

## Miscellany on the Tumshuqese Documents: Part II

OGIHARA Hirotoshi

The University of Tokyo,

Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology (Linguistics)

Tokyo, Japan

Centre de recherche sur les civilisations de l'Asie orientale (CRCAO),

Paris, France

DOI: 10.17816/WMO77877

Received 03.06.2021.

**Abstract:** The present article is part of the research on Tumshuqese (for Part I see *Central Asiatic Journal*, 2020, vol. 63, no. 1–2. pp. 11–24). Among Middle Iranian languages, linguistic research on Tumshuqese has been much delayed because of the insufficient documentation, and the lack of the parallel texts written in other languages which leads to the comparative study. However, the secular documents, especially the contracts, are the most important material for the linguistic study of this language in view of the fact [1] that Tumshuqese contracts offer the best preserved texts and [2] that some passages are comparable to the contracts written in other Central Asian languages. In this paper, an attempt will be made to elucidate following Tumshuqese words attested in the secular documents: the numerals *tshārsa* ‘forty’, *hodadja* ‘seventy’, *sodju* ‘hundred’, *drdja* ‘third’ and words of measure *jaha-* and *k<sup>h</sup>aa-* in addition to a noun *dau/do* ‘gift’. Among them, the numerals *tshārsa* ‘forty’ and *hodadja* ‘seventy’ are recognized for the first time. Although other words have been more or less known to scholars, different meaning and/or analysis have been assigned to them.

**Key words:** Middle Iranian languages, Central Asia, secular documents, contracts, numerals, words of measure.

**Acknowledgements:** This contribution is dedicated as a token of my gratitude to Prof. Irina F. Popova, who has kindly supported my research on Central Asian fragments preserved in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IOM, RAS) since 2008. I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to Prof. Duan Qing, who kindly made me available the electronic typesetting of the edition of two newly found Tumshuqese documents (Duan 2021).

**For citation:** Hirotoshi Ogihara. “Miscellany on the Tumshuqese Documents: Part II”. *Pis'mennye pamiatniki Vostoka*, 2021, vol. 18, no. 3 (iss. 46), pp. 148–159 (in English). DOI: 10.17816/WMO77877

**About the author:** OGIHARA Hirotoshi, Research Fellow of The University of Tokyo, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology (Linguistics) (Tokyo, Japan). Membre associé of Centre de recherche sur les civilisations de l'Asie orientale (Paris, France) (diyuanym@gmail.com).

## Introduction

The linguistic structure of Tumshuqese, one of the Middle Iranian languages most closely related to Khotanese, has been elucidated ambiguously despite of some newly found materials. However, as it was revealed by previous studies (Hitch 1988, 1990, 1992, TPR, Ogihara & Ching 2014, Ogihara & Ching 2017, Ching 2019, Ogihara 2019, 2020) the secular documents, especially the contracts, are still the most important corpus for linguistic study of this language. In this paper, which is the sequel of my article on the Tumshuqese documents (Ogihara 2020), I will treat some words attested in the Tumshuqese secular documents that have been scarcely discussed in the previous studies. My discussion concerns some passages attested in the Central Asian fragments preserved in IOM, RAS, which were made available to me thanks to the arrangement by our honorand.

### 1. *dau/do* = sg. acc. of *dā*- ‘gift’

As mentioned by Maue (Maue 2009), three fragments in the Paris collection have been identified with the Vessantara-jātaka and they belong to one single folio.<sup>1</sup> It is noteworthy to mention that two more Kucheana fragments kept in the Russian collection, the present inventory number of which are SI 2962-2 and SI 2998-8, were recently identified with this jātaka, and the Kucheana version of this story cannot be attributed to any known Indic texts, but rather most often exhibits similarities with the Chinese and Sogdian versions (Ogihara 2018: e9–e22 and 2021). In this text, a word *dau* is clearly read, and the meaning ‘gift’ could be assigned to it, based on the context where it appears.

HL 27b3–4: ] (*handa*)*ranu dau ārdī t<sup>h</sup> × [...]* *bārzi rende*  
‘[...] whoever(?) does donation to others, in that case(?) [...] he shall become a Buddha.’

HL 27b5: ] (*ha*)*nd(a)ranu dau arū* ‘[...] I shall do/did donation to others.’

The former passage is comparable to the following Kucheana version.

SI 2962-2 + SI 2998-8a6: /// (*āyor*) *aim w(atkā)ṣṣi k(,s)e (ña)štār alyeñk(ā)mts kartse rītatār sū pañākte mäs(ketār) ///*  
‘[...] whoever will give alms, order (alms), want and long for the welfare of others, he shall become a Buddha [...]

From the morphological point of view, Tumsh. *dau* can be regarded as the sg. acc. form of *dā*- ‘gift’, which is etymologically related to OA neuter noun *dāh*- ‘gift’. The Tumshuqese locution *dau ar-* could mean ‘to donate’.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tumshuqese fragments known to scholars by 2009 are quoted by HL number offered by Maue (2009). On the other hand, four documents published by Ogihara and Ching (2013) and TPR are mentioned by TX001–004, and H111 is used for the recently published Tumshuqese contract (see Duan 2021). The Tumshuqese and Kucheana (i.e. Tocharian B) texts quoted in this paper are from my transliteration based on the original fragments. The following signs proposed by Maue (Maue 2009) are used for Tumshuqese. The brackets [ ] placed at the beginning or end of a quoted passage indicate a textual loss at left or right edge of a fragment. One single illegible akṣara is indicated by +, and damaged part of an akṣara (vowel or consonant) is indicated by ×. Round bracket is used for the restored part by me. ♦, | and — indicate the punctuation given in the Tumshuqese documents. ✱ is the akṣara erased by the scribe, and < > is the akṣara added below a line. For the missing part of the fragment, [...] is used, but this sign is also used in the translation to indicate the part which I cannot understand. The <h> appeared in the consonant cluster is noted by the normal h <Ch>, while the aspirated consonant is noted by the superscript <C<sup>h</sup>>.

