Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Traces of language contact in Niya Prakrit: Bactrian and other foreign elements

Schoubben, N.

Citation
Schoubben, N. (2024, November 6). *Traces of language contact in Niya Prakrit: Bactrian and other foreign elements*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4108454

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4108454

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

CHAPTER 3 Iranian loanwords: The material

This chapter collects evidence for lexical influence of Iranian languages on Niya Prakrit. After some preliminaries (§3.1), the discussion starts with loan etymologies ascribable to Bactrian for phonological, semantic, or other reasons (§3.2). The discussion then moves on to loanwords that could be borrowed from Bactrian but also from one or more other Iranian languages (§3.3). Next follows a brief treatment of some foreign names from the Niya documents that may plausibly be interpreted as Bactrian in origin (§3.4). The chapter continues with loanwords from Iranian languages other than Bactrian (§3.5); borrowings from an unidentified Iranian source (§3.6); and words whose previously proposed Iranian etymology needs to be rejected on formal or other grounds (§3.7).

The data thus collected (see the reference list in §3.8) will form the basis for the more analytical treatment of Iranian loanwords in Niya Prakrit presented in the next chapter. Most of the data analysed there will be taken from §§3.2–3.3, but the names and loanwords discussed in §§3.4–3.6 can be used as supplementary data whenever deemed relevant. For obvious reasons, the rejected etymologies treated in §3.7 will not be investigated further in the remainder of this work.

3.1 Preliminaries

3.1.1 Definitions and terminology

At the start, it seems useful to define a few relevant terms from the field of loanword studies.

The term "loanword" itself is understood here, with Haspelmath (2009: 36), as "a word that at some point in the history of a language entered its lexicon as a result of borrowing (or *transfer*, or *copying*)".[136] The language from which the word is copied is the "donor" or "source language", the language adopting it the "recipient language". In cases where the direction of borrowing is not immediately obvious, one can try to determine which language is the donor and which the recipient by looking at (i) the morphological analysability of the word (typically only true for the source

[136] For convenience, I will use "loan" and "borrowing", the latter in its nominalised sense "borrowed element", as synonyms.

language); (ii) phonological integration in the recipient language; (iii) occurrence of a cognate in a language historically related to the source language but not in contact with the recipient language; and (iv) semantic arguments (Haspelmath 2009: 45).

There are two types of loanwords, i.e. "adoptions" and "impositions" (or: "interference through shift"). Adoptions are borrowings by native speakers, whereas impositions "are due to non-native speakers unintentionally retaining (= imposing) features of their native language [also lexical items] on a language to which they are shifting" (Haspelmath 2009: 50).[137] This distinction is less crucial for the etymological analyses conducted in this chapter, but it will become relevant in Chapter 7. There, I argue that scribes whose native language was Bactrian used (the ancestor of) Niya Prakrit as a chancellery language of the Kuṣāṇa empire, which means that at least some of the Bactrian loanwords in Niya Prakrit could be impositions (§7.3).

A second distinction is that between "cultural borrowings", i.e. loanwords referring to newly imported concepts, and "core borrowings" (or: "replacive borrowings"), i.e. loanwords that duplicate and may eventually replace words referring to already familiar concepts.[138] It is commonly stated that cultural borrowings are caused by a "need" or a "gap" felt by speakers of the recipient language and that core borrowings are the result of a certain "prestige" enjoyed by the donor language (see e.g. Matras 2020^2: 161–163). In practice, both causes of lexical borrowing can operate at the same time (cf. recently Carling et al. 2019). It will become clear that the Iranian loanwords in Niya Prakrit are usually cultural borrowings (see especially §§4.2 and 4.5).

Thirdly, one must distinguish between "loanwords" also used by non-bilingual speakers and "code-switches" (or: "foreignisms") limited to the speaking and writing of bilinguals.[139] The most decisive criterion to differentiate between these two is phonological and morphological integration: loanwords tend to be better integrated into the language than code-switches (e.g. Clyne 2003: 142–152). In addition, one can look at how

[137] On the difference between "adoption" and "imposition", see e.g. Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 20f.); van Coetsem (2000); and Winford (2005).
[138] Cf. e.g. Haspelmath (2009: 46–49); Tadmor, Haspelmath & Taylor (2010); and Grant (2015: 431f.).
[139] For this difference, see e.g. Thomason (2001: 131–136); Myers-Scotton (2006: 253–260); Gardner-Chloros (2009: 30–33); Haspelmath (2009: 40–43); and Matras (2020^2: 107–208).

frequently a particular word is used, as loanwords are typically employed with a higher frequency than code-switches (e.g. Clyne 2003: 73).[140]

In her work on Latin loanwords in Ancient Greek, Dickey (2018: 9–11; 2023: 7–16) makes a compelling case that studies of lexical borrowings in corpus languages should pay more attention to the linguistically crucial distinction between integrated loanwords and sporadic code-switches. Regarding the Iranian (and other) loanwords in Niya Prakrit, it is only fair to say that one cannot always tell the difference. Due to our limited corpus, quite some foreign words in Niya Prakrit occur only once or twice, which does not necessarily imply that they are code-switches. §§4.3–4.4 will moreover show that at least the (potentially) Bactrian borrowings in Niya Prakrit tend to be well integrated phonologically and morphologically, suggesting that they are loanwords in the strict sense of the word. The reader should nevertheless be aware that some words discussed in this chapter could be code-switches rather than integrated loanwords.

3.1.2 A research history

It is possible to distinguish three stages in the history of research on Iranian loanwords in Niya Prakrit.

The first stage started immediately after the edition of the Niya documents by Boyer et al. (1920–29 = KD) and is closely associated with the work of scholars such as Thomas Burrow and Harold W. Bailey. Burrow's two articles on "Iranian Words in the Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan" (1934; 1935a) remain fundamental reading, and he continued to identify additional loanwords in his 1937 grammar of the language (LKD) and his 1940 translation of the Niya documents (TKD). Bailey's primary contribution to the subject was his demonstration that the lion's share of Niya Prakrit loanwords could not have been borrowed from neighbouring Khotanese for phonological and other reasons (1949a: 121–128 *contra* Konow 1936: 232; cf. §4.2.5).[141]

In a second phase, contributions to the subject of Iranian loans in Niya Prakrit were made on an occasional basis (e.g. Harmatta 1960; 1964ab;

[140] If a foreign word occurs in many different contexts, this could also be an indication that it was well integrated into the language and thus is to be classified as a loanword.

[141] Many of Bailey's individual etymologies have not gained wide acceptance in subsequent scholarship because of their phonological and/or semantic problems; see the relevant lemmata.

Schwartz 1974). For a new synthesis, one had to wait until Weber's 1997 article, which significantly improved upon previous work because Weber paid close attention to the various directions of borrowings.

With the increase in the Bactrian text corpus since the 1990s, a third stage of research began. New texts enabled a more detailed understanding of the Bactrian language and this led to the subsequent realisation that some Iranian loans in Niya Prakrit came from this language specifically (cf. §1.1).[142] See, for instance, Tremblay (2001: 24f. fn. 37); Sims-Williams (BD II: 180–286; 2011c); Hitch (2009: 17–19); and Schoubben (2021).

3.1.3 The four aims of this chapter

Although Iranian loanwords in Niya Prakrit have been studied for almost a century, much basic work remains to be done in this area (cf. §1.1). This chapter takes up what I consider to be the four most urgent tasks.

First, this chapter aims to be a comprehensive collection of the previously proposed Iranian loanwords in Niya Prakrit because many etymological proposals lie scattered over various articles that are not always easily accessible.[143]

A second task is to critically assess each proposal in light of the advances made in Indian and Iranian studies since they were first published.

The third objective of this chapter is to find previously unrecognised Iranian loanwords, in particular borrowings from Bactrian. There are still many etymologically obscure words in Niya Prakrit, as well as some lexemes whose currently assumed derivation from OIA hinges on irregular sound changes and/or ad hoc semantic developments. As our knowledge of Bactrian and contemporary Middle Iranian languages has significantly advanced since the 1930s, it seems worth investigating whether more Iranian loanwords are hidden amongst this group of Niya Prakrit words.

The fourth task concerns the identification of the exact provenance of the loanwords. Since "Iranian" is a language family and not a language, one should try to identify the most likely donor form of every individual loanword based on phonological, semantic, and sociohistorical arguments, even if the data do not always permit firm conclusions (cf. Weber 1997).

---

[142] Harmatta (1960; 1964ab) and Schwartz (1974) anticipated this conclusion based on the evidence provided by the Surkh Kotal inscription.

[143] Two loans only attested in Khotan Prakrit (CKD 661), i.e. *Suliga* 'Sogdian' (§3.2.1 s.v.) and *hinajha* 'army commander' (§3.5.1 s.v.), are also included.

Apart from Bactrian, one expects the following Iranian languages to have been in contact with Niya Prakrit or its ancestor for historical reasons: Old Persian, Parthian, Khotanese, and Sogdian (see §1.5). Thus, when trying to identify the donor form of a particular loanword, these languages must be taken into account.[144]

3.1.4 The scope of this chapter and its internal division

This chapter contains 131 lemmata in total. 24 are words whose previously proposed Iranian etymology is rejected in this study (§3.7), while 10 are anthroponyms (§3.4). This leaves a collection of 97 words with an Iranian etymology.[145] When studying these, I could determine that 56 of them (~ 57,7%) were most likely borrowed from Bactrian. For another 24 words (~ 24,7%), Bactrian turned out to be a possible donor language.

Because of these statistics, I divide the loanwords into three main categories: "loanwords from Bactrian" (§3.2), "loanwords from Bactrian or another Iranian language" (§3.3), and "loanwords from Iranian languages other than Bactrian" (§3.5). With five words, I could not decide in which category to put them; they can be found under "Iranian loanwords from an unidentified source" (§3.6).

For ease of reference, the lemmata are numbered consecutively from (1.) to (131.). These numbers will be used in Chapter 4.

3.1.5 The content and structure of the lemmata

Inspired by Burrow's practice in the index of LKD (71–134), the citation form of Niya Prakrit words adopted in the lemmata is normally the most frequent orthographic variant or the one that stays closest to the presumed Iranian donor form.[146] A list of attestations added at the beginning of each lemma gives an overview of other orthographic variants; in the case of nouns,

---

[144] I consider Middle Persian, Khwarezmian, and Tumshuqese to be unlikely donor languages because (i) they were spoken too far away from Gandhāra and/or the SE part of the Tarim Basin and (ii) speakers of these languages did not have any particular political or cultural influence on these regions. For a more detailed treatment of the various layers of Iranian loans in Niya Prakrit, see §4.2.

[145] Obviously, not all these etymologies are equally reliable; cf. §3.1.7.

[146] In their Gāndhārī dictionary (2002a–), Baums and Glass use citation forms in a standardised spelling that is often not attested. I do not follow this practice because I fear that it may lead to the creation of ghost forms.

adjectives, and verbs, I will also mention their inflected forms. Occurrences of the same word as a personal name (PN), derivatives, and compounds (including derivatives from them) are listed separately. Except for some very frequently occurring words, I record all published attestations known to me, also those in other forms of Gāndhārī.[147] For the alphabetical order, see Table 1 (p. 37).

The list of attestations is followed by the actual examination. Unless there is a consensus about a word's exact meaning, the examination typically begins with a semantic analysis before moving on to the etymological discussion. The latter treats, amongst other topics, previously suggested and newly proposed etymologies; arguments to identify the most likely donor language; and the sound correspondences exhibited by a particular loanword. With longer and/or more complex lemmata, a concluding paragraph summarises the main results.

3.1.6 The reconstruction of unattested forms

Two methodological issues must still be addressed, i.e. whether to allow for the reconstruction of unattested forms (discussed in this section) and how to ensure that less reliable loan etymologies do not affect the eventual conclusions on language contact between Niya Prakrit and Iranian languages (discussed in §3.1.7).

As a matter of principle, one suspects that also languages which did not leave any trace in writing may have contributed loanwords[148] and that otherwise known languages lent words which happen not to be attested in the available texts in that language. Yet, one would like to avoid working with these unknowns since the more assumptions one has to posit and the more linguistic reconstruction is needed for a certain etymology, the less secure it becomes.[149]

I refrain from postulating loanwords from undocumented Iranian languages because proposals for borrowings of this kind quickly run the risk

[147] Convincing restorations and supplements have likewise been included.

[148] Cf. the previously hypothesised contact with the not directly attested "Indo-Scythian" language mentioned in §1.5.1.

[149] Even when one reconstructs an unrecorded cognate in language X of a particular word in language Y by applying regular and well-established sound changes, there is still a danger of ending up with a word that did not or no longer exists in language X; it could namely have been lost or replaced by a different lexeme.

of unverifiability due to our ignorance of the historical phonology of such languages. The only way to overcome this pitfall is to collect a sufficiently large amount of examples exhibiting regular and phonologically understandable correspondences that necessitate the assumption of borrowing from an otherwise unattested Iranian donor language. [150] The corpus of Iranian loanwords in Niya Prakrit collected here does not meet that criterion, however.

With unattested words in otherwise documented languages, prospects are somewhat better given that the historical phonology of these languages is known (even if not always in every detail). I therefore believe that a strict and cautious application of the comparative method (Campbell 2020[4]: 140–176) can be used to reconstruct additional lexemes if they would be a historically and formally plausible source of a word in a neighbouring language.

Indeed, the discovery of new materials has sometimes confirmed such reconstructions. Many Parthian lexemes had, for instance, been posited as the source of Armenian words before later being discovered in actual Parthian texts (Bolognesi 1990ab; Meyer 2023: 15 fn. 21). Similarly, several Bactrian words reconstructed by Schwartz (1974) based on loanwords in Tarim Basin languages have afterwards been found in Bactrian sources (Sims-Williams 1997a: 23f.). Such examples confirm the methodological validity of working with reconstructed data from (partly) known languages.

In the case of Iranian languages with a large corpus of sufficiently diverse texts, e.g. Sogdian or Khotanese, we tend to be passably well-informed about their lexicon. Consequently, one should exercise additional caution before reconstructing words not attested in these languages (cf. Dragoni 2023b: 24). [151] Yet, some other pertinent Iranian languages, most importantly Bactrian and Old Persian, are only documented by way of a small and uniform corpus (administrative texts and/or royal inscriptions). As our knowledge of

[150] See e.g. Bernard (2023), who uses a coherent set of loanwords in Tocharian partially to reconstruct the phonology of an otherwise unknown Old Iranian language, provisionally called "Old Steppe Iranian".

[151] Even in languages with a reasonably large corpus, one can still retrieve unattested lexemes based on loans in neighbouring languages. See e.g. Sims-Williams (2017a), who convincingly argues that Syriac borrowed two otherwise undocumented Middle Persian words, or Dickey's (2023: 20–502) lexicon of Latin loanwords in Ancient Greek, which contains several entries where the Latin source form is evident but not attested.

the lexicon of such languages is much less advanced, and we can be sure that many basic words are lacking by accident, I will in these cases be somewhat more lenient with reconstructions.

3.1.7 Reliable and less reliable etymologies

Since not every etymology is equally trustworthy, the second methodological concern is to make sure that the eventual conclusions on language contact between Niya Prakrit and Iranian languages rest on as solid an evidential basis as possible.

Therefore, the loan etymologies treated in §§3.2–3.3 and §3.5 are classified into four categories according to their reliability, i.e. "secure", "plausible", "arguable", and "tentative" etymologies.[152] The reliability will be checked with three parameters:

(i) Attestation of the relevant word in the preferred donor language

(ii) Semantic correspondence

(iii) Phonological match

The first parameter is satisfied when the assumed donor form is attested in the correct form or when it is safely deducible from a derivative or a compound, e.g. λασοβιδο* 'chief of ten households' (cf. λασοβιδιγο '(soldier) belonging to a company of ten') or πριγγο* 'damask' (cf. πριγγοοαβγο 'weaver of damask').[153] If the required donor form is not attested but a phonologically more advanced form of it is, e.g. *ζηνιγο 'under the care of' > ζινιγο, the parameter is also satisfied.[154] For a semantic correspondence to be perfect, there are two requirements: (i) the semantics of the pertinent words in Niya Prakrit and the Iranian source language are clear on internal grounds; (ii) their meanings form a close match. An exact phonological match is achieved when all the sound substitutions are phonologically easy to understand and/or paralleled elsewhere.

Only when these three criteria, i.e. attestation, semantic correspondence, and phonological match, have been fully met do etymologies pass the

[152] Sometimes, the etymological analysis of a derivative or a compound is less reliable than that of the base word under which they are discussed. For the sake of simplicity, I refrain from classifying these separately.

[153] As the examples show, I put an asterisk (*) behind the word in such cases.

[154] This also applies to some unrecorded Old Persian words discussed in §3.5.1 whose Middle Persian descendant is attested.

threshold for inclusion among the "secure etymologies", the first and most reliable category of loanwords.

"Plausible etymologies" make up the second category. There are two types of them. The first type concerns lexemes whose proposed donor form is attested but where there is a minor semantic or phonological difficulty, e.g. some doubts on the exact semantics of the Niya Prakrit word or a defendable yet not fully secure sound correspondence. The second type involves words whose suggested source is not attested in the preferred donor language but where there exists a sufficiently close parallel in another Iranian language, and there are no notable problems semantically or phonologically.

The third, somewhat less reliable, category is called "arguable etymologies". Most etymologies included here are words whose presumed donor form does not actually occur and which present us with an additional issue, e.g. the absence of a sufficiently close parallel for the reconstructed form in another Iranian language; the requirement to posit a semantic shift; or a sound substitution not seen elsewhere. Lexemes for which the suggested source is attested are allocated to this category when two phonological or semantic issues weaken the etymology, e.g. uncertain semantics combined with an unparalleled yet conceivable phonological correspondence.

"Tentative etymologies" constitute the fourth and least reliable category. I assign loan etymologies to this group for three reasons: (i) the combination of a reconstructed but paralleled donor form with two semantic or phonological uncertainties; (ii) the cooccurrence of an unattested and insufficiently paralleled source form with a semantic or phonological difficulty; and (iii) heavy reliance on precarious evidence, e.g. the etymological analysis of a toponym or an anthroponym.

Although they differ substantially in how reliable they are, these four types of loan etymologies share a characteristic: none of the phonological, semantic, or other problems seem so severe to be insurmountable. When I believe that previously proposed etymologies do present insuperable obstacles, I relegate them to the "rejected etymologies" in §3.7.

The analyses of the loanwords in Chapter 4 and the conclusions on language contact between Niya Prakrit and Iranian languages drawn from them will only be founded on the most reliable evidence, i.e. the secure and plausible etymologies. I will also point out when data from the arguable etymologies are consistent with the reliable evidence and provide supplementary evidence for a particular conclusion. However, they will not form the basis of any additional hypotheses; the same is *a fortiori* true of the

tentative etymologies, which have only been included as a basis for further research on the relevant words.

3.2 Loanwords from Bactrian

This section presents an overview of already established and newly proposed Iranian loanwords for which Bactrian is the most likely donor language because of their phonological appearance, their semantics, another linguistic argument, or a historical reason. For the classification system, see §3.1.7.

3.2.1 Secure etymologies

1. *aviṃdama* 'fine, recompense'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *aviṃdama*: CKD 482 (2x); 639 (2x); 665; 676; 788; 836; 837; *avidama*: CKD 187; 462; *aviṃdhama*: CKD 144 (2x); 345; *avidhama*: CKD 419; *aviṃtama*: CKD 209 (3x); 571; *avitama*: CKD 880

Derivatives

PRET.3SG. *aviṃdamavita* 'he imposed a fine': CKD 204

Based on the types of context in which *aviṃdama* is attested, Burrow (LKD: 78 s.v. *aviṃdhama*) could establish that this word means 'fine, recompense'. Bailey (1937b: 230; 1949a: 123; cf. also TKD: 149) added a comparison with MSogd. *βnd'm* (also *βnt'm*) 'penalty, punishment' (DMSB^2: 62).[155] Yet, the etymology of both words remained obscure at the time.

Meanwhile, it has become clear that both Niya *aviṃdama* and its Sogdian counterpart are borrowings from Bactr. αβινδαμο 'fine, penalty' (BD II: 184). The reason to think so is that αβινδαμο is clearly inherited in Bactrian since, as noted by Sims-Williams (BD II: 184), αβινδαμο is an abstract derived from a verb *αβιν-, an older form of the attested verb βιν- 'to oblige, to compel'.

[155] In Christian Sogdian, the same word occurs in the variant spellings *bnt'm*, *bnd'm*, and *bnθ'm* (DCS^2: 53). Hitch (1990) additionally compares Tumsh. *bandina*, which in his opinion would also mean 'punishment' (cf. further Ogihara & Ching 2017: 461), but I am not fully convinced that this word is etymologically related to Niya *aviṃdama* and Sogd. *βnd'm* given the difference in Auslaut (*-ama*/*-'m* vs. *-ina*).

*αβιν- itself is probably denominative to a noun *upa-ayană-, literally meaning 'going to' (BD II: 203).[156]

The etymology of αβινδαμο suggests that it phonologically stands for /əvindāmə/, which means that the initial *a-* in Niya *aviṃdama* must be a rendering of the initial schwa in Bactrian. This substitution does not come as a surprise given that the /a/ in Niya Prakrit was probably a central vowel (cf. §2.1.1).[157] Sogd. *βnd'm* (and variants) does not show a trace of an initial vowel. Here, one could either assume that the initial schwa was lost during the borrowing process or that *βnd'm* is a loan from a later Bactrian form *βινδαμο /vindāmə/, with the same loss of initial schwa as in the corresponding verb βιν- 'to oblige, to compel' < *αβιν-. The *β-* in *βnd'm* renders Bactr. -β- /v/.

2. *kṣuna* 'date, reign, regnal year'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *kṣuna*: CKD 222; 324 + 328;[158] 345; 420; 436; 577; 588; 652; 678; 788; 898; *kṣuna*: CKD 839; *kṣana*:[159] CKD 889

INS.SG. *kṣuṇeṇa*: CKI 172

LOC.SG. *kṣunaṃmi*: CKD 121; 147; 169; 180 (2x); 195; 203; 204; 209; 222; 298; 318; 321; 322; 324 + 328; 327; 331; 343; 345; 350; 378; 418; 419; 420; 425; 436; 437; 461; 488; 495; 496; 500; 505; 506; 568; 569; 570; 571; 572; 574; 575; 578; 579; 580; 581; 582 (2x); 583; 584; 586; 587; 589; 590; 591; 592; 593; 604; 648; 652; 654; 655; 656; 677; 709; 732; 760; 765; 770; 782; 788; 820; 839; 841; 842; 880; 881; 882; 884; 885; 889; 898; *kṣuṃnaṃmi*: CKD 401; 415; 478; 573; 576; 577; 588; 600; 715; 879; *kṣunami*: CKI 161; 225; CKD 661; *kṣunaṃmi*: CKI 152; 153; 155; CKD 369; 422; 808; *kṣuṃnaṃmi*: CKD

---

[156] For the semantics, cf. Bactr. αβιδανο 'obligation; liability' < *upa-(a)i-tana-* (BD II: 184) and MP *abāyēd* 'it is necessary' < PIr. *upa + √*Hai* 'to go to' (EDIV: 155).

[157] Otherwise, the sound substitutions do not require much commenting. The Bactrian cluster -νδ- /nd/ dovetails with Niya *-ṃd-* /nd/. The latter cluster is also spelled as <ṃt> or <ṃdh> (see the list of attestations), because Niya Prakrit did no longer distinguish voiced and unvoiced and aspirated and unaspirated consonants after nasals (cf. §2.1.5). The spelling variants *avitama*, *avidama*, and *avidhama* exemplify the frequent omission of anusvāra in Kharoṣṭhī.

[158] For the idea that CKD 324 and CKD 328 form one document, see Appendix 2 (p. 523).

[159] This variant spelling is probably a writer's mistake or due to a confusion with Skt./Gandh. *kṣaṇa-* 'moment' (Baums 2018b: 64). The same is probably true of the loc.sg. *kṣaṇe* in CKI 242.

801; *kṣuṇami*: CKI 148; 158; 160; 230; 245; 368; 564; *kṣuṇaṃmi*: CKI 154; 367; 466; 830; *kṣ̄onaṃmi*:[160] CKD 838; 898; 891; *kṣaṇe*: CKI 242

Compounds

ADJ. *navakṣ̄uniya* 'of the 9th year': CKD 830; *navakṣ̄oniya*: CKD 829
ADJ. *daśakṣ̄oniya* 'of the 10th year': CKD 831

kṣ̄una 'date, reign, regnal year' has cognates in most contemporary Tarim Basin languages. In Tocharian B, the same lexeme occurs as *kṣuṃ* 'regnal year, reign' (DoT: 261); in Khotanese as *kṣuṇa-* 'period of time, ruling year' (DKS: 69); and in Tumshuqese as *χšana-* 'idem' (Konow 1935: 819).[161] Since the discovery of the Surkh Kotal inscription, it has become clear that this calendrical term finds its origins in Bactr. χþovo /xšunə/ '(calendar/regnal) year' (Maricq 1958: 364).

Some of the Tarim Basin languages, for instance Tumshuqese, may have adopted this term through an intermediary language. Regarding Niya Prakrit, one can safely conclude that the word was borrowed from Bactrian directly since there is also a South Asian Gāndhārī cognate of *kṣ̄una* attested in inscriptions of the Kuṣāṇa period (cf. Baums 2018a: 63).[162]

The etymology of χþovo itself is slightly more contentious. Most commonly accepted is Thierfelder's suggestion (*apud* Humbach 1966–67 I: 24) that χþovo '(calendar/regnal) year' was borrowed from Gr. χρόνος 'time (period)' (see e.g. Sims-Williams 2002: 228; BD II: 281).[163] Recently, this etymology has been rejected by Scarborough (2021) because of the difference in Anlaut between Gr. χρόνος and Bactr. χþovo /xšunə/ and their slightly diverging semantics.[164] Yet, his counter-arguments are not decisive, as I shall try to show below.

---

[160] Forms with *kṣ̄o-* are restricted to documents in Kuča Prakrit, a type of Gāndhārī in which the vowels *u* and *o* are hardly distinguishable in the script (Ching 2013a: 62).

[161] The deviating vowel of the Tumsh. *χšana-* may be due to a folk etymological association with *χšanda-* 'ruler', with which *χšana-* is combined in the dating formulae of Tumshuqese administrative documents. Alternatively, one could invoke the influence of Skt./Gandh. *kṣaṇa-* 'moment' (cf. fn. 159).

[162] For the substitution of *xš-* with *kṣ̄-* (also *kṣ-*), cf. §4.3.18.

[163] Earlier etymological proposals can be found in e.g. Bailey (1948: 328f.; DKS: 69). The phonological problems these suffer from have been discussed by Scarborough (2021: 600–602 with fn. 10), so I will leave them aside here.

[164] Given that Bactrian uses omicron for /u/ and there is no decisive support for a Bactrian phoneme /o/ (cf. §2.2.2), the substitution of Gr. /o/ with Bactr. /u/ needed by Thierfelder's etymology is easy to understand.

Scarborough's main objection against Thierfelder's etymology is the required substitution of Gr. χρ-, i.e. /kʰr/ or /xr/, with Bactr. χþ- /xš/. Scarborough (2021: 604–606) finds this substitution hard to accept because there is no parallel in inherited words for a development from OIr. **xr-* to Bactr. χþ- /xš/. Most of the Bactrian evidence for initial **xr-* concerns the PIr. root **√xraiH* 'to buy' (EDIV: 446f.). This root shows an outcome χιρ- in the case of the verb χιρ-, pret. χιρδο 'to buy' < **xrǐnā-*, pret. **xrīta-* and the nouns χιρηγο 'purchase' < **xrayaka-* and χιρσο 'purchase' < **xrīti-čī-* (BD II: 277f.). Yet, given that χιρηγο and χιρσο can have been secondarily influenced by the verb χιρ-, the default development of **xr-* may have been to *χρ- /xr/, and then with a prothetic vowel to αχρ- /əxr/. This later stage may be seen in αχριανο 'purchasable' and αχρινο 'purchase', if from **xrayanǎ-* (so BD II: 199) and not **āxrayanǎ-* (so EDIV: 446).

However, phonetic descriptions of ancient grammarians suggest that the -ρ- /r/ in χρόνος may have been pronounced as a voiceless [r̥], which is relevant for the etymology of χþονο, as the change of a voiceless liquid to a sibilant is typologically widespread (cf. Kümmel 2007: 162f.). According to grammarians, Gr. -ρ- /r/ was pronounced "aspirated", that is "voiceless", when preceded by a voiceless aspirate (VG[3]: 41–43; Probert 2010: 91f.; Jatteau 2013: 228).[165] In the Vatican scholia to Dionysius Thrax, one of the example words of this rule is precisely χρόνος:

(3.1) *Grammatici Graeci* i. iii. 143. 20–22 Hilgard

Οἱ δὲ ἀρχαῖοι γραμματικοὶ τὸ μὲν μετὰ ψιλοῦ εὑρισκόμενον ρ̄ ἐψίλουν, τὸ δὲ μετὰ δασέος ἐδάσυνον· οἷον τὸ Ἀτρεύς καὶ κάπρος ἐψίλουν, τὸ δὲ χρόνος ἀφρός θρόνος ἐδάσυνον.

"The ancient grammarians used to pronounce a ρ /r/ found adjacent to an unaspirated consonant unaspirated, but aspirated when adjacent to an aspirated consonant. They, for instance, used to pronounce Ἀτρεύς [name Atreus] and κάπρος [boar] unaspirated, but χρόνος [time (period)], ἀφρός [foam], and θρόνος [throne] aspirated." (tr. mine).[166]

---

[165] The same type of assimilation occurs in some contemporary English dialects where rhotics are devoiced after initial aspirates, e.g. in 'to cry' (VG[3]: 43 fn. 74; Jatteau 2013: 224 fn. 12).

[166] The same rule, again with χρόνος as an example, is given in Choeroboscus' *Scholia in Theodosium Alexandrinum* (*Grammatici Graeci* iv. i. 257. 33–34; iv. ii. 44. 15–17 Hilgard).

Based on the testimony of these grammarians, one can hypothesise that speakers of Bactrian felt /xš/ to be phonetically closer to the Greek cluster [kʰr̥] (or [xr̥]) than **/xr/.[167]

Additional support for the derivation of χþovo from χρόνος comes from palaeography. In Greek sources from the Indo-Iranian borderlands, the letter rho has been used to write sibilants. On a coin of the Indo-Scythian ruler Śpalirises (ca. 70–60 BC), his name is, for instance, written in Greek script as gen.sg. ΡΠΑΛΙΡΙΣΟΥ. In other words, the cluster /śp/ is spelled with rho and pi. Starting from this example, Falk (2022: 155–167) has been able to trace the origin of the Bactrian letter þ to this special use of rho in Greek sources from the region,[168] thereby providing indirect evidence that the -ρ- in Gr. χρόνος could have developed into the -þ- seen in Bactr. χþovo.

A separate issue is the semantic difference between χρόνος and χþovo: the Greek word means 'time (period)', whereas the Bactrian signifies '(calendar/regnal) year', a meaning which χρόνος only starts to develop after the Hellenistic period, as noted by Scarborough (2021: 600f. fn. 7; 606). This discrepancy should nevertheless not concern us too much, since the Gāndhārī evidence bridges the semantic gap between χρόνος and χþovo. Gandh. *kṣuna* can not only mean 'reign' or 'regnal year' but also 'date', a polysemy which, as briefly pointed out by Baums (2018a: 61), hints at a semantic specialisation from 'time' over 'date' to 'year'.[169]

In two administrative formulae, the meaning of Gandh. *kṣuna* is still particularly close to that of χρόνος. The first concerns the loc.sg. *iśa kṣunaṃmi* (and variants) 'at this date' used to round off dating formulae.

(3.2) CKD 204 obverse 1
saṃvatsare 4 3 Mahanuavamaharaya jiṭugha Vaṣmana devaputraṣa maṣe 4 1 divaṣe 10 2 iśa kṣunaṃmi …
"In the 7th year of the great king of great Nuava, the *jiṭugha* Vaṣmana, the son of god, in month 5, day 12, at this date …" (tr. mine).

[167] Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.) points out that if one interprets Bactr. αθþo '(God) Fire' as a loanword from the Avestan day-name *āθrō*, there would also be an example of a foreign -*θr*- being substituted as Bactr. -θþ- /θš/.
[168] For the intermediary stages, see Falk (2022: 167 with figure 5).
[169] χρόνος could already mean 'date' in Classical Greek, e.g. ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων 'out of old dates' or μετενεγκόντα τοὺς χρόνους 'having transposed the dates' in Demosthenes *De corona* 225.

In examples such as (3.2), one could almost translate *iśa kṣ̣unaṃmi* as 'at this time', a possibility reinforced by the fact that in CKD 120, *iśa kalaṃmi* 'at this time' is employed in the same function as *iśa kṣ̣unaṃmi*.[170]

The second formula is *aja kṣ̣una uvadae* (and variants).[171] This expression means 'from this date onwards', which makes it comparable to Greek expressions such as ἀπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ χρόνου 'from that time onwards' in the Greek translation of Aśoka's 13th Major Rock Edict.

In my opinion, the semantic development from 'date' to 'reign' / 'regnal year' could have happened in dating formulae because *kṣ̣una* is sometimes the syntactic host of a genitive complement mentioning the name of the ruling king, as in (3.3).

(3.3) CKD 572 under-tablet obverse 1
saṃvatsare 20 1 maṣe 4 2 divaṣe 10 3 Mahanuavamaharaya jiṭugha Aṃg̱oka devaputraṣa kṣ̣unaṃmi …
"In the 21st year, 6th month, 13th day in the reign of the great king of great Nuava, the *jiṭugha* Aṃg̱oka, the son of god …" (after TKD: 114).

In this type of context, translating *kṣ̣unaṃmi* as "at the date of king X" does not make much sense, and one can imagine that it was the addition of genitive complements which resulted in a semantic extension of *kṣ̣una* from 'date' to 'reign' / 'regnal year'.

To sum up, Gandh. *kṣ̣una* 'date, reign, regnal year' is a direct loan from Bactr. χϸονο /xšunə/ '(calendar/regnal) year'. The Bactrian word can, despite Scarborough's objections, be accounted for as a loanword from Gr. χρόνος 'time (period)'.

---

[170] *kṣ̣una* 'date, reign, regnal year' and *kala* 'time' are occasionally also juxtaposed in the Niya documents, e.g. *taṃ kālaṃmi iśa kṣ̣unaṃmi* "at that time, at this date" in CKD 209. Note moreover that in Tocharian, where *kṣuṃ* only means 'regnal year' and 'reign', the loc.sg. *ce$_u$ prekene*, literally 'at this time', is used in the same function as Gandh. *iśa kṣ̣unaṃmi*; cf. e.g. THT 4001 a1 *ñu kṣunne trice menne śak-ṣuk[t]ne k$_u$śiññ-orocepi lānte Sal[a]ri kṣuntsa ce$_u$ prekene* … "In the year nine, in the third month, on the seventeenth (day) (lit. "on seventeen"), under the rule of the Great Kuchean King Salare*. At this moment …" (Ching & Ogihara 2013: 103).

[171] Attestations: CKD 222 (*uju kṣ̣u<*na> uvadae*); 324 + 328 (*aja kṣ̣una uvatae*); 345 (*aja kṣ̣una uy̱adae*); 420 (*aja kṣ̣una uvatae*); 436 (*aja kṣ̣una upadae*); 577 (*aja kṣ̣uṃna uvatae*); 588 (*aja kṣ̣uṃna uvatae*); 652 (*aja kṣ̣una uvada[e]*); 678 (*aja kṣ̣una uy̱adae*); 788 (*aja kṣ̣una uy̱ataya*); 839 (*aja kṣuna upātaya*); 889 (*aju kṣ̣ana uvatae*); 898 (*aja kṣ̣una uatae*).

3. *guśura* ‘prince’

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *guśura*: CKD 187; 216; 295; 320; 401; 415; 478 (2x); 584 (2x); 654; 696 (2x); 702; 703; 899; *guśuro*: CKD 884; *gośora*: CKD 837 (3x)
GEN.SG. *guśuraṣa*: CKD 696 (2x)
INS.PL. *guśurakehi*: CKI 249
GEN.PL. *guśurana*: CKD 324 + 328; 884 (2x); *guśurane*: CKD 842; *guśuraṇa*: CKI 564;
abbr. *go*: CKD 831 (2x; Strauch *apud* Ching 2013a: 66).

The official title *guśura* (variant *guśuraka**) is attested in Niya Prakrit, South Asian Gāndhārī, and (Epigraphical) Sanskrit.[172] As far as can be seen from the attestations in these languages, the duties of a *guśura* were of a judicial and military character.[173] *guśura* moreover appears to have been a title carried by the nobility (cf. LKD: 87f. s.v.; Schoubben 2023: 287).

Three different etymologies have been proposed for this title.[174] They all start from the same premise, viz. that *guśura* is borrowed from an Iranian dialect showing fortification of OIr. **w*- to **γ*- or **g*-. This premise is justified, as such strengthening is also occasionally evidenced in Bactrian (cf. γολο ‘wife’ < **wadū*- and the PN γοραμβαδο < **wr̥θragna-pāta*-) and in some Iranian names attested in Gāndhārī (Schoubben 2023: 289–291).

Burrow (1935a: 781f.; LKD: 87f. s.v.) at first suggested *guśura* to be related to Av. *vīčira*- ‘decider (?)’, MP *wizīr* ‘argument, decision’, and NP *wazīr* ‘counsellor, vizier’. However, the semantics of Av. *vīčira*- are uncertain, and there is no guarantee that this word is a cognate of MP *wizīr* and NP *wazīr* in the first place (cf. Ciancaglini 2008: 166). This issue, combined with the absence of an agentive meaning ‘decider’ for MP *wizīr*, casts doubt on Burrow’s suggestion, which, as a result, tends to be no longer accepted in current scholarship.[175]

---

[172] The attested forms in Sanskrit are *guśūra*-; *gośūra*-; *gauśūra*-; *gaśūra*-; now also *giśūra*-. See Falk (2004: 149f. = 2013a: 362f.); Schoubben (2023: 286); Sims-Williams (2022–23: 136).
[173] See in particular CKI 249 and CKD 478.
[174] I pass over the unconvincing comparisons with the Bactrian royal name Κοζο(υ)λο (e.g. Konow 1916: 819) and the Turkic title *kül čur* (briefly considered by Lüders 1922: 261 = 1940a: 546).
[175] Allon (2019: 24) is one of the few exceptions to this tendency.

A decade later, Burrow conceived of a different etymology for *guśura*, again assuming a change from **wi-* to **gu-* in the Iranian donor language.[176] This time, Burrow compared *guśura* to Av. *visō.puθra-*, MP/Parth. *vispuhr*, Ṣiṇā *gušpūr*, Burushaski *gušpuhr*, and other witnesses of the Iranian title **wisah puθra-* 'son of the house > prince' (on which cf. e.g. Colditz 2000: 328ff.).[177] The source of *guśura* would, according to Bailey (1947: 150), be a "Scythian" dialect, for which he posited the following phonological changes: **wisah puθra-* > **wisē puθra-* > **gusĭ̈vura-* > **gusiura-* > *guśura-*.

In Schoubben (2023: 289), I questioned Burrow's comparison between *guśura* and **wisah puθra-* on semantic and phonological grounds.[178] I further suggested (2023: 292–295) that *guśura* was back-formed from *guśuraka** (cf. infra) and borrowed from **γwazurg* (or: **γwuzurg*; **γuzurg*), a dialect form continuing OIr. **wazr̥ka-* 'big' and thus related to OP *wazr̥ka-*, MP/Parth. *wuzurg* (*wazarg*; *wuzarg*), Pāzand *guzurg* (*guzarg*), NP *buzurg*, and Bactr. οαζαρκο (οαζορκο).

Evidence published since the completion of Schoubben (2023) shows my suspicions against Burrow's etymology to be unfounded and my alternative derivation to be incorrect. The Bactrian birchbark letters recently surveyed by Sims-Williams (2022–23) contain a newly attested form γοσοβοργο 'prince' < **wisah puθra-ka-*[179] as a dialect variant of the previously known οισβοργο 'idem', and *guśura* (in the Brāhmī texts also *guśūra* and *giśūra*) appears as the corresponding title in unpublished Indian documents from the same collection (Sims-Williams 2022–23: 136). Consequently, Burrow's etymology can now be regarded as essentially proven.

Some phonological details still require a separate treatment. The first point concerns the initial of *guśura* (and its variants). In New Iranian languages from the region undergoing the same type of fortification as dialectal Bactrian, the outcome of an initial **w-* is a fricative *γ-* (cf. e.g. Parāčī *γurγ* 'wolf' < OIr. **wr̥ka-*). It therefore seems most plausible that the <γ> in

[176] Burrow communicated this idea to Bailey, who published it in Bailey (1947: 149f.; 1950a: 391–393). One can find the gist of Burrow's idea also in a hand-written note added to p. 87 of Burrow's annotated copy of LKD.

[177] **wisah puθra-* was additionally calqued into Aramaic as *br byt'*. On the more recently discovered Bactrian cognates, see below.

[178] I pointed to the lack of "clear evidence for any close connection between the *guśura*s and the royal court", and I followed von Hinüber (2003: 29f.) in querying the unparalleled phonological changes, particularly the assumed loss of **p*.

[179] For the presence of the *ka*-suffix, one may also compare Khot. *bīsīviraa-* 'of noble birth' (Skjærvø 2004 II: 317) and Sogd. *wyspδr'k* 'prince' (DMSB^2: 250).

γοσοβοργο also stands for /γ/ (and not for /g/). In other words, Bactr. initial /γ/ needs to have been substituted with Gandh. *g-* /g/. Why this substitution happened is easy to understand from Gāndhārī phonology: Gandh. /γ/ only occurs in intervocalic position (§2.1.2).[180]

The palatal *ś* in *guśura* / *guśuraka** asks for slightly more discussion. Sims-Williams (2022–23: 136) phonologically transcribes γοσοβοργο as "[γusvurg]". Yet, if this were correct, it would be hard to account for the *ś* in *guśura* / *guśuraka**, given that Gāndhārī keeps its dental and palatal sibilants distinct. I would rather transcribe γοσοβοργο as /γuśvŭrgə/.[181] When we compare MBactr. *wyś(p)* (~ οισ(π)ο) 'all' < **wispa-* and suppose that the palatalisation of **s* after **ĭ* manifested in this and other Manichaean Bactrian words happened early enough (§2.2.4.2), also the **s* in **wisah puθra-ka-* would be expected to yield a palatal /ś/ in Bactrian.[182] If so, the *ś* in *guśura* / *guśuraka** is explained more easily: it would directly correspond to the Bactr. /ś/,[183] and the only additional assumption needed is that the Bactr. /v/ was lost in front of the back vowel /u/ when speakers of Indic borrowed the word.

The final topic to treat is the co-existence of *guśuraka** and *guśura*. One way to account for this co-existence is to assume that *guśuraka** is more original,[184] given that *guśuraka** can be directly explained from Bactr. γοσοβοργο /γuśvŭrgə/.[185] If so, the more frequent variant *guśura* can be interpreted as a back-formation, the final *-ka* of *guśuraka** possibly having been reanalysed as the *ka*-suffix inherited from OIA.

---

[180] See also §3.3.2 s.v. *gavāśa* and §4.3.10.

[181] I transcribe the first <ο> in -βοργο as /ŭ/ because the loss of **h* < **θ* may have caused compensatory lengthening, and the vowel in question is typically written as <ū> in Sanskrit.

[182] Another theoretical option is that the **-ah* in **wisah* first developed to **-i* (for which cf. §4.2.1 and Khot. *bīsīviraa-*) and that this **-i* caused palatalisation of the preceding sibilant before disappearing itself.

[183] As I point out in §4.3.16, the scenario advocated above would imply that the colouring of the **i* in **wisah* to /u/ postdates the palatalisation of **s* to /ś/. Note also that the **i* is still preserved in Bactr. οισβοργο (and the corresponding οισλογδο 'princess' < **wisah duxtā*) and in Skt. *giśūra-* (next to *guśūra-*, *gośūra-*, etc.).

[184] It may be relevant in this regard that the ins.pl. *guśurakehi* in CKI 249 is the oldest attestation of the title under discussion.

[185] /rg/ can have been broken up by a *svarabhakti* vowel during the borrowing process.

Such a reanalysis could have been motivated by a folk etymology with *śūra-* 'warrior, hero', as would be fitting for a title with military associations. *śūra-* 'warrior, hero' is often used as the second part of Sanskrit compounds (e.g. *raṇaśūra-* 'hero in war', *śr̥ṅgāraśūra-* 'a hero in love-affairs'), and compounded personal names (e.g. *Somaśūra-* or *Samudraśūra-*), whereas ***-śūraka-* does not seem to exist. Since the *ka*-suffix has a diminutive, sometimes even pejorative, connotation in (Classical) Sanskrit, it may have been avoided for a word meaning 'hero' and a military title such as *guśuraka**. From there, it would have been a small step to back-form *guśura* from *guśuraka**.

A second possibility is that the co-existence of *guśuraka** and *guśura* reflects the situation in the donor language. The Bactrian PN οισβοροζινιο 'in the prince's charge' indirectly preserves Bactr. οισβορο* 'prince' from **wisah puθra-* without the *ka*-suffix (BPN: no. 350). Thus, instead of being back-formed from *guśuraka** ← γοσοβοργο /γuśvŭrgə/, it is also possible that *guśura* is to be traced back to *γοσβορο /γuśvŭrə/, a dialect form of οισβορο*.

To wrap up, the discovery of Bactr. γοσοβοργο in recently published birchbark letters has more or less settled the question of the etymology of the official title *guśura* (variant *guśuraka**). When taking into account the palatalisation of OIr. **s* after **ĭ* suggested by the Manichaean evidence, *guśuraka** can be derived in a straightforward manner from γοσοβοργο /γuśvŭrgə/ < **wisah puθra-ka-*. The more frequent *guśura* could either have been back-formed from *guśuraka** or borrowed from a Bactrian by-form *γοσβορο /γuśvŭrə/ < **wisah puθra-*.

4. *jheniga* 'in charge of, under the care of'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *jheniga*: CKD 161; 177; 184; 244; 258; 288; 362; 370 (2x); 372; 373; 585; 644 (2x); 722; 735; 819; 840; *jheniya*: CKD 278 (2x)

DIR.PL. *jheniga*: CKD 152; 164; 271 (2x); 307 (2x); 475; 509; 721 (2x)

jheniga 'in charge of, under the care of' has been known to be an Iranian loanword since at least Konow (1932: 80; cf. also 1936: 239).[186] He convincingly compared the Niya word with Khot. *ysīnīya-* (also *ysīnīta*;

[186] For more discussion on the etymology of *jheniga*, see also Burrow (1934: 514; LKD: §1; 93 s.v.) and Bailey (1949a: 132; DKS: 351) *contra* Thomas (1946).

ysīnīyä; *ysīnī*) ‘in charge of’ < **zainiya-kă-* and BSogd. *zyn’y* (also *zyny(h)*; *zynyy*) ‘deposit, care’ < **zainiyV-* (cf. Av. *zaēni-* ‘vigilance’ and Skjærvø 1991).

Meanwhile, it has become evident that the same lexeme was also borrowed into other Tarim Basin languages. In Tocharian A/B, the word occurs as *senik* ‘care, pledge’ (Pinault 2002: 272f.; DoT: 764f.; DTTA: 530f.; Dragoni 2023b: 197–199). Skjærvø (1991) further proposed that the sequence *ysenikāṃ* in a Sanskrit manuscript from the Tarim Basin belongs here as well, although it could perhaps also be a proper name, as per Dragoni (2023b: 198).

According to Konow and Burrow (1934: 514; LKD: §1; 93 s.v.), Niya *jheniga* would be a Khotanese loanword. This idea rests on the assumption of a very early borrowing, since *jheniga* must then come from a pre-form of Khot. *ysīnīya-* (and variants) which had not yet undergone the development of **-ai-* > Khot. *-ī-*, over **-ē-*. We cannot exactly date this Khotanese sound change, but Khotan Pkt. *hinajha* ‘general’ ← Khot. *hīnāysa-* < **hainām̈za-* ‘army leader’ (§3.5.1 s.v.) indicates that it had already been completed by the first centuries AD. The development of **-ē-* < **-ai-* to Khot. *-ī-* is moreover already found in Pre-Khotanese loanwords into Tocharian, approximately datable to 500 BC–400 AD (Dragoni 2023b: 256). A (Pre-)Khotanese origin of Niya *jheniga* is thus improbable for chronological reasons.[187]

It seems more likely that *jheniga* is a Bactrian word instead. The Bactrian cognate of Khot. *ysīnīya-* (and variants) is attested as ζινιγο /zīnīgə/ ‘under the care of’ (IUr_1 2; IUr_2; cf. BPN: nos 239; 264).[188] In Bactrian, *-ē-* was raised to *-ī-* in front of a nasal (SFBG: 61f.), and the older and newer form are sometimes attested next to each other, e.g. οιν- < οην- ‘to see’ < **waina-* (BD II: 245). In view of this, I propose to interpret *jheniga* as a loanword from a more archaic Bactrian form **ζηνιγο /zēnīgə/ < **zainiya-kă-*, for which one may further compare Bactr. ζηνοβιδο /zēnəvidə/ < **zaina-pati-* ‘chief of the armour’ (→ Niya *jenavida*, §3.2.2 s.v.) and the PN ζηνιβο /zēnĭvə/ < **zaini(ya)-pā-* ‘he who protects what is entrusted (to him)’ (BPN: no. 151).

---

[187] If Skt. *ysenikāṃ* belongs here too, the spelling with <ys> does not need to point to a Khotanese source either (*pace* Skjærvø); the use of the ligature <ys> to write /z/ is also known from South Asian Brāhmī (Hitch 1984: 190–197) and not necessarily a marker of Khotanese origin.

[188] See additionally BD II (201) on βανοζινιιο < *βανοζινιγο ‘royal infant’ < **bānu-zainiya-ka-* ‘in the queen’s charge’ and BPN (nos 350; 472) on the PNs οισβοροζινιιο and τοβαζινι (family name τοβαζηνανο).

TA/TB *senik* may have been borrowed from Niya Prakrit (so Dragoni 2023b: 219), but there is no cogent reason to exclude a direct loan from Bactrian.

5. *daśavida* 'chief of ten households'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *daśavida*: CKD 41 (7x); 65 (3x); 66 (3x); 80; 93; 105 (3x); 115 (4x); 118; 129 (3x); 146 (3x); 148; 170 (2x); 173 (3x); 174; 181; 199; 204; 210; 221; 266 (3x); 299; 337; 404; 407; 409; 411; 419; 448; 449; 456; 457; 458; 459; 460; 462; 463; 464; 465; 467; 485; 533; 535; 543; 597; 601 (6x); 605; 607; 609; 615; 618; 620; 627; 631; 642; 727; 731; 758; 762 (3x); 763; 774 (6x); 795; 810; 833; *daśavita*: CKD 104 (2x); 108; 146 (4x); 191; 204; 205; 237; 608; 613; 628; 688; 776; 790; *taśavita*: CKD 610; *daśapati*: CKD 838 (2x)

DIR.PL. *daśavite*: CKD 477 (3x)

daśavida is an official title given to people in charge of a fiscal and administrative unit of (approximately) 'ten households' known in Niya Prakrit as *daśa* (and variants) (Stein 1936: 766ff.; LKD: 97 s.v. *daśavita*; Padwa 2007: 85–89).

Most likely, *daśavida* is based on a Bactrian compound λασοβιδο* /lasəvidə/ 'chief of ten households' < **dasa-pati-* (so first Harmatta 1960: 209–217).[189] Bactr. λασοβιδο* can be safely posited based on (i) the attested derivative λασοβιδιγο '(soldier) belonging to a company of ten' (BD II: 226) and (ii) its cognates OP **daθa-pati-* → Elam. *da-sa-bat-ti-iš* and Med. **dasa-pati-* → Elam. *da-šá-bat-ti-iš* (Iranica: §4.4.7.25; §4.4.7.30).

Obviously, there is no one-to-one phonetic correspondence between Niya *daśa-* (and *taśa-* with initial devoicing) and Bactr. λασο-. One therefore has to assume that *daśavida* is a hybrid compound whereby λασο- 'ten' has been replaced by its Prakrit cognate during the borrowing process.[190]

---

[189] On Bactr. -βιδο /vidə/, see also §3.2.1 s.v. *śadavida* and §3.2.2 s.v. *jenavida*.

[190] Conceivably, λασο 'ten' as the name of the administrative unit a λασοβιδο* was responsible for was first calqued into Niya Prakrit as *daśa* (and variants), from where *daśa* may have been introduced into the official title too. When assuming that the compound *daśavida* was created as such in Niya Prakrit, it would be more difficult to explain why an Indic and a Bactrian element are combined. This inner-Indic approach would furthermore neglect the Achaemenid origin of these administrative divisions implied by the Old Persian and Median evidence cited above (see further Weber 1983: 94f.). There is also a variant form *daśapati* where both elements of the compound are Indic; but this

The dir.pl. of the title under discussion is attested as *daśavite* in CKD 477. This form could merely be an instance of the infrequent plural ending in *-e* sometimes found also in inherited vocabulary (LKD: §60). A Bactrian source for this plural is possible too since the dir.pl. of -βιδο would likewise end in -ε /e/ in Kuṣāṇa times (cf. also §4.4.3).

6. *nokṣ̱ari* 'month of the new year'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *nokṣ̱ari*: CKD 195

Since *nokṣ̱ari* occurs behind the loc.sg. *maṣ̱e* 'in the month' in the dating formula of CKD 195, this word must be a month name.[191] Konow (1924: 121) recognised it to be "the ‚new-year's' month, corresponding to *Nausaryī* in the Khorasmian and *Nausard* in the Sogdian calendar".[192] In Old Iranian terms, this month name is a compound of **nawa(-ka)*- 'new' and **sardV*- 'year'.

Burrow (1934: 512) saw in *nokṣ̱ari* a loanword from Khotanese ("Saka" in his terminology). As this requires the ad hoc assumption that word-final **-rd-* would become *-r-* in Khotanese and not *-l-* as elsewhere, including in *salii-* 'year', I concur with Bailey (1949a: 127) that this proposal is unlikely. A Sogdian origin of *nokṣ̱ari* is likewise implausible because **-rd-* is continued in this language as *-rδ-*, also in *srδ* 'year'.

More plausibly, *nokṣ̱ari* is a Bactrian loan because then the *-r-* in *nokṣ̱ari* can be due to a simplification of the foreign cluster -ρλ- /rl/ < OIr. **-rd-* (cf. also Harmatta 1960: 206; §4.3.25). The relevant month name is moreover indirectly attested by way of the compound βιδδιγονωγοσαρλο 'second new year' and the Late Bactrian form νωγοσαρδο 'new year', which has -ρδ- from earlier -ρλ- (BD II: 203; 240; SCBD: 89).

A final note is due on the word-final *-i* in *nokṣ̱ari*. There is no case ending *-i* in Niya Prakrit, and old *i*-stems were being remade into *a*-stems (LKD: §70), so it seems that the *-i* in *nokṣ̱ari* was taken over from the source form. In view of the final *-i* in Arm. *Nawasardi* 'month of the new year' and Sims-Williams' derivation of Khot. nom.sg. *salī* 'year' < *salii-* < **sardī-kī-* (1990: 291–294; SVK

---

form is likely to be a secondary creation given that it only occurs in CKD 838, one of the documents in Kuča Prakrit.

[191] Cf. e.g. the month name *Arthamisiya* ← Gr. Ἀρτεμίσιος, which is likewise put behind the loc.sg. *maṣ̱e* (*maṣ̱a*) in CKI 152; 159; 509. I owe this comparison to Stefan Baums (Munich).

[192] See also Burrow (1934: 512); LKD (77 s.v. *are*; 101 s.v. *nokṣ̱ari*); TKD (36).

III: 153), Bactr. νωγοσαρλο* may go back to **nawa-ka-sardī-*. I would therefore like to suggest that *nokṣ̲ari* is a loan from a Kuṣāṇa Bactrian form *νωγοσαρλι /nōgsarlĭ̆/ with a final **-ĭ̆* still preserved.

7. *prigha* '(monochrome) damask'

Derivatives

DIR.SG. *prighamag̲a* 'made from damask': CKD 316

Compounds

DIR.SG. *śpetaprigha* 'white damask': CKD 318

In both its attestations, *prigha* refers to the fabric from which a certain textile product is made: *pajhavaṃta* 'breastband (?)' in CKD 316 (cf. §3.3.3 s.v.) and *kaṃculi* 'jacket' in CKD 318. The more exact meaning '(monochrome) damask' is suggested by Lüders' (1936a: 30) discovery of a Sanskrit cognate *pṛ̊ṅga-* (and variants) which is found under the title *vastranāmāni* 'textile terminology' in *Mahāvyutpatti* 5866 and translated into Tibetan as *dar ri mo can* 'figured silk' and into Chinese as *cǎi juàn* 綵絹'coloured silk'.[193]

The Iranian origin of *prigha* and its Sanskrit cognate was pointed out by Henning (1946: 150–157 = 1977 II: 259–266). When Henning published his article, the word for 'monochrome damask' was known as *p(i)ring* in Middle Persian (cf. CPD: 69; DMMP: 282) and as *pryng* / *pr'ynk* in Sogdian (SD: 281; 296; DMSB^2: 175).[194] In recent decades, the evidence has been enlarged further by the Bactrian compound πριγγοοαβγο 'weaver of damask' (BD II: 258).

Determining the most likely source of Niya *prigha* depends on one's views on the ultimate etymology of this Iranian word for 'damask'. In Henning's

[193] In view of the nasal in Skt. *pṛ̊ṅga-*, one could expect the Niya form to have been spelled as ***priṃgha*. The writing of anusvāra is, however, not always consistent in Kharoṣṭhī, and an akṣara 𐨨𐨿𐨫 *priṃ* is never attested in the currently available sources (possibly because a postconsonantal *r* and an anusvāra were difficult to combine). The 𐨨 *pri* in both instances of *prigha* is rather cursively written, the *i-mātrā* and the stem of the underlying 𐨦 *pra* being drawn in one stroke (Stefan Baums p.c.). In a handwritten note added to his personal copy of LKD, Burrow wonders whether *piṃga* (CKD 416) and *piṃgha* (CKD 264) are variants of the same word, but the unclear contexts in which these words occur should leave this option undecided for now. Agrawala (1951: 15–17) suggests to also add Skt. *piṅgā-* (Hcar.) to the dossier.

[194] Henning (1946: 151f. = 1977 II: 260f.) also compared Sogd. *spyt̲yy pryng* 'white damask' with the Niya equivalent *śpetaprigha*.

opinion, it could have been an originally Sogdian word. In this vein, he cautiously derived Sogd. *pryng* from **upa-ringa-* 'marked, lined' (cf. also SD: 281), which, if correct, would imply Niya *prigha*, its Sanskrit cognate, and MP *p(i)ring* to all be loanwords from Sogdian. Henning's etymology is, however, not self-evident given that the postulation of an Iranian word **ringa-* 'mark, line' rests on a doubtful comparison with Av. *haptō.iriŋga-*, whose assumed meaning 'having seven distinguishing marks' is not entirely sure (Goldman 2015: 185f.). Other options need thus be considered as well.

If we instead assume that the word for damask originated in Bactrian and spread from there to the other languages, a more straightforward etymology presents itself. Bactr. πριγγο* 'damask' could be derived from **pir-aina-ka-* 'made from the silkworm > damask'. This proto-form would be a derivation from **pirV-* '(silk)worm' and the Iranian material suffix **-aina-ka-* (= Bactr. -ηγγο / -ιγγο, cf. BD II: 213). **pirV-* can be reconstructed on the basis of Khot. *pira-* / *pära-* '(silk)worm', Khwar. *pyryk* 'silkworm cocoon', and Sogd. *pyrcyq* 'silk thread or cloth', the latter consisting of *pyr** 'silkworm' and the adj. suffix *-cyk* (thus Sims-Williams 2005: 182; 2008; 2023: 58). [195] **pir-aina-ka-* would moreover regularly yield Bactr. πριγγο* /prīŋgə/ because of (i) intervocalic lenition of **-k-* to *-g-* (SFBG: 35); (ii) syncope of the unaccented short vowels **-i-* and **-a-* (SFBG: 60f.); and (iii) monophthongisation of **-ai-* to **-ē-* with a further development to *-ī-* in front of a nasal (SFBG: 61f.).

In view of this new etymology, the least costly hypothesis would be that Niya *prigha* was borrowed directly from Bactr. πριγγο*. Theoretically speaking, it is still possible that the word passed through a Sogdian or other intermediary, but there is no evidence in support of this. Opting for such a scenario would thus be a violation of Ockham's razor.

8. *laṣi* 'gift'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *laṣi*: CKD 122; 243 (2x); 380; 415; 677 (2x); 678; 839; 860 (3x); *laṣiya*: CKD 573; *laṣa*: CKD 222 (2x); 690

[195] Even though these East Iranian words closely resemble Skt. *pīlu-*, Tamil *puṛu*, and other Dravidian words for 'worm', the ultimate etymology remains unclear (Sims-Williams 2008a). If my etymology of πριγγο* is accepted, Sims-Williams' reconstruction of the Iranian word with a long **ī*, as in Sanskrit, seems no longer possible.

In every instance except CKD 690, Niya *laṣi* /lăṣnĭ/ is a complement of the verb *de(na)-* 'to give' and in certain formulae this word can be replaced by *prahuḍa* 'gift' < OIA *prābhṛta-* (cf. Burrow 1935a: 786; LKD: 115 s.v.); the meaning 'gift' is hence secure.

Etymologically, *laṣi* is certainly a borrowing from Bactr. λαþνο /lāšnə/ 'gift', a cognate of MMP/Parth. *dāšin* 'idem' (DMMP: 136).[196] Based on a convincing comparison with Skt. *dakṣiṇā-* 'given by the right hand > priest's fee, priestly gift', Schwartz (1974: 400f.) reconstructs the proto-form of the Iranian words as OIr. **dāšinăˇ-*. In view of the final *-i* of Niya *laṣi*, one could also consider to reconstruct **dāšinī*, a feminine in **-ī* derived from the thematic masculine stem in **-a*. This alternative reconstruction would have the advantage that it allows us to posit an early Kuṣāṇa form *λαþνι /lāšnĭˇ/, corresponding sound for sound with Niya *laṣi* /lăṣnĭˇ/. A different option could be that *laṣi* is a loan from an archaic nom.sg. *λαþνι with *-ι /i/ < *-*ah* as in Sogdian and Khotanese. Yet, this option appears less likely because it is hard to see why *laṣi* would have been borrowed from a more archaic form of Bactrian than the other loanwords, which typically end in *-a* rather than **-*i*; see in more detail §4.2.1.

9. *lastana* 'dispute, lawsuit'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *lastana*: CKD 298

Niya *lastana* 'dispute, lawsuit' and Khot. *lāstana-* 'quarrel' are borrowings from Bactr. λαστανο /lāstānə/ 'litigation, dispute' (Schwartz 1974; BD II: 226 *pace* Bailey in KT VI: 315–317; DKS: 371).[197] We can be confident that this term originated in Bactrian since λαστανο regularly derives from **dāta-stāna-*, literally 'the place of law/judgement' (cf. MP/Parth. *dādestān*), with lambdacism and simplification of **-tst-* to -στ- /st/ after syncope.[198]

---

[196] See BD II (227), building further on Burrow (1935a: 786; LKD: 115 s.v.), Schwartz (1974: 400f.), and Weber (1997: 31). The superseded etymologies by Thomas (1934a: 49 fn. 3), from OIA *lakṣya-* 'aim' or *lakṣmī-* 'richness', and Bailey (KT VI: 315–317), from PIr. **√HraH* 'to give', will not be addressed here.

[197] The connection between Niya *lastana* and Khot. *lāstana-* had already been made by Konow (1932: 80); cf. also Burrow (1934: 514). In Niya Prakrit, the default word for 'dispute, lawsuit' is *vivada* < OIA *vivāda-*.

[198] Cf. further TA *lāstaṅk* / TB *lastāṅk* 'executioner's block (?)', which are probably loans from a related Bactrian word *λασταγγο /lāstāŋgə/. The latter could be derived from **dāta-stāna-ka-* (Schwartz 1974: 403), or it could be a

In CKD 298, *lastana* is used as part of a light verb construction with pret.3pl. *kritaṃti* 'they made'. This construction may have been taken over from Bactrian too since λαστανο always pairs together with κιρ- 'to make, do'. The Bactrian phrase has itself a parallel in MP *dādestān kun-* 'to pass judgement, judge' and Parth. *dādestān kar-* 'to quarrel' (DMMP: 133).[199]

10. *vaga* 'rent (paid for the use of land)'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *vaga*: CKD 574; 815; *vaka*: CKD 496; 498; 559[200]

Burrow (LKD: 117 s.v. *vaka*) could show that Niya *vaga* refers to the 'rent' paid by a tenant to the owner of a piece of land. This rent likely consisted of a certain percentage of the generated harvest, as *vaga* is always paid for with agricultural commodities (*ghrida* 'ghee' in CKD 496; *aṃna* 'corn' in CKD 559; 574; 815).

Unaware of previous suggestions to etymologise this word, I propose to derive *vaga* from Bactr. βαγο /vāγə/ 'share, part, portion' < OIr. **bāga-* (BD II: 200). This Bactrian word occurs in contexts resembling those Niya *vaga* is found in. βαγο combines, for instance, with ιαοοιοαρδαοι 'grain, corn' (doc. eg 3–5), comparable to how Niya *vaga* co-occurs with *aṃna*, the functional equivalent of ιαοοιοαρδαοι. The farming contract known as doc. U moreover stipulates that the tenant can keep a υιρδδιγο βαγο, i.e. a 'third part' (U 15 = U 13'), of the harvest produced on a leased vineyard.

Obviously, the spelling *vaga* corresponds phonologically better to Bactr. βαγο /vāγə/ than its alternative spelling *vaka* does. The variant with *-k-* may

---

substantivised adj. derived from λαστανο with the suffix -αγγο /āŋgə/ < **-āna-ka-* and haplological shortening as in καδγοσταγγο 'belonging to Kadagstan' < **kataka-stāna-ka-* < **kataka-stān-āna-ka-* (DoT: 592f.). I slightly prefer the second option since the suffix -αγγο is particularly prone to be attached to nouns (originally) referring to places (BD II: 187). See also §3.2.4 s.v. *ṣvaṭhaṃgha / ṣoṭhaṃga*.

[199] Khot. *lāstana-* can also be used in a light verb construction with *yan-* 'to do'; cf. e.g. inf. *lāstanä / lāstanu yanä* 'to quarrel' in *Saṅghāṭasūtra* §206.7 (Canevascini 1993: 85).

[200] I refrain from including the ambiguous sequences *bhumanavakaaṃna* and ins.sg. *bhumanavakaaṃnena* (CKD 165). These can be understood as "corn newly (*navaka*) harvested from the land (*bhuma*)" or as "corn paid as rent (*vaka*) for the lands (gen.pl. *bhumana*)" (see TKD: 32). Either option suits the context and both *vaka aṃna* (cf. infra) and *bhuma navaka* (CKD 599) are otherwise attested.

be attributable to the "nonstandardization and apparently idiosyncratic variation" (Salomon 1999a: 115) so characteristic of Kharoṣṭhī orthography in general. Conceivably, *vaka* was intended as a hypercorrect spelling induced by the general lenition of OIA intervocalic *-k-* to Niya *-g̲-* /ɣ/ (§2.1.2; cf. further §4.3.10).[201]

On its own, the change of initial OIr. **b-* to *v-* exemplified by βαγο /vāγə/ < **bāga-* is not a decisive indicator of a Bactrian loanword. In Sogdian (and the geographically remote Khwarezmian), **b-* also changed to *v-*. Yet, *vag̲a* is probably not a Sogdian loan because Sogd. *β'γ*, the cognate of Bactr. βαγο, only means 'garden' and not 'share' or the like (see DMSB^2: 57).[202] In all probability, *vag̲a* thus finds its origin in Bactrian.

