

# みんなくりポジトリ

国立民族学博物館学術情報リポジトリ National Museum of Ethnology

## Chapter4

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2011-07-22 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 長野, 泰彦, 武内, 紹人, バークハート, ケッセル メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.15021/00000979">https://doi.org/10.15021/00000979</a>

## Linguistic

(1) Cis-Himālayan areas.

(1a) Indo-Āryan Languages.

### 1. Dating of Indo-Āryan Languages.

It has been mentioned that nearly the whole cis-Himālayan area with which we have been dealing is at the present time domain of Indo-Āryan speech. The different languages and dialects are all, excepting that of Kangra, described and mapped in a very massive volume (IX.iv) of the Linguistic Survey of India, where, along with the Khas-kura or Naipālī/Nepali of Nepal they are grouped as 'Pahārī', sc. 'mountain' (Sanskrit *Pārvāṣṭya*) languages. In the Introduction it is pointed out that in a number of grammatical features they are less akin to the West Panjābī adjoining them on the south than to dialects of Rājputānī; and this is explained historically as due to invasions and settlements of Rājput̄s in the area. The theory is complicated by the notion that the territory was occupied somewhat earlier by a foreign people named Gurjaras, who in the VIth and later centuries established several states in Western India and in particular engendered the ruling dynasties of Rājputānā. As Rājput̄s, they returned to the territory speaking dialects acquired in Rājputānā.

It is conceivable that the complication resulted from a first notion that the Gurjaras were a Central-Asian people, whose invasion of India was connected with the Hūna invasions from about the middle of the Vth century A.D., continued during the VI-VIIth centuries by domination in Kashmir and, no doubt, to some extent in the Himālayan states to its east. But in Central-Asian history no Gurjaras are known; and there is no evidence of any connection between the actual Gurjaras and the Hūnas: in the Introduction there is a somewhat candid consideration of the alternative, and, one may say, sole probable, view, that the Gurjaras entered India from the west. But for a prepossession the Survey might have been content with the indubitable fact that in the Himālayan territories there were invasions or settlements of Rājput̄s: as for the Gujur dealers in buffalos, cattle, sheep, etc., who are found on the southern border of the territories and also in Swat, it seems that their comparatively recent interposition is not contested.

As pointed out *supra*, the first appearance of 'Rājput̄s' in the territories cannot have been prior to the VIIth, or, at earliest, the VIth, century A.D., since at such a time India itself knew nothing of any 'Rājput̄s': in fact the Rājput̄ immigrations are usually referred to a much later, Muhammadan, period. Moreover, in most of the territories there is evidence of rulers or chiefs with Indian titles, *rāṇā*, *śhākura*,

*rāstriya*, etc., referable to prior periods and now borne by classes which the superposition of the 'Rājput' has relegated to an inferior status: in the case of Chamba the actual continuity of the historical and archaeological record renders this patent.

It is not quite clear how the Linguistic Survey would have conceived the situation in the pre-Rājput period. But, reckoning back from c.700 A.D. to the Epic period, when we first find unquestionable evidence of intimate acquaintance of Indians with some of the territories, there is an interval of at least 1,000 years. It is incredible that this long period should have passed without a measure of Indo-Āryanization of speech, as well as of culture. It could be supposed that the current native speech which the 'Rājputs' found in the countries, whether purely non-Indian or partly Indianized, was, in fact, ignored by the subsequent developments with which we are concerned: and, so far as any Tibeto-Burman native language should be involved, there is the rather singular resistance, already remarked by the late Professor Lüders (see Professor R. L. Turner, *Nepali Dictionary* (p. xv.5)) to adoption of any terms from such. It may also be noted that the Linguistic Survey view concerning the relation between the Pahārī languages and the Rājasthānī is somewhat impaired in Professor Turner's observation (*ibid*, p. xiii) —

'The close resemblance, noted by Grierson, of the Pahari languages with the Rajasthani is due rather to the preservation of common original features than to the introduction of common innovations.'

However, the activity of actual 'Rājput' individuals or groups in all the territories is historically and sociologically beyond question.

## 2. Early and other loan-words in, or from, Indo-Āryan: preservation of old forms.

The high antiquity and long duration of Indian culture in the territories opens a possibility of detecting in the present languages at least some traces of earlier stages of Indo-Āryan itself, not to speak of any native languages. The Prākṛitization taking place in India was not necessarily reflected in a region originally alien and always outside the main stream of events. Hence it is possible that old words which in India had lost currency or had changed their significations, and old forms which in India had undergone modification, may exist in the languages: and this possibility covers even Vedic Sanskrit expressions, whereof we may propound some instances.

In the *Ṛg-Veda* the word *samudra* has not prevalently the signification 'ocean', which in Classical Sanskrit and in the Pāli and Prākṛit forms *samuddo*, *samudda*, has become, except for certain technical and other senses, exclusive. In non-literary Prākṛit and in the later dialects it seems to be unrecorded. The Vedic

signification (see Vivien de Saint-Martin, *Essai sur la Géographie du Vēda*, pp. 62 sqq., Grassmann's *Wörterbuch* and Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, pp. 21-5) is, as the etymology also suggests, 'joined waters', sc. 'confluence', a sense which is specially explicit in the famous hymn to the two rivers, Vipās (Beas) and Śutudrī (Sutlej). For such an expression the hill territories had constant occasion: the (Tibeto-Burman) Kaṇaurī (Kunāwarī) language retains it practically unaltered in form and sense as *samudrañ*, 'river', (Gerard's *sumudrung* (with Gilchrist's system of transliteration), Grahame Bailey's *sōmūdrōñ*); and it may even be suspected that its precise meaning is rather 'main river (with tributaries)', a sense highly applicable to the uppermost Sutlej, to which it is confined in one of Gerard's maps. The very accurate retention in a non-Indo-Āryan language might be not accidental: should the word hereafter be found in one of the Indo-Āryan Pahārī dialects, its form there might be much more degenerate: in the Garhwāl-Kumaon region where its early introduction is proved by the retained meaning, 'river' (Atkinson, *op.cit.*, pp. 338-9), the form may have been preserved as being Sanskrit.

Another *Ṛg-veda* term is, in fact, widespread in hill Indo-Āryan, being represented by words denoting 'wind', generally 'strong wind', as in —

Simla Hill dialects: *bāgur* (Kjūnthālī, Kotgurū, Jubbal, Kocī).

*bāgar* (Kocī).

Kulu dialects: *bāgur* (Inner Sirājī).

*bagur* (Sainji).

*bagurī* (Outer Sirājī).

Mandi and Suket: *bāgar* (Maṇḍeālī).

*bāk* (N.Maṇḍeālī).

*bāgrē* (Maṇḍi and Suket).

Kangra: *bāgur*.

The more westerly districts, Chamba, Kāngra, have a form *biār*, *byar* (Kului *biānna*), perhaps independent. *Bāgur* is found also in a Garhwāl dialect (Jaunsārī); and Hīndī *bagulā* 'whirlwind', should be the same. This word, the sense of which in Himālayan districts is indispensable, is used also (*bāghur*, 'air') by Indo-Āryan low-castes in Kunāwar (J. D. Cunningham, *op.cit.*, p. 225).

It does not seem possible to separate *bāgur*, *bāgur*, etc., form from the *Ṛg-veda* word *bākura*, *bākurā*, which occurs in the phrases—

abhi dāsyum bākureṇā dhamantā I.117.21.

'blowing upon the brigand with a *bākura*'.

dhāmanti bākuraṃ dṛtim IX.1.8.

'they blow a *bākura* hide'.

The '*bākura* hide' has been understood as (1) a wind instrument of music, sc. a bagpipe, or (2) bellows: see Macdonell and Keith, *Velic Index*, II, p. 58, where the

former is preferred: Grassmann 'blowing-instrument for war' (*bākura*), 'perhaps bagpipers' (*bākurā dṛti*), and Zimmer, *Altind. Leben*, p. 290; Hillebrand, *Lieder des R. V.*, p. 32, n.3, 'bagpipes or the like'; Oldenberg, *R. v. Noten*, II, 154, 'bagpipe-like instrument or bellows'. The notion of a musical instrument, propounded by Roth, was perhaps suggested by the occurrence of a *bakurā*, *bakuri*, *vekuri*, *bhakuri*, *bhākuri*, in certain Brāhmaṇa and *Yajur-veda-saṃhitā* passages. The meaning in these passages is nowhere clear, and the forms with *bh-* seem to point to a factitious etymologizing: in fact, the meaning *nakṣatra*, which is sometimes attributed by paṇḍit conjecture to the word, is probably accountable for the introduction of the *bh* in *bha*, *bhā*; the same meaning is given to *vekuri* in *Taittirīya-saṃhitā*, III. 4.7.1, where Keith's conjecture, 'melodious', is connected with his understanding of *bākura* as a wind-instrument of music.

