



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **“In the tune of the king of Khotan”: the name of Khotan in the Tarim Basin and beyond**

Dragoni, F.

### **Citation**

Dragoni, F. (2023). “In the tune of the king of Khotan”: the name of Khotan in the Tarim Basin and beyond. *Journal Of The American Oriental Society*, 143(2), 289-308. doi:10.7817/jaos.143.2.2023.ar011

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3626910>

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

# “In the Tune of the King of Khotan”: The Name of Khotan in the Tarim Basin and Beyond

FEDERICO DRAGONI  
LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

The name of Khotan (Old Khotanese *hvatana-*) is attested in Chinese, Niya Prakrit, Tibetan, Sogdian, and Old Uyghur. Strangely, the name has not previously been identified in Tocharian and Bactrian. This paper argues that a form of the name of Khotan is actually attested in Tocharian A and B and was borrowed from native speakers of Pre- or Old Khotanese. Moreover, the Bactrian documents may have preserved a form of the name of Khotan as well. The analysis of the newly identified forms enables a fresh examination of the borrowing directions of the name of Khotan in the Tarim Basin and beyond and allows several historical and linguistic conclusions.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The first historical notices of the existence of the reign of Khotan can be found in the *Shiji* 史記 and in the *Hànshū* 漢書. They report the mission of the Chinese envoy *Zhāng Qiān* 張騫 to the West during the second half of the second century BCE (Kumamoto 2009). At that time, Khotan was already an organized urban entity. Some centuries later, the fame of Khotan as an important center of Buddhist studies and a significant commercial hub on the Silk Road was diffused in the whole of the Tarim Basin and beyond. In fact, the name of Khotan is attested in almost all neighboring languages (Chinese, Tibetan, Niya Prakrit, Sogdian, and Old Uyghur). Strangely, no mention of Khotan is found in the Tocharian sources. With such a wealth of historical sources, and given the geographical proximity of Tocharian speakers, the silence of the Tocharian documents seems quite odd. In this contribution I argue that the name of Khotan was actually known to the Tocharian people and that it was directly borrowed from Khotanese speakers in the first centuries CE. Further, I put forward the hypothesis that OKh. *hvatana-* ‘Khotanese’ was borrowed also into Bactrian in the same period. The discussion consists of the following parts:

- §1. Introduction
- §2. The Name of Khotan in Khotanese and Tumshuqese
- §3. Foreign Names of Khotan and Its People
- §4. The Name of Khotan in Bactrian: A New Proposal
- §5. Other Forms of the Name of Khotan
- §6. The Name of Khotan in Tocharian: A New Identification
- §7. Dating of the Borrowing into Tocharian and Bactrian
- §8. Conclusions and Outlook

---

*Author's note:* This research was supported by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO, project number 276-70-028). An earlier version of this paper was presented during the two hundred and thirty-first meeting of the American Oriental Society (March 14, 2021). I am grateful to Michaël Peyrot, Nicholas Sims-Williams, Niels Schoubben, Mauro Maggi, Alessandro Del Tomba, and Abel Warries for comments on an earlier draft of this paper. My deepest thanks go to Stephanie Jamison, whose detailed remarks were instrumental in giving the paper its final form, and to the three anonymous reviewers.

## 2. THE NAME OF KHOTAN IN KHOTANESE AND TUMSHUQESE

The oldest form of the name of Khotan is OKh. *hvatana-*. On the history of this identification in general one may consult Konow 1914: 342; Leumann 1933–36: VIII; Konow 1935: 799–801; KT IV: 1; Pelliot 1959: 408–25; Emmerick 1968b: 88; KT VI: 431–32. The following sections examine the attested forms in Old Khotanese, Tumshuqese, and Late Khotanese.

## 2.1. Old Khotanese

Most of the Old Khotanese material for the name of Khotan is found in the Book of Zambasta. In this text (Z), the following expressions containing the name of Khotan are found: *hvatānā rre* (Z 5.114) ‘the Khotanese king’  
*hvatana-* (Z 23.4) ‘the Khotanese (people)’  
*hvatāna-kṣīra* (Z 23.14, 15.9) ‘the Khotanese realm’  
*hvatanau* (Z 23.4 etc.) ‘in the Khotanese (language)’

The phonological development of *hvatana-* as accepted in the scholarly literature is outlined in Maggi (2009: 156): OKh. *hvatana-* > OKh. *hvatāna-* > LKh. *hvaṃna-* > LKh. *hvana-*. Maggi (2009: 157) also provides a useful statistic: in this text the name occurs ten times, five times with weakening of the medial vowel (*hvatāna-*) and five times without (*hvatana-*). Another source for the oldest form *hvatana-* in Old Khotanese is found in the preface to the Khotanese version of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* (§0.17, see Suv I: 8). A further, more surprising occurrence of *hvatana-* is to be found in a later manuscript from Dunhuang (P 2023.8, on which see Emmerick 1992: 38), where it should probably be seen as an attempt of the scribe to confer to the text a more authoritative Old Khotanese appearance. This could show that the oldest form of the name was known to Khotanese speakers throughout the whole history of the language. The adjective *hvatam-kṣīraa-* ‘of the land of Khotan’, occurring in Suv 0.19, shows no weakening and syncope of the middle vowel *a* of the compound adjective *\*hvatana-kṣīraa-*. Konow (1935: 799) claimed that a shorter form *hvata-* may also have existed in a compound *hvata-kṣīra-* (Leumann 1920: 176), but this reading has been rejected by Emmerick (SDTV I: 26). He convincingly argued that the first akṣara of *hvata-kṣīra-* cannot be read as *hva*.<sup>1</sup>

## 2.2. Tumshuqese

The identification of the name of Khotan in the Tumshuqese documents is fraught with problems. Konow (1935: 799–801) sought to recognize OKh. *hvatana-* in Tq. *hvaḍ<sub>1</sub>na* (HL 8b6) and *hvaḍ<sub>1</sub>ane* (HL 6.67). He put forward the hypothesis that this could be a relic of the ethnic name of the people who, coming from the north, first settled in the northwest of the Tarim Basin. This could well be possible, but it is very difficult to prove.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the passages in which *hvaḍ<sub>1</sub>na* and *hvaḍ<sub>1</sub>ane* occur are obscure and several alternative interpretations are possible. In light of these facts, the alleged Tumshuqese name of Khotan will not be further considered in this study.<sup>3</sup>

1. He tentatively proposes *cī*, but this seems difficult as well. The upper part of the akṣara could perhaps be read as *ta*, but the lower part remains unclear.

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

3. For an examination of the passages where these forms occur, see in detail Dragoni 2022: 43–44.

### 2.3. Late Khotanese: Khotan as the “Golden Land”

A peculiar designation of the Khotanese kingdom that is mainly found in later documents from Dunhuang is LKh. *ysarnai bāḍa* ‘Golden Land’ (Or. 8212/186.34, IOL Khot S. 21.34, P 2027.7, P 2786.197, P 2787.51, P 2958.127, P 4649.5 and 8). As it may also be attested in Tocharian B, always referring to Khotan (see §6.1.1), a brief commentary is necessary. LKh. *ysarnai bāḍa* is commonly believed to refer to Khotan proper, not to Dunhuang (Zhang and Rong 1984: 27). It has been very tentatively proposed that this term was adopted after Khotan regained its independence from Tibetan rule in the second half of the ninth century CE (Zhang and Rong 1984: 27). There seems to be no consensus on the exact origin of this designation. Whereas Bailey linked it immediately to Skt. *suvarṇagotra-* and Tib. *gser rigs* ‘Golden Race’ (Bailey 1940: 602), Kumamoto (1982: 220) explicitly rejected this connection.<sup>4</sup> A recent survey of the Tibetan sources regarding *gser rigs* and the diffusion of this designation in the Tarim Basin is offered by Zeisler (2010: 419–25). She concludes that it is rather to be identified with the Hunza region, which was probably connected to Khotan politically and geographically. Thus, it is indeed possible that LKh. *ysarnai bāḍa* was also ultimately connected to *suvarṇagotra-*, but the precise directions of diffusion of this name are still obscure.<sup>5</sup>