11. *valag̲a* 'animal keeper'

Attestations of the base word

DIR.SG. *valag̲a*: CKD 14 (3x); 40; 176; 367; 557; 671; *valag̲aṃ*: CKD 367 (2x); *valaka*: CKD 777 (4x)
INS.SG. *valag̲ena*: CKD 82 (2x); 253
GEN.SG. *valag̲aṣa*: CKD 14; 25; 777

Attestations as a PN

GEN.SG. *Valakasa*: CKI 1059

Compounds

DIR.PL. *śeṣavalag̲e* 'remaining animal keeper': CKD 788
GEN.PL. *uṭavalag̲ana* 'camel keeper': CKD 637

The word *valag̲a* has previously been translated as 'keeper' (TKD: 10; 16; 47; 138) or 'guard' (TKD: 3f.; 6; 73), but it more specifically refers to people in charge of animals during embassies to neighbouring kingdoms (Høisæter 2020: 443–449). Accordingly, a more precise translation would be 'animal keeper'.

In Burrow's view (LKD: 119 s.v.), *valag̲a* would come from Skt. *pālaka-* 'protector', but this etymology forces him to assume that the otherwise

[201] Cf. also the PN *Vakamihira* ← Bactr. *βαγομιυρο /vagəmih(i)rə/ < **baga-miθra-* 'lord Mithra' in a Brāhmī inscription from Mathurā (Lüders 1961: 94f.), and the use of 𐨐 *ka* to indicate the spirant /ɣ/ in the *Khotan Dharmapada* (LKD: §16; Brough 1962: 86).

[202] In line 56 of Sogdian Tale B (M 135), Henning (1945: 470 = 1977 II: 174) translated *β'γ* as "allotments" (cf. also SD: 97), but the English word "allotment" can also mean a type of garden, as Nicholas Sims-Williams kindly remarked.

unexpected initial *v-* is adopted from compounds such as *paśuvala* 'keeper of livestock' < *paśupāla-*.

Therefore, it seems more attractive to adopt Sims-Williams' suggestion (*apud* Høisæter 2020: 444f.) that *valaga* is borrowed from Bactr. οαλαγο, a hapax legomenon attested in cl 5. The context in which this Bactrian word occurs has to do with the transport of horses, thus allowing us to assume that οαλαγο, like Niya *valaga*, approximately meant 'animal keeper'. Etymologically, οαλαγο can be compared to Parth. *wāδāg* 'leader, pilot' (DMMP: 335) and BSogd. *w'δ'kk* 'leader' (SD: 396) < **wād-āka-*.[203]

Høisæter observes a complementary distribution in the functions of a *valaga* and an *arivaga* (also *ariyaga*).[204] While the former looks after pack animals when travelling, the latter guides people (see also Høisæter 2022: 563–565; 2023: 422f.). Although I presently cannot solve the etymology of *arivaga,* I agree with Salomon (2020: 13f. *contra* Falk 2014: 5f.) that also this title is likely Iranian in origin. Given its link with *valaga*, one wonders if *arivaga* could be a Bactrian title ending in -οαλγο /wālgə/ 'leader' < **-wāda-ka-*, as in the title αþτοοαλγο (BD II: 200).[205]

12. *śadavida* 'chief of a hundred households'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *śadavida*: CKD 86; 216; 569 (2x); 586; 587; 590; 637; 648; 654; 656; 795; 797 (2x); 808; 879; 886; *śadavita*: CKD 159; 247; 436; 586 (2x); 715; *śatavita*: CKD 683; *śatavida*: CKD 422

DIR.PL. *śadavida*: CKD 482 (2x); *śadavide*: CKD 580 (2x)

śadavida 'chief of a hundred households' is the title carried by officials who were responsible for the administrative and fiscal unit known as *śada* (also *śata*) '(a) hundred (households)' (Stein 1936: 766ff.; Padwa 2007: 85–89).

Harmatta (1960: 209–217) recognised *śadavida* to be based on a Bactrian title *σαδοβιδο /sadəvidə/ < **sata-pati-*, a cognate of OP **θata-pati-*, the

[203] See §4.3.22 for the correspondence between Bactr. -ο- /w/ and Niya *-v-* /v/.

[204] Attestations: CKI 564 (3x, dir.sg. *arivagi*, gen.sg. *arivagisa*, ins.sg. *arivagiṇa*); CKD 10 (3x); 22; 67; 135 (2x); 244; 251; 253; 388; 438 (3x); 507; 569.

[205] A potential problem with this idea is that it assumes Bactr. -λγ- /lg/ to be substituted with Niya *-g-*, whereas Bactr. -λγ- /lg/ seems to be continued as Niya *-lg-* in some names (§3.4.2 s.vv. *Namilga*; *Palge*). I have no solution for the first part of this title. There is a Niya title *ari*, perhaps 'Aryan' (LKD: 76 s.v.), but it is far from certain that this can be equated with the first element of *arivaga* / *ariyaga*.

latter attested via Elam. *sa-ad-da-bat-ti-iš* / *sa-da-bat-ti-iš* (Iranica: §4.4.7.107).[206] Bactrian *σαδο- /sadə/ would probably have been rendered as ***sata-* or ***sada-* in Niya Prakrit, so we are not dealing with a one-to-one borrowing. Instead, *σαδο- /sadə/ was replaced by its Niya cognate *śata-*, a process which I discuss in more detail in §3.2.1 s.v. *daśavida* (see especially fn. 190). The actual Bactrian form *σαδοβιδο may be indirectly preserved as *sadāvida*, a title attested in a colophon of a Gilgit *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* manuscript (von Hinüber 2017: 137 = 2009–19: 1630).

It has gone unnoticed so far that Niya Prakrit *śadavida* 'chief of a hundred households' may, in its turn, have been borrowed into Old Turkic and Sogdian as *šadapït* and *š'δpyt*, respectively. OT *šadapït* occurs as an official title in the Orkhon inscriptions from the 8th century (cf. Kljaštornyj & Livshits 1972: 89 with ref.), and the Sogdian word, also an official title, is attested in the Bugut inscription from the 6th century (revised edition in Yoshida 2019). Since the content of the Bugut inscription is purely Turkic, it seems most likely that Niya *śadavida* was (via some intermediary) first borrowed into Old Turkic as *šadapït* and thence into Sogdian as *š'δpyt*.[207] I should admit, though, that it is hard to explain why the *-v-* in Niya *śadavida* was borrowed as Turkic *-p-* and not simply as **-v-*.[208]

In any case, the etymology of OT *šadapït* and Sogd. *š'δpyt* does not affect the etymological analysis of *śadavida* itself, which can safely be assumed to come from Bactr. *σαδοβιδο.

13. *ṣada* 'pleased, happy'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *ṣada*: CKD 157; 305; 307; 317; 390; 399 (2x); 475; 713; *ṣado*: CKD 247; 714; CKM 274 (2x); *ṣade*: CKM 274 (7x); *ṣato*: CKD 164; 385; 541 (2x); 702
INS.SG. *ṣātena*: CKD 702
GEN.SG. *ṣadasa*: CKM 267

---

[206] σαδο 'hundred' < **sata* and -βιδο 'lord, chief' < **-pati-* are both attested in Bactrian, but the compound *σαδοβιδο is not. I consider the etymology secure because of the parallel *daśavida* 'chief of ten households' ← λασοβιδο* (§3.2.1 s.v.).

[207] For a similar chain of borrowings, cf. §3.2.3 s.v. *toṃga*.

[208] One option would be to posit a Tocharian intermediary as Indo-Aryan *-v-* is more often borrowed as *-p-* in Tocharian (e.g. *sintāp* 'rock-salt' ← *saindhava-*); but the absence of the relevant word in Tocharian seems to speak against this scenario.

Derivatives

INS.SG. *ṣadimeṇa* 'pleased, happy': CKM 274 (2x)
PRES.1SG. *ṣademi* 'I am happy': CKD 139; 259; 302; 305; 307; 390; 819; 840; *ṣatosmi*: CKD 399
PRES.1PL. *ṣadama* 'we are happy': CKD 399; 721; *ṣadema*: CKD 690; *ṣatama*: CKD 797

Most likely, Niya *ṣada* 'pleased, happy' is a loanword from Bactr. þαδο /šādə/ 'idem' < **čyāta-*.[209] This etymology is strongly supported by the exact match between Niya 1sg. *ṣademi* 'I am happy' and Bactr. 1sg. þαδημο /šādēmə/ 'idem', both forms being used in nearly identical contexts in (3.4) and (3.5).

(3.4) CKD 139 obverse 3f.
tena ṣademi tahi paride aroga śrudemi
"I am pleased because I have heard from you that you are in good health" (TKD: 25)

(3.5) ba 2f.
[οτο]μο̣ ναγατο σιδο̣ λ̣ρο̣γηιο ταδο þαδημο
"[And] (since) I have heard that you are healthy, therefore I am happy" (BD II: 52).

This parallel is the reason that I take Bactrian to be the most likely donor language, even though Parth. *š'd* 'happy, joyful, serene' (DMMP: 313) and Sogd. *š't* 'happy, rich' (SD: 370) would in theory also work as a source of Niya *ṣada*.[210]

14. *Suliga* 'Sogdian'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *Suliga*: CKD 661

[209] Cf. BD II (283) and Hitch (2009: 18), building further on KD (373) and Burrow (1934: 514; LKD: 126 s.v.). Schlosser (2022: 84; 193) considers *ṣada* to be an inherited word related to BHS *śāta-* (Pāli *sāta-*) 'pleasant, agreeable' (BHSD: 525). Yet, she does not explain how to account for the initial retroflex in the Gāndhārī form.

[210] Note that the attestation of a South Asian Gāndhārī cognate of Niya *ṣada* in manuscripts from Bajaur, i.e. at the border between present-day Pakistan and Afghanistan, also speaks in favour of a Bactrian origin for the word. Khot. *tsāta-* cannot have been the source of Niya *ṣada* because of the different initial and because the Khotanese word only means 'rich' (DKS: 146).

Suliga is an epithet carried by a certain *Vagiti Vadhaga,* the purchaser of a camel figuring in the Khotan Prakrit document CKD 661. It most likely means 'Sogdian', as Konow (1932: 74 with fn. 2) convincingly suggested; compare Sogd. *swγδyk* 'idem' and other forms cited below.[211]

A forceful argument in support of Konow's interpretation is the Sogdian origin of the PN *Vagiti Vadhaga*, whose second element is almost certainly to be identified with the common Sogdian name component *βntk* 'servant' < **banda-ka*- (for which cf. e.g. Lurje 2010: no. 295).[212] There is moreover at least one other Sogdian name mentioned in CKD 661, i.e. *Nani Vadhaga* ← Sogd. *nnyβntk* (Brough 1965: 594 = 1996: 289; Lurje 2010: no. 787).

In order to account for the presence of a sound *l* in *Suliga*, we must look at how other languages from the region refer to the Sogdians. This survey will show that Khotan Pkt. *Suliga* is all but a unique form.

With regard to languages from the Tarim Basin, both Tocharian and Khotanese provide relevant evidence.[213] The ethnonym for 'Sogdian' has not yet turned up in Tocharian texts proper, but the Tocharian gloss *Suklyī[ka]* in the Sanskrit manuscript SHT 2030 (a fragment of the *Mahāmāyūrīvidyārājñī*) is probably an indirect witness to such an ethnonym (cf. K. T. Schmidt *apud* SHT IX: 58f.; Ching 2013b: 346); further evidence comes from the Tocharian B name *Suklyike* (Ching 2013b: 346; 365–368). The Khotanese form *sūlīya*- (*sūlya*-) 'Sogdian, merchant' resembles *Suliga* even more closely (KT VII: 76–78; Emmerick *apud* SVK II: 148f.).

---

[211] Following a suggestion by F. W. Thomas, it was originally thought that *Suliga* corresponds to Tib. *shu lig* 'native of Kashgar' (cf. KI: 378; Noble 1931: 446; 453; Thomas 1945: 525f.). Yet, if this were true, one would expect initial *ś*- or *ṣ*- in the Prakrit form because the Chinese name for Kashgar, i.e. *shū lè* 疏勒, was pronounced in (Early) Middle Chinese as *srjo lok* (<sr> stands for [ʂ] in Baxter and Sagart's reconstructions). See Konow (1932: 74). Thomas (1945: 526) furthermore proposed to recognise the name of the Sogdians in the expression gen.sg. *sokhaliga sarthaṣa* 'of the *sokhaliga* caravan' in CKD 665 (so also Høisæter 2020: 412). Although conceivable, this proposal is hard to verify because of the bad preservation of the document in which *sokhaliga* occurs.

[212] The element *Vagiti* may, as argued by Sims-Williams, stand for Sogd. *βγyšty* 'of the gods' (Grenet, Sims-Williams & de la Vaissière 2001: 102 fn. 3; differently Lurje 2010: no. 290).

[213] Tumsh. *sud₁ana*- (= *suḍana*-) 'Sogdian' (Konow 1947: 189) is a ghost word. The relevant instances are better read as *sud₁ata*-, a PN (Maue 2009; Ogihara 2021: 154 fn. 21).

Forms with *l* in languages spoken outside the Tarim Basin have been collected by Bailey (KT VII: 77f.) and Tremblay (2004: 133). The following can be cited here:

(i) ZMP *sūlīg* (*Greater Bundahišn* B 205,11). Cf. also *sūlīg mānišn* as a gloss of Av. *suγδō.šayana-* 'where the Sogdians live' (AIW: 1582).

(ii) MMP *suγlī* in the tune name *ēn pad suγlī zgar* 'this (one) to the Sogdian melody' (BBB 462; cf. DMMP: 310; 381; Sims-Williams, Sheldon & Gulácsi 2022: 59 fn. 87).

(iii) Skt. *śūlīka-* (variant *sūlīka-*) 'Sogdian' (MW: 1087; 1244).[214]

On the Chinese evidence, see Kumamoto (1982: 193ff.).

What is the most likely source of these forms with *l*, including Khotan Pkt. *Suliga*? In light of Henning's (1939 = 1977 I: 639–652) hypothesis of an unattested Sogdian dialect with lambdacism, one could imagine them to be borrowed from a dialect form of Sogd. *swγδyk* 'Sogdian' < **sugdiya-ka-* in which *-δ-* < **-d-* had been lenited to **-l-* (cf. e.g. Kumamoto 1982: 196 on the Khotanese evidence). Yet, the recent refutation of Henning's hypothesis by Lurje and Yakubovich (2017) invites one to look for a different scenario. In line with Dragoni's (2023a; 2023b: 47f.) proposal that the name of Khotan passed through a Bactrian intermediary before being adopted in Niya Prakrit and languages like Sogdian (§3.2.2 s.v. *Khotaṃna*), I would therefore argue that Khotan Pkt. *Suliga* and its congeners are borrowings from Bactrian (so also Baums and Sims-Williams *apud* Høisæter 2020: 412).

For this argument, the following Bactrian words are of relevance:

(i) the personal name σογδοκανο, a patronymic in -ανο from σογδοκο* /suγdək(k)ə/ 'Sogdian'.

(ii) the toponym βονοσογολιγο, which probably means 'Sogdian estate' (cf. BPN: nos 249; 441, adopting a suggestion by Pavel Lurje).

σογδοκανο is, as pointed out in Sims-Williams (2016b: 277f.), probably a late form in which *-γλ- /γl/ < **-gd-* has been reversed to -γδ- /γd/. The earlier Bactrian designation for 'Sogdian' would be σογλιγο* /suγlīgə/ < **sugdiya-ka-*, as can be safely posited on the basis of the attested compound βονοσογολιγο 'Sogdian estate' (with an additional -ο- /ə/ between -γ- /γ/ and -λ- /l/).

[214] The initial *ś-* is hypercorrect.

Interpreting *Suliga* as a loan from Bactr. σογλιγο* /suγlīgə/ merely requires the assumption that the foreign cluster -γλ- /γl/ was simplified during the borrowing process.[215] The same simplification would be needed in the case of Khot. *sūlīya-* (*sūlya-*), ZMP *sūlīg*, and Skt. *śūlīka-* (variant *sūlīka-*), whereas MMP *suγlī* and TB *Suklyike* (also *Suklyī[ka]*) can be seen to preserve the Bactrian cluster more faithfully.

Because of Bactrian's prestige in the region (cf. §1.4.3), it is also historically understandable that the Bactrian word for 'Sogdian', rather than the Sogdian one itself, was borrowed into languages like Prakrit and Khotanese. Considering the close political and historical ties between Bactria and Sogdiana since Achaemenid times (for which cf. Lurje & Yakubovich 2017: 328), it is not unexpected either that the Bactrian designation for "Sogdian" was taken over by Sanskrit and (some forms of) Persian.

In sum, Khotan Pkt. *Suliga* 'Sogdian' can be safely regarded as a loan from Bactr. σογλιγο* /suγlīgə/ 'idem' < **sugdiya-ka-* (cf. the attested βονο-σογολιγο 'Sogdian estate') with simplification of the foreign cluster -γλ- /γl/ to Pkt. *-l-*. Bactr. σογλιγο* probably also lies at the origin of, amongst others, Khot. *sūlīya* 'Sogdian, merchant'; the TB name *Suklyike* and the gloss *Suklyī[ka]*; and Skt. *śūlīka-* (variant *sūlīka-*) 'Sogdian'.

15. *stora* 'large animal, horse, camel'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *stora*: CKD 25; 123; 125; 188; 272; 333 (3x); 367; 435; 634; 743 (2x); 842
INS.SG. *storena*: CKD 135; 139; 164; 381
GEN.SG. *storaṣa*: CKD 283; 292; 305; 361; 841; *storasya*: CKD 159
DIR.PL. *storaṃca*: CKD 13

Derivatives

DIR.SG. *storaga* 'large animal, horse, camel' < **staura-ka-*: CKD 306; *storae*: CKD 84

Compounds

DIR.SG. *storabala* 'animal flock': CKD 164; 376; 721
DIR.SG. *storavara* 'horse driver'; CKD 84; 119
DIR.SG. *storvana* 'groom': CKD 399
INS.SG. *storvanena* 'idem': CKD 399

---

[215] For Bactrian suffixal -γ- /g/ → Pkt. *-g-* /γ/, see §4.3.11. In case Niya *sokhaliga* were also connected (on which see fn. 211), Bactr. -γλ- /γl/ would be substituted with Niya *-khal-* and Bactr. -ο- /u/ as Niya *-o-*.

GEN.SG. *storvanaṣa* ‘idem’: CKD 399

The Niya Prakrit word *stora* has both a general meaning ‘large animal’, and more concrete meanings such as ‘horse’ or ‘camel’. A Sanskrit cognate of this word, i.e. *sthora-* ‘pack animal’, is attested three times in the *Divyāvadāna* (BHSD: 611; Schoubben 2022b: 343–346).[216]

Burrow (1934: 514; LKD: 132 s.v.) was undoubtedly correct to relate *stora* (and BSkt. *sthora-*) to Av. *staora-* ‘large animal’ and its cognates < **staura-* (cf. also Bailey 1949a: 122; Agrawala 1956–57: 112). The question remains from which Iranian language Niya Prakrit adopted this word. Bactr. στωρο /stōrə/ (later αστωρο, cf. BD II: 266) would be a fitting source, but what about the other Middle Iranian languages? Khotanese can be excluded since the vocalism of Niya *stora* differs from that of Khot. *stūra-* (DKS: 434). Yet, MP *stōr* (CPD: 77), Parth. *istōr* (DMMP: 91), and Sogd. *stwr* (SD: 363; DCS[2]: 174) would all work phonologically, so one has to decide on different grounds.

The phraseology of Skt. *sthora-* counts as an indirect argument to consider Niya *stora* a Bactrian loanword. The Sanskrit word consistently combines with the verb *lardayati*, explainable as denominative to OIA **larda-* ‘load, cargo’ ← Bactr. *λιρτο < OIr. **dr̥šta-* (Schoubben 2022b). Given this Bactrian etymology of *lardayati*, one expects Skt. *sthora-* and, by implication, Niya *stora* also to have been borrowed from Bactrian.

An additional reason to interpret *stora* as a loanword from Bactrian is the Niya compound *storabala*. Baums and Glass (2002a– s.v.) consider *storabala* to be made up of *stora* ‘animal’ and *bala* ‘force, army’.[217] Their assumed meaning ‘horse power, cavalry horses’ fits only the occurrence in CKD 376, where Burrow (TKD: 75) indeed translates the word with ‘cavalry attack’. In the other two instances (here cited as (3.6) and (3.7), a different meaning seems required, as Burrow’s translations make clear.

(3.6) CKD 164 obverse 7
storabala laṃcaga parivalidavya

[216] Falk (2004: 150 fn. 14 = 2013a: 363 fn. 14) suggests that the Gāndhārī official title *sturaka** (attested via the ins.pl. *sturakehi* in CKI 249) would also be connected to Niya *stora*. *sturaka** is, however, more easily explained as a borrowing from Bactr. στορογο ‘strong’ or its homonym meaning ‘vassal’ (cf. Schoubben 2023: 292 with further ref.).

[217] *-bala-* would function here like in the OIA compound *caturaṅgabala-* ‘the force of the fourfold limbs > the entire army’.

"the stock of beasts (*storabala*) is to be properly looked after." (TKD: 31).

(3.7) CKD 721 obverse 5
eṣa Danutreya atra viṣajidama stora[bala] paśaṃnae
"We have sent this Danutreya there to inspect the stock of draught animals (*storabala*)." (TKD: 144).

I propose that in these two cases *storabala* is to be compared to the attested Bactrian word στωροβαλο /stōrəbalə/ (or /stōrəvalə/) 'animal'. Bactr. στωροβαλο is a compound of στωρο 'animal' and παλο 'family' < **pada*- (cf. also Sogd. *'st'wrpδ'k* 'animal' and BD II: 266). The original meaning of στωροβαλο is accordingly 'the stock of beasts/animals', which is precisely how Burrow translates Niya *storabala.*[218]

Needless to say, this explanation of *storabala* only works with Bactrian as the donor language; otherwise, the *l* would remain unaccounted for. As it would be uneconomic to assume that the compound *storabala* came from Bactrian but *stora* itself from another language, I therefore deem it most likely that Bactr. στωρο /stōrə/ was the immediate source of Niya *stora*.

Two further compounds containing the element *stora* could be Bactrian loanwords too. The first is *storavara* 'horse driver' which could have been borrowed in its entirety from an unattested Bactr. *στωροβαρο /stōrəvărə/ < **staura-bă̆ra*-. The second, i.e. *storvana*, has so far remained unnoticed due to a misreading in CKD 399.

The scribe of this document distinguishes <vaṃ> from <rva> by the length of the vertical stroke of 𑀯 *va*. For <vaṃ>, this stroke is longer, and the anusvāra curl is added at the very bottom of the akṣara (e.g. *evaṃ* reverse tablet A 2), whereas for <rva>, this stroke is shorter and the curl indicating the preconsonantal *r* is added higher up (e.g. *ṣarva* reverse tablet A 2). Given this distinction between the two akṣaras, Boyer et al.'s (KD: 143) transliterations *stovaṃna*, *stovaṃnena*, and *stovaṃnaṣa* (reverse tablet A 2–3) should be corrected to *storvana*, *storvanena*, and *storvanaṣa*, respectively the dir.sg., ins.sg., and gen.sg. of an underlying word *storvana*.

As the context is about taking care for a camel, assigning the meaning 'groom' to *storvana* would fit the relevant part of CKD 399 (~ (3.8)) particularly well.

---

[218] Normally, Bactrian intervocalic β from **p* is rendered as Niya *v*. Yet, in the present case, the morpheme boundary between the two parts of the compound may have prevented the lenition of /b/ to /v/ from happening, either in Bactrian itself or after the word was borrowed into Niya Prakrit. See in more detail §4.3.8.

(3.8) CKD 399 reverse A2f.
tasmartha itani eta storvanena atra viṣajita uṭa prichaṃnaye yahi eṣa storvana atra eśati lekha vacitu tomi storvanaṣa haste uṭa iśa prahadavya
"For that reason this groom has been sent there to demand the camel. When this groom arrives there, you should read the letter and the camel is to be sent in the hand of the groom." (after TKD: 81).

I would therefore argue Niya *storvana* to be etymologically connected to OIr. **staura-pāna-* 'groom', a compound attested through MP *'stwrp'n* (CPD: 77).[219] The immediate source of the Niya Prakrit word could be Bactr. *στωροβανο /stōrvānə/. This word is not yet attested as such in Bactrian, but its existence is made plausible by χοβανο /xuvānə/ 'shepherd' from OIr. **fšu-pāna-* (BD II: 279).

To summarise, Niya *stora* 'large animal, horse, camel' is most probably a loanword from Bactr. στωρο 'idem'. Indirect proof that *stora* is a Bactrian borrowing and not a loanword from another Iranian language comes from (i) the observation that Skt. *sthora-* occurs together with an etymologically Bactrian verb and (ii) the derivation of the Niya compound *storabala* 'animal flock' from Bactr. στωροβαλο < **staura-pada-*.

16. *sṕara* / *sṕura* 'full, completely'

Attestations of the base word

ADV. *sṕara*: CKD 42 (2x); 57; 59; 272; 275; 333; 374; 387 (2x); 796 (3x); 797 (2x); 817; *sṕura*:[220] CKD 158; 165 (2x); 211; 329; 414; 517; 714 (2x); 725

sṕara and *sṕura* are used indiscriminately with the meaning 'full, completely'. Observe, for example, the similar contexts in which *sṕara* and *sṕura* occur in (3.9) and (3.10).

(3.9) CKD 59 reverse 1f.
*[palýi] lihidaga sarva sṕara cavala yatma Motge ageta Angi Tsoṃgoṣa ca hastami iśa (*vi)ṣajidavo*.

[219] According to Bailey (DKS: 434), a Khotanese cognate *sturapāna-* would also be attested once, but see Skjærvø (2002: 108) for a different interpretation of the relevant passage.
[220] I follow LKD (133 s.v. *sṕora*) in reading *sṕura* also where Boyer et al. (KD) read *sṕora*, viz. in CKD 165 (2x); 211; 329.

"The tax has been written down and it is to be sent all complete (*sarva sṕara*) in the hand of the *yatma* Motg̲e and the *ag̲eta*s Angi and Tsoṃg̲o." (after TKD: 13).

(3.10) CKD 714 obverse 4
yaṃ ca aṃña palýi ş̲arva sṕura ag̲eta Lýipeya Tsug̲etaş̲a ca hastaṃmi cavala iśa viş̲ajidavo.
"The rest of the tax is quickly to be sent here all complete (*ş̲arva sṕura*) in the hand of the *ag̲eta* Lýipeya and Tsug̲eta." (after TKD: 143).

Burrow (1935a: 787f.; LKD: 132 s.v.) convincingly explained *sṕara* / *sṕura* as an Iranian loanword by comparing it to OIr. **us-pr̥na*- 'full, complete'. Some of the latter's reflexes are MMP/Parth. *ispurr* 'full, complete, perfect' (DMMP: 87); Sogd. *'spwrn*- 'idem' (also *'spwrn*-; *spwrn*-; SD: 65f.; DMSB^2: 53); Khot. *uspurra*- 'full, completed' (DKS: 43); and Bactr. σπορο /spurə/, later ασπορο /əspurə/ 'complete, completely, in full' (BD II: 197).[221]

An additional argument in support of Burrow's etymology comes from phraseology. As can be seen from the quotations above, *sṕara* / *sṕura* can form a pair with *sarva* 'all', the combination of the two meaning 'all complete'. This phraseology is closely paralleled in Iranian languages given that outcomes of **us-pr̥na*- can likewise be combined with a word meaning 'all'. A Bactrian phrase οισπο ασπορο 'all complete' is, for instance, attested in J 16 ~ J 23' (BD I^2: 48ff.), while Khot. *biśśu* (*bäśśu*) *uspurro* 'all complete' is used to translate Skt. *sakalasamāptam* in the *Saṅghāṭasūtra* (Canevascini 1993: 257). The combination of *sṕara* / *sṕura* with *sarva* 'all' in Niya Prakrit may hence be calqued on this Iranian idiom.

In the donor language of Niya *sṕara* / *sṕura*, the initial **u*- of **us-pr̥na*- must have been lost and the **-n*- assimilated to the preceding **-r*-. The first requirement excludes Khot. *uspurra*- as the source of Niya *sṕara* / *sṕura*, while the second excludes Sogd. *'spwrn*- (and variants). Bactr. σπορο /spurə/, on the other hand, meets both requirements, making it plausible that Niya *sṕara* / *sṕura* is a Bactrian loanword.

Still, the immediate source of Niya *sṕara* / *sṕura* was probably not the attested σπορο /spurə/ but a more archaic form *σπορρο /spurrə/ with a geminate -ρρ- /rr/. The fact that the Bactrian outcome of OIr. **farnah*- is attested in the Kuṣāṇa period as φαρρο /farrə/ and in later times as φαρο

[221] In Achaemenid times, **us-pr̥na*- was also loaned into Aramaic and Elamite as *'sprn* / *'šprn'* and *ú-iš-bar-na-iš-be* (pl.) / *ú-iš-pír-na-iš-be* (pl.), respectively (Iranica: §4.4.2.21; ADAB: 55; 116; 270).

/fă̆rə/ (BD II: 274) allows for the conclusion that *-*rn*- first developed to a geminate -ρρ- /rr/ before being simplified to single -ρ- /r/ in post-Kuṣāṇa times. Since there are both historical and linguistic reasons to think that the Bactrian loanwords in Niya Prakrit were adopted in the Kuṣāṇa period (§4.2.1), a Kuṣāṇa form *σπορρο /spurrə/ thus seems the most likely source form of Niya *sṕara* / *sṕura*, even though the Kharoṣṭhī script does not indicate geminate consonants and /rr/ was probably absent from Niya Prakrit phonotactics in any case (cf. Table 1, p. 37).

The initial σπ- /sp/ of Bactr. *σπορρο corresponds to Niya *sṕ*-, the element *ṕ* being a way to write a fricative close to /v/, perhaps /f/ (cf. §2.1.6). The observed fricativisation can, as Burrow (1935a: 787f.) already noted, be ascribed to Niya Prakrit itself, as the same development occurs in an inherited word like *parosṕara* 'one another' < *paraspara*-.[222]

A more tricky question is how to account for the different vowels -*a*- and -*u*- in *sṕara* / *sṕura*. In this regard, Burrow (1935a: 787) pointed to a few other forms made from the same root as **us-pr̥na*-, but which contain a vowel -*a*-, i.e. NP *sipari* 'complete, exhausted' and Arm. *spaṙ* 'completeness' (cf. Olsen 1999: 907). Yet, there is so far no evidence for an alternative Bactrian form *σπαρρο or the like, and the fact that *sṕara* and *sṕura* are used interchangeably suggests that they were borrowed from one and the same source. That said, it is likewise difficult to attribute the difference in vocalism between *sṕara* and *sṕura* to a phonological process in Niya Prakrit. The closest parallel available seems to be the word *kamaṃta* / *kamuṃta*, which is not very useful as neither its meaning nor its etymology is clear (§3.7.2 s.v.). Therefore, I would tentatively go for a third option, viz. that the variation between *sṕara* and *sṕura* is to be ascribed to the phonetics of the -ο- /u/ in Bactr. *σπορρο /spurrə/ (later (α)σπορο). Since the -ο- /u/ in this word results from the vocalisation of OIr. *-*r̥*- in a labial environment (SFBG: 60), it is conceivable that its phonetic realisation was as a central vowel that speakers of Niya Prakrit could approximately render as either -*u*- or -*a*-, the latter probably being a schwa (Baums 2009: 112 fn. 26). See further §4.3.7.[223]

[222] For another Iranian loanword starting with *sṕ*-, see §3.3.1 s.v. *sṕaṣa*.

[223] Unfortunately, there is no other instance among the Bactrian loanwords in Niya Prakrit containing a vowel ο /u/ derived from OIr. *-*r̥*- to check whether this double treatment was standard or not. My proposal also raises questions to what extent *sṕara* / *sṕura* was integrated into the language.

Despite this uncertainty about the best way to explain the difference in vocalism between *sṕara* and *sṕura* 'full, completely', one can safely conclude that we are dealing with a loan from Bactr. *σποροο /spurrə/ (later (α)σποροο) 'complete, completely, in full' < OIr. **us-pr̥na-*.

3.2.2 Plausible etymologies

17. *aṃtaḡi* 'belonging to the district'

Attestations of the base form

ADJ. *aṃtaḡi*: CKD 64; 135 (2x); 213; 223;[224] 743 (2x)

How exactly to translate the Niya adjective *aṃtaḡi* cannot be deduced from the available contexts. The attestations have in common that *aṃtaḡi* modifies animal names, namely *aśpa* 'horse' (CKD 213; 223), *uṭa* 'camel' (CKD 64; 135), and *stora* 'large animal' (CKD 743).

Burrow (1935a: 779f.; LKD: 73 s.v.) etymologised *aṃtaḡi* as OIr. **han-tāka-* 'swift, express', from **ham* + *√*tač* 'to run' (EDIV: 372ff.).[225] However, the consistent spelling with final *-i* poses a problem. A suffix *-i* typically derives adjectives from nouns in Niya Prakrit (§6.4.3), which means that Burrow's postulated **han-tāka-* would have been a noun. But how should we understand the derivation process in that case? Would **han-tāka-* have meant 'swiftness' and *aṃtaḡi* 'connected with swiftness', whence 'quick'? As this scenario seems rather complicated, I hesitate to accept Burrow's etymology.[226]

In fact, a close reading of CKD 135 seems to suggest that *aṃtaḡi* has a different meaning. The relevant context is here cited as (3.11).

(3.11) CKD 135 under-tablet obverse 1–5
ahuno cuγalayina Vhurmaṣevaṣa Khotaṃnaṃmi dutiyae gaṃdavo huda … edaṣa Apitaṣa dudi ? gaṃdavo cuγalayina Vhurmaṣevena ṣadha

[224] It seems to have gone unnoticed that the contents of CKD 213 and 223 complement each other.

[225] For the combination of preverb and root, cf. e.g. CSogd. *'ntxs* (also *nt'xs* in Sogdian script) 'to flee, take refuge' (DCS[2]: 29).

[226] Burrow's etymology has been endorsed by, amongst others, Bailey (1958b: 532; KT VI: 386). Bailey's further comparison with the second part of Arm. *sowrhandak* 'runner' is not compelling, as this Armenian word can be more easily explained as a participial derivation from *sowrham* 'to run' (Olsen 1999: 304; 907).

> *Khotaṃnaṃmi gaṃtavo huda yo cuẏalayina Vhurmaṣevaṣa aṃtaḡi uṭa 2 dadavo yo etaṣa Apita[ṣa] aṃtaḡi uṭa 1 dadavo avi arivaḡa maṃnuśa aṭ́hovaḡa 1 dadavo … etaṣa arivaḡaṣa tanu storena gaṃtavo.*
> "Now the *cuẏalayina* Vhurmaṣeva had to go on a mission to Khotan. … this Apita must go on the mission, and the *cuẏalayina* Vhurmaṣeva must go with him to Khotan. The two *aṃtaḡi* camels (destined for) the *cuẏalayina* Vhurmaṣeva must be given (to him), (likewise) the one *aṃtaḡi* camel (destined for) Apita must be given (to him). Also a suitable man is to be given them as a guide (*arivaḡa*) … This guide must go on his own animal (*tanu storena*)" (after TKD: 24).

This document informs us that three people will go on a mission, viz. Vhurmaṣeva, Apita, and an unnamed guide. Since the latter has to make use of his own animal (*tanu storena*), whereas Vhurmaṣeva and Apita are given *aṃtaḡi* camels, it seems tempting to infer a contrast between *aṃtaḡi* and *tanu* 'own'. In other words, the local government may have provided the *aṃtaḡi* camels for Vhurmaṣeva and Apita since they do not have to use their own.

This interpretation finds further support when the attestations of *aṃtaḡi* in other documents are taken into account. One, for instance, observes that both the *kori* and *klaseṃci* official, i.e. the animal keepers of the Shanshan kingdom,[227] are responsible for these *aṃtaḡi* animals (see CKD 64; 213; 223; 743). In CKD 223, it is moreover explicitly stated that an *aṃtaḡi* horse is provided by the state (abl.sg. *rajade*).

Based on this different semantic analysis, I propose to compare *aṃtaḡi* to Bactr. ανδαγο /andăgə/ (or /andăγə/) 'subdistrict of a city' (BD II: 191). As also shown by the existence of a bureaucratic title ανδαγοβιδο 'chief of the district', this Bactrian word probably denoted an administrative unit (Miyamoto 2019: 171).

If the comparison is correct, Niya Prakrit *aṃtaḡi* can be interpreted as an adjective meaning 'belonging to the district'. This proposal would also solve the problem of the final *-i* in *aṃtaḡi*, as the assumed basis *aṃtaḡa** 'district' ← ανδαγο would, as required, be a noun in this scenario. One can further draw a parallel between *aṃtaḡi stora* 'animal belonging to the district' (CKD 743) and gen.sg. *avaṃci storaṣa* 'of the animal belonging to the village' (CKD 841). *avaṃci* is a derivation with the *ci*-suffix from *aẏana* 'village' (§3.3.2 s.v.),

[227] Cf. LKD (84f. s.vv. *kori*; *klaseṃci*), Atwood (1991: 176; 178; 181; 194), and Høisæter (2020: 591; 595).

in the same way as *aṃtag̲i* would, in my interpretation, be a derivative with the essentially synonymous *i*-suffix from *aṃtag̲a** 'district'.

A potential problem for my etymology (and the reason I did not include it among the secure etymologies of §3.2.1) is the lack of evidence for the use of *aṃtag̲a** as an administrative unit in the Niya documents. It would, however, not seem impossible that one of the inherited denominations for administrative units, e.g. *pradeśa* / *pradeja̲* 'district', was considered equivalent to *aṃtag̲a** and therefore used instead.

Bactr. ανδαγο lacks cognates in the other Middle Iranian languages.[228] On this ground, I consider donor languages other than Bactrian less likely.

18. *are* 'a half'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *are*: CKD 2 (9x); *ara*: CKD 176

The Niya Prakrit word *are* occurs in lists modifying the unit of measurement *khi* (on which see Appendix 1 s.v.). Based on this observation, Burrow (LKD: 77 s.v.) made the plausible suggestion that *are* comes from an outcome of OIr. **arda-ka*- 'half', although **arda*- 'idem' (as in e.g. Av. *arəδa*-) could work too (see just below).[229]

---

[228] The etymology of ανδαγο is debated. Sims-Williams (BD II: 191) hesitatingly derives the word from **anta-ka*- 'border'. This derivation would be semantically plausible, as a development from 'border' to 'territory (e.g. land, city)' occurs in other languages (cf. Buck 1949: 1305). Yet, a drawback to Sims-Williams' etymology is that there is no other Iranian evidence for **anta-ka*-, which is mainly based on a comparison with Skt. *anta*- 'border'. As such, the alternative etymology from OIr. **han-tāka*- independently proposed by Humbach (2002: 417) and Tremblay (2003: 124 fn. 13) remains worth considering. Semantically, this idea is admittedly somewhat unclear, but it still has the advantage to compare ανδαγο with the semantically close ωδαγο 'district', for which a derivation from **awa-tāka*- can hardly be doubted (cf. BD II: 281). As my proposal on Niya *aṃtag̲i* is independent of the ultimate etymology of ανδαγο, I nonetheless prefer to leave the issue undecided for now.

[229] Meanwhile, Falk (2001: 312f. = 2013a: 51f.) also discovered a Kharoṣṭhī numerical symbol for ½ (the discussion of this symbol in Fan 2020 should be corrected in view of Falk's argument). The symbol ½ is normally written after the unit of measurement it modifies (cf. e.g. *khi* ½ in CKD 131), whereas *are* is put in front of *khi*. This discrepancy is due to a general tendency in Niya Prakrit to write numerical symbols after the nouns they modify. This "typical accounting usage" also occurs in Iranian languages (Sims-Williams 2023: 90) and may, in my

One can eliminate most of the relevant Middle Iranian languages as the source of Niya *are* for phonological reasons. Because of the *-l-* in *hala-* 'half' < **arda-* (DKS: 470), Khotanese cannot be the donor language, while Parthian and Sogdian are excluded since in these languages the cluster **-rd-*is either preserved as such (Parthian) or continued as *-rδ-* (Sogdian).

Seeing that none of the known Middle Iranian languages develops **-rd-* into ***-r-*, it seems most plausible that the *-r-* in *are* 'half' results from a simplification of the Bactrian cluster -ρλ- /rl/ < **-rd-* (see further §4.3.25). If we follow Burrow in opting for OIr. **arda-ka-*, one can reconstruct the Bactrian source of *are* as *αρλαγο /arləgə/ 'half'. In this case, the final *-e* in *are* can be the result of a lenition process from **araga* > **arae* > *are* (cf. LKD: §16; §74). Alternatively, *are* could be borrowed from an obl.sg. or dir.pl. *αρλε /arle/ 'halve(s)' ← *αρλο /arlə/ < **arda-*, for which see the discussion in §4.4.3. For the phonological development, compare the attested Bactrian word αρλο 'side, bank (of a ditch)' < **arda-*.

19. *aśpista* 'lucerne'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *aśpista*: CKD 214 (2x); 272

Niya *aśpista* is mentioned as part of a horse's provisions (CKD 214 *aśpaṣa … parivanae*) and as a type of fodder (CKD 272 *ghaṣa*). It is therefore highly likely, as Burrow (TKD: 40) was the first to note, that *aśpista* is an Iranian loanword connected to, amongst others, MP *aspast* 'clover, lucerne' (CPD: 12), NP *aspist / supust* 'trefoil, clover' (CPED: 48; 652), and Psht. *špešta* 'lucerne' (EDP: 80).[230] For Old Iranian, this word for 'lucerne' can be reconstructed as **aspa-sti-*, a compound of **aspa-* 'horse' < PIr. **aćwa-* and **sti-* 'food' < PIr. **Hsti-* < PIE **h₁d-ti-* (Mayrhofer 1985).[231]

---

view, have originated in Aramaic, where numeral signs are also written after the noun; cf. e.g. the "lists of supplies and labels" in ADAB (174ff.).

[230] This Iranian word for 'lucerne' was also transmitted to Elamite and various Semitic languages, including Syriac (Iranica: §4.2.144; §4.2.162; §4.4.20.2; Ciancaglini 2008: 112).

[231] Since PIr. **aćwa-* 'horse' is continued as OP *asa-* and not as ***aspa-*, MP *aspast* < OP **aspa-sti-* should be a loan from another Iranian language (possibly "Median" seeing that "lucerne" is called μηδική 'Median plant' in Greek). Because of the initial laryngeal of PIr. **Hsti-* 'food', the short medial **-a-* in **aspa-sti-* is somewhat peculiar. Mayrhofer therefore argues that the creation of the compound is to be dated after the loss of the initial laryngeal (1985: 169 fn. 20).

Concerning the identification of the donor language of Niya *aśpista*, Bailey (1949a: 121f.; 1949b: 167; 1960: 82; DKS: 12) could already exclude Khotanese since this language has a slightly different word for 'lucerne', i.e. *aśpara-*. I should like to add that the vowel *-i-* in *aśpista* renders several other languages unlikely donors too, for it seems that in the source of *aśpista* the word-internal *-*a-* in **aspa-sti-* has been raised to *-*i-*. Such raising did not happen in MP *aspast,* which only later developed into NP *aspist* (and variants), nor would one expect such raising in Parthian or Sogdian.[232] I therefore concur with Harmatta (1960: 206f.) that *aśpista* is probably a Bactrian loanword. Although the word for 'lucerne' is not attested in this language, *i*-umlaut (SFBG: 65) leads one to expect Bactr. *ασπιστο 'lucerne' < **aspa-sti-*,[233] a form which fits well with the vocalism of Niya *aśpista.*

If, as I tentatively assume (§2.2.4.2), the type of palatalisation observable in MBactr. *wyś(p)* ~ οισ(π)ο 'all' < **wispa-* was already current in Kuṣāṇa Bactrian, *ασπιστο would be phonologically /aspiśtə/. Consequently, the Bactrian cluster -στ- /śt/ in *ασπιστο would have to correspond to a non-palatal *-st-* in Niya *aśpista*. This correspondence is entirely understandable as ***-śt-* is a phonotactically prohibited cluster in Niya Prakrit (cf. §3.2.2 s.v. *saste*). The cluster *-śp-* in *aśpista* has probably nothing to do with the pronunciation of Bactr. *ασπιστο since it finds a straightforward explanation in a folk etymological influence from the Niya word for horse, i.e. *aśpa*.[234]

One final note: the Bactrian origin of Niya *aśpista* also dovetails with the documented spread of lucerne cultivation from the Iranian world to both China and India in antiquity (Laufer 1919: 208–219).

Alternatively, the compound may have been folk etymologically adapted to **aspa-* (Sasha Lubotsky p.c.).

[232] The Sogdian name *'spst* cited in DMMP (55) should rather be read as *'spstyy* (DMSB^2: 28) and is probably not related to the word for 'lucerne' (see Colditz 2018: no. 158).

[233] Alternatively, one could compare the raising of *-*a-* to Bactr. -ι- /i/ in λιστο 'hand' < **dasta-*. Since the exact reason behind this change is, however, unclear (cf. §3.2.4 s.v. *lastuga*), it is difficult to use λιστο as a parallel for the reconstructed *ασπιστο.

[234] Note nevertheless that the σπ- /sp/ in Bactr. σπαλο* 'army' < **spāda-* is also rendered as *śp-* in Gāndhārī (e.g. CKI 230 gen.sg. *śpalasakarita(*sa)* 'worshipped by an army'), without there being any reason to suspect a folk etymology.

20. *Khotaṃna* ‘Khotan’

Attestations of the base form

ABL.SG. *Khotaṃnade*: CKD 248; 272 (3x); 283; 289; 291; 329; 333; 341; 349; 351; 357; 358; 362 (2x); 368; 379; 400; 403; 578; 584; 637

LOC.SG. *Khotaṃnaṃmi*: CKD 14 (2x); 22; 135 (2x); 214; 223; 248; 251; 253; 362 (2x); 367; 400; 403; 584; 637 (2x); *Khotaṃnami*: CKD 14 (2x); *Khotanaṃmi*: CKD 388

Derivatives

ADJ.DIR.SG. *Khotaṃni* ‘Khotanese’: CKD 36; 180 (2x); 216 (2x); 296; 322 (2x); 335; 438; 517 (2x); 583; 622; 823; *Khotani*: CKD 30 (2x); 592; *Khotaṃniya*: CKD 330; *Khotaniya*: CKD 549

ADJ.DIR.PL. *Khotaṃniye* ‘idem’: CKD 86; 333; 625; 881; *Khotaniye*: CKD 376; 415 (3x); *Khodani*: CKD 686

ADJ.GEN.PL. *Khotaṃniyana* ‘idem’: CKD 471; 494 (2x); 735; *Khotaniyana*: CKD 516; *Khotaṃniyāna*: CKD 399

Compounds

DIR.SG. *Khotanamaharaya* ‘great king of Khotan’: CKD 661

GEN.SG. *Khotaṃnamaharayaṣa* ‘idem’: CKD 214

LOC.SG. *Khothanaraṃjiyami* ‘kingdom of Khotan’: CKD 895

Recently, Dragoni (2023a: 293f.; 304; 2023b: 48f.) noted that the Niya Prakrit designation for neighbouring Khotan was probably not borrowed from the Khotanese endonym *hvatana-* ‘Khotan(ese)’ directly, as the rendering of Khot. *hva-* (phonetically approximately [ɦʷa]) with Niya *kho-* would be unexpected. Observing the close connections between Khotan and Bactria in Kuṣāṇa times evidenced by the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins, Dragoni plausibly argues that Niya *Khotaṃna* was instead borrowed via Bactrian.[235]

One can debate how to reconstruct the Bactrian donor form of Niya *Khotaṃna*, and Dragoni (2023a: 294; 2023b: 49) lists the following possibilities: *χο/ωτανο, *χο/ωδανο, *χοατανο, or *χοαδανο. Out of these, the last two seem most plausible to me, because of the lack of good parallels for an early Bactrian development of χοα- /xwa/ to χω- /xō/ or χο- /xu/. The only assumption needed is that the sequence *-*wa*- in *χοαδανο /xwadanə/ (or *χοατανο /xwatanə/) is rendered as -*o*- in Niya Prakrit. Parallels for this sound substitution are given in §4.3.1 (cf. also LKD: §7).

[235] The plausibility of Dragoni’s proposal is further enhanced by the fact that Khotan Pkt. *Suliga* ‘Sogdian’ was probably borrowed via Bactrian too (§3.2.1 s.v.).

21. *jenavida* 'chief of the armour'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *jenavida*: CKD 506

Niya *jenavida* is a hapax legomenon; but given that this word stands in front of the combination of an official title and a personal name (*caṃkura Kuviñeya*), it is likely to be another title, even if its more precise meaning cannot be established based on the Niya evidence alone.

Harmatta (1960: 217–219; 1964b: 376) convincingly suggested that *jenavida* is a loan from Bactr. ζηνοβιδο /zēnəvidə/, a title occurring in the Palamedes inscription and an obvious cognate of Inscriptional MP *zynpt* and Inscriptional Parth. *zynpty* < **zaina-pati*- 'chief of the armour' (cf. also Henning 1960: 50 fn. 9 = 1977 II: 548 fn. 9).[236]

The sound correspondences between *jenavida* and ζηνοβιδο /zēnəvidə/ do not need to be commented on, except to remark that the foreign *z* is here apparently substituted with *j* and not with *jh*, as is more common; §2.1.7.1 and §4.3.19 treat this substitution in more detail.

22. *nihaṃñ*- 'to deposit, to put down'

Attestations of the base form
PRET.3PL. *nihañitaṃti*: CKD 746
GERV. *nihaṃñitavo*: CKD 283; *nihaṃñitavya*: CKD 291
INF. *nihaṃñanae*: CKD 331

The meaning of the verb *nihaṃñ*- is most clearly visible from its occurrence in CKD 291, where it is stipulated that corn (*aṃna*) should be deposited (*nihaṃñitavya*) in a place called Piṣali.[237] See (3.12).

(3.12) CKD 291 obverse 4f.
yahi eda anadilekha atra eśati praṭha sā aṃna cavala saṃgalitavo dui bhaga juṭhi eka bhaga sahini uṭa 20 20 tre tre milima nadha kartavo dui vara Piṣaliyaṃmi nihaṃñitavya
"When this letter of command reaches you, forthwith that corn is quickly to be collected. Forty camels are to be given loads of three *milima* each

[236] Two more Bactrian titles ending in -βιδο were borrowed into Niya Prakrit; see §3.2.1 s.vv. *daśavida* and *śadavida.*
[237] In CKD 331, *nihaṃñ*- is used for the abandonment of a child. The attestations in CKD 283; 746 unfortunately occur in a badly preserved context.

> (each load consisting) of two parts *juṭhi* and one part *sahini*. (The remaining) two loads are to be deposited at Piṣali." (after TKD: 52; for the translation of *dui vara* as two loads, see §3.3.3 s.v. *vara*).

It has proved more challenging to find a convincing etymology. Burrow (LKD: 101 s.v. *nihañ*) hesitatingly suggested that *nihaṃñ-* is a cognate of OIA *ni* + √*khan*. The latter means, however, 'to dig', so Burrow's suggestion is semantically not entirely attractive. Formally, it is not either, as Burrow is forced to explain the constant palatal *-ñ-* in *nihaṃñ-* as "due to native phonetic tendencies" (cf. also Burrow 1935b: 671). Baums and Glass (2002a– s.v.) try to solve the latter problem by deriving *nihaṃñ-* from the passive stem *nikhanya-* 'to be dug', but this proposal is rendered unlikely by the fact that passive stems have largely been lost in Niya Prakrit (cf. LKD: §94). For the same reason, Baums and Glass' (2002a– s.v.) alternative derivation from *nihanya-* 'to be hit' is implausible too; they moreover attribute a meaning 'to implant' to *nihanya-* which is not easily derived from the literal meaning 'to be hit' and does not fit well with the occurrences of Niya *nihaṃñ-*.

My proposal is that *nihaṃñ-* is borrowed from Bactr. *νιυανζ- /nihanź/ < **ni-θanǰa-* 'to hold back > to deposit, to put down' (cf. EDIV: 391f.).[238] The reconstruction of this Bactrian verb can be supported by the existence of (i) a corresponding noun ναυαγγο < **ni-θanga-* 'adjacent, environs' (BD II: 239) and (ii) cognate verbs in other Middle Iranian languages, e.g. Khot. *nuhaṃj-* 'to hold back > open' (SGS: 59f.), MMP *nihenz-* 'to hold back > refrain', and Parth. *nihenǰ-* 'idem' (DMMP: 242). The reason to consider *nihaṃñ-* a loanword from Bactrian is that the vocalism of *nihaṃñ-* fits better with *νιυανζ- /nihanź/ than with the cognates in the other languages.[239]

My etymology requires that the Bactrian verb was originally borrowed into Gāndhārī as **nihaṃj-* or the like and underwent a subsequent loss of the voiced consonant as in Gandh. *kuñaru* 'elephant' < *kuñjara-* (DhP^{K} 123; 132, cf. §2.1.5). Since more (potentially) Bactrian loanwords into Niya Prakrit seem to have still undergone this sound change (see §4.3.29), this requirement is not too much of a problem.

---

[238] For the phonology, cf. Bactr. αλφανζ- /əlfanź/ < *λφανζ- (cf. pret. λφαχτο in DN$_1$ 6f.) 'to acquire' < **θwanǰa-* (BD II: 190). The preverb **ni-* often develops to να- or νο- /nə/ in Bactrian, but in texts before 380 AD a more archaic form νι- /ni/ < **ni-* can still be found (SCBD: 63, see also §3.2.3 s.v. *nihala*).

[239] *nuhaṃj-* is already attested in Old Khotanese (SGS: 59f.), but I must admit that we do not know exactly when **ni-* developed to *nu-* in Khotanese.

23. *picara* '(mark of) honour'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *picara*: CKD 107; 206; 247;[240] 288; 377; 395; 756; CKM 267

The lexeme *picara* seems to have a positive connotation. To begin with, *picara* occurs in the compound *picaradivyavarṣaśatayupramaṃna* '(with) a life span of a 100 divine and *picara* years',[241] one of the wishes the author of a letter can extend to his addressee. In addition, the word *picara* can occur in the context of gift giving. In (3.13), the writers of the document reassure their correspondent that they will send him a present which they consider *picara*, evidently something positive.

(3.13) CKD 288 cover-tablet reverse 2–4
pačadara Dharmapriyaṣa hastaṃmi lekha prahuḍa preṣiśama yo tehi picara syati[242] *Yiliyaṣa paride raju 1 Namilg̱aae paride lastug̱a 1*
"Later we will send a letter and present in the hand of Dharmapriya, which will be (a) *picara* for you—from Yili one rope, and from Namilg̱a one *lastug̱a*." (after TKD: 52).

Further confirmation that *picara* refers to a positive characteristic comes from the verbs with which the word occurs in its sole attestation in a South Asian Gāndhārī text, here cited as (3.14).

(3.14) BC 4 verso 1f.
*yaṣabhuda picara ahiva<*di>da[va] codidava ca ś̱aṣ̱idava ca*
"according to [their] *picara* [they] should be saluted and exhorted and commended." (after Schlosser 2022: 129).

Thomas (1934a: 66 fn. 9; 1936a: 792f.), Burrow (LKD: 104f. s.v.; TKD: 52; 76), and Schlosser (2022: 129; 187f.; 307) translate *picara* as 'worthy', 'merit', or 'desert'. These translations are partially based on a supposed etymological connection with Skt. *pratyarham* 'worthily' (attested via *yathāpratyarham* 'according to merit'; MW: 842). As noted in LKD (104f. s.v.), this etymology is phonologically problematic since, depending on how far

[240] Read in this document *picara* and not *piṃcara* (as per KD: 94). The relevant akṣara seems to be a 𐨨 *pi* with a footmark type 1 (Glass 2000: 24).
[241] The compound occurs (with insignificant spelling variants) in CKD 107; 206; 247; 395.
[242] Note the parallel *picara siyati* in the fragmentarily preserved CKD 377.

lenition has gone, *prati-* by default develops to Gandh. *paṭi-* / *paḍi-* / *paḍ̲i-* and not to ***pic-* (cf. Baums 2009: 141f.).[243]

I would propose to equate *picara* with Bactr. πιδοφαρο /pidfarə/ '(mark of) honour' (BD II: 256), a word which was also borrowed into Sogdian as *ptfr-* 'honour' (also *pδfr-*; *pδβr-*; cf. Sims-Williams 2004a: 541 fn. 8; DMSB^2: 180f.). In an attempt to prove that their semantics resemble each other closely, I will first compare the usage of *picara* and πιδοφαρο. The phonological details of the etymology will be dealt with below.

A first type of context πιδοφαρο is used in are openings to letters; (3.15) is an example of this kind.

(3.15) xm 4–8

μισιδο αḷσιχτογιμο αζο μαρηγο μαρδο σαγονδο το χοηο ṭαρο λρογηιο οτο ασιδουανο βαγανο αβηζαρηιο αλο αργαο αλο πιδοφαρο σαγονδο το χοηο αζανο ταδομο το χοηο πιδο χοβο βιζαο ναβισο οτο βαδο βοανο.

"Moreover, I, (your) serving man, am desirous that your lordship there should be healthy, and should be free from annoyance from the lords, with respect (and) with honour (αλο πιδοφαρο), as your lordship deserves. So your lordship in your goodness should write to me, and I shall be happy." (BD II: 156f.).

Although Bactr. αλο πιδοφαρο 'with honour' in the above sentence is not precisely parallel to the compound *picaradivyavarṣaśatayupramaṃna* 'with a life span of a 100 divine and *picara* years' in Niya Prakrit, the overall sense is the same: the author of the letter wishes *picara* / πιδοφαρο, i.e. 'honour', for his addressee.[244]

Secondly, πιδοφαρο occurs in the context of gift giving in (3.16).

---

[243] Mindful of this problem, Thomas (1936a: 792f.) argued in favour of a regressive dissimilation of the first *r* in *pratyarha-*, but even this ad hoc account leaves the vowel *i* in *picara* still unexplained. In addition, Thomas' etymology presupposes OIA *-rh-* to have become Niya *-r-*, even though elsewhere *-rh-* is broken up by a *svarabhakti* vowel (LKD §10) or continued as *-h-* (*yahi* 'if' < OIA *yarhi* 'when'; Schlosser 2022: 225f.; 258; 311).

[244] For a comparable example, cf. ch 7f.: τακαλδανο ασο το χοηο λρογοασταṇọ νιγạυạṇο οḍ̣ο πιḍ̣ọφαρο ταδο χοζο βαδο βοοạνο "If I should hear from your lordship (of your) health and honour, then I should be well pleased" (BD II: 82f.). One should moreover note that both in this passage and xm 4–8 πιδοφαρο co-occurs with βαδο βο(ο)ανο 'I will be pleased' similar to how *picara* pairs together with *ṣadosmi* 'I am pleased' (§3.2.1 s.v. *ṣada*) in the opening of CKD 247.

(3.16) al 17–19
ο̣τ̣ο̣μ̣ο̣ λ̣[αδο] φ̣α̣ρ̣ο̣ οιριβ̣τ̣ο̣μ̣ιβ̣ο ι χοη̣[οι]ν̣α̣μωσ̣ο̣γ̣α̣ν̣ο̣ ο̣δ̣ο̣ πιδο̣φ̣[αρο] δι̣ν̣α̣ρ̣ο̣ β̣’
“And I [gave], (as) an offering and (mark of) ho[nour] (πιδοφαρο) for Wirishtmish the lord, two dinars.” (BD I^2: 164f.).

If read and interpreted correctly, (3.16) is similar to the Niya example (3.13) discussed above, where the relative clause *yo tehi picara syati* can also be translated as “which will be a (mark of) honour for you”.[245]

Now that the semantic overlap between *picara* and πιδοφαρο has been illustrated, it remains to clarify the phonological details of the proposed equation. It would namely be unexpected that Bactr. πιδοφαρο /pidfarə/ were borrowed as *picara* and not as ***pitvara* or something similar.

A glance at the etymology of πιδοφαρο helps to remedy this problem. πιδοφαρο is, as observed by Sims-Williams (BD II: 256), cognate with MMP *padixšar* ‘honour, dignity, rank’ and Parth. *padišfar* ‘honour’ (DMMP: 273f.), and thus to be derived from OIr. **pati-fšarV-*.[246] I therefore propose that *picara* was borrowed from a dialect form *πιδοþαρο /pidšarə/, in which the cluster **-fš-* in **pati-fšarV-* was simplified to -þ- /š/ and not to -φ- /f/ as in the attested πιδοφαρο. This proposal would be closely paralleled by the idea that there were two dialectal outcomes of OIr. **xšāθriya-* in Bactrian, i.e. χαρο /xă̆rə/ ‘khar, ruler’ with **xš-* > χ- /x/ and *þηρο /šērə/ ‘idem’ → Arabic *šyr* / *š’r* with **xš-* > *þ- /š/ (Sims-Williams 1997a: 15f.; BD II: 277; Khan 2007: 16f.). It also solves the problem of the *-c-* in *picara* as there are two potential parallels for the assumed correspondence between Bactr. -δοþ- /dš/ and Gandh. *-c-* (see §3.2.3 s.vv. *aco*; *picav-* and §4.3.18).[247]

In brief, the semantic match between Gandh. *picara* and Bactr. πιδοφαρο makes it likely that the two are etymologically related. Yet, in light of the uncertainty about the reconstruction of the exact donor form, including *picara* with the secure etymologies of §3.2.1 is still not merited.

---

[245] The meaning ‘honour’ also fits the occurrence of *picara* in BC 4 cited supra.
[246] For the phonological development of **fš* in Middle Persian and Parthian, cf. MP *šārs-* < **xšārs-* and Parth. *šfars-* ‘to be ashamed’ < **fšars-* (DMMP: 315; EDIV: 92).
[247] Another, in my opinion less likely, option would be to assume that *picara* was borrowed from a more archaic form that still preserved the cluster **-fš-* in **pati-fšarV-* or had metathesised it to **-šf-* as in Parth. *padišfar*.

24. *maḱa* ‘bean’

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *maḱa*: CKD 401;[248] 505; 713 (2x); 714

The semantics and etymology of *maḱa* have been treated in Schoubben (2021: 50–52), so a summary of the conclusions reached in that article will suffice here.

Semantically, the attestations of *maḱa* point to the conclusion that this word refers to a food product that can be preserved relatively well, as it is, for instance, given as provisions for a long journey through the desert (cf. CKD 401; 505).

The previously proposed etymologies for *maḱa* do not stand closer scrutiny. Burrow (1935b: 673; LKD: 110 s.v.) used this word as an argument for his “Tocharian C” hypothesis by comparing TA *malke* ‘milk’ (DTTA: 332). This etymology requires, however, an unlikely substitution of TA *-lk-* with Niya *-ḱ-*, the latter representing the combination of a sibilant and *-k-* (§2.1.6). Taking account of the default value of Niya 𐞀 *ḱa*, Bailey (1946a: 796f.) made an alternative comparison with Sogd. *m’škh* (and variants). Yet, seeing that the basic meaning of *m’škh* is ‘substance, matter, capital’ and not ‘meat’ as claimed by Bailey (SD: 208f.; DMSB^2: 129), this idea is unconvincing for semantic reasons.

In the article, I proposed that *maḱa* is a loanword from an unattested Bactrian word *μαþκο /māškə/ < **māša-kă-* ‘bean’, a cognate of, amongst others, Pers. *māš* ‘bean’ < **māša-* (see Kümmel 2017: 284). The required syncope of the internal *-*a-* in **māša-kă-* fits a Bactrian source, and Sogdian is excluded as the donor because its word for ‘bean’, i.e. *mwškh*, has a different vocalism in its first syllable, continuing **muša-kă-* (a typically East Iranian form). The etymology furthermore dovetails with the historically documented spread of bean cultivation to China from Iranian-speaking regions more to the west (cf. Laufer 1919: 305–308), and the amount of linguistic reconstruction needed for it is minimal.[249] Therefore, I include it among the plausible etymologies.

---

[248] As pointed out in Schoubben (2021: 50), there is no reason to read *maḱe* instead of *maḱa* in CKD 401 (KD: 144 fn. 2 ad locum; TKD: 82).

[249] Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.) wondered whether the unexplained word μαþτρο in df 5, denoting some commodity (BD II: 232), could be a misreading of *μαþκο. Yet, doc. df is unfortunately badly readable at this crucial point.

25. *milima*, a unit of measure

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *milima*:[250] CKD 131 (2x); 142; 151 (2x); 154 (5x); 168 (2x); 175; 207; 225 (5x); 282; 329 (2x); 345 (10x); 387; 456; 460 (2x); 465; 467; 476; 495; 536 (6x); 547 (2x); 574 (3x); 579; 580; 581; 608; 637 (7x); 648; 655; 662; 718; 762 (3x); 763; 774 (2x); 801; 828; 868

DIR.PL. *milima*: CKD 60; 67 (6x); 89 (2x); 93 (2x); 94 (5x); 98; 104; 108; 121 (2x); 122; 131 (8x); 140; 146 (4x); 154 (3x); 181; 200 (3x); 207 (5x); 225 (4x); 282; 291 (2x); 292; 309; 345 (2x); 349; 463; 468 (2x); 477 (3x); 478 (2x); 505 (2x); 527 (4x); 530; 536; 539 (2x); 547 (8x); 549 (2x); 567; 575 (2x); 585; 603; 634; 637 (5x); 659; 668; 703 (4x); 740; 762; 765; 776; 795; 796; 797 (2x); 839; 868 (3x); 869 (2x); 882; 897 (3x); *milimaṃ*: CKD 25 (3x)

GEN.PL. *milimana*: CKD 595

Derivatives

ADJ.DIR.SG. *milimi* 'with a capacity of X *milima*': CKD 422; 496; 580 (2x); 652; 654; 677; 678; 715; 782; 805 (?); *milimī*: CKD 422; *milimiye*: CKD 808.

milima is a unit employed in the Niya documents for measuring commodities such as corn and wine. It corresponds to 20 *khi*, another unit of measure (on which cf. Appendix 1 s.v.).

It is generally accepted that *milima* goes back to the Ancient Greek measure μέδιμνος, as first pointed out by Thomas (*apud* KD: 363). Because of the correspondence between Gr. -δ- (either /d/ or /ð/) and Niya *-l-*, an unattested Bactrian intermediary should probably be posited,[251] even though other Greek loanwords in Bactrian were admittedly no longer affected by lambdacism (**d* > λ /l/).[252] Potentially, μέδιμνος was borrowed

[250] The instances of *milima* classified as dir.sg. are those followed by the numerical sign "1" and those for which it is contextually clear that a singular is intended. All other instances, including debatable cases, have been placed under the heading dir.pl. (which for this word is more frequent than dir.sg.).

[251] Cf. Tremblay (2001: 25 fn. 37) and Sims-Williams (2002: 229; BD II: 232), building further on Burrow (1935a: 785; LKD: 111 s.v.) and Lüders (1936b: 640f.). As discussed in Lurje & Yakubovich (2017), there is no decisive evidence favouring a Sogdian dialect with lambdacism. I further agree with Tremblay (ibid.) that the Sogdian unit of measure *myδ'mβn*, also borrowed from μέδιμνος, need not have passed through a Bactrian intermediary, as its form is difficult to reconcile with that of Niya *milima*.

[252] The relevant examples are the month name δηματριγανο / δ(δ)ρηματιγανο which is based on Gr. Δημήτηρ, δ(δ)ιναρο / Διναρο 'dinar' ← Gr. δηνάριον ← Latin *denarius*, and Δραχμο / δδραχμο 'dirham, drachma' ← Gr. δραχμή.

slightly earlier, at a time when lambdacism had not yet stopped operating entirely.[253]

The sound correspondence between the -ε- /e/ in Gr. μέδιμνος and the first -*i*- in Niya *milima* is not necessarily due to the hypothesised Bactrian intermediary. Gr. -ε- /e/ could namely also be rendered as -*i*- in Gāndhārī names of Greek origin for which no Bactrian intermediary should be posited, e.g. *Alikasudara* (SHĀH XIII; MĀN XIII) ← Ἀλέξανδρος and *Telipha* (CKC 121; 122) ← Τήλεφος (cf. VG^3: 64). Yet, one still cannot exclude that the vowel raising did happen in Bactrian. Gr. -ε- /e/ could, for instance, have been substituted with Bactr. -ι- /i/, parallel to the rendering of Gr. -ο- /o/ as Bactr. -ο- /u/ in χϸονο /xšunə/ '(calendar/regnal) year' ← χρόνος (§3.2.1 s.v.). If this were the case, the immediate source of *milima* is to be reconstructed as *μιλιμνο /milimnə/ rather than *μελιμνο /melimnə/ (cf. also §4.3.3).