The bagpipe, if it was even known in India, seems never to be mentioned as used in war, which would be the notion in R. v. I. 117.21; nor do we hear of it in connection with the preparation of the *soma*. Hence the meaning 'bellows', an instrument very widely known in India (and Tibet and elsewhere), is preferable for *bākurā dṛti*: the bellows would be used to blow a fire for warming the liquid, *soma* or milk; and what in the passage R. v., IX.i,8, effects the blowing is the fingers, *agruvo*, which seems more appropriate with the bellows.

It should have been remarked that *bākurā*, a regularly formed Adjective from *bākura*, must differ in meaning from *bākura*. But in the first passage *bākura* is itself an instrument for blowing: hence *bākurā dṛti* means 'a hide which has *bākura* property (sc. that of blowing)'. It seems that the only appropriate meaning for *bākura* is 'wind' and for *bākurā dṛti* 'windy hide', sc. bellows.

It may yet be asked what the Aśvins have to do with wind. In reply it might be asked 'What have the Aśvins to do with planting seed, or with 'milking out sustenance (*iṣu*) for mankind', which are mentioned in the immediately preceding context? The many miscellaneous feats attributed to the Aśvins (see Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 51-3) may excuse us from venturing upon this obscure topic: but it is conceivable that the season of ploughing, of rain, and of violent wind (*bākura*) was one in which the Aśvins were astronomically or calendrically conspicuous. For preservation of an ancient term denoting 'strong wind' or 'hurricane' the Himālayan Hill territories had, of course, ample reason.

A Ṛg-vedic and Sanskrit word which in the hill dialects has very widely resisted a Prākṛit change is *grāma* 'village', which everywhere else assimilated and lost its *r*. We find —

Simla Hill dialects:      *grau* (Kotgurū).  
    *grāḍ* (also *gāḍā*, Kiūthalī, *gāḍ*,

	Baghātī, Jubbal), <i>grā̃</i> (Kocī, also <i>gāō</i> , <i>gaũ</i> ).
Kulu dialects:	<i>grā̃</i> (Kuluī, Inner Sirājī). <i>grā̃ū</i> (Outer Sirājī, Sainjī).
Mandi and Suket:	<i>grāō</i> (Maṇḍeālī). <i>graū</i> (Suket).
Kāngra:	[Bara] <i>grāon</i> , [Lamba] <i>graon</i> etc.: also <i>gāōñ</i> .
Chamba:	<i>grā̃</i> (Cameālī). <i>girā̃</i> (Bhateālī, Curāhī, Pangwālī).

(The Kanāwarī (Tibeto-Burman) *grāman*, and also the more common equivalent *deśaṅ* (Sk. *deśa*), need perhaps not be ancient, though it is not obvious how a modern borrowing of them from Sanskrit should be conceived).

The above instances suggest that the Prakritizing processes did not normally take place in the hill regions, at least in the same way and to the same extent as in India: the actual Prakrit forms will have been introduced already developed; and any further changes will have been governed by local conditions. Such a discrimination, where words are introduced into an alien linguistic area, is self-evident and everywhere exemplified. From pursuing the matter further in regard to abnormal forms of Indo-Āryan words in the hill dialects we shall be readily excused on the ground that, until something is ascertained concerning the supposed original substrate languages, the matter is not very germane to the present study. A second hindrance is the inadequacy of the available vocabularies of nearly all the Pahārī dialects: only for Nepālī have we a full dictionary, viz. Sir R. L. Turner's *Nepālī Dictionary*, which furnishes also reliable etymologies of practically all the words occurring in that language, citing all Indo-Āryan cognates (and also extraneous sources, where requisite), and in massive Indexes grouping them conveniently under the respective language heads. Naturally words not represented in Nepālī do not appear in this Dictionary, and so we depend upon the other available vocabularies. In order not to depreciate the merit and value of these latter and also to attract the attention of scholars prepared to make further special study of the dialects, we may here cite in a note those known to us. The same vocabularies are also important here in connection with our next topic, which is 'non-Indo-Āryan words attested only in the hill dialects': for, while some of the words actually recognized in the Nepālī Dictionary as non-Āryan, e.g. the numerous forms, *bheḍ*, etc., of a word for 'sheep', and even some first found not earlier than in Prakrit, might have been Himālayan, there is no general presumption of such local origin.

Perhaps the oldest clearly Himālayan word in Indo-Āryan, if we overlook certain Proper Names, such as the river-names *Vipās* and *Śutudrī*, which do not look Indo-Āryan, and *Kailāsa*, *Mānasa*, which have generally been regarded as

non-Indo-Āryan, and possibly one or two others, is the name of the yak, the 'hairy ox', in Sanskrit *camara*, whence in Sanskrit was formed *cāmara*, 'yak-tail fly-flap'. This word occurs not only in the *Mahā-Bhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*, but also in the other ancient texts cited supra (p. [...]), *Mahā-parinirvāṇa-sūtra*, *Saundara-Nanda* of Aśvaghoṣa, *Mahā-vastu*, *Kauṭaliya-artha-śāstra*. A Pahārī form, *camar*, is cited only from Nepālī (see Turner, *op.cit.*); but no doubt, an equivalent exists in most of the languages: even Moorcroft in the account of his journey to Mānasa (*Asiatic Researches*, XII, pp. 411, 430) has it as 'chourr bullock' = yak, and 'tails of the chouri cow'. So Traill in his *Report on Kumaun*, Atkinson, *op.cit.*, p. 38, (*chaura*). There can be no doubt that this is derived from a Tibeto-Burman word *cham* or *tsham*, which in Tibetan is *tshams*, *tshoms*, 'bunch of hair', etc., and is applied to a yak-tail, a beard, etc.; in forms such as *swom*, *twong*, *sām*, *som*, *sūm*, *sēm*, *swem*, *swōng*, *cham*, it is frequent in Kirāntī (Vayu, Bāhing, etc.) and other (Lepcha *a-tsom*) Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal. To India it came, no doubt, from the Kailāsa-Mānasa region, to which the above-cited texts relate and where we have Kunāwarī *cham* (Gerard = G. Bailey *tsamm*) 'wool', *mik-can* (Gerard = Bailey *mig-tsam*, Joshi *mig-chām* = Bāhing *michi-swong*), 'eyelashes', *mig-cham* (Gerard) 'eyebrow'. The yak, as is well known, does not descend below the Great Himālaya. The Indo-Āryan Suffix *ra* in *camara* is as in other names of animals, *vyāghra*, *vānara*, *sūkara*, etc.

There are in the Hill dialects some words which, though indubitably Tibeto-Burman or Tibetan, are for the present study without significance, since they can easily have been imported during the historical period. Such are —

<i>saru</i> (Jaunsārī)	}	'hail = Tib. <i>ser-ba</i> ( <i>wa</i> ), Kunāwarī
<i>saru</i> (Kulu)		<i>śaru</i> (Gerard p. 492, G. Bailey <i>shōrū</i> , 'hailstone')

Here the *-ba* of Tib. *ser-ba* would not have been found in an earlier Tibeto-Burman language.

<i>nihal</i> (Inner Sirājī)	}	'plain' (Kāngra has also <i>nīhliā</i> , 'plainsman') = Tib. <i>ñe-yul</i> , 'low-country', Kunāwarī <i>nial</i> , 'plain', <i>neulī</i> , 'plainsman'.
<i>newōl</i> (Outer Sirājī)		
<i>nīul</i> (North Jubbal)		
<i>nīhl</i> (Kāngra)		

( <i>ḍillā</i> (Baghātī)	}	'lazy' = Kunāwarī <i>ḍilos</i> , <i>dēlmig</i> , <i>dēlua</i> (Nepālī <i>ḍhilo</i> , 'slow', <i>dhul-dhal</i> , 'delay'), <i>dālmig</i> 'delay', 'escape', Tib. <i>dal</i> , 'be lagging or languid'.
( <i>dalidrī</i> (Kiūnthālī)		
( <i>daliddar</i> (Bararī)		
<i>dālji</i> < 'dri (Kulu, Sainjī)		
( <i>dalīlda</i> (Maṇḍī)		
( <i>dalidrī</i> )		

( <i>daliddri</i> (Curāhī))	}	
( <i>ḍhillā</i> (Pangwālī))		
<i>dālji</i> (Kiūnthali)	}	'poor' = Kunāwarī <i>daljes</i> , <i>ḍāl-dish</i> .
<i>drāldā</i> (Chamba-Lahulī, 'straightened')		
<i>dalji</i> (Soracholi)		

This is a troublesome group of words. The cerebral *d* in Nepali need not be disconcerting in case of a Tibeto-Burman etymology, since the sensitive Indian ear refuses to recognize in the foreign *t, d, l* its own dentals and substitutes cerebrals: an instance is the actual name, *Bhoṭ*, of Tibet, = Tib. *Bod*. Nor is the aspirate in *dh* a difficulty, as Tibetan initial voiced consonants are now normally aspirated. But the numerous equivalents in Indo-Āryan cited by Professor Turner, s.v. *dhil, dhilo, dhil-dhāl*, certainly inspire doubt.

