The Injunctive in Khotanese

HIROSHI KUMAMOTO

University of Tokyo

1. It appears that the claim of the survival of the injunctive in Middle Iranian languages was first made by Paul Tedesco in 1923. In an article remarkably penetrating in many respects,[1] Tedesco proposed to see (p. 289ff.) the "Präsensstamm-Präteritum", that is, the present stem with the secondary ending in two Khotanese forms (1sg. *parsu* and 3sg. *nāsta*), in which earlier Ernst Leumann wanted to see alternative subjunctive (Konjunktiv) forms.[2] This is remarkable because at that time, the only published Old Khotanese text in which these "injunctive forms" exclusively occur was the Maitreya chapter of the Book of Zambasta (*Z* 22; Leumann's[3] E XXIII), and these forms are not included there. Tedesco apparently picked them up, without knowing the contexts, from the "Glossar" in Leumann's 1912 book (n. 2), which offers words with some grammatical discussion from published and unpublished materials. He then compared them to the Christian Sogdian form *ϑbrw* "I give" in the phrase *qt sn'm ϑbrw pr 'p* "that I give baptism with water" (Jo 1.33).[4] Tedesco calls this "einen auffallenden Rest injunktivischer Verwendung".

Nine years later, in the first systematic grammatical survey of the Khotanese language, published in his *Saka Studies* (1932), Sten Konow remarked (p. 54) that:

> The old past tense has ceased to denote the past. As in Sogdian, however, we have a tense with secondary terminations, which might be characterized as an imperfect. In Saka it is used as an imperative and as a future, and I shall call this tense injunctive.

He then goes on to set up a section "Injunctive" on pp. 56-7 following those on "Conjunctive" (i.e. subjunctive) and "Optative". There he states as follows:

> The form which I call injunctive is, as already remarked, used as an imperative, or as a future, generally with the implication of intention.

---

[1]   It is here that the Sogdian "rhythmic law" was first mentioned.

[2]   Leumann (1912) 120 (there *nāsta* is grouped together with *nāsāte* under Konj. 3sg.) and 122.

[3]   Leumann (1919).

[4]   Müller (1912) 61. The Greek original has (ὁ πέμψας) με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι, but the Syriac, from which the Sogdian version was made, has *d-'a'med b-mayā* "that I baptize with water".

> In the sing. we have 1 *parsu*, I will be released, let me be released; *pulsu*, I will ask; *biṣṭ-ū*, *biṣṭ-ūṃ*, I will be a pupil; *haurūmä*, I will give; *hvāñūṃ*, I will say, &c.; 2 *dijsi*, take; *ma khiji*, don't be wearied, &c; 3 *birätaʼ*, will split, with active; *hautta*, will know, *nāsta*, will take, &c., with middle termination. No certain plural forms have been recorded, but *parsāma*, we may be released, mentioned above as a conjunctive, is perhaps more properly an injunctive.

Actually, in the Glossary of the book, which covers all the published materials at that time, some more verb forms are assigned to the injunctive (altogether 11 forms for the 1sg. act., 7 forms for the 2sg. act., 10 forms for the 3sg. act. and mid.).

When a complete edition by Ernst Leumann (1859-1931) of the longest and most important Khotanese text (his manuscript E; later to be called the Book of Zambasta by H. W. Bailey) was published by Manu Leumann in three parts (1933, 1934 and 1936),[5] Konow wrote two review articles[6] and was able to add some more "injunctive" forms to his collection.

In 1941, when Konow published *Khotansakische Grammatik*, he has a section on the Injunktiv after the Konjunktiv and the Optativ and before the Imperativ, as follows:

> 77. Die Form, die hier Injunktiv genannt wird, wird mit Sekundärendungen gebildet, und gebraucht von einer beabsichtigten Handlung, als ein milder Imperativ mit und ohne Negation, und als erzählendes Tempus. Belegt sind bloß Singularformen und die 1. Pers. Plur. Vgl. *pulsu* 'ich möchte fragen'; *pajāysä* 'empfang', *ma khiji* 'werde nicht müde'; *drāha* 'er möge befestigen', *yana* 'will machen'; *nāsta* 'wird nehmen', *haraysda* 'streckte sich aus'; *yanāma* 'wir mögen machen'.

His posthumously published *Primer of Khotanese Saka*,[7] which is a revised English version of the *Khotansakische Grammatik*, has essentially the same passage with some examples removed and some others added:

---

[5]   The first part (up to p. 193) has the first half of the text with translation, the second part (up to p. 359) the rest of the text, and the final part (up to p. 530) has "Einleitung" (pp. VII-XXXIX), some Appendices and a complete glossary prepared by Manu Leumann. All three parts were reprinted in a single volume in 1966 by Kraus Reprint Limited.

[6]   Konow (1934) for parts 1 and 2 and (1939) for part 3.

[7]   Also separately as a book (Oslo 1949).

77. The form I here call injunctive consists of the present base with secondary terminations. It denotes an intended action and is used as a polite imperative and also as an imperfect; thus *pulsu*, "I intend to ask"; *vahīysu*, "I intend to descend"; *ma khiji*, "don't worry"; *drāha*, "he may strengthen"; *haraysda*, "he prostrated himself"; *yanāma*, "we may make". The last-mentioned form can also be considered as a conjunctive.

It is to be kept in mind that, although Konow apparently had partial access to the unpublished manuscripts at the India Office Library late in his life (see occasional mentions in the articles of 1934-1939), it was impossible for him to get an adequate picture of the development of the Khotanese language. It was only in 1949 that H. W. Bailey, who by that time had gone through all the materials of the British and French collections, made it clear that there are (at least) two distinct stages, each with a more or less coherent grammatical system, of Older and Later Khotanese.[8] With this recognition many of Konow's "injunctives", which belong to Late Khotanese, came to be explained otherwise (thus, all the 1sg. act. forms in -*ūṃ* belong to Late Khotanese and are to be explained as IIr *-*āmi* > *-*ami* > O.Kh. -*īmä* > -*ūmä* > L.Kh. -*ūṃ*; some forms in -*u* are to be seen as the 2sg. imper. mid. < *-*ahu̯a*; all the 2sg. forms are identical with opt. and to be seen as such, etc.).