As can be seen from these reconstructions, I believe that the Greek cluster -μν- /mn/ was preserved unchanged when μέδιμνος was borrowed into Bactrian. I think so because the phrase οβεινα ζαμνα 'at that time' (Ayrtam 5) and the conjunction κιζαμνιδο 'as soon as' (BD II: 222) show -μν- /mn/ to be a phonotactically permissible cluster in Bactrian. Consequently, Bactr. -μν- /mn/ should have been simplified to -*m*- in Niya Prakrit, which seems plausible, as -*mn*- probably was not a standard cluster in Niya Prakrit. The only word to contain such a cluster is the dis legomenon *ṣamnera* 'novice' (CKD 415, 2x), an exceptional form secondarily syncopated from the better-attested *ṣamanera* < OIA *śrāmaṇera*-.[254]

In short, deriving *milima* via Bactr. *μελιμνο / *μιλιμνο out of Gr. μέδιμνος is both formally and semantically convincing, but since *μελιμνο / *μιλιμνο is not attested in Bactrian, I did not include it among the secure etymologies.

[253] On the chronology of Bactrian lambdacism, see de Blois (2013: 269f.), who dates lambdacism to the Late Achaemenid period based on loanword evidence (cf. also Kreidl 2021: 176f.). In view of *milima* (not taken into consideration by de Blois), lambdacism may still have been operative at the beginning of the Hellenistic period, when contact with Greek increased.

[254] Cf. CKD 288 *ṣama(ṃ)nera* (2x); 358 *śramanera*; 466 *Ṣamanera*; 535 *Ṣamanera* (2x); 569 *Ṣamaṃnera* (3x); 727 *Ṣamanera*. The capitalised occurrences are personal names. In other forms of Gāndhārī, a cluster -*mn*- is never found.

26. *yatma* ‘measurer of rations’

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *yatma*: CKD 23; 37; 59; 146 (2x); 272; 275; 291; 305; 307 (2x); 326; 374 (3x); 428; 430 (3x); 439; 444 (2x); 546; 571; 581 (2x); 582; 586; 587; 589 (2x); 590; 599; 640; 715; 765; 797 (2x); 817 (4x); 880; 881 (3x)
DIR.PL. *yatma*: CKD 590
GEN.PL. *yatmana*: CKD 714[255]

It has been evident since Burrow (LKD: 113 s.v.) that the *yatma* is an official whose duties primarily involve collecting and conveying taxes (cf. also Atwood 1991; Høisæter 2020: 599). The *yatma* was in particular responsible for measuring out the correct amount of tax to be paid, as is said explicitly in (3.17) (note the gerv. *mavidavya* ‘to be measured’).

(3.17) CKD 146 obverse B3b–B4b
yatma Pogeyaṣa aṃna pruchidavya … sarva piṃḍa milima 20 4 ma[v]idavya
“The corn had to be asked by the *yatma* Pogeya. … The total to be measured (*mavidavya*) is 24 *milima*.” (tr. mine).

A comparable example is (3.18), where a *yatma* and an *ageta*, another type of tax collector (see §3.3.3 s.v.), should make sure that a sufficient amount of corn and wine is collected.

(3.18) CKD 307 obverse 5–7
yo ca adehi palýi saṃgalitaga hotu yaṃ ca aṃna masuẏena krinidavya siyaṃti taha krinidavya yatma agetaṣa piḍita maṃtra dadavya ma iṃ ci omaga siyati.
“Whatever tax (there is) from there, let it be collected. Also what corn had to be bought by (a payment of) wine, so let it be bought. Particular instructions must be given to the *yatma* and the *ageta* that nothing must be short.” (after TKD: 55).

As regards etymology, Harmatta (1960: 213) suggested that *yatma* is a *man*-derivative from the OIA root √*yat* ‘to arrange’. Such a form is, however,

[255] It remains unclear whether the word *yatmi* in CKD 349 is connected to the official title *yatma*. The relevant context runs as follows: *sā aṃna saṃgalidavo eda aṃnaṣa aṃña pajeka yatmi kartavo*, translated by Burrow (TKD: 67) as “This corn is to be collected. Of this corn another *yatmi* is to be made.” Could we translate *yatmi* e.g. as ‘measurement’ and assume that *yatmi* is a derivation of *yatma* with the *i*-suffix (so already Lüders 1940b: 43 fn. 1)?

nowhere attested, and *man*-derivatives are typically abstracts rather than agent nouns (cf. AiG II.2: 754–768).

Seeing that most bureaucratic titles in Niya Prakrit are loanwords and a *yatma* had to measure the ratio of taxes, I would rather propose that this title ultimately derives from an Old Iranian compound **yāta-mā-* 'measurer of rations' of the type **xšaθra-pā-* 'satrap'. My reconstruction **yāta-mā-* finds a close parallel in OIr. **yāta-kara-* 'assigner of rations', indirectly attested through Aram. *ytkr'* (Iranica: §4.4.7.134). *yāta-* on its own is attested twice in the Avesta (A 3.11; Vd 19.29), in both cases translated in Pahlavi as *bahr* 'portion, share' (Hintze 2007: 126f.). Middle Iranian cognates of **yāta-* are MP *yād* (CPD: 46) and Bactr. ιαδο /yādə/ (BD II: 215), both meaning 'share, ration'.

yatma would have to represent an outcome of **yāta-mā-* that has undergone syncope. Therefore, Bactrian appears to be the most plausible source language of the Niya word. *yatma* could either come from an early Bactrian form *ιαδμα /yādmă̆/, with final -α still preserved as in e.g. λογδα 'daughter' < **duxtā-* or þοδβα 'PN or title' < **čyuta-pā-* 'person responsible for the expenditures' (BPN: no. 557), or it could have been borrowed from a later form *ιαδμο /yādmə/.[256]

In brief, the Niya title *yatma* seems to continue a Bactrian compound *ιαδμα /yādmă̆/ (later *ιαδμο /yādmə/) < **yāta-mā-* 'measurer of rations'. This compound is admittedly not attested elsewhere in precisely this form. Yet, given that (i) **yāta-kara-* can count as a close parallel, (ii) ιαδο 'share, ration' < **yāta-* is attested in Bactrian, and (iii) *yatma* can be the (logical) subject of the Niya Prakrit cognate of PIr. *√*maH* 'to measure', I conclude that this etymology is sufficiently plausible to warrant inclusion in the present category of loanwords.

27. *vaṣe* 'garments'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.PL. *vaṣe*: CKD 534 (*vaṣe* 4 '4 garments').

The exact semantics of the Niya hapax *vaṣe* cannot be deduced from the context. Yet, the fact that *vaṣe* occurs in a list of (mostly) textile products

[256] The rendering of Bactr. -δμ- /dm/ as Niya *-tm-* and not as **-*dm-* is probably orthographic in nature; cf. §4.3.13. The root *√*maH* 'to measure' is continued in Bactrian in the verb φρομιι-, pret. φρομαδο 'to order' < **fra-māya-*, pret. **fra-māta-* and its derivatives (EDIV: 256).

makes Maggi's (2017: 157; 2022b: 152) comparison with the newly discovered Khotanese phrase 6 *baṣe* 'six garments' (90-YKC-40) sufficiently attractive.

The most likely source of Niya *vaṣe* and Khot. *baṣe*, Maggi argues, is Bactr. *οαþε /waše/, dir.pl. of *οαþο /wašə/ 'garment' < **wastra*- (cf. Av. *vastra*-).[257] The reconstruction of a dir.pl. would account for the final -*e* in Niya *vaṣe* / Khot. *baṣe*, and it fits with both words being used with a number higher than one (see above, cf. also §4.4.3).

28. *saste* 'day, elapsed'

Attestations of the base form

LOC.SG. *saste*: CKI 245; 328; 368; *sasteyaṃmi*:[258] CKD 329; 403; *ṣasteyaṃmi*: CKD 153

INS.PL. *sastehi*: CKI 152; 155; 159; 225; 245; 509; CKD 422; 656; 808.

The word *saste* 'day, elapsed' is found in the Niya documents and in inscriptions in South Asian Gāndhārī. In both types of texts, *saste* mainly occurs in dating formulae as in (3.19).[259]

(3.19) CKD 422 obverse 1f.
*saṃvatsaraye 3 maṣ(*e) 4 3 sast(*e)hi 4 4 maharaja̱ṣa raja̱tiraja̱ṣa mah. … ṣa Mahanuavaraja Tajaka devaputraṣa asti kṣunaṃmi …*
"In the 3rd year, 7th month, when 8 days had passed (*sast(*e)hi 4 4*) of the great king, the king of kings […], Tajaka, the king of great Nuava, the son of heaven — it is in his reign." (after TKD: 86).

According to Konow (1916: 809; 1924: 124; KI: 152; 167), *saste* would have been borrowed from an "Indo-Scythian" cognate of Khot. *sasta*-, the verbal adj. of *sad*- 'to appear' (SGS: 130f.). Yet, despite its having been accepted by

[257] For the phonology, cf. οαþο (MBactr. *wš*) 'hay' < **wāstra*-. For the rendering of Bactr. ο- /w/ as Niya *v*-, see §4.3.22.

[258] It is on the basis of the loc.sg. *sasteyaṃmi* (*ṣasteyaṃmi*) that the dir.sg. is generally set up as *saste**.

[259] It seems to have escaped notice that the ins.pl. *sastehi* (on which see below) is only used in dating formulae mentioning one of the three earliest kings of the Shanshan kingdom referred to in the Niya documents, i.e. Tajaka (CKD 422), Ro(ṃ)graka (CKD 808), and Pepiya (CKD 656). In the other documents, the inherited word *divasa* (with orthographic variants) is the standard word for 'day', also in dating formulae. For the relative chronology of the kings mentioned in the Niya documents, see Høisæter (2020: 96).

Burrow (1934: 514; LKD: 130 s.v. *sastehi*), Salomon (2003: 76 fn. 5), and others, Konow's etymology suffers from a few drawbacks. To begin with, the meaning 'day' is nowhere attested for Khot. *sasta-*, a point already made by Bailey (1949a: 127); *sasta-* instead means 'appeared, looked good', and the default word for 'day' in Khotanese is *haḍāa-* (DKS: 418f.; 447).[260] The chronological and geographical distribution of *saste* moreover suggests that this word for 'day' was not borrowed from the Indo-Scythians (Indic Śakas) but from the Kuṣāṇas: *saste* occurs almost exclusively in inscriptions from the Kuṣāṇa kings Kaniṣka and Huviṣka (Salomon 2003: 76f.; Baums 2018a: 63), and it is widespread in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions from Afghanistan, i.e. in texts from the heartland of the Kuṣāṇa empire (Falk 2003: 73 = 2013a: 66).

Because of the connection between *saste* and the Kuṣāṇa empire, it seems worthwhile to investigate the possibility of a Bactrian origin of *saste*. A plausible donor form would be Bactr. σαχτο 'day, elapsed', the earliest occurrence of which is cited below as (3.20). Etymologically, σαχτο derives from **saxta-*, the verbal adj. of the root *√*sač* 'to pass' (cf. EDIV: 324f.; BD II: 263; SCBD: 21).[261]

(3.20) NPlate 5–6
καλδι κανηϸκι ϸαο αμο ọηϸο αγαδο πιδο ι λαṣο χϸονα ṿẹịṣạνε μαε λασσο σαχτε
"When king Kanishka brought it to Wesh (it was) in the year ten, the month Nisan, the tenth day (λασσο σαχτε)." (Sims-Williams 2015: 257).

(3.20) shows that Bactr. σαχτο is used in the same type of dating formula as Gandh. *saste*.[262] Note, for instance, that σαχτο occurs side by side with χϸονο

[260] Aware of this problem, Burrow (LKD: 130 s.v. *sastehi*) drew a parallel with the semantic shift from 'that which shines' to 'day' undergone by OIr. **raučah-*. This parallel is, however, not quite exact given that the outcomes of *√*sand*, including Khot. *sad-*, do not mean 'to shine' (EDIV: 332).

[261] σαχτο instead of expected **σαγδο could be due to influence from the present stem σαχσ- < **sax-sa-* or σαχτο could be a dialect form. Given that the word already occurs in Kuṣāṇa times (see (3.20)), Gholami's suggestion (SFBG: 47) that σαχτο is a loanword from MP/Parth. *saxt* appears unlikely to me.

[262] Outcomes of the Iranian root *√*sač* 'to pass' are more generally used in dating formulae (cf. e.g. SD: 353; Yoshida 1996: 72 on Sogd. *sγty* 'passed, elapsed'). Konow (KI: 152) incidentally remarked on the similar usage of Gandh. *saste* and the derivatives of *√*sač*. Yet, he did not infer an etymological relationship between the two from his observation.

'calendar/regnal year',[263] in the same way that *saste* tends to co-occur with *kṣuna* ← χþovo (also in (3.19)). The derivation of *saste* from σαχτο thus receives support from phraseology.

My etymology requires Bactr. -χτ- /xt/ to have been rendered as Gandh. -*st*-. An exact parallel for this sound correspondence is lacking. Yet, one of the previously identified Iranian loanwords, i.e. Niya *nacīra* /naścīra/ 'hunting' ← **naxčīr* (§3.6 s.v., cf. also Epigraphical Skt. *naścīrapati*-), at least shows that /x/ could be substituted with a sibilant to accommodate foreign clusters to Gāndhārī phonotactics. In the case of *nacīra* /naścīra/, /x/ became a palatal sibilant, hence one might expect σαχτο to have become ***saśte*. But a cluster **-*śt*- is phonotactically inadmissible in Gāndhārī, so this could be a reason why σαχτο was instead approximated as *saste* (see further §4.3.27).[264]

Finally, deriving *saste* from σαχτο could account for the use of the form *sastehi* in dating formulae (including the one cited above). Although there seems to be no other option than to take *sastehi* as an ins.pl.,[265] Burrow (LKD: 130 s.v.) still hesitated to accept this morphological analysis because he considered the syntax of *sastehi* to be "by no means clear". In my view, the polysemy of Bactr. σαχτο helps to clarify the syntax. Since σαχτο means not only 'day' but also 'elapsed', the same could be applicable to *saste*. If so, *sastehi* may be an abbreviation for something like **divasehi sastehi* "with (X) days (*divasehi*) having elapsed (*sastehi*)", comparable to Bactr. σαχτο Αβαμοχοινο ρωσο "the day (ρωσο) Abamukhwin having elapsed (σαχτο)" (doc. A 1).[266]

In brief, the derivation of *saste* from Bactr. σαχτο 'day, elapsed' instead of from an "Indo-Scythian" cognate of Khot. *sasta*- 'appeared, looked good' is preferable for both historical and linguistic reasons: *saste* is a word that is strongly associated with Kuṣāṇa sources; there is an exact semantic match

[263] The same can be said about the two other attestations of σαχτο in A 1 and R 1 (where χþovo occurs in the later spelling αχþovo).
[264] For a possible explanation of the final -*e* in this word, see §4.4.3.
[265] Note moreover the combination of *sastehi* with the ins. *daśahi* 'ten' in CKI 155.
[266] One is further reminded of the Old Persian formula *X raučabiš θakatā āha* "X days have passed", where the ins.pl. *raučabiš* appears to be the subject of the sentence (cf. Konow 1938a: 155). As *θak*- is the Old Persian outcome of *√*sač*, there may be some historical connection, but the details remain unclear. Michaël Peyrot and Federico Dragoni (p.c.) have further reminded me of a similar use of the ins.pl. in Tumshuqese dating formulae, as in *bistyo patsyo* "with 25 (days passed)" (contract 4, line 2, cited from Dragoni 2020: 216).

between *saste* and σαχτο; and this new etymology of *saste* may explain the syntax of the ins.pl. *sastehi* employed in dating formulae.

3.2.3 Arguable etymologies

29. *aṃbukaya*, a title

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *aṃbukaya*: CKD 251 (2x)

The title *aṃbukaya* only occurs in CKD 251, and its precise meaning cannot be established from the context (LKD: 75 s.v.; TKD: 46). Given the phonetic similarity, it seems tempting to consider *aṃbukaya* to be the same word as Bactr. αμβουκαο /ambūkă̆(y)ə/ (?), a title held by the famous Kuṣāṇa official Nukunzuk in NPlate 1 (Sims-Williams 2015: 259).[267] This proposal should be treated with caution, though, since neither the exact meaning nor the etymology of αμβουκαο has as of yet been determined.[268]

30. *aco* 'frontier, border post'

Attestations of the base form

ABL.SG. *acoade*: CKD 152
LOC.SG. *acovaṃmi*: CKD 125[269]

Attestations as a PN

GEN.SG. *Acoaṣa*: CKD 374 (2x); *Acoṣa*: CKD 374

Derivatives

DIR.SG. *acoviṃna* 'border official': CKD 125; 133 (2x); 323; 563; *acovina*: CKD 139 (2x); 152

---

[267] The assumed correspondence between Bactr. -μ- /m/ and anusvāra would be due to the absence of a cluster **-*mb*- in Niya Prakrit. The -*y*- in Niya *aṃbukaya* remains puzzling.

[268] By the time of the Surkh Kotal inscription, Nukunzuk had been promoted to the rank of καραλραγγο 'margrave', so it is conceivable that αμβουκαο was a military title too. In view of the intervocalic -κ- /k/, one may want to posit a morpheme boundary between αμβου- and -καο (the latter perhaps from **kawi*- 'prince, giant, hero'?).

[269] Loukota (2024: 77) cautiously suggests resegmenting the sequence *Acokiṣgiya devataṣa* "of the deity Acokisgiya" in CKD 361 to *aco Kiṣgiya devataṣa*, in which case we would also have an attestation of the dir.sg. *aco.*

Compounds

LOC.SG. *Acomenaṃmi*, place name: CKD 637 (2x)

The semantic analysis of *aco* depends to some extent on that of the better-attested derivative *acoviṃna*. This derivative quite clearly denotes an official whose duty it was to look after border posts and report imminent danger (cf. e.g. CKD 139). On this basis, *aco* has been interpreted either as an 'errand' (Thomas 1935: 57–61) or as a 'frontier' or 'border post' (Burrow in LKD: 72 s.v.; TKD: 22). Since the attestations of *aco* leave little doubt that this noun refers to a physical place, the latter interpretation is preferable.[270]

In Thomas' opinion, *aco* would be an inherited word derived from a reconstructed OIA noun **ājava-* ← the preverb *ā* + √*jū* 'to hurry', but this etymology requires, as already remarked in LKD (72 s.v.), the implausible premise of intervocalic *-j-* being devoiced to *-c-*. In Niya Prakrit (not in other types of Gāndhārī), final *-o* is moreover a marker of loanwords, and seeing that the semantically closely related word *piro* 'military post, fort' has been argued to be borrowed from Bactrian (§3.2.3 s.v.), it seems worth investigating whether *aco* could also come from this language.

In my view, Niya *aco* 'frontier, border post' points to a so far unattested Bactrian noun *αδοþαοο /adšāwə/ < **ati-čyāwa-* 'the place where one crosses/enters' (cf. þαο- 'to go' < **čyawa-*, BD II: 283).[271] I am not aware of other Old or Middle Iranian words derived from **ati-čyāwa-*, which is the reason not to include *aco* among the plausible etymologies of §3.2.2. Yet, there is at least evidence for the underlying root **ati* + *√*čyaw* in the form of the Khotanese verb *ttätsu-* (*ttätsa-*) 'to cross' (SGS: 38; EDIV: 40–42), and the nominal formation **ati-čyāwa-* would be closely paralleled by **ati-gāma-*, the source of Sogd. *tγ'm* 'the place where one enters/crosses > ford' and Bactr. αδογαμο 'income (in a financial sense)' (SD: 386; Sims-Williams 2013: 195). The reconstruction of a Bactrian noun *αδοþαοο would thus not be too far-fetched.

Two substitutions are necessary to derive Niya Prakrit *aco* from *αδοþαοο /adšāwə/, both of which can be paralleled. First, Bactr. -δοþ- /dš/,

---

[270] CKD 125 obverse 2: *ari Apeṃnaṣa uṭa acovaṃmi ukasidavya* "The *ari* Apeṃna has to ride out on a camel to the *aco*" (TKD: 22). CKD 152 cover-tablet reverse 1: *itu uṿutaya acovina acoade tura nikhalidavo* "From now on (this) *acovina* … is to be removed from the *aco*" (TKD: 27).

[271] I opt for a Bactrian source because in no other known Middle Iranian language would we have at the same time preservation of the initial **a*, syncope of the internal **i*, and a development of **čy* to /š/.

phonetically conceivably [tʂ], would correspond here to the Niya voiceless palatal *-c-*, as in *picav-* 'to hand over' ← *πιδοþαο- < **pati-čyawa-* (§3.2.3 s.v. and see also §4.3.18). Second, the Bactrian final -αοο /āwə/ needs to have been rendered in Niya Prakrit as *-o(va)*, due to a colouring of /ā/ next to /w/. A potential parallel for this sound substitution is *badho* 'pledge, mortgage' ← *βαμδαοο /bāmdāwə/ ← *βαμδο 'loaned' < **apāmita-* + suffix -αο (see §3.2.3 s.v. and §4.3.1).

acoviṃna 'border official' is derived from *aco* with an adjectival suffix *-ina* 'related to' that occurs more often in Niya Prakrit loanwords (cf. Burrow 1935b: 672; LKD: §77). This suffix will be treated in more detail in §6.4.1.

It seems plausible that the word *aco* 'frontier, border post' is also found in a place name mentioned twice in (3.21).

(3.21) CKD 637 obverse 3f.
*taṃ kalaṃmi Aco<*me>naṃmi*[272] *aṃna nikhasta milima 1 khi 10 masu Acomenaṃmi khi 3 nikasta*
"At that time the expenditure of corn was 1 *milima* 10 *khi* in Aco<*me>na, and of wine 3 *khi* in Acomena." (after TKD: 132).

If this is correct, it is tempting to identify the second element *-mena* as Bactr. *μηυανο /mēhanə/ < OIr. **maiθana-* 'dwelling', a common element in Iranian place names.[273] The literal meaning of *Acomena* could be 'dwelling located at the border'. Deriving *-mena* from *μηυανο /mēhanə/ would require the loss of intervocalic *h* and subsequent vowel contraction during the borrowing process; for this, see §4.3.23.

In the same vein, another place name ending in *-mena*, i.e. *Remena*, could perhaps come from *ρη(ο)μηυανο /rē(w)mēhanə/ < **raiwa-maiθana-*, literally 'rich dwelling'. In this case, a comparison can be drawn with the attested Bactrian place name ρη(ο)γανο /rē(w)ganə/, as the latter likely also contains **raiwa-* 'rich' as its first part (BD II: 260; BPN: no. 394).

[272] So tentatively emended by me, in view of the spelling *Acomenaṃmi* later. It seems clear that the same place is meant twice.
[273] Cf. e.g. Bab. *Ú-ra-zu-me-ta-nu* ← OIr. **warāza-maiθana-* 'dwelling of the boars' (Iranica: §4.3.242) and Parth. *brzmytn* /barzmēθan/ (Diakonoff & Livshits 1977–2001: 189). For *Acomena*, Thomas (1935: 60) considers a different connection with Chin. *mén* 門 'gate', in (Early) Middle Chinese *mwon* (cf. Baxter & Sagart 2014: 63; 284; 288; 352). If I am correct that *aco* is a Bactrian word (cf. supra), it seems best to assume the same for *-mena*.

Coming back to *aco*, it can, with due caution, be concluded that it is a loanword from Bactr. *αδοþαοο /adšāwə/ < **ati-čyāwa*- 'the place where one crosses/enters'.

31. *aḍini* '(broomcorn) millet'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *aḍini*: CKD 222 (2x); 579; *aḍiṃni*: CKD 83; *aḍina*: CKD 722 (2x); *aḍiṃ*: CKD 140

It has been known since at least Burrow (LKD: 73 s.v.) that *aḍini*, whose -*ḍ*- stands for /ṛ/ (§§2.1.2; 2.1.6), refers to a certain crop. Further progress was made by Bailey (1948: 332), who could assign the meaning '(broomcorn) millet' to *aḍini* by comparing it to Dardic forms of the same meaning, i.e. Pashai *aṛ́ĩn* and Dameli *ärĩn* (cf. CDIAL: no. 195 for more forms).[274]

According to Morgenstierne (1942: 156) and Turner (CDIAL), Niya *aḍini* and its Dardic cognates would go back to OIA **aṇuni*-, a hypothetical derivative of the attested word *aṇu*- 'millet'. The main problem with this etymology is that it requires an ad hoc dissimilation of *-*ṇ*- to *-*ḍ*- supposedly induced by the *-*n*- later in the word. In addition, the vowel -*i*- in the second syllable of Niya *aḍini* is not so easily explained in this way.

Given these issues, it seems better to build further on Morgenstierne's later suggestion (1973: 258) that we are dealing with an Iranian loanword. Indeed, Niya *aḍini* and its Dardic cognates resemble a word for '(broomcorn) millet' found in various Iranian languages, e.g. MP *arzan* (Parth. (?) LW), LKhot. *ā'ysaṃ*, Psht. *ǧdən*, Yidgha *yurzun*, Sanglechi *wuǯdän*, and Wakhi *yirzn* (CPD: 11; DKS: 20; EDP: 29; Morgenstierne 1938: 273; 421; 554).

The main challenge with the hypothesis of an Iranian loanword is to find a historically plausible donor language that can account for the sequence -*ḍi*- /ṛi/ in Niya *aḍini*. Below, I will argue in favour of a Bactrian donor, but some of the steps in my argument are admittedly hypothetical.

My first point concerns the pre-form of the Iranian word for '(broomcorn) millet'. This word is traditionally reconstructed as an *a*-stem, i.e. **arzana*- (cf. e.g. Kümmel 2017: 283f.; 2020: 258, who uses the notation **(ḥ)arjana*-). The newly discovered Tumshuqese acc.sg. *arzanu* 'millet' must indeed come from an *a*-stem **arzana*- (Ogihara & Ching 2024: 313–315), but most of the

[274] For the Niya evidence, see recently also Høisæter (2020: 155f.).

attested forms could also go back to an *i*-stem **arzani-*.[275] From the perspective of Niya *aḍini*, it would be good if we could posit such an *i*-stem for a pre-stage of Bactrian. In that case, *i*-umlaut (SFBG: 65) would namely permit one to reconstruct a Bactrian form *αρζινο, which, like Niya *aḍini*, has a vowel -ι- /i/ in its middle syllable.[276]

Since it is cross-linguistically common for words referring to cereals to influence each other analogically,[277] a preform **arzani-* could conceivably be due to analogy with an *i*-stem of similar meaning, e.g. **dāsi-*, a term for 'oats' that may have existed in (Pre-)Bactrian, as it is well-attested in the neighbouring Pamir languages (e.g. Munji *lisok*; cf. Kümmel 2017: 282).

If Niya *aḍini* indeed goes back to a Bactrian word *αρζινο < **arzani-*, the presence of a phoneme *-ḍ-* /ɽ/ in *aḍini* may be explained as the result of a sound substitution. In *αρζινο, the cluster -ρζ- < **-rz-* stands in front of -ι- /i/, meaning that it may have been palatalised to /rź/ (cf. §2.2.4.3). Such a cluster, consisting of a rhotic and a palatalised voiced sibilant, is alien to Gāndhārī phonology. One may therefore hypothesise that *-ḍ-* /ɽ/, phonetically most likely a retroflex flap [ɽ] (§2.1.6), was the closest sound available to render such a foreign cluster in loanwords. As discussed in §3.2.3 s.v. *oḍ-* and §4.3.26, there may indeed be another example of this correspondence between Bactr. -ρζ- /rź/ and Niya *-ḍ-* /ɽ/.

A closing remark is due on the word-final *-i* in *aḍini*. If the hypothesis of a Pre-Bactrian preform **arzani-* is correct, *aḍini* may reflect Early Bactrian *αρζινι /arźini/ with final **-i* preserved, in which case the variant spellings *aḍina* and *aḍiṃ* could be the result of the weakening of final vowels in Niya Prakrit (cf. LKD: §13). But there is a second, perhaps preferable, option. Bactr. -βιδο < **-pati-* is never rendered in Niya Prakrit with a final ***-i* (see §3.2.1 s.vv. *daśavida*; *śadavida*; §3.2.2 s.v. *jenavida*), suggesting that word-final **-i* causing umlaut of a preceding vowel may already have been weakened to *-ə* (or -Ø) at the time of the Bactrian borrowings into Niya

[275] Parth. **arzan*, for example, the most likely source of MP *arzan*, could be derived from either **arzana-* or **arzani-* (cf. *žan* 'woman' < **ǰani-*).

[276] Cf. ζινο /źinə/ 'woman' < **ǰani-* (BD II: 212), where one can, however, not be sure if the raising of **-a-* to -ι- /i/ was caused by *i*-umlaut or by the preceding palatal. Out of **arzana-*, one would anticipate Bactr. *αρζανο (cf. ζαγγο /zaŋgə/ 'manner, way' < **zana-ka-*).

[277] Two examples: (i) Dutch *gierst* 'millet' < Middle Dutch *herse* received its initial *g-* due to analogy with *gerst* 'barley' (Philippa et al. 2005–9 II: 275) and (ii) MP *ālum* 'millet' goes, by way of OP **arduma-*, back to a blend of **arzana-* 'millet' and **ganduma-* 'wheat' (Kümmel 2017: 283f.).

Prakrit. In this case, *aḍina* and *aḍiṃ* could be a faithful reflection of Bactr. *αρζινο /arźinə/ and *aḍini* a secondary form of the same type as the semantically related dir.sg. *yavi* 'barley' < *yava-* and dir.sg. *gohomi* 'wheat' < *godhūma-* (both CKD 83).

32. *atga* 'additional, complementary'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *atga*: CKD 327; 571; 580; 591; 592

Since *atga* is "always used in connection with *muli* 'price, payment'" and generally refers to a second payment to be made, Burrow (LKD: 72 s.v. *aṅǵa*) plausibly inferred this adjective to mean something like 'additional, complementary' (cf. also Høisæter 2020: 194).

I propose to trace *atga* back to a Bactrian adjective *αδγο /adgə/ < **ati-ka-* 'which is beyond > additional, complementary' ← OIr. **ati* 'over, beyond' and the *ka*-suffix.[278] An exact parallel for this formation is admittedly lacking. Yet, the derivation of adjectives from preverbs/prepositions such as **ati* is well-attested in ancient Indo-Iranian languages (Bailey 1985). Two Avestan examples with the adj. suffix *-na-* are the superlative *apanō.təma-* 'farthest' < **apana-* ← OIr. **apa* 'away' and *paitina-* 'different, single, each' ← OIr. **pati* 'towards, against, etc.' (AIW: 75; 833). The postulated **ati-ka-* finds its closest parallel, formally and semantically, in OIA *adhika-* 'additional' ← *adhi* 'above, over' and the *ka*-suffix.

The reason to ascribe *atga* to a Bactrian source is the syncope of the vowel **i* which my etymology from **ati-ka-* requires. As a preverb, **ati-* is well-attested in Bactrian, examples including αδβηγο 'disrespect' < **ati-baya-ka-* (BD II: 187) and αδογαμο 'income' < **ati-gāma-* (Sims-Williams 2013: 194f.).

In short, the derivation of Niya *atga* 'additional' from Bactr. *αδγο /adgə/ < **ati-ka-* works fine. As the reconstruction of this Bactrian word cannot be backed up by an exact parallel from another Iranian language, caution is still called for.

33. *avaliḱa* 'swaddle'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *avaliḱa*: CKD 575 (2x)

[278] For the presumed rendering of Bactr. -δγ- /dg/ as Niya *-tg-*, see §4.3.13.

The dis legomenon *avaliḱa* is mentioned side by side with *kośava* ‘rug, blanket’ and *namata* ‘felt’ and most likely refers to a similar type of textile product (LKD: 78 s.v.).

Based on an etymological comparison with Psht. *blēğ-* ‘to wrap, swaddle’ < **upa-darzaya-* (EDP: 14; EDIV: 63), I have argued (Schoubben 2021: 53f.) that *avaliḱa* means ‘swaddle’ and is borrowed from an unattested Bactrian word *αβαλιþκο /əvališkə/ < **upa-dr̥̊štaka-*.[279] For the development of **upa-*, one can compare, amongst other examples, αβαστανο /əvastānə/ ‘support’ < **upa-stāna-* (BD II: 181). The development of **-dr̥̊štaka-* to *-λιþκο would be regular because of (i) lambdacism (SFBG: 35f.); (ii) the vocalisation of **-r̥̊-* to *-ir-* in a non-labial context (SFBG: 59f.); (iii) the loss of **r* in front of **š* (SFBG: 56); and (iv) the syncope and simplification of **-štak-* to *-šk-* as in υαþκο ‘pupil’ < **hāwišta-ka-* (BD II: 272; SFBG: 50).

Alternatively, *avaliḱa* could be a loan from *αβολιþκο /avəliškə/ ‘swaddle’, a hypothetical Bactrian cognate of Sogd. *βδ’yštk* ‘swaddled’ < **abi-dr̥̊štaka-* (MacKenzie 1970: 39; SD: 100). For this option, see Schoubben (2022b: 352 fn. 23).

34. *aṣg̲ara* ‘herald (?)’

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *aṣg̲ara*: CKD 80; 104; 118; 483; 525; 604[280]

Attestations as a PN

ADJ. *Aṣg̲arani* ‘the son of Aṣg̲ara’: CKD 110; 536

aṣg̲ara is a title of otherwise unknown semantics also used as a personal name. I cautiously propose to connect it with the Bactrian PN αζγαρακο, a diminutive in -κο < **-k(k)a-* from an underlying *αζγαρο.

The etymology of *αζγαρο is debated. According to Sims-Williams (BPN: no. 13), *αζγαρο could be compared with the Avestan name *Zīγri-* and the Sogdian name *’zγr* (cf. also Lurje 2010: no. 265) or with Sogd. *jγ’r* ‘cry’. He also records a proposal by Rüdiger Schmitt, according to whom *αζγαρο

[279] For the correspondence between Bactr. -þκ- /šk/ and Niya *-ḱ-*, cf. §2.1.6; §4.3.18.

[280] I wonder whether the hapax legomenon *aṣga* in CKD 584 could be a mistake for *aṣga<*ra>* so that we could read and interpret the relevant passage as *yaṃ kala Kutreya aṣga<*ra> huati taṃ kalaṃmi Ramṣotsaṣa samana anitaṃti* “When Kutreya was a herald (?), at that time they took a gift of honour to Ramṣotsa” (after TKD: 122).

would be the Bactrian outcome of OIr. **azdā-kara-* 'herald' (Aram. *'zdkr'*; Bab. *az-da-kar-ri*; MP/Parth. *azdĕgar*; cf. Bactr. αζδο κιρ- 'to give notice'). If one accepts *αζγαρο to be the source of *aṣg̱ara*, it must have been a title in origin. I therefore prefer Schmitt's etymology.

To arrive at *αζγαρο from **azdā-kara-*, one should probably posit an intermediary pre-form **azda-kara-* since a long **ā* would typically not be syncopated.[281] Contrast, for instance, ζιγαβαργο 'destructive' < **z(i)yakā-bă̆ra-ka-*, with preservation of the **ā* in **z(i)yakā-* as <α>. **azda-kara-*, with a short **a*, would regularly yield **azdgarə* with syncope in between **-zd-* and **-g-* < **-k-*. Subsequently, the heavy cluster **-zdg-* in **azdgarə* could have been simplified to the attested *-zg-*, parallel to the simplification of **-štk-* to *-šk-* presupposed by υαþκο /hāškə/ 'pupil' < **hāwišta-ka-* (SFBG: 50).

By implication, *αζγαρο would write /azgarə/, meaning that Bactr. -ζγ- /zg/ would need to have been substituted with *-ṣg̱-* in Niya Prakrit. This substitution, which could be due to the absence of a cluster **/zg/ in Niya Prakrit, will receive a more detailed treatment in §4.3.19.

In summary, the Niya official title *aṣg̱ara* may be a loan from Bactr. *αζγαρο, as indirectly attested in the PN αζγαρακο. If *αζγαρο results from **azda-kara-* < **azdā-kara-*, the meaning of *aṣg̱ara* would be 'herald'.

35. *oḍ̱-* 'to let go'

Attestations of the base form

PRES.2SG. *oḍ̱esi*: CKD 317
PRES.3SG. *oḍ̱eti*: CKD 18
PRES.3PL. *oḍ̱eṃti*: CKD 482
PRET.1SG. *oḍ̱idemi*: CKD 153; 417; 450; 546
PRET.3SG. *oḍ̱ita*: CKD 52; 292; 324 + 328; 345; 425; 527; 577; 667; 788 (3x);[282] 889; *oḍ̱ida*: CKD 236; 437; 574; 889 (2x)

---

[281] As Sasha Lubotsky (p.c.) suggests, one could assume that in the syntagm **azdā* + √*kar* 'to give notice' (cf. Bactr. αζδο κιρ-), the final *-ā* was shortened and from there introduced into the compound.

[282] One should read *oḍ̱ita* (3x) instead of Wu's (2020: 151) *oḍ̱ita*. Her translation (2020: 153) of the relevant passage of CKD 788 (under-tablet obverse 9f.) can also be refined. Wu translates *Caṃpira uthita ima Paṃcapriyae dura oḍ̱ita yo tatra jaṃñatriyaṃmi nikastaga taha sarva dura oḍ̱ita* as "Caṃpira arose, he sent Paṃcapriya away. He who went away in the marriage, also sent everything away." In my view, the latter part rather means "those things which had been acquired during the period of lawful marriage, he all let go". Or, to put it differently, the bridegroom must return the property his wife acquired during

PRET.3PL. *oḍitaṃti*: CKD 1; 9; 212; 386
PST.PTCP. *oḍitaga*: CKD 198; 206; 320; *oḍidaga*: CKD 198; 236
FUT.3SG. *oḍiṣyati*: CKD 358
FUT.2PL. *oḍiśatu*: CKD 546; *oḍiśaṃtu*: CKD 159; 633; *oḍiṣyatu*: CKD 125; 157; 320
GERV. *oḍidavo*: CKD 77; 109; 152; 197; 198; 212; 358 (2x); 506; 743; *oḍidavya*: CKD 272; 320; 362; 381; 430 (2x); 639 (2x); 665

Derivatives

GERV. *praoḍidave*: CKM 267 (3x)

In spite of the general agreement that the verbal root *oḍ-* means 'to let go' (cf. Baums & Glass 2002a– s.v.), there is so far no consensus on its etymology.

Burrow (LKD: 81 s.v.) hesitatingly compared the Pāli verb *oḍḍeti* (also *uḍḍeti*), which he translated as 'to throw away, reject' and 'to set or lay a snare'. This comparison is semantically and formally unconvincing: 'to set or lay a snare' is not what Niya *oḍ-* means, and Burrow's alternative translation of Pāli *oḍḍeti* (*uḍḍeti*) as 'to throw away, reject' is based on a wrong reading.[283] In fact, the basic meaning of Pāli *oḍḍeti* (*uḍḍeti*) is rather 'to fly up' (cf. Cone 2001– I: 406; 565; Oberlies 2019[2] I: 368). It would moreover be exceptional that a geminate *-ḍḍ-* developed to Niya *-ḍ-* /ṛ/, this type of lenition generally being restricted to single intervocalic retroflexes.

Proceeding from a newly attested gerundive *praoḍidave* 'it should be let gone, rejected' in South Asian Gāndhārī (Bajaur fragment 4 = CKM 267), Schlosser (2022: 171; 307) has recently proposed an alternative etymology. According to her, *praoḍ-* would derive from an otherwise unattested combination of the preverb *pra-* and the BHS verb *chorayati* 'to abandon, to leave' (BHSD: 236f.). Although semantically plausible, this etymology suffers from the lack of parallels for the loss of intervocalic *-ch-* in Gāndhārī (and MIA in general). In addition, Schlosser does not explain how the prefix-less form *oḍ-* would have arisen.

---

their marriage. The same legal procedure is stipulated in the Sogdian marriage contract: "But if it should occur to Ot-tegin that he will not have Čat as a wife [any more], but *send her away, he will release her with [her] inherited and acquired property*, [as well as] with the gifts received, without compensation, …" (Yakubovich 2006: 312; emph. mine).

[283] To justify his translation 'to throw away, reject', Burrow referred to *diṭṭhiṃ uḍḍayāmi* (Burrow *o-*) *'chaḍḍayāmi'* in *Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā* 256 (ed. Hardy 1894); but instead of *uḍḍayāmi*, one better reads *ucchaḍḍayāmi* 'I vomit, eject' with the Burmese, Sri Lankan, and Thai editions (see Cone 2001– I: 406).

Since *oḍ-* lacks an obvious etymon within Indo-Aryan and it is attested both in a Gāndhārī text hailing from the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan (Bajaur) and in the Niya documents, it could alternatively be a loan from Bactrian. In this language, the notion 'to let go' is normally expressed as υιρζ- < OIr. **hṛ̊z-* to **√harz* (BD II: 272f.; EDIV: 132f.). My suggestion is that *oḍeti* was borrowed from a synonymous verb *ωυιρζ- < OIr. **awa-hṛ̊z-* as in the Avestan pres.1sg. *auuaŋhərəzāmi* 'I let go' (Y 10.15).

This new etymology is not only semantically straightforward; it may also receive support from phraseology. In §3.3.1 s.v. *ajhate*, I argue that the syntagm *ajhatu oḍidavo* in CKD 152 means 'to be let free' and that the adverb *ajhatu* is a borrowing from an Iranian language in which OIr. **āzātam* became **āzātu* or **āzādu*. The importance of this argument for the etymology of *oḍ-* is that OIr. **āzātam* is known to form a collocation with the root **√harz* 'to let go': compare Aram. *'zt šbq,* a calque of OP **āzātam hṛ̊d-*, MP *āzād hil-*, and Bactr. αζαδο υιρζ-, all of them meaning 'to let free'. The derivation of *oḍ-* from *ωυιρζ- < OIr. **awa-hṛ̊z-* would thus allow for the attractive conclusion that *ajhatu oḍ-* is another witness of the Iranian collocation of **āzāta-* 'free' + **√harz* 'to let go', though one must acknowledge that the preverb **awa-* is missing in the parallels.[284]

On the formal side, my etymology would need two sound substitutions, viz. (i) loss of intervocalic *-h-* and (ii) rendering of Bactr. -ρζ- as Niya *-ḍ-* /ṛ/. Because of them, one cannot be entirely confident that the derivation of *oḍ-* from *ωυιρζ- < OIr. **awa-hṛ̊z-* is indeed correct. Yet, I intend to show below that both substitutions are understandable.

To begin with, my etymology requires that the intervocalic -υ- /h/ in *ωυιρζ- was lost during (or after) the borrowing process with subsequent contraction of the vowels. Inherited words such as *goma* 'wheat' < *gohoma* (CKD 795) < Skt. *godhūma-* provide a parallel for this development, and /h/ was generally an unstable phoneme in Niya Prakrit (LKD: §28). Hence, this is not too much of a problem.[285]

---

[284] A possible option to justify the presence of the preverb would be to assume that the Aramaic formula *'zt šbq* had been back-translated into Bactrian with both υιρζ- and *ωυιρζ- (Federico Dragoni p.c.).

[285] At the same time, the (potentially) Bactrian loanwords collected in this chapter do not show a consistent picture (cf. §4.3.23): there are other words where intervocalic *-h-* seems to have disappeared, but in the case of *nihaṃñ-* 'to deposit, to put down' ← *νιυανζ- /nihanź/ (§3.2.2 s.v.) and *nihala* 'settlement, agreement' ← *νιυαλο /nihālə/ (§3.2.3 s.v.), the *-h-* seems to be preserved.

How to account for the rendering of Bactr. -ρζ- as Niya -*ḍ*- /ṛ/ is a more intricate question. Yet, there may be a way to explain it when one assumes that, as I argue for different reasons in §4.4.4, speakers of Niya Prakrit borrowed Bactrian verbs in their 3sg. forms. In the case of *ωυιρζ-, its 3sg. can be more or less confidently reconstructed as *ωυιρζιδο based on the attested 3sg. υιρζιδο (xl 10f.). In this form, the cluster -ρζ- would be immediately in front of the vowel -ι- /i/, thus allowing for a palatalisation of **rz* to /rź/.[286] If so, *oḍ*- could be a second example of the sound substitution which I cautiously proposed §3.2.3 s.v. *aḍini*, whereby the non-Indic cluster /rź/ was approximated with the closest sound at hand, i.e. -*ḍ*- /ṛ/. The phonetic details behind this hypothesis will be discussed in more detail in §4.3.26.

Summary: Niya *oḍ*- 'to let go' has arguably been borrowed from Bactr. *ωυιρζ- /ōhirz/ 'idem' < **awa-hṛz*-; more specifically, its source may have been a 3sg. *ωυιρζιδο in which **rz* could have been palatalised so as to result in Niya -*ḍ*- /ṛ/.

36. *caṃkura* 'imposer of penalties'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *caṃkura*: CKD 16; 64; 236; 297; 318; 345; 437 (4x); 506; 532 (2x); 582 (2x); 584 (2x); 732; 788; 796; 815; 842; 884
GEN.SG. *caṃkuraṣa*: CKD 437

The officials called *caṃkura* were entrusted with various administrative duties, and they often acted as judges.[287] *caṃkura*s were, in other words, an integral part of the civil administration of the Shanshan kingdom (cf. also LKD: 88 s.v.; Padwa 2007: 281).

The same title is known in Tibetan and Sogdian. In the later Tibetan administrative documents from Xinjiang, it occurs as *cang khyu(r)* (also *cang khyir*) (Thomas 1934a: 68ff.; 1935: 72ff.), most likely because the Tibetans took over this existing title when conquering parts of the Tarim Basin in the 7th century AD (so Burrow in LKD: 88 s.v.). Based on the contexts in which it appears, Thomas plausibly argued that the functions of a *cang khyu(r)*

[286] As not all the forms in the paradigm would have allowed for such a palatalisation, it may only have been subphonemic in this specific case. Cf. also the Manichaean Bactrian opt.3sg. *hyrzyḫ* ~ *υιρζηιο, which shows no trace of palatalisation in the script.
[287] Cf. CKD 318; 506; 582; 584; 732; 815; 842; 884.

correspond approximately to those of a *nagararakṣaka-* or *nāgaraka-* in the Indian tradition, "a city official who also acted as chief of the police". He furthermore noted that in a Tibetan-Chinese bilingual Tib. *cang khyu(r)* is translated as Chin. *shǒu hùn* 守護 'protector', and used for the person in charge of a stūpa. This translation does, however, not necessarily entail that the etymological meaning of *caṃkura* was 'protector'. In a Sogdian document from Lóulán, the title under discussion occurs as *cnkwr*, presumably also a loan from Niya Prakrit (Sims-Williams 1996a: 49; 2020: 24; 2023: 75). This Sogdian attestation is unfortunately largely uninformative on the duties of a *caṃkura*.

According to Brough (1970b: 85 = 1996: 362), *caṃkura* would be one of the few Chinese loanwords in Niya Prakrit. He argued to identify *caṃkura* with the Chinese title *jiāng jūn* 將軍 'bring + army' > 'general, high-ranking military officer', in (Early) Middle Chinese approximately *tsjang* + *kjun.*[288]

I find Brough's idea not entirely convincing phonologically. (E)MC *tsjang* + *kjun* comes close to *caṃkura*, but some uncertainty remains whether this etymology can explain the *-r-* in *caṃkura* satisfactorily. Aware of this issue, Brough referred to the well-attested substitution of a foreign final *-r* with *-n* in Chinese. This correspondence is, however, due to the lack of word-final *-r* in (Early) Middle Chinese, and not the same as Brough has to assume for Niya Prakrit.[289] Perhaps more relevant in this regard is Starostin's (1989: 399–401) proposal that final **-r* still existed in Old Chinese and that the word for 'army', i.e. *jūn* 軍, can be reconstructed as OC **[k]ʷər*. Yet, by the time of Middle Chinese, this **-r* had gone in the majority of dialects to *-n* (Baxter & Sagart 2014: 252–255; Hill 2019: 187). Accordingly, this phonological issue remains a weak point of Brough's etymology, even if one could theoretically argue that *caṃkura* was borrowed from a more archaic form of Chinese where **-r* was preserved until the first centuries AD.

On the semantic side, there is hardly any evidence that *caṃkura*s played a significant role in the army of the Shanshan kingdom, as no *caṃkura* is mentioned among the military officers listed in CKD 478. Consequently, Brough (1970b: 85 = 1996: 362) had to speculate that a *caṃkura* was not so much "a general of the highest rank, but presumably a local military

[288] Cf. also Høisæter (2020: 593), who wrongly attributes the etymology to Yoshida (1996: 70 fn. 3).

[289] Unlike Chinese, Niya Prakrit lacks any relevant phonotactic constraints on *n* and *r*. One should also contrast the later borrowing of the same Chinese title into Sogdian/Turkic as *saŋun*, where the expected *-n* is found.

commandant". Further, if *caṃkura* comes from *jiāng jūn* 將軍, it is somewhat unexpected that Tib. *cang khyu(r)* is translated with Chin. *shǒu hùn* 守護 'protector' instead. All in all, I would therefore caution against Brough's etymology.

As *caṃkura*s appear to have a judicial rather than a military function (cf. supra), I deem it more likely that *caṃkura* should be compared with the Bactrian legal formula ζιανο κιρ- 'to impose a penalty' < OIr. **ziyāni-* 'penalty, punishment' (e.g. Av. *ziiāni*; MP *zyān*) + *√*kar* 'to do' (BD II: 212). Based on this expression, it seems safe to reconstruct a corresponding nominal compound **ziyāni-kara-*, which would regularly yield Bactr. *ζιαγγαρο 'imposer of penalties' because of syncope of the **i* in between **n* and **k*. I propose that this hypothetical Bactrian title *ζιαγγαρο is the direct source of Niya Pkt. *caṃkura*:[290] the interpretation of *caṃkura* as 'imposer of penalties' fits semantically well with their acting as judges in a lawsuit, and it also is not far removed from Thomas' proposal to draw a parallel between the functions of a *caṃkura* and a *nagararakṣaka-* / *nāgaraka-* 'chief of the police'.

How does *caṃkura* relate phonologically to *ζιαγγαρο? If one accepts the premise that **z* could be palatalised to Bactr. /ź/ in front of **i* (§2.2.4.3), ζιανο would stand for /ź(i)yānə/ and *ζιαγγαρο for /ź(i)yāŋgarə/. Since voiceless consonants became voiced after nasals in Niya Prakrit (§2.1.5), the sequence <ṃk> in *caṃkura* is one of the ways to write /ŋg/ in Kharoṣṭhī script, hence an exact correspondent of the cluster /ŋg/ in *ζιαγγαρο /ź(i)yāŋgarə/.

Two other substitutions require more discussion, viz. the apparent devoicing of Bactr. ζ- /ź/ to Niya *c-* and the rendering of Bactr. -αρ- /ar/ as Niya *-ur-*. Unfortunately, both are not exactly paralleled in one of the other (potential) Bactrian loanwords in Niya Prakrit.[291] Yet, I hope to demonstrate below that neither of them is so implausible as to present an insuperable obstacle against my etymology (see also §4.3.1; §4.3.28).

Concerning the initial *c-* in *caṃkura*, the first thing to note is that there is no exact counterpart in Niya Prakrit of the initial /ź/ in *ζιαγγαρο /ź(i)yāŋgarə/. There is, of course, a phoneme /ź/ in Niya Prakrit, but this only occurs in intervocalic position due to the lenition of OIA *-c-*, *-j-*, and *-ś-* (§2.1.2). Consequently, Bactr. ζ- /ź/ had to be approximated in one way or another. Given that Indic initial *j-* is rendered as MBactr. *ź-* in the case of *źmbwd'ng* 'worldly, earthly' < *źmbwd** ← *jambudvīpa-* (with adaptation) +

[290] The syncope excludes donor languages other than Bactrian.

[291] For this reason, I did not include *caṃkura* among the plausible Bactrian loanwords collected in §3.2.2.

adjective suffix *-'ng* < **āna-ka-*, one may expect *ζιαγγαρο /ź(i)yāŋgarə/ to have been approximated as ***jaṃkura.* If this is true, the attested form *caṃkura* could be due to the occasional process of initial devoicing which also affected inherited words in Niya Prakrit, e.g. *ciṿanae* 'to live' (CKD 703) from √*jīv*. Although it is still peculiar that only *caṃkura* is attested, the apparent substitution of Bactr. ζ- /ź/ with Niya *c-* is thus understandable from within Niya Prakrit (see also §4.3.28).

Finally, a few comments are to be made about the apparent rendering of Bactr. -αρ- /ar/ as Niya *-ur-*, which contrasts with the default substitution of Bactr. -α- /a/ with Niya *-a-*, including when before *-r-* (see §4.3.1). I do not have a conclusive explanation for this phonological peculiarity, but it reminds me of the spelling variation between Bactr. παρο- and πορο- < **pari-*, as in παρογατο next to πορογατο 'observed' < **pari-kašta-* and similar examples (on which cf. also Lazard, Grenet & de Lamberterie 1984: 221). In my view, this interchange between <α> and <ο> suggests that Bactr. -ρ- /r/ may have caused subphonemic rounding of a preceding **a*, a hypothesis which may also explain why, in contrast to πιδο- < **pati-*, **pari-* did not undergo *i*-umlaut to result in **πιρο-.[292] If acceptable, the same hypothesis may also account for the apparent substitution of Bactr. -αρ- /ar/ with Niya *-ur-* presupposed by my etymology of *caṃkura*. It should be admitted, however, that there is no evidence for a graphic alternation between <α> and <ο> in the case of the Bactrian outcome of *(-)*kara-*.

To summarise, Brough's idea to interpret Niya *caṃkura* as a loan from Chin. *jiāng jūn* 將軍 'general, high-ranking military officer', (E)MC *tsjang* + *kjun*, faces phonological and semantic issues. Although these are insufficient to prove Brough wrong, it seems more plausible that *caṃkura* was borrowed from Bactr. *ζιαγγαρο /ź(i)yāŋgarə/ < **ziyāni-kara-* 'imposer of penalties' (cf. the attested phrase ζιανο κιρ-). This proposal requires two unparalleled but understandable substitutions, i.e. Bactr. ζ- /ź/ → Niya *c-* and Bactr. -αρ- /ar/ → Niya *-ur-*.

[292] The absence of *i*-umlaut in γαρο /γarə/ 'mountain' < **gari-* (and αριαο 'in Bactrian' if from **arya-* with a short vowel + suffix -αο) could be explained in the same way. One may also compare Benvenuto and Bichlmeier's idea (2022a: 100; cf. also 2022b: 25) that Bactr. ρ /r/ was phonetically realised "in a similar way to how it is pronounced in Standard English, *thus furthering any potential rounding*" (emph. mine).

37. *tim-* ‘to be concerned about, to be angry’

Attestations of the base form
GERV. *timidavo*: CKD 109; 152; 184; 499; 840; *timidavya*: CKD 91; *timitavya*: CKD 335; *dimidavo*: CKD 159; 288; 424

Superseding an earlier interpretation by Thomas (1934a: 64; 66 fn. 6), Burrow (LKD: 94f. s.v. *timitavya*) could prove that Niya *tim-*[293] is a synonym of the phrasal verb *manyu kar-* ‘to be concerned about, to be angry’.

Finding a plausible etymology for this Niya verb is more complex. Skt. *tāmyati* ‘to be distressed, etc.’ would provide a semantically attractive etymon, but this derivation would, as conceded by Burrow, leave the vocalism of *tim-* unaccounted for.[294] As another option, Burrow conceived of a connection with NP *tīmār* ‘care for somebody > worry, sorrow’. Since this Persian word lacks a convincing etymology itself (Hasandust 2015: 935), using it as an explanation for Niya *tim-* would, however, be a case of *obscurum per obscurius*.

I propose to derive *tim-* from a so far unattested Bactrian cognate of PIr. *√*tamH* ‘to faint, to be tired’, a verbal root continued in most Middle Iranian languages.[295] In light of the parallel provided by κιμ- /kīm/ ‘to want’ < **kāmaya-* (BD II: 223), the presumed Bactrian source of Niya *tim-* can be reconstructed as Bactr. *τιμ- /tīm/ < **tāmya-*, the same *ya*-present as in Khot. *pätem-* ‘to confound’ < **pati-tāmya-* and Skt. *tāmyati* (cf. EDIV: 376; Emmerick in SGS: 83 reconstructs **pati-tāmaya-* as the etymon of *pätem-*).[296]

Semantically, my etymology hinges on the additional assumption that Bactr. *τιμ- shared the same type of development from ‘to faint, to be tired’ to ‘to be concerned about, to be angry’ as Skt. *tāmyati*. Verifying this additional step will require an actual attestation of the hypothesised verb

---

[293] I follow Burrow in assuming that the form with initial *t-* is original. The variant *dim-* can be the result of the frequent interchange between *t-* and *d-* in Niya Kharoṣṭhī (LKD: §§14f.).
[294] Burrow’s suggestion that “we may have a special treatment of an original **tr̥̄myeti*” does not carry conviction.
[295] Cf. e.g. Parth. *tām-* ‘to choke’, Sogd. *ṭ’s’δ* ‘tired’, Khot. *ttāma-* ‘fatigue’, and the other forms cited in EDIV (376f.).
[296] Since κιμ- ‘to want’ is already attested in doc. xp, a text datable before 380 AD (SCBD: 82), the raising of **-ā-* to -ι- /ī/ in front of **-m-* will have been sufficiently early. This sound change is moreover typical for Bactrian, meaning that if the etymology of Niya *tim-* proposed here is correct, one can exclude other donor languages.

*τιμ-, so this new etymology of Niya *tim*- has to be treated with caution for now.

38. *toṃga*, a title

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *toṃga*: CKD 3 (2x); 11 (2x); 23; 28; 37 (2x); 42 (2x); 45 (2x); 46; 49 (2x); 72 (2x); 124; 138; 180; 189; 208; 224; 226; 236 (2x); 272; 375; 427; 451 (2x); 468 (2x); 470; 481 (2x); 516; 524 (2x); 540 (2x); 561 (2x); 568; 720; 729; 746; *toṃgha*: CKD 78; 82; 85; 103; 115; 123; 131; 132; 137; 151; 216; 431 = 432 (2x); 571 (2x); 572; 587; 589; 590; 656; 820; 839; *togha*: CKD 436; 579; 589; 654; 880
GEN.SG. *toṃgaṣa*: CKD 105
DIR.PL. *toṃga*: CKD 357; 387; 796; *toṃgha*: CKD 96 (9x); 622
INS.PL. *toṃgehi*: CKD 165[297]
GEN.PL. *toṃgana*: CKD 165; *toṃghana*: CKD 387

Attestations as a PN

GEN.SG. *Toṃgaṣa*: CKD 494

Compounds

DIR.SG. *sruvatoṃga*:[298] CKD 509
DIR.PL. *survatoṃga*: CKD 524; *survatoṃge*: CKD 524

Officials carrying the title *toṃga* are often mentioned together with *cojhbo*s (CKD 3; 11; 23 *et passim*), and one of their duties may have been the transportation of goods and animals (CKD 165; 357; 431 = 432; 622; cf. also LKD: 95f. s.v.). In CKD 494, *toṃga* is used as a name (gen.sg. *Toṃgaṣa*).

In Thomas' view (1934b: 255; 1935: 52–54), *toṃga* would be etymologically related to Tib. *stong dpon* 'chief of a thousand' (~ Skt. *sahasrapati*-). Yet, the latter title is best kept apart from *toṃga*, as the

[297] Based on a suggestion by Meng Xiaoqiang (Leiden), I propose that the unclear hapax *toṃmihi* (LKD: 96 s.v.) in CKD 165 is a misreading for ins.pl. *toṃgehi*. A glance at the available images makes clear that the reading 𐨐 *ge* is preferable over 𐨏 *mi* because of the leftward orientation of the tail of the relevant akṣara (cf. also the gen.pl. *toṃgana* in line 8 of the obverse). The resulting translation "Also in Peta-aẏana the arrears of last year's tax and the tax of this year is to be sent here all complete with the *toṃga*s (*toṃgehi*)." (after TKD: 32) is one other indication that *toṃga*s were responsible for transportation (for which cf. infra).
[298] On the compound *sruvatoṃga* (variant *surva*-), the first element of which is obscure, see TKD (99f.).

phonetic resemblance is only superficial, and their duties differ (cf. again LKD: 95f. s.v.).

Burrow (LKD: 96) more convincingly suggested that *toṃga* is related to OIr. **tuwāna-ka-* 'strong' ← *√*tauH* 'to be able, strong' (cf. e.g. MMP *tuwān* 'mighty, powerful' < OIr. **tuwāna-*; DMMP: 330; EDIV: 386f.).[299] If this etymology is correct, the Niya cluster *-ṃg(h)-* /ŋg/ presupposes that the **a* in between **n* and **k* in **tuwāna-ka-* underwent syncope. As Bactrian is the only known Middle Iranian language in which this type of syncope is regular,[300] *toṃga* would most likely be a loanword from an unattested Kuṣāṇa title *τ(o)oαγγo /t(u)wāŋgə/ < **tuwāna-ka-*.[301]

Building further on a suggestion by Pinault (*apud* Ching & Ogihara 2012: 92 with fn. 28), I propose that once this hypothesised Bactrian title was borrowed by Niya Prakrit, it spread to other languages of the region. One piece of evidence for this hypothesis is the Tocharian B PN *Toṅkā* (Ot.12 a9; see Ching & Ogihara 2012: 81; 83 and DoT: 327).[302] Another potential witness is OT *toŋa* 'hero, outstanding warrior', a word also used as a personal name and a title. *toŋa*, which already occurs in the Kül Tegin and Bilge Khagan inscriptions (dated to respectively 732 and 735 AD),[303] lacks an inner-Turkic etymology and is probably a loanword (Clauson 1972: 515; cf. also HWA: 731). If indeed connected to Niya *toṃga*, its meaning 'hero, outstanding warrior' would find a straightforward explanation in Burrow's derivation of *toṃga* from **tuwāna-ka-* 'strong'.[304]

---

[299] Bailey's (1982: 98 n. 7) alternative suggestion to derive Niya *toṃga* from the root *√*tauǰ* 'to (re)pay, pay back, expiate' (EDIV: 388) does not carry conviction, as the nominal formation **tauga-* continued in Khwar. *twγ* and Bactr. τωγ(γ)o (BD II: 270) refers to the tax paid and not to the person to whom taxes are paid.

[300] Contrast e.g. -ηγγo /ēŋgə/ (later -ιγγo /īŋgə/), the Bactrian outcome of the material suffix **-aina-ka-*, with its cognates Sogd. *-ynyy* /ēnĕ/, Khot. *-īnaa-*, and MP/Parth. *-ēnag* (Degener 1989: 133; BD II: 213).

[301] This reconstructed form would regularly result in Niya *toṃga* with the default substitution of *-wă-* with *-o-* (§4.3.1).

[302] It remains in doubt whether the Tocharian A female name *Toṅkitsā* is also connected; cf. DTTA (219).

[303] Cf. *toŋa : teg(i)n* 'prince Toŋa' in line 7 of the north side of Kül Tegin and line 31 of the east side of Bilge Khagan. See recently Rykin & Telitsin (2020: 295 with fnn. 60f.).

[304] *Pace* Bailey (KT IV: 34; DKS: 219), there is no Khotanese evidence to consider. See Zhang (2016: 122), a reference I owe to Federico Dragoni.

Given the contacts with Kuča reported in the Niya documents (Høisæter 2020: 367–369), TB *Toṅkā* potentially represents a direct borrowing from Niya *toṃga*. As *Toṅkā* is attested only once as a personal name, it cannot be decided whether it was also used as an official title in Tocharian; this seems, however, conceivable.

Subsequently, Old Turkic may have borrowed the word under review as *toŋa*. At the time of the first Turkic qaghanate (552–603 AD), there probably was already contact between the (northern part of) Tarim Basin and the Turkic populations in the steppes northeast of Turfan. This contact is, for instance, testified by the spread of the Brāhmī script to the Mongolian steppes witnessed by the inscriptions from Bugut (584–587 AD) and Khüis Tolgoi (604–620 AD). Independent of one's idea about the language used in these inscriptions (Maue 2018; 2019; Vovin 2018; 2019), the script most likely spread to Mongolia from Turfan, and the same could apply to official titles.

Thereupon, the word can, together with the various Turkic populations, have spread over a large area of the Eurasian steppes. By the second half of the 8th century, OT *toŋa* must have been in use in the western part of Inner Asia since in the Bactrian doc. Y, datable to 771/772 AD (SCBD: 84), OT *toŋa* is rendered as τογγαυο (cf. BD II: 222; 275; BPN: no. 211).[305]

To sum up, if the etymological and historical scenario suggested above is correct, this means that a Kuṣāṇa Bactrian title *τ(ο)οαγγο /t(u)wāŋgə/ was borrowed at the beginning of the first millennium into Niya Prakrit as *toṃga*. Once adopted in Niya Prakrit, the title may have become current also in the north of the Tarim Basin, as suggested by the Tocharian B PN *Toṅkā.* In the form *toŋa*, the title could subsequently spread further to the Turkic groups on the steppes before eventually being reborrowed into Bactrian as τογγαυο.

39. *nihala* 'settlement, agreement'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *nihala*: CKD 788

[305] An additional witness to this spread is the PN *twnk' 'rsl'n* /toŋa arslan/ in a Sogdian administrative document from the 9th–10th century (Pelliot Chinois 3134 ll. 11; 24; cf. Lurje 2010: no. 1260; Sims-Williams & Hamilton 2015: 28f.; 109).

The lexeme *nihala* is a hapax from CKD 788, a document registering the divorce between a man Caṃpira and his wife Paṃcapriya. The relevant context is cited below:

(3.22) CKD 788 under-tablet obverse 7–9
edaṣa[306] *stri Paṃcapriyae Caṃpiraṣa vaṃti nihala krita tena vidhanena ede Caṃpira Paṃcapriyae ca priti[ṣehe]na sarajitaṃti*
"His wife Paṃcapriya made a *nihala* with Caṃpira. In this way, this Caṃpira and Paṃcapriya came to an agreement in love and affection." (tr. mine).

In her edition of this text, Wu (2020: 153–155) translates *nihala krita* as "was expelled", maintaining this verb phrase to correspond to an OIA *cvi*-construction *niṣkalī* + √*kr̥* 'to expel'. This interpretation is, apart from resulting in an illogical sequence of events, questionable on phonological grounds. The corresponding verb *niṣ* + √*kal* 'to drive out' yields Niya *nikhal*- with a geminate /kk^{h}/ (LKD: 101 s.v.; CDIAL: no. 7484), and a subsequent development to ***nihal*- would be hard to explain.

Given that Caṃpira and Paṃcapriya eventually agree on a divorce by mutual consent, it would make more sense if the sentence with *nihala* meant something like "his wife Paṃcapriya made a settlement with Caṃpira".[307]

This translation can now be strengthened with a Bactrian etymology for *nihala*. In lines 19–20 of the Rabatak inscription, the opt.pres.3sg. νααληιο points to a present stem νααλ-, whose preterite is attested as ναυαβτο /nəhāštə/ (BD II: 239). This verb derives, with Bactrian's typical lambdacism, from **ni-šādaya*-, pret. **ni-šāšta*- < **ni-šāsta*- and means 'to fix, to settle, to pacify' < **ni* + *√*had* 'to sit down' (EDIV: 125f.).[308] Intervocalic /h/ is not written in the Rabatak inscription (Sims-Williams 2008c: 60), so the basic form of the present stem can be set up as *ναυαλ- /nəhāl/. In

[306] I adopt Lin's (1990: 284) reading *edaṣa*, gen.sg. of the demonstrative pronoun, instead of Wu's (2020: 151; 154) new reading *eda ṣā*. The form of the akṣara does not necessitate the assumption of a length stroke and Wu's reading results in a syntactically awkward sentence. In line 5 of the cover-tablet, Lin's reading *siyaṃti* is also preferable over Wu's *siyati*.
[307] If this interpretation is correct, *nihala* would be a synonym of *samaga* < OIA *samaya*- 'settlement, agreement' in CKD 588 under-tablet obverse 3f.: *ahuno Pitga divira Sugaṃtaṣa ca saṃti samaga kritaṃti sarajitaṃti* "Now Pitga and the scribe Sugaṃta have made a settlement (*samaga kritaṃti*); they have agreed." (TKD: 125).
[308] On the -υ- in ναυαβτο, see now Michetti (2024: 175–177).

