
The purpose and general format of *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese* are already familiar from the first volume published in 1982. In his introduction to *Studies I* Emmerick describes the series as “a kind of central repository for work being done on any aspect of the Khotanese vocabulary” and explains that the concept of such a series “has arisen gradually as a consequence of the need to find a modus vivendi after the appearance of H. W. Bailey, *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*”. The lemmata in *Studies* are alphabetically arranged; so far as possible they are adopted without modification from Bailey’s *Dictionary*, so that *Studies* may be employed as a commentary or companion to the latter work. However, while *Studies I* seems to contain only one lemma not in the *Dictionary* (tiitta- “balsam pear”, p. 50), such cases are frequent in *Studies II*. A number of these are words of Indian, or other foreign, origin (excluded as a matter of policy by Bailey).

Another welcome new feature of *Studies II* is the inclusion of articles by contributors other than the two named on the title-page. In particular, Hiroshi Kumamoto (Osaka) has made substantial contributions, largely based on the results of his so far unpublished Pennsylvania PhD. thesis *Khotanese official documents in the tenth century A.D.* (1982). Previously unrecognized Indian terms in Khotanese have been identified by Duan Qing (pp. 61—2), Almuth Degener (pp. 95—8), and O. von Hinüber (pp. 115—16), while T. Takata has performed a similar service on the Chinese side (pp. 17—18, 49—50). Finally, the present reviewer has contributed a note on the etymology of a Khotanese enclitic pronoun (pp. 74—5). The greater part of the volume is, however, the work of Emmerick and Skjaervø.

This second volume of *Studies* will be as indispensable as the first to those scholars whose etymological researches extend to the Khotanese lexicon, not to mention the select few who are prepared to grapple with
the texts themselves. Others who dip into it may well be rewarded by unexpected finds: the historian of religions, for instance, by von Hинубер’s note on *mātrvālaa-* “priest of the mārkā” and by Emmerick’s demonstration (s.vv. *vīvīvāya* and *durausā*) of the non-existence of supposed Khotanese equivalents of Avestan *baya*- and *dūraoṣa*.-

It is pleasing for a reviewer to observe that the authors have taken into account the reviews of *Studies I*, where necessary including in *Studies II* a further discussion of a word already treated in the first volume. The following notes are therefore in part intended as suggestions for *Studies III*, which will be eagerly awaited.

*a bustling* (pp. 15–16). Cf. also *hīsaṇī* “on account of greed”, *Z* 12.65. Emmerick’s description of such forms as locatives to abstract nouns in -aṇa- (not attested in any other case) seems less natural than Skjaervo’s definition of them as adverbs (*BSOAS* 48, 1985, p. 62 n. 4). Those that are derived from past stems should perhaps be compared with the Buddhist Sogdian gerunds in -t’ny (npst’ny “lying down”, p cxśi’ny “kneeling”, *GMS* §1036), Khot. *tvamdanu* “reverently”, Tumshuqese *pyerdanu* “deliberately” (*Dict.*, p. 145) and infinitives in -toni, -tanāya, -tanāyā tsi, -tānā (Emmerick, *The Tumshuqese Karmavacanā text*, Stuttgart, 1985, p. 14; Skjaervo, *JRA S*, 1987, p. 86), etc.

*a māga* (pp. 17–18). Similar forms of this Chinese title occur also in Sogdian (*’my’*) and Turkish (*amya, imya*), for instance in both languages in the bilingual Pelliot chinois 3134v, which will be published by James Hamilton and myself.

*kara* (pp. 32–4). From internal evidence one may deduce that Emmerick is the author of this unsigned article!

*nasyaiyā* (pp. 71–2). The type D inflexion of active present stems in *-āwa-* is due to the palatalizing effect of *-i*, cf. Emmerick, *JRA S*, 1969, p. 68 s.v. *buysaitīa*. In the middle the palatalization is absent, as in *skote < *skāwatai, buvsyāre* (not *buvsyāre*) < *wi-zāwārai*. Hence the Old Khot. 3 sg. pres. mid. *niyaiye* here reconstructed by Emmerick must be understood as a secondary middle (= passive) based on, and indirectly attesting, an active *niysaiyā* “extinguishes” < *ni-zāwati*.

*nahāṣta* (pp. 72–3). If *nahāṣta* “downwards” is “a word in its own right” rather than a mistake for *nāṣṭa*, a connexion with Sogd. *nyx, nxy* “deep” seems worth considering.


*mūla* (p. 117) and *hāmnā* (pp. 167–9). If *tcim-mūlā* means either