When in the 1960s most of the major collections[9] of the Khotanese manuscripts became available through the efforts of H. W. Bailey, his student R. E. Emmerick undertook a systematic description of the nominal and verbal morphologies of Khotanese as a doctoral dissertation at Cambridge. On pp. 210-1 of *Saka Grammatical Studies*,[10] he describes the Injunctive as follows:

INJUNCTIVE

Active	Middle
1. sg. -*u*	1. sg.
3. sg. -*(ä)ta*	3. sg. -*(ä)ta*

---

[8] Bailey (1949) 138f.

[9] The Hoernle and Stein collections in London, the Pelliot collection in Paris and the Hedin collection in Stockholm, but not the Russian (Petrovsky and Malov) collections, which became available *in toto* outside Russia only in the 1990s. At that time only the Book of Zambasta and a few other texts in the Russian collections, on which Ernst Leumann had worked, were known in the West.

[10] Emmerick (1968a); hereafter *SGS*.

1. First person singular active

-u < O.Ir. **-am*, cf. Av. *-əm*, O.Ind. *-am*. Cf. Chr. B. Sogd. *-w* I.G., *GMS*, § 688, p. 108.

One certain example, O.Kh.: *parsu Z* 24.435. In the case of present stems already palatalized, it is not possible to distinguish inj. from opt. (v. p. 207, I (b)).

2. Third person singular active

-ta must be from the mid. *-ta* generalized.

A. *-äta*, *-ita*. O.Kh. *-äta*: *kūśäta Z* 14.98; *-ita*: *māñita Z* 22.278 (v. S. Konow, *NTS*, vii, 1934, 16-7).

B. *-ta*: *tsūta Suv* K. 32r5 *KT* 5.110; *-da* (after *-n*): *jinda Z* 22.278 (v. S. Konow, *NTS*, vii, 1934, 16-7). Act. or mid.: *paysānda Suv* K. 34r3 *KT* 5.112; *yanda Z* 2.180; 5.48; 14.86; 22.22; 22.278.

3. Third person singular middle

-ta < O.Ir. **-(a)ta*, cf. Av., O.Ind. *-(a)ta*.

A. O.Kh. *-äta*: *hämäta Suv* K. 35r6 *KT* 5.113.

B. O.Kh. *-ta*: *nāsta Z* 3.149; 24.387; Kha. 1.13. 145r5 *KBT* 7; *SS* 36v1 *KT* 5.337; *butta Z* 2.25, 117; 8.36; *hautta Z* 24.437.

After *-ṣ* O.Kh. has *-ḍa*: *nijsaṣḍa Z* 14.96; *pyūṣḍa Z* 5.25; 8.35; *Suv* K. 34r5 *KT* 5.112 tr. *śṛṇuyād*; *haṃjsaṣḍa Z* 13.147; *Suv* K. 32r6 *KT* 5.110 tr. °*kāmo bhavet*.

After *-ys* O.Kh. has *-da*: *pachīysda Z* 11.4; *haraysda Z* 5.88, 106. *-va* is found in O.Kh.: *darrauva* H 147 NS 109 41v3 *KT* 5.73.

———————————————————

In a grammatical survey "Khotanese and Tumshuqese" (1989), Emmerick only briefly refers to the Injunctive (p. 222):

Injunctive. One instance only of the first person sing. has been found: *parsu Z* 24.435. The third pers. sing. act. and middle end in *-(i)ta*: *māñita*, *butta*.

In a forthcoming article on the Khotanese language in the *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, P. O. Skjærvø is expected to give an example from the Suvarṇabhāsa-sūtra where the subjunctive, optative and injunctive are used indiscriminately in different manuscripts of the same passage in Old and Middle Khotanese.

So far the most detailed description of the Khotanese injunctive is given by Emmerick in *SGS* above. So this will be the starting point of our discussion (with some corrections and additions as necessary (see **Appendix**)).

2. The injunctive can formally be defined as an augmentless finite verb form with the secondary ending.[11] The history of studies of the injunctive in the Rigveda is presented in an exemplary way in the Einleitung of Karl Hoffmann's classic book.[12] In Old Iranian, the situation in Avestan is rather complicated, since the augment is not only relatively rare but also difficult to identify (in most cases indistinguishable from the preverb *ā-*),[13] while in Old Persian the injunctive is limited to the prohibitive sentence as in Classical Sanskrit.[14]

In Middle Iranian, apart from Khotanese, the injunctive is recognized in Sogdian and Khwarezmian. Ilya Gershevitch's *Grammar of Manichean Sogdian* (= *GMS*), which is still the standard reference work, registers some 1sg. forms[15] as injunctive, but no mention is made of its functions. In 1996 in an article entitled "On the Historic Present and Injunctive in Sogdian and Choresmian" N. Sims-Williams was able to demonstrate that a peculiar phenomenon in Khwarezmian syntax first pointed out by Henning (n. 11 above), namely, in negative clauses the past tense is not expressed by means of the imperfect (as in positive clauses) but by means of the present indicative or injunctive accompanied by the particle *f'*, holds true in the case of Sogdian, too, except for very late texts, and here (in Sogdian) with or without the optional particle *β(y)*. It appears that in these languages the tense opposition is neutralized under negation allowing only the unmarked member (non-past forms) to stand,[16] although Sims-

---

[11] A similar, strictly formal, definition is given by W. B. Henning (1958) 118f.: "unter 'Injunktiv' verstehen wir eine Form, die vom Imperfekt nur dadurch verschieden ist, dass ihr das Argument bzw. seine Vertretung fehlt". No Middle Iranian language preserves the Old Iranian aorist, and there is practically no trace of the Old Iranian perfect.