Bactrian documents from before 380 AD, there are moreover some words in which the vowel **i* in the preverb **ni-* has not yet been weakened to a schwa (SCBD: 63; cf. also §3.2.2 s.v. *nihaṃñ-*).[309] Consequently, *ναυαλ- /nəhāl/ may in turn come from *νιυαλ- /nihāl/, pret. *νιυαβτο /nihāštə/.

Against this background, my suggestion is that Niya *nihala* is borrowed from a Bactrian noun *νιυαλο /nihālə/ 'settlement, agreement' derived from the verb under discussion. A seemingly later variant of *νιυαλο, i.e. ναυαλο /nəhālə/, is attested in Bactrian (Tt 12; 14; 19), perhaps denoting a type of text (BD II: 239); and Sims-Williams (2008c: 66) has cautiously suggested that Bactr. *νιυαλο / ναυαλο may also be the source of Pers. *nihāl* 'young plant, shoot, sucker, transplanted cutting; cushion, mattress' and of Sogd. *nx"δδ* 'cushion' (translating Parth. *brz*).[310]

One final point on the phonology: in the case of some other Bactrian loanwords into Niya Prakrit, one can observe a tendency for intervocalic *h* to be lost with subsequent contraction of the vowels (see §4.3.23). With *nihala*, the morpheme boundary between *ni-* and *-hala* may have blocked such contraction. For this, one may compare Niya *nihaṃñ-* 'to deposit, to put down' ← *νιυανζ- /nihanź/ < **ni-θanǰa-* (§3.2.2 s.v.).

In short, this new etymology for *nihala* can be said to be formally and semantically straightforward. Nevertheless, the meaning assigned to the hapax *nihala* is at least partially based on etymology. The threshold for inclusion among the plausible etymologies of §3.2.2 has accordingly not been met.

40. *paḱe* 'allotment, share'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *paḱe*:[311] CKD 66 (3x); CKD 75 (54x); 79 (19x); 87 (34x); 95 (8x); 116 (5x); 191 (2x); 204 (12x); 242 (12x); 313 (4x); 398 (2x); 446 (9x); 449 (3x); 453: 462; 619 (8x); *phaḱe*: CKD 204 (9x)

ABL.SG. *paḱayade*: CKD 608

---

[309] Examples include νιβαγο /nivāgə/ next to ναβαγο /nəvāgə/ 'pawn, pledge' < **ni-pāka-* and the aforementioned νιþαλμο /nišalmə/ besides ναþαλμο; νοþαλμο /nəšalmə/ 'seat, throne' < **ni-šadma(n)-*.

[310] For a further cognate, cf. Parth. *nš'l* 'draff, dregs, lees (in wine)', on which see Durkin-Meisterernst (2013: 98f.).

[311] Whenever it is ambiguous whether *paḱe* is dir.sg. or dir.pl., I list the attestation under dir.sg.

DIR.PL. *paḱe*: CKD 66; 147; 313; 614 (2x); *paṃḱe*: CKD 68; *paḱeyu*: CKD 75 (2x); 87; 116 (2x); 619

The Niya word *paḱe* 'allotment, share' has been compared since Burrow (LKD: 102 s.v.) with TB *pāke* 'parcel, share', itself most likely a loanword from OIr. **bāga-* (see now Bernard 2023: 41–43). This etymology fails to account for the consistent spelling of *paḱe* with <ḱa>, which otherwise represents the combination of a sibilant and *k* (cf. §2.1.6).

The spelling with <ḱa> would, as I argue in more detail in Schoubben (2021: 52f.), be explained more easily when deriving *paḱe* from an unattested Bactrian noun *παþκο /pəškə/ < **pišta-ka-*, the verbal adj. of *√*paiš*. In most Iranian languages, the outcomes of *√*paiš* mean 'to crush, to grind' (EDIV: 292f.). Yet, in Pashto, the probably related root *peğ-* means 'to cut' (EDP: 61), so if we are allowed to postulate the same semantic development for Bactrian, *παþκο could have developed a meaning 'share' out of 'that which is cut'.[312]

Phonologically, **pišta-ka-* would regularly result in *παþκο /pəškə/ due to (i) a change of **-i-* > -α- /ə/ in front of **št* as in e.g. κισατο 'youngest' < **kasišta-* (BD II: 224); (ii) syncope of the unaccented medial **a* (SFBG: 60f.); and (iii) a simplification of **-štk-* to -þκ- /šk/ as in υαþκο 'pupil' < **hāwišta-ka-* (BD II: 272; SFBG: 50). This combination of sound changes moreover exclude the possibility that *paḱe* would have been borrowed from another Iranian language.

Given that Niya *a* was most likely pronounced as a schwa (cf. §2.1.1), Bactr. *παþκο /pəškə/ corresponds sound for sound with Niya *paḱe*. The final *-e* in *paḱe* may be accounted for by assuming that *paḱe* was borrowed from a dir.pl. *παþκε 'shares', as argued in §4.4.3.

The form *paḱeyu* is a separate issue. This is a plural or possibly a collective which always occurs at the beginning or end of lists of allotments.[313]

[312] The reconstruction of *παþκο enables us to explain at the same time NP *pišk* 'lot, share' and Kurd. *pəšk* 'idem' as Bactrian loanwords (for earlier ideas on the etymology of these words, cf. Hasandust 2015: 702). Contrary to what I wrote in Schoubben (2021: 53 fn. 31), I am no longer sure that MP *pistag* 'pistachio' and related forms < **pištaka-* are a direct cognate of *παþκο. As pointed out by Rasmus Björn (p.c.), pistachios do not need to be crushed to eat them, as one only has to peel off their outer skin. In view of pistachios being native to Central Asia (cf. Spengler 2019: 225f.), Björn reasonably suggests that the word for pistachio is instead a BMAC word.

[313] *paḱeyu* can co-occur with numerals higher than one (CKD 87; 116); the dir.pl. *ede* 'these' (CKD 87; 116); and plural verb forms (CKD 116; 619).

According to Burrow, the ending *-u* in *paḱeyu* would be comparable to the Tocharian A plural in *-u* found in words such as *cmolu* 'births' ← *cmol* or *kälmeyu* 'directions' ← *kälyme* (TG: 93). Burrow's comparison is not compelling, though, seeing that TA *-u* is an extremely rare and unproductive plural ending—not to speak of the fact that *paḱe(yu)* is probably not a Tocharian word in the first place (cf. also §6.4.5).

That said, I am myself unable to explain the morphology of *paḱeyu*, and this point, combined with the semantic shift of PIr. *√*paiš* from 'to crush, to grind' to 'to cut' required by my Bactrian etymology, prevents me from including *paḱe* amongst the plausible etymologies of §3.2.2.

41. *picav-* 'to hand over'

Attestations of the base form

PRES.2SG. *picavesi*: CKD 553
PRES.2PL. *picavetu*: CKD 439
PRET.1SG. *picavidemi*: CKD 152; 272; 519
PRET.2SG. *picavideṣi*: CKD 552
PRET.3SG. *picavita*: CKD 889; *picavida*: CKD 16; 42; 506 (2x)
PRET.2PL. *picavidetha*: CKD 375
PRET.3PL. *picavitaṃti*: CKD 322
FUT.3SG. *picaviṣyati*: CKD 735
PST.PTCP. *picavitaṯa*: CKD 248
GERV. *picavitavo*: CKD 296; 403; *picavitavya*: CKD 788; *picavidavo*: CKD 46; 143; 159; 198; 235; 366; 439; 440; 532; 546; 562; 706; 719; 734; 735; *picavidavya*: CKD 46; 310; 439; 545; 703
INF. *picavaṃnae*: CKD 152; 375; 506
picavi///: CKD 292

The contexts in which *picav-* occurs make it evident that the general meaning of this verb is 'to hand over' (LKD: 105 s.v.). Note, for instance, (3.23), where the gen.sg. *Caṣṯeyaṣa* (PN) fulfils the syntactic role of the recipient.

(3.23) CKD 532 cover-tablet reverse 2–4
yatra eda manuśa Vusmeka karmavidae siyati ṣadha parikrayena Caṣṯeyaṣa picavidavo ṣadha śramanehi
"Wherever this man Vusmeka has been employed, he is to be handed over (*picavidavo*) to Caṣṯeya along with the hire, along with the monks." (TKD: 105).

The etymologies previously proposed for this word are unconvincing. Boyer (1905: 467; cf. also KD: 355; Thomas 1934a: 66 fn. 9) compared *picav-* to the

OIA causative of *prati* + √*r̥*, i.e. *pratyarpayati* 'to give back, to restore'. Yet, this etymology is to be rejected for phonological reasons (cf. LKD: 105 s.v. *pace* Schlosser 2022: 187f.):[314] a derivation of *picav-* from *pratyarp-* would not correspond to the normal development of *prati-* to *paṭi-* / *paḍi-* / *paḍ̲i-* (see also §3.2.2 s.v. *picara*), and there is no parallel for a change from OIA *-rp-* to Niya *-v-*.

Burrow (LKD: 105 s.v.) briefly considered deriving *picav-* from a reconstructed OIA verb **pi-cyāvayati* 'to cause to go to > to hand over' instead. This somewhat hypothetical solution is hampered by the lack of clear evidence in favour of a preverb **pi-*.[315]

In my view, *picav-* is rather a Bactrian loanword, possibly from *πιδοþαο- /pidšaw/ 'to go towards > to hand over' from OIr. **pati-čyawa-*.[316] *πιδοþαο- is admittedly not attested as such in Bactrian, but the base verb þαο- /šaw/ 'to go' < **čyawa-* frequently occurs (BD II: 283), and Khot. *patäts-* 'to let go, to abandon' would provide a parallel for the combination of the root *√*čyaw* with the preverb **pati-* (SGS: 67; EDIV: 41).

The meaning of *πιδοþαο- would be different from that of Khot. *patäts-*. Yet, a semantic development from 'to go to' to 'to hand over' is understandable because handing over an object or a person implies a movement in the recipient's direction. The semantics would be even more straightforward when we could reconstruct a causative **pati-čyāwaya-* 'to cause to go towards > to hand over' of the same type as Av. 3sg. *fraš̌āuuaiieiti* 'to send to' < **fra-čyāwaya-ti*. Since, however, Bactrian **ā* is palatalised to η /ē/ when followed by **y* (e.g. ληρ- /lēr/ 'to have, hold' < **dāraya-*), **pati-čyāwaya-* may have yielded *πιδοþηο- /pidšēw/ instead. In this case,

[314] Semantically, the comparison with *pratyarpayati* would be fine, as this verb can also mean 'to deliver' (cf. Thomas 1936a: 793 *contra* LKD: 105 s.v.).

[315] In LKD (§20; 106 s.v.), Burrow proposed to derive *pivaṃnaṃnae* in CKD 581 from **pi-bandhanāya*, thus with this same preverb. Yet, this form is more likely a dittography for *pivaṃnae* 'to drink' (TKD: 150).

[316] The *i*-umlaut undergone by the preverb **pati-* is only found in Bactrian, thereby excluding *picav-* to have been borrowed from another Iranian language. For the sound substitutions Bactr. -δοþ- /dš/ → Niya *-c-* and Bactr. -o- /w/ → Niya *-v-*, see respectively §4.3.18 and §4.3.22. The adoption of *picav-* into the Niya Prakrit conjugation class in *-eti* is discussed in §4.4.4.

the phonological comparison with Niya *picav*- would no longer be as neat, so I still prefer to reconstruct *πιδοþαο- < **pati-čyawa*- instead.[317]

To sum up, the reconstruction of a Bactrian verb *πιδοþαο- < **pati-čyawa*- would provide Niya *picav*- 'to hand over' with a semantically and formally plausible source. As only the base verb þαο- 'to go' is attested in Bactrian, and one has to postulate a semantic shift from 'to go towards' to 'to hand over', one still needs to exercise some caution.

42. *piro* 'military post, fort'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *piro*: CKD 639 (2x); *pirova*: CKD 120; 376; *piroy̲a*: CKD 188; 246; 310; 333
INS.SG. *pirovena*: CKD 665
GEN.SG. *pirovaṣa*: CKD 639
LOC.SG. *pirovami*: CKD 157 (2x)

Derivatives

ADJ. *pirovi* 'of the fort': CKD 639

Compounds

LOC.SG. *Parconapirovaṃmi* 'Parcona fort': CKD 122
DIR.SG. *pirovala* 'fort keeper': CKD 154; *piroy̲ala*: CKD 765
DIR.PL. *piropa(*la)ye* 'idem': CKD 188

A close reading of all instances of the word *piro* suggests that this word refers to a 'military post' or 'fort' at the boundaries of the Shanshan kingdom (cf. Ching 2017: 27 fn. 32 and Høisæter 2020: 424–434 with ex.).[318]

piro is not the only attested dir.sg. form of this word; there are also the longer variants *piroy̲a* (4x) and *pirova* (2x, cf. further ins.sg. *pirovena*; gen.sg. *pirovaṣa*; loc.sg. *pirova(ṃ)mi*). Most likely, *piroy̲a* / *pirova* was shortened to *piro* by sound law, parallel to the development of word-final *-iya* > *-i* seen in words such as *muli* 'price' < *muliya* < OIA *mūlya*- (cf. LKD: §9).

Semantically attractive comparanda for *piro* are Khot. *prūva*- 'military post, fort'; MSogd. *pṭrwp* (in Sogdian script *ptr'wp*) 'fort, castle'; and Oss. I. *byru*, D. *buru* 'enclosure, castle' (cf. Bailey 1951a: 920-926; DKS: 256; 1982:

[317] Occasional transitive uses of þαο- < **čyawa*- (see BD II: 283 for the meanings 'to use' and 'to spend') also suggest that there is no need to reconstruct a causative for *πιδοþαο- to mean 'to hand over'.
[318] The compound *pirovala* (and variants) 'fort keeper' can be explained as an inner-Indic formation, consisting of *piro* 'military post, fort' and *-vala*- < Skt. *-pāla*- 'protector'.

28; 46).[319] The Sogdian form unambiguously points to a reconstruction *_pati-raupa-_, but Sims-Williams (2011c: 194) observed that Khot. _prūva-_ cannot be directly derived from *_pati-raupa-_, because in Khotanese *_patir-_ yields first _patär-_ and later _pār-_ (cf. SGS: 236). The Ossetic forms with their initial _b-_ must be loanwords too, given that OIr. *_p-_ develops into Oss. _f-_ and not **_b-_ (cf. Weber 1997: 36).

Based on these observations, Sims-Williams plausibly suggested that Niya _piro_ < earlier _pirova_ / _piroṿa_, Khot. _prūva-_, and Oss. I. _byru_, D. _buru_ are all borrowed from Bactrian (in the case of Ossetic necessarily via a no longer identifiable intermediary language). *_pati-raupa-_ is expected to yield Bactr. *πιδορωβο /pidrōvə/ with the characteristically Bactrian change of *_pati-_ to πιδ(ο)-, whence a simplified form *πιρωβο /pirōvə/ would need to be assumed.[320]

Unfortunately, there is no good parallel for the simplification of Bactr. /dr/ to /r/ Sims-Williams needs to hypothesise. In his article, Sims-Williams compared the variation between Bactr. πιριβτο and πιδοριβτο 'ancestral estate', but the more recent discovery of Bactr. obl.pl. πιοριβτειγανο /pihrištīgānə/ 'belonging to the father' has made it clear that instead of being a more archaic form than πιριβτο, πιδοριβτο may have been analogically influenced by dir.sg. πιδα 'father', later πιδο (see Sims-Williams 2015: 259 with fn. 16).

It is due to this lack of a good parallel for the postulated simplification of *πιδορωβο /pidrōvə/ to *πιρωβο /pirōvə/ that I classify this etymology one category below the plausible etymologies.

43. *badho* 'pledge, mortgage'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *badho*: CKD 587; 590; 591; 592; *baṃdhava*: CKD 473 (3x); 492; *baṃdhova*: CKD 678; *baṃthova*: CKD 569[321]

---

[319] There have been other etymological proposals for Niya _piro_, i.e. from a thematicised cognate *_pṛ̊θwa-ka-_ of Av. _pərətu-_ 'bridge' and MP _pwhl_ /puhl/ 'idem' (Burrow 1935a: 784f.; LKD: 105f. s.v.) or from Skt. _prapā-_ 'cistern, well' (Thomas 1945: 536–539). As these etymologies are no longer accepted in current scholarship (cf. Weber 1997: 36), I will not discuss them.

[320] There seems to be no good reason why **_pitro_ or **_pidro_ would have been simplified to the attested _piro_ within Prakrit.

[321] In CKD 331, _ba vothavidavo_ is probably a misspelled form of the word under discussion.

The various forms of the word *badho* 'pledge, mortgage' are always used as a complement of either *thav-* 'to place, to put' (CKD 473; 492; 569; 591; 678) or *de(na)-* 'to give' (CKD 587; 590; 592); in both cases, the meaning of the verbal phrase is 'to pledge' or 'to mortgage' (see LKD: 108f. s.v.).

The etymological analysis of this legal term has remained unclear. Burrow (LKD: 109) observed that OIA *bāndhavaka-* would be a phonologically plausible source, but given that *bāndhavaka-* only means 'kinsman', this etymology is semantically not quite attractive (as Burrow duly admitted). A second option which Burrow considered was to compare *badho* (and variants) with OIA *bandha-* 'bond' or *baddha-* 'bound' (cf. also Lüders 1940b: 46 who opts for acc.sg. *baddham*). Although semantically a better match, this etymology is to be rejected as well since it would not account for the variation between *-o(va)* and *-ava* at the end of the word. All in all, we may thus want to consider the possibility that Niya Prakrit *badho* is rather a loanword, an option also favoured by its final *-o* (cf. §3.2.3 s.v. *aco*).

My proposal is that *badho* derives from Bactr. *βαμδαοο /bāmdāwə/ 'pledge, mortgage'. This reconstructed form would be an abstract noun in -αο /āwə/ (BD II: 193), derived from a past stem *βαμδο /bāmdə/ 'loaned' < **apā-mita-*, which is indirectly attested by Bactr. βαμδδιγο /bāmddigə/ 'loan' < **apā-mita-ka-* (BD II: 201).[322] The same combination of a past stem with the abstract suffix -αο is found in MBactr. *βwrd'w* 'suffering' ← *βwrd* ~ βορδο /vurdə/ < **bṛta-* 'carried' and *wmwwrt'w* 'destruction' ← *wmwwrt* ~ *οιμορτο (or the like) /wimurtə/ < **wi-mr̥šta-* 'destroyed' (Sims-Williams 2009a: 262; 264).

On top of fitting well semantically, the derivation of *badho* from *βαμδαοο /bāmdāwə/ is also plausible phonologically: Bactrian final -αοο /āwə/ would nicely account for the variation within Niya Prakrit between *-ava* and *-o(ya)* (cf. also §4.3.1) and Bactr. -μδ- /md/ is a cluster which lacks an exact counterpart in Niya Prakrit, so *-ṃth-* (in *baṃthova*) and *-(ṃ)dh-* (in *badho*; *baṃdhava*; *baṃdhova*) would be sufficiently close approximations.[323]

The main point of concern with my etymology is that it requires procope to have happened before the change of **b* from OIr. **p* to Bactr. /v/ (cf.

[322] βαμδδιγο exemplifies the gemination of δ /d/ in front of a palatal vowel typical of later Bactrian texts (BD II: 38).

[323] Cf. also the rendering of Bactr. -μβ- /mb/ as Niya *-ṃb-*, if the title *aṃbukaya* is indeed a loanword from Bactr. αμβουκαο (§3.2.3 s.v.). The aspiration seen in *-ṃth-/-(ṃ)dh-* could be unetymological (cf. §2.1.3), in this particular case perhaps caused by a folk etymology with derivatives of √*bandh* 'to bind'.

§2.2.3.3 and §4.3.9). Otherwise, *βαμδαοο would have been pronounced as /vāmdāwə/, making the phonetic comparison with Niya *badho* (and variants) less neat. Because of this uncertainty, *badho* does not meet the threshold to be included among the plausible etymologies in §3.2.2.

44. *muṣḍhaṣi*, woman exchanged within exogamous marriage practices

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *muṣḍhaṣi*: CKD 573

The hapax *muṣḍhaṣi* (CKD 573) occurs in the context of exogamous marriage practices whereby two women from different families are exchanged (cf. LKD: 115–117 s.v. *lote*; Padwa 2007: 233). In contrast to the contexts in which the closely related term *muḱaṣi* occurs (see §3.7.2 s.v.), the women mentioned in CKD 573 are not exchanged simultaneously, and one is seen as "more valuable" than the other.

Proceeding from this observation, I proposed in Schoubben (2021: 55f.) to interpret *muṣḍhaṣi* as a loan from an archaic Bactrian compound *μοζδοþι /muždəšĭ/ < **mižda-strī*- 'reward woman'. Since *muṣḍhaṣi* is attested only once, this etymological proposal cannot be more than a hypothesis for the time being. Yet, it would at least account for the fact that a *muṣḍhaṣi* is seen as "more valuable" than a *muḱaṣi*; and Bactr. μοζδο* 'reward' is indirectly attested in the PNs βοδδομοζδο 'reward (bestowed by) the Buddha' and λαδομοζδο 'of whom the reward has been given' (BPN: nos. 93; 228).[324]

According to Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.), one may rather want to derive *muṣḍhaṣi* from Bactr. *μοζδοþι < **miždušī*- 'gnädige (Frau)'. In contrast to **mižda-strī*-, the pre-form **miždušī*- is easily paralleled: the Elamite divine name *Mi-iš-du-ši(-iš)* is clearly a rendering of an Old Iranian nom.fem.sg. **miždušīs* (Iranica: §4.1.4), and Khot. *mäjṣaï*- 'woman' can be etymologised as **miždušakī*- (Sims-Williams *apud* SVK III: 123f.). Because of these cognates, I would indeed be happy to accept Sims-Williams' etymology. Since, however,

[324] Bactr. μοζδο* 'reward' may also be attested as an independent word in the meaning 'spoils' in NPlate 4, but this is not certain (see Sims-Williams 2015: 261). If my etymology of Niya *muṣḍhaṣi* is correct, the elements pointing to Bactrian as the donor language are the change of *-*str*- > -þ- /š/ (SFBG: 52) and the colouring of *-*i*- to -o- /u/ in μοζδο* < **mižda*-. Regarding the latter, it seems most likely that *-*i*- first developed to *-*ə*- in front of *-*žd*- parallel to the weakening of *-*i*- to *-*ə*- in front of *-*št*- as in κισατο 'youngest' < **kasišta*- before being coloured to -o- /u/ because of the preceding **m*-.

muṣḍhaṣi is a technical term which must have a more specific meaning than 'gracious woman' or the like (cf. supra), I still would not entirely exclude the derivation from **mižda-strī*- 'reward woman'.

45. *leṣ*- 'to dispatch, to conduct'

Attestations of the base form
PRET.3SG. *liṣita*: CKD 52
PRET.1PL. *leṣitama*: CKD 392
FUT.3SG. *leṣiṣyati*: CKD 624
FUT.3PL. *leṣiśaṃti*: CKD 367

The etymological analysis of the Niya verb *leṣ*- 'to dispatch, to conduct', phonologically probably /lēẓ/ (see §2.1.2), has not yet been conclusively settled. Thomas (1934a: 51 fn. 1), followed in this by Burrow (LKD: 115 s.v.), assumed a connection with the OIA root √*śliṣ* 'to embrace, to cling to'. To account for the meaning of the Niya verb, they hypothesised *leṣ*- to continue the causative *śleṣayati*, arguing for a semantic development from 'to bring into contact with' to 'to conduct'. This etymology results in a phonological problem since one expects OIA *śl*- to yield Gandh. *śil*- and not *l*-; compare, for instance, the ins.sg. *śilogano* 'verse' from OIA *śloka*- in Av^{L6} recto 25 (Lenz 2003: 265) and the parallel development in Pāli *siloka*- and Pkt. *siloya*- (and minor variants, cf. CDIAL: no. 12748). A different etymological proposal for *leṣ*- thus seems in order.

I cautiously propose that *leṣ*- is a loanword from a so far unattested Bactrian cognate of Psht. *leǧ*- 'to dispatch, to send, to load a beast' < **darzaya*- to the root *√*darz* 'to attach, to fasten, to load, to sew' (EDP: 42f.; EDIV: 62f.).[325]

At a Pre-Bactrian stage, lambdacism, syncope, and the umlaut of *-*a*- to *-*i*- caused by a following *-*y*- would have changed **darzaya*- into **lirzya*- (cf. SFBG: 35f.; 60f.; 65), out of which Bactr. *λιζ- /liž/ may have developed eventually (cf. infra). *λιζ- /liž/ would be a possible source of *leṣ*- given that -*i*- and -*e*- can occasionally interchange in Niya Prakrit, including in the verb under discussion (cf. pret.3sg. *liṣita* in CKD 52 next to the forms with -*e*-). It should be noted, though, that this interchange is rare in Niya

[325] The pronunciation of the letter *ǧ* differs among the various dialects of Pashto. In southern dialects, *ǧ* is normally pronounced as a voiced sibilant (EDP: viif.). Some of the attested cognates of Psht. *leǧ*- are Av. *darəzaiia*- 'to attach', Khot. *dalś*- 'to make firm, to fasten, to load', and Khwar. *δžy*- 'to (up)load'.

Prakrit (cf. LKD: §§1; 3), and that in the case of other loanwords, Bactr. -ι- /ǐ/ is rendered quite consistently with Niya *-i-*, not with **-*e-* (cf. §4.3.5).

The other option would be to reconstruct a Bactrian form *ληζ- /lēž/ as the source of Niya *leṣ-*. *ληζ- /lēž/ would probably not be the regular outcome of **darzaya-*. Still, one could assume that *λιζ- /liž/ < **darzaya-* was remade into *ληζ- /lēž/ due to analogy with the similarly sounding and semantically comparable ληρ- 'to have, to hold, etc.' < **dāraya-* (BD II: 226f.); or that an earlier analogy with **dāraya-* caused **darzaya-* to be remade into **dārzaya-*, whence Bactr. *ληζ- /lēž/ with umlaut of **ā* to -η- /ē/ (SFBG: 65). Analogical influence from ληρ- < **dāraya-* would indeed be plausible, given that ληρ- has a suppletive preterite stem λριγδο < **dr̥xta-* to the root *√*dra(n)ǰ* 'to fix, to fasten, to hold', and the latter has been thought to be etymologically related to *√*darz* 'to attach, to fasten, to load, to sew' (cf. EWAia I: 706f.; EDIV: 62f.; 76).

Irrespective of whether one opts for *λιζ- /liž/ or for *ληζ- /lēž/, my etymology rests on the assumption of a Bactrian sound change from **-rzy-* to -ζ- /ž/. Because none of the currently attested Bactrian words shows us the outcome of **-rzy-*, the correctness of this sound change can unfortunately not be independently verified.[326] Yet, there is at least some circumstantial support for **-rzy-* becoming -ζ- /ž/. Between vowels, **-rz-* is by default preserved in Bactrian, e.g. in ανδαρζο /andarzə/ 'instruction' < **han-darza-*. But the change of the cluster **-rǰy-* to Bactr. -ζ- /ž/ observable in **arǰyāna-* > αζανο /ǎžānə/ 'worthy' indicates that **-rzy-* may still have become /ž/. Another indication of this possibility is the capacity of **r* to retract a neighbouring **s* to /š/ and **z* to /ž/ in certain contexts (for which see §2.2.4).[327]

If one accepts this new etymology of *leṣ-*, it may be worthwhile to reconsider the translation of pret.3sg. *liṣita* in (3.24). Burrow translated this verb form, in line with the other attestations of *leṣ-*, as 'he dispatched'.

(3.24) CKD 52 under-tablet obverse 2
ahono iśa Lýipeya viṃñaγeti yatha eṣa iśa klasenadharmena mahi maharayaṣa uṭa liṣita taṣa nadha coritaga hoati

[326] For this reason, I did not include *leṣ-* among the plausible etymologies in §3.2.2.

[327] It is not necessarily a problem that **-VrzV-* would develop differently from **-Vrzy-*; the same is, for instance, true of **-Vzdi-* and **-Vzdy-*, as shown by comparing νοζδιγο /nəzdīgə/ < **nazdiya-ka-* 'close, intimate, friend' with βιζαγο (MBactr. *βyźg*) /viźagə/ 'sin' < **bazdya-kă-*.

> "Lýipeya reports that he dispatched (*liṣita*) a camel to me the great king according to the *klasena* arrangements, and its load was stolen." (TKD: 12; cf. also Ching 2017: 24).

In case Bactr. *λιζ- /liž/ or *ληζ- /lēž/ would have the same semantic range as Psht. *leğ-,* i.e. 'to dispatch, to send, to load a beast', one may wish to translate *uṭa liṣita* instead as 'he loaded a camel for me'. This translation would namely fit well with the statement in the next sentence that the camel's load (*nadha*) has been stolen.

One final point: the preterite of *λιζ- / *ληζ- would presumably have been *λιρτο /lirtə/ < **dṛšta-*, argued in Schoubben (2022b) to be the source of Skt. **larda-* 'load, cargo', whence *lardayati* 'to load'. In other words, Niya Prakrit may indirectly preserve the present stem of the Bactrian outcome of *√*darz* 'to load', and Sanskrit the past stem.

46. *vaṣḍhiga*, festival on the mountain

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *vaṣḍhiga*: CKD 622; 634; 637
LOC.SG. *vaṣḍhikaṃmi*: CKD 637

Derivatives

ADJ. *vaṣḍhigaïṃ* 'relating to the *vaṣḍhiga*': CKD 140 (2x)

The noun *vaṣḍhiga* is attested in contexts that closely resemble each other, all of them mentioning wine (*masu*) and a mountainous area around Caḍota (*parvata*):

(3.25) CKD 622 obverse 2f.
yaṃ ca atra masu aẏamici tatra cavala saṃghalidavo eṣa masu parvataṃmi giṃnidavo vaṣḍhiga kartavo
"The wine which is on loan there is to be quickly collected. This wine is to be taken to the mountain and *vaṣḍhiga* is to be made." (TKD: 129f.).[328]

(3.26) CKD 634 obverse 4f.
tuo masu milima 4 2 nikhalidavo Cgito Cakuẏala ta[hi] ṣadha parvataṃmi gaṃtavo vaṣḍhiga karaṃnaya
"… You have to provide six *milima* of wine. Cgito and Cakuẏala have to go with you to the mountain to make *vaṣḍhiga*." (TKD: 131).

[328] Later in the document, it is said that tax (*palýi*) should also be brought.

(3.27) CKD 637 obverse 2–5

taṃ kalaṃ kāla Kirteya iśa agata Caḍotaṃmi parvataṃmi vaṣḍhiga kṛta cojhbo Soṃjaka kalaṃmi taṃ kalaṃmi vyaga nikasta masu potgoñena parvataṃmi milima 1 khi 4 aṃña dirpira aṃna milima 2 khi 10 aṭa milima 1 khi 4 1 … aṃña parvatade kala Kirteya nivartita taṃ kalaṃmi Caḍotaṃmi vaṣḍhikaṃmi masu khi 4 3 nikhasta

"… at that time the *kāla* Kirteya came here to Caḍota and made *vaṣḍhiga* in the mountain, in the time of the *cojhbo* Somjaka. At that time (the following) expenditure was incurred: Wine *potgoñena* in the mountain 1 *milima* 4 *khi*; further, *dirpira* corn 2 *milima* 10 *khi*, and flour (*aṭa*) 1 *milima* 5 *khi* … Further, the *kāla* Kirteya returned from the mountain, and at that time the expenditure of wine in Caḍota, in [during?] the *vaṣḍhika*, was 7 *khi*." (TKD: 131).

In addition, an adjectival derivative *vaṣḍhigaïṃ* occurs twice in CKD 140 modifying *aṃna* 'corn'.[329]

Because of its co-occurring with *masu* 'wine', and *parvata* 'mountain', Burrow (LKD: 120 s.v.) advanced the hypothesis that *vaṣḍhiga* refers to "some kind of regular festival held on the mountain, at which wine was consumed". As observed by Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.), this hypothesis has gained in plausibility now that the Kuṣāṇa Bactrian inscription DN_1, located on the ridge of Mount Qarabayu (4320 m), has been interpreted as recording precisely such a festival (see Halfmann et al. 2024: 33–45; note especially ι μολο χοαρδο 'he drank wine' in line 13). Since *vaṣḍhiga* also co-occurs with *aṃna* 'corn' (see CKD 140; 637)—like *masu* 'wine', a prototypical tax product in the Niya documents—part of the festival may have consisted of sacrificing to the gods a portion of the commodities collected as tax.[330]

The etymology of *vaṣḍhiga* has so far remained obscure. I like to propose that it is a loan from an unattested Bactrian word *βαγδιγο /vaγdīgə/, a derivative of the verbal adj. βαγδο /vaγdə/ 'given away, distributed' < **baxta*- with the frequent suffix -ιγο /īgə/ < **-iya-ka*- (BD II: 200; 217).[331]

---

[329] For the suffix -*ïṃ* (shortened from -*ina*), see §6.4.1. In its second occurrence, *aṃna vaṣḍhigaïṃ* is contrasted with *aṃna kriṣide* 'corn from the field'; but unfortunately this does not tell us much about the semantics of *vaṣḍhiga*.

[330] Interestingly, CKD 622 and 634 mention that the *vaṣḍhiga* must be organised by a *vasu*, a type of official known to be involved in the collecting of taxes (LKD: 120 s.v.; Høisæter 2020: 598f.).

[331] Because gemination of -δ- /d/ to -δδ- /dd/ before -η- /ē/ and -ι- /ĭ/ only occurs in post-Kuṣāṇa Bactrian (cf. SCBD: 60), I reconstruct the proposed source

*βαγδιγο could have meant something like ‘tribute’, which would fit well with the idea that offerings to the gods were made during a *vaṣḍhiga*. Its morphological formation would be comparable to that of the Middle Persian legal term *baxtīgīh* ‘distribution of the inheritance’ (Macuch 1993: 694), an abstract in *-īh* < *-*iya-θwa-* derived from **baxtīg* ← *baxt* ‘distributed’ < **baxta-* + suffix *-īg* < *-*iya-ka-*.[332]

Phonologically, my etymology requires that the foreign cluster -γδ- /γd/ was borrowed as Niya *-ṣḍh-*.[333] For this substitution, one may compare the proposal that Bactr. σαχτο ‘day, elapsed’ was borrowed into Gāndhārī as *saste* (§3.2.2 s.v.). For this word, I argue that the un-Indic cluster -χτ- /xt/ was substituted with *-st-* through an intermediary *-*śt-* that violated Gāndhārī phonotactics. In a similar vein, I would hypothesise that -γδ- /γd/ was perceived as *-*źd-*, which, given that neither this cluster nor *-*zd-* are allowed by Gāndhārī phonotactics, was rendered with the best option at hand, i.e. the retroflex cluster *-ṣḍh-* /ʐɖ⁽ʰ⁾/.[334]

If Niya *vaṣḍhiga* can indeed be traced back to Ir. **baxt-iya-ka-*, other potential donor languages are impossible or at least less plausible than Bactrian. In Khotanese, **baxta-* became *būta-* ‘distributed’ (SGS: 103), which is clearly incompatible with *vaṣḍhiga*, and in Parthian and Middle Persian, initial **b-* and the cluster **-xt-* are preserved. For Sogdian, one could reconstruct **βγtyk* (cf. attested pret. *βγt* ‘give, divide’ < **baxta-*), which, in theory, could still be a possible source of *vaṣḍhiga*. Yet, one would have to make the extra assumption that the /t/ in *-γt-* was first voiced before the whole cluster was rendered as *-ṣḍh-* /ʐɖ⁽ʰ⁾/ in the same way as argued above for Bactrian. Overall, the hypothesis of a Bactrian loanword therefore seems the least costly option.

---

of Niya *vaṣḍhiga* as Bactr. *βαγδιγο and not as *βαγδδιγο. If it existed, the latter form would have been a homonym of Late Bactr. *βαγδδιγο ‘Bactrian’, which has been plausibly reconstructed by Sims-Williams (2016b: 279) as a later development of *βαχλιγο ‘Bactrian’ ← βαχλο ‘Bactria’.

[332] Cf. also MMP *baxtagīh* ‘opposition, division, conflict’ and MParth. *baxtagīft* ‘oppositeness, split, conflict < **baxta-k-iya-θwa-* (DMMP: 119).

[333] The assumed rendering of Bactr. -ιγο /īgə/ as Niya *-iga* /ĭγa/ is regular (cf. §4.3.11), and the variant *vaṣḍhika** (attested through loc.sg. *vaṣḍhikaṃmi*) can be accounted for as a hypercorrect spelling inspired by the OIA suffix *-ika-*.

[334] For a more detailed treatment of this argument, see §4.3.27.

47. *ẏapg̱a* ‘weaver’

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *ẏapg̱a*: CKD 174

Attestations as a PN
DIR.SG. *V̱apg̱a*: CKD 797;[335] *Vapg̱a*: CKD 821
GEN.SG. *V̱apg̱aaṣa*: CKD 797 (3x)

The word *ẏapg̱a* is used in parallel with *takṣ̄ana* ‘carpenter’ in CKD 174, suggesting that *ẏapg̱a* also denotes a profession. It therefore seems conceivable that we are dealing with a loanword from Bactr. οαβγο* ‘weaver’ < **wāba-ka-*, the latter attested as the second member of the compound πριγγοοαβγο ‘weaver of damask’ (BD II: 258).[336] The syncope which made **wāba-ka-* into οαβγο* is typically Bactrian, meaning that, if my etymology holds true, other Middle Iranian languages do not qualify as the source of *ẏapg̱a*.[337]

In view of its etymology, Bactr. οαβγο* was most likely pronounced as /wāvgə/ (cf. §2.2.3.3), thus requiring the assumption that Bactr. -βγ- /vg/ was borrowed as Niya *-pg̱-*. I discuss this apparent fortition in more detail in §4.3.8.[338]

48. *sujinakirta* ‘needlework, embroidery’

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *sujinakirta*: CKD 318 (2x)

The word *sujinakirta* occurs twice in a list of stolen textile products, so it is semantically attractive to assume borrowing from a cognate of NP *sōzankard*

---

[335] Read in under-tablet obverse line 5 *tuo V̱apg̱a na laṃcag̱a kareṣi* ‘you, V̱apg̱a, do not do rightly’ with Hasuike (1996: 307) against Lin’s (1999: 230) *t(*e)na ẏapg̱ana laṃcag̱a kareṣi*. For *na* ‘not’ + *laṃcag̱a* ‘right’ + *kare-* ‘to do’, cf. CKD 272; 399 (2x); 538; 562.

[336] Bactr. πριγγο* ‘damask’ was also borrowed into Niya Prakrit; see §3.2.1 s.v. *prigha*.

[337] The nominal formation **wāba-ka-* seems moreover unattested outside Bactrian. Most Middle Iranian languages continue the allomorph of the root for ‘to weave’ with **f* (on which cf. EDIV: 402; Kümmel 2018: 165); cf. e.g. MSogd. *w’f* (DMSB^2: 233).

[338] See also §4.3.22 for the substitution of Bactr. ο- /w/ with Niya *ẏ-* /w/.

'needlework, embroidery' < OIr. *saučanya-kr̥ta- (so first Lüders 1936a: 31f.; cf. also Bailey 1936: 578; 1966: 34f.; 1982: 16; LKD: 131 s.v.).

According to Lüders (followed in this by Bailey 1936: 578), Niya Prakrit borrowed *sujinakirta* from a pre-stage of Khotanese. This suggestion could work for the second part of the compound. Yet, it hinges on the assumption that *-kr̥ta- had only developed as far as *-kärda- (or *-gärda-) and not yet into the historically attested -gäḍa- / -yäḍa- when Pre-Khotanese came into contact with Niya Prakrit (SGS: 110–112; Maggi 2022b: 154).[339] More severely, it would be hard to interpret Niya *sujina-* as a loan from Khot. *suṃjsañu- / saujsaña-* 'needle' (DKS: 427; 429): there is no trace of a vowel *-i-* in *suṃjsañu- / saujsaña-*, nor does the palatal *-ñ-* in Khotanese correspond well to the non-palatal *-n-* in Niya Prakrit.[340]

In my view, it is more likely that *sujinakirta* is a Bactrian loanword. The element *-kirta* can be explained without any additional assumptions from the attested Bactr. κιρδο /kirdə/ 'made' < OIr. *kr̥ta- (BD II: 223).[341] In addition, Bactrian would seem the only relevant Middle Iranian language providing a straightforward explanation of the vowel *-i-* in Niya *sujinakirta*.[342] As shown by κινο /kinə/ 'ditch' < *kanyă- and λρουμινο /lruhminə/ 'enemy' < *dušmanyu- (BD II: 223; 228f.), OIr. *-any- became -ιν- /in/ in Bactrian. Therefore, the outcome of OIr. *saučanya- may be reconstructed as Bactr. *σωσινο, out of which it would be easy to explain the *-i-* in Niya *sujinakirta.*

---

[339] One would have to assume that the Khotanese mid vowel *ä* was rendered as Niya *i* since the confusion between *ä* and *i* within Khotanese only occurred after the first written attestations of this language (cf. Emmerick 1970: xix–xxi). The voicing of PIr. *-rt- to *-rd- had probably already happened in Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese (Peyrot 2018b: 273; Dragoni 2023b: 39), but I do not know of good evidence to tell when *-rd- < *-rt- developed further to Khot. -ḍ-.

[340] Although not inconceivable, substituting Khot. *-js-* /dz/ as Niya *-j-* /ź/ would be likewise unparalleled.

[341] As the second member of a compound and after preverbs, the κ /k/ of κιρδο is voiced to -γ- /g/ in the case of λιστηγιρδο 'estate; ward, dependant' < *dastay(ā)-kr̥ta- and φρογιρδο 'constructed' < *fra-kr̥ta-. Yet, this voicing process was probably not consistently applied in light of MBactr. *βyźg-qyrdg'nyg* ~ GBactr. *βιζαγοκιρδογανιγο 'wrong-doing, (guilty) of evil deeds' < *bazdya-kă- + *kr̥ta-k-āna-ka-* (Sims-Williams 2009a: 262). There is thus no problem with assuming Niya *sujinakirta* to have been borrowed from a Bactrian compound ending in -κιρδο /kirdə/ rather than -γιρδο /girdə/.

[342] Alanic probably also had an *-i-* in the word for 'needle' (cf. Oss. I. *sūʒīn*), but this is a geographically and historically unlikely donor language.

In line with my argument that GBactr. <σ> from OIr. *č stands for /tś/ in front of ι /i/ (§2.2.4.2), I take *σωσινο to stand for /sōtśinə/. From this, it follows that Bactr. -σ- /tś/ would correspond to the -*j̲*- /ź/ in Niya *su̲jinakirta*. This substitution is explainable when assuming that -σ- /tś/ was borrowed as Niya -*c*- (cf. §4.3.17), for the latter could subsequently have been lenited to the attested -*j̲*- /ź/ (cf. §2.1.2).

One peculiarity remains: the -ω- /ō/ in *σωσινο does not square well with the -*u*- in *su̲jinakirta*, -ω- /ō/ normally being borrowed as -*o*- (cf. §4.3.6).[343] To account for this point, some options can be considered, although all are subject to doubt. One could, for instance, hypothesise that -*o*- and -*u*- were confused in this word since alternations between these vowels are encountered more often in Kharoṣṭhī sources. These alternations are, however, rare in Niya Prakrit (LKD: §2; §4). Another option would be to assume a folk etymological contamination with Niya *su̲*ji* 'needle' as the outcome of Skt. *sūcī-*. Yet, the drawback to this explanation is that *su̲ji* is so far not attested in Niya Prakrit.

Up to now, my argumentation has been based on the assumption that the Bactrian word for 'needle' would derive from OIr. **saučanya-*. Yet, two dialect forms in Pashto, i.e. Bangash *stana* 'needle' and Wanetsi *sənǰán* 'idem', provide tentative evidence for an OIr. variant form **sŭčanya-* with the same vocalism as YAv. *sūkā-* 'needle'.[344] In the hypothetical case that the Bactrian word for 'needle' also continued **sŭčanya-* instead of **saučanya-*, one could reconstruct it as *σοσινο /sŭtśinə/. Then, the -*u*- in Niya *su̲jinakirta* would be a faithful rendering of the corresponding vowel in Bactrian.

In summary, Lüders' comparison between Niya *su̲jinakirta* and NP *sōzankard* 'needlework, embroidery' < **saučanya-kṛta-* is convincing. His argument that *su̲jinakirta* is a loanword from Khotanese seems unlikely. In

[343] That the first akṣara of *su̲jinakirta* is 𐨯𐨪 *su* and not 𐨯𐨞 *so* is beyond doubt. Occasionally, Bactr. -ω- /ō/ < *-*au*- is raised to -ο- /ŭ/, as e.g. in σαγονδο < σαγωνδο 'as, like, etc.' < **čiyāt-gauna-* + -δο < *-*uti*. The form σαγονδο does, however, not occur in texts before 430 AD (SCBD: 61f.) and seems an isolated feature in the historical grammar of Bactrian, so it appears doubtful whether one could assume raising from *σωσινο to *σοσινο in Bactrian itself. Note nevertheless that raising of *-*au*- to -*ū*- has also occurred in some modern Iranian languages, including the Iron dialect of Ossetic (Cheung 2002: 17), where the word for 'needle' occurs as *sūʒīn* (cf. Abaev 1958–89 III: 164f.; Lubotsky 2001: 306).

[344] See Morgenstierne (EDP: 76), who reconstructs **sŭčanī-*, and Cheung (2011: 175), who has **sučánya-*.

view of the *-i-* in *sujinakirta*, I would argue that a more plausible source is Bactrian, for which the relevant word can, with due caution, be reconstructed as *σωσινοκιρδο /sōtśinəkirdə/. The vowel *-u-* in *sujinakirta* remains a moot point, unless the Bactrian source form was rather *σοσινοκιρδο /sŭtśinəkirdə/ < **sŭčanya-kr̥ta-*.

3.2.4 Tentative etymologies

49. *apcira*, a unit of measure (for vineyards)

Attestations of the base form
LOC.SG. *apciraṃmi*: CKD 655
DIR.PL. *apcira*: CKD 419; *apacira*: CKD 655; *avacira*: CKD 581

apcira is a measurement of vineyards (*masuśaḍa*) that are sold. When discussing this term, Burrow (LKD: 74 s.v. *apacira*) noted that agricultural land was by default "measured not by area but by the amount of seed which was sown on it", as e.g. in CKD 715 *bhuma … tre milimi bhijapayati* "a land with a capacity of three *milima*".[345] On this basis, Burrow deduced that *apcira* likewise does not refer to an area, hypothesising that it may instead have been "a row of standard length in which vines were planted". In my view, the parallel with *bhijapayati* 'capacity of seed' suggests that *apcira* may more specifically have been a type of unit (e.g. a row of vines) whose cultivation required a fixed amount of seed.

In case *apcira* is indeed connected with seed, it appears conceivable that the element *-cira* is etymologically related to OIr. **čiθra-* 'seed, origin'. This word is, for instance, continued in Middle Persian and Parthian as *čihr* (CPD: 22; DMMP: 132) and indirectly attested in Bactrian by way of the PNs σιροχομαρο ← *σιρο < *σιυρο < **čiθra-* + *χομαρο 'consolation' < **wahu-manθra-* and σιυραζαδο < **čiθrāzātā-* 'noble in respect of (her) lineage' (BPN: nos. 434; 438).

Regarding the first part of *apcira*, a comparison could be drawn with the Bactrian phrase αββο ζαμιγο, literally meaning 'water (and) land', whence its more technical sense 'irrigated land' (BD II: 182).[346] More specifically, I would like to suggest that *apcira* is a loan from a parallel Bactrian syntagm

[345] There is a parallel for this in the Linear B documents, where plots of land are also measured by the amount of seed (*pe-ma* / *pe-mo* ~ σπέρμα) required to sow them (cf. Duhoux 2008: 306–308).
[346] In N 18 ~ N 9', αββο ζαμιγο contrasts with ροζγανο 'vineyards'.

*αβο σι(υ)ρο /āvə tśi(h)rə/ < **āp-* + **čiθra-*.[347] The latter's literal meaning would be 'water (and) seed', but one may tentatively presume a more specialised meaning 'irrigated unit of a vineyard'.[348] Although caution remains due because of the uncertain semantics, this etymological proposal receives some support from Niya *udagabhiśa* < **udakabīja-* 'water and seed' (CKD 160; 6x), a compound which is structurally equivalent to the hypothesised Bactr. *αβο σι(υ)ρο and like Niya *apcira* referenced in an agricultural context.[349]

If one accepts this etymology, the variant spelling *avacira* (CKD 581) corresponds sound for sound to Bactr. *αβο σι(υ)ρο /āvə tśi(h)rə/.[350] The *-p-* in *apcira* (also *apacira*) could be due to influence from Skt. *āp-* 'water' or to fortition of an inadmissible cluster **-*vc-* to *-pc-*, similar to what may have happened in the case of Niya *ṿapg̱a* 'weaver' ← οαβγο* /wāvgə/ (§3.2.3 s.v.; §4.3.8).

I will now move on to a discussion of a passage (3.28), where *apcira* (dir.pl. *apacira*; loc.sg. *apciraṃmi*) co-occurs with a word which, according to Boyer et al. (KD: 246f.), could be read as either *veda* or *reda*[351] and which Burrow left untranslated.

(3.28) CKD 655 under-tablet obverse 5f.
masuśaḍa tatra masu vuta apacira 10 3 tatra ṿu [cha] ka pi ta [c]. [10] ? ? ? ? + + ? [ve]da (or *[re]da*) *sujada aṃña apciraṃmi veda* (or *[re]da*) *4 2.*

[347] I write *αβο σι(υ)ρο instead of *αββο σι(υ)ρο since the spelling αββο 'water' is typical of post-Kuṣāṇa Bactrian and the contact between Bactrian and Niya Prakrit should date back to Kuṣāṇa times (§4.2.1). The reason the word for 'water' came to be written as αββο was to distinguish it from the very frequent preposition αβο 'to' < **abi* (Sims-Williams 2017b: 450).

[348] For artificial irrigation techniques in the Shanshan kingdom, also concerning vineyards, cf. Bertrand (2012).

[349] In CKD 160, the successful cultivation of a strip of land is said to depend on *udag̱abhiśa* 'water and seed'.

[350] For the rendering of Bactr. -σι- /tśi/ as Niya *-ci-*, cf. §4.3.17. As implied by the brackets in σι(υ)ρο, Bactr. /hr/ < **-θr-* could already have been simplified to /r/ in Bactrian. Yet, it is also possible that the /h/ was lost during the borrowing process (cf. §4.3.23).

[351] Boyer et al.'s indeterminacy results from the fact that 𐨯 *ve* and 𐨮 *re* can be difficult to distinguish in (Niya) Kharoṣṭhī. Unfortunately, no image of CKD 655 is available to check the reading.

> "Also a vineyard. There thirteen *apacira* of vines are planted. [. . . . .][352] In another *apcira*, six *veda* (*reda*)." (TKD: 136).

Although the somewhat fragmentary nature of (3.28) complicates its comprehension, it is reasonably clear that *veda* / *reda* is something planted inside an *apcira*.

Given the co-occurrence of *veda* / *reda* with *apcira*, it seems worth examining if perhaps this word could be explained as a borrowing from Bactrian as well. With the transliteration *reda*, there is at least a tentative possibility to do so. Reading *reda* would namely allow us to compare the Niya word with Bactr. ρηδο* /rēdə/ as attested in the personal name ρηδοφαρο. Sims-Williams (BPN: no. 393) interprets ρηδοφαρο as a synonym of the Old Iranian name **čiθra-farnah-* 'glorious by his seed/descent', assuming ρηδο* to mean 'seed' as a cognate of Skt. *retas-* 'idem'.[353] Since 'seed' or 'sprout' would also fit the context of CKD 655, I find it tempting to read *reda*, and see in this word a loan from Bactr. ρηδο* 'seed, sprout' < **raita(s)*-.[354] But obviously, this remains mere conjecture.

Summary: in order to measure vineyards, the technical term *apcira* (also *apacira*; *avacira*) is used in the Niya documents. As agricultural land is typically measured according to its seed-capacity, I cautiously propose that *apcira* is an irrigated unit of a vineyard requiring a certain amount of seed. Etymologically, I believe that *apcira* may be a loan from a Bactrian asyndetic binominal phrase *αβο σι(υ)ρο /āvə tśi(h)rə/ 'water (and) seed', which would be comparable to Bactr. αββο ζαμιγο 'water (and) land > irrigated land' and Niya *udaga̱bhiśa* < **udakabīja*- 'water and seed'. In CKD 655, it is said that *veda* / *reda* is planted inside an *apcira*. If we read this word as *reda*,

---

[352] The part from *tatra* until *sujada* is incomprehensible. *sujada* recurs in a similar context in CKD 586 under-tablet obverse 2 *masuśaḍo ṣadha vṛkṣ̌ena sujada paṃcadaśa matra* "a vineyard along with the trees consisting of fifteen *sujada*". There is no obvious etymological connection between *sujada* and Skt. *sujāta*- 'well-born'.

[353] There have not been discovered any other Iranian cognates of *retas*- with the meaning 'seed'. It is, however, possible that words such as MP *rēdag* 'lad, page' (CPD: 71) and Bactr. dir.pl. ρηδγε 'attendants' (Rab. 21) are built from the same stem. Cf. also EWAia (II: 459f.).

[354] Although phonologically possible, it seems less likely that the presumed Niya *reda* would be inherited from Skt. *retas*- as this type of technical, agricultural word tends not to be inherited in Niya Prakrit.

it could perhaps be a borrowing from ρηδο* 'seed, sprout' < **raita(s)*- as possibly attested in the PN ρηδοφαρο.

50. *kilme* 'family estate'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *kilme*: CKD 422; 598 (?); 795
ABL.SG. *kilmeyade*: CKD 358; 817; 884; *kilmiyade*: CKD 358
LOC.SG. *kilmeyaṃmi*: CKD 256; 482; 859; *kilmeyami*: CKD 817 (2x)

Derivatives

ADJ. *kilmi* 'concerning the family estate': CKD 46
ADJ.DIR.SG. *kilmeci* 'belonging to the family estate': CKD 209; 278; 279 (2x); 297; 331; 358; 437 (2x); 474 (2x); 495; 519; 581; 585 (2x); 621 (2x); 806 (3x); 884 (2x); *kilmeciya*: CKD 381; 393; 532; 806
ADJ.DIR.PL. *kilmeci* 'idem': CKD 632; *kilmeṃci*: CKD 639; *kilmeciye*: CKD 152; 271 (2x); 279; 307; 338; 468 (2x); 817; *kilmeṃciye*: CKD 713
ADJ.GEN.PL. *kilmeciyana* 'idem': CKD 16; 254; 338; 374; 468 (4x); 734; 819; 848; *kilmiciyana*: CKD 261; 358
ADJ. *kilme[c].* 'idem': CKD 257

Compounds

ADJ. *vegakilme* 'outside (?) the family estate': CKD 211; 481; *ye̱gakilme*: CKD 714; *ve̱gakilmi*: CKD 165
DIR.SG. *kilmerakṣana* 'guard of the family estate': CKD 808
LOC.SG. *Petaaya̱nakilmeyaṃmi* 'family estate (located) in *Peta* village': CKD 32
GEN.PL. *Yaye̱kilmeciyana* 'belonging to the *Yaye* family estate': CKD 431 = 432 (*Yave*-)

kilme is closely connected to the word *aya̱na* 'village, territory of a clan' (§3.3.2 s.v.) and has been translated as 'district' (cf. Burrow 1935b: 674f.; LKD: 83 s.v.). Its meaning is nevertheless likely to have been somewhat more precise.

According to some researchers (e.g. Thomas 1935: 63f.; Atwood 1991), *kilme* and its derivative *kilmeci* 'belonging to a *kilme*'[355] would need to be interpreted within a feudal framework, viz. *kilme* would refer to an estate whose lands were possessed by a landowner, but whose cultivation was in the hands of serfs or tenants, called *kilmeci.*

Padwa (2007: 204–211) has cogently refuted this interpretation (cf. also Høisæter 2020: 142–144). He assembled evidence that the word *kilme* has

[355] *kilmeci* is derived from *kilme* with the appurtenance suffix *-ci* (on which cf. §5.2.2). *kilmi* in CKD 46 is formed by adding the adj. suffix *-i* (§6.4.3) to *kilme*.

more to do with kinship groups. There are, for instance, indications for exogamous marriage practices between different *kilme*s / *a̱yana*s (§3.2.3 s.v. *muṣḍhaṣi*; §3.7.2 s.v. *muḱaṣi*). Even more crucial is the testimony provided by CKD 437, where *kilmeci* occurs in a list of kinship terms (see Padwa 2007: 208).

Nonetheless, there is still room for disagreement with Padwa's interpretation, especially on his view on the distinction between *kilme* and *a̱yana*. According to Padwa (2007: 209),

> "it seems hard to escape the conclusion that *kilme* refers to groups allied by marriage, and *a̱yana* to the territorial residence groups at least partly coterminous with the spatial extent of those groups."

Yet, Padwa neglects the fact that *kilme* already refers to the territory of a kinship group rather than to the kinship group as an abstract concept.[356] Otherwise, it would be difficult to account for a passus as (3.29), where it is said that land has been taken in Śakā's *kilme*.

(3.29) CKD 482 under-tablet obverse 2
Śakā garahati yatha eda̱ṣa kilmeyaṃmi Molýina bhuma ladhaye
"Śakā complains that Molýina has received land in his estate (*kilmeyaṃmi*)." (TKD: 94).

On this basis, I propose to take *kilme* as an estate of a family consisting of different households or farms (cf. infra) and *kilmeci* as an inhabitant of such a family estate. *a̱yana*, on the other hand, refers to a larger territory, as a *kilme* is often located inside an *a̱yana* (e.g. CKD 32 *Petaa̱yanakilmeyaṃmi* 'in a family estate (located) in *Peta* village'). One could thus interpret *a̱yana* as a small village consisting of different estates, possibly still linked to one another by tribal connections.

Besides, I would argue that a third term should be included in this hierarchy, i.e. Niya *goṭha* 'farm, household' < Skt. *goṣṭha*- 'cow-stable'. *goṭha* and *kilme* regularly occur in similar contexts, and both appear to count as administrative units from where to provide taxes.[357] Yet, the two words are still not entirely synonymous, as becomes clear from (3.30).

---

[356] As I learn from the summary in Jiang (2020: 145f.), Duan & Tshelotar (2016: 43) have voiced similar objections against Padwa's analysis.

[357] For *kilme* as an administrative unit taxes are paid from, cf. CKD 165; 211; 261 (?); 374; 468; 481; 714; 819, and for *goṭha*, cf. CKD 147; 165; 211; 373; 713; 714. As concerns *a̱yana* 'village, territory of a clan', cf. *a̱yaneṃci palýi* 'village tax' in

(3.30) CKD 358 obverse 7
avi atra Sudarśanaṣa atra kilmeci goṭha 2
"also there are two households (*goṭha*) which belong there to the estate (*kilmeci*) of Sudarśana" (tr. mine).

It seems likely that a family estate (*kilme*) is instead made up of different farms/households (*goṭha*) in the same way that a village (*aṿana*) consists of various estates (*kilme*). This makes me assume a threefold hierarchy: *goṭha* 'farm, household' < *kilme* 'family estate' < *aṿana* 'village, territory of a clan'.

This renewed understanding of the semantics of *kilme* allows us to re-evaluate the etymologies hitherto proposed. According to Burrow (1935b: 674f.; LKD: 83 s.v.), *kilme* would be one of the key arguments supporting his "Tocharian C" hypothesis. He compared *kilme* to TA *kälyme* and TB *kälymiye* 'region, direction' (DTTA: 131f.; DoT: 186f.). While formally acceptable, Burrow's etymology is not entirely satisfactory from the semantic point of view. TA *kälyme* and TB *kälymiye* refer to the cardinal points and large regions, being used to calque and translate Skt. *diś-*.[358] *kilme*, by contrast, denotes only a small territory. In addition, *kilme* pairs with *aṿana*, an Iranian loanword from **ā-wahana-* 'dwelling' (§3.3.2 s.v.). Hence, it seems more logical that also *kilme* was borrowed from an Iranian language. The frequent combination of *kilme* with the appurtenance suffix *-ci* suggests the same scenario, given that the suffix *-ci* is most likely Bactrian in origin (see §5.5.2).

As far as this last point is concerned, Thomas' (1944: 61f.) idea to derive Niya *kilme* from Gr. κλίμα would seem more promising, as the Greek word can have passed through an Iranian language such as Bactrian (cf. also Hitch 2009: 22 fn. 73). If so, one could argue that the initial sequence κλ- was metathesised to something like *κιλμο /kilmə/ because of the absence of an initial cluster κλ- in Bactrian.[359] Still, there is again a semantic objection to be made since the basic meaning of κλίμα is 'slope of a mountain'. κλίμα can also mean 'region', but when it has this meaning, the word refers, like TA *kälyme*

CKD 713. Ching (2013a: 73) already suspected *goṭha* to be an administrative unit, and she compared some technical usages of Khot. *bisā-* 'house'. One can additionally draw a parallel with Bactr. καδγο 'household, estate', which is also used as an administrative unit taxes are paid from (see doc. J).

[358] Cf. e.g. TA *himavant ṣulyiṃ kälymeyac* "towards the mountainous region of the Himavant" (A 77 = THT 710 b3).

[359] κλ- would have to come from a phonotactically impossible Old Iranian cluster **kd-*. The cluster -λμ- /lm/ is allowed in Bactrian, as proved by νιϸαλμο 'seat' < **ni-šadma(n)-*.

and TB *kälymiye*, to large-scale territories, something which is difficult to reconcile with the semantics of Niya *kilme* (Banti 2000: 6).[360]

Seeing that neither Burrow's Tocharian nor Thomas' Greek etymology is compelling and in view of the indications that we are instead dealing with an Iranian loanword, I cautiously suggest that *kilme* may be borrowed from Bactr. *γιρλομηυο /γirlmēhə/, the expected outcome of a hypothetical Old Iranian compound **gr̥da-maiθa-* 'dwelling of a household'.[361] The default Iranian word for 'dwelling' is admittedly **maiθana-* (e.g. MP *mēhan* 'home'), but a variant **maiθa-* 'dwelling' has also been proposed for the PNs Elam. *Ra-da-me-sa* and Gr. Ῥαδαμασις ← OIr. **rāda-maiθa-* 'readying the home' (Iranica: §4.2.1323) and Tumsh. *bimex$_6$a-* 'lodger' < **wi-maiθa-* 'dwelling' (Dragoni 2020: 219f.).[362]

The main advantage of my etymology is semantic, as the meaning of **gr̥da-maiθa-* neatly matches that of *kilme*. Formally, there are some potential drawbacks, though I would argue that none is so severe as to be insuperable.

The first drawback is the lack of further evidence to support the reconstruction of an Old Iranian compound **gr̥da-maiθa-*. Yet, at least three Indo-Iranian compounds are structurally comparable in that their first part means 'house' and their second 'place, dwelling'. To begin with, Arm. *gerdastan* 'household, body of servants' allows us to reconstruct an Old Iranian compound **gr̥da-stāna-* 'place of the house' (Olsen 1999: 872; Schwartz 2023: 188). Secondly, there is the Bactrian place name καδγοστανο, a transparent compound of καδγο 'house' < **kata-ka-* and στανο 'place' < **stāna-* (BD II: 220). A third parallel is Skt. *gr̥hāvāsa-* / Pāli *gharāvāsa-* 'dwelling of the house'. This compound occurs as *gr̥havasa* (also *gr̥havaṣa*; *grihavaṣa*) in the Niya documents too, where it consistently pairs with *goṭha* 'farm, household' (cf. 47; 62; 292; 326 (7x)), similar to how *kilme* and *goṭha* are semantically connected (cf. supra).

---

[360] Cf. e.g. τὰ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν κλίματα τῆς Μηδίας "the southern regions of Media" in Polybius 5.44.6, with Montanari (2015: 1139).

[361] As the etymology requires lambdacism to have happened, donor languages other than Bactrian can be excluded. For the phonological development of the first part of the compound, cf. γιρλ- /γirl/ 'to call, to name' < **gr̥da-* (BD II: 207); the change of intervocalic **-θ-* to Bactr. -υ- /h/ is evidenced by, amongst others, παυαγγο /pahaŋgə/ 'plate' < **paθana-ka-* 'broad' (Sims-Williams 2013: 194). On the evidence for OIr. **gr̥da-* 'house(hold)', see now Bernard (2023: 120f.).

[362] Cf. also Khot. *parmiha-* 'village' < **pari-miθā-*, with zero grade of the root.

The other issue with my etymology is that it presupposes two phonetic substitutions which, though conceivable, are not paralleled elsewhere.[363] First, one needs to assume that the foreign cluster /rlm/ in *γιρλομηυο /γirlmēhə/ was simplified to *-lm-* during the borrowing process, even though the Bactrian liquid cluster -ρλ- /rl/ seems in more secure loanwords to be substituted with Niya *-r-*. All instances of the latter substitution concern, however, intervocalic -ρλ- /rl/, so it is not unthinkable that /rlm/ would be treated differently (see further §4.3.25). Second, my etymology necessitates the assumption that expected ***gilme* was devoiced to the attested *kilme*. On this devoicing, see §4.3.28.

Niya *kilme* also occurs in the compound phrase *vegakilme* (once *ṿegā-*), which is always used in the context of a particular form of taxation. Interestingly, this tax should be paid by women, even though family estates were usually in the hands of males.

Because of this connection with women, Burrow (LKD: 123 s.v.) suggested *vegā* to be related to MP *wēwag* and NP *bewa* 'widow' < **widawa-kā-*. This etymology is formally unattractive. In no known Middle Iranian language would one expect to have a form **wēg* (or the like) out of **widawa-kā-* and postulating a contraction of *-*ēwa-* (cf. MP *wēwag*) to Niya *-e-* would also be without close parallels.[364]

I propose that *vegā-* (once *ṿegā-*) is instead a loanword from Bactr. βηγο /vēgə/ or βηκο /vēkə/ < **bai(d)-ka-* 'outside, except, rather than' (BD II: 202). On top of being formally straightforward, this etymology is potentially supported by the fact that Bactr. βηγο (βηκο) can, like Niya *vegā-*, be used as the first element of a compound (cf. βηγοτωγο 'exempt from taxation', BD II: 183).[365] As there is, however, insufficient evidence to determine which type

[363] Otherwise, the phonological correspondences work fine. Given that intervocalic *h* is liable to be lost in Niya Prakrit (§4.3.23), a derivation from *γιρλομηυο /γirlmēhə/ would nicely account for the final *-e* in Niya *kilme.*

[364] Thomas' (1935: 63; 1944: 61) proposal to see in *vegā* an inherited word out of Skt. *vegā-* 'stream, flood' is implausible for semantic reasons.

[365] Variation between *v* /v/ and *ṿ* /w/ occurs in inherited words too (cf. §4.3.22), and the substitution of Bactrian intervocalic -γ- /g/ with Niya *-ḡ-* /γ/ is regular (cf. §4.3.11). The Sogdian cognate of βηγο (βηκο), i.e. *βyk* (also *βyq*; CSogd. *byq*, cf. DCS^2: 57; DMSB^2: 70), is also found as the first member of compounds (e.g. *βyknγwδn* 'outer garment'). If one assumes lenition of intervocalic *-k-* to *-ḡ-* /γ/ after the word was borrowed, Sogd. *βyk* could also be the source of Niya *vegā-*. Yet, if it is true that *kilme* is a Bactrian loanword, it would seem better to derive the element *vegā-* from the same source.

of legal context could lie behind an expression 'outside the family estate',[366] this etymology must be considered tentative.

To sum up, *kilme* denotes a family estate consisting of different farms/households. Based on these semantics, I propose to derive *kilme* out of Bactr. *γιρλομηυο /γirlmēhə/ < **gṛda-maiθa-* 'dwelling of a household'. While admittedly conjectural, this etymological proposal may account more easily for the semantics of *kilme* than connecting the Niya word to TA *kälyme* and TB *kälymiye* 'direction, (large) region' or Gr. κλίμα 'slope of a mountain, (large) region'.

51. *taravara* 'sword'

Attestations of the base form
INS.SG. *taravarena*: CKD 585

Since the ins.sg. *taravarena* in CKD 585 is used parallel to the ins.sg. *śastrena* 'with a knife', the underlying word *taravara* is probably cognate with Hindi *tarwār* / *talwār*, Bengali *taroyāl*, and other NIA words meaning 'sword' (cf. Thomas 1935: 80; TKD: 123). In Sanskrit, the same word occurs in the meaning 'one-edged sword' as *taravāri-* (e.g. Hcar.), fem. *taravālikā-* (in lexical sources), and *talavāraṇa-* (Kir. 14.29) (cf. MW: 438; 440).