The forms *dālji, daljes*, have a *j* which can be derived from *dr* and so fall in with those which are patently descended from Sanskrit *daridra*, 'poor'. The change of meaning, 'poor' > 'lazy', may have resulted from reaction between 'I am poor' and 'he is lazy'; but the fact that *none* of the recognizably reduplicated forms such as *dalidri* retained the original sense suggests that there was some disturbing factor: that factor may have been a Tibeto-Burman form *dil-dal*, which, as we see, is found in Nepālī and which cannot have had any meaning but that of 'dilly-dally', 'be lazy', or the like. If this is the right explanation, the change in the meaning of *daridra, daliddo*, will have been due to simple mistake, on the part of a Tibeto-Burman population. A term signifying 'idle', 'lazy', derived from Sanskrit, is recorded in practically all the modern Indo-Aryan languages of India including Kumaonī (Turner, *Nepali Dictionary*, s.v. *ālś*); its indispensability is further evidenced by occurrences in Himālayan dialects, Kuluī *ālsī*, Jubbal *ālsī*, and even Burushaskī *aračo*.

<i>söllö, sollo</i> (Koci)	}	'plain', evidently = Kunāwarī <i>soldas</i>
<i>sörlau</i> (Kulu, Outer Sirājī)		
<i>sönnau</i> (Suket) (Gerard, G. Bailey <i>sollös</i> ), 'plain', 'level' <i>sō</i> (N. Jubbal).		

*ḍukrau* (Koci), 'field'. This seems to correspond to Gerard's (*Koonawur*, p. 80) *degree or shurning*, 'small houses where they [the Kunāwarīs during their summer encampments] employ themselves in making butter'. J. D. Cunningham (p. 209) remarks that 'A mere sheepfold is called *shir nang*, but where a little cultivation is attached to it, the term is *dogrge*'. *Ḍukrau* = *dog-ro* = *dog-ra* = *dog-ri*. The word *shurning* is interesting, being

clearly = Sanskrit *śarana*, 'hut', 'shelter', a signification obsolete after the Vedic and Epic period.

<i>chāṅtu</i> , 'son'	}	(Kiünthali, Śōrāchōli) = Kunāwarī <i>can</i>
<i>chāṅti</i> , 'daughter'		
<i>beang</i>	(Kulu) = Kumāwarī <i>beang</i> (Gerard, p. 499), Tib. <i>g-yan</i> , 'sheep'.	
<i>sih</i>	(Baghātī, Kiünthali, KoṭGurū, Outer Sirājī)	}
<i>si</i>	(Kulu and Kāngra, 'tiger')	
<i>sih, sihi</i>	(Chameāli, Bhateāli, Curāhī)	
<i>dlig</i>	(Bhalesī), 'leopard', = Kunāwarī <i>sik</i> (Gerard, p. 482)	
	Tib - <i>gzig</i> , 'leopard'.	

Such words as these, in so far as they are actually existent in Tibeto-Burman languages which are neighbours of the Indo-Āryan dialects or in Tibetan, can in general have been borrowed by the latter during the historical, or even the modern, period: and this applies prominently to the Kocī dialects, which belong to the same State (Bashahr) as does Kunāwarī. There are therefore not chronologically instructive. But the Indo-Āryan vocabularies comprize a fair number of words for which no Sanskrit, but at the most a Prākṛit, etymon is available. Some of these, e.g. the manifold forms, *bheṛ*, *bheḍ*, *bhraḍḍ*, *bēhri*, *bhēṛo*, etc., signifying 'sheep', may be really Desi words and non-Āryan. Those which are represented in Nepālī have been discussed in Professor Turner's Dictionary and may here be disregarded; but in the W. Himālayan areas there are some others, widespread, which, being restricted to that area, might here be relevant. While not prepared to deal at length with these, we may take note of one or two —

<i>būt</i>	(KoṭGurū and Kocī, Outer Sirājī, Jaunsārī)	}
<i>buṭṭā</i>	(Kulu).	
<i>būṭā</i>	(Chameāli).	
<i>buṭ</i>	(Churāhī).	
<i>būṭ</i>	(Pangwāli).	
<i>būṭā</i>	(Bhadrawāhī).	
<i>boṭ</i>	(Pāḍarī).	

'tree' = Kunāwarī *botang* (J.D.C. (p. 226) *bhotang*, G.B. *bōḥōn*, Joshī *botang*) = Lahulī *buṭṭh*.

This must be a Tibeto-Burman *bo-ta* from *bo* = Tib. *ḥbo*, 'swell up', 'grow', 'sprout'. Nam *ḥbo*, 'forest', Vayu *but*, Bāhing *bōto*, 'flower' (Hodgson, *Essays* (1880), pp. 265, 343).

<i>gāhṛ</i>	(KoṭGurū, Kocī)	}
<i>gāhḍ</i>	(Kocī).	
<i>khāḍ</i>	(Kocī).	

<i>gahḍ</i> (Kocī).	}	'stream', 'river' = Kunāwarī <i>gārañ</i> (G.B. <i>gārōñ</i> ), Lahulī <i>gar</i> . This may be connected with Tib. and Nam <i>gad</i> , <i>ḥkad</i> , 'precipitous ravine of a river', which would well suit the deep-lying W. Himālayan rivers.
<i>khāḍ</i> (Mandēālī).		
<i>khad</i> (Kāngra).		
<i>gaḍḍ</i> ( <i>gaṭ</i> 'hole') (Chamba)		
<i>gaḍ(dri)</i> (Pangwālī).		
<i>gaḍ</i> (Bhadrawāhī).		
<i>gaḍōṛ</i> (Pāḍarī).		
<i>gād</i> (Jaunsārī).		
<i>gār</i> (Kumaunī, Atkinson, <i>op.cit.</i> , p. 832).		
<i>gaṛ(-tir)</i> ( <i>Nepālī</i> )		
<i>ḍaūk</i> } (Kocī).	}	'mountain' = Kunāwarī <i>dokang</i> (J.D.C.) and <i>ḍokha</i> , 'collection of hills' (G.B.), <i>dōkhōñ</i> , 'hill' (G.B.). Cf. Tib. <i>tog</i> , <i>thog</i> , 'top'.
<i>ḍāghūr</i> }		
<i>ḍāg</i> } (Kulu).		
<i>ḍhog</i> }		
<i>dog</i> , 'head' (Bhadrawāhī)		
<i>ḍhig</i> (Kāngra).	}	'precipice': cf. Tib. <i>doñ</i> , 'hole', 'pit', <i>doñkhuñ</i> , 'precipice', 'hole'.
<i>ḍhadḍ</i> (Bhalesī)		
<i>ḍhūng</i> , also <i>ḍhudh</i> (Jaunsārī).		
<i>cugṇā</i> (Baghātī) - also Panjābī	}	'graze', 'cause to graze'. The common Indo-Āryan terms are <i>carṇā</i> and <i>cārṇā</i> . Cf. Tib. <i>ḥjug</i> , <i>bcug</i> 'put', 'send', 'appoint'? <i>ḥdzugs</i> ?
<i>tsungṇā</i> } (Kiūnthālī).		
<i>tsugaunā</i> }		
<i>cugṇā</i> (Mandēālī).		
<i>cugṇā</i> } (Chameālī & Bhateālī)		
<i>cugāṇā</i> }		

The etymology of these and other words widespread in the W. Himālayan hills might well occupy a specialist in Indo-Aryan; but a condition precedent is the provision of more complete vocabularies of the dialects, joined to ampler acquaintance with Tibeto-Burman.

In the Kunāwarī itself the loan-words from Indo-Āryan are so abundant that in 1882 Cunningham, with inadequate regard to morphological and syntactical facts, wrote that —

'The language of the Kunets ... is a corrupt dialect of Hindi, but it still retains several traces of a non-Aryan language'.

If he could have seen the XXth century vocabularies of Ṭikā Rām Joshī and

Grahame Bailey, he would have found, especially if the vocabularies had constantly noted the loans, that modern intercourse had made considerable further progress in replacing the native vocabulary. The borrowing may have commenced early, the case of Sanskrit *samudra*, at least, being actually of a Vedic period; and, since the loan-words need not in the foreign milieu have undergone any further Prakrtization, the Kunāwarī forms may carry a date. One very general feature may, as following an early established type, be strongly evidential in this respect. The Sanskrit stems ending in *a*, which normally in nearly all the 'tertiary Prakrits', sc. the vernaculars, have lost the *-a*, have in Kunāwarī preserved the syllable in the form *-ar*: thus *grāma*, 'village', which in the Indo-Āryan dialects is become *gāōñ* or *gāō*, is in Kunāwarī *grāman*. The instances are very numerous; and it is likely that the *ñ* also is a survival of Sanskrit-Prakrit *m* or *ṃ*, the Sanskrit-Prakrit nouns and adjectives in *-a* having been introduced into Kunāwarī, as into Dravidian, as neuters or Accusatives in *-m*. Some words in *-i* have been similarly treated, e.g. *mauli* > *molīñ*, 'pigtail'.

