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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 “Präsenstamm-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’s3 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the “Glossar” in Leumann’s 1912 book (n. 2), which offers words with some grammatical discussion from published and unpublished materials.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 ḥbrw “I give” in the phrase qt sn’m ḥbrw 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-ūm*, I will be a pupil; *haurūmā*, I will give; *hvāṇūm*, I will say, &c.; 2 *di̱si*, take; *ma khiji*, don’t be wearied, &c.; 3 *birūta’,* 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), Konow wrote two review articles 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:


His posthumously published *Primer of Khotanese Saka*, 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).
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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 pulsū, “I intend to ask”; vahīsū, “I intend to descend”; ma khīji, “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. 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 -ūm belong to Late Khotanese and are to be explained as Ir *-āmi > *-ami > O.Kh. -imā > -īmā > L.Kh. -ūṃ; some forms in -u are to be seen as the 2sg. imper. mid. < *-ahyu; all the 2sg. forms are identical with opt. and to be seen as such, etc.).

When in the 1960s most of the major collections 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, he describes the Injunctive as follows:

INJUNCTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. sg.</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sg.</td>
<td>-(ā)ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. sg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sg.</td>
<td>-(ā)ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. -\( am \), 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. -\( äta \): kāśa\( t\)a Z 14.98; -\( ita \): mā\( ñ\)\( it\)a Z 22.278 (v. S. Konow, NTS, vii, 1934, 16-7).
B. -\( t\)a: ts\( u\)\( t\)a Suv K. 32r5 KT 5.110; -\( da \) (after -\( n \)): jinda Z 22.278 (v. S. Konow, NTS, vii, 1934, 16-7). Act. or mid.: pays\( ë\)\( n\)\( d\)a 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. -\( äta \): hām\( ë\)\( ë\)\( t\)a Suv K. 35r6 KT 5.113.
B. O.Kh. -\( ta \): nā\( ë\)\( s\)\( t\)a 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 -\( ñ \) O.Kh. has -\( da \): ni\( ñ\)\( ā\)\( ñ\)\( s\)\( ṭ\)\( a \) Z 14.96; py\( ë\)\( ṭ\)\( s\)\( \( ñ\)\( ñ\)\( s\)\( ṭ\)\( a \) Z 5.25; 8.35; Suv K. 34r5 KT 5.112 tr. śṛ\( n\)\( ṭ\)\( ṭ\)\( u\)\( y\)\( ṭ\)\( ā\)\( ñ\)\( ṭ\)\( a \) Z 13.147; Suv K. 32r6 KT 5.110 tr. "\( k\)ā\( m\)o bhavet."
  After -\( ys \) O.Kh. has -\( da \): pach\( ë\)\( ñ\)\( s\)\( ṭ\)\( a \) Z 11.4; harays\( ñ\)\( s\)\( a \) Z 5.88, 106. -\( va \) is found in O.Kh.: darra\( u\)\( v\)a 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 -\( (i)ta \): mā\( ñ\)\( it\)a, butta.

In a forthcoming article on the Khotanese language in the Encyclopaedia Iranica, P. O. Skjærvø is expected to give an example from the Suvarṇabhaṣa-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)).
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2. The injunctive can formally be defined as an augmentless finite verb form with the secondary ending.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 $\ddot{a}$-),\textsuperscript{13} while in Old Persian the injunctive is limited to the prohibitive sentence as in Classical Sanskrit.\textsuperscript{14}

In Middle Iranian, apart from Khotanese, the injunctive is recognized in Sogdian and Khwarezmian. Ilya Gershevitch’s Grammar of Manichean Sogdian ($= \text{GMS}$), which is still the standard reference work, registers some 1sg. forms\textsuperscript{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 $\beta$'', holds true in the case of Sogdian, too, except for very late texts, and here (in Sogdian) with or without the optional particle $\beta(y)$. It appears that in these languages the tense opposition is neutralized under negation allowing only the unmarked member (non-past forms) to stand,\textsuperscript{16} although Sims-

\textsuperscript{11} A similar, strictly formal, definition is given by W. B. Henning (1958) 118f.: “unter ‘Injektiv’ 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.

\textsuperscript{12} Hoffmann (1967).