Mayrhofer (KEWA: 482; EWAia III: 237) argues that we are dealing with a *Kulturwort* without ascertainable etymology. One of his reasons for thinking so is that two Nuristani cognates and one NIA form are not easily reconciled with the Sanskrit prototype. This point concerns Kati *tərwōč* (aberrant *č*), Prasun *trāž* (aberrant *ž*),[367] and Odiya *tarāṛi* (aberrant *ṛ*). As the vast majority of NIA cognates are still regularly derived from **taravārV-* (see CDIAL: no. 5706), a specialist in the relevant languages should investigate whether the Kati, Prasun, and Odiya forms could not be explained as secondary. Until then, the alternative proposal made below must be regarded as tentative.

---

[366] In light of the exogamous marriage practices evidenced in the Niya documents (cf. §3.2.3 s.v. *muṣḍhaṣi*; §3.7.2 s.v. *muḱaṣi*), one could conjecture that women who had married into a different family, i.e. were living "outside their (original) family estate", but who were nonetheless legally bound to the family they were born in (e.g. because not all the legal requirements for marriage had been met), still had to contribute to the taxes which her original family was supposed to pay.

[367] *trāž* is the spelling of the Prasun word used by Mayrhofer (in KEWA) and Turner (in CDIAL). Buddruss & Degener (2015: 809) record as dialect forms *tərw'až* / *terw'až* and *tər'až*.

Given that several words for military equipment in Indo-Aryan languages are Iranian loanwords (Burrow 1973[3]: 389; Ollett 2024: 96),[368] and words for 'sword' often derive from verbs meaning 'to cut' (Buck 1949: 1392f.),[369] I hesitantly propose that Niya *taravara* and its cognates are borrowed from a hypothetical Bactrian word *ταρλοβαρο /tarləvărə/ < **tarda-băra-* 'splitter > sword'. The underlying verbal root would be *√*tard* 'to pierce, to split' (EDIV: 380), and *-*băra-* could have agentive meaning, as more often in this type of compound (cf. BD II: 202 for Bactr. -βαρο in this function).

Were this etymology on the right track, the change from *-*rd-* to *-rl-* would unambiguously point in the direction of Bactrian as the most likely donor language. Other loanwords secure the assumed correspondence between Bactrian intervocalic -ρλ- /rl/ and Niya *-r-* (see §4.3.25), and the foreignness of the cluster -ρλ- /rl/ could have motivated the observed variation between *-l-* and *-r-* in the Sanskrit cognates (*taravāri-*; *taravālikā-*; *talavāraṇa-*) and NIA forms such as Hindi *tarwār* / *talwār*.[370]

The adoption of a Bactrian word meaning 'sword' into Indo-Aryan languages other than Gāndhārī could be due to the military expansion of the Kuṣāṇa empire over large parts of northern India (see e.g. lines 4–7 in the Rabatak inscription and cf. §7.2).[371]

52. *reda* 'seed, sprout (?)'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.PL. *reda*: CKD 655

As I argue §3.2.4 s.v. *apcira*, Niya *reda* may be a loan from Bactr. ρηδο* 'seed, sprout' < **raita(s)-* as possibly attested in the PN ρηδοφαρο. Yet, this etymology remains highly uncertain as *reda* has alternatively been read as *veda* and the existence of Bactr. ρηδο* hinges on the etymological interpretation of a personal name.

---

[368] More generally, words denoting "sharp cutting implements" are cross-linguistically borrowed quite often (see e.g. Carling 2020: 129–131; 135).

[369] Cf. e.g. Av. *karəta-* 'knife, sword' from *√*kart* 'to cut (EDIV: 243f.).

[370] Liquid dissimilation could have been a contributing factor.

[371] For additional notes on the historical context in which Bactrian words can have been adopted by the local vernaculars of northern India, see Schoubben (2022b: 352–354).

53. *Remena*, place name

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *Remena*: CKD 518
LOC.SG. *Remenaṃmi*: CKD 214; 251; 376

§3.2.3 s.v. *aco* advances the hypothesis that the place name *Remena* is borrowed from a Bactrian compound *ρη(ο)μηυανο /rē(w)mēhanə/ < **raiwa-maiθana-*, literally 'rich dwelling'. Support for this idea comes from the parallel formation of the attested Bactrian toponym ρη(ο)γανο and the use of **-maiθana-* as the second element of place names in other Iranian languages. As etymologies of toponyms are tricky to prove, the proposal must still be regarded as tentative.

54. *laṭhana* 'plain, open land (?)'

Attestations of the base form
LOC.SG. *laṭhanami*: CKD 392

The context in which *laṭhana* occurs renders it likely that this hapax refers to a type of land (Burrow 1935a: 786; LKD: 114 s.v. *laṭhanami*).[372] Burrow's cautious comparison with MP *daštān* 'menstruating, menstruation' (CPD: 25) has therefore little to recommend itself from a semantic point of view. A semantically better fit is Burrow's alternative proposal to compare *laṭhana* to MP *dašt* 'plain, open ground' (CPD: 25) and Sogd. *δxšt-* (also CSogd. *dxšt-*) 'plain, desert' (DMSB^2: 89; DCS^2: 72) < OIr. **daxštă̆-*.[373]

If there exists an etymological relationship between **daxštă̆-* 'plain, desert' and Niya *laṭhana*, the latter should be a Bactrian loanword in view of its initial *l-*. As it happens, a Bactrian cognate of MP *dašt* and Sogd. *δxšt-* seems to be attested as λαχþτα 'desert' in line 4 of the Ayrtam inscription (Sims-Williams fthc.).[374] In addition, a later form λαχþτο /laxštə/ may be attested

[372] It remains unclear to what extent *laṭhaya*, an adjective used in CKD 298 to define *kriṣivatra* 'cultivation', is connected.
[373] It is unknown if there is any etymological connection between this noun and the verbal adj. **da(x)šta-* 'burnt', for MP *dašt* and Sogd. *δxšt-* seem "to signify "plain" or "open, uninhabited place" rather than "scorched land"" (Greenfield & Shaked 1972: 39). Burrow's (TKD: 80) conjectural translation of the loc.sg. *laṭhanami* as "to the open lands" is presumably based on his etymological proposal.
[374] Sims-Williams (fthc.) reads and translates line 4 of the Ayrtam inscription as follows: [ ]ą[c. 18]δι λαχþṭą στąδǫ αβαβσα τιδι þǫδβąą δι ι••νο κανδο α["…

in the Hephthalite fragment h_8, but unfortunately in a badly understandable context (Sims-Williams 2004b: 331).

Bactrian λαχβτα (later λαχβτο) can, however, not be the direct source of Niya *laṭhana*, as this would leave the sequence *-ana* unaccounted for. One way out of this conundrum would be to interpret *laṭhana* as a loan from Bactr. *λαχβτανο /laxštanə/ < **daxštana-*, a form safely reconstructable based on the attested λαχβατανιγο 'cremation place' (BD II: 226 *contra* Humbach 2002: 417). Being a derivative from *√*daǰ* 'to burn', *λαχβτανο is, however, expected to mean 'burning', a translation which does not suit the attestation of Niya *laṭhana*. Therefore, it may be preferable to assume that *laṭhana* is borrowed from Bactr. *λαχβτανο /laxštānə/, possibly an adjectival derivative in -ανο < **-āna-* from λαχβτα (later λαχβτο) 'desert, plain' < **daxštă̆-*. In case *λαχβτανο was substantivised, as adjectives in -ανο < **-āna-* often do (BD II: 193), *laṭhana* could then still mean something like 'open land' or 'plain'.[375]

Phonologically, Bactr. *λαχβτανο /laxštānə/ would be a straightforward source of Niya *laṭhana*. The only assumption needed is that the Bactrian cluster -χβτ- /xšt/ was simplified to Niya *-ṭh-* /ʂʈ$^{(h)}$/ during the borrowing process. This simplification could even have something to do with the substitution of Bactr. -χ- /x/ with a sibilant observable in some other Bactrian loanwords in Niya Prakrit (cf. §4.15).

To sum up, Niya *laṭhana* could be a loan from Bactr. *λαχβτανο /laxštānə/, a derivative in -ανο from λαχβτα (later λαχβτο) 'plain, open land' < **daxštă̆-*. As, however, the semantics attributed to *laṭhana* are conjectural and the reconstruction and morphological analysis of *λαχβτανο uncertain, this etymology can only be tentative at the present stage of research.

55. *lastuga,* textile product

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *lastuga*: CKD 161; 184; 288; 566; 585; 728; *lastuka*: CKD 416

---

was (?) a desert, without water, then the *shudva* dug the …". The apparent preservation of **-xšt-* in Bactrian is unusual, as this cluster is by default simplified to -χτ- /xt/, e.g. σπαχτο /spaxtə/ 'service' < **spaxšti-*.

[375] As a third option, one could speculate that *laṭhana* was borrowed from an obl.pl. in -ανο < **ānă̆m* of λαχβτα (later λαχβτο) 'desert, plain'. Yet, if so, *laṭhana* would be the only Bactrian loanword in Niya Prakrit where the obl.pl. was borrowed.

The word *lastuga* refers to a textile product, as is clear from CKD 566, where a *lastuga* is said to be made from polychrome silk (*citrapaṭamae*). In addition, we know that a *lastuga* could be up to seven "hands" long (CKD 728: *hasta 4 3*); that it was not of great value (CKD 184: *lahu manasigara matra*); and that it was frequently sent as a gift (cf. CKD 161; 184; 288; 585; 728). See Burrow (1935a: 786; LKD: 115 s.v.).

Scholars have made various proposals on what type of textile product could be meant, but no definitive conclusions have been reached: Thomas (1934a: 66 fn. 11) thought of a 'shawl'; Lüders (1936a: 29 fn. 2) of a 'turban'; and recently Høisæter (2020: 259) suggested that *lastuga* "could be equated with something like the small bags holding mirrors or combs found in both grave M3 and M5" (cf. also Høisæter 2023: 412f.). Given that a *lastuga* was measured in "hands" (cf. supra), I consider it also possible that it was simply an unprocessed strip of cloth.

Etymologically, Burrow (1935a: 786) compared NP *dastār* 'towel, handkerchief, napkin, sash, turban' (CPED: 521), a comparison which made him to assume that *lastuga* is, like NP *dastār*, derived from OIr. **dasta*- 'hand', but "with a different suffix".[376]

Although it is certainly conceivable that a textile term is based on a word meaning 'hand',[377] there are some formal issues with Burrow's etymology. The first point concerns the vowel -*a*- in *lastuga*. Unless one is willing to posit a loan from an otherwise unattested Iranian language, the change of **d*- to **l*- presupposed by Burrow's etymology implies that *lastuga* is a Bactrian loanword. Yet, the Bactrian outcome of OIr. **dasta*- 'hand' is by now well attested as λιστο (BD II: 227f.; SFBG: 65), including in compounds and derivatives such as λιστηγιρδο 'estate, ward, dependant', λιστοβανδιγο 'bracelet', οιλιστο 'disappeared (?)', and χολιστο 'with one's own hands > acting personally' (BD II: 227; 246; 281). In other words, the **a* in OIr. **dasta*- developed to Bactr. -ι- /i/.[378]

[376] Burrow's etymology has been accepted by e.g. Schwartz (1974: 400) and Weber (1997: 31). Bailey's (KT VI: 317) alternative comparison with ZMP *lystk*ˡ, transliterated by him as "*rastak, ristak*" and wrongly interpreted as a textile, has been cogently refuted by MacKenzie (1969: 400) and Schwartz (1974: 400).

[377] Cf. e.g. English "handkerchief", Dutch *handdoek* 'towel', and NP *dast-māl* 'handkerchief, napkin'. In addition, it seems worth comparing the similar formation of Oss. I. *fadyg*, D. *fadug* 'piece of cloth, stripe' (quoted from EDIV: 305), an adjectival derivation from *fad* 'foot'.

[378] The reason for this vowel raising is not entirely clear. Gholami (SFBG: 65) attributes it to the following sibilant, but *-*a*- is normally preserved in this

Burrow's etymology consequently requires that the -ι- /i/ in Bactr. λιστο /liśtə/ was substituted with Niya *-a-*.[379] Such a substitution is not impossible if one posits a scenario whereby Bactr. -ι- /i/ was phonetically realised as a central vowel (e.g. [ɨ] or [ɪ]) and therefore rendered as Niya *-a-*, itself also a type of schwa (§2.1.1). One could even draw a parallel with my argument that Bactr. *λιρτο /lirtə/ 'load, cargo' < **dr̥šta-* was borrowed into Sanskrit as **larda-* 'idem', whence *lardayati* 'to load' (Schoubben 2022, see especially pp. 350f.).[380] However, Bactr. -ι- is otherwise always rendered with Niya *-i-* (see §4.2.2),[381] so the required substitution could still be a problem for Burrow's etymology.

In addition, one should ask exactly what type of formation lies behind *lastuga*. Weber (1997: 31) reconstructed the Old Iranian pre-form as **dastuka-*, presumably to account for the vowel *-u-* in Niya *lastuga*. This reconstruction is nonetheless morphologically implausible, as **dasta-* 'hand' is not a *u*-stem, and there is hardly any evidence supporting an Iranian suffix **-ukă-*.[382] A morphologically more attractive reconstruction would be OIr. **dasta-ka-* as in MP *dastag* 'bunch, bundle, group' (CPD: 25) and the

position; cf. e.g. αβαστανο /əvastānə/ 'support' < **upa-stāna-*; αστο /astə/ 'home, household' < **asta-*; and pret. βαστο /vastə/ 'to bind' < **basta-* (BD II: 181; 198; 202). In the case of ζιβτο /źištə/ 'requested' < **ǰasta-*, **-a-* was raised to -ι- /i/ because of the preceding palatal (BD II: 212). Since OIr. **dasta-* goes back to PIr. **ǰasta-* (with **ǰ* ~ [dᶻ]; see Klingenschmitt 2000: 200f. fn. 30), one could also consider that the raising is due to the preceding affricate. This may be chronologically difficult, however, as it places the vowel raising—a sound change peculiar to Bactrian—before the Common Iranian dissimilation of **ǰ-* [dᶻ] to **d-* in the word for 'hand'. Sims-Williams (p.c.) cautiously suggests that the -ι- of λιστο was generalised from the loc.sg. **dastayā*, which will have been in common use and may survive as the first element of λιστηγιρδο 'estate; ward, dependant' < **dastay(ā)-kr̥ta-* (cf. further Khot. loc.sg. *dīšta*, as pointed out by Federico Dragoni).

[379] I transcribe λιστο as /liśtə/ because of the arguments regarding palatalisation made in §2.2.4.2. It is phonologically understandable that Bactr. -στ- /śt/ would be rendered as Niya *-st-*; see §3.2.2 s.vv. *aśpista*; *saste* and §4.3.16.

[380] Cf. further TB (→ TA) *pärmaṅk* /pərmə́ŋk/ 'hope' ← Bactr. φρομιγγο < **fra-manyu-ka-*, where Bactr. -ι- /i/ is substituted with an accented schwa in Tocharian.

[381] In case Niya *avaliḱa* means 'swaddle' and is a loan from Bactr. *αβαλιβκο /əvališkə/ < **upa-dr̥šta-ka-* or *αβολιβκο /avəliškə/ < **abi-dr̥šta-ka-* (§3.2.3 s.v.), this would also be true of the sequence -λι- /li/.

[382] The hypocoristic suffix *-uka-* potentially seen in Old Iranian anthroponyms (Iranica: 573) is probably irrelevant for the morphological analysis of *lastuga*.

loanwords Arm. *dastak* ‘palm of the hand’ (Olsen 1999: 876) and Syr. *dstq’* ‘handle, hilt’ (Ciancaglini 2008: 155).

In the latter case, the *-u-* in Niya *lastuga* may form a problem. **dasta-ka-* could yield Bactr. *λιστογο, with the same development of **-a-ka-* as in e.g. πωστογο ‘document, letter, contract’ < **pawasta-ka-* (BD II: 258f.). Yet, the <ο> in πωστογο and, by implication, *λιστογο probably stands for /ə/ and not for /u/ (cf. the variant spellings of πωστογο in -αγο and -ιγο). Deriving *lastuga* out of *λιστογο /liśtəgə/ < **dasta-ka-* accordingly requires one to posit a rendering of Bactr. -ο- /ə/ as Niya *-u-*. While such a substitution should not be regarded as impossible (cf. 3.4.2 s.v. *Vhurmajheva*), it adds still another complication.

Because of the formal issues discussed above and the uncertainty on the exact semantics, I conclude that the derivation of Niya *lastuga* from Bactr. *λιστογο /liśtəgə/ < **dasta-ka-* is merely tentative.

56. *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* ‘finance officer’

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *ṣvaṭhaṃgha*: CKD 11; 33; 713; *ṣoṭhaṃga*:[383] CKD 7 (2x); 12 (2x); 14 (2x); 19; 35; 37 (2x); 38; 54; 64; 70 (2x); 71 (2x); 91; 123; 134; 142 (2x); 155; 156; 158; 165; 182 (2x); 192; 206; 208; 230; 265; 310; 341; 344; 358; 400; 403 (2x); 413; 422; 427; 433 (2x); 439 (2x); 461; 469; 474 (2x); 484 (2x); 494 (2x); 497; 502; 503; 504; 509 (2x); 520; 521; 524 (2x); 548; 555; 567 (4x); 582; 592; 598; 636 (2x); 638; 641; 657; 686; 716; 721; 723; 734; 735; 744; 745; 795; 796; 808; 821; 859; 887; 888 (2x); 897; 899; *ṣoṭhaṃgha*: CKD 19; 21; 22; 34; 83 (2x); 85; 86 (2x); 90; 97; 107; 110; 135 (2x); 140 (2x); 143 (2x); 152 (2x); 157; 159; 162 (2x); 165; 203; 206 (2x); 220; 243; 327; 330; 340; 453; 454; 498; 507; 541 (2x); 547; 552; 569; 572; 575; 576 (2x); 577; 580 (5x); 582 (2x); 586; 587 (3x); 589; 593; 604; 648; 767; 769; 771; 787; 816 (2x); 817 (2x); 839

GEN.SG. *ṣoṭhaṃghaṣa*: CKD 656

DIR.PL. *ṣoṭhaṃga*: CKD 272

GEN.PL. *ṣoṭhaṃgana*: CKD 198; 567

[383] For some documents (CKD 35; 265; 400; 887; 897), the available editions have *ṣothaṃga*. Yet, in all cases where I could check the reading, the expected *ṣoṭhaṃga* is visible on the images, so I assume for convenience that everywhere ϶ *ṭha* and not † *tha* must be read. I likewise assume that KD’s (48) reading *soṭhaṃgha* in CKD 123 is a typo for *ṣoṭhaṃgha* with an initial retroflex. In CKD 422 (obverse 10) and 821, read *ṣoṭhaṃga* instead of *ṣoṭhaga*.

Compounds

ABL.SG. *ṣoṭhaṃgadharmade* 'the office of a finance officer': CKD 567

The official called *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga*[384] in Niya Prakrit was in charge of collecting taxes and, even more so, preparing account lists and administering the offices where these tax products were stored (cf. LKD: 127f. s.v.; Høisæter 2020: 169; 597); hence the approximate translation as 'finance officer' (so Atwood 1991: 194 *et passim*).

Niya *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* has a cognate in TA *ṣoṣṭaṅk** (LKD: ix; 128; Bailey 1937a: 905 with fn. 3; 1947: 149; 1949a: 124; DTTA: 497f.). This Tocharian word is attested through its nom.pl. *ṣoṣṭäṅkāñ* in the syntagm *lāñc āmāśāñ ṣoṣṭäṅkāñ* "kings, ministers, and finance officers" (A 222 a2 = THT 855 a2); it does not occur in administrative documents.

More recently, it has been argued that also the Bactrian title σωταγγο is connected to the words under discussion (BD II: 266; Hitch 2009: 18). I doubt the correctness of this argument. The dis legomenon σωταγγο only occurs in contexts that do not allow to determine its precise meaning, and one is forced to resort to ad hoc assumptions for the comparison with *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* to work phonologically. To begin with, the initial *ṣ-* of *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* does not correspond to any known phonological value of Bactr. <σ>, i.e. /s/, /ś/, /ts/, and /tś/ (§2.2.4.2). Aware of this issue, Sims-Williams (BD II: 266) conjectured that "the initial consonant of one form or the other" was "affected by dissimilation or assimilation", but this cannot be proved as long as the ultimate etymology of σωταγγο remains unknown. A second problem is the discrepancy between Bactr. -τ- /t/ and Niya *-ṭh-* /ṣṭ/. To be clear, Bactr. -τ- /t/ can derive from earlier *-*št*-, e.g. in ατασ /ată/ 'eight' < **aštā*, but this sound change had already been completed by the time of the earliest Bactrian inscriptions.[385] If one wants to connect *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* to σωταγγο, one thus either has to assume a very early borrowing or a dialect variant with -þτ- /št/ preserved. As neither option is particularly plausible, I prefer to leave Bactr. σωταγγο aside for now.

None of the previously proposed etymologies for *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* carries full conviction. Thomas (1926b: 51) hypothesised this title to be borrowed from Tib. *so tham* 'chief of the military guards', but this proposal is semantically unconvincing, as the duties of a *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* are of

[384] *-ṭh-* stands for /ṣṭ/, cf. §2.1.6.

[385] Cf. e.g. Sims-Williams (1985) on the evidence from the Surkh Kotal inscription.

a financial rather than a military character (cf. supra). In addition, the phonological correspondence is weak.[386]

Bailey (1949a: 123–126) reconstructed the ultimate source of *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* as OIr. **fra-waxš-tana-ka-* 'seller', a nominal derivative of the verbal root **fra* + **√waxš* seen in e.g. MMP *frawaxš-* (or *frōxš-*) 'to sell' (so also van Windekens 1976: 640; Isebaert 1980: 57f.). This suggestion is not compelling either. A *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* was not a merchant but somebody collecting and storing taxes, and formally, Bailey had to posit ad hoc sound changes that cannot be ascribed to any known Middle Iranian language: **fra-waxš-tana-ka-* > **frōxštanaka-* > **šōštanaka-* > **šōštanka-*.[387]

According to Tremblay (2001: 35 fn. 54), *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* would come from Skt. *śodhanaka-* 'a kind of official or servant in a judge's court'. This derivation is phonologically impossible, as Skt. *-dh-* cannot become Niya *-ṭh-* /ṣṭ/.

Pinault (*apud* Carling 2005: 57) traced *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* back to a Chinese combination *shōu cáng* 收藏 'receive, accept, gather, harvest' + 'conceal, store'. From the semantic point of view, Pinault's etymology is attractive, but his idea still suffers from some drawbacks. First of all, there seems to be no trace of an official named *shōu cáng* 收藏 in the contemporary Chinese documents from the Tarim Basin.[388] Pinault's proposal is moreover phonologically not self-evident. In (Early) Middle Chinese, *shōu cáng* 收藏 would have been pronounced as *syuw dzang* (Baxter and Sagart's notation). This is, however, only superficially similar to *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* or *ṣoṭhaṃga*, as it is, for instance, counterintuitive that Chin. *-dz-* would be rendered as /ṣṭ/ in Niya Prakrit and Tocharian.[389] Consequently, this etymology is not fully convincing either.

Most recently, Pinault (in DTTA: 497f.) has proposed to interpret Niya *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* and TA *ṣoṣṭaṅk** as a hybrid compound with a

---

[386] The dental sibilant in Tibetan does not correspond to the retroflex in Niya, and there is no reason why Tib. *-th-* would be substituted with Niya *-ṭh-* /ṣṭ/.
[387] The relative chronology assumed here is *exempli gratia*.
[388] Chavannes (1913); Maspero (1953); Hou & Yang (1999); Trombert (2000). I thank Meng Xiaoqiang (Leiden) for checking the Chinese evidence for me.
[389] Observe also the different treatment of (E)MC *uw* shown by Niya *jiṭu(ṃ)g(h)a* 'palace attendant' ← Chin. *shì zhōng* 侍中 'serve, wait upon' + 'centre', (E)MC *dzyiH trjuwng*. In this word, (E)MC *uw* is rendered as Niya *u* and not as *va* or *o*, as is assumed in Pinault's etymology of *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga*.

Chinese first member and an Indic second member. Based on Burrow's (LKD: 128) observation of a close relationship between the office of a *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* and that of a *divira* 'scribe' (§3.5.1 s.v.), he regards *ṣo-* as a loan from either Chin. *shū* 書 'write, written document', (E)MC *syo*, or Chin. *xiě* 寫 'depict, write', (E)MC *sjaeX*.[390] The element *-ṭhaṃg(h)a* would, in his opinion, be cognate with Skt. *sthānika-*, an "officer … in charge of record of towns and villages, and of the census of the households" mentioned a couple of times in Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* (DTTA: 497, referencing MW: 1263; Kangle 1965: 195–198).[391] Leaving aside the question of how a Chinese word for 'to write' would have been compounded with an Indic official title, I find this etymology unlikely for phonological reasons. The Niya outcome of Skt. *sthānika-* should namely have been written with 𐨯 *ṕha* and not with 𐨮 *ṭha* /ṣṭ/ (cf. Niya *vaṕhayaga* 'attendant' < Skt. *upasthāyaka-*; §2.1.6), and the assumed syncope of the *-i-* in *sthānika-* would be at odds with the normal development of Skt. *-ika-* to Niya *-iga* > *-iya* > *-i* (LKD: §75).

Previous etymologies commonly neglect the alternative form *ṣvaṭhaṃgha*. Yet, even though it is attested much less frequently than *ṣoṭhaṃga*, *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* still deserves due attention as a development of *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* > *ṣoṭhaṃga* is more easily motivated than the other way around and paralleled by *Aṃgvaga* (and variants) > *Aṃgoka* (*Aṃgoka*) 'name of a king' (LKD: §7). Therefore, I take *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* to be the more original form.

In what follows, I hope to make it plausible that *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* represents a borrowing from an as yet unattested Bactrian title *αζβαρσταγγο /əzvarstāŋgə/ < **uz-bara-stāna-ka-* < **uz-bara-stān-āna-ka-*, literally 'the person in charge of the place (office) tax products are stored'.[392] The discussion will focus on (i) evidence from Bactrian and other Iranian languages to back up the reconstruction of **uz-bara-stān-āna-ka-*; (ii) the semantics and morphological formation of this pre-form; and (iii) the

[390] Phonologically, the first of these options seems preferable, though it would still be peculiar that (E)MC **sy-* would be borrowed with a retroflex *ṣ-* and not with a palatal ***ś-*.

[391] For this official's involvement with taxes, cf. *Arthaśāstra* 2.35.7 *gopasthānikasthāneṣu pradeṣṭāraḥ kāryakaraṇaṃ balipragrahaṃ ca kuryuḥ* "In the offices of the Revenue Officers and County Supervisors, Magistrates should carry out their duties and the collection of tributes." (Olivelle 2013: 174).

[392] In view of the syncope of *-*āna-ka-* to -αγγο /āŋgə/, the etymology suggested here is only possible with Bactrian as the donor language.

phonological substitutions that have to be assumed to derive *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* out of *αζβαρσταγγο /əzvarstāŋgə/.

The reconstructed **uz-bara-stān-āna-ka-* would be an adjectival derivation in **-āna-ka-* (treated below) from **uz-bara-stāna-* 'the place (office) tax products are stored'. **uz-bara-* is a nominal derivative from **uz* + **√bar* (EDIV: 6–10), a root continued in Bactrian as αζβαρ- /əzvar/ 'to bring forth, produce, disburse' (BD II: 188).[393] This Bactrian verb has a suppletive preterite αζγαδο /əzγadə/ < **uz-gata-*, to which the noun αζγαμο /əzγāmə/ 'disbursement, allocation' corresponds (cf. also Sims-Williams 2008b: 530).[394] αζγαμο is derived from OIr. **uz-gāma-*, which literally means 'coming out' (cf. Parth. *izyām* 'exit, passing away', Sogd. *zγ'm* 'end'), but is already used in the meaning 'disbursement, allocation' in the Aramaic documents from Bactria (ADAB: 55; 206).

Data from other languages support the hypothesis that there additionally was a Bactrian noun *αζβαρο /əzvarə/ < **uz-bara-*, possibly meaning 'tax product, disbursement'. One piece of evidence for this is Bab. *uz-ba-ra* (also *uz-ba-ri; uz-bar-ra*; *uz-bar-ri*) 'crown land' ← OIr. **uz-bara-* 'the land which produces crops, etc.' (Iranica: §4.4.12.11). A still more important witness is Parth. *'wzbry* (also *'wzbry'*; *'wzbr*), an adjectival derivation from **uz-bara-* used in the Nisa documents to denote a type of vineyard that is 'liable to taxation' (Diakonoff & Livshits 1977–2001: 187). In other words, Parth. *'wzbry* refers to vineyards from which a part of the harvest should be disbursed as tax to the government.[395]

My hypothesis is that *αζβαρστανο /əzvarstānə/ 'the place (office) tax products are stored' < **uz-bara-stāna-* would be the technical term used to denote the financial departments a *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* was responsible for (cf. supra).[396] If this is correct, *αζβαρσταγγο /əzvarstāŋgə/ could, as hinted at above, be a derivative of *αζβαρστανο with the adj. suffix -αγγο < **-āna-ka-* 'connected with' often added to nouns indicating a location (BD II: 187).

---

[393] Variant spellings αζαβαρ-; αζοβαρ-; later εζβαρ-.

[394] See also doc. am, which is a list of such disbursements.

[395] Parth. *'wzbry* was, in the meaning 'vineyard', eventually borrowed into Georgian as *zvari* (Bielmeier 2008).

[396] For the preservation of the cluster -ρστ- /rst/ at a compound boundary, cf. Τοχοαρ(α)στανο /tuxwar(ə)stānə/ 'Tocharistan' (BD II: 270; Sims-Williams 2015: 261) and þαυροστανο /šahr(ə)stānə/ 'capital city' < **xšaθra-stāna-* (h_5 5; Sims-Williams 2006: 112).

There are two potential parallels for this type of derivation and the haplological shortening required by it. First, Sims-Williams & de Blois (SCBD: 131, correcting BD II: 220) have noted that Bactr. καδγοσταγγο /kadgəstāŋgə/ (doc. de) may be derived with the suffix -αγγο from the commonly attested place name καδγοστανο, literally meaning 'the place of the household'. Put differently, καδγοσταγγο would come from **kataka-stāna-ka-* < **kataka-stān-āna-ka-*. Second, a Bactrian noun *λαστανγο /lāstāŋgə/ has been plausibly reconstructed as the source of TB *lastāṅk* 'executioner's block (?)' → TA *lāstaṅk* 'idem (?)' (DoT: 592f.; DTTA: 398 with literature). *λαστανγο is a derivative from λαστανο /lāstānə/ 'litigation, dispute' < **dāta-stāna-* 'the place of law/judgement' (cf. §3.2.1 s.v. *lastana*), and may, by way of **dāta-stāna-ka-*, ultimately derive from **dāta-stān-āna-ka-* (cf. also §3.2.1 s.v. *lastana* fn. 198).

If I am correct that *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* is a loanword from *αζβαρσταγγο /əzvarstāŋgə/, two phonological substitutions need to have taken place.

First, one has to assume that Niya *ṣv-* (possibly /ẓv/) corresponds to Bactr. αζβ- /əzv/. While the loss of an initial unaccented schwa does not need to be commented on, there is, unfortunately, no other loanword that could confirm how Iranian **zv* would be borrowed. However, as **zv* is, in any case, a cluster foreign to Gāndhārī phonology, it seems at least conceivable that speakers would render **zv* as <ṣv>. See the more detailed argumentation in §4.3.19.

Second, Niya Prakrit needs to have rendered Bactrian -ρστ- /rst/ as *-ṭh-* /ṣṭ/ (cf. also §4.3.24). Such a substitution is understandable, as a cluster ***-rst-* violates the phonotactics of both OIA and MIA,[397] and clusters of preconsonantal *r* and dentals often result in a retroflex in Gāndhārī, as in MIA in general (cf. von Hinüber 2001[2]: §256).[398] One can moreover draw a parallel with Maggi's (2022a) recent argument that Skt. *hapuṣā-* (also *habuṣā-*; *havuṣā-*) 'juniper' is borrowed through a Gāndhārī intermediary **havuṣa* from "East Iranian" **havursā-* < OIr. **hapr̥sā-* 'juniper' (cf. Av.

[397] A sequence <rst> is twice attested in Central Asian Gāndhārī, but once in a foreign PN, i.e. *Tsagirsta* (CKD 419), which does not need to comply with the same phonotactic constraints as integrated loanwords, and once in an incomprehensible passage in the Kuča Prakrit document CKD 834.

[398] A Niya example is *parivaṭ-* /parivaṭṭ/ 'to exchange' < *parivart-*.

hapərəsī-).[399] He assumes (2022a: 6f.) that *-*rs*- is rendered as Gandh. -*ṣ*-, comparable to how I suppose *-*rst*- to be substituted with -*ṭh*- /ṣṭ/.

In order to get rid of its un-Indic initial cluster, *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* can, as alluded to above, have developed further to *ṣoṭhaṃga*. I therefore hypothesise that Tocharian A borrowed this bureaucratic title through a Prakrit intermediary, a scenario already considered in Carling (2005: 57). Otherwise, the initial *ṣo*- in TA *ṣoṣṭaṅk** would not be accounted for.

In sum, a so far unattested Bactrian title *αζβαρσταγγο /əzvarstāŋgə/ < **uz-bara-stāna-ka*- < **uz-bara-stān-āna-ka*- 'the person in charge of the place (office) tax products are stored' may first have been borrowed into Niya Prakrit in the form *ṣvaṭhaṃgha*, before developing further to *ṣoṭhaṃga*. Subsequently, the latter form may have been borrowed as *ṣoṣṭaṅk** by speakers of Tocharian A. Semantically, this proposal would seem superior over previous suggestions, but it must be acknowledged that it requires a considerable amount of reconstruction and the unparalleled assumption that foreign **zv* is substituted with Niya <ṣv>.

3.3 Loanwords from Bactrian or another Iranian language

The preceding section dealt with Iranian loanwords in Niya Prakrit for which I consider there to be a decisive phonological, semantic, or other argument supporting Bactrian as the donor language. In addition, there are Iranian loanwords whose phonology permits the assumption of a Bactrian donor while also allowing one to posit a different source language, e.g. Parthian or Sogdian. Such loanwords are treated in the present section, which again uses the classification system introduced in §3.1.7.

[399] I have slightly adapted Maggi's orthography to make it consistent with the spelling used in the present work. Given that one of the natural habitats of juniper trees is Afghanistan (see Maggi 2022a: 5), it seems possible that the source language of Gandh. **havuṣa* → Skt. *hapuṣā*- (*habuṣā*-; *havuṣā*-) can be identified more precisely as (Early) Kuṣāṇa Bactr. *υαβορσα /havursă̆/ < **hapr̥sā*- (cf. λογδα /luγdă̆/ < **duxtā*-).

3.3.1 Secure etymologies

57. *ajhate* 'free, noble'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.PL. *ajhate*: CKD 272; 588; 889; *ajhade*: CKD 120 (2x); 507; 593; [400] *ajhati*: CKD 576; *asade*: CKD 436

GEN.PL. *ajhateyana*: CKD 242

Derivatives

ADV. *ajhatu*: CKD 152

Burrow (1934: 509; LKD: 73 s.v.) convincingly argued *ajhate* to be a loanword from a Middle Iranian derivative of OIr. **āzāta-* 'noble, free'.[401] Bactr. αζαδο /āzādə/ (BD II: 188) would be a likely source, but the lack of distinctive phonological features renders it difficult to exclude MP/Parth. *āzād* (DMMP: 84), Sogd. *''zty* (also *''zt'y*; *''z'ty*; DMSB^2: 51), or Khot. *āysāta-* (DKS: 20f.). The ending *-e* in *ajhate* will be examined in §4.4.3.

More discussion is needed on the seemingly adverbial form *ajhatu* in (3.31).

(3.31) CKD 152 under-tablet obverse 4f.
ahuno atra rayaka uṭiyana viṣajidemi tatra trevarṣaga uṭa 1 eṣa bhuya rajyami ajhatu oḍidavo
"Now I have sent some royal camels there. Among them there is a three-year-old camel. This is to be again sent back to the kingdom." (TKD: 27)

Based on the idea that *ajhatu* "seems to have nothing to do with *ajhate*" (LKD: 73 s.v.), Burrow translates *ajhatu oḍ-* as 'to send back'. The latter meaning is, however, customarily expressed by *patama oḍ-* (CKD 1; 9; 386); so, it would seem counter-intuitive not to translate *ajhatu oḍ-* as 'to let free', a translation which fits the context of (3.31) equally well. If correct, the final *-u* in *ajhatu* could conceivably represent the outcome of an adverbial neuter in **-am* in the Iranian source language (see just below).

As discussed in more detail elsewhere (§3.2.3 s.v. *oḍ-*), an additional argument supporting this interpretation of *ajhatu oḍ-* comes from

[400] The form *ajhade* is also attested in the unpublished loan contract in Bajaur fragment 15 (CKM 278).
[401] For the semantics of this Iranian word, see de Blois (1985) and Colditz (2000: 53–107).

phraseology. Aram. *'zt šbq,* a calque of OP **āzātam hṛd-*, MP *āzād hil-*, and Bactr. αζαδο υιρζ- allow for the reconstruction of an Old Iranian collocation **āzātam* + **√harz* 'to let free'.[402] If my argument that the verb *oḍ-* is derived from Bactr. *ωυιρζ- < **awa-hṛz-* is correct (for which see §3.2.3 s.v.), Niya Prakrit would preserve an indirect witness to the same Iranian collocation.

58. *śpaṣa* 'watching, guarding'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *śpaṣa*: CKD 123; 133; 272;[403] 283; 291; 329; 340; 341; 349; 351 (2x); 357; 358; 362; 368; 379; 387; 541 (2x); 578

Compounds

DIR.SG. *śpaṣavaṃna* 'guard, watchman': CKD 178; 518 (2x); *śpaṣavaṃnaga* (< **spāsa-pāna-ka-*): CKD 507; 515; 541 (2x); *śpaṣavaṃni*: CKD 84; *śpaṣavaṃne*: CKD 126

DIR.PL. *śpaṣavaṃne* 'idem': CKD 88; *spaṣavaṃne*: CKD 119; *śpaṣavaṃneya*: CKD 522; *svaṣavaṃniye*: CKD 471

GEN.PL. *śpaṣavaṃnaṃna* 'idem': CKD 71 (3x); *śpaṣavaṃnana*: CKD 297; *śpaṣavaniyana*: CKD 471

ADJ. *śpaṣavaṃni* 'of the watchman': CKD 520 (3x)

The meaning and etymology of *śpaṣa* and the compound *śpaṣavaṃna* have been elucidated by Thomas (1934a: 44f. fn. 7) and Burrow (1934: 512f.; LKD: 132 s.v.; *pace* Lévi *apud* Bloch 1937: 52). While *śpaṣavaṃna* 'guard, watchman' refers to the persons responsible for watching after the outer borders of the kingdom, the base form *śpaṣa* refers to the act of 'watching, guarding' itself. Etymologically, *śpaṣa* is probably a loan from a descendant of OIr. **spāsa-*, a noun made from the verbal root **√spas* 'to see, to watch > to attend to, to serve' (EDIV: 353f.). The compound *śpaṣavaṃna* can be traced back to OIr. **spāsa-pāna-* 'the one in charge of watching'.

The initial cluster *śp-*, also once *sp-* and once *sv-*, probably stands for something like /sf/ (cf. §2.1.6). This phonological feature should not be assigned to the donor language, since *sp* likewise develops to *śp* in inherited

[402] For Aram. *'zt šbq*, see Benveniste (1954: 299) and Gershevitch (1954: 126 = 1985: 164), and on MP *āzād hil-*, cf. Colditz (2000: 82–86). The Bactrian syntagm is attested in documents F 8~F 7', F 16~F 14'f., and P 17'.

[403] Based on the photograph, I read *śpaṣa* in this document and not *śpasa* as per Boyer et al. (1920–29: 102).

words such as *parosṕara* 'one another' < *paraspara-*.[404] The word-internal voiced sibilant -*ṣ*- /z/ is also explainable from within Niya Prakrit since all intervocalic sibilants were voiced in this language (cf. §2.1.2).

OIr. **spāsa-* has descendants in the following Middle Iranian forms: MP/Parth. *(i)spās* (→ Arm. *spas*) 'service, gratitude, thanks' (CPD: 75; DMMP: 86; Olsen 1999: 907); Bactr. (α)σπασο /(ə)spāsə/ 'service' (BD II: 265); and Sogd. *sp'ś* 'service, office' (SD: 358; DCS^2: 171f.). In other words, **spāsa-* has undergone a semantic development from 'watching' to 'service' in Middle Iranian times.

To me, this development seems insufficient a reason to exclude languages like Bactrian or Sogdian as the donor of Niya *sṕaṣa*, as it seems possible that the absence of the etymologically older meaning 'watching, guarding' in these Iranian languages is due to their limited documentation. Two observations are worth making in this regard. First, the hypothesised compound **spāsa-pāna-* 'the one in charge of watching' may have contributed to the preservation of the older meaning of the simplex **spāsa-*. Second, the meaning 'service' may also have left a trace in Niya Prakrit; as Burrow (1934a: 513) already remarked, a meaning such as 'duty' or 'service' would namely suit well in the formulaic phrase *avi sṕaṣa jividaparicaḡena anada rakṣ̣idavya* "also your duty is to be kept even at the expense of your life".[405]

To my knowledge, the compound **spāsa-pāna-* is not so far attested in an Iranian language, but it could easily have been formed. If we are dealing with a Bactrian loanword, the source of *sṕaṣavaṃna* would be reconstructable as *σπασοβανο /spāsəvānə/.[406]

---

[404] For another Iranian loanword starting in *sṕ-*, cf. §3.2.1 s.v. *sṕara* / *sṕura* 'full, completely'. On the phonological development, see also §4.3.14.

[405] This phrase is attested with minor variations in CKD 283; 291; 329; 341; 349; 351; 357; 358; 362; 368; 379; 387 (all documents written on leather).

[406] Currently, two other Bactrian compounds in -βανο < **-pāna-* are known, i.e. χοβανο 'shepherd' < **fšu-pāna-* (BD II: 279) and ραυοβανο* 'robber' < **rāθa-pāna-* → ραυοβαναο 'robbery' (BD II: 259). See furthermore §3.2.1 s.v. *stora*, where I argue that Niya *storvana* is a loan from Bactr. *στωροβανο 'groom' < **staura-pāna-*.

59. *harga* ‘dues, tax’

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *harga*: CKD 141; 206; 285; 295; 677; 696

Although *harga* is only rarely attested, it is not in serious doubt that this word refers to a kind of tax. Its relationship to *palýi*, the default word for ‘tax’, has yet to be fully clarified (Burrow 1935a: 788; LKD: 133 s.v.; Høisæter 2020: 172–174).

As discovered by Bailey (*apud* Burrow), *harga* must be compared with, amongst others, MP *harg* (also *xarg*) ‘duty, tribute’ (CPD: 43; DMMP: 182; 364) and Parth. → Arm. *hark* ‘tax’ (Olsen 1999: 890f.).[407] These Iranian forms go, by way of OP **harkā-*, probably back to an Ancient Near Eastern administrative term reflected in Bab. *ilku* ‘land tax’ (Henning 1935 = 1977 I: 355–357; Sims-Williams 2002: 227; *pace* e.g. Burrow 1935a: 788; EDIV: 131f.).

The question remains from which language Niya Prakrit borrowed the word *harga*. Bactrian is a likely possibility, as the term in question occurs in this language as υαργο /hargə/ (BD II: 272).[408] This scenario would probably work best if, contrary to what has been claimed by Schwartz (2008: 144), υαργο is not “borrowed from Sasanian MPers. economic terminology”, but a word already used in Kuṣāṇa times (despite there being no attestation from this period). Else, it may be chronologically difficult for υαργο to still have been borrowed into Niya Prakrit (cf. §4.2.1).

Schwartz’s main argument to regard υαργο as a borrowing from Middle Persian seems to be the preservation of the initial *h-*. This is, however, not a diagnostic feature of a Middle Persian loanword. While *h-* can indeed disappear in Bactrian (SFBG: 39), there are also native words where it generally stays, e.g. in υιρζ- /hirz/ ‘to let go’ < **hṛza-*.

Therefore, I am more inclined to agree with Sims-Williams (2002: 227), according to whom υαργο was borrowed from OP **harkā-* and thus belonged to the Achaemenid heritage in Bactrian. In this case, the word would have existed early enough in Bactrian for this to be the source language of Niya *harga*.

---

[407] For more forms, see Schwartz (2007: 26; 2008: 143f.).
[408] Note in passing the resemblance between the Bactrian syntagm χοηαγγο υαργο ‘dues of the lord’ (doc. Nn) and Niya *raya[ka] harga* ‘dues from the king’ (CKD 696; cf. perhaps also *raja harga* in CKD 285).

Due to the lack of phonological indications that could prove a Bactrian origin of *harga*, other scenarios are not to be excluded *a priori*, even if they are historically less likely. One theoretical option is that *harga* is a loanword from Parth. *hark* hailing back to the Indo-Parthian conquest of Gandhāra.[409] Another possibility is an Old Persian loanword into pre-Gāndhārī. Since there are more examples of Gāndhārī administrative terms dating back to the Achaemenid conquest of the region (§4.2.2), it is not unthinkable that OP **harkā*- was borrowed into pre-Gāndhārī and from there continued into Niya Prakrit. Yet, the absence of any trace of the word in Sanskrit may warn against this scenario because the Old Persian words in Gāndhārī tend to have a cognate in Sanskrit (cf. again §4.2.2).

3.3.2 Plausible etymologies

60. *aṭa* 'flour'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *aṭa*: CKD 358; 637; 797;[410] 854 (?)

Niya *aṭa* /ăṭṭa/[411] 'flour' has been convincingly compared to Skt. *aṭṭa*- 'food', Hindi *āṭā* 'flour, meal', and various other NIA words of the same meaning (Thomas 1935: 67; LKD: 73 s.v.; CDIAL: no. 1338). While so much is clear, the etymology has been a continuous topic of debate. The most widely held opinion states that Niya *aṭa* and the other Indic forms are inherited words cognate with, amongst others, MP *ārd* 'flour' (CPD: 11); Bactr. αρδο /ārdə/ (BD II: 193f.); Tumsh. *ārda*-* (acc.sg. *ārdu*; Ogihara & Ching 2024: 315); and

[409] The assumption of a Parthian borrowing would require voicing of the velar stop after *r* in Prakrit. Such voicing would be unremarkable, as the clusters -*rk*- and -*rg*- are not kept distinct in Niya (LKD: §36).

[410] Basing myself on the hand copy of CKD 797 in Hasuike (1996: 307), I consider Hasuike's reading *aṭa naṃdha* in line 1 of the reverse of the cover-tablet preferable over Lin's (1999: 231) incomprehensible *aɣanaṃ ca*. *aṭa naṃdha* can be translated as 'a load of flour' and compared with *aṃna nadha* 'a load of corn' in CKD 68; 200; 468 and loc.sg. *kuɣana nadhaṃmi* 'a load of *kuɣana* (corn)' in CKD 435.

[411] Cf. §2.1.2 (fn. 42) for the fact that intervocalic -*ṭ*- stands for a geminate /ṭṭ/ in Niya Prakrit.

Khot. *āḍa-* (DKS: 17) < **ārta-* ← PIr. **arta-* < PIIr. **HrHtá-* < PIE **h₂lh₁tó-* 'ground' (root **√h₂elh₁* 'to grind' as in Gr. ἀλέω 'idem').[412]

The ensuing observations make me doubt this idea. To begin with, no Indo-Aryan derivative from the PIIr. root **√HarH* 'to grind' has been securely identified so far.[413] In light of Ved. *ír̥ṣyant-* 'jealous' ~ Av. *arəšiiaṇt-* 'idem' < PIIr. **HŕHšiant-*, I would moreover anticipate the verbal adj. **HrHtá-* to yield OIA **īrta-*, whose vocalism does not fit that of the attested forms. Finally, Skt. *aṭṭa-* 'food' is only attested in the *Medinīkośa*, a lexicon of the 14th century AD, which makes that Niya *aṭa* (3rd–4th century AD) is the first attestation of this term for 'flour' in an Indo-Aryan language. Given this chronology, it does not seem too likely that we are dealing with an inherited word (cf. also Emeneau 1966: 135).

These problems do not pose themselves when one regards Niya *aṭa* as an Iranian loanword: (i) **ārta-* 'flour' is widely attested in Iranian languages; (ii) its vocalism fits with that of Niya *aṭa* and its cognates; and (iii) the assumption of a borrowing makes it more easily understandable why the word is not attested in Indic earlier than the Niya documents.[414] The main issue with the assumption of an Iranian loan is the presence of a retroflex in Niya *aṭa*.

The first option one could think of is that *aṭa* /ăṭṭa/ were a loan from Khot. *āḍa-*. Because devoicing can happen in Niya Prakrit (§2.1.4), the substitution of Khot. *-ḍ-* with Niya *-ṭ-* /ṭṭ/ required by this idea would phonologically not be inconceivable. Yet, a Khotanese origin for Niya *aṭa* is still unlikely for geographical reasons in view of the cognates of Niya *aṭa* in other Indo-Aryan languages.

---

[412] See e.g. Scheller (1965) and Burrow (1972: 539; 1973³: 47). The geminate *-ṭṭ-* of Skt. *aṭṭa-* would point to Prakrit origin.

[413] Burrow (1979–83: 81–83) has argued that Ved. *aráṇi-* / *aráṇī-* 'piece of wood used to kindle fire by attrition' should be analysed as an agent noun of the type *cakṣáṇi-* 'looking' from **√HarH* 'to grind'. In my opinion, *aráṇi-* / *aráṇī-* more likely comes from the widely attested root *√ar* 'to move, to rouse' (so Grassmann 1873: 102), as it is the constant moving of the sticks against one another that causes the kindling of the fire. The Sogdian hapax *l'n*, perhaps 'flint', is probably unconnected to the Vedic word (Benkato 2017: 68f.).

[414] That Niya *aṭa* and its cognates may be Iranian loanwords seems not to have been seriously considered in previous scholarship. Yet, Mayrhofer (EWAia III: 8) mentions a personal communication from Chlodwig Werba, saying that the hypothesis of an Iranian loanword would be "lautlich einfächer".

A geographically more attractive option is to see in Niya *aṭa* a loan from Bactr. αρδο /ārdə/. Then, one can hypothesise that this word for 'flour' was borrowed into South Asian Gāndhārī as **ǎṭṭa-* and transmitted in this form to the Prakrit vernaculars of northern India via the trade routes that were under the control of the Kuṣāṇa dynasty (Neelis 2011: 132–144; 186–204).[415] The example of Niya *sujinakirta* 'needlework, embroidery' suggests that the -ρδ- /rd/ in Bactr. -κιρδο could be rendered as *-rt-* in Gāndhārī (§3.2.3 s.v.). If we assume the same sound substitution for αρδο, this could yield Gandh. **ǎrta-*. *-rt-* can furthermore develop to *-ṭ-* /ṭṭ/ in Niya Prakrit and Gāndhārī at large, e.g. *kaṭavo* 'to be done' next to *kartavo* < *kartavyaḥ*; so, **ǎrta-* ← αρδο could have yielded Gandh. **ǎṭṭa-*, whence Niya *aṭa*.[416]

Still, the absence of any decisive phonological arguments makes it difficult to be sure that Bactr. αρδο /ārdə/ is the source of Niya *aṭa* and its cognates. Gandh. **ǎṭṭa-* < **ǎrta-* could also have been borrowed from another Iranian language used in the region in which the word for 'flour' had the form **ārd(ə)*, e.g. Parthian. It is even possible that **ǎrta-* (> **ǎṭṭa-*) was borrowed from an older form **ārt(ə)* < **ārta-*, comparable to Sogd. *'rtk* (*'rt'k*) 'flour' < **ārta-ka-* (Livshits 2015: 173).

61. *aɣana* 'village, territory of a clan'

Attestations of the base form

ABL.SG. *aɣanade*: CKD 334; 696
LOC.SG. *aɣanaṃmi*: CKD 46; 334 (4x); 549; 629; 823; *avanaṃmi*: CKD 295

Derivatives

ADJ. DIR.SG. *aɣaneṃci* 'belonging to the village': CKD 713 (2x)

Compounds

LOC.SG. *Aṃtuaɣanaṃmi* (alternatively *Vaṃtu-*) '*Aṃtu* (*Vaṃtu*) village':[417] CKD 296 (3x); 859; 884
ADJ. DIR.SG. *Aṃtuaɣaneṃci* 'belonging to *Aṃtu* (*Vaṃtu*) village': CKD 496
ADJ. DIR.PL. *Aṃtuaɣaneṃci* 'idem': CKD 296
ABL.SG. *Ajiyamaaɣanade* '*Ajiyama* village': CKD 573; 817 (2x);

[415] See also §3.2.4 s.v. *taravara* for this type of borrowing chain.
[416] For this sound development, cf. also §4.3.24.
[417] For the uncertainty whether to read *Aṃtu-* or *Vaṃtu-*, see Ching (2012: 28). In CKD 884, I propose to restore *aṃ ? aɣanaṃmi* (the reading of Duan 2016b) as *Aṃ(*tu)aɣanaṃmi* (or *Vaṃ(*tu)-*).

LOC.SG. *Ajiyamaaɣanaṃmi* 'idem': CKD 105; 181; 199; 275 (2x); 279 (2x); 389; 422; 713;[418] 714 (2x); 817; *Ajhiyamaaɣanaṃmi*: CKD 207
ADJ. GEN.PL. *Ayiyamaaɣaneṃciyana* 'belonging to *Ajiyama* village': CKD 817
LOC.SG. *Ajiyamaaɣanakilmeyami* 'family estate (located) in *Ajiyama* village': CKD 817
LOC.SG. *Catiṣadeviaɣanaṃmi* 'Queen *Catiṣa* village': CKD 496
ADJ. DIR.SG. *Catiṣadeviavaneṃci* 'belonging to Queen *Catiṣa* village': CKD 476
LOC.SG. *Traṣaaɣanaṃmi* '*Traṣa* village': CKD 70; 326; 393 (2x)
ADJ. DIR.PL. *Traṣaaɣaneṃciyana* 'belonging to *Traṣa* village': CKD 326 (2x)
LOC.SG. *Navaga̱aɣanaṃmi* '*Navaga̱* village': CKD 366; *Naɣakaavanaṃmi*: CKD 193
ADJ. GEN.PL. *Navaga̱aɣaniṃciyana* 'belonging to *Navaga̱* village': CKD 366
LOC.SG. *Paginaavanaṃmi* '*Pagina* village': CKD 750
DIR.SG. *Petaavana* '*Peta* village': CKD 16 (2x)
LOC.SG. *Petaaɣanaṃmi* 'idem': CKD 42 (3x); 46 (2x); 121; 136 (2x); 137; 165; 494; 628; *Petaavanaṃmi*: CKD 10; 105; 808
ADJ. DIR.SG. *Petaaɣaneṃci* 'belonging to *Peta* village': CKD 32; 46; 124
ADJ. DIR.PL. *Petaaɣaneṃci* 'idem': CKD 124; *Petaaɣaneṃciye*: CKD 164
ADJ. GEN.PL. *Petaaɣaneṃciyana* 'idem': CKD 839; *Petaavaneṃciyana*: CKD 162; *Petaaɣaniciyana*: CKD 110
LOC.SG. *Petaaɣanakilmeyaṃmi* 'family estate (located) in *Peta* village': CKD 32
LOC.SG. *Yaɣeaɣanaṃmi* '*Yaɣe* village': CKD 121; 254; 279 (4x); 431 = 432; 439; 468; 481; 495; 497; 532 (3x); 621 (2x); 632; 884 (2x); *Yaɣeavanaṃmi*: CKD 254; *Yaɣeyaaɣaṃnaṃmi*: CKD 581
ADJ. DIR.SG. *Yaɣeaɣaneṃci* 'belonging to *Yaɣe* village': CKD 532; 740; *Yaveavaneṃci*: CKD 474
ADJ. DIR.PL. *Yaɣeaɣanemciya* 'idem': CKD 37; *Yaveavaniṃciye*: CKD 401
ADJ. GEN.PL. *Yaɣeaɣaneṃciyanana* (?) 'idem': CKD 37; *Yaɣeaɣani(ṃ)ciyana*: CKD 431 = 432; *Yaɣiaɣaniṃciyana*: CKD 745
DIR.SG. *Yiruṃḍhinaaɣana* '*Yiruṃḍhina* village': CKD 297
LOC.SG. *Yiruṃḍhinaaɣanaṃmi* 'idem': CKD 297; *Yiruṃḍhinaavanaṃmi*: CKD 163

As the word *aɣana* 'village, territory of a clan' is semantically closely connected to *kilme* 'family estate', this lemma is best read in conjunction with §3.2.4 s.v. *kilme*. As described there in more detail, *aɣana* refers to a territorial unit more extensive than a *kilme* but likewise used to collect taxes. That *aɣana* refers to a larger territory is, for instance, clear from compounds such as the loc.sg. *Petaaɣanakilmeyaṃmi* 'in a family estate (located) in *Peta* village' (CKD 32). In addition, Burrow (1935a: 779; 1935b: 674) noted that *Petanagaṃraṃmi* 'in *Peta* city' appears as a substitute for the more frequent

[418] One could emend the transmitted *Ajimaaɣanaṃmi* to *Aji<*ya>maaɣanaṃmi*.

Petaaẏana in CKD 25. It seems, however, doubtful that one can use this as evidence that *aẏana* and *nagara* 'city' are exact synonyms.[419]

Given its semantics, *aẏana* probably does not come from Skt. *āpaṇa-* 'market place' (so e.g. KD: 333; Thomas 1931: 520f.; 1935: 63f.; Bailey 1946: 793 fn. 1). More likely, Burrow (1935a: 779) was correct when he suggested *aẏana* to be a further witness of OIr. **ā-wahana-* 'dwelling', an Iranian word preserved in OP *āvahana-* 'village' (Schmitt 2014: 145); MP *āwahan* 'fortified place, stronghold' (CPD: 13); and, as a loanword, Arm. *awan* 'village, small town' (Olsen 1999: 869).[420]

Niya *aẏana* differs from **ā-wahana-* in that the intervocalic **h* has been lost. If this loss happened already in the donor form, Sogdian presents itself as a possible source language in view of examples such as Sogd. *z'k* /zāk/ 'child, offspring' vs. MP/Parth. *zahag* 'idem' < **zaha-ka-*. Intervocalic *h* can also disappear in Niya Prakrit's inherited vocabulary, as shown by examples such as *danagrana* (CKD 577; 588) next to *danagrahana* 'giving and taking' < Skt. *dāna-grahaṇa-* (cf. LKD: §28). Therefore, *aẏana* could as well be borrowed from an unattested Parth. **āwahan* or Bactr. *αοαυανο /āwahanə/ < **ā-wahana-*, whose formal reconstruction can be backed up by Parth. *padwahan* 'supplication, prayer' and Bactr. πιδοοαυανο 'request, entreaty' < **pati-wahana-* (DMMP: 271; BD II: 255).[421]

---

[419] The names given to *aẏana*s (see the attestations above and cf. LKD: 77f. s.v.) are sometimes also transferred to words denoting different territorial units. Note e.g. gen.pl. *Yaẏekilmeciyana* (also *Yave-*) in CKD 431 = 432, with the element *Yaẏe* that frequently occurs as the name of an *aẏana*. Note also that Caḍota, called a *nagara* 'city' in CKD 879, is a larger territory than an *aẏana* (see e.g. CKD 496). On this basis, I conclude that a *nagara* 'city' is a larger unit than an *aẏana* 'village, territory of a clan' (cf. also Padwa 2007: viii).

[420] Khot. *vāna-* does not mean 'dwelling place', but 'temple' < **dmāna-* and should be kept apart (Skjærvø 1985: 69f. *contra* DKS: 383). The alleged Tumshuqese acc.sg. *wāno* < *wānā-** 'village' (so Konow 1935: 804; 823) is probably a ghost word, as Maue (2009) has read its sole instance (I 24) more plausibly as acc.sg. *gūno* < *gūnā-** 'mark, sign' (cf. Ogihara & Ching 2017: 462).

[421] If my Bactrian etymology of *kilme* ← *γιρλομηυο < **gr̥da-maiθa-* 'dwelling of a household' were to be confirmed (§3.2.4 s.v.), this would favour the assumption that *aẏana* indeed comes from Bactr. *αοαυανο /āwahanə/. For more discussion on the treatment of intervocalic *h* in the Iranian loanwords in Niya Prakrit, see §4.3.23.

62. *gavāsa* ‘deer, stag’

Compounds

DIR.SG. *gavāsanačira* ‘deer hunting’: CKD 509

gavāsa, i.e. /gă̆vă̆sna/, occurs only once in the Niya documents, but in a compound that leaves no doubt that this word refers to an animal one goes hunting for (*načira*). The more precise translation ‘deer, stag’ is based on an etymological comparison with various Iranian words of this meaning, including Av. *gauuasna-* < **gawazna-* (TKD: 99; cf. also Konow 1943: 67).

As is often the case, Khotanese is an unlikely donor language since the vowel *-ū-* in Khot. *ggūysna-* /gūzna/ < **gawazna-* (DKS: 87) does not match the sequence *-ava-* in Niya *gavāsa*. In Sogdian, the word for ‘deer, stag’ is attested as BSogd. *γ’wzn-* (SD: 162), CSogd. *γwẓ-n-* (only acc.pl. *γwẓ-nt’*; DCS[2]: 88), and MSogd. *γwzn-* (nom.sg. (?) *γwznyẖ*; DMSB[2]: 107). The phonological realisation behind these variant spellings was probably /γuzn/ (earlier **γwazn*), as Schwartz (*apud* Sims-Williams 2014: 47f.) convincingly argues based on the light-stem inflection of this word in Christian Sogdian. Accordingly, the assumption of a Sogdian loanword would again leave the sequence *-ava-* in Niya *gavāsa* unaccounted for.

A phonologically possible source of Niya *gavāsa* is MP *gawazn* ‘deer’ (CPD: 36; cf. NP *gawazn*). Yet, it would seem more logical that *gavāsa* was borrowed from a language spoken closer to Gandhāra and/or the Tarim Basin. Therefore, one may also consider the possibility that *gavāsa* is a loan from a hypothetical Bactrian form *γαοαζνο /γawaznə/ < **gawazna-*. In the latter case, one would have to assume that the word-initial γ- /γ/ was substituted with Niya *g-* /g/ rather than ***g̲-* /γ/ because of the absence of a phoneme /γ/ in initial position in Gāndhārī (§2.1.2).[422]

Otherwise, the phonological correspondences are easy to understand: there are parallels for foreign *-w-* being borrowed with Niya *-v-* (cf. §4.3.22), and the substitution of the cluster *-zn-* with Niya *-s̄-* /sn/ is not surprising either, since /sn/ may well have been pronounced as [zn] due to assimilation of the sibilant to the voiced nasal.

[422] There are personal names in which Bactrian initial γ- /γ/ is, as expected, substituted with Gandh. *g̲-* /γ/, i.e. *Ġaṇavhryaka* ← *γοανοφριακο /γwanəfriyak(k)ə/ < **wana-friya-k(k)a-* (CKI 150) and *Ġema* ← *γοημο /γwēmə/ < **waima-* (CKI 1073; CKM 297); see Schoubben (2023: 290f.). Being foreign names, they do not necessarily comply with the phonotactic rules applied to inherited words and phonologically integrated loanwords.

63. *tavastaḡa* ‘carpet’

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *tavastaḡa*: CKD 431 = 432; 527 (3x); 534; 578; 579; 581; 583; 590 (2x); 633; 728 (2x); 797; *tāvastaḡa*: CKD 583; *tavastae*: CKD 59
DIR.PL. *thavastaḡa*: CKD 416; *thavastae*: CKD 714; *tavastaḡa*: CKD 622; 728[423]

As first recognised by Thomas (*apud* KD: 348), *tavastaḡa* ‘carpet’ is one of the many textile products of Iranian origin in Niya Prakrit.[424] The closest match to the Niya form is Arm. *tapast(ak)* ‘carpet, mat’, a loan from Early Parth. **tāpast(ak)*, later **tābast(ag)*, < OIr. **tāpasta(-ka)*-.[425] As is always the case with nominal derivatives of the root *√*tāp* ‘to twist, to wind’ (EDIV: 389), **tāpasta(-ka)*- should be reconstructed with a long vowel **ā* in its first syllable; the Niya variant spelling *tāvastaḡa* (CKD 583) provides corroborating evidence for this.

The -*p*- and -*k*- in **tāpasta(ka)*- respectively correspond to -*v*- and -*ḡ*- /ɣ/ in Niya *tavastaḡa*. Due to the Gāndhārī lenition of intervocalic consonants to fricatives (§2.1.2), it is not clear whether these correspondences are to be attributed to the donor language or the recipient. If the former, *tavastaḡa* could, like Arm. *tapast(ak)*, be a Parthian loanword, or it could have been borrowed from Sogdian where OIr. *-*p*- is likewise preserved as such. In case of the latter option, Bactr. *ταβασταγο /tāvastəgə/ would be a plausible source form.

64. *draṃga* ‘office’

Attestations of the base form

ABL.SG. *traṃghade*:[426] CKD 640
LOC.SG. *draṃgaṃmi*: CKD 98; 357 (3x); *draṃgami*: CKD 567 (2x); *traṃghami*: CKD 173
DIR.PL. *draṃga*: CKD 439 (3x); 520 (2x); *draṃgha*: CKD 430; 775

---

[423] The variant spellings with initial *th*- are due to unetymological aspiration (§2.1.3); the dir.sg. *tavastae* shows lenition of -*aḡa* to -*ae* (LKD: §16).
[424] Cf. also Lüders (1936a: 12f.; 37f.); Burrow (LKD: 94 s.v.); Weber (1997: 32). In general on the terminology for carpets in Central Asia, cf. Zhang (2015).
[425] The frequently cited NP *tabastah* ‘fringed carpet’ may be a ghost word (cf. CPED 280).
[426] Boyer et al. (KD: 241) read *traghade*, but a trace of the expected anusvara is visible on the picture in Stein (1921 IV: Plate XXIII).

Compounds

DIR.PL. *draṃgadhare* 'office holder': CKD 272; *draṃghadare*: CKD 107; *traṃghadhare*: CKD 554; *traṃghadhāre*: CKD 86
GEN.PL. *draṃgadharanaṃ* 'idem': CKD 3
ABL.SG. *nagaradraṃgade* 'city office': CKD 317
LOC.SG. *nagaradraṃgaṃmi* 'idem': CKD 283
LOC.PL. *nagaradraṃgeṣu* 'idem': CKD 272

Niya Pkt. *draṃga*[427] means 'office' in a double sense (cf. LKD: 98f. s.v.). On the one hand, this word can refer to administrative duties, e.g. 'collecting taxes' (cf. CKD 430; 439; 520; 775); people responsible for such bureaucratic tasks are called *draṃg(h)adhara*, literally 'office-holder'.[428] On the other hand, *draṃga* could signify the physical buildings in which tax products were stored (cf. CKD 98; 173; 272; 283; 317; 357; 567). This meaning may be compared with the semantics of the Sanskrit cognate *draṅgă-*, used in Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* (12th century AD) and later Kashmirian chronicles for "a watch-station established near mountain passes for the double purpose of guarding the approaches to the Valley and *of collecting customs revenue*" (Stein 1900: 291; emph. mine).

Burrow (1934: 509f.) made the convincing proposal that Niya *draṃga* and Skt. *draṅgă-* are loanwords from a nominal derivative **dranga-* of the Iranian root **√dra(n)ǰ* 'to fix, fasten, hold' (EDIV: 76). With this etymology, the meanings of Niya *draṃga*, i.e. 'office (held)', and Skt. *draṅgă-*, i.e. 'stronghold', can be traced back to a more original meaning 'holding, established position' (Bailey 1955: 15).