[12] Hoffmann (1967).

[13] Kellens (1984) 245. The above applies mostly to Young Avestan. It is difficult to evaluate the situation in Gāthic, given both the limited corpus and questions of syntactic ambiguity. It may prove to be closer to Rigvedic rather than to Young Avestan. Cf. Kuryłowicz (1927), where, 40 years before K. Hoffmann's book, the tense (past, present, future) and modal (order, desire) functions of the injunctive are seen as secondary, resulting from the context.

[14] Kent (1953) §§ 224, 281. All the forms recorded there are the inj. pres. (i.e. augmentless imperfect), with no inj. aorist found (a single example of *mā* + opt. exists according to Kellens, *Verbe* 244, n. 3). Contrary to this, in Classical Sanskrit, the inj. aor. is much more frequent than the inj. pres. in prohibitive sentences; Renou (1961) §§ 294, 315.

[15] Since the word-initial (i.e. without preverb) augment is lost in Sogdian, the injunctive cannot be identified as distinct from the imperfect in such verbs (cf. *GMS* 610ff.). Sims-Williams (1996) 179, n.18 considers some 2pl. and 3pl. forms as injunctive although formally they are not distinct from subjunctive.

[16] Cf. Renou's explanation for a somewhat similar situation, in Vedic narrative, as to why with the negative *ná* the present predominates and the imperfect, aorist or perfect is rare; Renou (1947) 46.

Williams prefers traditional terms and speaks about "the historic present" and the "historic use" of the negative injunctive (p. 183). In addition to the "historic" use of the injunctive, Sims-Williams proposes to see some other functions such as "a polite request" in the 2sg. ("Would you not …?") or "a deferential nuance" in the 1sg. ("I would not …") (p. 182). Although these meanings seem to work in context, they are essentially the result of assigning a "modal" sense to the injunctive form. With the limited number of examples adduced there, we still cannot say that they do not reflect merely an occasional or marginal function of the Sogdian injunctive. After all, almost all the "modal" injunctives in the Rigveda as traditionally held could not be maintained after the strict analysis of Hoffmann (*op. cit.* 236-64), although in individual cases the "modal" translation mostly works.

In any case, Sogdian and Khwarezmian are the two languages in Middle Iranian in which the imperfect of Old Iranian not only has survived, but has also been analogically expanded. It is only natural to suppose that the survival of part of the Old Iranian augmented form (with the aorist completely lost) greatly assisted the survival of the unaugmented form. In this respect the situation in Khotanese is rather different.

3. We might pose two separate questions in regard to the (so-called) Khotanese injunctive. First, are these forms the remnant of at least part of the injunctive in Old Iranian (or Indo-Iranian), or are they something else, an innovation within Khotanese? Second, what is the function of these forms?

Let us address the first question. We have a single example of the 1sg. act. form (*pars-* always takes active endings) and the rest are all the 3sg. in -*ta*. *SGS* considers that the middle ending is generalized here, although the general tendency in the Khotanese verb is that the active is expanding at the cost of the middle. The vowel notation of the endings in OKh. is not perfectly consistent. Thus it is not rare even in *Z* that in the 3sg. middle for the expected -*te* the active ending -*tä*, -*ti* is written (*SGS* 199). However, the form without vowel sign -*ta* for the 3sg is only found in LKh. manuscripts. Apart from *yan-* "to do, make" and a few other verbs, which take both active and middle endings, most verbs take either the active (-*tä*/-*ti* in the 3sg. pres.) or middle (-*te* in the 3sg. pres.) endings, and the -*ta* form is neither. It could only be the reflex of O.Ir. 3sg. mid. -*ta*. The fact that a type B verb with clear palatalization in the 3sg. pres. act. (e.g. *paysān-* "to recognize", 3sg. pres. act. *paysendä*) shows a non-palatalized form *paysānda* (**Appendix #6**) suggests that the latter form is a genuine one rather than a lapsus in the manuscript.

The construction with *ko va ...* (something like "if only…, if indeed …") (**Appendix #1**) is found in a number of passages in the Book of Zambasta (*Z* 1.84, 86; 4.90; 8.14, 18; 11.8; 15.40; 22.212; 23.173; 24.5), and where the context is preserved, the verb is always a subjunctive or an optative (in 24.5 the verb seems to be omitted). Elsewhere we have only one example in the Khotanese version of the Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra (SI P 65.3r1), where, although the middle part of the clause is lost, we have the verb *āya* (3sg. subj. "be").[17] In any case no subjunctive[18] or optative form, active or middle, in Old Iranian can yield the ending *-u* in Khotanese. *parsu* must contain the ending O.Ir. *-am*.

If these forms attest to the survival of the injunctive of Old Iranian, we are faced with a number of unsolved mysteries. In order to obtain an idea of how remarkable (or unlikely) an event this survival would have been, we have only to see what is lost. Khotanese has lost all the non-present indicative forms. As in all the other Middle Iranian languages, Khotanese developed the past (perfect) system based on the verbal adjective in O.Ir. *-ta*, which necessarily entailed a dichotomy between the intransitive and the transitive. The perfect intransitive is formed, as in most other Middle Iranian languages, with the addition of enclitic forms of the copula **ah-* "to be", conjugating in person, number and gender. On the other hand, Khotanese developed no split ergativity in the perfect transitive as in Western Middle Iranian languages and early Sogdian, but a unique formation whose history is still obscure.[19] The loss of the aorist, imperfect and perfect simplified the subjunctive and optative as well as the indicative. In the indicative we have only the present system, which is well on the way to the establishment of the transitive/intransitive dichotomy by a variety of means, among which the opposition of the old *aya*-causative and *s*-inchoative from the same base is prominent. In the subjunctive not only is the distinction between present and aorist lost, but also that between active and middle is threatened (see n. 18 above). In the history of Khotanese it is increasingly used as a simple future, while the optative, which is morphogically more clearly marked, seems to have retained its modal function even in Late Khotanese.