It might seem surprizing that Kunāwarī, originally a monosyllabic language, should have preserved dissyllabic and poly-syllabic forms which the adjacent languages, whence they were taken, have tended to curtail. But this would result naturally: in monosyllabic languages the several syllables retain their individual, recognizable, significations, and those which have sunk into mere formatives are few: we do not find meaningless suffixes like the *-a* in Latin *mensa* or the *-er* or *-ther* in English father. Hence the unfamiliar syllables are felt to be equally essential. The converse case of borrowing from a monosyllabic language may be illustrated by the above-cited instance of Kunāwarī *bo-tang*, 'forest'. Originally it will have been *bo-ta*, wherein the *ta* will have been, in fact, a (well ascertained) Suffix corresponding in use to Tibetan *-pal-ba*, so that the meaning would be 'grow-er' or 'growth'. Coming into Indo-Āryan with the established denotation 'forest' or 'tree', it did not bring with it an understanding of its etymology or formation: it was simply a word ending in *a*. It was therefore inevitable that the Prakrtizing process should deal with it as with the Indo-Āryan words in *-a*, reducing the terminal *a* and yielding such forms as the *būt*, *but*, *bott*, assembled *supra*. If this account is correct, such converse loan-words from Tibeto-Burman in the Indo-Āryan dialects make a contribution to the chronological outcome. But for a substantial result an amplification of the so far available material is requisite.

The possible retention in Pahārī languages of words or forms belonging to prior stages of Indo-Āryan does not greatly concern our present subject, which relates to the non-Āryan languages surviving in the narrow, most northerly, strip of cis-Himālayan territory. Presuming the priority of the latter to the progress of Indo-Āryanization, we have the possibility that not only may they, at any date, have

contributed items to the Pahārī languages as now known, but also that among their numerous borrowings from Indo-Āryan there are some particulars derived from early stages of these. What little can be propounded under these heads must, however, be preceded by discussion of a phonological matter which is common to both groups.

### 3. A wide-spread phonetic change.

This matter, which in connection with the name Kuninda/Kanet has already presented itself, is a change of *i* and *u* in pre-accentual syllables to *a*. The change, which, since the *a* is the Indian *a*, rather similar to English *a* in *an-*, is effected simply by suppression of the mouth-action requisite for *i* and *u*, is exemplified over the whole area. In the Linguistic Survey volume, where it is not, it seems, discussed, it is evidenced by numerous examples in Panjābī, some of which may here be cited, together with a number extracted from Dr. Grahame Bailey's select vocabularies for other languages: —

Panjābī:

a < i		a < u
<i>valāit</i> = <i>vilāyat</i> (Arabic)		<i>kamārā</i> (ī) = <i>kumāra</i> (ī) (Sk.)
<i>vasākḥ</i> = <i>viśākḥa</i>	}	(Sk.).
<i>vayāḥ</i> = <i>vivāḥa</i>		
<i>vayākarn</i> = <i>vyākaraṇa</i>		

Kāngra, Chamba, Bhadrawāh, etc.:

a < i		
<i>balā</i> (Pāḍarī, Bhadrawāhī)	}	= <i>vidāla</i> (Sk.).
<i>balār</i> (Pāḍarī)		
<i>basāḥ</i> (Kāngra) = <i>viśvāsa</i> (Sk.).		
<i>bayog</i> (Kāngra) = <i>vīyoga</i> (Sk.).		
<i>ghareth</i> (Pangwālī) = <i>gṛastha</i> (Sk.).		
<i>katāb</i> (Curāhī, Pāḍarī, Bhadrawāhī) = <i>kitāb</i> (Ar.).		
<i>napīlṇā</i> (Gujurī) = <i>nipīd-</i> (Sk.), Cameālī <i>paletṇā</i> .		
<i>pasāc</i> (Cameālī) = <i>piśāca</i> (Sk.).		
<i>siruāl</i> (Cameālī) <i>saruāl</i> (Mandeālī).	}	= <i>śirobāla</i> (Sk.), 'hair'.
<i>shiruāl</i> (Curāhī)		
<i>shirāl</i> (Bhadrawāhī)		
<i>sirāl</i> (Bhateālī)		
<i>bharukk</i> (Kāngra) = Sk. <i>bubhukṣā</i> , 'hunger'.		

Simla Hill States, Kulu, Mandī, Suket, etc.:

<p>a &lt; i</p> <p><i>katāb</i> (Sirāji, Kocī, Jubbal, Suket) } = <i>kitāb</i> (Ar.).</p> <p><i>barāhg</i> (Sirāji, Kocī) = <i>vyāghra</i> (Sk.).</p> <p><i>bareālāu</i> (Sirāji) <i>bareālā</i> (Sainji) <i>berailu</i> (Kocī) <i>barāthau</i> (Kocī) <i>barāl</i> (Baghāti) } = <i>vidāla</i> (Sk.).</p> <p><i>bayāh</i> (Mandeālī) = <i>vivāha</i> (Sk.).</p> <p><i>kanāre</i> (Kunāwarī) = <i>kināraha</i> (Pers.), 'edge'.</p> <p><i>pharād</i> ('help') = <i>firyād</i> (Pers.)</p> <p><i>sail</i> (Jubbal) <i>shail</i> (Koṭgurū) <i>shailtu</i> (Suket) } = <i>śṛgāla</i> (Sk.)</p> <p><i>sarāj</i> (Sirāji) = <i>sirāj</i> ('mountain').</p> <p><i>shakār</i> (Baghāti) = <i>shikār</i> (Pers.).</p> <p><i>satāz</i> (Kocī)</p> <p><i>shrāl</i> (Outer Sirāji) <i>shrēāl</i> (Inner Sirāji) <i>shrāl</i> (Koṭgurū) } = Sk. <i>śiro-bāla</i> 'hair'.</p>	<p>a &lt; u</p> <p><i>darera</i> = <i>dūre-</i> (Sk.).</p>
--	--

The pronunciation in question has accordingly a very wide range. In Panjābī itself it is probably of great prevalence, since the quoted examples are taken merely from a list of words with initial *v*: it is found in all the Pahāri and other Indo-Āryan dislects of the Panjāb Hill States; and more widely still, since we have found unimpeachable evidence of a pronunciation in Kumaon of its own name as *Kamaon* and that despite the circumstance that the original *u* of the first syllable had to be shortened to *u*, as in the *dur* (= Sanskrit *dūra*) of Turner's Nepali Dictionary. But this does not cover all the facts, since a communication from Sir R. L. Turner assures us that the same phenomenon is general in Gujarātī also. It figures also in the variant spellings of the names of Hill States or provinces, e.g. Sarmūr and Sirmūr, Sirāj, Sarāj, and Saorāj, whereof the extreme example is Bashahr, for which we have *Bushur* (i.e. *Bashahr*, Gerard), Basahi (Strachey, map), Busehur (i.e. Basehar, Gerard), Busahir (i.e. Basahir, Gerard), Buesahir (Harcourt), Baschar (Moorcroft), Baśahr or Biśahr (Atkinson), Bischur (Fraser), Bisahar (Moorcroft and A. Cunningham), Bissehir (J. D. Cunningham). In the Kunāwarī group of Tibeto-Burman the mutation *i* > *a* is evidenced in the L.S. vocabulary (pp. 532 sqq.) by *nasā/nizzā/nyiza*, '20', *najang/nijang*, 'iron', *chame/chime*, 'daughter',

*napyā/nipaé*, 'cock', and other instances, *jablejabliljibe*, 'tongue'.

Chronologically also the pronunciation has had an extensive range. Not only has it affected even fairly old borrowings from Arabic (*kitāb*, *vilāyat*) and Persian (*kinārah*, *shikār*), but it must also be recognized in the ancient Sanskrit modification, *Śatadru*, of the Vedic name, *Śutudri*, of the Sutlej river and in the corresponding Greek *Zaradros*: the same *a* is current in modern Himālayan names of the Sutlej, in Chamba (Gazetteer 1904, p. 54. *Satludr*), in Kunāwar (Gerard's map) *Sutroedra*, i.e. *Satrudra*: Hsüan-tsang's *She-tu-lu* also does not represent *su-*.