When Burrow published his etymology, no derivative of OIr. **dranga-* having the same meaning as Niya *draṃga* had been discovered. Meanwhile, a neat equivalent of Niya *draṃgadhara* has surfaced in the form of the Bactrian compound δδραγγοληρο /draŋgəlērə/[429] 'office-holder' (cf. BD II: 208). δδραγγοληρο allows one to also safely posit the existence of Bactr. (δ)δραγγο* /draŋgə/ 'office'.

Although Bactr. (δ)δραγγο* /draŋgə/ would obviously be a plausible source of Niya *draṃga*, there may still be a chronological problem. Because

[427] The variant spellings of this word listed above do not require much commenting. If not resulting from the palaeographic similarity between ϟ *tra* and ϛ *dra*, spellings with initial *tr-* can be due to initial devoicing (§2.1.4).
[428] Cf. also the syntagm *draṃga* 'office' + *dhar-* 'to hold' in CKD 439 (2x), 520 (2x), and 775.
[429] On the late use of δδρ- to write /dr/, cf. BD II (39).

of καραλραγγο ‘margrave’ < *karāna-dranga- ‘holding the border’ (Henning 1965: 77–79 = 1977 II: 633–635), *dranga- would be expected to yield (Kuṣāṇa) Bactr. *λραγγο,[430] and δδραγγοληρο is only attested in doc. Y, a text datable to 771–772 AD (SCBD: 84), at a time when Bactr. λρ- /lr/ from *dr- had been reversed to /dr/ (written δρ-; δδρ-; Δρ-; cf. SCBD: 60). With only this evidence, the least costly hypothesis would be that (δ)δραγγο* ‘office’ is a late form of earlier *λραγγο, itself an unlikely source of *draṃga*.[431]

Nevertheless, there is at least potential evidence that (δ)δραγγο* does not derive from earlier *λραγγο but existed already in this form in Kuṣāṇa Bactrian. In line 4 of the Kuṣāṇa inscription $DilT_5$, a clearly readable sequence δραγγα is preceded by omicron, a frequent marker of word end, and followed by the preposition πιδο < *pati. Although the context is too fragmentarily preserved to allow for secure conclusions, δραγγα thus seems to be a separate word (cf. Davary 2023: 41 *contra* 1982: 131), which one could analyse as an abl.-ins.sg. in -α from δραγγο* < *dranga-.[432] Consequently, there is at least a tentative possibility that δραγγο* already existed in Kuṣāṇa Bactrian and Niya *draṃga* is a Bactrian loanword after all.

That said, δραγγα in $DilT_5$ line 4 remains too uncertain to build firm conclusions on. Therefore, I would still not exclude that Niya *draṃga* is a loan from a different Iranian language. As it remains a fact that Bactr. δδραγγοληρο ‘office-holder’ is the only secure derivative of *dranga- having the same semantics as Niya *draṃga*, it is hard to tell which this language could be.[433]

---

[430] OIr. *dr- also becomes λρ- /lr/ in initial position; cf. e.g. λρο(υ)γο /lrūgə/ ‘healthy, in good health’ < *druwa-ka- (BD II: 228).

[431] Given that intervocalic -ρλ- /rl/ is, as a rule, substituted with -r- (§4.3.25), I would expect λρ- /lr/ to be simplified to either *l*- or *r*-. Due to its late attestation, Skt. *draṅgă-* could still be an independent borrowing from Late Bactrian (δ)δραγγο*.

[432] For the Kuṣāṇa Bactrian abl.-ins.sg. in -α, cf. Sims-Williams (2015: 258) and Halfmann et al. (2024: 27f.). Davary’s (2023: 41) hypothetical translation of δραγγα as “Befestigung” suggests that he also understands it to be from δραγγο* < *dranga-. It still remains unclear why δραγγο* would have escaped the change from *dr- to λρ- /lr/. One could think that δραγγο* is a loanword, but there is no obvious source language.

[433] If the word was borrowed very early, one may consider its source to have been a hypothetical OP *dranga-, cf. OP *ā-dranga- ‘guarantor, guaranteed’ → Aram. *’drng* (Iranica: §4.4.10.3; ADAB: 115). Another theoretical possibility is that *draṃga* is a loan from Parth. *drang. Depending on the chronology of the

65. *namata* 'felt'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *namata*: CKD 151; 184; 382; 385 (3x); 575 (2x); 796; *namatha*:[434] CKD 154
DIR.PL. *namata*: CKD 151; 382; 387; *namate*: CKD 476; *namati*: CKD 345; *naṃmati*: CKD 728

Attestations as a PN

DIR.SG. *Namata*: CKD 742
GEN.SG. *Namataṣa*: CKD 376

Derivatives

DIR.SG. *namataga* 'felt' < **namata-ka-*: CKD 728; *naṃmataga*: CKD 728; *naṃmatae*: CKD 714

That Niya Pkt. *namata* means 'felt' has been noted as early as Stein (1903: 402; 1907: 367), who identified it with Anglo-Indic *numdah* 'felt-rug'. The same word also occurs in other ancient Indo-Aryan languages: there is Pāli *namataka-* 'a felt covering for a knife' and *nantaka-* 'dirty or ragged cloth; rag' (Cone 2001– II: 505; 508); BHS *namata-* 'felt to make a monk's garment' and *nāmatika-* 'wearing garments of felt' (BHSD: 290; 293); and Skt. *namata-* / *navata-* 'felt, woollen stuff' (in lexica; MW: 528; 531).[435]

Niya *namata* and its cognates are likely Iranian in origin and to be compared with the many derivatives of OIr. **namata-* 'felt' (cf. Lüders 1936a: 13–20; LKD: 100 s.v. *namatae*), e.g. YAv. *nəmata-* / *nimata-* (AIW: 1068);[436] MP *namad* (CPD: 57); BSogd. *nmt* (SD: 240); Khot. *namata-* (DKS: 173); and Oss. I. *nymæt*, D. *nimæt* (Cheung 2002: 209f.).

Due to the lack of distinctive phonological developments, it is difficult to determine the donor language of Niya *namata* and its congeners. Yet, the aforementioned Sogdian and Khotanese forms would, for instance, work

---

relevant sound change, Sogdian is excluded as a donor since **dr-* became Sogd. *ž-* (via **δr-*; Sims-Williams 1989a: 180).

[434] This variant spelling with *-th-* is due to unetymological aspiration (§2.1.3).

[435] Lelli (2020: 151f.) argues that this word for 'felt' occurs already in AVP 15.12.6 as nom.pl. ⁺*namatā*. This form is, however, an uncertain emendation of the received text *namatis* / *namatas*, so it seems best not to build conclusions on this Atharvavedic passage regarding how old this term for 'felt' is in Indic.

[436] The Avestan word does, however, not refer to 'felt' but to a type of wood, as observed by Milad Abedi, in his talk "A pressing matter – the linguistic origin of Iranian felt terms" presented at the conference "Language and culture in the borderlands of the eastern silk road" (Vienna, 5 September 2024).

phonologically.[437] In case there also existed a Bactrian descendant of OIr. **namata-*, one may consider the further possibility that *namata* was borrowed from an unattested word *ναμαδο /namadə/.[438]

66. *paraṣa* 'abduction, plundering'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *paraṣa*: CKD 165; 195; 324 + 328; 338; 625
INS.SG. *paraṣena*: CKD 436

Derivatives

PRET.3PL. *parasitaṃti* 'they abducted': CKD 324 + 328; *paraṣitaṃti*: CKD 491
PST.PTCP. *paraṣitaya* 'abducted': CKD 283; *paraṣitae*: CKD 292

paraṣa, i.e. /părăza/, means 'abduction, plundering' (Thomas 1934a: 48 fn. 1). Therefore, Burrow (LKD: 103 s.v.) related it to PIr. **parā* + **√Haz* 'to take away, carry' (EDIV: 171f.), a verb continued in Avestan (3pl. *parāzəṇti* 'they take away' Yt 13.68; opt.3sg. *para … azōiṯ* Vd 18.12) and Wanetsi (*pr(y)ez-* 'to take out' < **parai-az-*; EDP: 65). Although a corresponding nominal formation **parāza-* 'taking away' seems otherwise unattested in Iranian, this etymology is both semantically and formally quite plausible.[439]

If Burrow's idea is indeed correct, the absence of distinctive phonological developments hinders the identification of the most likely donor language. Some hypothetical options would be Bactr. *παραζο /parāzə/, Parth. **parāz*, Sogd. **parāz*, or Khot. **parāysa-* /parāza/.

As an alternative etymology, one could envisage that Niya *paraṣa* 'abduction, plundering' is a loanword from Bactr. παρασο /parātsə/ 'away' < **parāčā* (BD II: 251). This idea would have the significant advantage of not requiring the reconstruction of unattested forms, and Bactr. παρασο is used in the phrase παρασο ζιν-, pret. παρασο ζιδο 'to take away', which comes

[437] Because of the cognates of Niya *namata* in South Asian languages, Sogdian and Khotanese are, however, not so likely donor languages for geographical reasons.
[438] The voiced -δ- /d/ would not be a problem as the *-t-* in Niya *namata* stands for /δ/ (§2.1.2). The Sanskrit and Pāli forms with a voiceless dental could have been back-formed from the Gāndhārī one, there being reason to assume that this type of Iranian loanword first entered Gāndhārī before spreading towards other Indo-Aryan languages (Burrow 1973[3]: 389).
[439] Foreign *z* is more commonly rendered as *jh*. Yet, by the time of the Niya documents, *jh* and *ṣ* /z/ had become interchangeable, so there is no reason why *ṣ* /z/ could not have been used for a foreign *z* too (cf. also §2.1.7 and §4.3.19).

close to the semantics of Niya *paraṣa*.[440] Yet, there is also a drawback. Since Bactr. παρασο is an adverb, while Niya *paraṣa* is an inflectable noun (cf. the ins.sg. *paraṣena* in CKD 436), one would have to posit a reanalysis from adverb to noun during the borrowing process. Such a reanalysis is not inconceivable, but it is still not immediately obvious how and why this would have happened.[441]

As concerns phonology, it may seem counter-intuitive that Bactr. -σ- /ts/ would be rendered as Niya -*ṣ*- /z/, even though there is a cluster -*ts*- in Niya Prakrit, including in loanwords (e.g. *putgetsa*, a type of camel). Yet, there appears to be a parallel for this substitution in the feminine marker -*(i)sa* (-*(i)ṣa*), which can probably be derived from Bactr. -σα /tsă/ < *-*čī-ā*- (§6.4.4). As I will further discuss in §4.3.15, I therefore do not consider this phonological peculiarity an insuperable obstacle against deriving *paraṣa* out of Bactr. παρασο /parātsə/.

In conclusion, it seems that, with the evidence at hand, Niya *paraṣa* 'abduction, plundering' could either be a loan from a descendant of OIr. **parāza*- 'taking away' or from Bactr. παρασο /parātsə/ 'away' < **parāčā*.

67. *parivanae* 'burden, provisions'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *parivanae*: CKD 214

According to Burrow (LKD: §20; §45; 104 s.v.), Niya *parivanae* 'burden, provisions' could be derived from Skt. *paribhāṇḍa(-ka)*- (so also CDIAL: no. 7850), with the same phonological development of the cluster -*ṇḍ*- shown by Niya *rupyabhana* 'silver object' < Skt. *rūpyabhāṇḍa*- (CKD 149). The semantic aspect of this etymology is nevertheless not self-evident, since Skt.

[440] The semantic match is not exact, because the Niya word consistently refers to kidnapping and plundering, whereas Bactr. παρασο ζιδο in doc. je refers to the confiscation of animals for tax purposes.

[441] As an alternative option, Federico Dragoni (p.c.) suggested that an allegro pronunciation of Bactr. παρασο ζιδο /parātsə źidə/ was borrowed into Niya Prakrit as *paraṣita** 'kidnapped' (cf. the verb forms listed under "derivatives"). In this case, the noun *paraṣa* could be a back-formation, but it still remains unclear how and why such a back-formation would have happened. If directly from παρασο ζιδο /parātsə źidə/, I would perhaps also expect *paraṣita** to contain a palatal sibilant /ź/ rather than a dental sibilant -*ṣ*- /z/.

paribhāṇḍa- has a different meaning than Niya *parivanae*, i.e. 'utensils, furniture'.[442]

Burrow's alternative derivation from OIA **paribandhaka*- 'bound around (the beast of burden)' is semantically more attractive, but this formation seems otherwise unattested in Indo-Aryan. I therefore suggest that *parivanae* is an Iranian loanword related to CSogd. *prbnty* /parvandĕ/[443] 'burden' (~ Syr. *mwbl'*) < **pari-banda-ka*- 'bound around (the beast of burden)' (DCS^2: 135); Pers. *parwanda* 'bundle, roll of tissues, etc.' < **pari-banda-ka*- (CPED: 246); and TB *perpente* 'burden' < PToch. **perpente* ← OIr. **pari-banda*- (Bernard 2023: 51f.).

A first possibility is that *parivanae* is borrowed from Sogdian, seeing that in Niya Prakrit voiced consonants could be assimilated to a preceding nasal.[444] The other option is that *parivanae*, which can be regularly traced back to earlier **parivanaga*, is a loan from Bactr. *παροβανδαγο /parəvandəgə/ < **pari-banda-ka*-. This option likewise requires the loss of /d/ to have taken place in Gāndhārī.[445]

68. *pravaṃnaga* '(authoritative) document'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *pravaṃnaga*: CKD 72; 81; 86 (3x); 100; 275; 348; 416; 419; 443; 549; 571 (2x); 579 (2x); 582; 586 (2x); 587 (2x); 589 (2x); 590 (2x); 633; 648; 654; 655 (2x); 710; 715; 782; 795; 805; *pravaṃnae*: CKD 369; *pravaṃnaka*: CKD 370; *pravaṃna*: CKD 573

INS.SG. *pravaṃnagena*: CKD 275

LOC.SG. *pravaṃnagaṃmi*: CKD 59; 633

---

[442] Note moreover that intervocalic -*bh*- by default develops to Niya -*h*- (LKD: §27) and not to -*v*-, as Burrow's etymology requires.

[443] Except for the position after a nasal, CSogd. <b> from OIr. **b* stands for /v/; cf. e.g. CSogd. *prbyr*- /parvēr/ 'to explain, expose, tell' < **pari-bāraya*-, a verb spelled as *prβ(')yr*- in Manichaean and Sogdian script (SD: 282; DMSB^2: 168f.; DCS^2: 136). For the use of CSogd. <nt> to write the cluster /nd/, cf. e.g. the spelling variation between *nbnt*, *nbnθ*, and *nbnd* 'with, at, beside, by' (DCS^2: 114), a cognate of Bactr. ναβανδο / νοβανδο 'idem' < **ni-bandV* (BD II: 236).

[444] See §4.3.29 for more examples of this change in Iranian loanwords.

[445] In Khotanese, **pari-banda-ka*- would probably yield **parbanaa*-, cf. *parbav*- 'to overcome (tr.), grow up (intr.)' < **pari-bawa*- (SGS: 75; EDIV: 17) and *bana*- 'bundle' < **banda*- (DKS: 264). Were **parbanaa*- the source of *parivanae*, one would be freed from the assumption that the *d* was lost in Gāndhārī, but then *b* needs to have been lenited to *v*.

Compounds

DIR.SG. *gaṃnaṃnapravaṃnaga* 'accounting document': CKD 159; *ganana-pravaṃnaga*: CKD 278; *ganaṃnapravaṃnaga*: CKD 289
DIR.SG. *rayakaüṭipravaṃnaga* 'account of the royal she-camels': CKD 180
DIR.SG. *lekhapravaṃnaga* 'written document': CKD 580 (2x); 582

The word *pravaṃnaga* refers to a contract or legal document that is written on a double rectangular tablet, has a summary of its contents and seals on the obverse of the cover-tablet, and concerns exchange or a legal dispute (Høisæter 2020: 108).

In Burrow's view (LKD: 107 s.v.; cf. already KD: 357), *pravaṃnaga* would be an inherited word and derived from Skt. *prapanna-* to *pra* + √*pad* with an additional *ka*-suffix. There is a semantic problem with this etymology since the basic meaning of Skt. *prapanna-* is 'approached' (MW: 682), and the required meaning 'document' seems to be found nowhere. For the same reason, I reject Bailey's (KT IV: 70) derivation of *pravaṃnaga* from Skt. **pratipanna-ka-* to *prati* + √*pad* 'to enter, to arrive at, etc.' (MW: 667). His proposal moreover runs into phonological problems as **pratipanna-ka-* should yield Niya ***paḍivaṃnaga* or the like.[446]

I propose to compare Niya *pravaṃnaga* with Sogd. *prwn'k'** 'document' in *prwn'k' kr'k* 'document compiler' (Livshits 2015: 164) and Bactr. παροοανανγο /parwānāgə/ 'authorisation, authority' < OIr. **parwānākă-* (BD II: 252).[447] The Sogdian and Bactrian forms would both be a fitting source of Niya *pravaṃnaga*, the Bactrian especially so when Miyamoto (2022–23: 92) is correct in thinking that παροοανανγο meant 'type of document on which orders were written' instead of 'authorisation, authority', as Sims-Williams has it (BD II: 252).[448]

---

[446] Bailey (KT IV: 70) further proposed that Khot. *pravanaa-* is a loan from Niya *pravaṃnaga* (so also Yoshida 2008: 106; Zhang 2016: 162f.). Yet, the meaning of Khot. *pravanaa-* is considered unclear by some researchers (cf. Degener 1989: 211 s.v. *pravanāja* and Skjærvø 2002: 8), so I leave this question open.

[447] After completing my lemma on *pravaṃnaga*, I found out that Miyamoto (2022–23: 92ff.) independently makes the same comparison. Our treatments of the subject complement each other since my approach is more linguistic than Miyamoto's: he only notes that "Gāndhārī *pravaṃnaga* and Bactrian παροανανγο have some relationship" and mainly focusses on the semantics and sociohistorical interpretation of the Bactrian word.

[448] The required lenition of Bactr. -γ- /g/ to Niya -*g*- /γ/ would be regular (cf. §4.3.11), and it seems possible that Sogd. -*k*- would likewise be lenited to Niya -*g*- /γ/ just like OIA -*k*- became a voiced fricative in Niya.

The reason for not including this etymology among the secure ones is that one could expect Bactr. παροοαναγο or Sogd. *prwn'k'* to have resulted in ***paronaga* or the like because of the substitution of Ir. *-wă-* with Niya *-o-* seen elsewhere (§4.3.1). In my view, one can assume that the initial *pra-* in Niya *pravaṃnaga* is due to contamination with *pramana* 'authority' < Skt. *pramāṇa-*, as these two words regularly co-occur, and *pramana* was specifically used for the authority enjoyed by a legal document.[449]

69. *maravara* 'accountant'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *maravara*: CKD 186; 187; 385; 781; 782

maravara is one of the lower-ranking official titles in the Niya documents. Its meaning, as Burrow (1935a: 785 *contra* 1934: 510) observed, "must be something like accountant, because the *maravara* Kuviñeya (385) is also referred to as *gaṃñavara* "treasurer" (310)". Therefore, it seems clear that *maravara* ultimately goes back to OIr. **hmāra-bă̆ra-* 'accountant' (so first Bailey *apud* Burrow 1935a: 785), a variant of **hmāra-kă̆ra-* 'idem', whose second element is built with *√*bar* 'to bring, carry' instead of with *√*kar* 'to do, make'.[450]

Niya *maravara* differs from OIr. **hmāra-bă̆ra-* in two respects: the initial **h* has been lost, and the intervocalic **b* has been lenited to *v*. As for the first point, one could argue that **hm-* had already been simplified in the donor language (as Burrow seems to have thought). Yet, seeing that ***hm-* is an impermissible onset in Niya Prakrit, it is equally possible that the loss of the **h* occurred during the borrowing process (cf. also §4.3.23). Theoretically, the lenition could likewise be ascribed to the recipient language (cf. §2.1.2).

---

[449] See CKD 348; 419; 571; 573; 579; 580; 582; 586; 587; 589; 590; 648; 654; 655; 782. Contamination is more likely to happen when two lexemes regularly co-occur (Hock 1991[2]: 197–199; Vine 2006). It is moreover worth noting that *pramana* was borrowed into Bactrian as παρμανο 'authoritative' (BD II: 251f.), whose initial sequence παρ- rather than **πρα- may itself result from contamination with παροοαναγο 'authorisation, authority' (*teste* πριγγοοαβγο 'weaver of damask', there was no inhibition against initial πρ- /pr/ in Bactrian).
[450] Whereas **hmāra-bă̆ra-* does not seem to be attested elsewhere, reflexes of **hmāra-kă̆ra-* have been borrowed into many languages, including Aramaic, Babylonian (Iranica: §4.4.7.57), Armenian (Olsen 1999: 889), and Syriac (Ciancaglini 2008: 101). For corresponding forms in Indian inscriptions, see Falk (2002–3: 44f. = 2013a: 329f.; 2010b: 78 = 2013a: 249).

However, intervocalic **b* also develops to a voiced fricative in various Middle Iranian languages, most notably in Parthian,[451] Sogdian, Khotanese, and Bactrian, so the lenition may rather be attributed to the donor language. If *maravara* was borrowed from Bactrian, its donor form could be reconstructed as *υμαροβαρο /hmārəvă̄rə/ < **hmāra-bă̄ra-*.[452]

70. *raj̲i* 'cloak, woollen cloth'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *raj̲i*: CKD 431 = 432; 655; 714; 795

The word *raj̲i* clearly refers to a textile product, as Lüders (1936a: 21 fn. 2) was the first to recognise (see also Agrawala 1953a: 83). Its exact meaning cannot be deduced from the available contexts, since they mostly consist of lists.

No etymology appears to have been proposed until now. Yet, in neighbouring Iranian languages, there are some words for textiles which are similar in form to *raj̲i*. I am referring to New Iranian forms, such as Dārī *raγza* and Yidgha *roγz* 'women's cloak' (Morgenstierne 1938: 243); Sogd. *rγzy* /raγzi/ 'cloth made of wool or hair' (Sims-Williams & Hamilton 2015: 30; 108); and Bactr. ραγαζο 'cloak' (BD II: 259).[453]

Sogd. *rγzy* /raγzi/ is also attested in the derived adjective *rγzy-cykw* 'of *raγzi* type', which confirms that the *-y* in *rγzy* is not the nom.sg. ending of light stems but an integral part of the word. It follows that the immediate pre-form of Sogd. *rγzy* /raγzi/ and Bactr. ραγαζο can be reconstructed as OIr. **ragzi-*.

---

[451] Cf. Sundermann (1989: 123). It is irrelevant for my argument whether the lenition is phonemic or allophonic in Parthian (for which cf. GW: §§173–178).

[452] The root **√hmar* 'to count' (EDIV: 137f.) occurs in the Bactrian words αυμαρο 'account' < **ā-hmāra-* (BD II: 198), υαμαρο 'account, total' < **ham-(h)māra-*, and υαμαρογαρο 'accountant' < **hmāra-kă̄ra-* (BD II: 271). MBactr. *hm'r* could be either from **ham-(h)māra-* (= GBactr. υαμαρο) or from **hmāra-* without any preverb (Sims-Williams 2009a: 262).

[453] In Bactrian orthography, an alpha is sometimes added in between a consonant cluster, perhaps to render a svarabhakti schwa. Cf. e.g. the variation between τογδο /tuγdə/ and τογαδο /tuγədə/ 'paid' < **tuxta-* (BD II: 270). Although it is only a hapax, ραγαζο is found next to other textile products, such as κωσοβο 'blanket' and βαρζο 'pillow' (BD I^2: 28f.). Interestingly, Niya *koj̲ava* 'rug, blanket', conceivably a loan from Bactr. κωσοβο (§3.3.3 s.v.), is also found in the proximity of *raj̲i* (CKD 714).

Niya Pkt. *raj̲i* likewise ends in final *-i*, so one could take *raj̲i* to be a loan from Sogd. *ryzy* /raɣzi/ 'cloth made of wool or hair'. This option requires Sogd. *-ɣz-* /ɣz/ to have been rendered as Niya *-j̲-* /ź/ (or /źź/), which seems conceivable since Sogd. /z/ stands here in front of the palatal vowel /i/ and /ɣ/ may easily have been lost during the borrowing process as the first member of a foreign cluster. As argued in more detail in §4.3.27, there is even a possibility that this observed loss of /ɣ/ has to do with a tendency to borrow velar fricatives as sibilants in Niya Prakrit: instead of arguing that /ɣ/ was simply lost during the borrowing process, one could alternatively conjecture that /ɣ/ was substituted in this word with Niya /ź/. In this case, the *-j̲-* in *raj̲i* could indicate a geminate /źź/.

There is a second option. In Kuṣāṇa Bactrian, final **-i* could still be preserved (cf. §4.2.1). Bactr. ραγαζο may therefore stem from earlier *ραγζι. When one accepts that OIr. **z* (< PIr. **ǰ*) became palatalised to Bactr. /ź/ in front of **i* (§2.2.4.3), this form would be phonologically interpretable as /raɣźi/ and thus an attractive etymon of Niya *raj̲i*. The Bactrian cluster -γζ- /ɣź/ would be rendered as Niya *-j̲-* /ź/ (or /źź/), with the same loss of /ɣ/ that one has to assume if regarding *raj̲i* as a Sogdian loanword.

In conclusion, it seems plausible that Niya *raj̲i* is borrowed from Sogd. *ryzy* /raɣzi/ 'cloth made of wool or hair' or Bactr. *ραγζι /raɣźi/ (cf. attested ραγαζο) 'cloak' < OIr. **ragzi*-. The etymology is not entirely secure because the semantics attributed to *raj̲i* are partially based on the etymological proposal.

3.3.3 Arguable etymologies

71. *ag̲iṣḍha* 'cover, rug'

Attestations of the basic form

DIR.SG. *ag̲iṣḍha*: CKD 154; 431 = 432;[454] *akiṣḍha*: CKD 207; 881
DIR.PL. *ag̲iṣḍha*: CKD 431 = 432; 652; *akiṣḍha*: CKD 881 (2x)

Based on the contexts in which *ag̲iṣḍha* occurs, Lüders (1936a: 12) reasonably suggested that this lexeme refers to some form of 'cover' or 'rug' (cf. also LKD: 71 s.v. *akiṣḍha*). Etymologically, the Niya form may be

[454] KD's (157) reading *agiṣḍha* in CKD 432 under-tablet obverse line 7 should be corrected to *ag̲iṣḍha*.

connected with Bactr. γιζδο /gižḏə/ (or /γižḏə/) ‘rug (?)’, Kabuli Pers. *γižḏī* ‘goats-hair tent’, and Psht. *kəǧḏəy* ‘idem’ (cf. EDP: 38; BD II: 207).

It is difficult to trace the exact trajectory of borrowings.[455] Given that initial α- /ă/ can sometimes be lost in Bactrian, Niya *agiṣḍha* could be a loan from Bactr. *αγιζδο /ăgižḏə/ (or /ăγižḏə/), a more archaic form than the attested γιζδο.[456] A Bactrian loanword may also be the most plausible option since this textile term has not yet been found in other Middle Iranian languages, and one cannot easily think of another donor language for Niya *agiṣḍha*. Yet, as long as we remain ignorant of the ultimate etymology, I would not claim that Niya *agiṣḍha* is necessarily a Bactrian loanword.

72. *ageta* ‘tax collector’

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *ageta*: CKD 105 (2x); 132; 169 (2x); 197; 264; 384; 411; 422 (3x); 431 = 432; 444; 571; 577; 580; 583; 586; 587 (2x); 590; 592 (2x); 640 (2x); 715 (2x); 782; 823; 879; 886; *agita*: CKD 42; 137
GEN.SG. *agetaṣa*: CKD 275; 307 (2x); 322
DIR.PL. *ageta*: CKD 59; 714; *agita*: CKD 725
GEN.PL. *agetana*: CKD 437; 496; 571; 714

It is generally accepted that Niya Pkt. *ageta* approximately means ‘tax collector’ (cf. e.g. LKD: 71f. s.v.; Atwood 1991: 194).

Because of these semantics, I cautiously propose that *ageta* is an Iranian loanword ultimately going back to OIr. **ā-kaita-* ‘assessor (of taxes)’, an agent noun made from the preverb **ā* and the root **√čait/θ* ‘to consider’

---

[455] Harmatta’s (1964a: 16f.; 1967: 3ff.) suggestion to trace *agiṣḍha* back to Sogd. **ākišt* ‘drawn, hung’ < OIr. **ā-kr̥šta-* (cf. BSogd. *’’k(’)yš-* ‘to draw, pull out’ < **ā* + **√karš*; SD: 6; EDIV: 241) is semantically not self-evident and phonologically hardly possible. Out of **-št-*, one would namely anticipate Niya *-ṭh-* /ṣṭ/ and not the voiced cluster *-ṣḍh-* /ẓḍ$^{(h)}$/. For the same reason, one should resist an otherwise tempting comparison with Aram. *’krst*, a type of dress mentioned in the Aramaic documents from Bactria and interpreted in ADAB (57; 217; 274) as a loan from OIr. **ā-kr̥sta-* ‘something cut’ ← **ā* + **√kart* ‘to cut’.

[456] For the loss of initial α- /ă/ in Bactrian, cf. e.g. μαχο /māxə/ ‘us, we’ < αμαχο /amāxə/ < **a(h)māxam* and ματο /matə/ ‘broken up, disposed’ < αματο /āmatə/ < **āmašta-* (BD II: 191). It should, however, be conceded that γιζδο, attested in doc. cj of about 465 AD (SCBD: 83), would be the earliest example of the loss of initial α- /ă/. If *agiṣḍha* is indeed borrowed from *αγιζδο, the variant spelling with *-k-* could be due to a hypercorrect fortition of the intervocalic velar consonant in Niya Prakrit, for which cf. §3.2.1 s.v. *vaga* and §§4.3.10–11.

(EDIV: 31). **ā-kaita-* does not seem to be continued elsewhere; but a parallel **abi-kaita-* can be posited based on Oss. I. *ævǵid*, D. *evged* 'guarantee' (Cheung 2002: 166), and **kaita-*, without a preverb, is attested by way of MP *kēd* 'magician' (CPD: 50) and Bactr. κηδο /kēdə/ 'priest' (BD II: 222). The original form of the verbal root is *√*čait* (cf. Ved. √*cit*). PIIr. **t* developed to PIr. **θ* before any consonant, thus giving rise to a by-form *√*čaiθ* (e.g. opt.3sg. **čiθyāt* < PIIr. **čityāt*). In the agent noun, the **t* was followed by the vowel **-a-* < PIE **-o-* (τομός-type), which allowed the original form of the root to be preserved. For the combination of the preverb **ā* with *√*čait/θ*, one may refer to OAv. *acistā* (Y 51.11), which, for instance, Insler (1975: 316) interprets as standing for **ācistā*, i.e. a middle 3sg. injunctive aorist based on **ā* + *√*čait/θ*.[457]

My etymology requires one to accept that **ā* + *√*čait/θ* underwent a semantic development from 'to consider' to 'to assess, to reckon (taxes)' so that the agent noun **ā-kaita-* would mean 'assessor (of taxes)'. Although hypothetical, this semantic change seems conceivable, as Niya Pkt. *ciṃt-* / *ciṃd-*, a cognate of PIr. *√*čait/θ*, is also used in the technical sense 'to assess, to reckon (taxes)' (LKD: 89 s.v.). An additional parallel is Latin *censor*. Etymologically an agent noun to *censeo* 'to estimate, to think', this Roman official was responsible for the national register used to collect the right amount of taxes.

If the etymology proposed here is correct, the lack of distinctive phonological features makes it challenging to identify the donor language of *ag̲eta* with any precision. In view of the vowel *-e-* in *ag̲eta*, the diphthong **-ai-* in the reconstructed Old Iranian pre-form **ā-kaita-* should have been monophthongised; this points to a Middle Iranian source, but one cannot go much further than that. Given that some of the bureaucratic titles in the Niya documents are quite certainly borrowed from Bactrian (cf. §4.5.2), *ag̲eta* could be a loan from Bactr. *αγηδο /āgēdə/ < **ā-kaita-*, but Parth. **āgēd* cannot be excluded on phonological grounds. If one accepts that intervocalic **-k-* could still be lenited to Niya *-g̲-* /ɣ/ in loanwords, a hypothetical Sogdian form **ākēt* would also be a possible source of Niya *ag̲eta*.[458]

---

[457] A corresponding verb *ā* + √*cit* is also attested in Vedic, but with a different meaning, i.e. 'to attend to, comprehend, appear'.

[458] As there are only three attestations of *agita* and *ageta* is clearly the standard form, a Khotanese source seems less likely since **-ai-* develops to *-ī-* in this language, probably already before coming into contact with Niya Prakrit (see §3.2.1 s.v. *jheniga*).

73. *kojava* ‘rug, blanket’

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *kojava*: CKD 173; 222; 327; 382; 416; 431 = 432 (2x); 448; 534; 549; 583; 592; 633; 668 (2x); 841 (2x); *kośava*: CKD 345; 448; 575 (2x); 714; 728
DIR.PL. *kojava*: CKD 431 = 432; *kośava*: CKD 207.

The contexts in which Niya *kojava* (also *kośava*) occurs prove that this word denotes a textile product. That it meant something like ‘rug’ or ‘blanket’ is rendered likely by the obvious etymological connection with the following Indo-Aryan words (first compared to *kojava* by Lüders 1936a: 4f.):

(i) Pāli *kojava(ka)*- ‘woollen rug or cover’ (Cone 2001– I: 731).

(ii) BSkt. *kocava*- ‘woollen blanket’ (BHSD: 193). In Mvy. 5861, the nom.sg. *kocavaḥ* is translated as Tib. *la ba* ‘woollen rug’ and Chin. *hè zǐ* 褐子 ‘coarse cloth made of wool’. In addition, Mvy. 8982 lemmatises a neuter form *kocavakam*, again translated into Tibetan as *la ba* ‘woollen rug’ and into Chinese as either *zhāng pí* 麞皮 ‘deerskin’ or *dà máo shuā róng* 大毛刷絨 ‘long-haired brushed velvet’.

(iii) Skt. *kaucapaka*- in a list of textile products in *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* 2.11.98 (Olivelle 2013: 126; 533).[459]

Regarding the etymology of these words, Lüders (1936a: 11) already noted the absence of a straightforward inner-Indo-Aryan derivation, which led him to conclude that they are loanwords, “vermutlich aus dem Iranischen”. At the time, Lüders’ proposal of an Iranian origin could not be confirmed as forms resembling Niya *kojava* and its cognates were nowhere attested in Iranian languages. This is no longer true since the surfacing of a Bactrian word κωσοβο, which, given its co-occurrence with βαρζο ‘pillow’, probably means

[459] In addition to these Indo-Aryan forms, Lüders (1936a: 10f.) also compared Latin *gausape* (also *-um*; *-es*; *-a*) ‘cloth of woollen frieze or a piece of it; cloak made of this material’; Gr. γαυσάπης (a form cited within the Latin text of Varro’s *De lingua Latina* fr. 14 Kent as the putative source of *gausape*; cf. de Melo 2019: 640f.; 1259f.); and Gr. γαύσαπος* ‘woollen cloth’ (nom.pl. γαύσαποι at Strabo 5.1.12). It is, however, not guaranteed that these Latin and Greek words are indeed connected, as they have alternatively been argued to find their origins in a Balkanic language (cf. EDG: 263 who cites Albanian *gëzóf* ‘animal skin, cloak’). Due to this uncertainty, I will not discuss them further.

'blanket' and hence semantically matches well with Niya *koj̲ava* and its cognates (BD II: 225).[460]

Can we conclude that Niya *koj̲ava* is a loanword from Bactr. κωσοβο 'blanket'? In principle, one would like to answer this question with a simple "yes"; after all, Bactrian is the source of several other terms for textile products in Niya Prakrit (cf. §4.5.3), and κωσοβο is so far the only trace of this word for 'blanket' in Iranian languages. Yet, the absence of a convincing etymology of κωσοβο complicates matters, as this means that we cannot be sure about the phonological interpretation of κωσοβο.[461]

Sims-Williams (BD II: 225) derives κωσοβο from **kaučapa-*, presumably under the influence of the Sanskrit forms *kocava(ka)-* and *kaucapaka-*. This derivation would entail that κωσοβο stands for /kōtsəvə/ as the default outcome of OIr. **č* is Bactr. /ts/ (cf. §2.2.4.2). Were this correct, it would not be so easy (though perhaps not impossible) to interpret *koj̲ava* (also *kośava*) as a loan from Bactrian: the alternation between *-j̲-* and *-ś-* in *koj̲ava* / *kośava* points to the presence of a phoneme /ź/, and it seems difficult to reconcile this with Bactr. /ts/.[462] Since **kaučapa-* is only a mechanical reconstruction and it thus is not certain that κωσοβο stands for /kōtsəvə/, other options may be pursued as well.

I wonder if the -σ- in κωσοβο could alternatively stand for /ś/, perhaps as the result of an older cluster **-sy-*. Although I am unable to substantiate this suggestion with a convincing etymology of κωσοβο, this would at least allow for a plausible chain of borrowings. If we take into account that intervocalic *-ś-* became a voiced /ź/ in Gāndhārī (written as *-ś-* or *-j̲-*; cf. §2.1.2), κωσοβο would, when standing for /kōśəvə/, be a phonologically straightforward source of *koj̲ava* (also *kośava*). In other words, Gāndhārī could have borrowed this word directly from Bactrian. Pāli *kojava-* 'rug,

[460] Another word which may belong here is Syr. *gwšp'* (fem. *gwšpqt'*) 'rug' / *kwšp'* (fem. *kwšpt'*) 'outer garment'. According to Ciancaglini (2008: 140f.), this Syriac lexeme is an Iranian loanword somehow related to Bactr. κωσοβο. As the details are, however, complicated (something Ciancaglini duly admits), I will leave the Syriac evidence aside in what follows. In any case, it does not contribute anything essential to the etymological analysis of Niya *koj̲ava*.

[461] Cf. the similar case of Niya *agi̱ṣḍha* 'cover, rug' and Bactr. γιζδο 'idem' (§3.3.3 s.v.).

[462] By default, one would assume Bactr. /ts/ to be borrowed with Niya *-ts-*, although there is so far no example of this correspondence. There are two cases where Bactr. /ts/ may have been substituted in Niya Prakrit with *-s-* or *-s̲-* /z/ (cf. §3.3.2 s.v. *paraṣa*; §4.3.15; §6.4.4).

cover' would be explainable as a borrowing from Gāndhārī, conforming to Burrow's (1973[3]: 389) observation that this type of Iranian word first entered Gāndhārī before spreading to other Indo-Aryan languages.[463] The Sanskrit forms could be hypersanskritisms based on a Gāndhārī model. As Skt. *-c-* regularly corresponds to Gandh. /ź/ (§2.1.2), it would namely be possible to back-form the Sanskrit forms with *-c-* out of *kojava* (*kośava*).[464]

Although this scenario seems attractive, one cannot prove it as long as the etymology of Bactr. κωσοβο has not been clarified. This calls for cautious conclusions: it seems plausible that Niya *kojava* 'rug, blanket' and its cognates are Iranian loanwords and etymologically connected to Bactr. κωσοβο 'blanket', but whether the latter is also the donor of the Indic forms remains to be seen.

74. *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* 'exchange'

Attestations of the basic form

DIR.SG. *namanaga*: CKD 222; 769 (2x); *namaṃnaga*: CKD 279; *namaṃniya*: CKD 571; 580; 581; 586; 590; 655; 839; *namani*: CKD 587; 591; 769; *namaṃni*: CKD 582; 820; *naṃmaṃni*: CKD 839; *naṃmaniya*: CKD 592

Compounds

INS.SG. *namanagamuliyena* 'price (consisting of) an exchange': CKD 677

The Niya word *namanaga* / *namaṃniya*[465] typically co-occurs with the verb *de(na)-* 'to give', most frequently in a legal formula stipulating the rights one has with regard to newly acquired property. (3.32) is a representative example.

(3.32) CKD 592 under-tablet obverse 5–7
taha ajuvadae atra striya Lýimisoae vaṃti Ramṣotsaṣa eśvarya huda taḍanae baṃnanae vikranaṃnae naṃmaniya deyaṃnae badho deyaṃnae taha ṣarva boga kikama karaṃni siyati
"From now on Ramṣotsa has ownership of the woman Lýimisoae, to beat her, to bind her, to sell her, to give her (as) *naṃmaniya*, to pledge her, to do whatever he likes with her." (after TKD: 127).

---

[463] Phonologically, this proposal assumes that the Gāndhārī voiced palatal sibilant was substituted with the voiced palatal affricate *-j-* in Pāli.
[464] Consequently, I cannot entirely agree with Lüders (1936a: 5) that the Sanskrit forms are necessarily more archaic because of their intervocalic *-c-*.
[465] The variation between *-aga* and *-i(ya)* will be discussed below.

In Bailey's view (1955: 19; 1982: 38f.), *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* would be translatable as 'pledge'. This translation seems unlikely, as the word *badho* is already used in this meaning (see §3.2.3 s.v.), and the two words can occur side by side, as they do in (3.32) (see also CKD 590; 591). Consequently, I also reject Bailey's etymological proposal to trace *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* back to MIr. **ni-vă̆na-* < OIr. **ni-pă̆na-*, which is anyhow but a postulated variant of OIr. **ni-pāka-* 'pledge' (Bactr. ναβαγο, Sogd. *np'k*, etc.).[466]

Instead, I follow Burrow (LKD: 100 s.v. *namaṃniya*) in thinking that *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* means 'exchange'. The best evidence in favour of this translation comes from CKD 279, where *namaṃnaga* seems to be used for the exchange of two women in the context of the exogamous marriage practices also evidenced elsewhere in the Niya documents (cf. §3.2.3 s.v. *muṣḍhaṣi*; §3.7.2 s.v. *muḱaṣi*).[467]

Burrow likewise provided *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* with a possible etymology. He compared the Niya word to Arm. *nman* 'similar, like', generally accepted to be an Iranian loanword that can be traced back to OIr. **nimāna-* (cf. NP *namūna* 'similar, like; pattern, etc.'; Hübschmann 1897: 205).[468] The meaning 'exchange' in Niya Prakrit would be based on the notion that one gives something for something like it when exchanging goods.

A potential issue with Burrow's etymology is how to account for the variation between Niya forms in *-aga* and *-i(ya)*.[469] If I understand Burrow correctly, he thought that both forms were independent derivatives from an underlying word **namana* ← a descendant of OIr. **ni-māna-*. Although not impossible, this seems implausible since the forms in *-aga* and *-i(ya)* are interchangeable.

---

[466] The *-m-* in *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* would, according to Bailey, result from earlier **-v-*, parallel to examples such as Niya *ami* < *avi* < *api* 'also'. Yet, there is no other Iranian loanword in which this change would have happened.

[467] Lüders' (1940b: 46–49) proposal to interpret *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* as 'loan' appears to fit less well. His etymological comparison with Av. *nəmah-* 'loan' (Vd. 4.1; AIW: 1070) seems unlikely too since this Avestan noun is otherwise isolated in Iranian, and there is no compelling evidence for an Iranian root **√nam* 'to loan' as posited by Lüders.

[468] As discussed below, the OIr. pre-form could also be reconstructed as **ni-māni-*. The underlying root is **√mān* 'to like, to resemble' (EDIV: 272f.), which itself is probably denominative from **māna-* 'measuring'.

[469] For the interchangeability between *-i* and *-iya* in Niya Prakrit, see LKD (§9).

A different option would be to assume that the forms in *-aga* are more archaic and those in *-i(ya)* due to a phonological development. Although *-aga* normally only develops as far as *-ae* or *-e* (LKD: §53), a parallel for *-aga* becoming *-i(ya)* may be sought in dir.sg. *śpaṣavaṃni* (CKD 84), possibly a lenited form of dir.sg. *śpaṣavaṃnaga* (CKD 507; 515; 541 (2x)). Under this assumption, the Iranian source of *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* may descend from OIr. **ni-māna-ka-* 'equal > exchange'.

Given that the forms in *-i(ya)* outnumber those in *-aga* (14 vs. 5 tokens), yet another possibility would be to take the forms in *-i(ya)* as the more original ones. This option would allow us to compare Olsen's (1999: 296 fn. 221) observation that Arm. *nman* inflects as an *i*-stem in the fifth-century authors Eznik Kołbacʿi and Łazar Pʿarpecʿi, which may be taken to suggest that the Old Iranian pre-form is to be reconstructed as **ni-māni-* rather than **ni-māna-*.[470] Since Niya *-i(ya)* often derives from earlier *-*iga*, the Iranian source of Niya *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* could thus also derive from **ni-māni-ka-* 'equal > exchange'.

Most likely, *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* was borrowed from an Iranian language in which **ni-* developed to **nə-*, for otherwise the rendering with Niya *na-* would be hard to account for. This development cannot be ascribed to any language in particular, as it occurs in all relevant Middle Iranian languages.[471] Depending on how to account for the variation between *-aga* and *-iya*, a possible Bactrian source of *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* could be reconstructed as *ναμανο /nəmānə/ < **ni-mānV-*, *ναμαναγο /nəmānəgə/ < **ni-māna-ka-*, or *ναμανιγο /nəmānigə/ < **ni-māni-ka-*.[472]

---

[470] Iranian loanwords in Armenian are often assigned to a declension type that reflects the corresponding Old Iranian morphological class; see Olsen (2005); Korn (2013); Fattori (2023).

[471] In Bactrian, the outcome of **ni-* can be written as νι-, να-, or νο- (SCBD: 63), and in Sogdian, as *ny-* or *n-* (GMS: §§676–678). In (Old) Khotanese, there is variation between *ni-*, *nä-*, and *nyi-*, but before *-m-*, the default outcome is *nu-* (SGS: 234). For Parthian and Middle Persian, Durkin-Meisterernst (GW: §462) assumes that **ni-* is continued as *ni-*. Yet, given that the outcome of **ni-* in these languages can be spelled with simple *n-*, e.g. *nm'y-* 'to show' < **ni-māya-*, I would not exclude that the **-i-* could also be weakened to a schwa-like sound.

[472] Note, however, that *nihaṃñ-* 'to deposit, to put down' and *nihala* 'settlement, agreement' seem to have been borrowed from a Bactrian source where **ni-* was continued as νι- /ni/ and not as να- /nə/ (§§3.2.2 and 3.2.3 s.vv.).

75. *pajhavaṃta* ‘breastband (?)’

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *pajhavaṃta*:[473] CKD 316
DIR.PL. *pasaṃvaṃta*:[474] CKD 534

In CKD 316, *pajhavaṃta* combines with the adjective *prighamaga* ‘made from damask’, while in CKD 534, its spelling variant *pasaṃvaṃta* is specified by the adjective *thavaṃnamae* ‘made from cloth’, so we can be sure that some textile product is meant. The alternation between *-jh-* and *-s-* points to the presence of a phoneme /z/, a potential marker of Iranian loanwords.[475]

In my view, Niya Pkt. *pajhavaṃta* may be derived from an Iranian compound **pāza(h)-banda-* ‘breastband’, i.e. a band worn around the breast. Although I am unaware of other derivatives of the reconstructed **pāza(h)-banda-*, various parallels can be cited for this type of compound. Compare, for instance, MP *kamarband* ‘bound around the waist > belt’ (CPD: 49); NP *gardanband* ‘bound around the neck > necklace, ornament, etc.’ (CPED: 1081); (Parth. →) Arm. *dandanawand* ‘bound around the teeth > bridle’ (Olsen 1999: 875); and Bactr. λιστοβανδιγο ‘bound around the hand > bracelet’ (BD II: 227).[476]

If accepted, the proposed etymology of *pajhavaṃta* implies that the cluster **-nd-* in OIr. **pāza(h)-banda-* was continued unchanged in the donor language and borrowed from there into Niya Prakrit as *-ṃt-* /nd/.[477] Consequently, Khotanese can be excluded as a donor language because **-nd-* develops to *-n-* in this language (cf. Khot. *bana-* ‘bundle’ > **banda-*). In addition, the **-b-* in **pāza(h)-banda-* corresponds to *-v-* in *pajhavaṃta*. In

[473] Boyer et al. (KD: 115) read this word as *paṃjhavaṃta*. In my view, the first akṣara is more likely a 𐨤 *pa* than a 𐨯𐨤 *paṃ*; cf. the similarly drawn 𐨤 *pa* in *aparimana* ‘without measure’ in the same line.
[474] See TKD (106) for this reading. The etymology proposed below starts from the assumption that the anusvāra in <saṃ> is non-etymological.
[475] For the alternation between *-jh-* and *-s-* in an Iranian loanword, cf. *asade* (CKD 436) next to *ajhate* ‘free’ (§3.3.1 s.v.).
[476] In Indo-Aryan, such compounds exist too, e.g. BSkt. *kāyabandhana-* ‘bound around the body > girdle’ or Niya Pkt. *karnabaṃdhana* ‘bound at the ears > earring’ (CKD 566). In a note added to his copy of LKD (104), Burrow compares *pajhavaṃta* to NP *pazwand* ‘a bundle of clothes’ (CPED: 248). This Persian word lacks, however, a good etymology and seems completely isolated in Iranian, making me to prefer the etymology presented above.
[477] For the phonological interpretation of Niya <ṃt> as /nd/, see §2.1.5.

theory, such a lenition could have happened in Gāndhārī itself (cf. §2.1.2). Yet, it may rather be attributable to the Middle Iranian source. Bactr. *παζοβανδο /pāzəvandə/ would therefore be a likely source of *pajhavaṃta*,[478] although Parth. **pāzβand* or Sogd. **pāzβand* would work phonologically too.[479]

76. *rasaṃna* 'rope (?)'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.PL. *rasaṃna*: CKD 345

The hapax *rasaṃna* occurs in a list of stolen commodities. Its semantics cannot be deduced from the context. If, however, Burrow (1935a: 786; LKD: 114 s.v.) is correct in his assumption of an etymological relationship with MP *rasan* 'rope' (CPD: 71; cf. also Khwar. *rsyn* 'knit, rope'), the meaning 'rope' may arguably be assigned to Niya *rasaṃna*.[480]

For geographical reasons, MP *rasan* 'rope' is an unlikely donor form of Niya *rasaṃna*. Given the Indo-Parthian rule in Gandhāra (cf. §1.5.1), a more plausible source of *rasaṃna* would be Parth. **rasan*, which can be safely posited as the donor of Arm. *aṙasan* 'cord' (Olsen 1999: 867). Yet, one can envisage other options too, e.g. that *rasaṃna* is borrowed from a hypothetical Bactrian word *ρασανο /rasanə/ < OIr. **rasanā*-.[481]

[478] παζο 'breast' and βανδο 'bundle, bond' are both attested in Bactrian (BD II: 201; 250f.).
[479] For the (possibly allophonic) lenition of OIr. postvocalic *-*b*- to Parth. -*β*-, cf. Sundermann (1989: 123) and GW (§§173–178).
[480] Niya *rasaṃna* cannot be inherited, as the palatal sibilant seen in Skt. *raśanā*- 'rope, cord, girdle' should have been preserved. Sindhi *rasan* 'girdle' (CDIAL: no. 10647) is probably an Iranian loanword too; the inherited form in Sindhi is *rähäna* (also *rāna*) 'cord, rein, line', given that intervocalic sibilants regularly become -*h*- in Sindhi (Masica 1991: 194; 207). MP *rasan* 'rope' is a loanword from another Iranian language, as PIr. **raćanā*- (cf. Skt. *raśanā*-) should yield OP ***raθanā*-, whence MP ***rahan* (cf. PIr. **daća* 'ten' > OP *daθa* > MP *dah*).
[481] Gholami's (SFBG: 65) claim that *-*a*- is changed to Bactr. -ι- /i/ in front of *-*n*- is not wholly accurate. The change to -ι- /i/ is only regular "in the case of the sequences -ινδ- and -ινζ- or where there was a palatal vowel or consonant before or after *-*an*-" (Sims-Williams 2017c: 111). None of these contexts applies to *ρασανο /rasanə/ < **rasanā*-.

77. *vara* ‘load’

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *vara*: CKD 291 (*eka vara*)
DIR.PL. *vara*: CKD 291 (*dui vara*)

In nearly all its instances, Niya Pkt. *vara* means ‘time’ (as in French *fois*) < Skt. *vāra-* ‘idem’, but this meaning does not seem to suit the two occurrences of *vara* in CKD 291, here cited as (3.33) (Burrow 1935a: 787; LKD: 119 s.v. *varaya*). In this passage, dealing with the collection and transport of corn, Burrow instead translated *vara* as ‘part’.

(3.33) CKD 291 obverse 3–5
eka vara ya[482] *abhyadara kuhaniyaṃmi aniṣyaṃti ityartha ima yatma Porkota atra viṣajida … dui vara Piṣaliyaṃmi nihaṃñitavya.*
“The *yatma* Porkota has been sent there on the understanding that they will bring one-(third) part of it (*eka vara*) into the capital. … (The remaining) two-thirds (*dui vara*) are to be deposited at Piṣali.” (TKD: 52).

Since ‘part’ is not a known meaning of Skt. *vāra-* (cf. MW: 943; CDIAL: no. 11547), Burrow furthermore suspected the *vara* in (3.33) to be related to MP/Parth. *bahr* (also *baxr*) ‘part, share’ (DMMP: 107; 119).[483]

The etymology of *bahr* speaks against Burrow’s proposal. *bahr* is most likely a cognate of Av. *baxəδra-* ‘share, portion’ < **baxθra-* (Hübschmann 1895: 33; AIW: 923).[484] For Burrow’s idea to work, Niya *vara* would consequently have to come from a Middle Iranian language in which initial **b-* is spirantised to **v-* and **-xθr-* underwent the same type of simplification as in Persian and Parthian. Now, Bactrian and Sogdian would meet the first criterion, but neither language satisfies the second. In Bactrian, **bāxθri-* ‘Bactria’ yields βαχλο /vāxlə/ (BD II: 202), leading one to expect

[482] With Baums and Glass (2002a– *contra* Burrow 1935a: 787), I do not read *vara* and *ya* together as *varaya* < **varaga*, as this destroys the parallel with *dui vara*.
[483] Burrow cited the New Persian form *bahr(ah)* ‘part, portion’ (CPED: 210). Bailey (1951b: 32) additionally connected Khot. *vāra-*, but Skjærvø has shown (*apud* SVK III: 137–140) that this Khotanese lexeme does not mean ‘part’ (as claimed by Bailey), but rather ‘(still) missing > (still) owed’.
[484] In light of OP **bāxçi-* < **bāxθri-* → Elam. *pá-ak-ši-iš* ‘Bactria’ (Sims-Williams 2016b: 273), **baxθra-* ‘share’ should have resulted in OP **baxça-*. MP *bahr* must thus come from a different dialect showing an early simplification of **-xθr-* to *-hr-* (*-xr-*); cf. Tremblay (2004: 136).

**baxθra*- ‘portion, share’ to result in *βαχλο /vaxlə/, a phonologically unlikely source of Niya *vara*.[485] In Sogdian, *-*θr*- by default develops to the spirant -*š*- (Sims-Williams 1989a: 180), so a hypothetical Sogdian outcome of **baxθra*- would not account for the -*r*- in Niya *vara* either. Unless one is willing to accept an otherwise unknown Middle Iranian language as the donor of *vara*, Burrow’s etymology is thus best rejected.

In my view, Niya *vara* should instead be considered a loan from Bactr. βαρο /vārə/ ‘load’ (BD II: 202) or its Sogdian cognate *β’r* ‘idem’ < **bāra*- (SD: 97; DMSB^2: 57; Livshits 2015: 176).[486] The Bactrian word occurs in the phrase χαρο αλο βαρο ‘a donkey with its load’ (doc. xk), which comes close to the overall context of CKD 291, where it is said that camels (*uṭa*) transport *vara*, and one can translate the relevant passage as “they will bring one load (*eka vara*) into the capital. … (The remaining) two loads (*dui vara*) are to be deposited at Piṣali”. *eka vara* ‘one load’ is moreover paralleled by Sogd. *’yw β’r* ‘idem’ in the sentence *rty ’yw β’r ’rtk pr’šyw* ‘And (with him) I have sent a load of flour’ (Б11.9; Livshits 2015: 127f.).

In sum, this new etymology is phonologically more straightforward than Burrow’s and semantically not inferior. Due to its being attested in only one document, the semantics assigned to *vara* are partially based on etymology, however. My proposal can thus not be proved for now.

78. *ṣaṃna* ‘hemp, hempen (?)’

Compounds

DIR.SG. *ṣaṃnapaṭamae* ‘made of hempen (?) cloth’: CKD 318

The hapax legomenon *ṣaṃna* appears in the phrase *ṣaṃnapaṭamae kaṃculi* ‘a jacket made of *ṣaṃna* cloth’ and seemingly refers to a type of fabric. Given this, one could be inclined to regard *ṣaṃna* as a derivative of Skt. *śaṇa*- ‘hemp’ (also *śāṇa*- ‘hempen, a hempen garment’; MW: 1063). Phonologically, this idea is not viable, however, as the OIA sibilants are typically not confused in Gāndhārī (cf. §2.1.2).

---

[485] Henning (*apud* Livshits 1969: 76) regarded the sequence βαυ- on a potsherd from Kara-Tepe as the remnant of a Bactrian word βαυ[ρο] ‘share’, but βαυ- is better restored as βαυ[αρο] ‘monastery’ (BPN: no. 149; Fussman 2011: 106).

[486] Bactrian and Sogdian are the only relevant Iranian languages where initial **b*- develops to *v*- (cf. supra), so one does not need to consider other donor languages.

In light of the initial *ṣ-*, Burrow (1935a: 787; LKD: 126 s.v.) opted for an Iranian loanword, comparing Niya *ṣaṃna* to MP/NP *šan* 'hemp' < OIr. **šana-* (CPD: 79).[487] Like Lüders (1936a: 30) and Bailey (DKS: 52), I accept Burrow's comparison. Yet, it should be noted that the current evidence for OIr. **šana-* is limited to Persian, thus leaving us in the dark whether the relevant word also existed in more eastern Iranian languages. In any case, Khotanese and Sogdian already have a different word for 'hemp', i.e. Khot. *kaṃha-* < **kanafa-* (DKS: 51f.; Kümmel 2018: 163 fn. 3) and Sogd. *kynp'* (SD: 203). How the word for 'hemp' sounded in Bactrian is currently unknown. In case the word used was *þαvo /šanə/ < **šana-*, this could be a possible source of Niya *ṣaṃna*, but this naturally cannot be proved for now.

79. *hastama* 'quarrel, dispute'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *hastama*: CKD 434; 561 (2x); 569; 583; 584; 593; 767; 842; 884; *astama*:[488] CKD 506; 582; 676; 732; 820

The meaning and etymology of *hastama* have been discussed by Burrow (1935a: 788; 1936: 428; LKD: §45; 133 s.v.; TKD: 151) and Konow (1938a: 156). As noted by them, this lexeme frequently occurs together with words such as *garah-* 'to complain', *pruch-* 'to examine', and *nīce* 'decision'. Consequently, *hastama* is probably a synonym of *vivada* 'quarrel, dispute', with which it is used interchangeably (so e.g. in CKD 434).

Burrow connected *hastama* to the Proto-Iranian root **√stamb(H)* 'to withstand, be stiff, stern, unmoving' (EDIV: 362f.), on the assumption of a nominal formation **ha(m)-stamba-*. There being no independent support for the reconstructed **ha(m)-stamba-* or a corresponding verb **ham* + **√stamb(H)*, Burrow's etymology cannot be confirmed for now.[489] Yet, it is certainly worth considering in view of YAv. *stəṇbiia-*, an entry in the *Frahang-*

[487] See additionally Iranica (§4.3.206; §4.4.20.16) for indirect traces of OIr. **šana-ka-* 'hemp seed' or 'hemp cookie' in Elamite.

[488] The variant *astama* manifests the omission of *h-* found more often in Niya Prakrit (cf. LKD: §10).

[489] The root **√stamb(H)* does combine with other preverbs. Cf. e.g. Parth. *wistambag* 'rebellious' < **wi-stamba-ka-*.

ī ōīm (F 519), which is glossed by MP *stēz* 'strife, quarrel' and evidently derives from the root *√*stamb(H)* (AIW: 1606; Klingenschmitt 1968: 14).[490]

The simplification of *-*mb*- to -*m*- necessary for Burrow's etymology does not need to have happened in the donor language.[491] It could also be due to the loss of originally voiced consonants after homorganic nasals seen in Gāndhārī words such as the loc.pl. *udumareṣu* < *udumbara*- 'fig tree' in the *Khotan Dharmapada* (Brough 1962: 99).[492] If so, one cannot easily determine the immediate source of Niya *hastama*; it could, for instance, be Parth. **hastamb* or Bactr. *(υ)ασταμβο /(h)astambə/.[493]

Konow (1938a: 156) remarked that if the donor language was Khotanese, Niya *hastama* could alternatively go back to **fra-stamba*-, which would yield Khot. **hastama*- because **fra*- develops into Khot. *ha*- (e.g. *hatcañ*- 'to break' < **fra-sčandaya*-; SGS: 145f.) and *-*mb*- simplifies to Khot. -*m*- (Emmerick 1989: 215). This proposal has the advantage that it frees one from assuming that the -*m*- in *hastama* results from an inner-Prakrit simplification of *-*mb*- to -*m*-. The low number of Iranian loanwords in Niya Prakrit securely ascribable to Khotanese may, however, speak against Konow's idea (cf. §4.2.5), especially by lack of any trace of **hastama*- in Khotanese. Burrow's derivation from **ha(m)-stamba*- allows for more donor languages (cf. supra) and seems preferable.

3.3.4 Tentative etymologies

80. *ujhmayuḏa* 'trustworthy, skilled (?)'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.PL. *ujhmayuḏa*: CKD 283; 373

[490] Other derivatives of *√*stamb(H)* have, for instance, to do with "austerity" and "oppression". Cf. e.g. Bactr. σταμβο /stambə/ 'injury, ill-treatment, oppression'; MP *(i)stambag* 'oppressive' / *(i)stambagīh* 'oppression, obstinacy, tyranny'; MSogd. *stmb* (and variants) 'stern, severe, coarse'; and Arm. *stambak* 'austere'.
[491] In Khotanese, *-*mb*- becomes -*m*-; see just below.
[492] For more examples of Iranian loanwords in Niya Prakrit still undergoing this sound change, cf. §4.3.29.
[493] If *hastama* is a Bactrian loanword, it would come from the same language as the semantically related word *lastana* 'lawsuit'. The presence of a phoneme /h/ in *hastama* speaks against the assumption of a Sogdian source.

ujhmayuga is an adjective with a seemingly positive connotation, used to describe *manuṣya* 'man' (CKD 283) and *jaṃna* 'people' (CKD 373). Its exact meaning is uncertain, but the cluster *-jhm-* /zm/ suggests an Iranian origin.

Bailey (*apud* Burrow 1935a: 780; LKD: 79 s.v.) drew a comparison between *ujhmayuga* and MP *uzmāy-* 'to prove, to test, to try' (also *uzmāyišn* 'skill, experience'; CPD: 85), the latter having a cognate in Sogd. *zm'y-* 'to tempt' < **uz* + **√maH* (SD: 461; DCS[2]: 236; EDIV: 254–256). Accepting Bailey's comparison, Burrow conjectured *ujhmayuga* to mean either 'tried > trustworthy' or 'skilled'.

If this etymology is correct, *ujhmayuga* would seem to come from a donor form in which the initial **u-* of the preverb **uz-* remained unchanged. Sogd. *zm'y-* does not meet that criterion, but one can envisage other donor languages. In Khotanese, for instance, **uz-* is regularly continued as *uys-* /uz/ (SGS: 230), although it should be noted that there is no trace of a derivative of **uz* + **√maH* in this language. In Bactrian, the initial **u-* in **uz-* is usually weakened, including in loanwords into Niya Prakrit (cf. §3.2.1 s.v. *śpara* / *śpura*). Yet, there at least exist archaic forms showing a retention of the initial vowel, e.g. οζοαστο /uzwāstə/ 'brought out, released, issued' < **uz-wāsta-*. A Bactrian origin of *ujhmayuga* is thus not excluded *a priori*.

One problem remains: which type of formation is *ujhmayuga*, which Burrow does not discuss? Morphologically, it would probably be easiest to start from a pre-form like **uz-māy-a-ka-*. Yet, if so, it is not so clear how to account for the word-internal *-u-* in *ujhmayuga*. **uz-māy-a-ka-* could probably yield Bactr. *οζμαιογο. Still, I would expect this to stand for /uzmāyəgə/ rather than **/uzmāyugə/, and it is not quite certain whether -ογο /əgə/ could be rendered as *-uga* instead of as **-aga* (cf. §3.2.4 s.v. *listuga*). Starting from a pre-form **uz-māy-u-ka-* would be even less attractive since there is no productive suffix **-ukă̆-*,[494] and *u*-stems are rather rare. Therefore, I prefer to leave the issue open for now.

In brief, Bailey's proposal to see in *ujhmayuga* a further witness of the root **uz* + **√maH* is only tentative: it is not much more than a root etymology and the meaning assigned to *ujhmayuga* cannot be independently verified.[495]

[494] The hypocoristic suffix in **-uka-* proposed on the basis of some Old Iranian names (Iranica: 573) is probably irrelevant for *ujhmayuga*.

[495] Given its positive connotation, it may be worth considering if *ujhmayuga* could alternatively come from an Iranian adjective starting in **hu-* 'good'.

3.4 Personal names from Bactrian

3.4.1 Introductory notes

In addition to the loanwords, the Niya documents contain personal names whose origin is to be sought in Iranian languages. In his articles about Iranian borrowings in Niya Prakrit (1934: 515; 1935a: 789), Burrow, for example, noted the existence of some names ending in *-rasma* / *-rajhma* ← Ir. **razman*- 'battle'.

The Iranian names collected by Burrow can generally not be ascribed to Bactrian specifically since they lack decisive phonological features. More such examples remain to be discovered. I would, for instance, interpret the so far unexplained PN *Maṣḍhiġe* (e.g. CKD 17 (3x)) as "Middle Iranian" **mazdīg(ə)* < **mazd-iya-ka*- ← **mazdā*- 'wisdom', on the assumption of a substitution of Ir. *-*zd*- with Niya -*ṣḍh*- (on which cf. §4.3.19).[496] Yet, because of the focus of this study, I shall for now confine the discussion to names more securely ascribable to Bactrian.

Since the publication of Burrow's articles, various Bactrian names have been uncovered in Central Asian Gāndhārī sources. Below, I list three examples, two from the Niya documents and one from an inscription discovered in Miran.

(i) *Aṣaṃna* (CKD 327) ← Bactr. αζανο /ǎžānə/ 'worthy' < **arǰyāna*- (Weber 1997: 31f.)

(ii) *Mareġa* (e.g. CKD 431 = 432) ← Bactr. μαρηγο /marēgə/ 'servant' < **maryaka*- (Maricq 1958: 367; BPN: no. 237; cf. the patronymic μαρηγανο)

(iii) *Tita** (gen.sg. *Titaṣa* in CKI 443, an inscription from Miran) ← Bactr. τητο /tētə/, an attested PN (BPN: no. 465 *contra* Stein *apud* Boyer 1911: 417 who derives *Tita** out of Latin *Titus*)

In addition, Bactrian names have been discovered in Gāndhārī inscriptions.[497] One of these has a hitherto unrecognised pendant in Niya Prakrit, i.e. *Liaka* (CKI 46, 2x) ← Bactr. λιακο /l(i)yāk(k)ə/) < **dahyu-k(k)a*-

[496] See Iranica (244–246) for a list of Old Iranian names made from **mazdā*- 'wisdom', including **mazdā-ka*- and **mazd-uka*-.

[497] A somewhat famous example is Gandh. *Yolamira* (CKI 165, 2x) ← Bactr. *ιωλομι(υ)ρο /yōləmi(h)rə/ < **yauda-miθra*- (BPN: no. 195).

‘(little) land’ (BPN: no. 117), which I propose to compare with Niya *Lýaka* (CKD 701; cf. also §6.3).

§3.4.2 hopes to add to the evidence for Bactrian personal names in Niya Prakrit by proposing Bactrian etymologies for ten so far unetymologised Niya names. I do not aim at comprehensiveness, and a monographic study of the Bactrian names indirectly attested by the Gāndhārī collateral tradition remains a task for the future.