\textsuperscript{13} Kellens (1984) 245. The above applies mostly to Young Avestan. It is difficult to evaluate the situation in G\'athic, given both the limited corpus and questions of syntactic ambiguity. It may prove to be closer to Rigvedic rather than to Young Avestan. Cf. Kurylowicz (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.

\textsuperscript{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 $m\ddot{a} +$ 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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{16} Cf. Renou’s explanation for a somewhat similar situation, in Vedic narrative, as to why with the negative $n\ddot{a}$ 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. *paysāñ*– “to recognize”, 3sg. pres. act. *paysendāi*) shows a non-palatalized form *paysānda* (*Appendix #6*) suggests that the latter form is a genuine one rather than a lapsus in the manuscript.
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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 Bhaisajyaguru-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 subjunctive18 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\(^2\)) and the Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra (= Śgs),\(^2\) by P. O. Skjærø for the Suvarṇabhāsa-sūtra (= Suv.), by Giotto Canevascini for the Saṅghāta-sūtra (= Sgh.),\(^3\) 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-/parrāta- “to escape”; inchoative < *pari-raik-*)
thu ma tṛāya vaysṇa. narī stauru puvai’mā. ttu mā ggihu. ko va biṣyau 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** kūśāta (kūś-/kūysda- “to seek”; < *kauzaya-*)
kye rru buḍaru ttatvatu balysā na kṣamīyā vāstarna hota āvāñe šsadde jsa pyūṣte
vari tāto sūtruvo’ samu kūśāta jsei’nu

   “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, 4524).

3, 4, 5. **Z 22.278** māṅita (māṅ-/mānda- “to remain”; < *mānaya-*)
jinda (jin-/jāta- “destroy”; cf. Av. jinā-), yanda (yan-/yāda- “to make, do”; < *kṛṇ-?/kṛta-*)
ce mara tye śśāśiña balysā abitandi māṅita vaysṇa jinda puṣso harbiśśā yonāṃtha dukhānu paśkalu 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”.
   yohy aṣmīṁ dharmaṁ vinyate āparāgyaṁ bhaviṣyati prahāya jātisamsāraṁ duḥkhasyāntaṁ sa yāsyati (Uv Bernhard, iv 38)

6, 7. **Suv K. 34r3** paysānda (paysān-/paysānda- “to recognize”; cf. Av. paṭi-zāna-), yanda (Skjærø 62.68)
śuru ṇu vātā yanā ṭvāṣṭaṁ nā paysānda āyṣda nā yanda u pajāsamu nā yanā

   “(He who) may serve (3sg. opt.) them, revere them, watch over them and honour (3sg. opt.) them, …”
   sat-kāraṁ kuryād guru-kāraṁ māṇanāṁ pūjanaṁ

\(^2\) Emmerick (1968b).
\(^2\) Emmerick (1970).
\(^3\) Canevascini (1993).
\(^4\) Emmerick and Skjærø (1987).
8. Z 2.180 \textit{yanda}
\begin{quote}
ṣa ju māṭa nāśā kye pūru-śśau-ysāту tterā bṝ yanda crrāmu tvī balysa hamaṅgu biśśā sarvasatva uysnora

“The mother \textit{does not exist} (3sg. pres. act.) who \textit{feels} her only-born son as beloved as are all beings equally to you, Buddha”.
\end{quote}

9. Z 5.48 \textit{yanda}
\begin{quote}
rre jsaunāte stānye balysu vara dasta an̄jalu \textit{yanda} nasu mā yana nei’nau pūra cu thu \textit{bustī} hastamu dātu

“The king, bowed, \textbf{put} his hands in the an̄jali-position before the Buddha: \textit{Give} (2sg. imper. act.) me the portion of nectar, son, since you \textit{have realized} (2sg. pf. intr. m.) the best Law”.
\end{quote}

10. Z 20.22 \textit{yanda}
\begin{quote}
āysda nā \textit{yanda} sarvaṁṇi balysā thatau muśde jsa trāmu kho jū māṭa pūru briyu

“Through compassion, the all-knowing Buddha \textbf{would} quickly \textit{protect} them as a mother her beloved son”.
\end{quote}

11. Suv. K. 35r6 \textit{hāmāta} (Skjærvø 63.6) (hām-/hāmāta- “to be, become”; < ?)
\begin{quote}
u mūysan̄th[y]e jsīne u anāmṛkhaṣṭāna iśvarīṇa u huṣṣāmata kṣamīyā u anāmṛkhaṣṭāna ro rrvitānyā tīśāna uppurā \textit{hāmāta}

