusaṃgha’ ← LKh. *bi’saṃga*- (OKh. *bālsaṃga*-)
 - §§ 3.2.6.2, 3.3.2.6.e, 3.3.2.6.k, 3.4.9.2, 3.5.1.1
33. subst. *mraṅco* ‘black pepper’ ← PTK, PK acc. sg. **mirind^zyu*, OKh. **miriṃjsyu* ‘id.’ (LKh. *miriṃjsya*-)
 - §§ 3.2.4.2, 3.3.2.4.b, 3.4.7.1, 3.5.1.1
34. subst. TB *yolo* ‘evil’ ← OKh. acc. sg. *yaulu** ‘falsehood’
 - §§ 3.2.5.2, 3.3.1.4.c, 3.3.2.5.l, 3.3.2.5.n, 3.4.5.1, 3.4.5.2, 3.5.1.1
35. subst. TB *wañc** ‘sparrow’ ← PTK, PK nom. or acc. sg. **winji* ‘id.’ (LKh. *biṃji*-)
 - §§ 3.2.2.2, 3.3.1.3.b, 3.3.2.3.a, 3.3.2.3.b, 3.4.1.1, 3.4.1.2, 3.4.9.1, 3.5.1.1
36. subst. TB *warāñce** A *wāryāñc** ‘sand’ ← PTK, PK **wirwīca*- ‘grain (of sand)’ (OKh. *ggurvīca*-)
 - §§ 3.2.2.2, 3.3.1.3.a, 3.3.2.3.b, 3.4.2.1, 3.4.2.2, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.3.b
37. subst. TAB *śāṅcapo* ‘mustard’ ← PTK acc. sg. **śanžapu* (OKh. *śśaśvāna*-)
 - §§ 3.3.1.1.e, 3.3.2.1.k, 3.3.2.1.o, 3.4.5.1, 3.4.5.2, 3.5.1.1
38. subst. TB *šāmpo** TA *šāmpām* ‘haughtiness, pride’ ← PTK acc. sg. *čamfu* ‘violence, disturbance’ (OKh. *tcampha*-)
 - §§ 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.1.1.a, 3.3.2.1.c, 3.3.2.1.h, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1.1

39. subst. TB *śarko** ‘song, singing’ ← PTK acc. sg. **čarko*, A *tsärk* ← PK acc. sg. **tsarko* (OKh. *tcarkā*- ‘play, amusement’)
§§ 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.2.3.1, 3.2.3.2, 3.2.3.2, 3.3.1.1.f, 3.3.1.2.f, 3.3.2.1.c, 3.3.2.1.j, 3.3.2.2.c, 3.3.2.2.i, 3.4.3.1, 3.5.1.1
40. subst. TB *śintso** (a species of tree) ← OKh. acc. sg. **śšimjso* (LKh. *šimjā*- ‘id.’)
§§ 3.2.5.2, 3.3.1.4.g, 3.3.2.5.e, 3.3.2.5.p, 3.4.4.1, 3.5.1.1
41. subst. TA *śrittātak* ‘well-being’ ← OKh. *śśaratāti*- ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.5.2, 3.3.1.4.g, 3.3.2.5.e, 3.3.2.5.p, 3.4.4.1, 3.5.1.1
42. v. TB *šərt*- A *šərttw*- (PT **šərtw*-) ‘incite’ ← PTK past ptc. **šrtu* ‘id.’ (OKh. *ā-ššuda*-)
§§ 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.1.1.d, 3.3.2.1.e, 3.3.2.1.l, 3.5.1.4, 3.5.5.1.1
43. adj. TB *šupakīne* ‘pertaining to suppositories’ ← OKh. **ššūvakīna*- ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.5.2, 3.3.1.4.a, 3.3.1.4.d, 3.3.2.5.a, 3.3.2.5.f, 3.3.2.5.o, 3.3.2.5.q, 3.5.1.2
44. subst. TB *špakīye* ‘suppository’ ← LKh. *švakā*- ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.6.2, 3.3.2.6.h, 3.3.2.6.j, 3.3.2.6.o, 3.4.4.1, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.3.c
45. subst. TB *sāñ*, *šāñ*, A *šāñ* ‘artifice, expedient, means, method’ ← Khot. *sañā*- ‘id.’
§§ 3.2.6.2, 3.4.1.1, 3.4.1.2, 3.5.1.1
46. v. TB *sanapa*- ‘to anoint, embrocate’ ← PTK, PK **zənāf*-
§§ 3.2.2.2, 3.3.2.3.c, 3.5.1.4, 3.5.5.1.1
47. subst. TB *siñco** (plant name) ← OKh. acc. sg. **siñjo* ‘id.’ (LKh. *siñjā*- ‘id.’)
§§ 3.2.5.2, 3.3.1.4.e, 3.3.2.5.d, 3.3.2.5.r, 3.4.4.1, 3.5.1.1
48. subst. TB *tsuwo** ‘going’ (adv. *tsuwai* ‘towards’) ← PK acc. sg. **ts^hūwu* (OKh. *tsūka*-)
§§ 3.2.3.1, 3.2.3.2, 3.3.1.2.c, 3.3.2.2.j, 3.3.2.2.l, 3.3.2.6.c, 3.4.4.1, 3.5.1.1

INDEX OF PASSAGES

The signatures of the manuscripts containing the passages quoted in the text are listed under the respective languages. For Khotanese, an effort has been made to quote the manuscript signatures of the longest texts under the respective text abbreviations as listed at the beginning of this volume (Suv, JP, JS etc.). The order of the languages is the following:

- Tocharian (A and B)
- Khotanese
- Tumshuqese
- Avestan
- Bactrian
- Sogdian, Parthian, Middle Persian
- Sanskrit
- Gāndhārī
- Pāli
- Old Uyghur