## 3. FOREIGN NAMES OF KHOTAN AND ITS PEOPLE

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

### 3.1. The Sino-Kharoṣṭhī Coins

The earliest attestations of the name of Khotan are commonly believed to be found in the so-called Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins, which are also the earliest written local documentation extant from the Khotan area (Kumamoto 2009). However, the evidence is quite problematic and it is possible that the toponyms on the coin legends do not in fact represent the name of Khotan. Cribb (1984: 137 n. 20; photos in Cribb 1985) put forward the hypothesis that the correct reading of the Kharoṣṭhī legends should be *yidi/yiti*. Given the fact that the Chinese character *yú* 于 also appears to be written on the coins and is probably to be taken as short for *yúzhì* 于真 ‘Khotan’ (also attested in the legends; see Group 12 and 13 in Cribb 1984: 134–35),<sup>6</sup> one should conclude that the current pronunciation of *yú* 于 when these coins were issued was reflected in the Kharoṣṭhī phonetic reading <yi>. Baxter and Sagart (2014: 260) reconstruct the following development for *yú* 于: OCh. \**G<sup>w</sup>(r)a* > Hàn Chin. *hwa* > MCh. *hju*. This chronological development enables us to reconstruct a slightly more precise periodization of the borrowing chronology of the name of Khotan into Chinese. If the dating of the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins proposed by Cribb is correct, these were issued between

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

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

6. Apart from the findspot, there are other arguments that speak in favor of the identification of the name of Khotan in the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins. Unfortunately, the attempts to identify the royal names in these early coin legends with the names actually attested in the Khotanese material have not yielded positive results (see, e.g., Enoki 1965: 242).

the first and second centuries CE (Cribb 1984: 149–51). Thus, by that time Hàn Chin. *fiwa* should already have acquired its Middle Chinese shape *hju*. Consequently, the date of borrowing of Khot. *hvatana-* in Chinese should be placed roughly between the first mission to Khotan of the Chinese delegation of Zhāng Qiān 張騫 (after 140 BCE: Kumamoto 2009) and the issue of the first Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins that bear the legend *yidi/yiti* (probably in the first century CE).<sup>7</sup>

However, the phonetic shape of the form found in the Kharoṣṭhī transcriptions on these coins shows a very late appearance, and it is questionable whether the chronology implied squares with the materials known from Chinese reconstructions.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, this would perhaps imply an exceedingly early date of borrowing into Old Uyghur (*odon*; see §3.2), which is per se quite unlikely. Cribb (1984: 137 n. 20) does not seem to take into consideration these inconsistencies when he quickly dismisses the problem by stating that “Whichever pronunciation was current at the time of the issue of the coins, there is no reason to doubt that the Prakrit transliteration of the name of Khotan on the coins *yidi* or *yiti* closely resembles the Chinese transliteration of the same name.” Moreover, it should be noted that the second syllable *di/ti* also does not square with the Chinese form. All of this means that the identification of *yidi/yiti* with the name of Khotan is very problematic, and it is necessary to consider the possibility that *yidi/yiti* represents a different toponym for the Khotan region.

### 3.2. Old and Middle Chinese

The earliest mentions of the name of Khotan in the Chinese literary sources have been preserved in the Shǐjì 史記 and in the Hànsū 漢書, both composed during the first century BCE—a dating that could suit the time range outlined above. In the well-known chapter 123 of the Shǐjì 史記 (§123.2a), whose authenticity has been doubted various times,<sup>9</sup> the name is attested as *yúzhì* 于寘.<sup>10</sup> The second character corresponds to Middle Chinese *tsyeH* (Baxter and Sagart 2014). Its first consonantal element is quite puzzling, but according to Pelliot (1959: 408), this could have been an expected rendition of the Khotanese original. In the Hànsū (Hulsewé 1979: 96) it has a more “regular” correspondence with its Khotanese source, as it is given as *yútián* 于闐.<sup>11</sup> The second character is reconstructed as *den* by Baxter and Sagart (2014). *Yútián* 于闐 may have been borrowed into Old Uyghur as *odon* (Peyrot, Pinault, and Wilkens 2019: 79; see also Maue 2015: 505),<sup>12</sup> attested various times in the fifth chapter of the biography of Xuánzàng 玄奘. In Brāhmī script it is spelled as <otom> in U 5208 a8. It is noteworthy that *yútián* 于闐 was also “re-borrowed” into Late Khotanese, as in later documents from Dunhuang one finds such forms as *yūttyaina kūauhq* (P 2739.43), which neatly reflect a very recent pronunciation of Chinese *yútián guó* 于闐國.

The passage of the Dà Táng Xīyù Jì 大唐西域記 in which the name of Khotan is treated has been the object of numerous discussions (Pelliot 1959: 409), so it will not be considered here at length.<sup>13</sup> Suffice it to say that Xuánzàng’s information on the current pronunciation of *hvatana-* in the Khotan area at his time agrees with the forms that are actually attested in the Khotanese corpus and provides a precise terminus ante quem (middle of the seventh century CE) for the change *hvatāna-* > *hvaṃna-*. The same passage also contains Xuánzàng’s

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

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

9. See, e.g., de la Vaissière 2005: 25 n. 30, with further references.

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

11. It is also recorded as an “ancient” name of Khotan by the later Dà Táng Xīyù Jì 大唐西域記.

12. See §3.1 for the chronological problems involved.

13. The first attempt at an interpretation of this passage dates back to Lévi 1904: 560.

statement that the *hú* 胡 people referred to Khotan with the name *huōdàn* 豁旦. Following Pulleyblank 1991: 135,<sup>14</sup> the initial sound may be reconstructed as *xw* for Early Middle Chinese. As already noted by Pelliot (1959: 411), this name may refer to the forms current among the Iranian people living in the Tarim Basin in Xuánzàng’s time.

### 3.3. Sogdian

As it happens, we know that Sogdians referred to Khotanese people with the adjective *xwδnyk*, which is attested in a late list (Ch/So 20166 c3) bearing the title *n’βn’m’k*, literally “list of countries” (Henning 1940: 10). Yoshida (1993: 151) argues for a very late date of the fragment (tenth century CE) and concludes that the list was intended as a didactic compilation aimed at instructing Manichaean scribes in Turfan.

This is not the only occurrence of the name of Khotan in Sogdian, as the name is also attested twice in a small fragment of a document from the Hoernle collection (IOL Khot 158/5).<sup>15</sup> Significantly, it seems to be a fragment of a letter sent from Khotan, and it was found in the Khotan area.<sup>16</sup> IOL Khot 185/5 b1 has *xwδn’* and b4 *’xwδ’n*. Both occurrences confirm that the Sogdian name of Khotan had <δ> and <x> in the first syllable. In view of initial /xū/, one should probably argue either for a very early date of borrowing (early enough to undergo the same treatment as *\*hwa-* > *xū* in Sogdian (GMS: §238), or for a borrowing from another Iranian language. Thus, it is quite evident that this version of the name of Khotan cannot have been borrowed directly from Khotanese *hvatana-* in historical times.

### 3.4. Niya Prakrit

That the initial /xu/ or /xo/ for the name of Khotan was prevalent among Iranian peoples has already been noted for quite some time. One only needs to compare the forms attested in modern Iranian languages, which are usually derived from NP *Xutan*. However, what has gone unnoticed is that the oldest attested form of the name after the problematic occurrences on the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins clearly points to a form with initial /xo/ as well. In fact, the Niya documents mention Khotan and Khotanese people frequently. The form is *khotana-*. It is mostly attested in the loc. sg. *khotamna(m)mi* (e.g., CKD 14, 22, 135) or abl. sg. *khotamnade* (e.g., CKD 272, 283, 289). An adjective *khotaniya-* ‘of Khotan’ was also formed (e.g., CKD 30, 36, 86). The title *khotana maharaya* was borne by the king of Khotan. This titulature is attested in the famous tablet CKD 661, which was probably written in the Khotan area and displays a series of striking Khotanese features (Emmerick 1992: 2–3; Dragoni, Schoubben, and Peyrot 2020: 344).<sup>17</sup> This points to the relevant fact that the Prakrit administration of Khotan did not use the native Khotanese form *hvatana-* to refer to Khotan.

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

14. Not in Baxter and Sagart 2014.

15. I am grateful to Zhang Zhan, who kindly drew my attention to this fragment during the 2021 meeting of the American Oriental Society. On the history of the fragment, see Sims-Williams and Hamilton 1990: 11 and Zhang 2018: 30 n. 10. For an edition of IOL Khot 158/5, see Yoshida 2010: 6.