“And (whom) it \textit{may please} (3sg. opt.) (to obtain) growth for his life in this birth and (that) with immeasurable mastership, and (who) is \textit{complete} with immeasurable royal splendour, …”
\end{quote}

(Skt. deest)

12. Z 3.149 \textit{nāsta} (nās-/nāta- “to take”; cf. Av. nāsa- “erlangen”)
\begin{quote}
cu ne rro kye \textit{nāsta} ttaī rro bāysdaiyā biśśu ne hvatā hāmāre śśau kalpu vaṣṭa pūṇa

“How much more for one who \textit{should accept}, \textit{should so observe} (3sg. pres.! act.) it all, his merits \textit{cannot be told} (3pl. pres. mid.) in one kalpa”.
\end{quote}

13. Z 24.387 \textit{nāsta}
\begin{quote}
ttāthāgatta-ggarbā trāmu vaṣṭāte pūlśtā kho ye ratanu \textit{nāsta} u dī śśandau prīkā

“The tathāgata-garbhā is (3sg. pres. act.) hidden as one who \textit{would obtain} a jewel and \textit{conceal} (3sg. opt.) it under the earth”.
\end{quote}

14. Kha. I.13. 147r5 \textit{nāsta} (Śgs § 3.14)
\begin{quote}

“This is an illustration of this Buddha-Law. The man with the broken vessel
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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, hāmāta (Canevascini § 96.5)
pyu’ sarvaśūra pātco te ttādikā ttīye sūtṛā buljse hvaṇīmā. kau ju sarvaśūra sā hve’ hāmāta kye balysāṇa ciya hatcānā. u balysūṇāvyūṣu satvo samāḥānāna usthāṃjā. u balysūste jṣa uysnorā byanu yanā. u merā pirā jīvātu nāsta. u ustamu sā uysnorā āksū banāṇā u kāṣco yamdi u tāi hāmāte sā panaṣṭāmā aysu ttātena ttarandarna. u panaṣṭāmā ṣaṃdārīṇā yṣīnthā kalpu vaṣṭa aysu panaṣṭāmā.

“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-bhedam kārayet, saṃgha-bhedam ca, bodhisatvaṃ samādher uccālayet, buddha-jañānasantarāyaṃ kuryet, mātā-pitaram jīvītā vyavaropayed; atha sa satvaḥ paścāt paridevati, śocati: naṣṭo ‘ham anena kāyena, naṣṭaṁ me paralokam iti, kalpaṃ evaḥaṃ naṣṭaḥ.

17. Z 2.25 butta (bud-/busta- “to perceive, know”; < Ilr *bud(h)-) sṣai tā biśṣu ne butsa īndī yṣurā brīyo ni jātu yiḍāṇi cu va ne ko śate biśṣu butta tye klaixa biśṣau jīta 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 klesas be utterly removed (3pl. subj. act.)”.

18. Z 2.117 butta niṣṭā avyūṣṭā adāte avaysiaṇā kari abusta balysāṇu cu va ne butta biśṣu “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 buššañi vīri ysuyañi vīrā biśā varju nā byode ce va ju ttāte butta hāra

“(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-

vāna balysi nāśtā kye biśso baśdau hauTTa vāstarna hvīyā kye šsau jsīndā uysno[ru]

“As 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 nijsaḍa (nijsa-/nājaṣa- “to show”; < *ni-čaša-

haṃtsa ysurrā brīyai gyaḍā trāmai irdā gyātrā bāsā hauTTa vāstarna hvīyā kye šsau jsīndā uysno[ru]

“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-//pyūṣta- “to hear”; <*pati-gauša-

śśāra-śšūko hvīye baysāre ššāya šśūjiye biśśālsto tterā ku rre pyūṣḍa u rrīne andiāvāra harbiśśā kśīrā

“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
gguvo’ bajāśṣa tvī padī nīstā gguvo’ kye jsa ju pyūṣḍa o hamatā pyūṣḍa gguva’

“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)
anukampemate kādāna hama-raṣṭu auśku vātā ttū suvarṇabhāṣūttamu sūtrānu rrūṃdānu rrūṃdu pyūṣḍa