<sup>2</sup> In Khotanese, the words for ‘gift’ are *dāmgvā*- (< \**dānacī*- < *dā*- ‘to give’) and *haura*- (< *haur*-/lor- ‘to give’) = Tumsh. *rura*- ‘gift(?)’. On the etymology of Khot. *dāmgvā*- and *haura*-, see DKS: 155–156 and 499.

In addition, considering that the vowel /au/ changed into /o/ in a later stage of Tumshuqese as reflected in the declension of the *-aa-* stem nouns and variants of some words, a thus far attested form *do* could be the late form of this *dau*.<sup>3</sup> In fact, as far as the verbs remain, Tumsh. *do* can be regarded as a direct object of the verbs *ar-* ‘to do’ [HL 10.7] and *reṣṭ<sup>h</sup>*- ‘to send’ [HL 14.9], and the context does not contradict this meaning.<sup>4</sup>

HL 10.7: *cu ṣe azu do daro aru biṣu me ṣṣanda bujid<sub>i</sub>*  
‘That I have done donation(?) for a long time(?), thee (lit. my lord) knows (it) in full.’<sup>5</sup>

HL 14.9: *puṣṭā tirye pad<sub>i</sub>esa do ma reṣṭ<sup>h</sup>ed<sub>i</sub>a*  
‘Let (one) not do donation to *puṣṭa*(?) in any manners(?)’

## 2. Numerals

### 2-1. Tumsh. *tshārsa* ‘forty’

New numerals are attested in another fragment kept in the Paris collection. The context suggests that it is a part of a monastic account, both sides of which are written in a writing brush like other Tumshuqese documents.

HL 29b5: | *cantadewā brārā tshārsa ba(ri)* [  
‘[...] brought(3sg.) [...] to a brother of Cantadewa, 40 [...]

Tumsh. *tshārsa* can be regarded as an expected form for ‘forty’, cf. Tumsh. *tshāri* ‘four’, Tumsh. *dase* ‘ten’ and Khot. *tcaholsä/teoholsä* ‘forty’. On the other hand, in the joint article with Maue (Maue & Ogihara 2017), we interpreted Tumsh. *x<sub>8</sub>ārsu* as the numeral ‘forty’, mainly based on the context, the corresponding Khotanese form, and the phonological system of Tumshuqese.

TX002.16: *ṣṣerā bandina ṣe x<sub>8</sub>ārsu hvayi*  
‘He is to be beaten [with] 40 [strokes] as the punishment of the state’.

As suggested there, if our equation of <x<sub>8</sub>> with the phoneme /dz/ is correct, Tumsh. *dzārsu* (previously transliterated as *x<sub>8</sub>ārsu*) would be a secondary form created by the analogy on another numeral, ex. *drisu* ‘thirty’.

<sup>3</sup> The fact that the spelling <au> appears most often in the Buddhist texts, especially in the Karmavācānā text [HL 16], suggests that the vowel /au/ changed into /o/ at a later stage of Tumshuqese. See the alternation of <au> and <o> attested in the following words: Tumsh. *ustamatau* [HL 16.49], *ustamato* [HL 16.36, 58], *ustamad<sub>o</sub>* [HL 10.11] ‘even, finally’ and *gaursu* [H111.4, 5], *gaursā* [or *gorsā* in H111.4], *gorsi* [HL 29.3, 6, 7, H111.6] ‘name of food or cereal(?)’, the latter of which was read as *gautsu*, *gautsā*, *gautsi* respectively by Duan (Duan 2021: 5).

<sup>4</sup> The meaning ‘harm’ was supposed by Hitch (1992: 93), who compares it to Khot. *dū* ‘harm’.

<sup>5</sup> In my discussion on Tumsh. *ṣṣandaa-* ‘lord, ruler’ (Ogihara 2020: 20–21) I quoted three attestations from HL 10, which can be regarded as a letter or a report addressed to a monastery official. In this case, Tumsh. *tepi* at the beginning of this document may be a borrowing from Chin. 牒 *dié* (EMC \*dep; LMC \*tʰiap, on the reconstruction of EMC and LMC, see Pulleyblank 1991), a certain kind of Tang official document or 帖 *tiē* (EMC \*tʰep; LMC \*tʰiap), a simplified form of 牒 *dié* and less formal in use’, cf. Kuch. *tep* (Ching & Ogihara 2010: 108). Thus, the passage HL 10.1: *tepi pese aṣrā kṣemayeṣā* ♦ could be translated as ‘the document for the teacher, *ācārya*, Kṣemayaṣa(s)’. On the other hand, Bailey proposed tentatively the meaning ‘teacher(?)’ to Tumsh. *tepi* (SDTV I: 47).

## 2-2. Tumsh. *hodad<sub>1a</sub>* ‘seventy’

Another numeral appears in the following passages in the same document treated in the preceding section.

HL 29b1: ] *ka + ×i mure rorama hodad<sub>1a</sub>* | ‘We give money to [...], 70.’

HL 29b2: ] *rorama hodad<sub>1ä</sub> pantsi* | ‘We give [...], 75’.

Although Tumsh. *hodad<sub>1a</sub>/hodad<sub>1ä</sub>* has never been recognized by scholars, it is the numeral ‘seventy’, as suggested by the corresponding Khotanese form, *haudātāi/hodātāi* ‘seventy’. If this is accepted, Tumsh. *hodad<sub>1ä</sub> pantsi* should indicate ‘seventy five’.

In addition, Tumsh. *pantsasä* attested in the next line should be a variant for the numeral *patsasu* ‘fifty’.

HL 29b3: ] + *aśanu mure rorama, pantsasä* |

‘[...] We give money for horses, 50’.

## 2-3. Tumsh. *sod<sub>1u</sub>* ‘hundred’

In my latest article on the Tumshuqese, I proposed that Tumsh. *azaru*(sg.)/*zare*(pl.) would be the numeral for ‘thousand’ (Ogihara 2020: 18–20). In the discussion, I mentioned that only the plural form *sad<sub>1e</sub>* is attested for the numeral for ‘hundred’. However, the detailed research on the Tumshuqese materials leads to the supposition that Tumsh. *sod<sub>1u</sub>* would be the singular form for the numeral ‘hundred’. To my knowledge, Tumsh. *sod<sub>1u</sub>* is attested thrice.