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

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

calic position is common in Niya Prakrit (Burrow 1937: 7–8), so the <ɿ> cannot be used to reconstruct with certainty either \**t* or \**d* in the Iranian form.

#### 4. THE NAME OF KHOTAN IN BACTRIAN: A NEW PROPOSAL

We have seen that the Niya form must have been borrowed from a neighboring Iranian language, but *khotana-* cannot reflect a direct loanword from Khotanese *hvatana-* on account of the initial syllable. If one excludes Sogdian, Khwarezmian, Middle Persian, and Parthian for geographical and chronological reasons, the only possible donor language remaining is Bactrian. Based on the Niya form, a hypothetical Bactrian \**χ(o/ω)δανο* or \**χ(o/ω)τανο* may be reconstructed as a likely source form. This would also fit the data known from Bactrian historical phonology, as if it were theoretically issued from Old Iranian \**hwatana-*. For this development, one may compare the outcome of Ir. \**hwapaθya-*, which is to be sought in Bactrian *χοβο* (Sims-Williams 2007: 279),<sup>18</sup> and *οοχωβ-* ‘quarrel’ < \**wi-xwarša-* (Sims-Williams 2007: 248).<sup>19</sup> Another possible reconstruction is Bactr. \**χσα(δτ)ανο*, as internal *-σα-* in Iranian loanwords in Gāndhārī is known to have been regularly adapted as *ο* (cf. Gandh. *kakhordi-* ‘witch’, for which cf. Av. *ka-xʷarəda-*).<sup>20</sup>

The natural question to ask at this point is whether the name of Khotan is actually attested in the Bactrian material at our disposal. The result is negative, but this may be due to the scarcity of the sources. However, a different candidate for the name of the Khotanese people is attested in two so far unexplained personal names possibly borrowed from OKh. *hvatana-*. These are *βρηδαγο οατανανο* in cm1, 25 (Sims-Williams 2007: 91) and *οηλ(ο)οατανο* in cm4 and cl45 (Sims-Williams 2007: 89). They were treated more recently again by Sims-Williams (2010: nos. 105, 319, 328). The etymology was left unexplained. *οατανο* is tentatively interpreted as “perhaps in origin a patr. formed from a name-component \**οατο*” (Sims-Williams 2010: no. 319). While stating the \**οατο* has “no obvious Iranian etymology,” Sims-Williams further suggests that its origin could perhaps be sought in a participle \**wašta-* ‘driven’. Bactrian *τ* may indeed represent the outcome of an older \**št*. However, if *οατανο* were to be taken as a patronymic, how should one interpret *οατανανο*?

I would like to propose that *οατανο* is a direct loanword from Khotanese *hvatana-* and that *οατανανο* is its regular Bactrian obl. pl. Accordingly, *βρηδαγο οατανανο* would be “the Bredag of the Khotanese (people)” and *οηλ(ο)-οατανο* would be “Wel the Khotanese.” This would imply that *βρηδαγο* was used in this case as a title (Sims-Williams 1999: 198–99). It is less likely, though not impossible, that it could also be a personal name, thus “Bredag (belonging) to the Khotanese people.” It is not by mere chance that *οατανανο* and *οατανο* occur in the same document (cm). If these were simply patronymics, we should conclude that both Bredag and Wel belonged to the same family. This appears to be not very likely. *βρηδαγο οατανανο* is the addressee of the letter and was probably a person of high rank, since the ruler of Rob, the sender of the letter, referred to him as a person of almost equal rank. *οηλ(ο)-οατανο*, on the other hand, seems to be a person of secondary importance. Since they belong to different social strata, therefore, I believe that they are unlikely to be related. The aim of the letter is not clear, but it seems that the ruler of Rob wished to ensure that no

18. One should note, however, that, apart from Bactr. *χοβο*, which appears in texts of all periods, the precise chronology of the change *χσα > χο* is not entirely clear (cf. Sims-Williams and de Blois 2020: 60 n. 186).

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

20. I owe this observation to N. Schoubben.

more horses were taken from surrounding people without his authorization. The mention of *οηλ(ο)-οατανο* could be explained if we surmise that he belonged to the same community of *βρηδαγο οατανανο*, who was in charge in that period. The ruler of Rob may have addressed the *βρηδαγο οατανανο* because, in view of his connection with *οηλ(ο)-οατανο*, who was partly responsible for the horse theft, he could ensure that this practice stopped.

If this is correct, it implies that these occurrences could be read as a reference to a community of Khotanese people that was present in Bactria around the date in which this letter was written. Thus, based on the Niya form, it may be surmised that the official geographical name of the Khotan region in Bactrian was *\*χ(ο/ω)δανο* or *\*χ(ο/ω)τανο*,<sup>21</sup> whereas a secondarily borrowed ethnonym *οατανο* could be established on the basis of the analysis of two personal names. Since *οατανο* may have been used to refer to Khotanese people living in Bactria, who were possibly integrated in the local communities and were probably bilingual, it is not surprising that Bactrian borrowed their ethnic name without being aware of the actual geographical origin of these people, i.e., without making a connection with the toponym. In view of initial *οα /wa/*, *οατανο* appears to be a direct borrowing from OKh. *hvatana-*. The fact that Bactrian speakers failed to identify OKh. *hvatana-* with their own name of Khotan implies that OKh. initial *hv* was pronounced very differently at the time of borrowing. One could tentatively put forward the hypothesis that it was a weak voiced aspiration, i.e., [h<sup>w</sup>].

It is not surprising to find Khotanese-speaking communities in Bactria. As outlined above, contacts between Bactria and the Khotan region are documented at least since the first century CE by the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins. It is very likely that these contacts involved movements of people in both directions as well.<sup>22</sup>

#### 5. OTHER FORMS OF THE NAME OF KHOTAN

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

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

#### 6. THE NAME OF KHOTAN IN TOCHARIAN: A NEW IDENTIFICATION

As can be gathered from the discussion above, no name for Khotan has been so far identified in the Tocharian text corpus. Recently Ogihara (*apud* Ching 2010: 249) considered the possibility that the name of Khotan could be attested in some late Tocharian B documents. However, he concluded that “the meaning of these words remains to be studied.” The difficulties implied by his interpretation were considered too severe, and, in his opinion, they could not enable a precise identification. These Tocharian B documents will be considered in

21. Or *\*χοα(δ/τ)ανο*.

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

detail in §6.2. Besides this possible identification, Ogihara (l.c.) also put forward the preliminary hypothesis that the second member of the tune name *suwāññe-<sub>u</sub>wātatane* in THT 108 b9 could possibly contain the name of Khotan. In §6.1 I examine in detail this and other related tune names both in Tocharian B and A, and I propose several new identifications. The issue of Tocharian initial *<sub>u</sub>w*, relevant for the identification of the Tocharian B tune name and the forms in the documents, is dealt with in §6.3. Finally, in §6.4 I will summarize the preliminary conclusions of the entire section.

### 6.1. Khotan in Tocharian A and B tune names

#### 6.1.1. TB *suwāññe-<sub>u</sub>wātatane* in THT 108 b9

The interpretation of the Tocharian B tune name *suwāññe-<sub>u</sub>wātatane* (THT 108 b9) is uncertain. In the following, I will argue that the second part *<sub>u</sub>wātatane* should rather be read *<sub>u</sub>wātanane* and could contain the name of Khotan. As for the first part *suwāññe*, I will put forward the hypothesis that it could be a Tocharian adjective formed on the Gāndhārī word for ‘golden’, *suvaṃna-*.