TOCHARIAN

A 6 b5: 155 fn. 317	A 70 a3: 75, 76
A 7 b1: 72	A 71 b3: 53, 59
A 10 a4: 155 fn. 317	A 74 a1: 139, 140
A 14 a6-b1: 130, 132	A 83 b2: 199
A 15 b1: 176, 178	A 94 b5: 148
A 22 a5: 242 fn. 402	A 98 a1: 75
A 24 b5: 13 fn. 1, 53, 59	A 103 a5: 94
A 28 a5: 72	A 114 b4: 166
A 29 b1: 152	A 118 b3: 155 fn. 317
A 31 a1: 153	A 126 a6: 176, 178
A 57 a5: 139, 140	A 152 a3: 94
A 60 a1-2: 153	A 152 a4: 112
A 60 b4: 242 fn. 402	A 153 b6: 94
A 60 b6: 75	A 155 b2: 75
A 62 a1: 154, 154 fn. 314	A 163 b2: 53
A 62 b4: 155 fn. 317	A 188 b3: 72
A 62 b5: 155 fn. 317	A 211 a1, a3: 112
A 63 a6: 139	A 212: 55 Tab. 3
A 66 a1: 113	A 213 a2 + YQ II.4 b8: 242
A 66 a2: 36, 37, 37 Tab. 2	A 217 a2: 166
A 66 a4: 113	A 217 b5: 242 fn. 402
A 66 a6: 37	A 218: 55 Tab. 3
A 66 b2: 36, 37, 37 Tab. 2	A 220 b1: 68

- A 232 b6: 72
- A 238 a3: 92
- A 251 b6 (parallel A 252 b6): 64
- A 252 b4 (parallel A 251 b4): 154
- A 255 b7: 83
- A 258 b3: 64
- A 260 b2: 53, 59
- A 270 a8: 185
- A 301 a1: 242 Tab. 15
- A 302 b8: 120
- A 303 a5: 55
- A 303 b1: 55 Tab. 3, 55, 120
- A 315 a2: 165
- A 318 a2: 176, 177
- A 318 a6: 176, 177
- A 321 a8: 75
- A 329 b3: 174
- A 333 b3: 139, 140
- A 335 b9: 83
- A 353 a5: 92
- A 372 b4: 75
- A 375 a5: 83
- A 375 b5: 92
- A 403 a5: 136
- B SI P/2 a5: 87
- HWB 74(4) a1: 98
- HWB 74(4) a8: 187
- IOL Khot Wood 65: 120
- IOL Toch 2 b3: 70
- IOL Toch 4 a1: 112
- IOL Toch 4 b4: 200
- IOL Toch 5 b2-3: 128
- IOL Toch 7 a3: 166
- IOL Toch 23 a4: 200
- IOL Toch 62 a3: 36
- IOL Toch 63 a1, b5: 37 Tab. 2
- IOL Toch 64 a1: 87
- IOL Toch 79 a4: 196
- IOL Toch 80 a3, a5: 122
- IOL Toch 92 a2: 147
- IOL Toch 89: 153
- IOL Toch 100 b2: 169
- IOL Toch 106 a5: 157
- IOL Toch 106 b5: 134
- IOL Toch 108 a2: 245
- IOL Toch 116 a1: 177, 178
- IOL Toch 116 b4: 148
- IOL Toch 117 b4: 36
- IOL Toch 127 a1: 109
- IOL Toch 127 a2-3: 245
- IOL Toch 134 a1: 142, 144
- IOL Toch 159 b5: 143, 144
- IOL Toch 161 b4: 67
- IOL Toch 163 a4: 174
- IOL Toch 169 a5: 148
- IOL Toch 187 a5: 148
- IOL Toch 205 a4: 201
- IOL Toch 214 b4: 200
- IOL Toch 222 b2: 142
- IOL Toch 246 a4-b1: 245
- IOL Toch 246 b2: 245
- IOL Toch 248 a5: 68
- IOL Toch 248 b6: 197
- IOL Toch 255 b2: 87
- IOL Toch 258 a2-3: 148
- IOL Toch 259 b4: 196
- IOL Toch 262 b4: 112
- IOL Toch 305 b1: 93
- IOL Toch 306 a5: 94
- IOL Toch 306 b5: 85
- IOL Toch 360 b5: 67
- IOL Toch 369 a2: 131
- IOL Toch 466 a1: 153
- IOL Toch 574 b3: 142
- IOL Toch 803 b2: 169
- IOL Toch 871 b3: 109
- IOL Toch 899 b1: 245
- IOL Toch 1094 a1: 37 Tab. 2
- IOL Toch 1121 a3: 197
- Is-002-ZS-Z-02: 52 fn. 84
- Kizil WD-111-1: 52 fn. 84
- Km-034-ZS-L-01 a6: 176, 178
- Km-034-ZS-R-01 a7: 36
- Kz-222-ZS-R-02.2: 249
- Kz-225-YD-W-27: 52 fn. 84
- MIK III 4048 a2: 245
- MY1.6 a6: 148
- Ot. 19.1 a2-3: 98
- Ot. 12 a14: 142
- PD Bois B87 b4: 75
- PD Bois B97 a2: 148
- PK AS 2A a5: 27

PK AS 2A a6: 125
 PK AS 2A b2: 27, 125
 PK AS 2B a2: 125
 PK AS 2B a3: 169
 PK AS 2B a6, b4: 94
 PK AS 2C b6: 94
 PK AS 3A a1: 35, 94
 PK AS 3A a2, b1: 35
 PK AS 3A a3: 97
 PK AS 3A a5: 63
 PK AS 3A a6: 35, 94
 PK AS 3A b3: 51, 104, 109
 PK AS 3A b4, 5: 73
 PK AS 3A b6: 71
 PK AS 3B: 27 fn. 15
 PK AS 3B a2, b1: 94
 PK AS 3B b5: 27, 96, 125, 157
 PK AS 4B a5: 131, 132, 134
 PK AS 6B a6: 189
 PK AS 8C b1: 190
 PK AS 9A b8: 190
 PK AS 9B b6: 94
 PK AS 7A a1: 142
 PK AS 7H a2: 87
 PK AS 7H b3-4: 103
 PK AS 7L a5: 174
 PK AS 7M a5: 169
 PK AS 7M b1: 111
 PK AS 8A b7: 205
 PK AS 8A b7-8: 196
 PK AS 8A b9: 97
 PK AS 8B a1: 99
 PK AS 8B a2: 99, 100
 PK AS 8C a3-4: 130
 PK AS 8C a5: 97
 PK AS 8C a7: 94
 PK AS 8C b1: 190
 PK AS 9A b7: 125
 PK AS 9B b2: 125
 PK AS 9B b5: 130
 PK AS 9D b3: 130
 PK AS 12D a5: 245
 PK AS 12K b3: 29, 30
 PK AS 15G b2: 199
 PK AS 16.2 a4: 154
 PK AS 16.3 a5: 68