HL 11.1: *ak<sup>h</sup>aśad<sub>1a</sub> sod<sub>1u</sub> mare k<sup>h</sup>o*  
‘[...] ?-ed(3sg./pl.) [...] 100(?) *k<sup>h</sup>aas*.’<sup>6</sup>

HL 11.3: *pa-wa k<sup>h</sup>alire sod<sub>1u</sub> k<sup>h</sup>o ād<sub>1a</sub>*  
‘And then, *k<sup>h</sup>alire* arrived, 100(?) *k<sup>h</sup>aas*.’<sup>7</sup>

HL 32.7: [ca. 4 akşaras] + *rr<sup>×</sup> sod<sub>1u</sub> azarū be ma le ×r<sup>×</sup>* [  
‘[...] 100, 000(?) woven cloths(?) [...]’<sup>8</sup>

The context of these attestations is so obscure that it is not easy to propose the exact interpretation. However, Tumsh. *sod<sub>1u</sub>* precedes *azarū* ‘thousand’ in HL 32.7, which is comparable to Khot. *satā-ysāra-* ‘a hundred thousand’ (Skjærvø 2004: 351b). In addition, it is

<sup>6</sup> As will be discussed in the section 3–2 below, Tumsh. *k<sup>h</sup>aa-* is very probably a word of measure, not a commercial item as suggested (Ogihara 2020: 19, fn. 34). In this passage, the main verb *ak<sup>h</sup>aśad<sub>1a</sub>*, of which exact meaning cannot be restored, is the 3sg./pl. impf.-inj. mid. The obscure context does not permit me to decide the grammatical status of *mare* in this passage.

<sup>7</sup> Although Tumsh. *k<sup>h</sup>alire* can be regarded as the subject of *ād<sub>1a</sub>* ‘came(3sg./pl.)’, the number and gender of *k<sup>h</sup>alire* depends on the interpretation of *ād<sub>1a</sub>*. If *ād<sub>1a</sub>* is the f. sg. form, it is the f. sg. noun. On the other hand, it is the pl. noun in case that *ād<sub>1a</sub>* is the m. pl. form. Because it is not possible to decide which is correct, I am obliged to leave it open. If my interpretation of *sod<sub>1u</sub>* and *k<sup>h</sup>o* is correct, it should be a common noun. Still, the meaning of Tumsh. *k<sup>h</sup>alire* remains uncertain. In interpreting the new attestation of this noun in a thus far unknown Tumshuqese document found in China (the inventory number: H111), it is interpreted as ‘prince’ (Duan 2021: 7–8), based on Bailey’s proposition (SDTV I: 47) that it is a proper name, and the comparative study with the documents written in Niya Prākṛit and Bactrian. However, the context of this passage in H111 is too obscure to support the interpretation ‘prince’.

<sup>8</sup> This fragment is preserved in IOM, RAS. The present inventory number is SI Khot.954 (the previous number: SI B/10-1). It is uncertain whether Tumsh. *bema* is the cognate of Khot. *bema-* ‘woven cloth’ (DKS: 303b). Tumsh. *bema* is attested in H111.10 (cf. Duan 2021: 14), who translates this noun as ‘wealth’.

used with the sg. acc. of Tumsh. *k<sup>h</sup>aa-* in HL 11.1 and 11.3 which usually indicates the quantity of a noun accompanied by a numeral. Taking these attestations into account, Tumsh. *sod<sub>1</sub>u* could be most naturally explained as ‘hundred’, cf. Sogd. *stw /satu/* ‘hundred’ (Gharib 1995: 363b). It is remarkable that Tumsh. *sod<sub>1</sub>u* has the neuter ending *-u* as the Sogdian form *stw /satu/* comparable to Av. *satəm* ‘hundred’. In summary, the numerals ‘hundred’ and ‘thousand’ exhibit the same declension in Tumshuqese in difference to Khotanese.

|            | ‘hundred’ (sg./pl.)                        | ‘thousand’ (sg./pl.) |
|------------|--|----------------------|
| Tumshuqese | <i>sod<sub>1</sub>u : sad<sub>1</sub>e</i> | <i>azaru : zare</i>  |
| Khotanese  | <i>satā : sate</i>                         | <i>ysāru : ysāre</i> |

In Tumshuqese, the ending *-u* is used for the singular form of both numerals, and the ending *-e* is assigned to the plural form. On the other hand, the Khot. numeral ‘hundred’ shows the ending *-ā* in the singular form.

#### 2–4. Tumsh. *ḏṛd<sub>1</sub>a-* ‘third’

In the Tumshuqese contracts, the date of a transaction is clearly mentioned at the beginning. It refers to the day, the month and the regnal year of the Gūz̄dik king, to which most of our knowledge on the Tumshuqese ordinals owes. In the course of our decipherment of TX001–004, we encountered the ordinal ‘third’. As mentioned in TPR: 77, the Tumsh. ordinal *ḏṛd<sub>1</sub>e* ‘third’ first given by Ogihara and Ching (Ogihara & Ching 2013: 46, 47, 55) was corrected to *ḏṛd<sub>1</sub>we*, based on the suggestion by Maue.<sup>9</sup>

In her edition of two recently found Tumshuqese documents, Duan proposes the reading *ḏṛd<sub>1</sub>de* to the above mentioned form in the light of a newly attested *ḏṛd<sub>1</sub>te* ‘third’ in the Tumshuqese contract H111 and Khot. *dāda-/dādda-* ‘third’ (Duan 2021: 7, 11).

H111.1: *yaunduyā ḏṛad<sub>1</sub>te ḡṣane buzad<sub>1</sub>ine māste dauwars̄no*

‘In the 3rd regnal year of Yondu, in the Buzad<sub>1</sub>(ina) month, on the 13th day’<sup>10</sup>

However, the scrutiny on the plate of this fragment attached to her paper in which Tumsh. *ḏṛd<sub>1</sub>te* appears enables me to offer another possible interpretation to the Tumsh. ordinal ‘third’.