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

As for *<sub>u</sub>wātatane*, the nom. sg. could be reconstructed as *<sub>u</sub>wātato\**, as was already suggested by Ogihara. A word with a non-Tocharian appearance that exhibits a nom. sg. *-o* in Tocharian B is a very likely candidate for a loanword from Old Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese, or Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese.<sup>23</sup> However, no possible source could be identified for *<sub>u</sub>wātato\**.<sup>24</sup> Already in the first edition of the text, Sieg and Siegling (1953: 45 n. 23) noted “Im Metrumsnamen kann statt *t* auch *n* gelesen werden,” which suggests that they were also unsure about the identification of the element *<sub>u</sub>wātatane*. Unfortunately, it is not possible to examine the original fragment to check the readings, as its whereabouts are unknown at the moment and no photos are available. However, based on the authority of Sieg and Siegling, I would suggest that a reading *<sub>u</sub>wātanane* instead of *<sub>u</sub>wātatane* is to be taken into serious consideration. Thus, it is possible to reconstruct a nom. sg. *<sub>u</sub>wātano\**. This seems to satisfy the phonological criteria of a loanword from Old or Pre-Khotanese and the initial accent of the Tocharian word would neatly correspond to the Old Khotanese acc. sg. *hvatānu*.

If this identification is correct, an alternative explanation for *suwāññe* is needed. It is hardly possible that the tune name could be translated as “in (the tune of) piggy Khotan.”<sup>25</sup> No animal names seem to have been found within the attested Tocharian tune names listed by Peyrot

23. On this periodization, see Dragoni 2022: 231–48.

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

25. If we “translate” it into Khotanese, we could obtain a compound *\*\*hvatana-pā’saa-* “of the pig of Khotan,” but this is not attested in the Khotanese text corpus. One might explain the mention of this animal as a possible reference to the pig as the totemic animal of Khotan, but the Chinese and Tibetan sources seem to agree on the fact that the animal associated with the foundation of Khotan was the cow. This is also reflected in Skt. *go-stana-*, used to refer to Khotan (Emmerick 1968b: 89). On the other hand, the pig is used in dating formulas that employ the Chinese animal cycle, both in Khotanese and in Tocharian (see THT 549 a56). Thus, a possible translation could be “(in the tune) of the Khotanese (year) of the pig,” or even “(in the tune of the year) of the pig of the Khotanese (king).”

(2018: 332–42). Therefore, it seems justified to seek another interpretation for *suwāññe*. A possibility that should be examined is that *suwāññe* may be a Tocharian adjectival formation based on a loanword. If the donor language was Indic, one could identify two possibilities. On the one hand, one could connect it with Skt. *svāna-* (MW: 1283) or *svana-* (MW: 1280) ‘sound, noise’. The verb *svan* may also mean ‘to sing’, so the semantic connection with the tune names would be quite suitable. However, it is questionable whether initial *sv* in Sanskrit could be represented by TB *suw*, as this has no parallels.<sup>26</sup> TB *suw* could point more easily to an initial *suv* or *sup* in a hypothetical Indic source. As mentioned in §2.3, the names of the early kings of Kuča contained an initial element Skt. *suvarṇa-* ‘golden’. These are attested with either initial *sw* or *sv*, but a personal name *suwarne\** appears in THT 490.a2ii (Ching 2010: 456), which is probably to be interpreted as a loanword from Skt. *suvarṇa-*. Thus, the initial of Skt. *suvarṇa-* could be well represented in *suwāññe*. However, the absence of *r* needs an explanation. In Gāndhārī the regular outcome of the OIA cluster *rñ* seems to be *ñ(ñ)* (see Salomon 2000: 87). Ignoring some historical spellings with *rñ*, the forms attested in the Niya documents can be traced back to a single adjective *suvaṃna-* ‘golden’.

I would then propose to analyze TB *suwāññe* as a Tocharian B adjectival formation based on Middle Indic *suvaṃna-* ‘golden’. It could be argued that an adjective *\*suva(ñ)niya-* could have been already the base of TB *suwāññe* in the Middle Indic source. However, since this does not seem to be attested, it is safer to consider it as a Tocharian B formation. It is formally more convincing that *suvaṃna-* was first borrowed as TB *\*suwām* and a *-ññe* adjective was subsequently created on its basis.<sup>27</sup> Thus, I would propose to interpret the tune name *suwāññe-wātanane* as “(in the tune) of golden Khotan.” A possible connection with LKh. *ysarnai bāḍa* (cf. §2.3) may be envisaged, but its cultural implications should be studied more thoroughly.<sup>28</sup>

### 6.1.2. Tocharian A Tune Names Containing the Name of Khotan

In view of this possible identification, a necessary question to ask is whether other toponyms or ethnic names are attested within the corpus of Tocharian tune names. If the answer is positive, this could provide useful support for the connection made above. In fact, it is generally acknowledged that the two Tocharian A tune names *ārśi-lāñcinam* and *ārśi-niškramāntam* contain the element *ārśi*, which may refer to the Tocharian A language. Peyrot (2018: 323) points out that the first name could be translated either as “[tune] of *Ārśi* kings” or “*Ārśi* [tune] of kings.” This can indeed be interpreted as a compound formed by the substantive *ārśi* and the adjective *lāñci* ‘regal’ in the loc. sg., as usual in tune names (Peyrot 2018: 330–31). A similar compound is *ārśi-kāntu\** ‘*Ārśi* language’. The second name could refer quite clearly to an *ārśi* variant of the tune *niškramānt*, which is otherwise known as an independent tune name

This could be a reference to a Khotanese festivity or ritual that was celebrated in the year of the pig. However, this remains highly hypothetical.

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

27. As the second reviewer noted, Tocharian speakers did not recognize this adjective as a loanword from Gāndhārī anymore. This squares with the fact that no Middle Indic forms are attested in the extant corpus of Tocharian tune names, where instead learned forms from the Sanskrit tradition are very frequent.

28. The second reviewer drew my attention to two personal names attested in three cave inscriptions recently published in Zhao and Rong 2020. These are *suwāññetsko\** (Kz-225-YD-W-27), *suwāške* (Is-002-ZS-Z-02), and *suwāške* (Kizil WD-111-1). Possibly, *suwāške* could be taken as a diminutive of *suwo* used as a personal name with the ultimate meaning of ‘piglet’. *suwāññetsko\** might indeed contain the adjective TB *suwāññe* ‘golden’. For the semantics, cf. the Tocharian B personal name *kimña* ‘(woman) of *Kim*’, formed on the Chinese surname *Jīn* 金 ‘Gold’ (Ching 2010: 431).

in Tocharian A, B, and even in Tumshuqese (Maue 2007: 227–28). Thus, it seems perfectly possible that ethnic or language designations could appear in tune names.<sup>29</sup>

Another tune name that unmistakably contains the Tocharian A word for ‘king’ (the substantive in this case, not the adjective) in the loc. sg. is *watañi-lāntam* (A24 b5, A163 b2). The first element *watañi* is obscure (Peyrot 2018: 323). From a purely synchronic point of view, TA *watañi* could be interpreted as an *-i* adjective formed on a Tocharian A substantive whose nom. sg. may be reconstructed as *watam*\*. In view of *ārši-lāñcinam*, it can be argued that the first element could contain a language or ethnic name. In this case, an identification with OKh. *hvatana-* suggests itself as very likely, both from the semantic and the phonological point of view. All the lines of argument pursued until now seem to point in this direction. *watañi-lāntam* could thus be translated as “(in the tune) of the king of Khotan.” In view of this new identification, it is now possible to interpret with more confidence also the obscure tune name *watañinam* (A71 b3, A260 b2, THT 1464 b2), which seems quite clearly a loc. sg. of the adjective *watañi* ‘of Khotan’. *watañinam* could then be translated “(in the tune) of Khotan.”

### 6.1.3. The Correspondence TB <sub>u</sub>*wātano*\* A *watam*\*

Now that both the Tocharian A and B versions of the name of Khotan have been identified as TB <sub>u</sub>*wātano*\* A *watam*\*, it is necessary to comment on this new correspondence. It is quite unlikely that this ethnic name could be reconstructed for Proto-Tocharian. Moreover, for a smooth reconstruction one would at least expect the Tocharian A form to have been documented as *\*\*wātam*. A loanword from Tocharian B into A would probably require the same TA form *\*\*wātam*, perhaps with preservation of the final vowel. Thus, the most likely option is that they were borrowed into Tocharian A and B independently. The date of the borrowing should have been at any rate quite early, because the Tocharian A word is fully integrated within the morphology of the language, and Tocharian B may have had final *-o*, a feature of the loanwords from Proto-Tumshuqese-Khotanese, Pre-Khotanese, or the oldest layers of Old Khotanese (Dragoni 2022: 231–48).