Upon this evidence it is certain that in the name *Kanet*, if regarded as of Indo-Āryan currency, the *a* of the first syllable constitutes no objection to derivation of the name from the ancient *Kuninda*: that in *Kanet* the accent is on the second syllable is obvious from such spellings as *Kaneit*, *Kunait*: the like applies to the district name *Kanāwar*, *Kunawar*, *Knor*, *Kanor*, etc. When we turn to the Kunāwari language itself, not only have we the *u* retained in the forms *Kundas*, *Kunīta*, *Kuin*, which are applied to the most esteemed Kanets and of which the first is certified as the native name, but it can even be contended that in that language a modern *Kanet* could not be derived from an original form with *a* in the initial syllable. In words of this form Grahame Bailey's meticulous spelling substitutes for the *a* an *o*, e.g. in *sōmūdrōn*, which is an ancient derivative from Sanskrit *samudra*, and in *kōnōs*, 'friend', which Ṭikā Rām Joshī gives as '*ka-nes* or '*ko-nes*'. The change of *a* to *o*, so well known in Bengālī, is, in fact not confined to such syllables: the L. Survey remarks (p. 431) that 'the short *ō* often interchanges with *a*', and this is exemplified in the vocabularies by instances such as *bokras*, 'goat', from Indo-Āryan *bakra*, and conversely in *tan*, 'see' = Tibetan *mthoñ*, *hthoñ*. The latter also occurs in the neighbouring 'Bhotia' languages, as is indicated by the early travellers' spelling of the Gar-tog governor's title, *Sgar-dpon*, as *Gar* (or *Ge*)-*pang*. That such pronunciation was a feature of the 'Kanet' area appears from the fact that it is attested in practically all the Indo-Āryan vernaculars of that area and apparently not in other such W. Himālayan dialects. Instances are —

Kuluī: *bōhu*, 'much', *bōn*, 'jungle', *lōrnā*, 'fight', *nōshnā*, 'run away', *phōl*, 'fruit'.

Sirāji: *bōld*, 'ex', *kōlm*, 'pen', *ōkleālau*, 'wise'.

Maṇḍī: *bōld*, *phōl*.

Koṭgurū: *mōrnau*, 'die', *pōrhnu*, 'read', *tsōrnau*, 'graze'.

Jubbāl: *bōro*, *baro*, 'big', *pōlāg*, 'bad', *pōrno*, 'read'.

Kocī: *nōgēr*, 'village'.

In regard to the names *Kanet* and *Kanawar*, *Kanor*, this evidence seems to justify the inference that, if the vowel of the first syllable had originally been *ā*, it would now be *ō*.

(1b) Tibeto-Burman languages.

1. Bhotiya

Coming now to Tibeto-Burman languages, we may make short work of the '*B,hoteea*' of Alexander Gerard, whose very valuable article, *A Vocabulary of the Koonawur languages* (JASB, XI(1942), pp. 478-551), will be more extensively considered *infra*. Primarily this term, *B,hoteea*, may have been taken as denoting the speech of the cis-Himālayan 'Bhot' districts as defined above. But Gerard, who had encountered it also in the 'Tartar' (sc. Tibetan) of mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum, including 'Hung-rung' (Hañ-rañ), and had also recognized the language of Spyi-ti as identical with it, observes that —

'this language, with a few slight variations, prevails at Garoo (Gartog), Mansurmur (Mānasa-sarovera), and along the banks of the Brahmaputra to Jeshoo Loomboo and Lahassa, it is the native tongue of Ludak (Ladak).'

*B,hoteea*, therefore, simply denotes Tibetan, an usage which is also followed by the Linguistic Survey, which spells as *Bhotiya*.

The Linguistic Survey, while recognizing the similarity to 'Central Tibetan', distinguishes three dialects, viz. (1) Spiti dialect, (2) Nyamkat, 'spoken along the upper course of the Sulej in Kanawar' (read 'in mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum'), (3) Jaḍ language of the Jaḍs, who are 'Bhōtiās of Nilang in Tehri Gahrwāl'. It is stated that 'Nyamket, classical Tibetan *mnyam-skad*, means 'the Nyam speech, *lit.* 'the language of the equals': which, however, is not correct, since *Nyam* is the ordinary Kunāwar term for 'Tibetan'. It may be remarked that in the Simla Hill States Gazetteer (1910, pp. 22, xi, etc.) *Nyām* and *Jād (Zār)* are treated as indistinguishable.

It is known that the Bhotiyas proper, the people of Spyi-ti and, of course, the Tibetans of mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum all have markedly Tibetan physiognomy. And this actuality accords with the history as expounded *supra*, which renders it highly unlikely that Tibetan characteristics in the area commenced in times more remote than c.800 A.D., or intensely before c.900. It would follow that all the dialects are descended from the known Tibetan of that period, possibly with some items of popular or dialectical Tibetan speech. For this reason we have proposed to classify all the West-Tibetan languages as 'Western Colonial Tibetan'. It may be added that the Tibetanization has been continuous, so that items in the language may be of any subsequent period. In particular the cis-Himālayan Bhotiyas proper, brought from mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum by the trade, may be immigrants of decidedly later centuries.

This reasoning is confirmed by inspection of the only available vocabulary of

any extent, viz. that of Gerard, which records 1,000 words along with a sketch of the grammar and a quantity of specimen sentences. The great majority of the words, as soon as we discount the spelling (on Gilchrist's system), can forthwith be recognized as ordinary Tibetan, in many cases with pronunciations which in Tibetan are by no means early - such are, e.g. *da*, 'enemy' = Tib. *dgra* (pronounced *da*), *teeo* (*tio*), 'monkey' = Tib. *sprehu* (pron. *teu*), *peea* (*pia*), 'rat', = Tib. *byi-ba*, *too(zha)(tu)*, 'to wash', = Tib. *khru* (pron. *thu*). From the (systematically) restricted list in the L.S. 'Comparative Vocabularies' it may be seen that the same applies to the Spyi-ti dialect: the Ladakī dialects retain, as is well known, a number of old pronunciations, including some, e.g. *sta*, 'horse', = Tib. *rita*, which in Tibetan itself were originally dialectical.

The Declensional Suffixes of Number and Case are, as is recognized in the Linguistic Survey (III.i, pp. 84, 87, 92, 101), likewise predominantly as in Tibetan, with a few divergences, mostly perhaps originated in popular or local Tibetan: thus there is a Plural Suffix *gun*, which in Tibetan, where we may not find it as a Suffix, simply means 'all'.

Thus the particular dialects, and here we include those of Ladak, do not seem to present anything repugnant to the description of them as 'Colonial Tibetan'.

In the Conjugation of Verbs there are among the particulars noted in the Linguistic Survey one or two which may be reserved as possibly derived from a prior, non-Tibetan, speech: these are —

- (1) Some, not very extensive, distinctions of Persons in Finite forms of the Verb (Gerard, pp. 540-1 (Bhotiya), L.S., pp. 84, 167, 170 (Spiti)).
- (2) Present Participle in *-ā*, Perfect in *-ka* (Gerard, p. 543 (Bhotiya)).
- (3) Infinitive or Verbal Noun in *-ce*, etc. (Gerard, p. 539 (Bhotiya-*cha(ca)*), *-ja*, *-zha(zā)*; L.S., p. 85 (Spiti-*che(ce)*), p. 87 (Nyamket-*ja*), p. 92 (Jāḍ-*cha(cā)*) *-ja*, *-zha(zā)*, *-sha(sa)*, p. 101 (*-ja*)).

Any relevant facts in relation to these may be considered *infra*: as regards no. 3, it might be conjectured that the *ca*, *ja*, *zā*, *sa*, really derives from the Tibetan Verb *mdzad*, 'do', which, like *byed*, 'do', is sometimes a practically otiose Auxiliary to Verbs. But the Ladakī Infinitive in *-ces*, cited in this connection by L.S. (pp. 85, 92), and Balti and Purik *-cas*, suggest that, in case an Auxiliary should have to be brought in, it should be rather *bcaḥ*, 'arrange', than *mdzad*. The matter demands further consideration.

In general, it is likely that all the 'Bhot' districts of the W. Himālaya were originally inhabited by people speaking dialects of, or akin to, Kunāwari and have inherited from such predecessors some of the above, or other, non-Tibetan peculiarities of dialect: and, in fact, some 'Bhot' peoples of the far north of Kumaon are still linguistically non-Tibetan.

It would be paradoxical to suppose that the Kunāwarī, of which the characteristics are such that it cannot have been imported from any identifiable outside area, and which survives only in Kunāwar, where the people have been described as 'all Kanits', should not be ancestral speech of the Kanets. Nearly all other Kanets belong to areas of Indo-Āryan, which for them accordingly is 'acquired'. The presumption that these other Kanets, confined to districts included in the sphere of the ancient Kuninda State, originally shared the ancient linguistic heritage of the Kunāwar Kanets, was evidently comprised in Cunningham's original view that the 'Tibetan' dialects, surviving only in the narrow strip of territory immediately south of the Great Himālayan axis, had prior to the Indo-Āryan penetration extended almost down to the plains. The validity of Cunningham's reasoning is unaffected by his subsequent substitution of Muṇḍā for 'Tibetan': and his unassailable argument from the range of river-names in *-ti* is further strengthened by the present certainty that the *-ti* and the languages in question are alike Tibeto-Burman. Obviously the geographical coincidence between the Kanet area and the Kuninda State does not equally apply to the languages; but it does apply to the extent that the cis-Himāyan areas of the Tibeto-Burman group of languages are mainly Kanet areas and areas of river-names in *-ti*.