PK AS 16.7 a4: 36
 PK AS 16.8 a4: 109
 PK AS 16.8 b4: 122 fn. 231
 PK AS 17A a3: 201
 PK AS 17A b1-2: 176, 178
 PK AS 17B a5: 87
 PK AS 17J b5: 113
 PK AS 17K b4: 201
 PK AS 17F a3: 122
 PK AS 17F b3-4: 74
 PK AS 18A a5: 142
 PK AS 19.5 a2: 122
 PK Bois A26, A49, B3, B7, B25, B26, B31,
 B37, B40, B45, B51, B65, B125, B134/
 142, B135: 65
 PK Bois C1 a2: 151
 PK Bois C1 a5-7: 151
 PK Bois C1 b5ii: 148
 PK DA M 507.5 b2: 142
 PK DA M 507.8: 55 Tab. 3
 PK DA M 507.22 a8: 123
 PK DA M 507.23 a10: 142
 PK DA M 507.32 a6: 136
 PK DA M 507.32 a8: 118
 PK DA M 507.32 a9: 118
 PK DA M 507.32 a10: 148
 PK DA M 507.32 a11: 98
 PK DA M 507.34 a26: 143
 PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a26: 136
 PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a32-33: 148
 PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a40-41: 154
 PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a76: 142
 PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a97: 250
 PK DA M 507.37 and 36 a105: 98
 PK DA M 507.38 a69: 143
 PK DA M 507.39 and 43 a2: 151
 PK DA M 507.41 a5: 151
 PK DA M 507.41 b1: 151
 PK LC 11 a1: 148
 PK LC 11 a3: 250
 PK LC 39 a2: 142
 PK NS 1 b1: 92
 PK NS 2 a2: 94
 PK NS 3 a3: 97
 PK NS 3 b1: 94
 PK NS 13 and 516 b3: 153

PK NS 31 and 294 b6: 113
 PK NS 34 b2: 192
 PK NS 36 and 20 b5: 66
 PK NS 40 b1: 75
 PK NS 49B a2: 112
 PK NS 53 a5: 153
 PK NS 53 a6: 154
 PK NS 54 b3: 201
 PK NS 56 b5: 201
 PK NS 58 b3: 136
 PK NS 83 b5: 66
 PK NS 95 b2: 142
 PK NS 399 a3: 177, 178
 PK réserve 1517 B 3.2: 65
 SI B Toch 9 a13: 148
 SI B Toch 10 a2: 40, 41
 SI B Toch 10 a4: 151
 SI B Toch 11 a3: 55 Tab. 3
 SI B Toch 11 a4: 55 Tab. 3, 148
 SI B Toch 12 a2: 249
 THT 7 a7, b2: 112
 THT 9 b7: 34
 THT 10 a3: 34
 THT 11 b2: 201
 THT 15 a8: 118
 THT 17: 55 Tab. 3
 THT 17 b1-2: 118
 THT 18 b5: 94
 THT 22 a2-4: 118
 THT 23 b2: 75
 THT 23 b4: 201
 THT 25 a1: 68
 THT 27 a8: 94
 THT 29 a8: 130, 132
 THT 31 a2-3: 103
 THT 33 a4-5: 118
 THT 33 b6-7: 103
 THT 41 b4-5: 237
 THT 42 b5: 103
 THT 44 a6: 192
 THT 44 b6: 68
 THT 65 a3: 136
 THT 70.a a6: 122
 THT 73 b3: 153
 THT 79 a6: 192
 THT 82 b4: 87

THT 83 a3: 199
 THT 85 a1-2: 170
 THT 85 a3: 107
 THT 88 a1-2: 194
 THT 89 b1: 87
 THT 91 a1: 41
 THT 91 a3: 41
 THT 91 b6: 128
 THT 94 a2-3: 66
 THT 99 a2: 122
 THT 99 b3: 142
 THT 100 a1: 142
 THT 100 b1: 201
 THT 100 b6: 174
 THT 108: 55, 55 Tab. 3, 133 fn. 264
 THT 108 a6-7: 131, 133
 THT 108 a9: 68
 THT 108 b9: 50–52, 55 Tab. 3, 59
 THT 118 b1: 75
 THT 136 b8: 201
 THT 138 a3: 174
 THT 142 a4: 166
 THT 147.6 a1: 142
 THT 159 b6: 112
 THT 169 a2: 71
 THT 176 a7: 134
 THT 177 b2: 134
 THT 182 a3, a4, b2: 98
 THT 203 b4: 143, 144
 THT 204 a3: 143, 144
 THT 206 b2: 136
 THT 212 a4: 75
 THT 213 b5: 66
 THT 214 b2-3: 192
 THT 221 b4: 112
 THT 229 b1: 201
 THT 229 b4: 130, 132
 THT 239 a2 + THT 3597 a7: 75, 76
 THT 240 a2: 174
 THT 247 b2: 192
 THT 255 b3-4: 118
 THT 259 b3: 123
 THT 271 b2: 201
 THT 274 b4: 131, 133
 THT 277 b2: 201
 THT 281 a3: 41