Due to the methodological pitfalls involved in onomastic research,[498] I only include names that fulfil the following criteria. To begin with, the names discussed below contain phonological markers indicative of a Bactrian origin, such as the clusters *-tg-* (~ -δγ- /dg/) or *-lg-* (~ -λγ- /lg/). In this way, one can exclude more easily that these names were adopted from a (Middle) Iranian language other than Bactrian. Second, the sound substitutions required for my etymologies should be paralleled among the secure and/or plausible Bactrian loanwords treated in §2.2. Otherwise, they should be readily understandable phonologically. Finally, reconstructed donor forms need to comply with the general principles of Iranian and specifically Bactrian onomastics (on which cf. BPN: 5–12).[499] In other words, one has to find parallels in the onomastic record of Bactrian and closely related languages for the form and semantics of the reconstructed source.[500]

A peculiarity shared by some of the etymologies proposed in the following is that the Niya name ends in *-e* without there being a clear source for this *-e* in Bactrian (see s.vv. *Apge*; *Katge*; *Kutge*; *Palge*). This issue will receive a separate treatment in §4.4.3.

[498] On these pitfalls, cf. e.g. Kloekhorst (2019: 12–15). As the etymological origin of a name is often independent of the ethnic identity of the person bearing it, I am here purely concerned with the linguistic interpretation of these names. Baums (2018c) has shown how Gandhāran people from the same family carried names from Indian, Iranian, Greek, and other origins.

[499] It would be ideal if the proposed donor forms were actually attested in Bactrian as a name. Due to our small corpus, this requirement is, however, too strict (cf. §3.1.6).

[500] In searching for these, I have consulted Tavernier’s *Iranica* and various fascicles of the *Iranisches Personennamenbuch*.

3.4.2 A discussion of ten selected examples

81. *Apg̲e*, PN

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *Apg̲e*: CKD 36; 262; 701 (2x); *Apg̲eya*: CKD 262; 304; 580; 842 (2x); *Apg̲aya*: CKD 654
INS.SG. *Apg̲eyena*: CKD 47 (2x)
GEN.SG. *Apg̲eyaṣa*: CKD 313; 419; 428; 443; 444; 589; 648; 782
ABL.SG. *Apg̲eyade*: CKD 63

Niya *Apg̲e* may represent *αβγο /āvgə/, the expected Bactrian outcome of **āpa-ka-*, an Old Iranian hypocoristic name made from **āp-* 'water'. The same name is evidenced by Elam. *ab-ba-ka₄* / *ab-ba-ak-ka₄*; Gr. Ἀπάκης (Avroman 1 A28; B30); and Arm. *Apak* (see Martirosyan 2021: no. 37). If correct, this etymological proposal precludes donor languages such as Sogdian because of the apparent syncope of **-a-* in between **-p-* and the suffixal **-k-*.[501]

82. *Katg̲e*, PN

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *Katg̲eya*: CKD 324 + 328
GEN.SG. *Katg̲eyaṣa*: CKD 324 + 328; 886; *Katg̲ayaṣa*: CKD 324 + 328

The Niya PN *Katg̲e* (attested in the longer form *Katg̲eya*) could represent a so-called *Kurzname* *καδγο /kādgə/, derivable from **kāta-ka-* 'beloved' with syncope of the middle **-a-*, a characteristic trait of Bactrian. This reconstruction can be backed up by the attested Avestan name *Kāta-* 'the beloved one' (Mayrhofer 1977: 15) and other Iranian names made from the verbal root **√kaHm* 'to desire, to love', e.g. OIr. **r̥̄ta-kāma-* 'he who desires for order' → Gr. Ἀρτακάμας (Schmitt 2011: no. 62, cf. also Iranica: 593 for names with **kāma-* 'love' and see §3.4.2 s.v. *Kamlana*).

Alternatively, *Katg̲e* could be etymologically related to the Bactrian word for 'house', i.e. καδγο /kadgə/ < **kata-ka-* (BD II: 220). If this were the case, the name could have been extracted from compound names containing **kata(-ka)-* 'house', as in OP **xšaya-kata-* 'ruling the house' → Elam. *šá-a-ka₄-da* (Iranica: §4.2.1981) and perhaps the Bactrian royal name

[501] For the substitution of Bactr. -βγ- /vg/ with Niya *-pg̲-* required by my proposal, cf. §4.3.8.

καδφισο, if from **kata-fšuyantiča-* or nom.sg. **kata-fšuyans* 'lord of the house' (BPN: no. 218).

83. *Kamlana*, PN

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *Kamlana*: CKD 701; 754

The Niya PN *Kamlana* possibly reflects a Bactrian name *καμολανο /kāmlānə/, derivable with Bactrian's typical syncope and lambdacism from OIr. **kāma-dāna-* 'gift of (the god of) love'. While Iranian names ending in **-dāta-* 'given' are more frequent than those in **-dāna-* 'gift', two clear examples of the latter category are **baga-dāna-* 'God's gift' seen in Aram. *bgdn* and Elam. *ba-ka$_4$-tan-na* and **hauma-dāna-* 'gift of Hauma' seen in Elam. *u-ma-da-na* (Iranica: §4.2.244; §4.2.730). For the common use of **kāma-* as a name component in Iranian onomastics, see §3.4.2 s.v. *Katḡe*.[502]

The Brāhmī inscriptions from Mathurā may provide more evidence for the use of Bactr. *λανο 'gift' < **dāna-* as a name component. In my view, the name *Valāna* in Lüders (1961: §30 gen.sg. *Valānas[y]a*; §123 *Balānās[.]*) could be interpreted as a rendering of Bactr. *βαγολανο /vaγlānə/ < **baga-dāna-* 'God's gift', a cognate of the aforementioned Aramaic and Elamite names. The required simplification of Bactr. /γl/ to the *-l-* in *Valāna* (variant *Balāna*) would be the same as in Niya *Suliḡa* 'Sogdian' ← σογλιγο* /suγlīgə/ < **sugdiya-ka-* (§3.2.1 s.v.).[503]

84. *Kutḡe*, PN

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *Kutḡe*: CKD 11; 115; 221; *Kutḡeya*: CKD 125; 523; 898; *Kutḡo*: CKD 416
GEN.SG. *Kutḡeyaṣa*: CKD 11; 103; 823 (2x); 898 (2x)[504]

---

[502] The Niya name *Kame* (CKD 21) can perhaps come from a short name **kāma-* as in Elam. *ka$_4$-ma* (Iranica: §4.2.915).
[503] It has been suggested (cf. e.g. Lüders 1961: 67; Albery 2020: 315) that the PN *Ulāna* in Lüders (1961: §119 gen.sg. *Ulānāsya*) is another variant of the same name, but nothing proves the supposed equivalence. *Ulāna* may alternatively be accounted for as a rendering of Bactr. *(υ)ολανο /(h)ulānə/ < **hu-dāna-* 'good gift'. Harmatta's (1989: 302) suggestion to analyse *Ulāna* as "Khotanese Saka *ula* 'up' + the suffix *-āna-*" is unconvincing.
[504] The sequence *kutḡana* in CKD 819 may also belong here, but since the context is badly preserved, I leave this form aside here. It remains likewise uncertain

For the name *Kutg̲e*, I see two possible explanations.

One possibility is to compare the Parthian name *ktwk** /kadug/, attested by way of the patronymic *ktwkn* (ŠKZ §45; cf. MP *ktwk'n*; Gr. κιδουκαν). *ktwk** /kadug/ can be explained as a *ka*-extension to the Old Iranian name **katu*- known from YAv. *Katu*- (see Huyse 1999 II: 153f.; Schmitt 2016: no. 250). **katu-ka*- could yield Bactr. *κοδγο /kudgə/ in the same way that **razu-ka*- results in Bactr. ροζγο /ruzgə/ 'vineyard', viz. with *u*-umlaut happening before syncope (cf. Benvenuto & Bichlmeier 2022a: 98; 2022b: 24); and if *κοδγο /kudgə/ existed as a name in Bactrian, Niya *Kutg̲e* would be a phonologically plausible rendering of it.

The second possibility is to start from OIr. **kuta-ka*- 'the little one' (cf. Av. *kutaka*- 'small, less'), whose use as a personal name is suggested by Neo-Assyrian ^{m}*Ku-ta-ki* (see Schmitt 2009: no. 83).[505] Because of syncope, **kuta-ka*- would also result in Bactr. *κοδγο /kudgə/, and the base form κοδο /kudə/ 'small, insignificant' < **kuta*- has recently surfaced in Bactrian birchbark letters (see Sims-Williams 2022–23: 139f.).

Besides *Kutg̲e*, there also exists a Niya name *Kutaka* (CKD 129; 204; 700 gen.sg. *Kutakaṣa*). In case this second form contains the same basis as *Kutg̲e*, we could set up another Bactrian name *κοδοκο / *κοδικο / *κοδακο /kudək(k)ə/, with the hypocoristic suffix -κο /k(k)ə/ < **-kka*- (BPN: 11). The co-existence of syncopated *κοδγο and non-syncopated *κοδοκο / *κοδικο / *κοδακο would not be unexpected, as Bactrian also has ζαδγο 'born' next to ζαδοκο / ζαδικο 'child' < **zāta-k(k)a*- (BD II: 210). Cf. the discussion §3.4.2 s.v. *Pitg̲a*.

85. *Namilg̲a*, PN

Attestations of the base form

GEN.SG. *Namilg̲ae*: CKD 660; *Namilg̲aae*: CKD 288 (2x)

The female name *Namilg̲a* should, I think, be compared with Bactr. ναμιλγο /namilgə/ 'salt' (BD II: 238). Phonetically, this etymology is entirely straightforward, and Sogd. *nm'δkynch* is another example of a female name

whether the partially legible names *[Kutg̲].* (CKD 129) and *Kutg̲.ṣena* (CKD 684) have anything to do with the name under discussion here.

[505] More generally, there are parallels for Iranian names meaning 'small'. Cf. e.g. Khwar. *ksyštk* /kasištak/ < **kasišta-ka*- 'very small, smallest'.

derived from OIr. **namadkā-* 'salt' (Lurje 2010: no. 778; Colditz 2018: no. 371).[506]

Because of the sequence *-aae* in the gen.sg. *Namilg̱aae*, Burrow (LKD: §69) speculated that the final *-a* of Niya *Namilg̱a* may have been long. If true, *Namilg̱a* possibly reflects an early Kuṣāṇa form *ναμιλγα /namilgă/ < **namadkā-*, to be compared with other archaic feminine forms such as λογδα /luγdă/ 'daughter' < **duxtā-*.

86. *Palg̱e*, PN

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *Palg̱e*: CKD 209; *Palg̱eya*: CKD 209
GEN.SG. *Palg̱eyaṣa*: CKD 72

The Niya PN *Palg̱e* could come from Bactr. *παλγο /pālgə/ < **pāda-ka-* 'little foot'. This supposed Bactrian name would have cognates in Elam. *ba-da-ka$_4$*; Bab. *pa-da-ak-ka*; and Gr. Παδάγος (Iranica: §4.2.1205). Since both lambdacism and syncope have to be assumed, this etymology would only work with Bactrian as a donor language.

87. *Pitg̱a*, PN

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *Pitg̱a*: CKD 93; 108; 117; 185; 571; 588 (3x); 590; 774
GEN.SG. *Pitg̱aṣa*: CKD 108 (2x); 154; 168; 588; *Pitg̱asya*: CKD 588 (2x)

The well-attested anthroponym *Pitg̱a* could represent a hypocoristic name *πιδγο /pidgə/, derivable from **pati-ka-* with the syncope and *i*-umlaut that are indicative of a Bactrian origin.[507] Names with the element **pati-* 'lord, chief' are a characteristic feature of Iranian onomastics in general, and Bactrian names form no exception (cf. e.g. ασπαλοβιδο < **spāda-pati-* 'chief of the army'; BPN: no. 28).

In the case of *πιδγο, one can draw a comparison with the attested Bactrian name πιδοκο (also πιδικο; πιδακο) < **pati-kka-* (BPN: no. 372). The presumed co-existence of *πιδγο and πιδοκο would be of the same kind as that between ζαδγο 'born' < **zāta-ka-* and ζαδακο (also ζαδικο) child' < **zāta-kka-* (BD II: 210).

---

[506] The element *-ynch* in Sogd. *nm'δkynch* is a feminine suffix (GMS: §§1052f.).
[507] For the relative chronology of these sound changes, see §3.4.2 s.v. *Kutg̱e*.

The sequence *Pitg̲-* recurs in the female name *Pitg̲ina* (gen.sg. *Pitg̲inae* in CKD 762). Yet, the exact analysis of *Pitg̲ina* stays uncertain since the Bactrian hypocoristic suffix -ινο / -ηνο that could correspond to *-ina* has so far not turned up in inherited names (BPN: 11; cf. also §6.4.1).[508]

88. *Lamg̲a*, PN

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *Lamg̲a*: CKD 129; 686; *Lamg̲o*: CKD 80; 543

Lamg̲a can come from a Bactrian cognate *λαμγο /lāmgə/ of the Old Iranian name **dāmi-ka-*, the source of Elam. *da-mi-ik-ka₄* (Iranica: §4.2.485).[509] **dāmi-ka-* is a so-called *Kurzname* derived from longer compounds such as **dāmi-dāta-* 'given by the creator' (Aram. *dmydt*; Elam. *da-mi-da-ad-da*; Parth. *dmydt*; cf. Iranica: §4.2.484; Schmitt 2016: no. 167).[510]

89. *Larsu*, PN

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *Larsu*: CKD 69; 243 (2x); 318; 343; 345 (3x); 420
INS.SG. *Larsuena*: CKD 345 (2x)
GEN.SG. *Larsuaṣa*: CKD 94; 223; 236; 239; 318; 345 (4x);[511] 401; 558; *Larsuṣa*: CKD 345; 378; 383

Derivatives

ADJ. *Larsuani* 'of Larsu': CKD 74

The Niya PN *Larsu* may reflect Bactr. *λαρσαοο /lārsawə/ < **dāra-sawah-* 'the one having power'.[512] σαοο /sawə/ 'power' is one of the more frequent

---

[508] The Niya name *Pite* (longer form *Piteya*) perhaps reflects Bactr. *πιδο /pidə/ < **pati-* (for the ending *-e(ya)*, cf. §4.4.3).
[509] For the Bactrian outcome of *-*mVk-*, cf. ζιμγο 'winter' < **zima-ka-* (BD II: 212). This type of syncope and the change of **d* to λ /l/ point to Bactrian being the donor language.
[510] Cf. also SA Gandh. *Damijada* (CKI 42, gen.sg. *Damijadasa*), a PN ← Ir. **dāmizād(ə)* < **dāmi-zāta-* 'born through (the will of) the creator' (§2.1.7.1). One further wonders if the Niya PN *Laṃpurta* (CKD 678) could be interpreted as Bactr. *λαμβορδο /lāmburdə/ < **dāmi-bṛ̊ta-* 'carried by the creator', as a parallel to the Old Iranian PN **baga-bṛ̊ta-* 'carried by God' seen in Aram. *bgbrt* and Bab. *Ba-ga-bar-ta* (Iranica: §4.2.242).
[511] In cover-tablet obverse l. 10, read *Larsuaṣa* and not *Larsuasa* (so KD: 125).
[512] Lambdacism combined with syncope rules out other donor languages.

name components in Bactrian (cf. BPN: no. 418), and the assumed compound would structurally and semantically be comparable to the Middle Persian name *Dār-farrah* < **dāra-farnah*- 'the one having glory' (Colditz 2018: no. 191).[513]

This etymology requires that Bactr. *-*awə* was first rendered as *-*u(y)a* in Niya Prakrit, due to a colouring of the **a* by the following **w* and then shortened to the attested -*u* in the same way that word-final -*iya* developed to -*i* and -*oẏa* (-*ova*) to -*o* (cf. §3.2.3 s.v. *piro*).

90. *Vhurmajheva,* PN

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *Vhurmajheva*: CKD 143; *Vhurmaseva*: CKD 26; *Vhurmaṣeva*: CKD 135
INS.SG. *Vhurmaṣevena*: CKD 135
GEN.SG. *Vhurmajhevaṣa*: CKD 143; *Vhurmaṣevaṣa*: CKD 135 (2x)

The Iranian provenance of the name *Vhurmajheva* is shown by its initial since the only function of the akṣara 𐨯 *vha* in Niya Prakrit is to render an Iranian *f* (see §2.1.6). The spelling variation between -*jheva*, -*seva*, and -*ṣeva* moreover points to the presence of a phoneme /z/, another feature common in borrowings from Iranian.

Proceeding from these observations, Burrow (1935a: 789; LKD: 108 s.v. *pḱhum̃aṣeva*) saw a connection between the element -*jheva* (-*seva* / -*ṣeva*) and OIr. **zaiba*- 'beautiful, ornament', attested as a name component in Persian *Aurangzeb*, literally 'ornament of the throne'.[514] The element *Vhurma*- he left unexplained.

I suggest to compare *Vhurmajheva* to the Bactrian names φρομαοαραζο and φρομαριζμο (also φραμαριζμο). These names are either to be accounted for as governing compounds with φρομα- in the sense of the verb φρομιι- 'to order' < **fra-māya*- or as mechanical combinations of φρομα-, a shortened form of φρομανο 'command' < **fra-māna*-, with the frequent name

[513] Given these compounds with the root *√*dar* 'to hold', one wonders if the Niya PN *Larka* in CKD 80 likewise stands for a Bactrian *Kurzname* *λαργο /lārgə/ < **dāra-ka*-. For the assumed substitution of Bactr. -ργ- /rg/ with Niya -*rk*-, cf. LKD (§36), where it is pointed out that -*rk*- and -*rg*- frequently interchange in foreign PNs.

[514] The lack of a clear cognate of **zaiba*- in Eastern Middle Iranian languages makes one a little hesitant to accept Burrow's idea, but I have no better proposal on offer. Conceivably, the Niya Prakrit name *Sevaṣena* (CKD 181; 383; 499; 604 (2x); 612; 618; 620) contains the same name element with initial devoicing to *s*-.

components οαραζο < *_warāza_- ‘boar’ and ριζμο ‘battle’ < *_razman_- (see BPN: no. 506).

φρομαοαραζο and φρομαριζμο display the most common outcome of *_fra_- in Bactrian, i.e. φρο- /frə/. Yet, already in early Bactrian sources, a variant outcome φορ- is attested, e.g. φορζινδο next to φροζινδο ‘descendant(s)’ < *_frazanti_- (BD II: 274f.) and φορδαμσο ‘at first’ < *_fratama-čiya_- (SK_4M 2; SK_4A 3; SK_4B 4). It thus seems possible that *Vhurmajheva* was borrowed from a source starting in *φορμα- /furmă/.

I transcribe the -ο- in *φορμα- as /u/ because *_fra_- may have developed into φορ- via an intermediary *_fr̥_- (cf. Sims-Williams 2009b: 284) and *_r̥_ vocalises to Bactr. -ορ- /ur/ in a labial environment (SFBG: 60). What speaks in favour of an intermediary *_fr̥_- is the cluster -þτ- /št/ in φοþτιι-, pret. φοþταδο ‘to send’ < *_fra-stăya_-, pret. *_fra-stāta_- (BD II: 275), which evidently derives from earlier *-_r̥st_-, given parallels such as παροιþτο ‘blocked’ < *_pari-wr̥sta_- (SFBG: 56).[515]

If combining my idea about *vhurma*- and Burrow’s idea about -*jheva* (-*seva* / -*s̱eva*), one may tentatively reconstruct the hypothesised Bactrian source of *Vhurmajheva* as *φορμαζηβο /furmăzēvə/.

3.5 Loanwords from Iranian languages other than Bactrian

This section is devoted to Niya words with an established Iranian etymology whose donor language was most likely not Bactrian.

3.5.1 Secure etymologies

91. *gaṃña* ‘treasury’

Derivatives

ADJ. *gaṃñi* ‘of the treasury’: CKD 357; *kañi*: CKD 357 (2x)

Compounds

DIR.SG. *gaṃñavara* ‘treasurer’: CKD 310 (2x)
GEN.PL. *kaṃjhavaliyana* ‘idem’: CKD 725

[515] If one prefers to interpret φορ- as a metathesised variant of φρο-, *φορμα- may rather stand for /fər/. In this case, it is still possible that the -*u*- in *Vhurmajheva* was caused by an allophonic pronunciation of the Bactrian schwa as a back vowel.

The Iranian loanword *gaṃña* 'treasury' does not so far occur on its own. Yet, one can posit its existence on the basis of some derivatives and compounds (cf. Burrow 1934: 509).[516] To begin with, there exists the adjective *gaṃñi* / *kañi* 'of the treasury', which in its three attestations modifies *draṃga* 'office' (§3.3.2 s.v.). In addition, there are two compounds with the meaning 'treasurer', i.e. *gaṃñavara* (~ Skt. *gañjavara-*; Lüders 1961: 100) and *kaṃjhavaliya* (gen.pl. *kaṃjhavaliyana*).[517]

Before returning to the variant forms in Niya Prakrit, the Iranian evidence needs a brief review. The Iranian word for 'treasury' shows a cluster *-zn-* in some languages, e.g. Parth. *gazn* (DMMP: 170), Sogd. *γzn-* (SD: 182; DMSB^2: 107; DCS^2: 88), and Bactr. γαζνο /γaznə/ (BD II: 205). There is also a form with *-nz-*, i.e. "Median" **ganza-*, reconstructable by way of the Old Iranian *Nebenüberlieferung* (Gershevitch 1964b: 10–12 = 1985: 203–205; Iranica: §4.4.7.49) and the source of ZMP *ganǰ* and MMP *ganz* (CPD: 35; DMMP: 163). Henning (1963: 196–198 = 1977 II: 584–586) convincingly explained this state of affairs by assuming that the eastern languages directly continue an older form **gazna-*, which in "Median" was metathesised to **ganza-* and from there passed on to Old Persian in Achaemenid times.[518]

gaṃña derives from earlier **gaṃj(h)a* (cf. Skt. *gañja-*; Niya *kaṃjhavaliya*) with the reduction of voiced (aspirated) consonants after homorganic nasals frequently found in dialects of Central Asian Gāndhārī (§2.1.5). But what is the origin of this cluster *-ṃj(h)-* /ñj$^{(h)}$/?[519] It probably is not *-zn-*, as in e.g. Bactr. γαζνο, since Ir. *-zn-* is borrowed as *-s̄-* /sn/ (perhaps [zn]) in the case of *gavaśa* 'deer, stag' (see §3.3.2 s.v.). More likely, *gaṃña* < **gaṃj(h)a* was

[516] The Sanskrit cognate *gañja-* 'treasury' is attested as a separate word.

[517] Burrow (LKD: 81 s.v. *kaṃjhavaliyana*; 119 s.v. *valiyana*) considered the element *-valiya* in *kaṃjhavaliya* unclear. I agree with Weber (1997: 32) that this can be derived from OIA **-pālika-* 'in charge of' (cf. e.g. Skt. *udyānapālikā-* '(female) gardener'). Weber's alternative suggestion that it is from Ir. **-bāra-* with the addition of the *ka*-suffix leaves the Niya *l* unexplained. The initial *k-* in *kaṃjhavaliya* (and the adjective *kañi*) is due to devoicing (§2.1.4; §6.3.1).

[518] The genuine Persian form may be continued by Classical Persian *gašn* 'plenty', with the same change of **-zn-* to *-šn-* as in *ǰašn* 'celebration, festival' < **yazna-* 'sacrifice' (cf. Henning 1963: 198 = 1977 II: 586; Gershevitch 1964b: 10 fn. 1 = 1985: 203 fn. 1).

[519] *Pace* Weber (1997: 32), the variation between *-ṃj-* and *-ṃjh-* need not point to two different Iranian sources, since aspiration was, certainly after nasals, no longer distinctive in Gāndhārī (§2.1.3); cf. e.g. the variation between *-ṃg-* and *-ṃgh-* in a word such as *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* (§3.2.4 s.v.).

borrowed during the Achaemenid conquest of Gandhāra from OP **ganza-* (so also Henning 1963: 197 = 1977 II: 585),[520] seeing that foreign *z* is elsewhere substituted with voiced (aspirated) palatals too (§2.1.7.1; §4.3.19).

The observed change of *-b-* to *-v-* in *gaṃñavara* 'treasurer' ← OP **ganza-bara-* 'idem' (MMP *ganzwar*; ZMP *ganǰwar*) can be attributed to lenition processes in Gāndhārī (§2.1.2). As with other Old Persian loanwords (cf. §4.2.2), the Sanskrit cognate *gañjavara-* may therefore have been borrowed through a Gāndhārī intermediary.

92. *thavaṃnaga* 'cloth'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.PL. *thavaṃnaga*: CKD 141; *thavaṃnae*: CKD 207 (2x); *tavanaga*: CKD 476

Derivatives

DIR.PL. *thavaṃnamae* 'made from cloth': CKD 534

Compounds

DIR.SG. *kaśathavaṃnaga* 'silken cloth': CKD 897; *kajahavaṃnaga*: CKD 583; 808
DIR.PL. *kajathavaṃne* 'idem': CKD 149
DIR.PL. *oṃnathavaṃne* 'woollen cloth': CKD 149
DIR.SG. *uṃnathavanagamae* 'made from woollen cloth': CKD 318
/// *havaṃnaga*: CKD 808

A survey of the passages in which Niya Prakrit *thavaṃnaga* occurs shows it to be a textile product (see Lüders 1936a: 21–24). As first noticed by Burrow (1934: 515; LKD: 96f. s.v.), these semantics strongly favour an etymological connection with Khot. *thauna-* 'cloth' < **tāfna-*. Some other forms from the region meaning 'cloth(ing)' belong here too: Kuča Skt. *thacaṇa-*, a misspelling for **thavaṇa-*, TB *tono*, and Old Uyghur *ton*.[521]

In CKD 476, the Niya word is spelled with an initial *t-* and not with *th-*, as elsewhere. The compound form *-havaṃnaga* shows that the spelling with *th-* is the correct one and not an instance of unetymological aspiration as in *thavastaga* next to *tavastaga* 'carpet' (§3.3.2 s.v.). *-havaṃnaga* exemplifies

[520] If we can trust Herodotus 3.94, the Indians paid the largest tribute of the whole empire to the Achaemenid treasury.
[521] On these words, see e.g. Schaeder (*apud* Lüders 1936a: 24); Bailey (1937a: 916f. fn. 1); Schmidt (1980: 411); Ching (2011: 76 fn. 44); HWA (730f.); and Dragoni (2023b: 123–125). Sims-Williams (2023: 36) additionally refers to Sogd. *δβn'k* 'cloth'.

the default Prakrit development from intervocalic *-th-* to *-h-,* whereas a change from unaspirated *-t-* to *-h-* would be highly unusual.

The initial aspirate of *thavaṃnaga* is the reason why we are most likely dealing with a Khotanese loanword. The aspirated *th-* in Khot. *thauna-* < **tāfna-* is caused by the **f* later in the word, a transfer of aspiration (*Hauchumsprung*) which does not seem to occur in other Middle Iranian languages (see Sims-Williams 1983: 48, who calls this sound change "transfer of friction from internal to initial position").

The apparent rendering of Khot. *-au-* as Niya *-ava-* could suggest that Niya Prakrit borrowed the word at a time when the Khotanese form was still **thāvna-* with **-āvn-* as an intermediary stage between **-āfn-* and *-aun-*.[522] If so, the cluster *-vn-* could have been broken up by a *svarabhakti* vowel (cf. Dragoni 2023b: 124f.), for which one may compare Skt. *stavaraka-* 'silk', a loan from an East Iranian, perhaps Bactrian, cognate **stavrag* of MP *stabrag* 'shot silk' (Agrawala 1951: 14f.; EWAia III: 523).

thavaṃnaga may have been secondarily created in Niya Prakrit from an earlier **thavaṃna* ← **thāvna-*, possibly preserved in the derived form dir.pl. *thavaṃnamae* 'made from cloth' (CKD 534). Alternatively, *thavaṃnaga* could be a loan from a variant of Khot. *thauna-* exhibiting the *ka*-suffix, i.e. *thaunaka-*. The latter form is actually attested, but seemingly only in Late Khotanese and with a more specific meaning 'silk brocade' (Duan 2013a: 310f.). All in all, the assumption of an inner-Prakrit remodelling of **thavaṃna* to *thavaṃnaga* thus seems preferable.[523]

I now move on to a compound built from *thavaṃnaga* whose transliteration and etymological interpretation can be improved. Although the same word appears to be intended in both cases, Boyer et al. (KD: 61; 218) had read *kaṭathavaṃne* (dir.pl.) with 𐨟 *ṭa* in CKD 149, but *kaj̲ahavaṃnaga* with 𐨬 *j̲a* in CKD 583. Noting this inconsistency and observing that 𐨟 *ṭa* and 𐨬 *j̲a* can be difficult to distinguish in Niya Kharoṣṭhī, Lüders (1936a: 23) proposed to change the reading *kaj̲ahavaṃnaga* in CKD 583 to *kaṭahavaṃnaga*. New evidence suggests that the transliteration *kaj̲ahavaṃnaga*[524] was right after all, and that one should rather correct *kaṭathavaṃne* in CKD 149 to *kaj̲athavaṃne*. In the recently edited document

[522] This suggestion implies that the development to *-aun-* is recent in Khotanese, perhaps not earlier than the 3rd or 4th century AD.
[523] Possibly, an analogy with *tavastaga* 'carpet' played a role in the hypothesised remodelling to *thavaṃnaga*.
[524] Specifically this form is now also attested in CKD 808.

CKD 897, a new form *kaśathavaṃnaga* has surfaced, and given that intervocalically *-ś-* and *-j-* are alternative ways to write /ź/ (cf. §2.1.2), this new form makes it clear that the transliteration *kaja-* is preferable over ***kaṭa-*.[525]

Jiang (2020: 143f.) proposed to derive the element *kaśa-* (and by implication *kaja-*) from Skt. *kāśa-*, a type of grass used for hand-weaving. This derivation seems possible. Yet, I think that Skt. *kāśi-* '(Benares) silk' provides an even better source since *kaśathavaṃnaga* and its variants could then be seen as cognate with the Old Uyghur expression *kaš agılar üzäki ton* 'a garment from Benares silk' (HWA: 341), where the Indic loanword *kaš* '(Benares) silk' combines with the Old Uyghur pendant of Niya *thavaṃnaga*, i.e. *ton* 'garment'.[526]

To summarise, *thavaṃnaga* 'cloth' can be derived from **thavaṃna*, a loan from **thāvna-*, itself a more archaic version of the attested Khotanese word *thauna-* 'cloth'. *thavaṃnaga* can also be compounded with an element *kaśa-* / *kaja-*, which I propose to derive from Skt. *kāśi-* '(Benares) silk'.

93. *darṣ-* 'to load (a beast of burden)'

Attestations of the base form

PRET.3SG. *darṣida*: CKD 431 = 432
PRET.3PL. *darṣitaṃti*: CKD 305; 401
OPT.3PL. *darṣeyāti*:[527] CKD 842
PST.PTCP.INS.SG. *darṣidagena*: CKD 40
GERV. *darṣitavo*: CKD 73 (2x); 305; *darṣidavo*: CKD 236; *darṣidavya*: CKD 413 (2x)
darṣida ? ?: CKD 413

Derivatives

DIR.SG. *darṣa* 'load': CKD 329

Burrow (1934: 510f.; LKD: §23; 97 s.v.) convincingly compared *darṣ-* 'to load (a beast of burden)' to the Iranian root *√*darz*, which is continued by,

[525] The available pictures of CKD 149 and 583 confirm that it is possible to read *kaja-* there. This new reading renders Lüders' (1936a: 22f.) etymological comparison with Skt. *kaṭavānaka-* 'mat-cloth' obsolete.
[526] Cf. also Zieme (1997), who *inter alia* derives NP *kaǰ* 'coarse silk' from the same Indic source as Uyghur *kaš*.
[527] Read alternatively *darṣeyaṃti* (Schoubben 2022b: 346 fn. 5).

amongst others, Av. *darəz-* 'to attach' and Parth. *darz-* 'to tie on, load (carrier or pack animal)' (EDIV: 63f.).[528]

To account for the Niya cluster *-rṣ-*, Bailey (1946: 768) reconstructed the direct source of *darṣ-* as **darź-* < **darz(a)ya-*, comparing the palatalisation seen in Khot. *dalś-* 'to fasten, load' (SGS: 44). Given that this scenario requires *darṣ-* to have been borrowed from an otherwise unattested Middle Iranian language, other options need to be considered too. It would, for instance, also be conceivable that the retraction of the sibilant was caused by the preceding *r* since clusters of preconsonantal *r* and dental consonants often result in retroflexes in Gāndhārī and other MIA languages (cf. also §3.2.4 s.v. *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga*).

The absence of lambdacism precludes *darṣ-* from being a Bactrian loanword,[529] and most other Iranian languages do not qualify as a plausible source either.[530] The only form in a known Middle Iranian language that matches Niya *darṣ-* both semantically and formally is Parth. *darz-*. Consequently, *darṣ-* may be (but need not be) a linguistic vestige of the Indo-Parthian rule in Gandhāra (cf. also §4.2.4).[531]

94. *divira* 'scribe'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *divira*: CKD 348; 384; 385; 454; 507; 520; 552; 569; 571 (5x); 572; 576 (4x); 577 (3x); 579 (2x); 580 (3x); 581; 582 (2x); 586 (5x); 587 (2x); 588 (4x); 589 (5x); 592 (2x); 649; 765; 788; 819 (2x); 820 (2x); *tivira*: CKD 90; 157; 222 (2x); 234; 336; 415 (2x); 419; 422 (2x); 436; 437; 572 (2x); 573; 579 (3x); 581 (5x); 582 (2x); 587 (2x); 590 (6x); 591; 592; 598 (2x); 648; 652; 654 (4x); 655; 715 (2x); 782; 883; 889

GEN.PL. *divirana*: CKD 330; 816; *tivirana*: CKD 422; 436

---

[528] Khowar *drazēik* 'to load up' comes from a derivative of the same Iranian root (Morgenstierne 1936: 667).

[529] In Bactrian, the relevant verb may have been *λιζ- /liž/ or *ληζ- /lēž/ < **darzaya-* (→ Niya *leṣ-*; cf. §3.2.3 s.v.), pret. *λιρτο /lirtə/ < **dr̥šta-* (→ Skt. **larda-* 'load, cargo' → *lardayati* 'to load'; cf. Schoubben 2022b).

[530] Khot. *dalś-* is phonologically incompatible with Niya *darṣ-*, and no suitable source is found in Sogdian either. Persian seems to preserve no trace of *√*darz*, but a hypothetical MP **dāl-* < OP **dard-* (cf. *sāl* 'year' < **sardV-*) would in any case not fit the phonology of Niya *darṣ-*.

[531] A somewhat hypothetical option is to assume that *darṣ-* was borrowed at an early stage from a neighbouring Old Iranian language (cf. Av. *darəz-*).

Compounds

DIR.SG. *rajadivira* 'royal scribe': CKD 575
INS.SG. *rajadivirena* 'idem': CKD 677

Niya Prakrit *divira* 'scribe' and its Sanskrit counterpart *divira-* are most likely loanwords from OP **dipīra-* 'idem' > MP *dibīr*.[532] They are thus a linguistic trace of the Iranian influence on the development of writing in South Asia (Falk 2010a: 213; Ollett 2024: 90f.).

Itself going back to Elam. *tup-pi-ra* 'scribe',[533] the Old Persian word has been borrowed into various Iranian and non-Iranian languages, including Bactr. λαβιρο /ləvīrə/[534] and Arm. *dpir*. Skt. *divira-* may have been adopted through a Gāndhārī intermediary, as the observed lenition of postvocalic *-p-* to *-v-* could be ascribed to this language (cf. §2.1.2).

95. *dhane*, a unit of measure

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *dhane*: CKD 702 (3x *dhane ½*)
GEN.SG. *dhanaïasa*:[535] CKI 262; 263
DIR.PL. *dhane*: CKD 702 (*dhane* 3); *dhanea*: CKI 725
abbr. *dha*: CKI 91; 173; 260; 450; 716; 727; 729

dhane is a small unit of measure used to weigh pepper (*marica*), cinnamon (*tvaca*), and cardamom (*suṣmela*) in the Niya documents. The same word occurs in South Asian Gāndhārī (Falk 2001: 309–314 = 2013a: 48–53), and there is also a Sanskrit cognate *d(h)ānakā-*, the name of a coin (cf. Schmitt

[532] Cf. Burrow (1934: 514; LKD: 98 s.v.); Bailey (1949a: 127f.); and EWAia (III: 266; 560). The variant spelling with *t-* results from devoicing of the initial consonant (on which cf. §2.1.4; §6.3.1).
[533] See Livshits (1980: 168 fn. 17) against an Old Iranian compound **dipi-bara-* or **dipi-wara-*.
[534] The initial *l-* in λαβιρο of course precludes *divira* from being a Bactrian loanword. Instead of being an "East Iranian" loan (Henning 1957: 337 = 1977 II: 523; BD II: 227), Pkt./Skt. *lipi-* 'inscription, writing' next to *dipi-* can alternatively be explained from contamination with √*likh* 'to write' (cf. e.g. Bloch 1950: 90 fn. 2). This explanation would make these forms comparable to Pers. *nibīg* 'text, writing', Judaeo-Pers. *nywy* 'inscription', Sogd. *np'yk* 'book, scripture', and Bactr. ναβηγο 'text, writing', which derive from **dipīka-* with the **d-* changed to **n-* by contamination with **ni +* *√*pais* 'to write' (BD II: 236). With this account of *lipi-*, one moreover does not have to assume two different Iranian donor languages, one for *lipi-* and one for *dipi-/divira-*.
[535] For this interpretation of CKI 262; 263, cf. Falk (2001: 310 = 2013a: 49).

1991: 159; EWAia III: 264f.). The final *-e* in *dhane* probably derives via *-*ae* from earlier *-*aga*.

The Iranian origin of Niya *dhane* was first noticed by Burrow (1935a: 783; LKD: 99 s.v.), who compared, amongst others, MP *dānag* '1/4th of a drachm'. MP *dānag* derives from OP **dāna-kă-* (Schmitt 1991: 160), the source of Elam. *da-na-ka$_4$(-um)* / *da-na-kaš*, a weight unit (Iranica: §4.4.15.2), and Gr. δανάκη(ς), the name of a coin (Brust 2008^2: 230–235). Due to the lack of evidence supporting the assumption of an intermediary language,[536] the least costly hypothesis would be that OP **dāna-kă-* was adopted directly by the ancestor of Gāndhārī in Achaemenid times. From there, the word could have been continued into Niya Prakrit as *dhane* and passed on to Sanskrit as *d(h)ānakā-*.[537]

96. *prahoni* 'garment'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *prahoni*: CKD 318 (3x)

One cannot deduce the exact meaning of Niya Pkt. *prahoni* from the context. Yet, the word occurs in a list of textile products, so it probably belongs to this semantic category.

Burrow (1934: 514) persuasively related Niya *prahoni* to Khot. *prahoṇa-* (also *prahauṇa-*) 'garment'.[538] By lack of comparable forms in other Iranian languages, and in view of the corresponding verb *prahauy-* 'to put on (clothing)' (SGS: 89), Khotanese is probably also the direct donor of *prahoni* (cf. Bailey 1949a: 121; Weber 1997: 31).[539]

Niya Prakrit no longer distinguishes between dental and retroflex nasals (§2.1.6 under ṇ *na*), which explains why the Khotanese retroflex nasal is

[536] In any case, a Bactrian intermediary is excluded since Niya *dhane* and its cognates show no sign of lambdacism.
[537] The initial aspirate in Indo-Aryan may be due to folk etymology. Because OP **dāna-kă-* is likely derived from **dānā-* 'corn', Brust (2008^2: 233) suggests Skt. *dhānā-* 'idem' as the analogical model. One could alternatively think of *dhana-* 'valued object'. Why Brust uses the initial aspirate as an argument that Niya *dhane* is borrowed from Sanskrit is not clear to me.
[538] In Kuča Sanskrit, the same word occurs as *parhūṇa-* / *parhyaṇa-* (Bailey 1966: 32; DKS: 255).
[539] For a possible etymology of the Khotanese word, see now Dragoni (2023b: 124 fn. 239).

rendered in Niya with *-n-*. The word-final *-i* in *prahoni* may render the Khotanese nom.sg. in *-ä* (Lüders 1936a: 35).

97. *mudra* 'seal'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *mudra*: CKI 95; CKD 206; 318; 324 + 328; 332; 380; 421; 574; 575; 578; 582; 749; 787 (2x); 792 ; 793; 795; 819; *muṃdra*: CKD 331; 820; *mutra*: CKD 326; 345; 348; 416; 419; 436; 489; 496; 507; 576; 584; 588; 591; 592; 593; 879; 881; 885; 889; *mutre*: CKD 889; *muṃtra*: CKD 216; 247 (2x); 330; 383; 454; 461; 568; 569; 570; 577; 604 (4x); 676; 788

INS.SG. *muṃtrena*: CKD 247

Derivatives

DIR.SG. *mudraga* 'seal' < **mudra-ka-*: CKD 425

PST.PTCP. *mudrita* 'sealed': CKD 493; *muṃtritaga*: CKD 247; 838

Compounds

DIR.SG. *kilamudra* 'sealed wedge-tablet': CKD 3; 5; 6; 7; 8; 10; 12; 13; 14; 17; 18; 19, etc.; *kilamuṃdra*: CKD 11; 26; 49; 54; 57; 62; 68; 136; 198; 223; 226; 240; 256; 274; 310; 312; 339; 340; 374; 817 (2x); *kilamutra*: CKD 15; 308; 338; 403; 408; 520; 819; 860; *kilamuṃtra*: CKD 16; 33; 135; 152 (2x); 156; 160; 219; 251; 295; 296; 297; 315; 356; 366; 375; 400; 427; 430; 433; 439; 440 (2x); 474; 482; 524; 540; 564; 606; 621; 630; 706; 719 (2x); 743; 816

LOC.SG. *kilamuṃtraṃmi*: CKD 160

DIR.SG. *saṃghamudra* 'community seal': CKI 183; *saghamudra*: CKI 542; *saghamudre*: CKI 220

There is a consensus (cf. EWAia III: 409f.) that Gandh. *mudra* 'seal' and its Sanskrit cognate *mudrā-*[540] are loans from OP **mudrā-* (**muδrā-*), the latter safely reconstructable based on its Middle Persian descendant *muhr*. Signet rings being an Egyptian invention, the Persian term is itself probably derived from the name for Egypt, *Mudrāya-* (or *Muδrāya-*) in Old Persian (cf. de Blois 2013: 269).

Referring to a culturally important item *inter alia* used in an administrative context (Garrison 2021), OP **mudrā-* (**muδrā-*) was borrowed into various languages in Achaemenid times, also into Bactrian, where due to lambdacism the word became μολρο /mulrə/ 'seal'.[541] This

[540] The word is attested from the Sanskrit epics onwards. The personal name *Lópāmudrā-* in RV 1.179 is insufficient to postulate the existence of *mudrā-* in Vedic (cf. Remmer 2006: 71f.).

[541] For other Old Persian loanwords in Bactrian, cf. Sims-Williams (2002: 227f.).

Bactrian form can scarcely have been the source of Gandh. *mudra* and Skt. *mudrā-* since this would require Bactr. -λρ- /lr/ to have been substituted with Indic /dr/,[542] a counter-intuitive hypothesis at best. If one takes OP **mudrā-* (**muδrā-*) as the source of the Indic words, there are no phonological problems.

98. *hinajha* 'army commander'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *hinajha*: CKD 661

hinajha is attested once as a title of the Khotanese king and is probably a rendering of Khot. *hīnāysa-* /hīnāza/ 'army commander' < **hainā̆za-* (so first Burrow 1934: 514; cf. also DKS: 482). Not only is Khotanese the most likely donor language for historical reasons, the change of **-ai-* to *-ī-* → Pkt. *-i-* is also typical for Khotanese.[543]

It remains a matter of debate whether *hīnāysa-* is calqued on Gr. στρατηγός 'general, commander' (so e.g. Burrow; Töttössy 1980: 132f.; Sims-Williams 2023: 3 who also compares Sogd. *sp'δny* 'idem'), or an Old Iranian formation comparable to, for instance, Av. *nauuāza-* 'leader of the ship > sailor' (so Thomas 1936a: 789–791; 1945: 513–515).[544] As στρατηγός was borrowed into Gāndhārī as *stratega*, [545] option one seems entirely conceivable. Yet, the same seems true about the second option, given that a parallel OIr. **spādāza-* 'leader of the army' has been reconstructed based on the Lycian PN *Sppñtaza* (Schmitt 1971). It thus seems best to leave the issue undecided.

[542] The orthographic variation between <dr> and <tr> in Gāndhārī is probably phonologically insignificant.
[543] In front of a nasal, as is the case here, -η- /ē/ < **-ai-* can, however, also develop further to -ι- /ī/ in Bactrian (SFBG: 61f.). In fact, Bactr. *υινο /hīnə/ 'army' < **hainā-* may be attested in the PN υινοσαρο (BPN: no. 482).
[544] Thomas' assertion that the Chinese emperor conferred the title on the Khotanese kings is without foundation (cf. Brough 1965: 594 fn. 48 = 1996: 289 fn. 48).
[545] See recently Candotti & Guidice (2024: 245–252).

3.5.2 Plausible etymologies

99. *khakhordi* 'witch'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *khakhordi*: CKD 58; 63; *khakhorti*:[546] CKD 880; *khakhortiya* 'witchcraft': CKD 880

DIR.PL. *khakhordi*: CKD 63 (*khakhordi stri* 3); *khakhorda*: CKD 248

khakhordi can co-occur with *stri* 'woman' (CKD 58; 63; 248) and the contexts in which this word occurs allow one to deduce that being a *khakhordi* was considered a grave offence, punishable by death. Based on these observations, Burrow (1935a: 780f.) plausibly assigned the meaning 'witch' to *khakhordi* (see also Hansen 2004: 292; Kaur 2024).[547] He further made a convincing etymological comparison with Av. *kax^{v}arəiδī-* 'witch' < **kaxwardī-* (cf. masc. *kax^{v}arəδa-* 'wizard' < **kaxwarda-*) and various Late Sanskrit words for 'evil spirit', viz. *kākhorda-*, *kakkhorda-*, *kharkoda-*, and *khārkoṭa-*.[548]

Which Iranian language could be the source of Niya *khakhordi* 'witch' and its Sanskrit cognates? Many can be excluded for phonological reasons because they would not account for the cluster *-rd-* (alternative spelling *-rt-*) in *khakhordi*. In Bactrian, **-rd-* is expected to yield -ρλ- /rl/, a cluster by default substituted in Niya Prakrit with *-r-* (§4.3.25). In Middle Persian and Khotanese, intervocalic **-rd-* evolves to /l/ (cf. e.g. MP *sāl* 'year' < **sardV-*; Khot. *salii-* < **sardī-kī-*), so these languages do not work as a source of

[546] This variant form (on which cf. Duan & Tshelothar 2016: 15) proves that Burrow (1935a: 780f.; LKD: 86 s.v. *khakhorna*; cf. also Bailey 1955: 14 fn. 1) was correct in preferring the transliteration *khakhordi* over *khakhorni* (as in KI: 341).

[547] Accusations of witchcraft might seem like a phenomenon typical of Medieval Europe, not necessarily expected in an Ancient Central Asian context. Yet, important Mesopotamian parallels exist for witchcraft (Akkadian *kišpu*) being treated as a punishable offence: §2 of the Old Babylonian Codex Hammurabi (18th cent. BC) deals with false accusations of witchcraft (Roth 1997^{2}: 81); and in §47 of the Middle Assyrian Laws (11th cent. BC), it is ordered that practitioners of witchcraft be put to death when caught in the act (Roth 1997^{2}: 81).

[548] **kaxwarda-* / **kaxwardī-* may itself be a loanword from the BMAC language (Kümmel 2020: 258). For an overview of the contexts in which the Sanskrit words occur, see White (2021: 75; 77–80).

khakhordi either.[549] Phonologically, Sogdian would be a possible donor since in this language *-*rd*- is continued as /rδ/ (cf. e.g. *srδ* 'year' < **sardV*-). Yet, in view of the Sanskrit cognates of Niya *khakhordi* attested in South Asian sources such as the *Carakasaṃhitā*, Sogdian still seems an unlikely donor language because of its geographical remoteness.

Hence, only a few options are left. One possibility is that the word was borrowed early on in (Pre-)Gāndhārī from a neighbouring Old Iranian dialect (cf. Av. *kaxᵛarəδa*-; *kaxᵛarəiδī*-). In light of the Indo-Parthian rule in Gandhāra, it may, however, be more plausible that the Indic words come from a feminine equivalent of Parth. **kaxward* 'wizard', the latter probably also underlying Arm. *kaxard* 'idem' (Olsen 1999: 886).[550]

3.5.3 Arguable etymologies

100. *ratu,* a religious title

Attestations of the base form
DIR.PL. *ratu*: CKD 489

The hapax *ratu* is a title applied to elder monks (*vṛ̊rdha ratu bhikṣ̌u*). It has been compared by Konow (*apud* Thomas 1934a: 62 fn. 2) and Burrow (1934: 514) to Av. *ratu* 'judge, authority' and MP *rad* '(spiritual) chief, master' < OIr. **ratu*- (AIW: 1498–1502; CPD: 70). Since *ratu* is attested only once, one cannot confirm beyond doubt the correctness of this etymology; but the formal match makes it at least worth considering.

Burrow (LKD: 113 s.v.) observed that "if it is really the Iranian word it is noteworthy that the final -*u* is preserved at so late a date". The apparent preservation of -*u* also complicates the identification of the donor language of Niya *ratu*: in Middle Persian and Parthian, word-final vowels are lost; in Khotanese, *u*-stems were transferred to the *a*-declension (SGS: 250); and in Bactrian, OIr. **ratu* may, because of *u*-umlaut as in ροζγο /ruzgə/ 'vineyard' < **razu-ka*-, have become *ροδο /rudə/. These languages can thus all be ruled out. A Sogdian source of Niya *ratu* would formally not seem impossible, as

[549] Loukota (2024: 76) also notes that "the term *khakhorda* is unlikely to be Khotanese".
[550] When assuming that the initial aspirate in *khakhordi* is unetymological (§2.1.3), the phonological correspondences all work fine; for -*wa*- being rendered as -*o*-, cf. §4.3.1. I did not put *khakhordi* under the secure etymologies of §3.5 because Parth. **kaxward* is not attested.

OIr. **ratu* is continued in this language as *rtw* (also *rttw*; *rtww*; *ṛtww*), although only in the meaning 'period of ten seconds, moment' (DMSB^2: 199). Another possibility is that, as a technical Zoroastrian term, Niya Prakrit adopted the Avestan form via some currently unidentified Middle Iranian language (cf. also §4.2.3).

When correct, the etymology of *ratu* could have interesting historical consequences, for this would mean that a Zoroastrian term entered the Buddhist terminology of an Indo-Aryan language. Such a scenario is historically not too far-fetched given that Buddhism and Zoroastrianism co-existed in Bactria.[551] Caution is needed, however, before jumping to far-reaching conclusions.

3.5.4 Tentative etymologies

101. *denuga*, a title (?)

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *denuga*: CKD 418

The hapax *denuga* occurs in the phrase *denuga Aṃtoaṣa paride* "from (the) *denuga* Aṃto". Since it stands before a personal name, *denuga* seems to be a title, but this remains uncertain.

Burrow (1934: 513; LKD: 98 s.v.) tentatively assumed an etymological connection between *denuga* and Av. *daēnā-* 'religion' < **dayanā-*. Although he is not explicit, it seems as if Burrow interpreted *denuga* as a derivation in *-uga* from the Iranian word,[552] perhaps on the assumption that *denuga* approximately meant 'religious (specialist)'.

Were this highly uncertain etymology correct, *denuga* cannot have been an originally Bactrian word. **dayanā-* namely yielded Bactr. *ληνο /lēnə/, as indirectly preserved in MBactr. *lyn'ng* 'of the religion' and *ly(y)nlyryg* 'Electus' (Sims-Williams 2009a: 263).

---

[551] For Zoroastrianism in Bactria, see recently Grenet (2015) and Kreidl & Choksy (2021). For Buddhism, cf. e.g. Fussman (2015).

[552] According to Burrow, a suffix *-uga* would also occur in Niya *vevatuga* 'object of (legal) dispute, disputant', in his view derived with vr̥ddhi from OIA *vivāda-* 'dispute' (cf. LKD: §75).

102. *rotaṃna* ‘madder (?)’

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *rotaṃna*: CKD 261; 295; 357; 385 (2x); 450; *rotaṃ*: CKD 252; 272; 387.

Niya Prakrit *rotaṃna* is often mentioned in parallel with food commodities (e.g. *daḍima* ‘pomegranate’ in CKD 252; 295); it is also one of the typical tax products of the Shanshan kingdom (cf. CKD 295; 357; 385; 450). Its exact meaning can, however, not be established from the available contexts.

Bailey (1946a: 794) suggested *rotaṃna* to be loaned from an unidentified East Iranian cognate **rōδ-vanna-* of NP *rūband* / *rūy band* ‘veil’ < **rauda-banda-* ‘bound around the face’ (CPED: 591; 598). But the lack of occurrences of *rotaṃna* in lists of textile products renders this proposal semantically unconvincing.

Slightly more attractive, although still tentative, is Burrow’s (1935a: 787; LKD: 114 s.v.) comparison with OIr. **raudana-* ‘the reddening thing > madder’.[553] If this etymology were correct, MP *rōyan* (CPD: 72), Khot. *rrūnaa-* < **raudana-ka-* (DKS: 366), and a hypothetical Bactr. *ρωλανο /rōlanə/ are all easily excluded as donor languages on phonological grounds. Parthian and Sogdian would work fine since **raudana-* would be expected to yield respectively Parth. **rōδan* and Sogd. **rwδn*. As the word for ‘madder’ is not attested in these languages, and the semantics of *rotaṃna* cannot be determined on internal grounds, Burrow’s etymology must still be treated with caution.[554]

3.6 Iranian loanwords from an unidentified source

With the loanwords reviewed until now, one can apply Bactrian sound changes to an Old Iranian pre-form to determine if Niya Prakrit could have borrowed the relevant word from Bactrian, even if the word in question is not attested in this language.

This approach is not possible with four of the five words treated in this section, i.e. *anada* ‘carefully’; *kremeru* ‘crimson, scarlet’; *nacīra* ‘hunting’; and

[553] Madder owes its Iranian name to its use as a dye to colour textiles red. Archaeobotanical analysis of textiles from Xinjiang dating back to the end of the second millennium BC has revealed that madder was likely already used to dye cloths at that time (cf. Zhang, Good & Laursen 2008: 1099).
[554] Given that *rotaṃna* is mentioned next to words such as *daḍima* ‘pomegranate’, one should also consider the possibility that it refers to one of the locally grown fruits, e.g. grapes (so Thomas 1934a: 46 fn. 3) or apricots.

pacēvara ‘provisions (for a journey)’. Although these words are likely borrowed from an Iranian language, there is insufficient agreement on the inner-Iranian etymology to decide if borrowing from an unattested Bactrian cognate would be a viable option. Therefore, I classify these words as “Iranian loanwords from an unidentified source”.

The final lexeme to be discussed here, i.e. *bhaṭaraga* ‘lord, owner’, has been allocated to this section for a different reason. For this word, a plausible Iranian model has been suggested, i.e. **frataraka*- ‘superior, foremost’, but if this etymology is correct, the phonological appearance of *bhaṭaraga* still owes much to a folk etymological influence from MIA *bhaṭṭṛ*- ‘lord, husband’ < OIA *bhartṛ*-. Consequently, there is too much room for debate on what the Iranian donor form of *bhaṭaraga* looked like for one to be able to identify the most plausible donor language.

103. *anada* ‘carefully’

Attestations of the base form

ADV. *anada*: CKD 1; 3; 5; 7; 9; 11; 12; 13 (2x); 15 (2x); 18; 19; 20; 24; 26; 27; 29; 30; 32; 33; 36; 37; 38; 39; 42; 45; 46; 47; 49; 53; 54; 56; 62 (3x); 63; 71; 124; 134; 189; 192; 208; 212; 213; 229; 235; 240; 243; 256; 262; 265; 272; 283 (2x); 291; 297 (2x); 301; 308; 310 (3x); 312; 315 (3x); 318; 326; 329; 331; 341; 347; 349; 351; 356; 357; 358; 359; 364; 375; 383; 386; 387; 393; 400; 403; 408; 419 (2x); 423; 425; 433; 435; 437; 438; 451; 471; 473; 479; 480; 481; 482; 484; 494; 502; 509; 518; 520; 526; 528; 530; 532; 538; 542 (2x); 545 (2x); 551; 553; 556; 561; 564; 567; 571; 572; 574; 579; 580; 581; 582; 584 (2x); 586; 587; 589; 591; 606; 621; 636; 638; 640; 643; 676; 719; 720; 725; 735; 747; 751; 769; 792; 795; 815; 820; 841; 846; 859; 860; 862; 881; 885; *anata*: CKD 223; 335; 340; 345; 362; 366; 368; 379; 474; 540; 576; 577; 588; 635; 749; 869; *anatha*: CKD 322; 325; 330; 336; 348; 380; 421; 489; 635; 732; 889

The Niya Prakrit adverb *anada* (also *anata*; *anatha*) ‘carefully’ is usually employed in stock phrases with verbs such as *dhar*- ‘to hold’, *rakṣ*- ‘to protect’, and *pruch*- ‘to examine’ (LKD: §91; 73f. s.v.). Since the meaning of *anada* “hardly allows us to equate it with Skt. *ājñaptam* ‘ordered’” (LKD: 74 *pace* Bailey 1946a: 779),[555] we seem to be dealing with a loanword.

Indeed, it is likely that *anada* ‘carefully’ should be compared with (i) Khot. *ānata*- as used in the phrase *ānatä* (*ānatu*) *yan*- ‘to take care of, to protect,

[555] Phonologically, a derivation from *ājñaptam* would be regular; cf. e.g. Niya *anati* / *anadi* ‘command’ < *ājñapti*-.

pass. *ānatä häm-* 'to be taken care of, to be protected' (LKD: 73f. s.v.; Skjærvø 2004 II: 242) and (ii) BSogd. *''n't(t)* 'perfectly, clearly', an adverb which often pairs together with verbs of perception (KT VI: 95; DKS: 18; SD: 7).[556]

Khot. *ānata-* and Sogd. *''n't(t)* could both work as a possible donor of Niya *anada*. Whether an unattested Bactrian cognate of these words would also be a viable source of *anada* cannot be determined, since the inner-Iranian etymology has not been clarified, and we thus cannot confidently reconstruct an Old Iranian pre-form of Khot. *ānata-* and Sogd. *''n't(t)*.[557]

104. *kremeru* 'crimson, scarlet'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *kremeru*: CKD 318; 660

In both its attestations, Niya Pkt. *kremeru* appears to be an adjective specifying a type of textile product: *paliyarnaga*[558] *prahoni* 'a *paliyarnaga* garment' in CKD 318 and *paṭaṃca* 'silk-rolls' in CKD 660. A probable cognate is the Buddhist Sanskrit lookalike *kemerŭka-*, which, like *kremeru*, modifies a textile product, i.e. *kambala-* 'woollen blanket' (SWTF II: 122f.).[559] BSkt. *kemerŭka-* occurs in the *Sarvastivāda*-version of the *Vinayavibhaṅga* and corresponds in the Chinese translation of the *Mūlasarvastivāda*-version to a word for 'red' (cf. Rosen 1959: 107 fn. 1). It follows that BSkt. *kemerŭka-* probably means 'red', and we may cautiously assume the same for Niya *kremeru*.

---

[556] I leave aside Tumsh. *anād₁u* (1.22) as its meaning is up for debate; cf. e.g. Hitch (2009: 19), who translates *anād₁u* as 'commanded' and interprets it as a loan from Pkt. *anada-* < Skt. *ājñapta-*.

[557] Dragoni (*apud* Bernard 2023: 131 fn. 99; cf. already DKS: 18) has made a semantically attractive comparison with OIr. **nāθa-* 'protection, refuge', a supposed cognate of Ved. *nāthá-* 'refuge, help, protector' that seems to have left some indirect traces in Middle and New Persian (see Bernard 2023: 129–131). Formally, this etymology is, however, not self-evident because the *-t-* in Khot. *ānata-* and BSogd. *''n't(t)* cannot reflect earlier **-θ-*.

[558] This is the preferred reading of Boyer et al. (KD: 116), but *paliyardaga* is, as they note, palaeographically possible too. According to Bailey (1946a: 783; DKS: 220), *paliyarnaga* would also be an Iranian loanword, meaning 'of variegated colour'; but the etymology he proposes can easily be discarded because it is based on the implausible idea (see EWAia II: 163) that the Iranian word for 'panther' (e.g. Sogd. *pwrδnk*) continues a base **parda-* 'variegated'.

[559] The difference in onset between Niya *kremeru* and BSkt. *kemerŭka-* could be due to a dissimilation of *kr-* > *k-* in *kemerŭka-* induced by the *-r-* later in the word.

Bailey[560] made the attractive proposal that Niya *kremeru* is an Iranian loanword and connected it to the word for 'crimson, scarlet' seen in Arm. *karmir*, Hebr. *karmīl*, and BSogd. *krm'yr* (also MSogd. *qrmyr*; *krmyr*; CSogd. *qyrmyr*; SD: 193; DMSB^2: 116; DCS^2: 99).[561]

How to reconstruct the Old Iranian pre-form of this colour term is unfortunately a matter of debate. Since scale insects (cochineals) were used in antiquity to make a crimson dye, there is a general acceptance that the first part of the word continues OIr. **kṛ̊mi-* 'worm' (cf. MP *kirm*), parallel to how French *vermeil* 'scarlet' is derived from *ver* 'worm'. Yet, it is not entirely clear how exactly to reconstruct and interpret the second part of the word (see Korn 2016: 14–16 for various options). Due to this lack of consensus on the Old Iranian pre-form, I refrain from trying to identify the donor language of Niya *kremeru* (and BSkt. *kemerŭka-*).[562]

Even so, it is still worth commenting briefly on the phonological appearance of the Indic forms vis-à-vis the Armenian, Hebrew, and Sogdian forms. Three aspects are to be noted: (i) the onset *kr-* (Skt. *k-*); (ii) the vowel *-e-* where other forms have *-a-* and/or *-i-*; and (iii) the final *-u(ka)* which is absent in all other forms. As Bailey (1946: 782) pointed out, the first two features may be attributable to phonological processes in the recipient language, viz. Dardic liquid metathesis, as in e.g. *kramaṃ* 'action, work' < *karma(n)-* (SHĀH IV 10), and the Gāndhārī interchange of *-i-* and *-e-*, as in e.g. *petavaṃnidaga* 'yellow-coloured' < **pīta-varṇitaka-* (like *kremeru* attested in CKD 318).[563] As *u*-stems are moribund in Niya Prakrit (cf. LKD: §71), it is,

---

[560] See Bailey (1946: 781–783; 1954b: 14f.; KT VII: 85; 97 fn. 242), and cf. also Sims-Williams *apud* Høisæter (2020: 255 fn. 781).

[561] For a detailed study of these words, see now Korn (2016). I follow her in leaving MP *karmīr(-hyōn)* and Gr. Κερμιχίωνες / Ἑρμηχίονες, names of some Hunnic people, out of consideration (Korn 2016: 2–4). When first publishing his etymology of Niya *kremeru*, Bailey could not yet know of BSkt. *kemerŭka-*.

[562] In light of the prestige enjoyed by Armenian scarlet in antiquity, Korn (2016: 6–8; cf. also Korn & Warning 2017) has argued that the word originated in an Iranian language from within the Armenian-speaking territories. If this argument is correct, the word for 'crimson, scarlet' should have travelled a considerable distance for it to be found in Niya Prakrit. Accordingly, one probably has to posit several unattested intermediaries, which makes it even more cumbersome to reconstruct the exact paths of borrowing.

[563] This would seem most easy from an Iranian source with **kirm-* < **kṛ̊m-*. It is also conceivable that a folk etymology with Gandh. **krimi* or even **kremi* < Skt. *kṛ̊mi-* / *krimi-* 'worm' influenced the form of *kremeru*.

however, hard to explain the final *-u(ka)* in Niya *kremeru* and BSkt. *kemerŭka-* as having come about within Indic (*pace* Bailey 1954b: 14). Bailey (1946: 782) assumed word-final *-*am* to have become *-*u* in the source form of *kremeru*, in which case one has to interpret the *ka*-suffix in Sanskrit as a secondary addition. Although I cannot make a better proposal, Bailey's scenario is not entirely convincing, since it is not clear why a neuter or an acc.sg. in *-*u* < *-*am* would be the source of an adjective like *kremeru*.[564]

105. *nacira* 'hunting'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *nacira*: CKD 13 (3x); 15 (2x)
LOC.SG. *naciraṃmi*: CKD 156

Compounds

DIR.SG. *gavašanacira* 'deer hunting': CKD 509[565]

Niya *nacira* /naścĭra/ 'hunting' has an inner-Indic cognate in Epigraphical Skt. *naścīrapati-* 'person responsible for hunting' (Lüders 1940b: 37f.).[566] Its Iranian origin was first recognised by Bailey (*apud* Burrow 1934: 513; cf. also LKD: §123; 99 s.v.), based on a comparison with Sogd. *nxš(')yr* /naxšīr/ 'wild animal, deer' (SD: 237) and MP/Parth. *naxčīr* 'game, quarry, chase' (CPD: 58; DMMP: 249).[567]

From which Iranian language could *nacira* have been borrowed? One can rule out Khotanese and Sogdian, the first because this language preserves no trace of the word for 'hunting' (cf. Bailey 1949a: 122), the second because out

[564] Were *kremeru* an adverb, this problem would not pose itself; cf. §3.3.1 s.v. *ajhate* 'free' where I argue that the adverb *ajhatu* 'free' in CKD 152 is a loan from an Iranian language in which *-*am* became *-*u*. Bailey's (1946: 782) alternative proposal to compare the Khotanese suffix *-ua* < *-*ūka-* as in *kṣīrua-* 'of the land' ← *kṣīra-* 'land' is semantically unattractive, as this Khotanese suffix is typical for local and temporal adjectives (Degener 1989: 156–158), whereas *kremeru* is a colour term.

[565] If *niciri harga* in CKD 677 means 'hunting tax' (cf. Thomas 1936a: 792; LKD: 101 s.v.; TKD: 139), this expression must be added to the list of attestations too.

[566] The Sanskrit title occurs in the Kurā stone inscription of the time of Toramāṇa Ṣāhi (line 7). Bakker (2020: 326–328) recently re-edited and re-translated this inscription, but he does not take Lüders' proposal on *naścīrapati-* into account.

[567] The earliest trace of this Iranian term is Aram. *nḥšyr* in the Qumran War Scroll (1QM); see de Menasce (1956) and Asmussen (1961). For more cognates, cf. also Ciancaglini (2008: 213).

of *nxš(')yr* /naxšīr/ one would expect Niya ***nakṣira* rather than the attested *naćira* /naścĭra/ (cf. §4.3.18). Parthian could work phonologically, as the foreign cluster *-xč-* in *naxčīr* could easily have been substituted with Niya *-ć-* /śc/ (see §4.3.27). Whether the so far unattested Bactrian cognate of Parth. *naxčīr* would also be compatible with the form of Niya *naćira* is more difficult to predict since there is no consensus on the ultimate etymology of the Iranian word for 'hunting'.[568] Therefore, I have allocated *naćira* to the present category of loanwords.

106. *pačevara* 'provisions (for a journey)'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *pačevara*: CKD 19; 22; 109; 142 (2x); 164; 236; 505 (2x); 509; 637 (2x); 714; 842; *pačevare*: CKD 164; *pačavara*: CKD 382 (2x); 671; *pačivara*: CKM 84; *pacivara*:[569] CKD 25.

Compounds

DIR.SG. *aṃnapačevara* 'provisions of corn': CKD 637

It has long been known that Niya *pačevara* /paścēvă̆ra/ 'provisions (for a journey)' is an Iranian loanword (Burrow 1935a: 784; LKD: 102 s.v.). The following etyma, all with the same meaning as *pačevara*, are to be compared: Elam. *baššabara*, Aram. *pšbr'*, Arm. *pašar* ← Parth. **pašāβar* (cf. Korn 2013: 76f.), and Sogd. *pš'βr* (also *pš''βr*; *pyš''βr*; CSogd. *pš'br*; cf. SD: 300; DMSB^2: 177; DCS^2: 144).

Weber (1975: 91–94) proposed to trace these forms back to an Old Iranian compound **pasčābara-* 'that which is carried after'. This etymology works phonologically well for most languages and is commonly accepted nowadays.[570] Yet, it is far from obvious what the donor language of Niya *pačevara* could be, were Weber's proposal correct.