As mentioned by Duan (Duan 2021: 7), the second akṣara of <*ḏṛd<sub>1</sub>te*> can also be read as <*d<sub>1</sub>ne*>.<sup>11</sup> In my opinion, this form should be *ḏṛd<sub>1</sub>ne*, of which original form is *ḏṛd<sub>1</sub>ane*,

<sup>9</sup> In TX001a7 and a8, Tumsh. *bāg<sub>2</sub>e* is attested twice, to which the translation ‘management’ was given (Ogihara & Ching 2014: 30; 2017: 463). In addition to these attestations in TX001, it also appears in HL 11.7, 9 and HL 32.3. Taking into account that Tumsh. *bāg<sub>2</sub>e* follows the gen.-dat. form of a noun in these attestations, it may be a postposition ‘instead of, for the sake of’ as a cognate of Khot. *bāje, bāja* (SVK I: 86 and III: 112–114).

<sup>10</sup> Here I corrected *dauwa[rs̄aṅyo]* ‘thirteen’ read by Duan (Duan 2021: 5) to *dauwars̄no*, see *infra*.

<sup>11</sup> Although we have two more attestations of <*d<sub>1</sub>te*> in H111.7 and 111.9, the correct reading of these forms should also be <*d<sub>1</sub>ne*>, namely H111.7: <*lāzid<sub>1</sub>ne*> and 111.9: <*bidruhvid<sub>1</sub>ne*>. These are the infinitives with the vowel reduction in the penultimate syllable of *lāz-* ‘meaning unknown’ and *bidruhv-* ‘to misbehave(?)’ respectively. The expected forms are *lāzid<sub>1</sub>ane* and *bidruhvid<sub>1</sub>ane*, cf. *parād<sub>1</sub>ane, parād<sub>1</sub>āne, and parād<sub>1</sub>ine* attested as the infinitive of *parat<sup>h</sup>-/parād<sub>1</sub>a-* ‘to sell’. Although the insufficient documentation of Tumshuqese does not lead to the detailed description of the Tumsh. verbal system, Tumsh. verbs can be classified to four, mainly, two Classes as in Khotanese (Ogihara 2019: 299–302). Class A in Tumshuqese has *-i-* between stem and ending for the 3sg. prs. act./mid., which corresponds to *-ā-* of Khot. Class A. On the other hand, this *-i-* does not appear in Tumsh. Class B as in Khot. Class B, thus, stem directly followed by ending. The insertion of *-i-* also applies to the 3sg. imper. act. and past stem of Class A, the latter of which goes back to the past passive participle of Old Iranian in *\*-ta*. In the impf.-inj. in Tumshuqese, the distinction between Classes A and B is reflected by the different endings, namely 3sg. mid.: *-tal/-da*; 3pl. mid.: *-anda* are restricted to Class B, although the ending 3sg./pl. mid.: *-ad<sub>1</sub>a* applies to both Classes.

the m. sg. loc. of *drd<sub>1</sub>a-* as suggested by Tumsh. *dritana* ‘thrice’, the sg. instr.-abl. of *drita-* (Bailey 1950: 653).<sup>12</sup> Moreover, Tumsh. *bid<sub>1</sub>ane* attested in TX001a1 and b9, the m. sg. loc. form of *bid<sub>1</sub>a-* ‘second’, lends support to *drd<sub>1</sub>ne* with the vowel reduction in the penultimate syllable which goes back to *drd<sub>1</sub>ane*.<sup>13</sup> Thus, the above quoted passage should read as H111.1: *drad<sub>1</sub>ne xšane buzad<sub>1</sub>ine māste dauwarsño*.

If this is accepted, Tumsh. *drd<sub>1</sub>we* we read in TX001 and 003 should be reconsidered. I would rather like to read this form as <drd<sub>1</sub>nye> with <y> indicating the palatalization of a preceding /n/ caused by the ending *-e* as follows.

TX001a1–2 and b9–10: *wāsudewā bid<sub>1</sub>ane xšane gūhā sālye xšimane māste drd<sub>1</sub>nye*  
‘In the 2nd regnal year of Wāsudewa, the year of ox, in the 6th month, on the 3rd day.’

TX003a1–2: *wāsudewā hodmane xšane ašā sālye (a)hvarjane māste drd<sub>1</sub>nye*  
‘In the 7th regnal year of Wāsudewa, the year of horse, in the Ahvarjana month, on the 3rd day’<sup>14</sup>

The problem is that the akṣara <nya> written below <d<sub>1</sub>a> is different from the usually attested form, and it rather resembles <wa>. In the ligature <nya> composed of <na> and <ya>, <na> deletes the bottom stroke and only leaves the upper part, to which the <ya> specific to the ligature is attached.<sup>15</sup> What is important is that the akṣara <na> is never written in its full form as the first component of a ligature. On the other hand, <na> is written almost in its full form as the second component.

Now it is possible to suppose that the scribe of TX001 and 003 would have used the normal <na> as the second component to write the ligature <d<sub>1</sub>na> first, and added the <ya> specific to the ligature to this <d<sub>1</sub>na> as the third component. Consequently, the ligature <nya> in <d<sub>1</sub>nya> is different from the usually attested <nya>.<sup>16</sup> If it is correct, Tumsh. *drd<sub>1</sub>ne* and *drd<sub>1</sub>nye* can be set up as the m. sg. loc. form of the ordinal *drd<sub>1</sub>a-* ‘third’.

### 3. Words of measure

#### 3-1. Tumsh. *jaha-*

In the fragment preserved in the Paris collection, the hapax *jhā* appears.<sup>17</sup>

HL 30a5: ] *risa bari 2 jhā* | ‘[...] brought(3sg.) [...], 2 *jahas*’.

To my knowledge, the verb *hvan-* ‘to speak’ is the exception to these rules (cf. *hvan-* ‘to speak’: 3sg. act. prs. *hvanid<sub>1</sub>i/hvañid<sub>1</sub>i*, past stem: *hvata-/hvad<sub>1</sub>a-*). Tumsh. infinitives are based on the past stem. Consequently, Tumsh. *lāzid<sub>1</sub>ne* (< *lāzid<sub>1</sub>ane*) attested in H111.7 derives from *lāzid<sub>1</sub>a-*, the past stem of the verb *lāz-*. The present stem *lāz-* is confirmed by the agent noun *lāzāki* (TX003a4).