THT 281 b5: 130, 132
 THT 282 a7-b1: 170
 THT 282 b3: 201
 THT 282 b4: 152
 THT 282 b6: 201
 THT 283.a b6: 114
 THT 286 b6: 75
 THT 292 a2: 185
 THT 294 b4: 154
 THT 294 b8: 154 fn. 312
 THT 295 a6-7: 201
 THT 295 b2-3: 152
 THT 315 b3: 142
 THT 324 a3: 202
 THT 325 a1: 105
 THT 331 b1: 55 Tab. 3
 THT 331 b5: 41
 THT 333 b6: 98
 THT 333 b7: 98
 THT 334 a4: 99
 THT 334 b1: 112
 THT 337 a2: 142
 THT 337 b3: 142
 THT 338 a6: 87
 THT 364 a5: 130
 THT 364 b1: 94
 THT 370 b5: 134
 THT 375 a5: 148
 THT 382 a1: 177, 178
 THT 385 b4: 130, 132
 THT 386 b4: 114
 THT 388 a6: 112
 THT 389 b3: 136
 THT 404 a4: 134
 THT 408 b6: 112
 THT 412 b2: 185
 THT 429 b5: 54 fn. 86
 THT 459.2: 54
 THT 462 a5: 148
 THT 463 a5: 136
 THT 491 b5ii: 148
 THT 492 a2: 136
 THT 492 a3: 136, 138
 THT 496 a4: 201
 THT 497 a7: 125
 THT 497 b1: 190

THT 497 b4, b9: 94
 THT 497 b5: 94, 125
 THT 497 b8: 96
 THT 498 a8: 98
 THT 500-502 b7: 125, 157
 THT 500-502 b9-10: 63
 THT 503 a3: 35
 THT 505 b2: 94
 THT 510 b1: 188
 THT 510 b6: 35, 36
 THT 512 b1: 114
 THT 520 b5: 87
 THT 522 a4: 112
 THT 535 b3: 67
 THT 537 b5: 112
 THT 549 a5: 113
 THT 549 a5-6: 51 fn. 82
 THT 549 b3: 134
 THT 552 b1: 166, 167
 THT 554 a6: 129
 THT 559 a1-2: 186 fn. 350
 THT 566 b6: 166
 THT 566 b7: 61
 THT 575 b3: 174
 THT 588 a1: 106
 THT 588 a2: 177, 178
 THT 591 a4: 41, 55 Tab. 3
 THT 623 b5: 179
 THT 1104 a4: 177, 178
 THT 1105 a1, a4: 123
 THT 1107 a5: 142
 THT 1111 b2: 148
 THT 1116 b5: 87
 THT 1118 a3: 112
 THT 1120 a5-b1: 238
 THT 1192 a6: 112
 THT 1227.a a3: 112
 THT 1250 a5: 201
 THT 1252 b2: 130
 THT 1258 a4: 112
 THT 1335.a a7: 148
 THT 1382.e: 152
 THT 1412.i a2: 139
 THT 1442 b3: 192
 THT 1450b a2: 166
 THT 1460.a a2: 143

- THT 1464 b2: 53, 59
 THT 1475.d a3: 154 fn. 314
 THT 1468 a5: 154
 THT 1468 b5: 154 fn. 312
 THT 1520 a3: 109
 THT 1535 (a-e): 193
 THT 1535.b b3: 193
 THT 1535.c b3: 94
 THT 1535.d b3: 157
 THT 1540 a+b a2: 99 fn. 186, 180
 THT 1540 a + b a3: 180
 THT 1541.j b2: 201
 THT 1548.a a5: 142
 THT 1552.e b1: 75
 THT 1590.e b2: 155–156
 THT 1619.c b4: 192
 THT 1681: 55, 55 Tab. 3
 THT 1859 a1: 118
 THT 2227 b1: 112
 THT 2347.a a2, b3: 94
 THT 2348e b2: 98
 THT 2348.i b2: 94
 THT 2377.v a2: 130 fn. 260, 131, 133
 THT 2388 b1: 155 fn. 317
 THT 2401 a3: 112
 THT 2494 a2: 112
 THT 2676 a3: 96
 THT 2676 b3: 94
 THT 2677.d b1: 94
 THT 2677.d b2: 190
 THT 2688.10: 53
 THT 2709.2-3: 53
 THT 2761c.2: 54
 THT 3596 b3: 118
 THT 3998 a3: 94
 THT 4000 bli: 148
 THT 4000 b7iii: 54
 THT 4000 b11v: 65
 THT 4001 a8: 148
 THT 4001 b2: 65
 U 5208 a14: 168
 W1 b4: 63
 W2 a6: 112
 W3 a3: 188
 W4 a4: 85, 94
 W4 b1: 96
 W4 b2: 94
 W4 b3: 190
 W4 b4: 96
 W6 a6, b5: 63
 W6 b1: 94
 W7 a6: 94
 W7 b3: 96
 W7 b5: 190
 W8 b4: 188
 W9 a3: 188
 W10 a3; a4: 94
 W10 a4: 94
 W13 a6: 197 fn. 360
 W14 a2: 190
 W14 a6: 85
 W14 b1: 109
 W14 b1-2: 85
 W14 b2: 85
 W15 b3: 188
 W17 b5: 63
 W19 b1: 63
 W19 b3: 94
 W19 b5: 96
 W20 a4: 93
 W20 a5: 63, 96
 W21 b2: 94
 W21 b4: 96
 W22 a3: 93
 W23 a2: 94
 W24 a3: 94
 W26 b3: 190
 W26 b4: 96
 W27 a3, b3: 94
 W27 b1: 85, 190
 W29 b1: 87, 99, 197
 W30 a5: 85
 W30 b4: 94
 W31 b2: 94
 W32 a4: 96
 W33 b2: 94
 W34 a4: 94
 W34 a5: 190
 W34 b2: 188
 W35 a5: 94
 W35 a6: 190
 W37 b3: 85

W38 a5: 96
 W38 a6: 93
 W38 b5: 188
 W39 a3: 96
 W39 a4: 190
 W39 b1: 188
 W39 b3: 109
 W40 b2: 190
 W41 b2: 190
 W41 b3: 96