---

[568] Various unconvincing etymologies have been proposed in the past. See e.g. Bailey (1946a: 774 fn. 1; 1949a: 122) for **naxti-čiθra-* 'originating in the night' (decisively refuted by Henning 1947: 57 fn. 1 = 1977 II: 291 fn. 1); Bailey (1958a: 44f.) for **naxa-čarya-* 'wandering in the open space'; or Gershevitch (1964a: 91f. = 1985: 191f.) for **naxu-sčy̆a-* 'the first to be hunted'.

[569] Boyer et al. (KD: 9) note that the akṣara <ci> is hardly readable, so it is possible that the correct reading in CKD 25 is the more expected *pačivara* (or *pačevara*).

[570] See e.g. Iranica (§4.4.3.9) and Korn (2013: 76f. with fn. 12). Weber argues that **pasčābara-* would derive its name from the custom of carrying provisions at the

The word for 'provisions' has not yet turned up in Bactrian, but we at least know that **pasča-* 'after' yields Bactr. πισο /pitsə/ (Sims-Williams & Lee 2003: 169; BD II: 257), which is phonologically incompatible with Niya *pače-* (or *pāca-*). Sogdian and Parthian are likewise excluded since the sibilant *-š-* in Sogd. *pš'βr* and Parth. **pašāβar* (→ Arm. *pašar*) would not account for the Niya Prakrit cluster *-c̄-* /śc/ either.[571] Hence, in order to uphold Weber's etymology, one would probably need to assume that *pācevara* was borrowed from an unattested Middle Iranian dialect preserving **-sč-* or that the speakers of Niya Prakrit still recognised the literal meaning of the Iranian compound and substituted its first part by the Indo-Aryan cognate *pāca* / *pače* 'after'. Neither option seems particularly plausible, so Weber possibly went too far in claiming that *pācevara* "bestätigt … mit seinem *-c̄-* … unsere hier vorgetragene Etymologie." (1975: 93f.).

I would conclude more cautiously that while the Iranian origin of *pācevara* cannot be doubted, we currently cannot determine its etymology and exact source in more detail.

107. *bhaṭaraga* 'lord, owner'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *bhaṭaraga*: CKD 324 + 328; 492 (?); 552; 575; 675 (2x); 713; 722; 783; 842; 884

GEN.SG. *bhaṭaragaṣa*: CKI 363; CKD 24; 31; 34; 89; 104; 133; 247; 259; 278; 288 (2x); 320; 370; 372; 415; 492; 498; 563; 573; 585 (2x); 696 (2x); 819; *bhaṭaragasya*: CKD 541 (2x); *bhaṭarasa*: CKI 536 (cf. Baums 2012: 238 fn. 86); *bhaṭarakasa*: CKI 564

DIR.PL. *bhaṭare*: CKD 524; 682; *bhaṭari*: CKD 12 + 43

GEN.PL. *bhaṭaragana*: CKD 157; 164; 216; 552; 585; 702; 703; 897 (2x); *bhaṭaraganāṃ*: CKD 140 (2x); 162; *bhaṭaraganaṃ*: CKD 698; *bhaṭarana*: CKD 379

bhaṭaraga ///: CKD 216; 285; 372; 772; *bhaṭara* ///: CKD 663

---

end of a caravan, but Naveh & Shaked (ADAB: 197) point to an alternative interpretation of the same compound as 'carrying (food for) afterwards'.

[571] The assumption of a Parthian dialect form with **-čˇ-* < **-sč-* as in Parth. **pc'gryw* 'deputy (of the king)' < **pasčā-grīwa-* 'behind the self' → Syr. *pṣgryb'* (Gershevitch 1954: 125 = 1985: 163; Ciancaglini 2008: 235f.) would not account for Niya *-c̄-* /śc/ either. Khotanese preserves no trace of the word for 'provisions' and thus also seems an unlikely donor.

Derivatives

FEM.GEN.SG. *bhaṭariyae* 'lady': CKD 755; 756; *bhaṭariyāe*: CKD 697

Compounds

DIR.PL. *goṭhabhaṭare* 'farm-owner': CKD 147
DIR.PL. *goṭhabhaṭarajaṃna* 'idem': CKD 554

In the Niya documents, the lexeme *bhaṭaraga̱* 'lord, owner' (fem. *bhaṭari** 'lady') can, for example, refer to the owner of a particular commodity (see e.g. CKD 24; 31; 147; 324 + 328), including the master of a slave (Agrawala 1953b: 98). On the other hand, *bhaṭaraga̱* is often used as a honorific title (see e.g. CKD 34; 89; 104; 133), in which function the word also occurs in Gāndhārī inscriptions.

Gandh. *bhaṭaraga̱* corresponds to Skt. *bhaṭṭāraka-* 'great lord, venerable or worshipful person', fem. *bhaṭṭārikā-* 'noble lady, tutelary deity' (MW: 745). Traditionally (e.g. in EWAia III: 362), *bhaṭṭāraka-* is considered an enlargement with the *ka*-suffix of MIA *bhaṭṭṛ̊-* 'lord, husband' < OIA *bhartṛ̊-* (nom.sg. *bhaṭṭā*; acc.sg. *bhaṭṭāraṃ*). More recently, Falk (2010b: 75 = 2013a: 246; cf. also von Hinüber 2004: 129) observed that the earliest attestations of *bhaṭaraga̱* / *bhaṭṭāraka-* cluster in the NW of South Asia, suggesting that the word originated there.[572] Based on this argument from geography, Falk ingeniously argued that *bhaṭaraga̱* / *bhaṭṭāraka-* is "a local adaptation of the Iranian title *frataraka*, "the foremost", used for "leader, governor, forerunner"". The Iranian title which Falk refers to is attested since Achaemenid times through Aram. *prtrk* 'superior' (Iranica: §4.4.7.42; ADAB: 55; 74), a term used for the administrative head of a province or district.[573] Rather than being derived from MIA *bhaṭṭṛ̊-*, *bhaṭaraga̱* / *bhaṭṭāraka-* would thus be an Iranian loanword, although one that still underwent folk etymological influence from *bhaṭṭṛ̊-*.

Since (i) **frataraka-* is actually attested as an Iranian title, (ii) its semantics 'superior, foremost' dovetail with those of *bhaṭaraga̱* / *bhaṭṭāraka-*, and (iii) an Iranian origin fits well for a word seemingly originating in the NW of South Asia, I agree with Schmitt (2015: 154) that Falk's etymology is "überzeugend".[574]

---

[572] Consequently, Burrow's (LKD: §37) assertion that *bhaṭaraga̱-* is a loan from an eastern MIA dialect appears unlikely.
[573] For the use of the same title in Seleucid times (2nd century BC) by the dynasts of Fārs, see Panaino (2003).
[574] Falk's etymology is also accepted by Ollett (2024: 92–94).

At the same time, it seems that the phonological appearance of *bhaṭaraga* / *bhaṭṭāraka-* should still owe a lot to the hypothesised influence from *bhaṭṭr̥-*, viz. (i) the rendering of Iranian **f-* with *bh-* rather than *vh-*; (ii) its geminate retroflex; and (iii) its long *-ā-* (cf. acc.sg. *bhaṭṭāraṃ*) where all the *a*s in **frataraka-* are short.[575] Although I do not consider this a problem for the etymology as such, the consequence of allowing for such a heavy folk etymological adaptation is that one can debate what the actual donor form of *bhaṭaraga* / *bhaṭṭāraka-* exactly looked like and whether it was borrowed from an Old or a Middle Iranian language. Accordingly, it would be even more cumbersome to identify the (possible) donor language(s) of *bhaṭaraga* / *bhaṭṭāraka-* than with some of the loanwords discussed in §3.3 or §3.5. I therefore allocated *bhaṭaraga* / *bhaṭṭāraka-* to this section of "Iranian loanwords from an unidentified source".

3.7 Rejected etymologies

This section brings together Niya Prakrit words whose previously suggested Iranian etymology I propose to reject. The first group (§3.7.1) involves words that one can as plausibly explain as Indo-Aryan vocabulary. The second group (§3.7.2) concerns words whose formerly proposed Iranian etymology suffers from, in my view, insuperable phonological and/or semantic problems.

3.7.1 Possibly Indo-Aryan words

108. *kharaṿarna* 'donkey-coloured (?)'

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *kharaṿarna*: CKD 318[576]

kharaṿarna is attested only once, as an adjective describing *prahoni* 'garment' (for which cf. §3.5.1 s.v.). Although its exact meaning is thus unclear (cf. LKD: 86 s.v.; TKD: 59), Lüders' (1936a: 35) translation as

[575] Falk argues that an intermediary form **vhartaraga* or the like may be indirectly attested in Greek script as BAPTAP/// on a coin legend of Higaraka (ca. 65–55 BC). Because of the fragmentary preservation of BAPTAP///, this cannot be proved.
[576] One could also consider to read *kharaṿarda*, but this alternative reading has so far not yielded a better explanation of the word.

'donkey-coloured' from *khara-* 'donkey' and *varṇa-* 'colour' is definitely preferable over Bailey's (1954b: 18) unnecessarily complicated proposal to compare Ossetic *xæræ* 'grey, dark'. Bailey's proposal may even be chronologically impossible if it is true that the Ossetic word is a later borrowing from Turkic *kara* 'black', as argued by Sims-Williams (*apud* Wilkens 2021: 7 fn. 27).[577]

109. *baṃna* 'bundle'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.PL. *baṃna*: CKD 66 (3x)

Bailey (1946a: 767) and Weber (1997: 31) connect Niya *baṃna* 'bundle' to LKhot. *baṃ* 'idem' < **bana-* < **banda-* (DKS: 264) with the Khotanese development of **-nd-* > *-n-*.[578] Although formally possible, it cannot be proved that Niya *baṃna* is a Khotanese loanword. In Central Asian Gāndhārī, voiced (aspirated) consonants tend to be assimilated to a preceding homorganic nasal (see §2.1.5), meaning that *baṃna* can also be inherited from OIA *bandha-* (so already Thomas 1935: 56). Compare the infinitive *baṃna(ṃ)nae* (CKD 590; 592) 'to bind' < **bandhanāya* in the Niya documents and *bañа* 'binding' < *bandha-* (v. 28), *bañaṇa* < *bandhana-* 'bond' (v. 92; 146; 169; 170), and *bañava* < *bāndhava-* 'relative' (v. 261) in the *Khotan Dharmapada.*[579]

110. *masu* 'wine'

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *masu*: CKD 130; 140 (2x); 168 (3x); 169 (4x); 170 (3x); 172 (3x); 173 (6x); 174 (2x); 175 (2x); 176 (2x); 206 (2x); 207; 208; 225 (3x); 244; 247 (4x); 261; 268; 272 (4x); 299 (5x); 329 (4x); 345; 349 (2x); 358; 387; 405; 431 = 432 (5x); 443 (3x); 523 (2x); 539 (3x); 567 (5x); 571; 574 (3x); 585 (2x); 587; 619 (8x); 622 (2x); 633; 634; 637 (10x); 652; 655; 789 (6x); 796 (6x); 853; 856; 858; 881 (6x)

INS.SG. *masuẏena*: CKD 307; 728

GEN.SG. *masuaṣa*: CKD 431 = 432; *masuṣa*: CKD 585; *masusya*: CKD 329 (2x); 663

---

[577] Sims-Williams and Wilkens do not identify the exact donor language of Oss. *xæræ*.

[578] Contrast e.g. Bactr. βανδο /vandə/ 'bundle, bond' (BD II: 201).

[579] The akṣara 𐨣 *ña*, an orthographic peculiarity of the *Khotan Dharmapada*, is used for the sound deriving from OIA *-ndh-* (perhaps aspirated /n^{h}/). See Brough (62; 98f.), who points out that the outcome of *-ndh-* can alternatively be spelled with simple 𐨦 *na* (like the outcome of unaspirated *-nd-*).

LOC.SG. *masuaṃmi*: CKD 291; 333; 531; *masuvaṃmi*: CKD 567

Derivatives

ADJ. *masuvi* 'related to wine': CKD 272; 539; 567 (2x)

Compounds

DIR.SG. *masuśaḍa* 'vineyard': CKD 90; 187; 419 (2x); 581; 586; 655; 779; 805 (3x); *masuśaḍo*: CKD 586; *masuśaṭa*: CKD 473 (2x)
INS.SG. *masuśaḍena* 'idem': CKD 885
GEN.SG. *masuśaḍaṣa* 'idem': CKD 581; 655
LOC.SG. *masuśaḍaṃmi* 'idem': CKD 581; *masuśaṭaṃmi*: CKD 586
DIR.SG. *masuśaḍaükṣivana* 'tilling of vineyards': CKD 565
DIR.SG. *masuvyoṣitaga* 'reimbursement of wine': CKD 803

Lüders (1933: 1000–1002 = 1940a: 729f.) interpreted Niya *masu* 'wine' as a loanword from "East Iranian" **maδu*- < OIr. **madu*- 'idem' (cf. e.g. Av. *maδu*-), arguing the spirant *-*δ*- to have been rendered as -*s*- /z/.[580]

This would seem a viable option, but it should be investigated whether *masu* 'wine' can alternatively continue OIA *madhu*-, whose basic meaning is 'sweet drink' but which can also mean 'grape wine' (cf. McHugh 2021: 119–122). If we compare *gohoma* (*gohomi*, also contracted *goma*) 'wheat' < OIA *godhūma*- (LKD: 88 s.v. *goma*), *madhu*- may be expected to yield Niya ***mahu*, which could speak in favour of Lüders' etymology. However, in some other dialects of Gāndhārī, OIA intervocalic -*dh*- did lenite to -*s*- /z/ (see §2.1.2), including in the adj. *masura* (and variants) 'sweet' < OIA *madhura*- (Brough 1962: 94; Salomon 2000: 85; 232; 2008: 114; 436). It follows that *masu* can also be a loan from a different dialect of Gāndhārī, which means that Lüders' idea of an Iranian loan is difficult to verify.

3.7.2 Words of unknown origin

111. *akri*, a type of land

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *akri*: CKD 222; 579; 580; 582; 795; 885; *akriya*: CKD 580; *agri*: CKD 654

The Niya word *akri*, an epithet of *bhuma* 'grounds, land', has been argued by Bailey (1953: 540) to derive from Ir. **a-griya*- 'without soil ground'. A serious

[580] Cf. also Bailey (1954d: 1): "the Old Indian *madhu* was replaced in Krorain (Lou-lan) northwestern Prakrit by the frequent *masu*.". For the use of 𐨯 *sa* to write /z/, cf. §2.1.2 and §2.1.7.3.

issue with this argument is that Bailey's reconstruction is based on a hapax *graṃña* in the Khotanese *Rāmāyaṇa* that lacks comparative support from other Iranian languages (cf. DKS: 91) and may have been interpreted wrongly. Another problem is that the semantics of *akri* are very uncertain (cf. LKD: 71 s.v.).[581]

112. *arnavaj̲i* (or *ardavaj̲i*?), textile product

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *arnavaj̲i* (*ardavaj̲i*?): CKD 59; 83 (2x); 385; 433; 714
DIR.PL. *arnavaj̲i* (*ardavaj̲i*?): CKD 113

Although probably a textile product (Lüders 1936a: 20f.; LKD: 77 s.v.), the exact meaning of *arnavaj̲i* remains unclear. Bailey (1946: 793) suggested to analyse this word as a compound containing Ir. **warnā-* 'wool' (cf. Av. *varənā-*) as its first part. This etymology assumes, however, an ad hoc loss of **w-*,[582] while also leaving the second part of the word unexplained.

I wonder whether the word should not be read as *ardavaj̲i* instead, 𐨪 *rna* and 𐨫 *rda* being easily confused in Niya Kharoṣṭhī (cf. §3.5.2 s.v. *khakhordi*).[583] If so, it may be possible that *artaṿaśa*, a hapax in a document mentioning several textile products (CKD 431 = 432), is a variant of the same word.

113. *asaṃkharaj̲iya*, textile product

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *asaṃkharaj̲iya*: CKD 207

The reading of the hapax *asaṃkharaj̲iya*, given its co-occurrence with words such as *kośava* 'rug, blanket' and *akiṣḍha* 'cover, rug' presumably a textile

[581] Thomas (1934a: 38) argued on the basis of CKD 582 *puranaga̲ miṣiya bhuma huati tade paru eṣa bhuma akri patida* "formerly this land was *miṣi* but after that this land fell *akri*" (TKD: 120) that *akri* means 'uncultivated'.
[582] One likewise cannot derive the first element from Skt. *ūrṇā-* 'wool' (*pace* Loukota 2020: 106). It remains unclear if *arnavaniya* (CKD 883) is connected; the element *vaniya* in this word possibly means 'merchant', but Høisæter (2020: 417f.) goes too far in building historical conclusions on this highly uncertain etymology.
[583] The available pictures of CKD 385 and CKD 714 confirm the possibility of reading *ardavaj̲i*. Lüders' (1936a: 21 fn. 2) reading *arnaraj̲i* is palaeographically unwarranted.

product, is doubtful (cf. Lüders 1936a: 21 fn. 2). For this reason alone, Harmatta's (1967: 7–9) comparison with Sogd. *s'γr'* 'saddle', itself a hapax of uncertain etymology, can only be tentative.[584] Since Harmatta moreover had to postulate *asaṃkharaj̲iya* to be borrowed from an unattested derivative of *s'γr'* with the Sogdian adjective suffix *-cyk*, and his etymology requires several phonological assumptions,[585] I consider it best to reject Harmatta's proposal.

114. *ogu*, a title

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *ogu*: CKD 38; 71; 90; 114; 136 (2x); 165; 193; 198; 209; 214 (3x); 254 (2x); 297; 315; 320; 345; 370; 393; 399; 496 (2x); 506; 518; 546 (2x); 574 (2x); 575; 582 (2x); 621; 629; 639 (3x); 682; 721 (2x); 732; 734; 740; 788 (3x); 815; 817 (3x); 884 (4x); 888

GEN.SG. *oguaṣa*: CKD 377

GEN.PL. *oguana*: CKD 318 (2x); 324 + 328; 326; 494; 570 (2x); 574 (2x); 578 (2x); 665; 709; 793; 815; 817 (3x)

Bailey (KT VII: 5f.) proposed that Niya Pkt. *ogu*, a high-ranking official title (LKD: 80f. s.v.; Høisæter 2020: 596), could be traced back to Ir. **augu-*, a *u*-stem corresponding to Av. *aogah-* 'power'. This etymology is formally unconvincing because (i) the required *u*-stem is not paralleled elsewhere, and (ii) the consistent spelling of *ogu* with 𐨒 *ga* and not with 𐨓 *g̲a* suggests that *ogu* contains a geminate /gg/ (cf. LKD: 80f. s.v.).[586]

115. *kamaṃta* / *kamuṃta*, unclear

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *kamaṃta*: CKD 272 (*caṃdri kamaṃta*); 714 (*suḍ̲ae kamaṃta*[587]); *kaṃmaṃta*: CKD 714 (*cāṃdri kaṃmaṃta*)

DIR.PL. *kamuṃta*: CKD 207 (*kamuṃta 10 4 2*); *kamude*: CKD 357 (*karci kamude*)

---

[584] The Sogdian word is attested in Mugh document Б-19.6 (Livshits 2015: 133), mistakenly referenced by Harmatta as B-18. The meaning of *asaṃkharaj̲iya* would, in Harmatta's opinion, be 'saddle cloth'.

[585] Some of the assumptions are positing a prothetic vowel to explain the initial *a-* in *asaṃkharaj̲iya*, regarding the anusvāra unetymological, and supposing Sogd. *-čyk* to have been lenited to Niya *-j̲iya* /źiya/.

[586] It is perhaps possible but as yet unproven that Niya *ogu* is etymologically related to the Tocharian B title *oko$_u$* (also *okau*; *akau*) and the Old Turkic title *oko* / *ogu* (Ching & Ogihara 2013: 112f.; HWA: 505).

[587] For this word division, see Lüders (1936b: 642 fn. 4) *contra* KD (269).

The Niya word *kamaṃta* / *kamuṃta* (also *kamuda** in CKD 357) always occurs in lists of commodities paid as tribute, but the evidence is too scanty to determine what kind of commodity it could be.[588] Consequently, proposals to explain *kamaṃta* / *kamuṃta* as an Iranian loanword have remained conjectural. Schaeder and Henning (*apud* Lüders 1936a: 6 with fn. 2) suggested a connection with NP *kamand* 'halter, noose, snare, lasso' (CPED: 1051). Although formally conceivable, I reject this suggestion because the semantic part of this etymology remains highly uncertain, and the Persian word appears not to have any cognates in other Iranian languages. Bailey (1936: 576; 1946a: 793f.; 1966: 26; DKS: 58) made an alternative comparison with Khot. *kāṃmadä* 'trousers', but this etymology has been cogently refuted by Harmatta (1967: 9f.).

In an attempt to account for *kamaṃta* / *kamuṃta* as an inherited word instead, Thomas (1934: 46 fn. 3; 1944: 64f.) focussed on the phrase (or compound) *caṃdri kamaṃta* (*cāṃdri kaṃmaṃta*) in CKD 272 and 714. According to him, *kamaṃta* would be the outcome of Skt. *karmānta-* 'work', and *caṃdri* of Skt. *cāndrī* 'moonlight' (MW: 392). Together, these words would mean 'moonlight workings', which Thomas took as a reference to the famous jade from Khotan because "detection of jade in rivers by the aid of moonlight is a Khotanī craft reported by the Chinese" (1934: 46 fn. 3). This idea founders on the very hypothetical semantics and on the fact that *kamaṃta* would be the only derivative of *karma(n)-* 'work, action' where the cluster *-rm-* would not have been preserved (cf. LKD: 89 s.v. *caṃdrikamaṃta*).[589]

[588] Unlike Burrow (LKD: 81 s.v. *kamuṃta*; 89 s.v. *caṃdrikamaṃta*; TKD: 38), I follow Lüders (1936a: 6 fn. 2) in assuming that *kamaṃta* and *kamuṃta* are variants of the same word. They occur in similar lists, and the interchange between *-a-* and *-u-* does not seem a decisive reason to assume that they are different words (cf. the same variation in *sṕara* / *sṕura* 'full, completely').

[589] Bailey (1946a: 793; cf. also Harmatta 1967: 10) suggested that *caṃdri* could alternatively be an adjectival derivation from a cognate of NP *chādar* 'mantle, veil, etc.' (CPED: 383f.). Yet, this idea hinges on the doubtful idea that *chādar* is an inherited word and not, as more commonly thought (cf. e.g. EDIV: 341f.), a loan from Late Skt. *chattra-* 'covering'.

116. *kala,* a title

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *kala*: CKD 25; 28; 103 (2x); 169; 181; 202; 210; 221 (?); 245; 256; 278; 279; 294; 295; 307; 322; 324 + 328; 331 (3x); 349; 358 (3x); 360; 363; 366 (2x); 379; 383 (2x); 384; 387; 420; 425; 467; 495; 513; 524; 531; 558; 586; 606; 615; 630 (2x); 637 (6x); 640; 654; 715; 812; 815; 817 (2x); 880; 882; 885; *kāla*: CKD 112; 147; 210; 216; 305; 399; 529; 571; 572; 573; 579; 580 (2x); 581; 582; 587; 589; 590; 591 (4x); 622; 634; 637 (2x); 879; *kaṃla*: CKD 715

GEN.SG. *kalaṣa*: CKD 28; 132; *kālaṣa*: CKD 637

DIR.PL. *kale*: CKD 327

Burrow (LKD: 82 s.v.) observed that persons who carry the title *kala* are at the same time sometimes called *maharayaputra* 'son of the great king' (CKD 307; 331; 622; 634). Whether this observation counts as proof that *kala* means 'prince' remains to be seen. Sometimes, *kala*s also fulfilled official duties, e.g. supervising the collection of taxes (note CKD 634, and see also Høisæter 2020: 144; 594f.).

This word lacks a convincing etymology. Bailey (1964: 22) compared a supposed Khotanese title *kāla-*, which he derived from **kāẓala-* 'protector' to the root *kät'-*, pret. *kāṣṭa-*, 'to think, to protect' (SGS: 22). The existence of such a title in Khotanese hinges on a questionable interpretation of a particular Khotanese document, and Bailey later abandoned the connection himself (DKS: 59).[590]

117. *kuṭ́hakṣira*, unclear

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *kuṭ́hakṣira*: CKD 741; *kuṭ́hekṣira*: CKD 771

GEN.SG. *kuṭhakṣiraṣa*:[591] CKD 45; *kuṭ́hakṣiraṣa*: CKD 39 (2x); 553; 569 (2x); *kuṭ́hekṣiraṣa*: CKD 331; *kṣiraṣa*: CKD 415; 434

[590] DKS (58) contains a second lemma "*kālä* 'a title'", but the instances Bailey cites there belong to *kāla-* 'time', a loanword from Sanskrit (or Gāndhārī). See Skjærvø (2002: 352; 564), a reference I owe to Federico Dragoni.

[591] Given that 𐨯 *ṭ́ha* and 𐨭 *ṭha* tend not to be confused in Niya Prakrit (cf. infra), I deem it likely that this variant is a lapsus of Boyer et al. (KD: 15). In the absence of a picture of CKD 45, this suspicion cannot be verified, however.

The technical term *kuṭhakṣira* always occurs in the context of a payment to be made when adopting a child; its exact meaning remains unclear.[592]

According to Bailey (1950a: 397–399), *kuṭhakṣira* would represent an unattested Khotanese compound **ggurṣṭa-ṣīra-* 'called > adopted child'.[593] This etymology is marred with problems. To start with, Niya Prakrit uses *uneyaga*, a word found next to *kuṭhakṣira* in e.g. CKD 569, in the meaning 'adopted child', thus making one wonder what the distinction between *uneyaga* and *kuṭhakṣira* would be, were Bailey's idea correct. The second element of the presumed compound **ggurṣṭa-ṣīra-* is moreover but a postulated variant of an etymologically obscure word *ṣīrka-* 'child'.[594] In addition, Bailey had to hypothesise a more archaic form of **ṣīra-* with an initial **x-* still preserved to account for the Niya cluster *kṣ-*.[595]

Thomas (1934a: 37) and Burrow (LKD: 83 s.v.) started from the assumption that *kuṭhakṣira* is a compound containing the Indo-Aryan word for 'milk' as its second part. They, however, encountered difficulties in explaining the first part. As in other forms of Gāndhārī, the Kharoṣṭhī akṣaras 𐨟 *ṭ́ha* and 𐨠 *ṭha* are kept well distinct in Niya Prakrit, the former representing the outcome of OIA *-rth-* or (-)*sth-* and the latter of OIA *-ṣṭ(h)-* (cf. §2.1.6). Yet, in spite of this distinction, both scholars traced *kuṭ́ha-* back to an OIA source with *-ṣṭ-*: Thomas derived *kuṭ́ha-* from an unattested variant **kuṣṭa-* of Skt. *kuśita-* / *kuṣita-* 'mixed with water', adjectives only known from late lexica (MW: 297), while Burrow suggested that *kuṣṭa-* is here the verbal adj. of the root √*kuṣ* in the meaning 'to extract'. As both proposals do not account for the consistent spelling with 𐨟 *ṭ́ha*, I concur with Konow (1943: 72) in rejecting them.[596]

---

[592] *kuṭhakṣira* is mostly used in the gen.sg. (see the list of attestations), also in contexts where a gen. is difficult to explain (see LKD: 83 s.v. for a suggestion).

[593] Khot. *ggurṣṭa-* is the verbal adj. of the verb *grūs-* 'to call' < **xraus-* (cf. SGS: 32). On **ṣīra-*, see below.

[594] In a later publication (DKS: 410), Bailey derives *ṣīrka-* 'child' from the root **√fšar* 'to press' (EDIV: 93). This etymology for *ṣīrka-* has little to recommend itself, as **fš-* normally yields *kṣ-* in Khotanese (e.g. *kṣārma-* 'shame' < **fšarma-*).

[595] Bailey's etymology would further presuppose a substitution of Khot. *gg-* /g/ with Niya *k-*.

[596] The speculative semantics involved are another reason not to accept Thomas' and Burrow's suggestions. The latter, for instance, translated *kuṭhakṣira* as 'milk-payment', reasoning that, when adopting a child, the "extracted milk", i.e. the mother's milk, needs to be compensated to the biological parents.

118. *kurora*, an adjective specifying a type of land

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *kurora*: CKD 496; 574; 678; 839

Niya *kurora* is always used in connection with *bhuma* 'grounds, land', making it likely that it is an adjective specifying a particular type of land. Its exact meaning remains unclear.

The same applies to its etymology. Burrow (1935a: 780; LKD: 84 s.v.) cautiously compared *kurora* to NP *kurār(ā)* 'the threshold of a door; a plot of ground with a raised border prepared for sowing' (CPED: 1019). Yet, it remains highly uncertain if the meaning of the Persian word would fit Niya *kurora*. In addition, the lemma *kurār(ā)* in CPED is only based on a lexicographic source, which makes it doubtful if this Persian word is *sprachwirklich* in the first place. If it is, we are probably dealing with a comparatively recent loanword, as suggested by the variation between *kurār* and *kurārā* (Chams Bernard p.c.). As a result, a connection with Niya *kurora* seems unlikely at best.

119. *curorma*, an agricultural product

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *curorma*: CKD 264; 272; 357 (2x); *crorma*: CKD 714
GEN.SG. *cirormaṣa*: CKD 622; *curarmaṣa*: CKD 450
DIR.PL. *crorma*: CKD 264 (3x)

curorma is "some kind of agricultural commodity, sent as tax" (LKD: 90 s.v.). Because of these semantics, Bailey's (1946a: 794) proposal to interpret *curorma* as a loan from a hypothetical Middle Iranian **čīrōrma-* < **čihra-warma-* < *čiθra-warma-* 'face-covering' seems unconvincing.[597]

Burrow (LKD: 90 s.v.) observed that CKD 264 draws a distinction between a *ghriti paśu* and a *curorma paśu*, i.e. a sheep (or goat) used to produce ghee (*ghriti*) or *curorma*. According to Burrow, this distinction could point to *curorma* signifying 'cheese'. Yet, this piece of evidence would also fit Thomas'

[597] Besides, Bailey's etymology works with a long vowel in the first syllable, even though this vowel appears to be short, as it is liable to both colouring (cf. *curorma* vs. *cirorma*) and syncope (*crorma*).

(1934a: 46 fn. 3) proposal that it means 'skin' or 'leather'.[598] So far, neither option has resulted in a convincing etymology.

120. *cojhbo*, a title

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *cojhbo*: CKD 1 (2x); 3 (2x); 6 (2x); 7 (2x); 9 (2x); 10; 11 (2x); 13 (2x); 14 (2x); 15 (3x); 16; 17 (2x); 18; 19; 20 (2x); 23; 24 (2x); 26; 27 (2x); 28; 29 (2x); 30; 31 (2x); 33 (2x); 35; 36 (2x); 37 (2x); 39 (2x); 42 (2x); 44; 45 (2x); 46 (2x); 47 (2x); 49 (3x); 50; 51; 52 (2x); 53 (2x); 56; 57; 58; 61; 63 (3x); 68 (2x); 70 (2x); 71 (2x); 72 (3x); 85; 86 (2x); 97; 99; 100; 103; 104; 113; 114; 115; 118; 119; 120; 124 (6x); 126; 127 (2x); 130 (5x); 133 (2x); 134; 136 (2x); 138; 139 (2x); 142; 144 (2x); 145; 147; 150; 152; 153; 155; 156 (2x); 157; 158; 159; 160 (2x); 161 (2x); 162 (3x); 164; 165 (2x); 166; 184; 186; 189; 192; 193; 194; 198, etc.

GEN.SG. *cojhboaṣa*: CKD 247; 370

GEN.PL. *cojhboana*: CKD 22; 40; 55 (2x); 62 (2x); 64; 84; 88; 119; 126; 214; 322; 332; 360; 367; 421; 430 (2x); 435 (2x); 438 (2x); 490; 492; 494 (2x); 515; 532 (2x); 554; 576; 578; 582; 593 (2x); 842; 854; 884; 889 (3x); *cojhboaṃna*: CKD 709; *cojhboāna*: CKD 107; *cojhboanāṃ*: CKD 576

Compounds

DIR.SG. *mahacojhbo* 'great *cojhbo*': CKD 259; 288; 307; 385; 399; 585; 897; *mahācojhbo*: CKD 585

Despite a wealth of attestations, one cannot easily pinpoint the exact duties of officials referred to in Niya Prakrit as *cojhbo*s (LKD: 90f. s.v.; Atwood 1991: 195f.; Høisæter 2020: 593). The same is true of the cognate titles Tumsh. *cazbā-* (Konow 1935: 816) and TA *cospā* (Bailey 1947: 149; Ching 2019: 13; DTTA: 188).[599]

Niya *cojhbo* and its congeners still lack a convincing etymology. One proposal goes back to Henning (1936: 12 fn. 6 = 1977 I: 390 fn. 6), who,

[598] Some Niya documents are made from goat leather, which may thus have been a tax product. A potential counterargument against the meaning 'leather' is CKD 714. In this document, *crorma* occurs together with *maḱa* and *oḡana,* most likely products for human consumption (cf. §3.2.2 and §6.2 s.vv.).

[599] Unless one is willing to assume an unparalleled simplification from **cojhbuveṇa*, the Gāndhārī ins.sg. *cobuveṇa* (CKI 179) is best kept aside (*pace* Konow 1938b: 239). Any connection with the Bactrian PN ζαζοβο must likewise be regarded as extremely uncertain (BPN: no. 143).

proceeding from a comparison with OAv. *cazdōŋhuuaṇt-*,[600] reconstructed the source of Tumsh. *cazbā-* as a nom.sg. **čazdahwāh*. Henning's derivation is nonetheless unattractive from a phonological point of view (*pace* Tremblay 2005a: 429). **č-* must namely yield Tumsh. *ts-* when not before a front vowel as here (Dragoni 2023b: 120f.), and ad hoc assumptions are needed to account for the vocalism and the *-b-* of Niya *cojhbo.*

According to Bailey (1949a: 127), these words should instead be interpreted as an "East Iranian" derivative of **xšaθra-pāwan-* 'satrap'. This suggestion seems phonologically hardly possible, as **xšaθra-* cannot result in any straightforward way into either Tumsh. *caz-* or Niya *cojh-*.

Equally implausible is the idea that *cojhbo* and its cognates are loanwords from Chin. *zhǔ bù* 主簿 'master, host' + 'register', i.e. 'official scribe' (so e.g. Duan & Tshelothar 2016: 40f.). The (Early) Middle Chinese form of this title can be posited as *tsyuX* + *buX,* and it is not clear, as noted by Ching (2019: 13 fn. 23), where the /z/ in Niya Prakrit (written with 𐨕 *jha*) and Tumshuqese would come from, would this Chinese etymology be correct.

121. *truṣg̱a*, unclear

Compounds

LOC.SG. *truṣg̱akalaṃmi*[601] 'at the *truṣg̱a* time': CKD 581

The concrete meaning of the hapax *truṣg̱a* cannot be decided based on the available context. As the word pairs together with *trubhikṣa* < Skt. *durbhikṣa-* 'famine', one can conjecture *truṣg̱a* to refer to some unfavourable situation.

According to Burrow (1934: 511), *truṣg̱a* could have been made by adding the same prefix *tru-* < Skt. *dur-* 'bad' as in *trubhikṣa* 'famine' (Bailey 1946: 791) to a derivative of OIr. **huška-* 'dry' (e.g. Av. *huška-*). Semantically, this proposal would be conceivable, as *truṣg̱a* could then mean something like 'drought' (TKD: 120). Yet, Burrow's etymology still runs into trouble for

[600] The meaning of OAv. *cazdōŋhuuaṇt-* is not precisely known, but it is glossed in Middle Persian as *wizārtār* 'decider' (AIW: 583). *cazdōŋhuuaṇt-* is the traditional spelling, but Peschl (2022: 99) notes that the manuscript evidence may rather favour *cazdō.aŋhuuaṇt-*. The attested forms are dat.pl. *cazdōṇŋhuuadəbiiō* in Y 31.3 and acc.sg. *cazdōṇghuuaṇtəm* in Y 44.5.

[601] Reading *ɣuṣg̱a* (suggested as an alternative by Burrow 1935a: 783f.; LKD: §49; 96 s.v. *truṣǵa*) is palaeographically unwarranted.

formal reasons since Ir. *-*šk*- ought to be represented in Niya with -*ḱ*- and not with the voiced cluster -*ṣg̲*- (Schoubben 2021; §4.3.18).[602]

122. *Nuava*, ancient name of the Shanshan kingdom

Derivatives

ADJ. *Nuaviya* 'native of Nuava': CKD 883

Compounds

DIR.SG. *Nuavamaharaya* 'great king of Nuava': CKD 187; 581; 648; 655; 656
INS.SG. *Nuavamaharaẏena* 'idem': CKD 842
GEN.SG. *Nuavamaharayaṣa* 'idem': CKD 884
LOC.SG. *Nuavarajaṃmi* 'kingdom of Nuava': CKD 884
GEN.SG. *Mahanuavaṣa* 'great Nuava': CKI 363
DIR.SG. *Mahanuavaraja* 'king of great Nuava': CKD 422; 808; *Mahanuavaraya*: CKD 495
GEN.SG. *Mahanuavarayaṣa* 'idem': CKD 782
DIR.SG. *Mahanuavamaharaya* 'great king of great Nuava': CKD 1; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 24; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30; 31; 32; 33; 36; 37; 38; 39; 40; 42; 45; 46; 47; 49; 52; 53; 54; 55; 56; 57; 62; 63; 64; 68; 70; 71; 116; 124; 134; 135; 136; 143; 144; 156; 169; 180 (2x); 182; 189; 195; 198; 204; 212; 214 (2x); 219; 222; 223; 226; 228; 235; 236; 243; 251; 254; 262; 265; 272; 275; 279; 286; 291; 296; 297; 298, etc.; *Mahanuavamaharāya*: CKD 209; 604; 617; 828; *Mahanuavamaharayā*: CKD 589; *Mahanuaẏamaharaya*: CKD 430; 639; *Mahanuhavamaharaya*: CKD 339; 401; 569; 582; 593; 709; 732; *Mahanuhavamaharāya*: CKD 478

It had been generally accepted since Stein (1903: 361; 1907: 321; 325; 366) that *(maha)nuava maharaya* in the opening formula of many Niya documents would correspond to Skt. *mahānubhāva- mahārāja-* 'His Majesty the Great King' (LKD: 101 s.v. *nuava*; 111 s.v. *mahanuava*). In a recent article, Loukota (2020: 102–105) could prove that *Nuava* is instead the endonym of the Shanshan kingdom.

Based on this new interpretation, Duan Qing (*apud* Loukota 2020: 103) etymologised *Nuava* as "a compound of the stems **nau*- "new" … and a form akin to Khotanese *āvū*, *auv*- "village"". One can ask whether the resulting meaning 'new village' is so appropriate as the name of a kingdom. There are moreover some formal issues with Duan's suggestion. **nau*- "new" is not attested on its own in Khotanese and only found in the synchronically untransparent *nūvara*- 'new' < **nawa-kară*- (cf. Sogd. *nwkr* 'now'; Bactr.

[602] Burrow's (1934: 511; LKD: §49) suggestion that *ṣk* is sometimes voiced intervocalically is phonologically unlikely (cf. fn. 687).

πιδονωγαρο ‘anew, again’).[603] In addition, the Khotanese word for ‘village’ is more accurately transcribed as *āguta-* / *āguva-* / *āvua-* (Skjærvø 2004 II: 240f. *contra* DKS: 15; 48), and the spelling variation between *-g-* and *-v-* suggests that these are mere orthographic hiatus fillers (Federico Dragoni p.c.), which would not necessarily be rendered as Niya *-v-* (variant *-y̲-*). All in all, it thus seems best to suspend judgement on the etymology of *Nuava*.

123. *paṃcara* ‘animal provisions’

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *paṃcara*: CKD 349
INS.SG. *paṃcarena*: CKD 816 (5x)
DIR.PL. *paṃcare*: CKD 40

Derivatives

ADJ. *paṃcaraïṃna* ‘concerning the animal provisions’: CKD 146 (2x); *paṃcarayina*: CKD 146; *paṃcyarayina*: CKD 65.

Burrow (LKD: 102 s.v.) and Lüders (1940b: 39–43) noted that *paṃcara* by default refers to corn (*aṃna*) given to royal camels going on a journey, hence the approximate translation ‘animal provisions’.[604]

According to Harmatta (1960: 212), the original form of the word would have been **paṃcaraga*, which he proposed to interpret as a loan from a hypothetical MIr. **pačaraγ* < **paččaraγ* < OIr. **paθya-čaraka-*, literally ‘travel fodder’ (cf. MP *čarag* ‘fodder’). I find this etymology unconvincing for several reasons. To begin with, there is no good evidence that the original form of the Niya word was indeed **paṃcaraga*. In Harmatta’s view, the form *paṃcare* in CKD 40 would be from **paṃcaraga* via **paṃcarae*. Yet, nothing precludes *paṃcare* from being a dir.pl. in *-e* from an underlying *paṃcara* (so Baums & Glass 2002a– s.v.; cf. LKD: §60). More severely, Harmatta has to postulate a change from **-θy-* to **-č-* that is unparalleled in the known Middle Iranian

[603] For the derivation of Khot. *nūvara-* adopted here, see BD II (255) *contra* DKS (189) and Degener (1989: 268).
[604] Cf. Lüders (1940b: 43): “Es scheint also, daß der *paṃcara* ein bestimmtes Maß Korn war, das den Benutzern der Kamele des königlichen Gestüts zur Verpflegung der Tiere mitgegeben wurde.” *paṃcara* seems to stand in a complementary distribution with *pacēvara*, an Iranian loanword referring to the provisions humans take with them whilst travelling (see §3.6 s.v.).

languages.[605] Finally, his etymology does not account for the consistently written anusvāra in *paṃcara*, which Harmatta counter-intuitively explains away as being "unetymological".

124. *potg̲e* 'water tank'; *potg̲a* / *potg̲oña*, a type of wine

Attestations of the base forms
DIR.SG. *potg̲e* 'water tank': CKD 701
LOC.SG. *potg̲eyaṃmi* 'idem': CKD 204; 397 (3x)
potge ///: CKD 333
ADJ. *potg̲a*, a type of wine: CKD 225
ADJ.DIR.SG. *potg̲oña*[606], a type of wine: CKD 796
ADJ.INS.SG. *potg̲oñena* 'idem': CKD 207; 574 (3x); 637 (7x)

Derivatives

ADJ. *potg̲eci* 'related to the water tank': CKD 347

Compounds

DIR.SG. *ṣitg̲apotg̲eya* '*ṣitg̲a* water tank': CKD 259
ABL.SG. *ṣitg̲apotg̲eyade* 'idem': CKD 120
LOC.SG. *ṣitg̲apotg̲eyaṃmi* 'idem': CKD 120

The semantics of *potg̲e* have been interpreted in two different ways: whereas Burrow (LKD: 107 s.v.) hypothesised *potg̲e* to refer to a 'water tank' used for irrigation, Bailey (1951a: 925; 1954a: 129ff.) opined that this word means 'kitchen'. With the help of archaeological evidence, Bertrand (2012: 27–35 *et passim*) could prove that Burrow's is the more likely option, thereby rendering Bailey's suggestion of an etymological relationship between *potg̲e* and OIr. **puxta-ka-* 'cooked' obsolete.[607]

---

[605] In a later article (1964b: 376), Harmatta seems to imply that **pačaraγ* would be a Bactrian word, but contrast the development of **-θy-* in Bactr. χοβο < **hwa-paθya-* (§5.3.4.1).
[606] The reading *poḡoña* in Baums & Glass (2002b–) is to be corrected to *potg̲oña.*
[607] Bailey's etymology was, in any case, implausible in that a kitchen is 'a place where one cooks' and not 'something cooked'. *Pace* Bailey, it is moreover phonologically impossible to derive the element *ṣitg̲a-* in *ṣitg̲apotg̲eya* (CKD 120 (2x); 259) out of OIA **śr̥taka-* 'cooked'. The cluster *-tg̲-* in both *ṣitg̲a-* and *potg̲e* suggests that these words are borrowings from Bactrian. The same origin is suggested by Bertrand's (2012: 35–46) archaeological observation that the water tanks discovered in the territory of ancient Niya are inspired by tanks used in ancient Bactria and Gandhāra. No convincing etymology of either *ṣitg̲a-* or *potg̲e* has presented itself, however.

It remains an open question if the similarly looking adjectives *potga* / *potgoña*, both indicating a type of wine (*masu*), are historically related to *potge*. Whatever the answer, there is no hard-and-fast evidence in support of Henning's claim (1948: 603 fn. 3 = 1977 II: 317 fn. 3; cf. also Harmatta 1967: 10ff.) that *masu potga* (*potgoña*) is connected with Pers. *maipuxte* 'boiled wine, a sweet decoction of grape-juice or must with spices added' < **madu*- 'wine' + **puxta-ka*- 'cooked' (see further §3.7.2 s.v. *mepoga*).[608]

125. *pothi*, unclear

Attestations of the base form

DIR.PL. *pothi*: CKD 534

Compounds

DIR.SG. *carmapothithavitaga* 'deposit of a *pothi* made of skin': CKD 17

Niya Pkt. *pothi* occurs in a list mentioning deposited goods (CKD 534) and in the compound *carmapothithavitaga* 'deposit of a *pothi* made of skin' (CKD 17). More is not known about its semantics.

Burrow (LKD: 107 s.v.) tentatively compared *pothi* to MP/NP *pōst* 'skin' < **pawasta*- (CPD: 69; DMMP: 287). Yet, the cluster -*st*- is, including in borrowings from Iranian (cf. §4.3.14), preserved in Niya Prakrit, a point conceded by Burrow (TKD: 106).[609] In the other known MIA languages, -*st*- does develop to a voiceless aspirated dental (cf. e.g. Pāli *potthaka*- < *pustaka*-). As, however, positing interdialectal borrowing from a more eastern Prakrit would be a costly assumption in the case of Iranian loanwords, I remain hesitant to accept Burrow's etymology.

---

[608] Lüders (1936b: 642 fn. 3) compared the element -*oñ*- in *potgoña* to the Khotanese abstract suffix -*auña*- (on which see Degener 1989: 158ff.). This comparison remains to be confirmed by lack of an obvious Khotanese source of the base word. *potgoña* is moreover an adjective instead of an abstract noun. Burrow (LKD: 107f.) and Harmatta (1967: 11) additionally refer to a Tocharian B suffix -*oñe*, but such a suffix does not exist; a word such as TB *ompalskoñe* 'meditation, contemplation' is to be analysed as *ompalsko* 'meditation' + abstract suffix -*ñňe* (DoT: 125) and does not contain a suffix -*oñe* (there does exist an abstract suffix -*auñe*; cf. Peyrot 2008: 43f.).

[609] CDIAL's (no. 8414) comparison with Lahndā *pothī* 'fleece' does not solve this problem.

126. *miṣi,* a type of land

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *miṣi*: CKD 235 (3x); 655; 782; *miṣiya*: CKD 571; 580 (3x); 582; 715; 805 (3x); *miṣiye*: CKD 808
GEN.SG. *miṣiyaṣa*: CKD 571
ABL.SG. *miṣiyade*: CKD 296; 808
LOC.SG. *miṣiyaṃmi*: CKD 90; 212; 327; 419; 571; 572

Derivatives

ADJ. *miṣiyeci*: CKD 582

While it is beyond dispute that the Niya word *miṣi* denotes a specific type of agricultural land, its more exact semantics are yet to be determined (LKD: 111 s.v.; see also §3.7.2 s.v. *akri*).

Etymologically, Niya *miṣi* belongs together with Khot. *miṣ(ṣ)a-* (also *mäṣ(ṣ)a-*; DKS: 332f.), TA *miṣi* (DTTA: 348), and TB *miṣ(ṣ)e* (DoT: 498), all three of them translation equivalents of Skt. *kṣetra-* 'field'.[610] But the exact relationship between these words is, as shown below, difficult to disentangle, to the point that one cannot be sure if Niya *miṣi* is an Iranian loanword or not (see also Dragoni 2023b: 153–156).

The one reasonably clear thing is that TA *miṣi* and TB *miṣ(ṣ)e* are not inherited in these languages since it is impossible to reconstruct a single proto-form out of TA *miṣi* and TB *miṣ(ṣ)e* (Peyrot 2018a: 269). Formally, Niya *miṣi* could be the source of the Tocharian A form. Yet, for TB *miṣ(ṣ)e*, one probably needs a different source as the final vowels of Niya *miṣi* and TB *miṣ(ṣ)e* do not match up. In any case, the word is probably not Indic in origin, as it is hard to substantiate Burrow's (LKD: §38; 111 s.v.) derivation from Skt. *miśrya-* 'mixed' semantically.

Are the Niya and Tocharian words then loans from Khot. *miṣ(ṣ)a-*? Here again, the details are complicated. When taking into account that in the earliest Old Khotanese, the nom.sg. of *miṣ(ṣ)a-* ended in *-ä* and that the Khotanese vowels *ä* and *i* merged relatively early, one could theoretically

[610] It remains an open question whether Arm. *mṣak* 'farmer' and other Caucasian forms are also connected (so Bailey 1953: 539, but cf. Peyrot 2018a: 269 fn. 31). Khot. *ttumäṣä* 'seed-field' cited by Burrow is a ghost word (cf. Maggi *apud* SVK III: 69f.). The <ṣ> (variant <ṣṣ>) in Khot. *miṣ(ṣ)a-* stands for a voiceless single [ʂ] (Dragoni 2023b: 155).

regard Niya *miṣi* and TA *miṣi* as borrowings from Khotanese.[611] TB *miṣ(ṣ)e* is less easily interpretable as a loan from Khotanese as the final *-e* remains difficult to explain (see Peyrot 2018a: 269). An additional issue with taking Khotanese as the donor language is that Khot. *miṣ(ṣ)a-* does not have a convincing inner-Iranian etymology itself; Bailey made various etymological proposals (1953: 538f.; 1956a; 1958a; DKS: 332f.), but none of them works well (see Dragoni 2023b: 155).

To conclude, Niya *miṣi* is definitely related to Khot. *miṣ(ṣ)a-*, TA *miṣi*, and TB *miṣ(ṣ)e*. As long as the etymology of these words and the exact paths of borrowing remain unknown, one cannot determine if Niya *miṣi* is an Iranian loanword or if one should, for instance, posit independent borrowings from a non-Iranian language of the area (an option briefly considered by Dragoni 2023b: 156).

127. *muḱaṣi,* woman exchanged within exogamous marriage practices

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *muḱaṣi*: CKD 279; 338; 474 (2x); 481; 555; 585; 817 (2x)

The semantics and etymology of *muḱaṣi*, a word mistakenly read as *mukeṣi* in earlier scholarship, have been discussed in Schoubben (2021: 54–56). Building further on Burrow (LKD: 115–117 s.v. *lote*) and Padwa (2007: 211–215), I argued in my article that *muḱaṣi* is a technical term, referring to women given in reciprocal exchange in the context of exogamous marriage practices (cf. also §3.2.3 s.v. *muṣḍhaṣi*). A new attestation of *muḱaṣi* in the Schøyen manuscript MS 4579/1/2, a Niya document to be published in Baums (fthc.), yields further support for this argument:

(3.34) Schøyen MS 4579/1/2
asti maṃnuśa aṣ[ga]ra Lýimirkeya nāma se uthida kāla Rutrayena saṃñavita stri Suhapriyae nita muḱaṣi dita stri Cogaroae nama aṃña 3 arohaga aśpa trevarṣaga 1
"There is a man, a herald (?)[612] with the name Lýimirke. He arose and made an agreement with the *kāla* Rutraya. He [i.e. Lýimirke] married the woman Suhapriyae (and) as exchange woman (*muḱaṣi*) he gave a

[611] Khotanese borrowings into Tocharian normally end in *-o* (← acc.sg. *-u*), however (Dragoni 2023b).
[612] For the provisional translation of *aṣgara* as 'herald', see §3.2.3 s.v.

> woman called Cogaroae. In addition (*aṃña*), (he gave) a mountable (*arohaga*) three-year-old horse." (tr. mine).

As it is clearly the case in (3.34) that the woman (*strī*) Cogaroae should first be given (*dita*) as a *muḱaṣi* before Suhapriyae can marry with Lýimirke, it fits my approximate translation of *muḱaṣi* as 'exchange woman'.

Observing that the letter *ḱ* in *muḱaṣi* ought to stand for the combination of a sibilant and a *k* (cf. §2.1.6), I furthermore argued that *muḱaṣi* is a loan from an unattested Bactrian word *μοβκοβι /muškəšĭ/ 'exchanged woman' < OIr. **mišta-ka-strī-*. I would now like to retract this etymology. It still seems likely to me that *muḱaṣi* goes back to a compound ending in **strī-* 'woman' (cf. also §3.2.3 s.v. *muṣḍhaṣi*). But my assumption that **mišta-ka-* could be analysed as a verbal adj. of the PIr. root *√*Hmaiǰ* 'to exchange' (EDIV: 178) can hardly be justified: since *√*Hmaiǰ* would go back to PIE *√*h₂meigʷ* (Gr. ἀμείβω 'to (ex)change'), its verbal adj. could only be **mixta*(*-ka*)-, not ***mišta(-ka)-*. [613] So, for now, *muḱaṣi* remains without a convincing etymology.

128. *mepoga*, unclear commodity

Attestations of the base form

DIR.SG. *mepoga*: CKD 721

Henning (1948: 603 fn. 3 = 1977: 317 fn. 3) compared Niya *mepoga*, a hapax legomenon of unclear semantics, to Pers. *maipuxte* 'boiled wine, a sweet decoction of grape-juice or must with spices added'.[614] As it would be hard to explain a simplification of Pers. *-xt-* to Niya *-g-* /ɣ/, Henning's etymology is best viewed with scepsis.

[613] An additional issue is that the reconstruction of PIr. *√*Hmaiǰ* 'to exchange' rests on flimsy grounds. I provisionally accept Sims-Williams' idea to derive Bactr. μιγδο < **mixta-* from this root (Sims-Williams 1997a: 24; BD II: 232); but (i) one would like supporting evidence for the reconstruction of PIr. *√*Hmaiǰ* from other (Indo-)Iranian languages (not only from Greek), and (ii) there have been alternative interpretations of Bactr. μιγδο (see Skjærvø 2005: 315; Cheung 2009: 53–57).

[614] *maipuxte* was also borrowed into Syriac as *mypwkt'* (Ciancaglini 2008: 205).

129. *śiti* ‘side, direction’

Attestations of the base form

LOC.SG. *śitiyaṃmi*: CKD 604

Compounds

LOC.SG. *dakṣinaśitiyaṃmi* ‘southern side’: CKD 678

The Niya word *śiti* is attested twice in the loc.sg.[615]

(3.35) CKD 604 obverse 3
yaṃ kālaṃ Ramakaṣa śitiyaṃmi Caṣgeya soṃgha anita taṃ k[a]laṃ muṃtra biṃnitaga ṣoṭha[ṃ]gha Lýipeya.
“When Caṣgeya brought *soṃgha* (= ?) to (in) the *śiti* of Ramaka, at that time the *ṣoṭhaṃgha* Lýipeya broke the seal.” (after TKD: 128).

(3.36) CKD 678 under-tablet obverse 2f.
se Cimaka Kroraïṃnaṃmi mahaṃta nagaraṣa dakṣina śitiyaṃmi bhuma kurora tre milimi pramaṃna Yapguvasya vaṃti vikrita.
“This Cimaka sold to Yapgu *kurora* land with a capacity (for seed) of three *milima* (situated) on the south *śiti* (*dakṣina śitiyaṃmi*) of the great city.” (after TKD: 139).

Drawing chiefly on (3.35), Burrow (1934: 511) plausibly assigned the meaning ‘side, direction’ to *śiti.*

Seeing that *śiti* lacks an obvious Indo-Aryan cognate, Burrow (1934: 511f.; LKD: 125 s.v. *śitiyaṃmi*) suspected it to be an Iranian loanword. In Burrow’s view, *śiti* could have been borrowed from a cognate of Av. *šiti-* ‘dwelling’ (~ Skt. *kṣiti-*), but he had to admit that Ir. *š-* would be more likely borrowed with *ṣ-* in Niya Prakrit. [616] Attempting to circumvent this problem, Burrow considered the possibility of a palatalisation of **ṣi-* > *śi-*. However, such a palatalisation would be entirely ad hoc, given that an onset *ṣi-* is attested in Niya Prakrit loanwords, e.g. in *ṣitgapotge* (CKD 120; 259). A further issue with Burrow’s idea is the non-trivial semantic development from ‘dwelling’

[615] Reading the word as ***yiti*, as considered in Burrow 1934: 511f., can be excluded because the right-most vertical line of the akṣara is too long to read 𐨬 *yi* instead of 𐨪 *śi*.

[616] There could be a precedent for this substitution if one accepts Weber’s (1997: 37) proposal that the element *śir-* in the Niya PNs *Śirjhata* (also *Śīrjhata*) and *Śirmitra* should be identified with Sogd. *šyr* ‘good’.

to ‘side, direction’ one would have to assume. I therefore do not accept Burrow’s etymology.

130. *sanapru*, unclear

Attestations of the base form
DIR.SG. *sanapru*: CKD 660; *sānapru*: CKD 660

Basing himself on the fact that it is used to modify *paṭa* ‘silk roll’, Bailey (1946: 781f.; 1961: 482; 1966: 35) interpreted *sanapru* as an additional witness of the Iranian term for ‘vermilion’ attested via OP *sinkabruš* ‘red stone, carnelian’ (Schmitt 2014: 243; Brust 2018: 310), NP *šangarf* ‘cinnabar’ (CPED: 763), Sogd. *synqrb* ‘cinnabar’ (Sims-Williams 2019a: 93; 172; DCS^2: 179), and Arm. *sngoyr* ‘rouge, paint’ (Olsen 1999: 906). The context does, however, not necessitate *sanapru* to be a colour term in the first place,[617] and there is only a weak phonological similarity with the Iranian words cited.[618] Thus, it seems best to reject Bailey’s etymology.

131. *soṃstaṃni* ‘trousers’

Attestations of the base form
DIR.PL. *soṃstaṃni*: CKD 149

Seeing that the dir.pl. *soṃstaṃni* occurs in a list of textile products, one can agree with Lüders (1936a: 22) that this hapax legomenon is etymologically connected to Skt. *sunthaṇā-* (v.l. *saṃthaṇā*) in *Mahāvyutpatti* 5849 (~ Tib. *dor ma* ‘trousers’ and Chin. *kù zǐ* 褲子 ‘idem’; BHSD: 556; 599). Other forms of the same Sanskrit word are *sunthāṇa-* in the Lexicon Bacot 81 b1 (~ Tib. *dor ma*); *sūthāṃna-* in a Sanskrit-Khotanese bilingual (~ Khot. *kaumadai* ‘trousers’; Bailey 1938: 532); and *svasthāna-* (v.l. *svasthagana-*) in the *Harṣacarita* (Agrawala 1951: 16). Further cognates are found in NIA, e.g.

[617] Bailey drew a comparison with *paṭa paṃdura* (also CKD 660), assuming *paṃdura* to be derived from Skt. *pāṇḍura-* ‘white, yellow’. It is, however, far from certain that *paṃdura* is indeed connected to *pāṇḍura-*, given that this etymology requires the retroflex cluster *-ṇḍ-* to have become a dental *-ṃd-* /nd/ (cf. perhaps *dhaṃta* ‘punishment, fine’ < *daṇḍa-* in CKD 348; 419).
[618] The *-n-* in the Niya form does not correspond to the cluster of a nasal and a velar stop in the Iranian forms, and the variant spelling *sānapru* suggests a long vowel in the first syllable for which there is no evidence in Iranian.

Hindi *sūthan*, Lahndā *sutthan*, Romani *sosten*; and Nuristani languages, e.g. Ashkun *ṣätū / ṣäṭū*, Waigali *so(n)ta* (CDIAL: no. 13468).

According to Bailey (1954c: 16–18; 1956b), these lexemes would be loanwords from a Middle Iranian outcome of a presumed compound **srauni-starana-* 'covering of the hips'. If so, the phonology of Niya *soṃstaṃni* is not easily accounted for. To begin with, Bailey is required to postulate a change from **-starana-* over **-starna-* to Niya *-staṃna-*. Both these steps can be paralleled independently of one another but not in one and the same word.[619] Still worse is that out of **sr-*, one would expect an initial retroflex in Niya Prakrit and not the dental *s-* shown by *soṃstaṃni*.[620] Aware of this problem, Bailey conjectured that Niya Prakrit borrowed the word through the intermediary of a more eastern Prakrit where all sibilants became dentals. In my view, such a scenario seems hardly likely for an Iranian loanword.

Thus, despite the approval of Szemerényi (1959: 75) and Mayrhofer (EWAia III: 515f.), there is reason to doubt Bailey's etymology.

3.8 Reference list

By way of conclusion, the list below gives a synopsis of the data pertaining to Iranian lexical influence on Niya Prakrit collected and scrutinised in the present chapter. It outlines the different categories distinguished and lists the words belonging to each class.

Secure loanwords from Bactrian (§3.2.1)

1. *aviṃdama* 'fine, recompense'
2. *kṣ̱una* 'date, reign, regnal year'
3. *guśura* 'prince'
4. *jheniga* 'in charge of, under the care of'
5. *daśavida* 'chief of ten households'
6. *nokṣ̱ari* 'month of the new year'
7. *prigha* '(monochrome) damask'
8. *laṣ̱i* 'gift'
9. *lastana* 'dispute, lawsuit'
10. *vaga* 'rent (paid for the use of land)'

[619] For the first step, cf. Niya *vastarna* 'bedding' (CKD 565) next to *vastarana* < Skt. *upastaraṇa-*, and for the second, cf. Niya *vaṃna* 'colour' (CKD 501) < Skt. *varṇa-*.

[620] Ashkun *ṣätū / ṣäṭū* is the only form with an initial retroflex. Could this be due to contamination with NP *šalwār* 'trousers'?

11. *valaga* ‘animal keeper’
12. *śadavida* ‘chief of a hundred households’
13. *ṣada* ‘pleased, happy’
14. *Suliga* ‘Sogdian’
15. *stora* ‘large animal, horse, camel’ (also *storabala* ‘animal flock’; *storavara* ‘horse driver’; *storvana* ‘groom’)
16. *sṕara* / *sṕura* ‘full, completely’

Plausible loanwords from Bactrian (§3.2.2)

17. *aṃtagi* ‘belonging to the district’
18. *are* ‘a half’
19. *aśpista* ‘lucerne’
20. *Khotaṃna* ‘Khotan’
21. *jenavida* ‘chief of the armour’
22. *nihaṃñ-* ‘to deposit, to put down’
23. *picara* ‘(mark of) honour’
24. *maḱa* ‘bean’
25. *milima*, a unit of measure
26. *yatma* ‘measurer of rations’
27. *vaṣe* ‘garments’
28. *saste* ‘day, elapsed’

Arguable loanwords from Bactrian (§3.2.3)

29. *aṃbukaya*, a title
30. *aco* ‘frontier, border post’ (also *acoviṃna* ‘border official’; *Acomena*, place name)
31. *aḍini* ‘(broomcorn) millet’
32. *atga* ‘additional, complementary’
33. *avaliḱa* ‘swaddle’
34. *aṣgara* ‘herald (?)’
35. *oḍ-* ‘to let go’
36. *caṃkura* ‘imposer of penalties’
37. *tim-* ‘to be concerned about, to be angry’
38. *toṃga*, a title
39. *nihala* ‘settlement, agreement’
40. *paḱe* ‘allotment, share’
41. *picav-* ‘to hand over’
42. *piro* ‘military post, fort’
43. *badho* ‘pledge, mortgage’
44. *muṣḍhaṣi*, woman exchanged within exogamous marriage practices
45. *leṣ-* ‘to dispatch, to conduct’

46. *vaṣḍhiga*, festival on the mountain
47. *yapga* ‘weaver’
48. *sujinakirta* ‘needlework, embroidery’

Tentative loanwords from Bactrian (§3.2.4)

49. *apcira*, a unit of measure (for vineyards)
50. *kilme* ‘family estate’ (also *vegakilme* ‘outside (?) the family estate’)
51. *taravara* ‘sword’
52. *reda* ‘seed, sprout (?)’
53. *Remena*, place name
54. *laṭhana* ‘plain, open land (?)’
55. *lastuga*, textile product
56. *ṣvaṭhaṃgha* / *ṣoṭhaṃga* ‘finance officer’

Secure loanwords from Bactrian or another language (§3.3.1)

57. *ajhate* ‘free, noble’
58. *śpaṣa* ‘watching, guarding’
59. *harga* ‘dues, tax’

Plausible loanwords from Bactrian or another language (§3.3.2)

60. *aṭa* ‘flour’
61. *ayana* ‘village, territory of a clan’
62. *gavāša* ‘deer, stag’
63. *tavastaga* ‘carpet’
64. *draṃga* ‘office’ (also *draṃgadhara* ‘office holder’)
65. *namata* ‘felt’
66. *paraṣa* ‘abduction, plundering’
67. *parivanae* ‘burden, provisions’
68. *pravaṃnaga* ‘(authoritative) document’
69. *maravara* ‘accountant’
70. *raji* ‘cloak, woollen cloth’

Arguable loanwords from Bactrian or another language (§3.3.3)

71. *agiṣḍha* ‘cover, rug’
72. *ageta* ‘tax collector’
73. *kojava* ‘rug, blanket’
74. *namanaga* / *namaṃniya* ‘exchange’
75. *pajhavaṃta* ‘breastband (?)’
76. *rasaṃna* ‘rope (?)’
77. *vara* ‘load’
78. *ṣaṃna* ‘hemp, hempen (?)’
79. *hastama* ‘quarrel, dispute’

Tentative loanwords from Bactrian or another language (§3.3.4)

80. *ujhmayuga* ‘trustworthy, skilled (?)’

Bactrian PNs (§3.4.2)

81. *Apge*
82. *Katge*
83. *Kamlana*
84. *Kutge*
85. *Namilga*
86. *Palge*
87. *Pitga*
88. *Lamga*
89. *Larsu*
90. *Vhurmajheva*

Secure non-Bactrian loanwords (§3.5.1)

91. *gaṃña* ‘treasury’ (also *gaṃñavara* ‘treasurer’)
92. *thavaṃnaga* ‘cloth’
93. *darṣ-* ‘to load (a beast of burden)’ (also *darṣa* ‘load’)
94. *divira* ‘scribe’
95. *dhane*, a unit of measure
96. *prahoni* ‘garment’
97. *mudra* ‘seal’
98. *hinajha* ‘army commander’

Plausible non-Bactrian loanwords (§3.5.2)

99. *khakhordi* ‘witch’

Arguable non-Bactrian loanwords (§3.5.3)

100. *ratu*, a religious title

Tentative non-Bactrian loanwords (§3.5.4)

101. *denuga*, a title (?)
102. *rotaṃna* ‘madder (?)’

Iranian loanwords from an unidentified source (§3.6)

103. *anada* ‘carefully’
104. *kremeru* ‘crimson, scarlet’
105. *nacīra* ‘hunting’
106. *pacevara* ‘provisions (for a journey)’
107. *bhaṭaraga* ‘lord, owner’

Rejected etymologies: possibly Indo-Aryan words (§3.7.1)

108. *kharaɣarna* ‘donkey-coloured (?)’
109. *baṃna* ‘bundle’
110. *masu* ‘wine’

Rejected etymologies: words of unknown origin (§3.7.2)

111. *akri*, a type of land
112. *arnavaji* (or *ardavaji*?), textile product
113. *asaṃkharajiya*, textile product
114. *ogu*, a title
115. *kamaṃta* / *kamuṃta*, unclear
116. *kala*, a title
117. *kuɬhakṣira*, unclear
118. *kurora*, an adjective specifying a type of land
119. *curorma*, an agricultural product
120. *cojhbo*, a title
121. *truṣga*, unclear
122. *Nuava*, ancient name of the Shanshan kingdom
123. *paṃcara* ‘animal provisions’
124. *potge* ‘water tank’; *potga*/*potgoña*, a type of wine
125. *pothi*, unclear
126. *miṣi*, a type of land
127. *mukaṣi,* woman exchanged within exogamous marriage practices
128. *mepoga*, unclear commodity
129. *śiti* ‘side, direction’
130. *sanapru*, unclear
131. *soṃstaṃni* ‘trousers’