---

[17] Unfortunately the Skt. does not seem to match (Dutt (1939) 17.3; Chinese *T* vol. 14, 406c7).

[18] In the Khotanese subjunctive the opposition of active and middle is about to collapse (or has already collapsed). The 2sg. and 3sg. active are extremely rare (only one example each according to *SGS*), and the 1sg. ending is much easier to explain as opt. There is practically no distinction between active and middle in the plural. Apparently the more distinct middle endings are gaining ground here.

[19] For the latest attempt at explanation together with criticisms of earlier studies see Tremblay (2005).

We now come to the injunctive. With the loss of the aorist injunctive, which is so prominent in Gāthic Avestan (and of course in Rigvedic), a great part of its role is gone. Furthermore, its use with the prohibitive *mā* does not seem to have survived in Khotanese (see n. 25 below). Under such circumstances the claim that the so-called "modal" injunctive, which one would expect to have disappeared before all else, has survived in a Middle Iranian language, defies chronology. Yet the forms we have can only be explained as formed with secondary endings.

Our second question concerns the function of these forms. Looking at the examples of the translated texts (as a rule not literal ones), we notice that the Sanskrit optative (## **6, 15, 16, 24, 26, 30**) and future (## **3, 5**) are translated by means of the Khotanese injunctive. This has been used implicitly as evidence for its "modal" function (e.g. in *SGS*). On the other hand, passages such as ## **9, 22, 28** and **29** are rather plain descriptions of past events. We could call them mythical narratives if the Buddha's life-story is comparable to mythology. In such cases mechanical insertion of "would" in translation will stretch the English too much. Passages such as ## **12** and **18** can be seen as referring to general truth, where the auxiliary is not necessary in translation. In **# 12** Emmerick gave a translation with "should" for the injunctive and was forced to do the same for the following present indicative which is clearly parallel. In ## **31** and **32** also the injunctive forms occur in a parallel sequence together with the present indicative. The translator hesitatingly put "would" sometimes for the latter and sometimes not, producing rather an awkward translation.[20]

Now we can see that this situation is surprisingly similar to that of the Rigveda as analyzed by Karl Hoffmann. It would rather be premature, however, to jump to the conclusion at this stage that Khotanese has preserved the Indo-Iranian usage intact. We simply do not know what could have happened in between. We could at least maintain, after Hoffmann, that it would not be justified to take the Khotanese injunctive as "modal" when it seems appropriate, and as "non-modal" when it is not. Its primary function must be something that allows it to be used as a translation of the Sanskrit optative as well as on other occasions. In this respect the Sogdian (and Khwarezmian) usage mentioned above seems to lend support to the possibility that the injunctive in Khotanese goes back to the same source, in which case their common function would be described as "tenselessness".

---

[20] The syntactic feature of apparent tense/mood mixture as found here is no doubt the same as what is called "conjunction reduction" by Kiparsky (1968). See also Kiparsky (2005) for a revised version of his view.

Appendix

Translations are by R. E. Emmerick for *Z* (= the Book of Zambasta[21]) and the *Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra* (= *Śgs*),[22] by P. O. Skjærvø for the *Suvarṇabhāsa-sūtra* (= *Suv*.), by Giotto Canevascini for the *Saṅghāṭa-sūtra* (= *Sgh*.),[23] and by Mauro Maggi for **## 31-32**. These last two as well as **## 7, 16** are not in *SGS*. In the following the injunctive forms with their translations are in **boldface**, all the other verbal forms (finite verbs, infinitives and participles) are in *italics*.

1. *Z* 24.435 ***parsu*** (*pars-/parräta-* "to escape"; inchoative < **pari-raik-*)
thu ma *ttrāya* vaysña. narī stauru *puvai'mä*. ttu mä *ggīhu*. ko va biśyau karmyau **parsu**.
  "*Deliver* (2sg. imper. act.) me now. I *fear* (1sg. pres. act.) hell greatly. *Help* (2sg. imper. mid.) me in this. Would that I **may escape** from all karmas".

2. *Z* 14.98 ***kūśäta*** (*kūś-/kūysda-* "to seek"; < **kauzaya-*?)
kye rru buḍaru ttatvatu balysāna *kṣamīyä* västarna hota häväñe ṣṣadde jsa *pyūṣṭe* varī ttäto sūtruvo' samu **kūśäta** jsei'ṇu
  "Anyone whom the Buddha-power *should* in fact *please* (3sg. opt.) because of his own faith *to hear* (inf.) yet more minutely **should** merely **seek** it out in detail, at once, in those sūtras …" (translation altered in view of *Studies* II, 45[24]).

3, 4, 5. *Z* 22.278 ***māñita*** (*māñ-/mānda-* "to remain"; < **mānaya-*), ***jinda*** (*jin-/jäta-* "destroy"; cf. Av. *jinā-*), ***yanda*** (*yan-/yäḍa-* "to make, do"; < **kṛn-?/kṛta-*)
ce mara ttye śśāśiña balysä abitandi **māñita** vaysña **jinda** puṣṣo harbiśśä ysaṃtha dukhānu pāṣkalu **yanda**
  "One who now **remains** here in the Śāsana of this Buddha free from doubt **will remove** completely all births, **will make** an end of woes".
    yo hy asmiṃ dharmavinaye tv apramatto **bhaviṣyati prahāya** jātisaṃsāraṃ duḥkhasyāntaṃ sa **yāsyati** (*Uv* Bernhard, iv 38)

6, 7. *Suv* K. 34r3 ***paysānda*** (*paysān-/paysānda-* "to recognize"; cf. Av. *pa^iti-zāna-*), ***yanda*** (Skjærvø 62.68)
śuru ṇu vätä *yanä* hvāṣṭa nä **paysānda** āysda nä **yanda** u pajsamu nä *yanä*
  "(He who) *may serve* (3sg. opt.) them, **revere** them, **watch over** them and *honour* (3sg. opt.) them, …"
    sat-kāraṃ **kuryād** guru-kāraṃ mānanāṃ pūjanaṃ

---

[21] Emmerick (1968b).
[22] Emmerick (1970).
[23] Canevascini (1993).
[24] Emmerick and Skjærvø (1987).