KHOTANESE

Aśoka 6.8: 31
 Aśoka 5.14.2, 5.15, 5.17.3, 5.18.2: 143
 Avalokiteśvaradhāraṇī fol. 5r5: 96
 Avalokiteśvaradhāraṇī fol. 9r5: 99
 Avalokiteśvaradhāraṇī fol. 16r1: 90
 bi 33 (T III Š 16): **233–235**
 BM OA 1919.1-1.0177.1-3 fol. 8 r1: 110
 Ch 00266: 116
 Domoko C: 124 fn. 234
 Domoko D: 124 fn. 234
 Hedin 1: 124 fn. 234
 Hedin 2: 147
 Hedin 3.15: 149, 150
 Hedin 4: 147
 Hedin 4.5: 143
 Hedin 7r9: 90
 Hedin 7v8: 89
 Hedin 9.3: 198 fn. 361
 Hedin 9.4: 147
 Hedin 13: 124 fn. 234
 Hedin 15: 124 fn. 234
 Hedin 16: 124 fn. 234
 Hedin 16.1-2: 139
 Hedin 17.19: 154
 Hedin 19.13-14: 139
 Hedin 20a2: 31 fn. 38
 Hedin 25: 147
 Hedin 26: 147
 Hedin 29: 147
 IOL Khot 9/4 a1: 143
 IOL Khot 23/14 b2: 79 fn. 133
 IOL Khot 27/10 b3: 149, 150
 IOL Khot 28/14 b3-4: 191

W42 a5: 85
 W42 b1: 188
 YQ I.2: 55 Tab. 3
 YQ I.5 b3: 75
 YQ I.9 a2: 176, 177
 YQ I.9 b3: 176, 177
 YQ I.23 a4: 154
 YQ I.23 a5: 154
 YQ II.8 a7: 75, 76
 IOL Khot 34/2.a1: 95
 IOL Khot 35/8 a2: 31
 IOL Khot 41/1.9: 95
 IOL Khot 45/4.3: 144 fn. 298
 IOL Khot 46/3.3: 80 fn. 134
 IOL Khot 55/1 v1: 91
 IOL Khot 75/4 b2: 191
 IOL Khot 102/1v2: **116–117**
 IOL Khot 140/1a6-7, 10, 11, 12: 191
 IOL Khot 147/1 r5: 190
 IOL Khot 147/2 v4: 143
 IOL Khot 150/2 v5: 89
 IOL Khot 150/3 r4: 112
 IOL Khot 153/4 r1: 90
 IOL Khot 159/6 b3: 110
 IOL Khot 160/4 v3: 190
 IOL Khot 163/1 v3: 89
 IOL Khot 165/1a 32-33: 184
 IOL Khot 165/1b 12: 137 fn. 273, 184
 IOL Khot 165/1b 21: 159 fn. 324
 IOL Khot 166/1a 1-2: 184
 IOL Khot 171/1.5-6: 193
 IOL Khot 193/9: 110
 IOL Khot 197/7.2: 80 fn. 134
 IOL Khot 206/1.3: 89
 IOL Khot 220/1 b1: 90–91
 IOL Khot S. 2.16: 89
 IOL Khot S. 2.39: 110
 IOL Khot S. 5.6: 110
 IOL Khot S. 6.9: 69
 IOL Khot S. 10.8: 76
 IOL Khot S. 10.10: 76
 IOL Khot S. 10.29-30: 76

- IOL Khot S. 10.293: 91
 IOL Khot S. 13.29: 31
 IOL Khot S. 21.34: 45
 IOL Khot S. 47.3: 30
 IOL Khot Wood 2 b1: 91
 IOL Khot Wood 3 b1-2: 91
 IOL Khot Wood 6 a1: 249
 IOL Khot wood 6 b2: 249
 IOL Khot Wood 6 b3: 108, 248–249
 JP 44v1: 96
 JP 49r1: 63
 JP 52r1: 27
 JP 52r4: 110
 JP 56r4: 27
 JP 56v4: 110
 JP 57r4: 125
 JP 58v2: 125
 JP 58v3: 63
 JP 61v5: 27
 JP 62v2: 63
 JP 66r5: 63
 JP 67r4: 110
 JP 73r5: 63
 JP 73v1: 110
 JP 77v3: 63
 JP 78v4: 125
 JP 79v2: 63
 JP 80v5: 63
 JP 82r4: 32
 JP 82v3: 125
 JP 84r4: 63
 JP 85v3: 27
 JP 87r2: 125
 JP 88r2: 125
 JP 88r4: 125
 JP 91v2: 114
 JP 91v2-4: **116–117**
 JP 91v3: 114
 JP 92r1: 84
 JP 93r3: 157
 JP 93r4: 110
 JP 93v2: 31
 JP 93v3: 125, 157
 JP 95r3: 94
 JP 96r2: 157
 JP 96v4: 95
 JP 97r5: 27
 JP 97r2: 95
 JP 97v1: 95
 JP 97v3: 96
 JP 97v4: 80
 JP 98r2: 27, 95, 125
 JP 98v2: 27, 98, 125, 157
 JP 99r3: 125
 JP 99r4: 95, 157
 JP 99v2: 95, 125
 JP 99v3: 125
 JP 100r2: 157
 JP 100r3: 157
 JP 100v2: 27
 JP 101r4: 157
 JP 101v2: 125
 JP 101v3: 31, 95
 JP 104v5: 27, 157
 JP 105v1: 96, 157
 JP 106r2: 157
 JP 106r4: 125
 JP 106v4: 125
 JP 107v2: 157
 JP 108r5: 96
 JP 109r5: 125, 157
 JP 110r3: 125
 JP 111r1: 125
 JP 111v1: 125
 JP 112r4: 125
 JP 112r5: 157
 JP 113r1: 125, 157
 JP 113v2: 157
 JP 114r5: 157
 JP 115r1: 157
 JP 115r2: 125
 JP 115r5: 125, 157
 JP 115v5: 125, 157
 JP 116r5: 125
 JP 116v1: 157
 JS 5r2: 76, 77
 JS 6v1-2: 190
 JS 14r2: 144
 JS 16r4: 110
 JS 20r3: 31
 JS 20v1: 76
 JS 21r2: 143, 144