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

## 6.2. The Name of Khotan in Tocharian B Secular Documents

The passages gathered by Ching (2010) are the following:

THT 2688.10					
(1)	<i>(c)o(ki)ś</i>	<i>śalywe</i>	<i>śaṅk</i>	<i><sub>u</sub>watanams</i>	
	lamp:ALL.SG	oil:NOM.SG	pint:NOM.SG	Khot.(?):GEN.PL	
	<i>magālaše</i>	<i>śa(ly)w(e) ///</i>			
	Magālaše:NOM.SG	oil:OBL.SG			
	[the oil/ghee for lamps] ...: one pint. <i>Magālaše</i> of [ <sub>u</sub> <i>wātane</i> -people ?] ... [oil/ghee] (Ching 2010: 248)				

29. In this respect, the Iranian Manichaean texts offer interesting parallels that still await a thorough treatment. Cf. the tune captions MSogd. *pr t'jyg'nyy 'w'k* “In the Tajik melody” (M 339), MMP *swryg nw'g* “The Syriac melody” (M 6950), and MMP *yn pd sw'lyy zgr* “This in the Sogdian melody” (BBB 462). On these captions, see Sundermann 1993 and Brunner 1980: 352.

THT 2709.23					
(2)	[2] /// ( <sub>u</sub> )w(ātani)	laṃṣānte	ikām	wi	ikām
	Khot.(?):NOM.PL	work:PRET.3PL	20:NOM.PL	2:NOM.PL	20:NOM.PL
	ṣe	[3] /// ṣeṣṣe	ottār	pokai	ṣe
	1:NOM.SG	?	by.eights	arm:OBL.SG	1:NOM.SG
	<sub>u</sub> wātane	wi	ya ///		
	Khot.(?):NOM.SG	2:NOM.PL	?		
( <sub>u</sub> wātane-people?) have worked, twenty-two. Twenty-one [ <sub>u</sub> wātane-people?] ...: by eight arms/limbs. One <sub>u</sub> wātane (?), two ... (Ching 2010: 271)					

THT 459.2					
(3)	co	komtak	<sub>u</sub> watakas	yap	
	this:OBL.SG	same day	?:GEN.PL	barley:OBL.SG	
	wsāwa	wi			
	give:PRET.1SG	2:NOM.PL			
On the very same day, [I] gave barley to <sub>u</sub> wataka-people: two (Ching 2010: 291)					

THT 2761c.2					
(4)	ñi	<sub>u</sub> wātne	stare		
	I:GEN.SG	?	be:PRES.3PL		
of me ... <sub>u</sub> wātne are					

The occurrences of <sub>u</sub>wātane in sentences 1 and 2, although quite fragmentary, seem not to be linguistically problematic. The contexts indicate that <sub>u</sub>wātane should be a substantive referring to a particular category of people. Given that the two documents are of very late date, I put forward the proposal that this substantive in *e* was formed in recent times to refer exclusively to Khotanese people, and not to the geographical entity (B <sub>u</sub>wātano\* A wataṃ). The two other occurrences in sentences 3 and 4, on the other hand, are difficult to interpret. If <sub>u</sub>watakas in sentence 3 could be read <sub>u</sub>wanakas, one could think of a *-ka* derivative of LKh. *hvana-* ‘Khotanese’, but this cannot be proven or disproven with any certainty. Furthermore, this derivative has not yet been found in Khotanese. Adams (DoT: 76) is inclined to interpret this word as possibly connected with *upātatse* (THT 4000 b7iii), but this hapax is of uncertain interpretation as well.

The second reviewer draws my attention to the possibility of reading <sub>u</sub>watakams instead of <sub>u</sub>watanams in THT 2688.10. This option has the advantage of allowing one to compare the gen. pl. <sub>u</sub>watakas in THT 459.2. From a paleographic point of view, *ka* instead of *na* is justified by the shape of the lower part of the akṣara, which shows a curl open to the right. The top head of the akṣara, however, is not immediately comparable to other *kas* in the same manuscript. Therefore, even if this reading should be seriously considered, it is not unproblematic.

As for the difficult <sub>u</sub>wātne (sentence 4), one may think of a syncopated form of Khot. *hvatana-* for which one may compare the uncertain Tq. *hvaḍ,na* (see §2.2). Given the fragmentary state of THT 2761c.2, however, this hypothesis remains very uncertain.<sup>30</sup>

30. Adams (DoT: 76) tentatively proposed to see in <sub>u</sub>wamne (THT 429 b5) a loanword from Skt. *upānta-* ‘bor-

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

### 6.3. On Initial ${}_u w$ in Tocharian

The initial digraph  $\langle {}_u w \rangle$  is a very rare orthographic device in Tocharian and it is difficult to assess its phonetic value. Therefore, a complete overview of its occurrences, together with those of the related  $\langle {}_u p \rangle$ , is necessary. This section is divided into three parts: §6.3.1 presents the occurrences; §6.3.2 analyzes the data and concludes that the orthographic device should be relatively late; and §6.3.3 summarizes the consequences of this analysis for the name of Khotan in Tocharian B.

#### 6.3.1. Occurrences of $\langle {}_u w \rangle$ and $\langle {}_u p \rangle$

The precise value of initial  $\langle {}_u w \rangle$  in Tocharian is not straightforward and needs some comments. In Table 1, the occurrences of  $\langle {}_u w \rangle$  and  $\langle {}_u p \rangle$  in Tocharian A and B are listed.<sup>31</sup>

Table 1

$\langle {}_u w \rangle$		
Number	Manuscript	Occurrence
1	A 303 b1	TA $re{}_u w\dot{a}nt$ (personal name)
2	THT 331 b1	TB $t{}_u w\dot{a}k$ ‘this (emph.)’
3	THT 591 a4	TB $\tilde{n}{}_u w\dot{a}r$ ‘by nines’
4	SI B Toch 11 a3	TB ${}_u w\dot{a}\tilde{s}\dot{s}i$ (personal name?)
5	SI B Toch 11 a4	TB $\tilde{a}{}_u w$ ‘ewe’
6	THT 108	$suw\tilde{a}\tilde{n}\tilde{n}e-{}_u w\dot{a}tanane$ (cf. <i>supra</i> )
$\langle {}_u p \rangle$		
Number	Manuscript	Occurrence
7	A 212	TA ${}_u p\tilde{a}dhy\dot{a}y$ ‘teacher’
8	PK DA M 507.8 ×2	TB ${}_u p\tilde{a}dhy\dot{a}yem\acute{s}$ TB ${}_u p\tilde{a}dhy\dot{a}yem ntse$
9	THT 1681	TB ${}_u p\tilde{a}dhy\dot{a}ye$
10	YQ I.2 ×2	TA ${}_u p\tilde{a}dhy\dot{a} \times 2$
11	YQ II.1	TA ${}_u p\tilde{a}dhy\dot{a}y$

der, edge’. The passage is as follows: */// entwemem {}\_u w\dot{a}ntne yn\tilde{a}rki kaus ky\tilde{a}na amok\tilde{a}\tilde{s}\tilde{s}e ///* ‘thereupon, on the border *yn\tilde{a}rki* above he fulfilled the artificial (?)’.” If  ${}_u w\dot{a}ntne$  in sentence 4 were to be read as  ${}_u w\dot{a}nte$ , we might have here the same word in the nom. sg. However, given that the contexts of both passages are not clear, all this remains very hypothetical. Yet another possibility is suggested by the second reviewer, who is in favor of a reading  $ruw\dot{a}ntne$  instead of  ${}_u w\dot{a}ntne$ . This option may be preferable from a paleographic point of view and should be taken into serious consideration, but I cannot see any linguistic explanation for such a form.

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

12	THT 108	TB <i>ᵛpādhyāy(i)</i>
13	A 218	TA <i>ᵛpage</i> 'Upaga' (pers. name).
14	THT 17	TB <i>ᵛpāsakñeṣṣe</i> 'pertaining to the laity' (adj.)

### 6.3.2. On Initial <ᵛw> and <ᵛp>

This section is exclusively devoted to the analysis of initial <ᵛw> and <ᵛp>. Additionally, the special case of the Tocharian A personal name *reᵛwānt* (no. 1 above) is also discussed.