8. *Z* 2.180 *yanda*

ṣa ju māta *näštä* kye pūru śśau-ysātu tterä brī **yanda** crrāmu tvī balysa hamaṅgu biśśä sarvasatva uysnora

　　"The mother *does not exist* (3sg. pres. act.) who **feels** her only-born son as beloved as are all beings equally to you, Buddha".

9. *Z* 5.48 *yanda*

rre jsaunäte ṣṭānye balysu vara dasta aṃjalu **yanda** nasu mä *yana* nei'nau pūra cu thu *bustī* hastamu dātu

　　"The king, bowed, **put** his hands in the añjali-position before the Buddha: *Give* (2sg. imper. act.) me the portion of nectar, son, since you *have realized* (2sg. pf. intr. m.) the best Law".

10. *Z* 20.22 *yanda*

āysda nä **yanda** sarvaṃñi balysä thatau mulśde jsa trāmu kho ju māta pūru briyu

　　"Through compassion, the all-knowing Buddha **would** quickly **protect** them as a mother her beloved son".

11. *Suv* K. 35r6 *hämäta* (Skjærvø 63.6) (*häm-/hämäta-* "to be, become"; < ?)

u mūysaṃth[iye] jsīñe u anaṃkhäṣṭäna iśvarīṇa u huṣṣāmata *kṣamīyä* u anaṃkhäṣṭäna ro rrvīyäna ttīśäna uspurrä **hämäta**

　　"And (whom) it *may please* (3sg. opt.) (to obtain) growth for his life in this birth and (that) with immeasurable mastership, and (who) **is** complete with immeasurable royal splendour, …"

　　　(Skt. deest)

12. *Z* 3.149 *nāsta* (*nās-/nāta-* "to take"; cf. Av. *nāsa-* "erlangen")

cu ne rro kye **nāsta** ttai rro *bāysdaiyä* biśśu ne *hvatä hämāre* śśau kalpu vaṣṭa pūña

　　"How much more for one who **should accept**, *should* so *observe* (3sg. pres.! act.) it all, his merits *cannot be told* (3pl. pres. mid.) in one kalpa".

13. *Z* 24.387 *nāsta*

ttathāgatta-ggarbhä trāmu *vaṣṭäte* pūlstä kho ye ratanu **nāsta** u dī śśandau *prīhä*

　　"The tathāgatagarbha *is* (3sg. pres. act.) hidden as one who **would obtain** a jewel and *conceal* (3sg. opt.) it under the earth".

14. Kha. I.13. 147r5 *nāsta* (*Śgs* § 3.14)

ttīye balysāni dāti ṣā ūgama hatcasta-hamo hve' hamatä kyerī *kṣamätä* tterä *hvīḍä* u puṣo *jsāte*. ne hotanä *štä* ko ju varä **nāsta**. cu handarye kīro *jsāte*. ttrāma harbiśi ṣāvā prracī[ya-saṃ]buddha dyāña darra-hamau, gyasta balysa, hve'.

　　"This is an illustration of this Buddha-Law. The man with the broken vessel

eats (3sg. pres. act.) so much as *pleases* (3sg. pres.) him and *goes* (3sg. pres. mid.) off. He *is* (3sg. pres. act.) not capable of **taking** any away there so that he *should go* (3sg. pres.! act.) for the sake of another. All the Śrāvakas (and) Pratyekabuddhas are to be viewed as such as the man with a broken vessel, deva Buddha".

15, 16. *Sgh* 36v1 **nāsta, hämäta** (Canevascini § 96.5)

pyū' sarvaśūra pātco te ttädikä ttīye sūträ buljse *hvāñīmä*. kau ju sarvaśūra ṣä hve' **hämäta** kye balysāna cīya *hatcañä*. u balysūñavūysau satvo samāhānäna *usthaṃjä*. u balysūśte jsa uysnorä byanu *yanä*. u merä pīrä jīvätu **nāsta**. u ustamu ṣä uysnorä ākṣū banānä u kāṣco *yaṃdi* u ttai *hämäte* sä *panaṣṭämä* aysu ttätena ttarandarna. u *panaṣṭämä* haṃdarña ysīntha kalpu vaṣṭa aysu *panaṣṭämä*.

> "*Listen* (2sg. imper. mid.) Sarvaśūra, I *will tell* (1sg. pres. act.) you again a few (more) benefits of this sūtra: if there **were** now, Sarvaśūra, that man who *would break* (3sg. opt.) up Buddha shrines, and (who) *would pull* (3sg. opt.) out an enlightenment-seeking being from (his) trance, and (who) *would put* (3sg. opt.) an obstacle in front of enlightenment for a being, and (who) **would take** the life of (his) mother (and his) father, and finally that being *begins* (3sg. pres. act.) *to lament* (pres. pt. mid.) and *is* (3sg. pres. mid.) in anguish; and it *occurs* (3sg. pres. mid.) to him thus: I *have become lost* (1sg. pf. intr. m.) with this body and I *have become lost* in another birth; I *have become lost* for a kalpa".

> > *śṛṇu* sarvaśūra punar aparaṃ guṇaṃ *āmantrayāmi*: tadyathāpi-nāma kaścit satvo **bhaved** yaḥ stūpa-bhedaṃ *kārayet*, saṃgha-bhedaṃ ca, bodhisatvaṃ samādher *uccālayet*, buddha-jñānasyāntarāyaṃ *kuryet*, mātā-pitaraṃ jīvitād **vyavaropayed**; atha sa satvaḥ paścāt *paridevati*, *śocati*: naṣṭo 'ham anena kāyena, naṣṭaṃ me paralokam iti, kalpam evāhaṃ naṣṭaḥ.