- JS 23v1: 110
 JS 23v2: 112
 JS 25v1: 30
 JS 25v4: 143, 144
 JS 27v4: 112
 JS 28r1: 193
 JS 33r4: 144
 JS 34v1: 175
 JS 36v1: 90
 JS 37r3: 78, 79
 JS 37r3-4: 76
 Kh. i.120: **198**
 Khotan *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* Fol.
 456 b8: 147
 M1 r1: 110
 Mañj P 4099.19-21: 78, 79
 Mañj P 4099.20: 79
 Mañj P 4099.72: 91
 Mañj P 4099.73: 91
 Mañj P 4099.74: 91
 Mañj P 4099.124-5: 184
 Mañj P 4099.130: 143, 144
 Mañj P 4099.139: 139
 Mañj P 4099.150-151: 139
 Mañj P 4099.278: 112
 Mañj P 4099.291: 91
 Mañj P 4099.292: 89
 Mañj P 4099.137-138: 79
 Mañj P 4099.308-309: 114
 Mañj P 4099.313: 114
 Mañj P 4099.355: 112
 Or. 6393/2.4-5: 78
 Or. 6397/1.5: 77, 78
 Or. 6397/1 (G. 1).2, 5, 7: 235
 Or. 6397/1 (G. 1).3: 143
 Or. 6402B/2.1: 234
 Or. 8210/S. 5212.3: 89
 Or. 8210/S. 5212.5: 90
 Or. 8211/1454 r1: 80 fn. 138
 Or. 8212.162.13: 80 fn. 138
 Or. 8212/186.34: 45
 Or. 9268A c1: 155
 Or. 11252/1 r12: 110
 Or. 11252/15 b2: 143
 Or. 11252/15 b3: 143 fn. 295
 Or. 11344/4: 124 fn. 234
 Or.11252/4v.6-7: 245, 248
 Or. 11344/12 b4: 31
 Or. 12637/19.1 a1: 30
 Or. 12637/25 a1, a4: 137
 Or. 12637/41 (Jigdaliq I.i.02): 235
 Or. 12637/51 a2: 129 fn. 256
 Or. 12637/57.12: 30
 Or. 12637/78 1.2-3: 79 fn. 133
 P 4 12r4: 112
 P 4 12r4-5: 112
 P 51.1 b1: 89
 P 94.8.4: 94
 P 94.23.4,7: 94
 P 95.5.6: 94
 P 95.6.2: 94
 P 96.4.2: 94
 P 96.4.3: 94
 P 97.3.2: 94
 P 98.6.5: 94
 P 98.7.1: 94
 P 103.5.2,7: 94
 P 103.5.4: 94
 P 103.5.8: 94
 P 103.26.1: 94
 P 103.52 col. 2.1: 94
 P 1068: 234
 P 1311: 234, 235
 P 2022.39: 89
 P 2023.8: 44
 P 2024.45: 144
 P 2024.46: 155
 P 2025: 116
 P 2025.15: 76
 P 2025.45: 76
 P 2027.7: 45
 P 2027.16: 155
 P 2027.18: 155
 P 2027.28: 190
 P 2739.16: 32
 P 2739.19: 195
 P 2739.43: 47
 P 2741.3: 137
 P 2741.120: 29
 P 2782.16: 144
 P 2782.26: 69
 P 2786.60-62: 137

- P 2786.64: 137 fn. 270
 P 2786.70: 69
 P 2786.146-149: 137
 P 2786.197: 45
 P 2786.244: 143
 P 2787.51: 45
 P 2798: 143 fn. 290
 P 2891.20: 110
 P 2895.29: 93
 P 2898.12-13: 137
 P 2925.16: 90
 P 2925.49-50: 137
 P 2956.26: 76
 P 2956.28: 76
 P 2958: 143 fn. 290
 P 2958.127: 45
 P 3513.20r2-3: 119
 P 3513.24v2: 110
 P 3513.50r3: 139
 P 4649.5: 45
 P 4649.8: 45
 P 5538b.82: 38
 P 5538b.88: 190
 PiŚ IOL Khot. S. 9.2, 24, 31, 35, 40: 94
 PiŚ IOL Khot. S. 9.22, 110: 95
 PiŚ P 2893.35: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.46: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.48: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.56: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.57: 96
 PiŚ P 2893.62: 96
 PiŚ P 2893.80: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.83: 95
 PiŚ P 2893.89: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.113: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.120: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.127: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.131: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.139: 95
 PiŚ P 2893.147: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.158: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.163: 110
 PiŚ P 2893.164: 110
 PiŚ P 2893.165: 110
 PiŚ P 2893.165: 27, 95
 PiŚ P 2893.167: 95
 PiŚ P 2893.179: 95
 PiŚ P 2893.184: 35
 PiŚ P 2893.185: 35
 PiŚ P 2893.189: 35
 PiŚ P 2893.211: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.213: 63
 PiŚ P 2893.218: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.219: 27
 PiŚ P 2893.235: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.247: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.251: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.255: 94
 PiŚ P 2893.256: 95
 PiŚ P 2893.262: 94
 PiŚ §9: 85
 PiŚ §10-14: 85
 PiŚ §14: 195
 PiŚ §22.4: 97
 PiŚ §24-27: 85
 PS IOL Khot S. 6.57: 29
 Rāma P 2781.29: 94
 Rāma P 2781.53: 30
 Rāma P 2781.71: 68, 70
 Rāma P 2781.103: 89
 Rāma P 2783.31: 30
 Rāma P 2783.32: 30
 Rāma P 2783.43: 69
 Rāma P 2783.44: 69
 Rāma P 2783.53: 69
 Rk IOL Khot 36/2 r4: **33-34**
 Sgh 23: 31
 Sgh 28.3: 95
 Sgh 28.4: 95
 Sgh 29.4: 124
 Sgh 37.3: 95
 Sgh 43.6: 154, 155
 Sgh 51[2]: 109
 Sgh 72.2: 94, 154
 Sgh 73.1: 94, 95
 Sgh 73.2: 95
 Sgh 74.2: 95
 Sgh 88.2: 94, 95
 Sgh 142.3: 122
 Sgh 199: 79, 184
 Sgh 204.2-3: 122
 Sgh 204.5: 122