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

In Tocharian A, on the other hand, the situation is more complex. The digraph <ᵛw> is only attested in the personal name *reᵛwānt* (A 303 b1). This occurrence is unique because it employs the digraph <ᵛw> word-internally. If Tremblay's (2005: 430) derivation is correct,<sup>32</sup> however, <ᵛw> is likely to represent the two different sounds of the Sogdian source *rywβnt(k)*, if, as seems likely, there was a morpheme boundary between *ryw* and *βnt(k)*. It seems that Tocharian A <w> was used for Sogd. *β* at least in the personal names of the Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka; cf., e.g., *hkhuttem-wām* in A 303 a5, which is likely to have as putative source a Sogdian name *\*xwt'yn-β'm* (Tremblay 2005: 430; Lurje 2010: no. 1462). The occurrences of <ᵛp> in Tocharian A, on the other hand, are exclusively found in *ᵛpādhyā* 'teacher', a loanword from Skt. *upādhyāya-* 'id.', and in the personal name *ᵛpage*, borrowed from Skt. *upaga-*. Therefore, it seems that in Tocharian A the use of <ᵛp> and <ᵛw> cannot be much older than that of their Tocharian B counterparts.

Table 2 summarizes the conclusions reached so far.

Table 2

	Tocharian A	Tocharian B
Initial <ᵛp>	<i>ᵛpādhyā</i> 'teacher' (LW < Skt.) <i>ᵛpage</i> 'Upaga' (pers. name, LW < Skt.)	<i>ᵛpāsakñeṣṣe</i> 'pertaining to the laity' (adj.) (LW < Skt.) <i>ᵛpādhyāye</i> 'teacher' (LW < Skt.)
Initial <ᵛw>	Not attested	<i>ᵛwāṣṣi</i> (pers. name, LW < Chinese?) <sup>33</sup> <i>suwāññe-ᵛwātanane</i> "In (the tune) of Golden Khotan" (second member LW < Khot.)

It is now clear that the digraphs <ᵛp> and <ᵛw> are only attested in loanwords and cannot be reckoned amongst the oldest orthographic devices of Tocharian.

### 6.3.3. Consequences for the Interpretation of TB *ᵛwātano\** 'Khotan'

Having acknowledged the late character of <ᵛw>, two different hypotheses for its appearance in the name of Khotan in Tocharian B may be put forward. On the one hand, one could

32. See also Lurje 2010: no. 1049.

33. See Ching 2010: 432.

interpret <<sub>u</sub>w> as standing for older \**uw*-, much in the same way as <<sub>u</sub>p> stands for older *up*- in the Sanskrit source form (see §6.3.4). In this case, one could reconstruct a Tocharian B form \**uwātano*. If this reconstruction is accepted, the word should have entered Tocharian at a relatively old stage of Khotanese.<sup>34</sup> In fact, as noted by Hitch (2016: 49), the digraph <hv> denoted a single consonant already in Old Khotanese.<sup>35</sup> This hypothesis may lend more credibility to Emmerick's (1968b: 89) derivation of *hvātana*- from a hypothetical \**hu-wātana*- 'very powerful'. This etymological explanation, however, is hindered by the fact that the meaning 'to be able', and hence 'be strong', for PIr. \**wat*-, which otherwise means 'to inspire, be informed, acquainted' in other Iranian languages (EDIV: 427), is attested in Khotanese only with the preverb \**fra*- in the verb *hot*- 'to be able' (<\**fra-wat*-) and in the derived adjective *hotana*- 'strong'. It is questionable whether Khot. *vat*- without preverb could have meant 'to be able' as well. Moreover, the dangers of relying on uncertain etymologies of ethnic names for linguistic explanations are very well known.

As an alternative, it is also possible to consider initial <<sub>u</sub>w> as a late Tocharian B spelling for an original TB \**wātano*. It has plausibly been suggested that the akṣara *wa* has its origin in the independent vowel sign for *o* (Malzahn 2007: 260).<sup>36</sup> Further, alternations such as *wnolme* ~ *onolme* in metrical texts point to a vocalic realization of /w/ in early Tocharian B. Thus, one may surmise that the actual value of <w> was not distant from [w] in the early stages (Peyrot 2008: 89). Only in late colloquial texts does it alternate with <p>, so that one could assume a later pronunciation [β] or [v]. Thus, the necessity of a digraph <<sub>u</sub>w> to mark a pronunciation [w] in contrast with the current value assigned to <w> may have been felt only in a later period, when the value of <w> was no longer as clear as in the early period. A reconstruction \**wātano* for Tocharian B would also agree with the initial of its Tocharian A match *watam*\*. On the whole, given the etymological difficulties involved, the second explanation seems to be the safest for the time being.

#### 6.4. Preliminary Conclusions

This section has examined some alleged occurrences of the name of Khotan in Tocharian. The conclusions reached are the following. TB *suwāññe-<sub>u</sub>wātātane* could be interpreted as "in (the tune) of golden Khotan." The tune name TA *watañi-lāntam* could be translated as "(in the tune) of the king of Khotan" and the tune name TA *watañinaṃ* "(in the tune) of Khotan." Thus, for the first time, a substantive TB *<sub>u</sub>wātano*\* (<\**wātano*?), A *watam*\* can be reconstructed as the Tocharian name of Khotan. Moreover, a thorough analysis of the occurrences of the Tocharian A and B digraphs <<sub>u</sub>w> and <<sub>u</sub>p> in initial position has established the late date of these orthographic devices. Accordingly, the Tocharian B name of Khotan *<sub>u</sub>wātano*\* could represent a later orthography for an earlier \**wātano*.

### 7. DATING OF THE BORROWING INTO TOCHARIAN AND BACTRIAN

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

1. The initials agree with Chinese *yútián* 于阗, not with Sogdian, New Persian, or Gāndhārī.
2. The middle consonant seems to represent a dental stop, not a weakened fricative or a glottal stop.

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

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

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

3. The vowel of the middle syllable is rendered as /a/ in both the Tocharian and the Bactrian forms: there is no weakening to *hvatāna-* as already attested in Old Khotanese.

From these data it can be argued that the source of the loanwords into Tocharian and Bactrian<sup>37</sup> is to be identified with Khot. *hvatana-*, i.e., the oldest documented form in Old Khotanese. It is thus reasonable that the date of the borrowing should be placed roughly in the first centuries CE. This is based on the fact that the oldest written sources for Old Khotanese can be dated to the fifth century CE. Since a form *hvatana-* is only attested as the oldest possible form in Old Khotanese and forms with weakening seem to have already been common in the same period, the fifth century CE should be posited as *terminus ante quem*.<sup>38</sup>

For Bactrian the *terminus post quem* should be identified with the first documented contacts between Bactria and the Khotan area, i.e., the beginning of the first century CE, based on the dating of the Sino-Kharoṣṭhī coins (cf. *supra*). In the case of Bactrian there are two reasons that prevent us from positing a precise date. On the one hand, the letters in which the name occurs are not dated. On the other hand, it is always possible that migrant communities detached from their own homeland may have preserved more archaic forms. In fact, the chronology of sound changes reconstructed for the Khotanese of the Khotan area may have been completely different in a Khotanese community abroad.<sup>39</sup> Thus, it seems reasonable to identify the date of the borrowing into Bactrian within the first five centuries CE. This agrees with the date (458 CE) proposed for the document cm by Sims-Williams and de Blois (2018: 70).

It is more difficult to posit a *terminus post quem* for the borrowing into Tocharian. It seems certain that it cannot be traced back to Proto-Tocharian because of the Tocharian A form, but contacts between Tocharian and Khotanese seem to have taken place well before the first century CE (Dragoni 2022: 257–59). The initial *u*w of the Tocharian B noun is also problematic because it could point to a later date of borrowing. However, if my suggestion is correct, the digraph could be a later addition of the copyists, so that we may reconstruct an earlier spelling *\*wātano*, which would agree with Tocharian A. It seems therefore safe to maintain the same time span identified for the borrowing into Bactrian. Because of the Chinese form preserved in the Shǐjì 史記 and in the Hànnshū 漢書, which could be dated to the first century BCE, it is possible that a *terminus post quem* for the Tocharian borrowing may even be posited one or two centuries before the first contacts with Bactria. I would thus propose a time range of first century BCE to fifth century CE for the Tocharian word.