Of the languages in question the Kunāwarī, which is the most important and best known, was indeed the first to be brought to light. But one of the two earliest, if not the very earliest, reporters of it, Alexander Gerard (1819) not only expounded it in four distinct dialects, but also remarked upon an independent language, that of Lahul, as related to it.

## 2. The 'Western pronominalized' sub-group'.

We may now be considered free to approach the last group of cis-Himālayan languages, defined in the Linguistic Survey as 'the Western sub-group of pronominalized Himalayan languages', where the term 'pronominalized' and the classificatory principle which it conveys were adopted from Hodgson's repeated reasoning and usage. It does not appear that Hodgson, though he was well aware of 'the Palu Sen or cis-nivean Bhōtjās, the Garhwālīs, and the inhabitants of Kanāver and Hangrang' as 'of Tibetan stock' and had, no doubt, seen what had been published concerning their languages, ever gave special attention to them.

The most important of the languages, Kunāwarī, was also the first to be brought to notice, a vocabulary of not quite inconsiderable extent, with some sentences, having been printed in Captain J. D. Horbert's *An Account of a Tour made to lay down the Course and Levels of the river Setlej or Satudra ...* (Asiatic Researches, XV (1819), pp. 339 sqq., see pp. 417-422). Far more extensive and important, in fact fundamental, for the study of the language, is Captain Alexander

Gerard's *A Vocabulary of the Koonawur Languages*, which, though not published until 1842 (JASB XI, pp. 478-551), was compiled in 1819.

The main languages, each represented by a (parallel) vocabulary of 1000 words, a considerable quantity of (parallel) sentences, and a grammatical sketch, are 'Milchan', 'B,hooteea or Tartar', and 'T,heburskud', of which the second has already been discussed (*supra* pp. 26 sqq.). Of nos. 3 and 4 there are brief accounts inserted in the grammar of 'Theburskud'. A concluding note states the territorial extension of each of the five, on which matter see *supra*.

These vocabularies, with their accompaniments, have not received the attention which they merit. By Jaeschke they are not mentioned; and it may be doubted whether they were seriously examined by any of the later authorities: this may have resulted partly from their employment, though thoroughly systematic and intelligible, of an antiquated (Dr. Gilchrist's) transliteration. By their abundance and precision of information they compare with Hodgson's elaborate studies (*Essays* (1880), I, pp. 216-392, originally published in JASB XXVI (1857)) of the Vayu and Bāhing languages. In conjunction with the Linguistic Survey Volume III.1 (1909) and some other items they provide the linguistic situation in Kunāwar with a perspective, rare among Himālayan languages, of a century and more of history. It should be added that by the remark concerning Lahul, that the people were Tartars (Tibetans), but the language —

'as far as I can judge from a list of thirty words, is almost the same as in the lower parts of Koonawur, with some differences in the dialect' (*Account of an attempt ...* p. 312)

Gerard initiated the recognition of a group, with the Bu-nan and Ti-nan languages of Lahul as members. The vocabularies published by Alexander Cunningham (*Ladak*, pp. 398 sqq.) and J. D. Cunningham will be specified *infra*.

In 1865 the Moravian missionary, H. A. Jaeschke, the distinguished Tibetanist, drew attention to the 'Boo-nan' language —

'spoken in a small district of Lahoul, and in part of Kunawur, where it is called Tibar-skad, Tibar-language' (J.A.S.B. XXXIV (1865), p. 312).

This confirmation of Gerard's remark concerning the resemblance of the Lahul language to his 'Theburskud' was accompanied by a discussion of the structure of the Bu-nan language and of its vocabulary, which differentiated it from the Tibetan steadily encroaching upon it; similarly Gerard had presented his Kunāwarī dialects as a language distinct from his 'B,hooteea' (Tibetan): Jaeschke, having given a select vocabulary of genuine Bu-nan words, went on to examine and classify the Tibetan loanwords imported into it, which he referred to two distinct periods of Tibetan pronunciation. His identification of the Bu-nan language with the Tibar-skad of Kunāwar did not carry any view as to original affinity with Tibetan, which he was

not considering. In 1871 Harcourt (*op.cit.*, p. 134) brought to light a 'Malauna' language, spoken in a secluded (double) village on a tributary of the Pārbatī river in Kulu, as using many Tibetan words. Later in his book (pp. 311-4) he gives a full account of the isolated and peculiar people speaking it; and in an appendix (pp. 379-381) he prints a 'short vocabulary' of it. On p. 135, upon information from the Rev. Mr. Heyde, Moravian missionary in Kye-lang, he cites and precisely locates four languages of Lahul, whereof one is Jaeschke's Boo-nan, 'half Thibetan as far as the words go, but a separate language as far as grammar is concerned': the others are 'Mānchāt, or, in vernacular papers, *Puttun* (Patānī), 'composed of Hindee principally, a little Tae-nun Thibetan, and the rest quite a local language', and 'Teenuan (Ti-nan), made up with Tibetan words, Mānchāt, Boonun, a little Hindee and some few Persian words'. In these instances we do not find, apart from the identification of the Lahul-Bu-nan with the Kunāwarī-Tibar-skad and the common feature of immixture of Tibetan words, a comparative view of the languages in relation to Tibeto-Burman. Nor does comparison enter into Dr. Grahame Bailey's objective sketch of the [Chamba] -Lahulī language, published in the Appendix to the Chamba Gazetteer of 1904 (pp. 37-51).

It is different when we come to Sherring's *Western Tibet and the British Borderland* (1906), where a number of dialects (Rankas or Shokia Khun, pp. 63-4, Dāmiyā, Chaudāngsī, and Byāngsī, p. 64) are reported as spoken by Bhotias of districts adjoining the passes in the far north of Kumaon and as being not Tibetan, but Tibeto-Burman. This altered conception reflects, no doubt, the progress in linguistic inquiry accompanying the operations of the Linguistic Survey, which had been during some years in action and which in 1909 published as its 'Volume III, Tibeto-Burman Family, Part 1, General Introduction. Specimens of the Tibetan Dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the North Assam group': therein all the above languages, with the doubtful addition of a 'Janggali', surviving in the Almora region of Kumaon, are classed together as 'Western sub-group of Complex Pronominalized languages'. Their group features are expounded in an Introduction (pp. 427-9), where their close connection also is indicated by a short table of cognate words, more extensively supplemented in the 'List of standard words and sentences' (pp. 532-567), which follows the treatments of the languages severally.

Subsequent additions to the group were brought to light by Dr. Grahame Bailey in his *Linguistic Studies from the Himalayas* (1920), being two dialects of the Bashahr State, viz. 'Lower Kānaurī' (pp. 46-77) and 'Chitkhulī' (pp. 78-83). Conceivably one further language may eventually have to be added. The Pangi district, which adjoins Chamba-Lahul on its west and with it jointly constitutes the northernmost area of the Chamba State, the Great Himālaya only separating it from Zanskar of Ladak, is said to have been during one period part of a larger Lahul,

'both Triloknath and Pangi, at present in Chumba territory, having been within its limits' and the whole subject to the Gu-ge State of mÑah-ris-skor-gsum. The proximity of Pangi and Chamba Lahul and the notable similarities in the usages of the respective populations suggest also a common ethnic and linguistic past. Accordingly, just as it is stated (p. 160) concerning Chamba-Lahul that —

'There are also Bhots' (sc. the Tibeto-Burman speakers of Chamba-Lahulī),  
but the other castes have no communion with them'

so the (Buddhist) Bhots of 'the Bhotaurī villages of Pangi' (p. 181), with whom the high castes do not intermarry (p. 156), may be not Tibetan immigrants from Ladak, but survivals from pre-Tibetan times, with a Tibeto-Burman dialect.