- Sgh 211.3: 109
 Sgh 214.1: 109
 Sgh 214.4: 109
 Sgh 214.7: 109
 Sgh 253.72: 38
 Sgh MS 10: 155
 Sgh MS 22: 155
 Šgs 3.6v1-2: 187
 Šgs 3.14r3: 95
 Šgs 3.13v2, 4: 95
 Si 4v4: 110
 Si 9r3: 110
 Si 9r4: 94
 Si 9r5: 95
 Si 9v1: 94
 Si 9v5: 63
 Si 10v1: 27
 Si 10v2: 96
 Si 10v5: 80
 Si 11r3: 32
 Si 12r2: 93
 Si 12v4: 27
 Si 13r4: 80
 Si 15r1: 95
 Si 16v2: 94
 Si 16v3-4: 126 fn. 247
 Si 17r2: 109
 Si 19r4: 27
 Si 100r3: 94
 Si 100r4: 63
 Si 100r5: 190
 Si 100v2: 95
 Si 101r1: 110
 Si 101r3: 95
 Si 101v2: 94
 Si 101v5: 125
 Si 102r4: 110
 Si 103r1: 110
 Si 104v1: 95
 Si 106r3: 94
 Si 107r1: 31
 Si 109v5: 95
 Si 121v4-5: 110
 Si 121v5: 188
 Si 122r1: 188
 Si 122r3: 188
 Si 122r4: 27
 Si 123r1: 27
 Si 123r5: 27
 Si 124v1: 27
 Si 126r4: 27
 Si 126v4: 27
 Si 128r2: 95
 Si 128r4: 27, 95
 Si 129v2: 63
 Si 129v4: 95
 Si 130r2: 95
 Si 130r3: 95
 Si 130r4: 95
 Si 130v2: 27
 Si 130v5: 125
 Si 131r2: 95
 Si 132v3: 94
 Si 133r2: 63, 95
 Si 135r1: 33
 Si 135v2: 63, 190
 Si 135v3: 63
 Si 136v3: 112
 Si 136v4: 112
 Si 137v2: 80
 Si 139r2: 95
 Si 139r5: 63
 Si 140r2: 63
 Si 141r1: 95
 Si 141r2: 95
 Si 141r3: 95
 Si 142v1: 94
 Si 142v4: 110
 Si 142v5: 94
 Si 143r1: 94
 Si 143v2: 80
 Si 144r1: 95
 Si 144v1: 126 fn. 248
 Si 146r2: 125
 Si 148v4: 109
 Si 148v5: 188
 Si 149r1: 109
 Si 149r4: 188
 Si 149v5: 188
 Si 150v5: 188
 Si 151r1: 188
 Si 151r2: 188

- Si 151r4: 188
- Si 151r5: 188
- Si 153v4: 95
- Si 155r4: 95
- Si 156r1: 95
- Si 156r4: 95
- Si P 2892.60: 94
- Si P 2892.71: 63
- Si P 2892.82: 27
- Si P 2892.127: 27
- Si §0.8: 89
- Si §1.19: 85
- Si §1.56: 167
- Si §2.2: 181
- Si §2.3: 181
- Si §2.4: 97
- Si §2.5: 157
- Si §2.18: 157
- Si §2.21: 181
- Si §2.24: 157
- Si §3.21.5: 195
- Si §3.22.8: 181
- Si §3.23.1: 157
- Si §3.23.2: 157
- Si §3.4: 71
- Si §13.48: 181
- Si §14.12: 181
- Si §14.18: 157, 181
- Si §15.16: 167, 181
- Si §15.22: 157
- Si §20.11: 157
- Si §20.23: 157
- Si §21.11.19: 80
- Si §21.12: 157, 181
- Si §21.13.8: 80
- Si §21.16: 157
- Si §21.32.3: 80
- Si §21.36: 157
- Si §22.11: 157
- Si §22.12: 181
- Si §23.19: 181
- Si §24.7: 85
- Si §24.11: 157
- Si §24.12: 97
- Si §24.31: 124
- Si §25.24: 124
- Si §26.23: 157
- Si §26.29: 157
- Si §26.30: 157
- Si §26.55: 181
- Si §26.65: 157
- Si §26.79: 157
- Si §27.12: 195
- SI P 45.3 2: 174 fn. 338
- SI P 94.18 a1: 137
- SI P 103.17 l.5: 78
- Sudh MS C: 116
- Sudh MS P: 116
- Sudh 51: 114
- Sudh 56: 30
- Sudh 233: 190
- Sudh 235: 190
- Sudh 286-287: 114
- Sudh 373: 190
- Sudh 406: 245, 248
- Sudh 414-415: 245, 248
- Sudh 415: 248
- Sum §91: 165
- Suv 0.17: 44
- Suv 0.19: 44
- Suv 1.9: 67, 190 fn. 352
- Suv 1.14: 122
- Suv 1.15: 90, 91
- Suv 2.71: 122
- Suv 3.23: 178
- Suv 3.47: 190
- Suv 3.53: 67
- Suv 3.69: 184 fn. 349
- Suv 3.91: 139
- Suv 4.12: 242
- Suv 5.4: 119
- Suv 5.7: 119
- Suv 6.3.16: 190 fn. 352
- Suv 6.4.22: 76
- Suv 6.4.29: 122
- Suv 6.4.39: 76
- Suv 8.36: 190
- Suv 8.68: 31
- Suv 10.18: 184
- Suv 12.15: 67
- Suv 12.18: 67
- Suv 12.42: 178