It is possible to argue that the forms with initial /x/ attested in the other Iranian languages of the Tarim Basin go back to the official Bactrian designation of the Khotan area, as attested in the administrative documents in Niya Prakrit. It is not possible to determine the date of the borrowing into Bactrian exactly. However, one can be sure that it was borrowed before *oatavo*, because it underwent the change *\*hwa > χ(o/ω)*.

37. Although one should note that the Bactrian evidence is weaker, as <a> can also stand for /ə/.

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

39. At the moment, it is not possible to determine whether this Khotanese community in Bactria had contacts with the Khotan area. It is also not known to what degree they still had command of Khotanese. Were they still bilingual or were they completely Bactrianized?

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

## 8. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

The main conclusions reached in this article can be summarized as follows:

1. OKh. *hvatana-* was borrowed early into Bactrian, where it became  $*\chi(o/\omega)\delta avo$  or  $*\chi(o/\omega)ta vo$ , either with the Bactrian change  $*hwa > \chi(o/\omega)$ , or with adaptation of  $*hwa$  to  $\chi(o/\omega)$ , if that sound change had already occurred. Alternatively, the source form might have been simply  $*\chi o\alpha(\delta/\tau)avo$  (see §4). The Bactrian form was used as the official administrative term for the Khotan region in the first centuries CE, as documented by Gāndhārī *khotana-*, which was borrowed from Bactrian. It is the source of the other Iranian terms for Khotan in the Tarim Basin and beyond. The substitution of Gandh. *khotana-* with OKh. *hvatana-* in the official administration probably reflects a political change.

2. Another set of names for Khotan was borrowed directly from OKh. *hvatana-*. This set points to a weak word-initial aspiration in the Khotanese source, possibly [h<sup>w</sup>], which was represented with a similar initial in Chinese and Tibetan, and dropped altogether in Tocharian and perhaps Bactrian, when it was reborrowed at a later stage.

3. The name of Khotan in Tocharian can be now identified as TB  ${}_u wātano^*$  A *watam^\**. Both forms are attested in Tocharian A and B tune names.<sup>40</sup> The date of the borrowing may be placed in the first centuries CE because of the rendering of the middle syllable as *ta* without weakening of *t* and *a*. The forms attested in late Tocharian B documents remain of uncertain interpretation, but two of them could point to the existence of a late Tocharian B substantive  ${}_u wātane$ , derived from TB  ${}_u wātano^*$  in very recent times to refer exclusively to Khotanese people, not to the geographical entity.

4. Bactrian possibly borrowed the form *oatavo* at a later date directly from Khotanese speakers. *oatavo* is attested in personal names in two letters.<sup>41</sup> It may be argued that the association with the Khotan region was not evident to Bactrian speakers, and they did not connect it with their own official name for the region. Thus, *oatavo* may be taken as referring to a community of Khotanese people in Bactria, probably bilingual and fully integrated within the social and political system of the region. Contacts between Bactria and Khotan are documented since the first century CE. It can be surmised that people were moving not only from Bactria to Khotan, but also from Khotan to Bactria.

5. The alleged Tumshuqese forms of the name are of unsure interpretation, so they cannot be profitably used for the discussion.

6. The Khotanese pronunciation of the name of Khotan within the five centuries preceding its earliest attestations can be reconstructed as [ʰh<sup>w</sup>atana-].

This article has examined the forms of the name of Khotan attested in the languages of the Tarim Basin mainly from a linguistic point of view. Some of the conclusions of this contribution, however, are of social and historical importance. In particular, the newly identified Tocharian tune names open up new perspectives for the study of cultural exchanges between Khotan and the Tocharian-speaking oases in the north of the Tarim Basin. It is hoped that

40. B *suwāññe-{}\_u wātānane* THT 108 b9, A *watāñnam:* A71 b3; A260 b2 *watāñ(i)nam;* THT 1464 b2 *watāñin(am),* A *watāñi lāntam:* A24 b5 *w(a)tañi lāntam;* A163 b2 (*watāñi*) *lāntam.*

41.  $\beta\rho\eta\delta\alpha\gamma o$  *oatavavo* cm1, 25 (Sims-Williams 2007: 91) and  $o\eta\lambda(o)$  *oatavo* cm4 and cl45 (Sims-Williams 2007: 89).

further research will address these questions and contribute to a better understanding of these problems.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

##### *Technical Abbreviations*

abl. = ablative	nom. = nominative
all. = allative	NP = New Persian
acc. = accusative	obl. = oblique
Av. = Avestan	OCh. = Old Chinese
Bactr. = Bactrian	OIA = Old Indo-Aryan
Chin. = Chinese	OKh. = Old Khotanese
emph. = emphatic	pl. = plural
Gandh. = Gāndhārī	pres. = present
gen. = genitive	pret. = preterite
Ir. = Iranian	sg. = singular
Khot. = Khotanese	Sogd. = Sogdian
LKh. = Late Khotanese	Skt. = Sanskrit
loc. = locative	Suv = <i>Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra</i> (Khotanese version, numeration according to Suv I–II)
LW = loan word	TB = Tocharian B
MCh. = Middle Chinese	Tib. = Tibetan
MMP = Manichaean Middle Persian	Tq. = Tumshuqese
MS = Manuscript	Z = Book of Zambasta (Emmerick 1968a)
MSogd. = Manichaean Sogdian	

##### *Bibliographic Abbreviations*

BBB = Henning 1937
CEToM = A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts <a href="https://cetom.univie.ac.at">https://cetom.univie.ac.at</a>
CKD = Corpus of Kharoṣṭhī Documents
DoT = Adams 2013
EDIV = Cheung 2007
HL = Handlist (serial numbers of Tumshuqese manuscript fragments according to Maue 2009)
KT I–VII = Bailey 1945–85
GMS = Gershevitch 1954
MW = Monier-Williams 1899
SDTV I = Emmerick and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja 1995
Suv I–II = Skjærvø 2004

#### REFERENCES

- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Bailey, Harold W. 1940. Ttāgutta. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10.3: 599–605.
- . 1945–85. *Khotanese Texts*. Vol. 1 (1945); vol. 2 (1954); vol. 3 (1956) [vols. 1–3, 2nd ed. 1969 in one volume; repr. 1980]; vol. 4 (1961) [repr. with corrections 1979]; vol. 5 (1963) [repr. with corrections 1980]; vol. 6 (1967); vol. 7 (1985). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Baxter, William H., and Laurent Sagart. 2014. *Old Chinese: A New Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Bi Bo and Nicholas Sims-Williams. 2010. Sogdian Documents from Khotan, I: Four Economic Documents. *JAOS* 130.4: 497–508.
- . 2015. Sogdian Documents from Khotan, II: Letters and Miscellaneous Fragments. *JAOS* 135.2: 261–82.

- Brunner, Christopher. 1980. Liturgical Chant and Hymnody among the Manichaeans of Central Asia. *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 130: 342–68.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1935. Iranian Words in the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan, II. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 7.4: 779–90.
- . 1937. *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Cheung, Johnny. 2007. *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, vol. 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Ching Chao-jung. 2010. Secular Documents in Tocharian: Buddhist Economy and Society in the Kucha Region. PhD diss., École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris.
- Cribb, Joe. 1984. The Sino-Kharosthi Coins of Khotan: Their Attribution and Relevance to Kushan Chronology, Part 1. *Numismatic Chronicle* 144: 128–52.
- . 1985. The Sino-Kharosthi Coins of Khotan: Their Attribution and Relevance to Kushan Chronology, Part 2. *Numismatic Chronicle* 145: 136–49.
- Dragoni, Federico. 2022. Watañi lāntam: Khotanese and Tumshuqese Loanwords in Tocharian. PhD diss., Leiden University.
- Dragoni, Federico, Niels Schoubben, and Michaël Peyrot. 2020. The Formal Kharoṣṭhī Script from the Northern Tarim Basin in Northwest China May Write an Iranian Language. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 73.3: 335–73.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. 1967. Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan. London Oriental Series, vol. 19. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
- . 1968a. *The Book of Zambasta: A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism*. London Oriental Series, vol. 21. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
- . 1968b. Names from Central Asia. *Central Asiatic Journal* 12.2: 88–91.
- . 1992. *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan*. 2nd ed. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Emmerick, Ronald E., and Margarita I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja. 1995. *Saka Documents: Text*, vol. 3: *The St. Petersburg Collections*. Corpus inscriptionum iranicarum, part II: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, vol. 5: Saka. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Enoki, Kazuo. 1965. The So-called Sino-Kharosthi Coins. *East and West* 15.3/4: 231–76.
- Gershevitch, Ilya. 1954. *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Henning, Walter B. 1937. *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*. Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1936: Philosophisch-historische Klasse 10. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- . 1940. *Sogdica*. James G. Furlong Fund, vol. 21. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Hill, Nathan. 2009. Tibetan <ḥ> as a Plain Initial and Its Place in Old Tibetan Phonology. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 32.1: 115–40.
- Hitch, Doug. 1983. A Brāhmī-Manichaean Hybrid Script. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 14: 293–312.
- . 2016. The Old Khotanese Metanalysis. PhD diss., Harvard University.
- Hulsewé, Anthony F. P. 1979. *China in Central Asia: The Early Stage. 125 B.C.–A.D. 23*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Konow, Sten. 1914. Khotan Studies. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 46.2: 339–53.
- . 1935. *Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt*. Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Pp. 770–823. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kumamoto, Hiroshi. 1982. Khotanese Official Documents in the Tenth Century. PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- . 2009. Khotan ii: History in the Pre-Islamic Period. In *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*, <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/khotan-i-pre-islamic-history>.
- Leumann, Ernst. 1920. *Buddhistische Literatur nordarisch und deutsch, 1: Nebenstücke*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 15.2. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