<sup>12</sup> Concerning the m. sg. loc. ending *-ane*, see (Maggi 1991: 221–224).

<sup>13</sup> The vowel reduction in the penultimate syllable is also observable in *dauwarsño* (or *dowarsño*) ‘twelve’ in H111.1, which was read as *dauwa[rsañyo]* (Duan 2021: 5), cf. *dowarsañyo* without the vowel reduction attested in HL 33.2.

<sup>14</sup> The translation ‘In the 2nd regnal year of Wāsudewa’ at the beginning of TX003 given in (Ogihara & Ching 2017: 465) should be corrected as here.

<sup>15</sup> For the Brāhmī script developed in the northern rim of the Tarim basin (Malzahn 2007).

<sup>16</sup> At present, the lack of other attestations does not permit me to decide whether this is the normal writing style for <d<sub>1</sub>nya> in the Tumshuqese or not.

<sup>17</sup> The faint trace of a vowel diacritic sign above <jha> at the beginning of line a2 of the same document permits us to restore *jh(ā)*. The vertical line after this akṣara indicates that this passage ends with this akṣara as line a5 quoted here.

In my opinion, this form should be the m. pl. nom.-acc. form of *jaha-*. Tumsh. *jaha-* has been recognized since the pioneering work by Konow (Konow 1935: 818; Konow 1947: 183), according to whom it would mean ‘how, that’. However, the context suggests that it can be safely interpreted as a word of measure.

HL 7.1: *k<sup>h</sup>ašo g<sub>2</sub>i latsāngi yesi mo bari jahu nā*  
 ‘Latsāngi came(?) from Kāš(?). He brought wine, 9 *jahas*’.<sup>18</sup>

In this attestation, the sg. acc. form of *jaha-* is used to indicate the quantity of liquid.<sup>19</sup> As well as in Khotanese (Emmerick 1965: 25), the usage of the nominative case as measure is known to Tumshuqese as pointed out by Hitch (Hitch 1987: 59–60).

HL 6.5–6: *dad<sub>1</sub>i-hvana dād<sub>1</sub>u hvañi lāwu yi k<sup>h</sup>āli rorama śo soli*  
 ‘The preacher is scheduled to preach a law. We give oilcake paste(?) as a donation/tribute(?) to him, one *sola*’.<sup>20</sup>

In this passage, Tumsh. *soli* is the m. sg. nom. form of *sola-*, and its plural form *sole* is also attested in HL 6.2, 7.3 and 7.4. Thus, Tumsh. *jhā* in HL 30a5 introduced here can also be interpreted in the same line of thought. The vowel reduction in the first syllable and lengthening of the final vowel can be supported by *howa* attested in TX002a9, as a variant of the sg. nom. form *hvā* of *hvar-* ‘sister’.

Furthermore, the interpretation of Tumsh. *jhā* as the m. pl. nom.-acc. form of *jaha-* could lead to a better understanding of the final word in the following sentence which has been read and interpreted differently.

HL 4.13: *bije šeñcu sud<sub>1</sub>ati [SIG] hampara-ñijane še mo rahuho jhā*  
 ‘Witness, Śeñcu, Sud<sub>1</sub>ati. [SIG]<sup>21</sup> Wine to(?) the *hampara*’s [...], *rahuho jahas*’.<sup>22</sup>

These sentences appear in the list of witnesses of the contract. The last akṣara of the latter sentence has been interpreted in two different ways, namely as a verbal form and as a signature. Konow proposed <jāha> (Konow 1935: 808, 818) and <jeha> (Konow 1947: 168, 183) as a verbal form of 2sg. imper. act. of *jāh-* ‘to clean’. On the other hand, Hitch and Maue regard it as a signature, although their readings are different from each other: <jā + ha> (Hitch 1985) and <jhe> (Maue 2009).

However, the last akṣara can also be read as <jhā>. In addition, this line seems to be written in the same hand, and the signatures in the Brāhmī script given in this contract are rotated 90 degrees counterclockwise just like <su> in the preceding part of HL 4.13 quoted here (transliterated as [SIG]). These signatures and <jhā> are written in different hands

<sup>18</sup> I regard Tumsh. *k<sup>h</sup>ašo* as the pl. instr.-abl. of *k<sup>h</sup>aša-* ‘Kāš(?)’ tentatively, cf. Khot. *khyeša-* ‘Kāš (KT VII: 50–54)’.

<sup>19</sup> Tumsh. *jahu* also appears in HL 7.2 and 7.3. Furthermore, Tumsh. *jahā* attested in HL 29a3 can be taken as a variant of *jahu*.

<sup>20</sup> Tumsh. *k<sup>h</sup>āli* may be a loan word from BHS *khali-* ‘oil-cake’ (BHSD: 204a). I regard Tumsh. *lāwu* as a borrowing from an unattested Bactrian *\*lā-(?)*, cf. OA *dāh-* ‘gift’ introduced above.

<sup>21</sup> Tumsh. *šeñcu* was regarded as ‘a Chinese title’ (Konow: 1935: 808–809, 811, 822), or ‘name, or surname of a man’ (Konow 1947: 168–169, 170, 188). On the other hand, Tumsh. *sud<sub>1</sub>ani* read by Konow (op. cit.) was rejected by Hitch (1985) and Maue (2009), which I follow here. Tumsh. *šeñcu sud<sub>1</sub>ati* appears as *sud<sub>1</sub>ati šeñcu* in HL 6.3. In my opinion, Tumsh. *šeñcu* would be a title. The signature <su> confirms that Tumsh. *sud<sub>1</sub>ati* is a personal name.