17. *Z* 2.25 **butta** (*bud-*/*busta*- "to perceive, know"; < IIr **bud(h)-*)

ṣṣai ttä biśśu ne *busta* īndi ysurrä brīyo ni *jätu yiḍāndi* cu va ne ko ṣäte biśśu **butta** ttye klaiśa biśśu *jita āro*

> "Even they *did* not *know* (3pl. pf. intr. m.) everything. They *could* not *remove* (3pl. pf. tr. m.) anger, passion. How much less **should** he **know** all, *should* his kleśas *be* utterly *removed* (3pl. subj. act.)".

18. *Z* 2.117 **butta**

niśtä avyūṣṭä adäte avaysāndä kari abustä balysānu cu va ne **butta** biśśu

> "There *is* (3sg. pres. act.) *nothing* at all unheard, unseen, unrecognized, unknown for Buddhas. Nay rather, he **would know** all".

19. *Z* 8.36 ***butta***

haysge buśśañi vīri ysuyañi vīrä biśā varju nä *byode* ce va ju ttäte **butta** hära

> "(So) the nostrils with regard to smells, the tongue with regard to tastes. There *does* not *exist* (3sg. pres. mid.) there that which **would perceive** these things".

20. *Z* 24.437 ***hautta*** (*hot-/hosta-* "to be able"; < **fra-vat-*)

väna balysi *näśtä* kye biśśo baśdau **hautta** västarna *hvīyä* kye śśau *jsīndä* uysno[ru]

> "Apart from the Buddha, there *is* (3sg. pres. act.) *no one* who **could** *tell* (inf.) the whole evil in detail of one who kills (3sg. pres. act.) a single being".

21. *Z* 14.96 ***nijsaṣḍa*** (*nijsaṣ-/näjsaṣṭa-* "to show"; < **ni-čaša-*)

haṃtsa ysurrä brīyai gyaḍä trāmai irdä gyastānu käḍäna ttedärä hotu *näjsaṣḍe* cu ne rru vä balysä kye ttärä hota u mulysdä satvānu käḍäna u ni irdi nijsaṣḍa

> "(If) one has passion together with anger, a fool, (yet) such are his ṛddhis, such power *does* he *exhibit* (3sg. pres. mid.) for the sake of the gods, how much more would the Buddha (have power)! Who would have such power and compassion for the sake of beings and yet **would** not **exhibit** his ṛddhis?"

22. *Z* 5.25 ***pyūṣḍa*** (*pyūṣ-/pyūṣṭa-* "to hear"; <**pati-gauša-*)

śśära-ṣṣūko *hvīye baysāre* śśāya śśūjīye biśśälsto tterä ku rre **pyūṣḍa** u rrīṇe andīvärä harbiśśä kṣīrä

> "The Śākyas *ride* (3pl. pres. mid.) to one another's house *to tell* (inf.) the good news, so that the king **heard** it and the queens, the harem, the whole land".

23. *Z* 8.35 ***pyūṣḍa***

gguvyo' bajāṣṣa tvī padī *niśtä* gguvo' kye jsa ju **pyūṣḍa** o hamatä **pyūṣḍa** gguvaʾ

> "Sounds are due to the ears. In this way, there *does not exist* (3sg. pres. act.) in the ear that by which one **would hear** nor does the ear **hear** of itself".

24. *Suv* K. 34r5 ***pyūṣḍa*** (Skjærvø 62.70)

anukaṃpemate käḍäna hama-raṣṭu auṣku vätä ttū suvarṇabhāysūttamu sūtrānu rruṃdänu rruṃdu **pyūṣḍa**

> "By reason of sympathy ..... **may** continuously and always **listen** to this Suvarṇabhāsottama, king of kings of sūtras".
>
> > anukampārthāya satatasamitaṃ cemaṃ suvarṇabhāsottamaṃ sūtrendra-rājānaṃ **śṛṇuyād**

25. *Z* 13.147 **haṃjsaṣḍa** (*haṃjsaṣ-/haṃjsaṣṭa-* "to be about to, intend to"; < **ham-čaša-*)

anäggattāvattāro mudru vīrä tta vara vāśana *hīśtä* kau ye dryau bāryau **haṃjsaṣḍa** ttū lova-dhātu *na[rīnde]* śye ju pasä bārai *āya* śye hastä bārai *āya* śśau j[u] rrah[u] ba[ḍḍe ….] u purra *bāyä* [……]

> "So in the Aniyatāvatāramudrā, the statement *occurs* (3sg. pres. act.) there: If one **should intend** *to leave* (inf.) this world-sphere by means of three vehicles (and) for one vehicle there *should be* (3sg. subj.) a goat, for one vehicle there *should be* an elephant (and) one (vehicle) one rides a chariot …. and the moon *would guide* (3sg. opt.)…."

26. *Suv* K. 32r6 **haṃjsaṣḍa** (Skjærvø 62.36a)

haṃtsa tcūr-ysanye hīñe jsa u hā ju **haṃjsaṣḍa** *barāṇä*

> "With the fourfold army and **maybe about** *to ride* (pres. pt. mid.) thither, ….."
>> sārdhaṃ catur-aṅga-bala-kāyena tatra viṣaye upasaṃkramitu-**kāmo bhavet**

27. *Z* 11.4 **pachīysda** (*pachīys-/—* "to be called, considered"; < **pati-xaiz-*)

kye ṣä ce marä hvaṃ'duvo ysātä kvī mulysdä aysmya *niśti* ṣṣai ne hve' *hvīndi* ma *pulsa* ko bodhisatvä **pachīysda**

> "Anyone who has been born among men who *has no* (3s. pres. act.) compassion in his mind *is* not *called* (3sg. pres. mid.) even a man. Do not *ask* (2sg. imper. act.) whether he **should be considered** a Bodhisattva!"