- . 1933–36. *Das nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus: Text und Übersetzung. Aus dem Nachlaß hrsg. von M. Leumann.* Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1904. Notes chinoises sur l’Inde, IV: Le pays de Kharoṣṭra et l’écriture kharoṣṭrī. *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient* 4: 543–79.
- . 1913. Le “tokharien B,” langue de Koutcha. *Journal asiatique*, ser. 11, 2: 311–80.
- Lurje, Pavel B. 2010. *Personal Names in Sogdian Texts.* Iranisches Personennamenbuch, vol. 8. Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, vol. 808, Iranische Onomastik. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Maggi, Mauro. 2009. Annotations on the Book of Zambasta, I. In *Literarische Stoffe und ihre Gestaltung in mitteliranischer Zeit: Kolloquium anlässlich des 70. Geburtstages von Werner Sundermann*, ed. Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Christiane Reck, and Dieter Weber. Pp. 153–71. Beiträge zur Iranistik, vol. 31. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2007. The Most Archaic Manuscripts of Tocharian B and the Varieties of the Tocharian B Language. In *Instrumenta Tocharica*, ed. Melanie Malzahn. Pp. 255–97. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Maue, Dieter. 2007. Tumshukische Miscellen I. Beobachtungen zur Metrik. In *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan*, ed. Maria Macuch, Mauro Maggi, and Werner Sundermann. Pp. 225–38. Iranica, vol. 13. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 2009. *Corpus of Tumshuqese Fragments: Introduction, Handlist, Transliteration.* <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/iranica/tumshuq/handlist.pdf>.
- . 2015. *Alltürkische Handschriften*, vol. 19: *Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift*, Vol. 2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- . 2016. Tumschukische Miscellen / Miscellanea Tumšucica IV. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 17: 109–32.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages: New Edition, Greatly Enlarged and Improved.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ogihara, Hirotoishi, and Ching Chao-jung. 2017. Some Observations on the Tumshuqese Documents Newly Published in China. In *Zur lichten Heimat: Studien zu Manichäismus, Iranistik und Zentralasienkunde im Gedenken an Werner Sundermann*. Ed. by a team “Turfanforschung.” Pp. 453–82. Iranica, vol. 25. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Pelliot, Paul. 1959. *Notes on Marco Polo, I.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2008. *Variation and Change in Tocharian B.* Leiden Studies in Indo-European, vol. 15. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- . 2018. A Comparison of the Tocharian A and B Metrical Traditions. In *Language and Meter*, ed. Olav Hackstein and Dieter Gunkel. Pp. 319–45. Brill’s Studies in Indo-European Languages and Linguistics, vol. 18. Leiden: Brill.
- Peyrot, Michaël, Georges-Jean Pinault, and Jens Wilkens. 2019. Vernaculars of the Silk Road: A Tocharian B–Old Uyghur Bilingual. *Journal asiatique* 307.1: 65–90.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin.* Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Salomon, Richard. 2000. *A Gāndhārī Version of the Rhinoceros Sūtra: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5B.* Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, vol. 1. Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press.
- Schoubben, Niels. 2021. Accent Sign Matters: The Niya Prakrit Grapheme <ḱ> and Its Connection to Bactrian <ḡ>. *Journal asiatique* 309.1: 47–59.
- Sieg, Emil, and Wilhelm Siegling. 1953. *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B, Book 2: Fragmente Nr. 71–633.* Ed. Werner Thomas. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. 1999. A Bactrian Deed of Manumission. *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 5: 191–211.
- . 2007. *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan*, vol. II: *Letters and Buddhist Texts.* Studies in the Khalili Collection, vol. 3. London: Nour Foundation in assoc. with Azimuth Editions.

- . 2010. *Bactrian Personal Names*. Iranisches Personennamenbuch, vol. 7. Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, vol. 806, Iranische Onomastik. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas, and François de Blois. 2018. *Studies in the Chronology of the Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan*. With contributions by Harry Falk and Dieter Weber. Veröffentlichungen zur Iranistik, vol. 83. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas, and James Hamilton. 1990. *Documents turco-sogdiens du IXe-Xe siècle de Touen-houang*. Corpus inscriptionum iranicarum, part II: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, vol. 3: Sogdian. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Skjærvø, Prods Oktor. 2004. *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras: The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*. Vol. I: *The Khotanese Text with English Translation and the Complete Sanskrit Text*; Vol. II: *Manuscripts, Commentary, Glossary, Indexes*. Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures, vols. 60 and 61. Central Asian Sources, vols. 5 and 6. Cambridge, MA: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University.
- Sundermann, Werner. 1993. An Early Attestation of the Name of the Tajiks. In *Medioiranica: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 21st to the 23rd of May 1990*, ed. Wojciech Skalmowski and Alois Van Tongerloo. Pp. 163–73. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, vol. 48. Leuven: Peeters.
- Tremblay, Xavier. 2005. Irano-Tocharica et Tocharo-Iranica. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 68.3: 421–49.
- Vaissière, Étienne de la. 2005. *Sogdian Traders: A History*. Handbuch der Orientalistik, Section 8, Central Asia, vol. 10. Leiden: Brill.
- Yoshida, Yutaka. 1993. ソグド語の Nāfnāmak 「国名表」の2・3の読みについて [Sogudo-go no nāfnāmak kokumeihyō no 2, 3 no yomi ni tsuite. Some new readings of the Nāfnāmak in Sogdian]. *Bulletin of the Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan* 36.1: 151–53.
- . 2010. 新出のソグド語資料について - 新米書記の父への手紙から: 西蔵寺橋資料の紹介を兼ねて - [Shinshutsu no sogudo-go shiryō ni tsuite - shinmei shoki no chichi he no tegami kara saigon-ji tachibana shiryō no kekkai wo kanete. On newly discovered Sogdian materials: Beginning from a letter by a new scribe to his father, together with an introduction of the Tachibana Materials in Saigonji]. 京都大學文學部研究紀要 [Kyōto daigaku bungakubu kenkyū kiyō] 49: 1–24.
- Zeisler, Bettina. 2010. East of the Moon and West of the Sun? Approaches to a Land with Many Names, North of Ancient India and South of Khotan. *Tibet Journal* 34/35 (3/2): 371–463.
- Zhang Guangda and Rong Xinjiang. 1984. Les noms du royaume du Khotan. In *Contributions aux études de Touen-Houang*, vol. 3, ed. Michel Soymié. Pp. 23–46. Publications de l'École française d'extrême-orient, vol. 135. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Zhang Zhan. 2018. Sogdians in Khotan. *The Silk Road Journal* 16: 30–43.
- Zhao Li and Rong Xingjiang, eds. 2020. 龟兹石窟题记 [Cave inscriptions in ancient Kucha]. Shanghai: Zhongxi Book Company.

Copyright of Journal of the American Oriental Society is the property of American Oriental Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.