<sup>22</sup> The exact meaning of Tumsh. *hampara-* is ambiguous. Konow (1935: 817 and 1947: 189) and Bailey (1958: 152–153) regard it as ‘store, storehouse’. On the other hand, the interpretation of *hampara-* as ‘object that brings yearly profit’ was proposed by Ching Chao-jung in the course of our decipherment of TX001–004, cf. TPR: 85, Ogihara & Ching (2014: 24 and 2017: 471).

evidently. If this is the case, the latter interpretation as a signature should be reconsidered. The fact that Tumsh. *mo* ‘wine’ appears here suggests that <jhā> attested in this passage would be very probably the m. pl. nom.-acc. form of *jaha-*. In this case, *rahuho* preceding it would be a thus far unknown numeral which indicates plurality.<sup>23</sup>

### 3-2. Tumsh. *k<sup>h</sup>aa-*

As briefly mentioned in the footnote in the section 2–3 above, Tumsh. *k<sup>h</sup>aa-* is very probably a word of measure, not a commercial item as suggested in Ogihara (Ogihara 2020: 19, fn. 34). In most of the attestations, it appears as the sg. acc. form, *k<sup>h</sup>o* (in total 16 times). The nominative form is *k<sup>h</sup>a/ka* [HL 38.2, 38.3], and *k<sup>h</sup>ayo* [HL 11.15] can be assigned to the pl. instr.-abl. form. The sg. acc. form *k<sup>h</sup>o*, usually accompanied by a numeral, indicates the quantity of a noun. Below are quoted some attestations that exemplify well its usage.

HL 10.14: *śida k<sup>h</sup>o 50 mre 5 ka 1000 bārre 10*  
 ‘Śida (received?) 50 *k<sup>h</sup>aas*, 5000 *murās*, 10 *bārrās*’.

HL 11.1: *ak<sup>h</sup>aśad<sub>1</sub>a sod<sub>1</sub>u mare k<sup>h</sup>o*  
 ‘[...] ?-ed(3sg./pl.) [...] 100(?) *k<sup>h</sup>aas*’.

HL 11.3: ♦ *mare k<sup>h</sup>o Ꞥ cilye rorama* ♦  
 ‘Here we give 1 *k<sup>h</sup>aa* as *cila*’.

HL 11.3: *pa-wa k<sup>h</sup>alire sod<sub>1</sub>u k<sup>h</sup>o ād<sub>1</sub>a*  
 ‘And then, *k<sup>h</sup>alire* arrived, 100(?) *k<sup>h</sup>aas*’.

HL 11.4–5: *yaśawirā k<sup>h</sup>o t<sup>h</sup>a sad<sub>1</sub>a bista paṃ-tsi* ♦ *cīla bari* ♦  
 ‘He brought 120 *k<sup>h</sup>aas* of *cila* to Yaśawira’.

HL 11.5–6: *rid<sub>1</sub>a byeg<sub>1</sub>yi cākarra gix<sub>6</sub>e — parat<sup>h</sup>i dva sad<sub>1</sub>e <driśu> haśad<sub>1</sub>a k<sup>h</sup>o ag<sub>2</sub>ami*  
 ++ <10 5> [(+)] *g<sub>1</sub>×* [(+)] *ri bari* ♦  
 ‘[...] Cākarra sold sheep(?) [...] 230 *k<sup>h</sup>aas* [...] 15 [...] brought(3sg.) [...]’

HL 11.25: ♦ *briyalka* ♦ *k<sup>h</sup>o rori sa 10 cila ṅesta* ♦  
 ‘Briyalka gave [...] 1 *k<sup>h</sup>aas*, and received 10 *cilas*.’

HL 11.26: *śo k<sup>h</sup>o we lakana gr(nda) | kuṇḍi g<sub>1</sub>a še |*  
 ‘A pot was bought from Laka, 1 *k<sup>h</sup>aa*’.<sup>24</sup>

As the above attestations reveal, Tumsh. *k<sup>h</sup>o* indicates the quantity of a noun, accompanied by a numeral.

As for the classification of the stem of this noun, it can be regarded both as the *-ā-* stem noun and as the *-aa-* stem noun, for these two nominal classes have the same endings: the sg. nom. *-a* and sg. acc. *-o* (the original form being *-au* for the *-aa-* stem nouns). However, since Tumsh. *-ā-* stem nouns have *-yo* as the pl. instr.-abl. ending, cf. *bisyo* [HL 2.8] for *bisā-* ‘house’, the pl. instr.-abl. form *k<sup>h</sup>ayo* suggests that it would be classified to the *-aa-* stem noun.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the stem form of *k<sup>h</sup>ā-* (Ogihara 2020: 19, fn. 34) should be abandoned.

<sup>23</sup> Even if this is accepted, it is still not easy to interpret the interrelationship between these two sentences.

<sup>24</sup> Tumsh. *kuṇḍi* would be a loan word from Indic languages, cf. Skt. *kuṇḍin-* ‘a kind of vessel’ [MW: 290a].

<sup>25</sup> On the other hand, the sg. instr.-abl. ending of the *-aa-* stem nouns is *-ona/-onā*, cf. *mitrona* <*mitraa-* ‘Maitreya’, *pesonā* <*pesaa-* ‘teacher’, and *brikanonā* <*brikanaa-* ‘personal name’.



## Concluding remarks

In this paper, I interpreted some words appeared in the Tumshuqese secular documents. My discussion mainly concerns the Tumshuqese numerals together with words of measure. Among them, Tumsh. *tshārsa* ‘forty’, *hodad<sub>1</sub>a* ‘seventy’, *sod<sub>1</sub>u* ‘hundred’, and *dr<sub>1</sub>a-* ‘third’ deserve to be mentioned. These forms resemble the corresponding Khotanese forms, *tcaholsäl/tcoholsä*, *haudätäl/hodätä*, *satä*, and *däda-/dädda-* respectively. Still, they show the peculiarities in phonetic changes and the morphology in Tumshuqese. Although the documents belong to the best preserved materials in Tumshuqese, the attestations are so scarce that it is not easy to draw a decisive conclusion. Not only comparative research but also detailed examination of context of the texts will be required to elucidate unsolved problems.