### 3. Geographical distribution of the 'Western sub-group.'

It may be helpful now to enumerate the known languages in an order somewhat divergent from that adopted in the Linguistic Survey and exhibiting the geographical continuity: —

1. Chamba-Lahulī: The Chamba-Lahul district is to the west of a high spur of the Great Himālaya, separating it from the valley of the Bhaga branch of the upper Candra-Bhaga, or Chenab, river in Lahul.
2. Manchatī or Patnī: Man-chat, or Patan, is the district in the Chandra-Bhaga valley, west of the confluence, where in passing between the terminus of the above-mentioned spur on its north and the great Pir Panjal Range on the south, it progresses west into Chamba territory.
3. Bu-nan: Spoken in the valley of the Bhaga, before its confluence with the Candra, eastwards and northwards in the direction of the high passes. A mass of difficult mountains separates the upper course of the Bhaga from that of the Chandra, further east.
4. Ti-nan or Rangloi: Rañ-lo is the valley of the Chandra from the confluence eastwards to the point where it bends in emerging from the mountains on the north. The above 1-4 may be regarded as a Lahul group.
5. Kanāshī, far south, language of the above-mentioned village, isolated on a feeder of the Pārbatī river in Kulu: The Malāna village is not remote from a route up the valley of the Pārbatī which ultimately crosses the Hamta Pass or Rotang Pass into Lahul. It is conjectured by Harcourt (pp. 312-3) that the Malāna people, who have a peculiar physiognomy, are a colony driven up centuries ago from the plains; but the ancient and always frequented routes through Kulu to the north and the traditions of historical relations with Lahul, when it was subject to the rule of Gu-ge (*ibid.*, pp. 124-5), suggest a reverse direction. The country, always in trouble with its neighbours, Chamba, Ladak, and Bashahr (Fraser, *op.cit.*, p. 261), might also have owed its Malāna

remnant to the last named, which by several passes communicates with it.

At this point the geographical continuity of the group of pronominalized languages is interrupted by the great Pir Panjal Range of mountains, which, diverging from the main Himālayan axis, constitutes first the eastern, and thenceforward the southern, limit of Lahul, and also by a great southward trending spur separates nearly the whole of the Bashahr State from Kulu. The northernmost area of Bashahr has immediately to its west not any part of Lahul, but the intrusive district of Spi-ti, which linguistically and ethnically is definitely Tibetan. Spi-ti, however, is, as remarked *supra*, rather in than south of the main axis and is rather a trans- than a cis- Himālayan plateau with an elevation of c. 16000 feet; and historically there have always been communications, over high passes, between that part of the Bashahr State and Lahul also.

The next group of dialects belongs to Bashahr.

6. Tibar-skad, spoken in the northernmost districts on the right (west) bank of the Sulej from the confluence with the Spi-ti river downwards, is in contact with the Tibetan districts of Hañ-rañ and Chumurti: perhaps also named Gangyul or Gangel dialect: see the Gazetteer, Appendix II, pp. xi, xiii, xxiii, xxv.
7. Sum-cho ('Three Villages'), spoken in Kānam, Labrañ and Pilō (Spilo), further south on the right bank of the Sulej.
8. Zungram, spoken in the district of Zungram, adjacent to no. 7.
9. Milchan, or Kanāwrī, or Kanaurī, or 'Standard Kanaurī,' spoken in the main areas on the right bank, and also generally in the much more extensive area on the left, of the Sulej. Apart from a few larger settlements the populations on both sides are, no doubt, for the most part confined to deep-lying valleys of tributaries descending from the high mountain barriers on the west and east respectively. With the increasing divergence of the two curving ranges the total width of the territory, and consequently the length of the valleys, increases continuously as we advance south, but especially on the left bank, as the N.W. to S.E. bend of the Great Himalaya is the more pronounced. This does not differentiate the two regions, both consisting of high mountains cut through by the troughs of rivers descending to the Sulej: but ethnically there is this difference, that on the right bank the valleys ascend only to little used passes into Kulu, while those on the left bank encounter at the Himālayan passes Tibetan people and speech, with whom there are regular communications and trade.
10. Lower Kanaurī, spoken along a stretch of about 12 miles on the north of the Sulej, now turned westward. South of this the remainder of the Bashahr State is linguistically Indo-Āryan (Kocī dialects).

11. Chitkhulī, spoken in two villages, Raskam and Chitkhul, high up in the valley of the Bāspa tributary of the Sutlej. The situation is here analogous to that at the extreme east of Lahul, where are the sources of the Chandra branch of the Chenab. Just as the Chandra originates in the angle of parting of the Great Himālaya and the Pir Panjal, so does the Bāspa in the angle of parting of the Great Himālaya and the Dhavaladhār, which is, as has been seen, somewhat east of Badarīnāth, in British Garhwāl. Chitkhul having been several times visited by travellers, the upper Bāspa valley is presumably on an established route; and the route might well be regarded as aiming, like those further north, for Tibetan territory in mÑāḥ-ris-skor-gsum. The map, however, suggests that its markedly south-eastern direction points to a junction with the famous routes from British Garhwāl and Kumaon by the Māna, Niti and other passes, which reach the same (southern) part of mÑāḥ-ris-skor-gsum. This matter is by no means indifferent to our present inquiry, since such a junction would negate a geographical gap between the Kunāwar dialects and the remaining Tibeto-Burman group, which belongs to the northern fringe of Garhwāl and Kumaon. It would, indeed, affect the fundamental problem, which is 'Did these Tibeto-Burman dialects reach their present wide-stretching, but very narrow, areas, in which they everywhere encounter Tibetan on their north, by retreat under Indo-Āryan pressure from the south? Or are they ancient trans-Himālayan predecessors of the Bhotiya dialects and the Bhotiyas, if they are really such, found at present in sections of the same area?' This question should not be prematurely entertained; but it seems certain that the territory of the ancient Kunindas extended to areas of Garhwāl-Kumaon south of the not very formidable Dhavaladhār and eastward as far as the main feeders of the Jumna: this, in fact, was also, according to the evidence adduced by Cunningham, the case with the Kanets and is still in part the case with the Bashahr State.

The remaining group consists of —

12. Rangkas, Saukiā (Sokya)-khun, spoken in the Johar district in the north of Kumaon (Almora), east of Nanda Devī: with mÑāḥ-ris-skor-gsum the Johar district (Gori valley) communicates *via* the Untadhura Pass. The Saukiyas are said to be called also Rawāt (Sherring, p. 63), which seems to associate them with the Rao or Rawāt Kanets of the Pabur and other tributaries of the Jumna. By Sherring they are described as 'obviously not pure Mongolians' and as 'the most Hinduized of all Bhotias' (pp. 347-8).
13. Dārmīyā, spoken by Bhots of the Darma district, which is east of Johar: the people use the Darma Pass (Sherring, pp. 64, 343).
14. Byāngsī, spoken by Bhots of the extreme north-eastern, Byānghs, district of

Almora (Kumaon) bordering on Nepal, who use the Lipu-lekh and one or two other passes (Sherring, pp. 64, 343-4).

15. Chaudāngsī, spoken by Bhots of the Chaudānghs district, immediately south of Byāngs along the Kali river, who use the same passes as do the Byāngs people (Sherring, *loc. cit.*).
16. Janggalī, spoken by a remnant of forest-dwelling Rājīs, or Rājya-Kirātas, in the extreme south-east of Almora and in the adjacent district, Doti, of Nepal. The Linguistic Survey (p. 530), while recognizing the Tibeto-Burman character of the language, declares 'that it has few, if any, characteristics in common with the other Almora dialects'.

#### 4. Bhot and Bhotiya.

The designation *Bhot*, or *Bhotia*, 'Tibetan', in application to the speakers of nos. 13-15 above, termed by Sherring 'Western Bhots', whose situation in their extremely mountainous country and their relation to the passes and the trade show that communications with mÑah-ris-skor-gsum is the rationale of their existence, is supported by their physiognomy: it is affirmed by Sherring (p. 69) that —

'The Bhotias are of Tibetan origin ... there is no doubt that they are Mongolians, for their features betray them, and they eat and drink freely with the Tibetans'.

The fact that they currently claim a Hindu origin and have, like other populations of Kumaon and Garhwāl, a division into 'Rājput's and 'Dum-ras' (Doms, menials) goes for nothing; but the total difference, which Sherring proceeds (cc. IV-VIII) to particularize of their usages and beliefs from those of Tibetans, no less than of Hindus, inspires a doubt: even the items, such as polyandry, which they share with Tibetans are not precisely similar; and the very significant non-Tibetan features which we have had so frequently to remark in the Kanets, viz. licence of unmarried women and communal drunkenness (pp. 88-9, 111), are here at their maximum: it is here that the 'Rambang' we have previously noticed, is an ubiquitous institution (pp. 104 sqq.). The positive evidence of peculiar usages and superstitions is strongly confirmed by the lack of acquaintance with the all-powerful religious system of Tibet, Lamaistic Buddhism, even its commonest symbols, being unknown: only in the death ceremonies (c. VIII) are there resemblances, which Sherring ascribes to common inheritance from the ancient Bon-po religion. From the array of such facts and from the absence of any original acquaintance with writing Sherring reasonably concludes (pp. 77-8) that these peoples 'left Tibet before writing was introduced about 650 A.D. and that their immunity from subsequent developments, Hindu and Tibetan, has been due to their extremely secluded situation.