“By reason of sympathy … may continuously and always listen to this Suvarṇabhāṣottama, king of kings of śūtras”.

anukampārāhāya satatasamitaṃ cemaṇ suvarṇabhāṣottamaṃ sūtrendra-rājānaṃ śrṇuyād
25. Z 13.147 **hamjśaṣḍa** (hamjśas-/hamjśaṣṭa- “to be about to, intend to”; < *ham-ćaṣa-*)

anāggattāvattāro mudru vīrā tta vara vāśana hīṣṭā kau ye dryau bāryau **hamjśaṣḍa**
tū lova-dhātu na[rinde] śye ju pasā bārāi āya śye hastā bārāi āya śsau j[u] rrha[u] ba[ḍđe …] u purra bāyā [……]

“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 **hamjśaṣḍa** (Skjærvø 62.36a)

hamṣta tcūr-ysanye hiñe jsa u hā ju **hamjśaṣḍa** barāṃā

“With the fourfold army and maybe about to ride (pres. pt. mid.) thither, ….”

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

kye sā ce marā hvaṃ’duvo ysātā kvī mulysdā aysmya nīṣiś śsai ne hve’ hvīndi

ma pulsa ko bodhisatwać **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 Bodhisatwać!”

28. Z 5.88 **haraysda** (harays/-haraṣṭa- “to extend”; < *fra-ravz-*)

samu ne re pātcu **haraysda** balysi pvo’ brika māḍāmya na-ro ju vāte handarā

pūrā kye va tta yanā pūrā 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 ggyopya **haraysda** kho ye bankhy bīrāte śśando nāvuṇi mā jīvātā balysa

terā harāte ko rro dātāmā

“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”; < *drā-ṇu-*)

ttu cu te saittā sarvaśūra se hotāre jaḍa prahujana uysnau ra samghātu dātu
pyūvā’na. šsai khu nāma pyūvā’re ne nā hā praysātā hāmāte. pyū’ sarvaśūra aśtā kye hanā jaḍā hve’ prahujanā kye va darrauvā mahāsamudro vahyśāṇā. sarvaśūrā bodhisatvā tta hvote 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 spoke (3sg. pf. tr. m.) thus: (Certainly) not, Lord Buddha!”


31, 32. N 50.22-25 (Kāśyapa-fragment)25 panāmāta (panam-/panata- “to rise”; < *pati-namaya-), bīrāta (bīr/- “to throw”; < ?) pātcu kāśyapa ko ju hve’ panāmāta ce trāmo hoto nājaścē ku sumīru garu nāste nānera tebaljāṭā pārāḥṇātā uysvāṇātā o vā śiśe uysānē jsa handāra lovadhato bīrāta tta cu tā saśiṭā kāśyapa duṣkaru sā hve’ ttu kīru yīndā

“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[ṃ] (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

---

27 Konow (1914). The passage is on folio 269 verso (reproduced as 369b on plate XXXV).
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Z 14.86 *ya[n]da

ma ju ye ttuto śando karā bitamo ya[n]da ttāna ttvate sūtro hamatā sarvañi balysā

“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.

Suś K. 32r5 tsūta (Skjærvø 62.34)
śatā madāna gyasta balysa balysanī sānā rre tcūr-ysanyo hīno uthepāte āya se tsūta uholanā haṇḍarāṁ kṣīra gayu u hīvīna kṣīrā [x] naitsutā 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 sāmantakah pratiśatru-rājā catur-aṅginīṁ senāṁ yojayitvā paracakra-gamanāya sva-viśayāṁ niśkrānto bhavet

Another example of tsūta (30v5; Skjærvø 62.4) also listed as injunctive by Konow (1935) is 2pl. pres. according to Skjærvø.
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Sgh: Saṅghāṭa-sūtra (older also as SS; see CANEVASCINI 1993).

SGS: see EMMERICK 1968a.

Śgs: Śūrangaṃasamādhī-sūtra (see EMMERICK 1970).


SS: see Sgh above.


Suv: Suvagramabhāsā-sūtra (SKJÆRVØ, P. O. Habilitationsschrift Mainz).


T: Taishō Tripiṭaka. 1924-1934.


Uv: Udānavarga, see BERNHARD 1965.

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