## Addendum

After my submission of this contribution, Dr. Dieter Maue kindly informed me that <hvid<sub>1</sub>ne> attested in H111.9 should be interpreted as <bidruhvid<sub>1</sub>ne>, the infinitive of *bidruhv-* as quoted in p. 152, fn. 11 (p.c. email on 24 August 2021). I would like to express my deepest gratitude to him for his remarks. We are preparing the re-edition of two Tumshuqese documents H111 and H112 published by Duan (Duan 2021).

## Abbreviations

AV. — Avesta  
 BHS — Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit  
 EMC — Early Middle Chinese  
 Khot. — Khotanese  
 Kuch. — Kuchean  
 LMC — Late Middle Chinese  
 OA — Old Avesta  
 Sogd. — Sogdian  
 Tumsh. — Tumshuqese

BHSD — *Edgerton, Franklin*. Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit grammar and dictionary. Vol. II: Dictionary. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953 (in English).

DKS — *Bailey, H. W.* Dictionary of Khotan Saka. London: CUP, 1979 (in English).

KT VII — *Bailey, H. W.* Khotanese Texts. Volume VII. Cambridge: CUP, 1985 (in English).

MW — *Monier-Williams M.* Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged. Oxford: Clarendon, 1899 (in English).

SDTV I — *Bailey, H. W.* Saka Documents. Text Volume (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum. Pt. II: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Period and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia. Vol. V: Saka.). London: Lund Humphries, 1968 (in English).

SVK I — *Emmerick, R.E., P.O. Skjærvø*. Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese I (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 401. Bd.). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1982 (in English).

- SVK III — *Emmerick, R.E., P.O. Skjærvø. Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese III* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 651. Bd.). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997 (in English).
- TPR — *Bureau of Cultural Relics of Tumshuk City* 圖木舒克市文物局, *Center for Research on Ancient Chinese History, Peking University* 北京大學中國古代史研究中心, *Institute for Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions, Renmin University of China* 中國人民大學國學院西域歷史語言研究所. *Sanjian xinchu jushideyu qiyue* 三件新出據史德語契約 [Three Newly Found Tumshuqese Sale Contracts], *Xiyu lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 西域歷史語言研究所集刊 [Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions], 2014. Vol. 7. pp. 63–105 (in Chinese).

## References

- Bailey, H.W. “The Tumshuq Karmavācānā”. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 1950, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 649–670, 809–810 (in English).
- Bailey, H.W. “Languages of the Saka”. Ed. by K. Hoffmann, W.B. Henning, H.W. Bailey et al. *Handbuch der Orientalistik. 4. Bd. Iranistik; 1. Abschnitt: Linguistik*. 1958. Leiden: E.J. Brill, pp. 131–154 (in English).
- Ching Chao-jung 慶昭蓉. “The Four Cardinal Directions in Tumshuqese”. Ed. by Pavel B. Lurje. *Proceedings of the Eighth European Conference of Iranian Studies*, vol. 1, 2019. St. Petersburg: State Hermitage Publishers, pp. 66–86 (in English).
- Ching Chao-jung 慶昭蓉, Ogiwara Hirotochi 荻原裕敏. “Internal Relationships and Dating of the Tocharian B Monastic Accounts in the Berlin Collection”. *Nairiku aija gengo no kenkyu* 內陸アジア言語の研究 [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages], 2010, vol. 25, pp. 75–141 (in English).
- Duan Qing 段晴. “Huang Wenbi faxian de liang jian jushideyu wenshu” 黃文弼發現的兩件據史德語文書 [Two Gūzdiya Documents Discovered by Huang Wenbi]. *Xiyu wenshi* 西域文史 [The Western Regions Literature and History], 2021, vol. 15, pp. 1–18 (in Chinese).
- Emmerick, R.E. “Syntax of the Cases in Khotanese”. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 1965, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 24–33 (in English).
- Gharib, B. *Sogdian Dictionary: Sogdian—Persian—English*. Tehran: Farhang Publications, 1995 (in English).
- Hitch, D.A. *Tumshuqese Transcriptions*, 1985. Wateringen (in English).  
[[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329030821\\_Tumshuqese\\_Transcriptions](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329030821_Tumshuqese_Transcriptions) (Last access: 2021/8/4)].
- Hitch, D.A. “Tumshuqese and Tocharian Word of Measure”. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, 1987, vol. 1, pp. 59–62 (in English).
- Hitch, D.A. “Penalty Clauses in Tumshuqese, Khotanese and the Shanshan Prakrit”. *Studia Iranica*, 1988, Vol. 17, pp. 147–152 (in English).
- Hitch, D.A. “Prakrit Administration at Tumshuq”. *Paper read at the 33rd ICANAS. 1990* [[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320291220\\_Prakrit\\_Administration\\_at\\_Tumshuq](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320291220_Prakrit_Administration_at_Tumshuq) (Last access: 2021/8/4)] (in English).
- Hitch, D.A. “Tumshuqese *reṣth-* (*reṣṭh-*): Khotanese \**hiṣt-* ‘send’”. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 1992, vol. 16, pp. 91–95 (in English).
- Konow, Sten. “Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt”. *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse*. 1935. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrgang 1935, pp. 772–823 (in German).
- Konow, Sten. “The Oldest Dialect of Khotanese Saka”. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, 1947, Bind 14, pp. 159–190 (in English).
- Maggi, Mauro. “Note tumšūqesi”. *Studia linguistica amico et magistro oblata: Scritti di amici e allievi dedicati alla memoria di Enzo Evangelisti (Quaderni della collana di linguistica storica e descrittiva 3)*. Milano: Unicopli, 1991, pp. 219–228 (in Italian).