28. *Z* 5.88 **haraysda** (*harays-/haraṣṭa-* "to extend"; < **fra-raz-*)

samu ne rre pātcu **haraysda** balysi pvo' brīka mäḍāṃgya na-ro ju *väte* handarä pūrä kye va tta *yanä* pīrä kho maṃ thu

> "No sooner **had** the king **stretched out** before the Buddha's feet: Beloved, gracious One, there *has* never *been* (3sg. pf. tr. m.) another son who *would* so *act* (3sg. opt.) for his father as you for me".

29. *Z* 5.106 **haraysda**

trāmu hā ggopya **haraysda** kho ye banhyu *bīräte* śśando nāvuñi mä jīvätä balysa tterä *haräte* ko rro *dätāmä*

> "Gopikā **prostrated herself** before him as one *saws* (3sg. pres.) a tree to the ground: Not without merit is my life, Buddha, since so much *has been left* (3sg. pf. tr. m.) that I *have seen* (1sg. pf. tr. f.) you".

30. H 147 NS 109 41v3 (*Sgh* Canevascini § 91; Skjærvø, *Catalogue* 325 (IOL. Khot. 143/1)) **darrauva** (*darrv-/*darruta-* "to dare"; < **dr̥š-nu-*)

tta cu te *saittä* sarvaśūra se *hotāre* jaḍa prahujana uysnaura ttu saṃghāṭu dātu

pyūvā'ṇa. ṣṣai khu nāma *pyūvā're* ne nä hā praysātä *hämäte. pyū'* sarvaśūra *aśtä* kye hanä jaḍä hve' prahujanä kye va **darrauva** mahāsamudro *vahīysānä.* sarvaśśūrä bodhisatvä tta *hvate* se ne gyasta balysa.

> "What do you *think* (3sg. pres. act.; (lit.) "what seems to you?") then, Sarvaśūra? *Are* the foolish, ordinary beings *able* (3pl. pres. mid.) to hear the Saṅghāṭa Law? Even if they *hear* (3pl. pres. mid.) its name they *will have* (3pl. pres. mid.) no faith in it. *Listen* (2sg. imper. mid.), Sarvaśūra, *is* (3sg. pres. act.) there any foolish, ordinary man who **would dare** *to descend* (pres. pt. mid.) into the great ocean?' The Bodhisattva Sarvaśūra s*poke* (3sg. pf. tr. m.) thus: (Certainly) not, Lord Buddha!"

> tat kiṃ *manyase* sarvaśūra? *śakyam* idaṃ sūtraṃ bāla-pṛthagjanaiḥ
> śrotum? ye ca *śroṣyanti* na ca prasādam *utpādayiṣyanti. śṛṇu* sarvaśūra,
> *santi* kecit sarvaśūra bāla-pṛthagjanāḥ satvāḥ ye **śaknuyur** mahā-samudre
> gādhaṃ labdhum? *āha*: no hīdaṃ bhagavan!

31, 32. N 50.22-25 (Kāśyapa-fragment)[25] **panamäta** (*panam-/panata-* "to rise"; < *pati-namaya-*), **bīräta** (*bīr-/—-* "to throw"; < ?)

pātcu kāśyapa ko ju hve' **panamäta** ce trrāmo hoto *näjsaṣḍe* ku sumīru garu *nāste* nänerrra *tcabaljätä pärāñätä uysvāñätä* o vā śiñe uysäñe jsa handarña lovadhato **bīräta** tta cu tä *saittä* kāśyapa duṣkaru ṣä hve' ttu kīru *yīndä*

> "Then, Kāśyapa, if a man **should rise**, who *shows* (3sg. pres. mid.) such strength that he *would take* (3sg. pres. mid.) Mount Sumeru in the palm of (his) hand, *break up* (3sg. pres.), *scatter* (3sg. pres.) (and) *throw* (3sg. pres.) (it) *up*, or (that) he **would throw** (it) into another world by one breath, thus — what *does* it *seem* (3sg. pres. act.) to you, Kāśyapa — (is it) extraordinary (if) that man *does* (3sg. pres. act.) that deed?"

The following form is a reconstruction by E. Leumann. The second akṣara is totally rubbed off in the manuscript. The particle *ma* "not" in Khotanese may be followed by a verb in the imperative, subjunctive, optative, or even indicative.[26] In fact the only example of the injunctive with *ma* in OKh. quoted by Emmerick, *op. cit*. is this one. It could have been reconstructed as *ya[nä]* (opt. 3sg. as in Z 5.88 and ## **6, 7** above). A slight trace of the left-hand dot over the missing akṣara can still be seen on the facsimile plate.[27]

---

[25] Text published by Leumann (1920); See Mauro Maggi in Emmerick and Skjærvø ed. (1997) 28 s.v. uysanā.

[26] Emmerick (1990).

[27] Konow (1914). The passage is on folio 269 verso (reproduced as 369b on plate XXXV).

Z 14.86 ***ya[nda]**

ma ju ye ttuto śśando karä bitamo **ya[nda]** ttäna tta *hvate* sūtro hamatä sarvañi balysä

> "So that no one on this earth **should have** any doubt at all, for this reason the all-knowing Buddha himself *spoke* (3sg. pf. tr. m.) thus in a sūtra: …"

The following form listed as injunctive in *SGS* is 2pl. imper. according to Skjærvø.

Suv K. 32r5 **tsūta** (Skjærvø 62.34)

ṣätä māḍāna gyasta balysa balysanī sānä rre tcūr-ysanyo hīno *uthepäte āya* se **tsūta** uholañä haṃdarña kṣīra gyau u hīvīna kṣīrna [x] *naltsutä āya*

> "(Then) o gracious Lord Buddha, this enemy neighbouring king *may have raised* a fourfold army, saying: '**Go!** Elsewhere, in another land there is fighting!' and *may have gone* out of his own land".