- Suv 12.47: 89
 Suv 13.17: 190
 Suv 14.24: 122
 Suv 15.41: 122
 Suv 17.168: 65
 Vajr Ch. 00275 1b2: 128
 Vajr Ch. 00275 27b2: 89
 Vajr. Ch. 00275 4b2 (IOL Khot 75/4): 191
 Vim 248: 167
 VkN 5.15.2: 181 fn. 347
 Z 2.45: 243
 Z 2.67: 184 fn. 349
 Z 2.82: 51 fn. 81
 Z 2.85: 122
 Z 2.118: 174
 Z 2.121: 74
 Z 2.131: 184 fn. 349
 Z 2.141: 141
 Z 2.170: 191
 Z 2.179: 184 fn. 349
 Z 3.62: 74
 Z 3.80: 141
 Z 3.82: 124
 Z 3.102: 190
 Z 4.11: 122
 Z 4.18: 138 fn. 275
 Z 4.32: 122
 Z 4.77: 110
 Z 4.96: 124, 190
 Z 4.109: 110
 Z 4.114: 244
 Z 5.16: 35
 Z 5.18: 35
 Z 5.33: 38, 122
 Z 5.86: 124
 Z 5.90: 112
 Z 5.114: 13 fn. 1, 44
 Z 6.24: 119
 Z 7.17: 246, 246 fn. 410
 Z 12.51: 89
 Z 12.67: 67
 Z 12.114: 89
 Z 12.114-115: 90
 Z 12.115: 89
 Z 13.86: 89
 Z 13.89: 89
 Z 13.91: 31
 Z 13.109: 45
 Z 13.120: 45
 Z 14.88: 122
 Z 14.92: 122
 Z 15.9: 44
 Z 15.127: 143
 Z 16.14: 31
 Z 17.26: 103, 154
 Z 19.16: 184 fn. 349
 Z 19.53: 112
 Z 19.74: 89
 Z 20.3: 76
 Z 20.8: 187
 Z 20.33: 243, 244
 Z 21.13: 191
 Z 22.124: 108 fn. 204, 237
 Z 22.135: 139, 141
 Z 22.156: 139
 Z 22.159: 237, 238–239 Tab. 13, 240
 Tab.14, 241
 Z 22.167: 237, 239 Tab. 13, 240 Tab. 14
 Z 22.209: 124
 Z 22.228: 146
 Z 22.253: 172 fn. 335
 Z 22.255: 122
 Z 22.319: 184 fn. 349
 Z 23.2: 122
 Z 23.4: 44
 Z 23.14: 44
 Z 23.34: 184 fn. 349
 Z 23.38: 32
 Z 23.48: 32
 Z 23.102: 90
 Z 23.105: 89
 Z 23.118: 184 fn. 349
 Z 23.135: 110
 Z 23.142: 32
 Z 24.218: 124
 Z 24.220: 190
 Z 24.256: 90
 Z 24.414: 175
 Z 24.435: 89
 Z 24.512: 139, 141 fn. 288
 Z 24.652: 146

TUMSHUQESE

- HL 1.14: 249
 HL 2.8: 150
 HL 2.9: 150
 HL 3.5: 249, 250
 HL 3.6: 249, 250
 HL 3.7: 249
 HL 4.11-12: 249
 HL 6.5: 45, 163 fn. 327
 HL 6.6-7: 45
 HL 8b5: 45
 HL 8b6: 44, 45
 HL 18d b4: 202
 HL 24.1: 162
 HL 29.2: 162
 KVāc 4: 127
 KVāc 5: 44
 KVāc 6: 127
 KVāc 9: 44
 TUMXUQ 001: 250
 TUMXUQ 001.a.15: 250
 TUMXUQ 002: 162, 163 Tab. 8
 TUMXUQ 002.a.2: 162
 TUMXUQ 002.a.9-10: 250
 TUMXUQ 002.a.16: 250
 TUMXUQ 003: 251
 TUMXUQ 003.a.15: 250
 TUMXUQ 004.a.11: 250

AVESTAN

- Y31.3: 120
 Y44.5: 120

BACTRIAN

- cl4-5: 49, 59
 cm: 49, 58
 cm1: 49, 59
 cm4: 49, 59
 cm25: 49, 59

SOGDIAN, PARTHIAN, MIDDLE PERSIAN

- BBB 462: 53 fn. 85
 Ch/So 20166 c3: 47
 IOL Khot 158/5 b1, b4: 48, 48 fn. 74
 M 339/V/7/: 53 fn. 85
 M 1060 r6: 181
 M 6950/i/1-2/: 53 fn. 85
 Mugh document A-1 r9: 40
 P 29.9: 95 fn. 171
 SCE 321: 181
 So 10100m v9: 181
Vessantarajātaka 315-16, 800, 813: 76

SANSKRIT

- Udānavarga* 9.9: 119
Udānavarga 14.13: 132, 134
Karmavibhaṅga 56: 104
Kāśyapaparivarta 153-54: 33
Jīvakaṇḍikā 89v2-3: 117 fn. 218
Jātakamālā 9.32: 76, 76 fn. 120
Divyāvadāna 3: 238, 240 Tab. 14
Divyāvadāna 3 (C and N 56): 238-239
 Tab. 13, 251
Divyāvadāna 3 (C and N 59): 249
Mātāṅgalīlā 9.3-4: 183
Mātāṅgalīlā 9.9: 183
Maitreyavyākaraṇa C: 248
Maitreyavyākaraṇa C 49: 249 Tab. 13

Maitreyavyākaraṇa C 51: 238 Tab. 13
Maitreyavyākaraṇa G: 238, 239, 240 Tab.
 14

Maitreyavyākaraṇa K: 238, 240 Tab. 14
Sanḥāṭasūtra 225.1: 165

GĀNDHĀRĪ

CKD 14: 48
 CKD 22: 48
 CKD 30: 48
 CKD 36: 48
 CKD 86: 48
 CKD 135: 48
 CKD 214: 48 fn. 76
 CKD 272: 48

CKD 283: 48
 CKD 289: 48
 CKD 464: 147 fn. 303
 CKD 661: 48, 199
 CKD 703: 146
 CKI 197: 147 fn. 303
 CKI 359: 123 fn. 232
 CKM 244.73: 123, 123 fn. 232

PĀLI

Majjhima Nikāya 28: 78

OLD UYGHUR

MIK III 1054 /r/18/: 37 Tab. 2
 MIK III 1054 /r/21/: 37 Tab. 2

U 5208 a8: 47