- Malzahn, Melanie. “The Tocharian Brahmi Chart”. Ed. by Melanie Malzahn. *Instrumenta Tocharica*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2007, pp. 223–254 (in English).
- Maue, Dieter. *Corpus of Tumshuqese Fragments: Introduction, Handlist, Transliteration*. TITUS (Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien), 2009 [<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/indexe.htm>] (Last access: 2021/8/4)] (in English).
- Maue, Dieter, Ogihara Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏. “Tumshukische Miscellen III: 3. Tumshukese Dental Affricates”. Ed. by Turfanforschung. *Zur lichten Heimat. Gedenkschrift für Werner Sundermann*. 2017. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp. 421–432 (in German).
- Ogihara Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏. “Roshia shozo Tokarago bunken ni kansuru oboegaki” ロシア所蔵トカラ語文献に関する覚え書き [Remarks on the Tocharian Manuscript Remains Housed in the Russian Collection]. *Tokyo daigaku gengogaku ronshu denshiban (eTULIP)* 東京大学言語学論集 電子版 (eTULIP) [Tokyo University linguistic papers (eTULIP)]. 2018. pp. e1–e41 [<https://doi.org/10.15083/00076315>] (in Japanese).
- Ogihara Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏. “Tumshuqese Imperfect and Its Related Forms”. Ed. by Pavel B. Lurje. *Proceedings of the Eighth European Conference of Iranian Studies*, vol. 1, 2019. St. Petersburg: State Hermitage Publishers, pp. 297–309 (in English).
- Ogihara Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏. “Miscellany on the Tumshuqese documents”. *Central Asiatic Journal*, 2020, vol. 63, no. 1–2. pp. 11–24 (in English).
- Ogihara Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏. “She ji ji ren de zizai wangzi—Vessantara-jātaka zhi fan, han, qiuci, sute zhuben bijiao” 捨己濟人的自在王子—Vessantara-jātaka 之梵、漢、龜茲、粟特諸本比較 [Altruism of the All-subduing Prince: A Close Comparison of the Sanskrit, Chinese, Kuchean and Sogdian Versions of the *Vessantara-jātaka*]. Ed. by Zheng Acai 鄭阿財, Wang Juan 汪娟. *Zhang Guangda xiansheng jiushi huadan zhushou lunwenji* 張廣達先生九十華誕祝壽論文集. 2 vols. Taibei: Xinwenfeng chuban 新文豐出版, 2021, pp. 985–1022 (in Chinese).
- Ogihara Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏, Ching Chao-jung 慶昭蓉. “Xinchu Jushideyu siyuan qiyue wenshu ji qita” 新出據史德語寺院契約文書及其他 [A Newly Found Tumshuqese Monastic Contract and Other Related Findings]. *Xiyu wenshi* 西域文史 [The Western Regions Literature and History], 2013, vol. 7, pp. 43–61 (in Chinese).
- Ogihara Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏, Ching Chao-jung 慶昭蓉. “Xinshutsu Tumshukugo kēyaku monjo ni tsuite” 新出トウムシク語契約文書について [On the Tumshuqese Contracts Newly Published in China]. *Nairiku ajia gengo no kenkyu* 内陸アジア言語の研究 [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages], 2014, vol. 29, pp. 7–55 (in Japanese).
- Ogihara Hirotoshi 荻原裕敏, Ching Chao-jung 慶昭蓉. “Some Observations on the Tumshuqese Documents Newly Published in China”. Ed. by Turfanforschung. *Zur lichten Heimat. Gedenkschrift für Werner Sundermann*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2017, pp. 453–482 (in English).
- Pulleyblank, E.G. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1991 (in English).
- Skjærvø, Prods O. *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras, the Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra. Volume II: Manuscripts, Commentary, Glossary, Indexes*. (Sources of orien 慶昭蓉. “Some Observations on the Tumshuqese Documents Newly Published in China”. Ed. by Turfanforschung. *Zur lichten Heimat. Gedenkschrift für Werner Sundermann*. Wiesbaden: tal languages and literatures, 61. Central Asian sources; 6). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004 (in English).

## Сборник документов на тумшукском языке: Часть II

Хиротоси ОГИХАРА  
Токио, Япония

Статья поступила в редакцию 03.06.2021.

Аннотация: Настоящая статья является продолжением серии работ по тумшукскому языку (часть I см.: *Central Asiatic Journal*, 2020, vol. 63, no. 1–2. pp. 11–24). Исследования тумшукского языка, одного из среднеиранских языков, идут сравнительно медленно из-за недостатка письменного материала, а также отсутствия параллельных текстов, которые могли бы дать почву для сравнительного анализа. Однако гражданские документы, особенно различные контракты, являются крайне важным источником для лингвистического анализа языка, так как во-первых, контракты на тумшукском языке лучше всего сохранились, а во-вторых, некоторые части этих контрактов можно сравнить с подобными контрактами на других центральноазиатских языках. В настоящей статье делается попытка проанализировать некоторые тумшукские слова, встречаемые в гражданских документах, например, числительные *tshārsa* «сорок», *hodad<sub>1</sub>a* «семьдесят», *sod<sub>1</sub>u* «сто», *drd<sub>1</sub>a* «третий», меры *jaha*- и *k<sup>h</sup>aa*- к существительному *dau/do* «подарок». Среди этих слов числительные *tshārsa* «сорок» и *hodad<sub>1</sub>a* «семьдесят» встречаются впервые. Несмотря на то что другие слова были уже известны ученым, тем не менее в статье дается новая интерпретация их значения или анализ их использования.

Ключевые слова: среднеиранские языки, тумшукский язык, Центральная Азия, гражданские документы, контракты, числительные, слова мер.

Благодарность: Эта статья является выражением моей благодарности проф. Ирине Поповой за помощь в моей работе с центральноазиатскими фрагментами, хранящимися в Институте восточных рукописей РАН, которую я начал еще в 2008 г. Я также выражаю глубокую признательность проф. Дуань Цину, снабдившему меня электронным изданием двух недавно обнаруженных тумшукских текстов (Duan 2021).

Для цитирования: *Огихара Хиротоси*. Сборник документов на тумшукском языке: Часть II // Письменные памятники Востока. 2021. Т. 18. № 3 (вып. 46). С. 148–159 (на англ. яз.). DOI: 10.17816/WMO77877

Об авторе: ОГИХАРА Хиротоси, научный сотрудник Высшей школы гуманитарных исследований и социологии (лингвистика) Университета Токио (Токио, Япония). Центр исследований цивилизаций Восточной Азии (CRCAO), Париж, Франция (diyuanyumini@gmail.com).