> sa ca bhadanta bhagavan sāmantakaḥ pratiśatru-rājā catur-aṅginīṃ senāṃ yojayitvā paracakra-**gamanāya** sva-viṣayān niṣkrānto bhavet

Another example of **tsūta** (30v5; Skjærvø 62.4) also listed as injunctive by Konow (1935) is 2pl. pres. according to Skjærvø.

References

BAILEY, H. W. 1949. "Irano-Indica II", *BSOAS* 13/1:121-39.

————. see also *KBT*, *KT*.

BERNHARD, F. 1965. *Udānavarga*. Band I, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.

CANEVASCINI, G. 1993. *The Khotanese Saṅghāṭasūtra*, Wiesbaden: Reichert (= *Beiträge zur Iranistik* 14).

Catalogue: see SKJÆRVØ 2002.

DUTT, N. 1939. *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. 1, Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press (repr. 1984, Delhi: Sri Satguru).

EMMERICK, R. E. 1968a. *Saka Grammatical Studies*, London: Oxford UP (= *London Oriental Series* Vol. 20).

————. 1968b. *The Book of Zambasta*, London: Oxford UP (= *London Oriental Series* Vol. 21).

————. 1970. *The Khotanese Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra*, London: Oxford UP (= *London Oriental Series* Vol. 23).

————. 1989. "Khotanese and Tumshuqese", in R. Schmitt ed. *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 204-29.

————. 1990. "Khotanese *ma* 'not' ", *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies*, Rome: IsMEO, 95-113.

——— and P. O. Skjærvø ed. 1987. *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese*, II, Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

——— and P. O. Skjærvø ed. 1997. *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese*, III, Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Gershevitch, I. 1954. *Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*, Oxford: Blackwell.

GMS: see Gershevitch 1954.

Henning, W. B. 1958. "Mitteliranisch", in B. Spuler hrsg., *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, I-4/1, *Iranistik. Linguistik*, 20-130.

Hoffmann, K. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

KBT: Bailey, H. W. ed., *Khotanese Buddhist Texts*, London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1951 (Second ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1981).

Kellens, J. 1984. *Le verbe avestique*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Kent, R. G. 1953. *Old Persian* (second edition. revised), New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Kiparsky, P. 1968. "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax", *FL* 4:30-57.

———. 2005. "The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and Synchronic Implications", in R. Singh ed. *Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2005*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 219-35.

Konow, S. 1914. "Fragments of the Buddhist Work in the Ancient Aryan Language of Chinese Turkestan", *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 5/2, 18-41, with plates XXXIII-XXXV.

———. 1932. *Saka Studies* (= *Oslo Etnografiske Museum Bulletin* 5).

———. 1934. "The Late Professor Leumann's Edition of a New Saka Text", *NTS* 7:5-55.

———. 1935. "Zwölf Blätter einer Handschrift des Suvarṇabhāsasūtra in Khotan-Sakisch", *SPAW* 18:426-86.

———. 1939. "The Late Professor Leumann's Edition of a New Saka Text, II", *NTS* 11:5-84.

———. 1941. *Khotansakische Grammatik. Mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis* (= *Porta Linguarum Orientalium* 22), Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

———. 1949. *Primer of Khotanese Saka, NTS* 15:5-136.

KT: Bailey, H. W. ed. *Khotanese Texts*, Vols. 1-5, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1945-1963.

Kuryłowicz, J. 1927. "Injonctif et subjonctif dans les Gāthās de l'Avesta", *Rocznik Oryentalistyczny* 3:164-79.

Leumann, E. 1912. *Zur nordarischen Sprache und Literatur*, Straßburg: Trübner.

———. 1919. *Maitreya-samiti, das Zukunftsideal der Buddhisten*, Straßburg: Trübner.

———. 1920. *Buddhistische Literatur. nordarisch und deutsch, I. Teil, Nebenstücke* (= *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Band XV/2).

———. 1933-1936 (aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von M. Leumann). *Das Nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus* (= *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Band XX).

Müller, F. W. K. 1912. *Soghdische Texte (I)*, *APAW* 1912.

Renou, L. 1947. "Sur la phrase négative dans le R̥gveda", *BSL* 43:43-9 (= N. Balbir et G.-J. Pinault ed. *Louis Renou. Choix d'études indiennes*, Tome I, Paris: Presse de l'EFEO 1997, 137-43).

————. 1961. *Grammaire sanscrite* (tomes I et II réunis), Paris: A. Maisonneuve.

Sgh: Saṅghāṭa-sūtra (older also as *SS*; see Canevascini 1993).

SGS: see Emmerick 1968a.

Śgs: *Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra* (see Emmerick 1970).

Sims-Williams, N. 1996. "On the Historic Present and Injunctive in Sogdian and Choresmian", *MSS* 56:173-89.

Skjærvø, P. O. 2002. *Khotanese Manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library*, London: The British Library.

SS: *see Sgh* above.

Studies II, III: see Emmerick and Skjærvø 1987, 1997.

Suv: *Suvarṇabhāsa-sūtra* (Skjærvø, P. O. Habilitationsschrift Mainz).

Suv K: *Suv* folios first published by Konow 1935.

T: Taishō Tripiṭaka. 1924-1934.

Tedesco, P. 1923. "*a*-Stämme und *aya*-Stämme im Iranischen", *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 2:281-315.

Tremblay, X. 2005. "Die Bildung des chotansakischen agentiven Präteritums", in N. N. Kazansky et al. ed. *Hr̥dá mánasā. Studies presented to Professor Leonard G. Herzenberg*, St. Petersburg: NAUKA, 75-80.

Uv: *Udānavarga*, see Bernhard 1965.

Z: The Book of Zambasta; see Emmerick 1968b.