It may be questioned whether any of the speakers are properly designated Bhotias. The name *Bhot*, *Bhauta*, taken over by the Indo-Āryans from Tibetan *Bod*, which is name of the historical Tibetan State, with *Bod-pa* 'man (or thing) of Bod', was applied by them in general to all the peoples on their north whom they saw to be of Tibetan affinity. Practically this was, after the establishment of the great Tibetan State, not erroneous: the Tibetan peoples who appeared on the Indo-Āryan horizon were in fact Bod-pas; and, when the independent Ladak kingdom arose, the rulers were, in fact, of Bod-pa descent, and the peoples may have tolerated the designation *Bod-pa*, though perhaps there is no evidence of this. In the Himālayan districts the later Tibetan immigrants, or traders, from Tibet were in fact Bod-pas, as their language proves; but the Indo-Āryans, or their British administrators, came to extend the range of the term Bhot so as to include areas inhabited from far earlier periods by Tibeto-Burman people who were not Bod-pas. The difference is clearly apparent in the vicinity of the peoples here in question: their neighbours on their west, the inhabitants and traders in the high upper valleys of British Garhwāl and Tehri Garhwāl, are, in fact, Bod-pas, as their dialects prove: the speakers of the above languages, nos. 13-15, are Bhotias only in the sense that the territory which they inhabit is, or is thought to be, included by Indo-Āryans in the general term *Bhot*. (See Sherring's map).

The name *Bhotia* is stated (Sherring, pp. 61-2) not to be generally accepted by the peoples in question: it is even likely that for Tibetans, some of whom they may have known before 'Bod' existed, they have a different designation such as the *Jād* or *Zār* of Garhwāl and Kunāwar and the Nepal (Newārī) *Seyād*. It is somewhat curious that for none of the peoples, unless the speakers of no. 14, *Saukia-khun*, are tribally 'Saukiyas' or 'Sokyas', have we an ethnical name. As for the distinction of Tolchas and Marchas (Sherring, pp. 63, 348), the two terms are probably dialectical Tibetan, meaning simply 'uplanders' and 'downlanders': *Jethora*, which appears as a tribal designation in the south of Johar (language, no. 14), is as we have seen, an old term denoting a village 'elder'; it is interesting as being an ancient term and according with the people's claim to antiquity and their actually advanced Hinduization. As may be seen from the separate description given of their usages (Sherring, pp. 63-4, 349 sqq.), the Hinduization is far from complete: their propinquity to Garhwāl and their alternative name *Rawāts*, which we have noted in the Kuninda/Kanet area, seem to support Sherring's distinction of them, as 'Western', from the much less adapted speakers of nos. 13-15, with whom, in fact, there is no sympathy (pp. 63-4).

##### 5. The 'Western sub-group' and its pronominalization.

Recognition of all the above languages as a group and exposition of the class-

characteristics was first published in an article by the late [Professor] Dr. Sten Konow, adopting, with an important modification, a conception and the term 'pronominalized', frequently applied by Hodgson to certain languages of Nepal. There is no reason for supposing that Hodgson, though he was aware of 'the Palu Sen or cis-niveau Bhotias, the Garhwālis, and the inhabitants of Kanāver and Hang-rang' as 'of Tibetan stock' and had, no doubt, seen what had at the time been brought to light concerning them, had any serious knowledge of any of nos. 1-16, most of which had not even been noticed: some receive their first mention in the Linguistic Survey volume, of which Konow was the compiler.

The basis of the classification will have to be somewhat studied *infra*. In the Linguistic Survey volume it is succinctly restated in an introductory section (pp. 427-9). The systematic accounts of the languages severally, which then follow, commence invariably with a precise geographical allocation and statement concerning the speakers of them, statistics of their numbers and a bibliography, which from the circumstances is naturally very brief and in some of the obscurer cases had to be replaced by simple references to information supplied by official or private correspondents. The new materials, which invariably include a locally procured version of the parable of the Prodigal Son, and generally also a tale or other statement in the language, ensure a reflex as direct as possible of the living speech. The grammatical sketch, on a fixed model, is of an objective character; and naturally, as the languages have no known history, it abstains in general from discussions of origins. But, in fact, comparison, which in the concluding Comparative Vocabulary is brought to a point, is not infrequent and is instructive. On the 'language' level we find such observations as that concerning the resemblances between languages of the Lahul group (pp. 453, 461, 467) or the remark (p. 490) concerning the Dārmīyā language, no. 13, that —

'Dārmīyā is closely related to the dialects spoken in the neighbouring districts of Byangs and Chaudangs. It has been much influenced by Aryan forms of speech in vocabulary and grammar, not however to the same extent as Chaudāngsi'

or that concerning Chaudāngsi (p. 503) —

'There are also indications which point to an old influence exercised by another form of speech'.

On the general morphological level there are recurrent observations on the use of Participial forms compounded with the Verb Substantive to form Tenses of Verbs and, as characteristic of the whole group, an original Noun-nature in the Verb. The particular basic characteristics stated as differentia of the group naturally come in for repeated mention. In regard to individual Suffixes, etc., there are some comparisons between different languages (including of course, Tibetan) and also

some etymological explanations of origin in a single language. A feature welcome because apt to disappear in Comparative Tables is the citation of multiple alternative Suffixes hardly discriminable in function, this being, like confusion of the functions of Cases, etc., frequent in the languages. The pronunciation is always scrutinized in a separate section.

A genetic classification of the languages and a historical phonology were naturally not contemplated, the languages having no known history. Even the numerous and correct citations of Tibetan cognates of particular words or roots are largely open to suspicion of borrowing during the many centuries of continuous intimacy.

Here must be cited the group-features adduced by Konow as evidence of a Muṇḍā substrate language. These are —

1. 'The counting of higher numbers in twenties'.
2. 'The use of a dual in addition to the plural in the personal pronouns'.
3. 'The use of a double set of the dual and the plural of the pronoun of the first person, one including and the other excluding the person or persons addressed'.
4. 'The use of pronominal suffixes in order to distinguish the person of the subject with verbs'.
5. 'The incorporation of the object in the verb by means of a suffix'.

These considerations are not all of the same weight. No. 1, counting by 'scores', familiar in English, both literary ('three score and ten') and, still more, in business transactions, is very possibly intrusive in the languages, since for the decades 30-90 the Tibetan has a normal decadic series. The reckoning by scores seems to be almost unevicenced in the more easterly languages, nos. 13-15; and in the others, nos. 1-12, it rarely applies to '100', for which they have cognates of Tibetan *rgya* or *sa*. Granted the intrusiveness, the use of scores, which is found also, either sole or as an alternative, in some (e.g. Sunwar, Mumi, Lepcha) of the non-pronominalized languages of Nepal (see L.S. III.i, pp. 354-5) and, besides being generally wide-spread, prevails in the, not very remote, Burushaski and Sina, is poor evidence for a connection specially with Munda.

No. 3 also, being paralleled as regards the First Person, in spoken Tibetan of Ladak, is not very strong, more especially as it is lacking in a considerable proportion of the languages. Of no. 2 some traces have been noted in Tibetan. No. 4 needs to be considered in connection also with the fact of the proximity of Indo-Āryan languages with person-distinguishing Suffixes appended to Verb-tenses. No. 5, taken in its actual working, may be regarded as the strongest argument, to which the others by accompaniment lend some support: the evidence of the Nepal group of pronominalized languages is likewise momentous. A decided verdict may await

some further light upon the history of the languages.

Muṇḍā etymologies of particular words are conspicuously lacking, being confined to Cunningham's original instance of *tī*, 'water', which we have seen to be Tibeto-Burman and not identifiable in Muṇḍā of any known period. Since, however, the notion of a 'substrate' language may contemplate a very early date, a discovery of probable Muṇḍā etymologies of at least some words in the languages is not inconceivable.

The further study of the languages, especially if ampler vocabularies become available, may not only reveal new ethnographical items, but also contribute something to the etymology of the Pahārī in respect of words, such as suggested above, which, while not found in other Indo-Āryan (and not derivable from Tibetan), are current in the area: they will certainly be far from competing in number with the loans in the inverse direction.

#### 6. Kunāwarī, bibliography, names and dialects.

Any further discussion of the several languages would here be out of place, though some particulars will call for incidental mention. But concerning the Kunāwarī, which is not only far the most important and the best documented, but also conterminous along an extensive frontier with our Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ, something further must be stated, particularly as additions must be made to its bibliography.

To commence with the last item: It may assist future research if we proceed to cite, along with some comments where requisite, both the authorities listed in the Linguistic Survey and the additions, mostly posterior in publication, the latter being distinguished by an asterisk. We have —

1. Herbert, Captain J. D., *An account of a tour made to lay down the Course and Levels of the river Setlej or Satúdrá ...* (Asiatic Researches XV (1819), pp. 339 sqq.) pp. 417-422, a moderate Kunāwarī vocabulary and sentences.
2. Gerard, Captain Alexander, *A Vocabulary of the Koonawur Languages* (JASB XI (1942), pp. 478-551, with which should be associated the two works cited in a note *supra*, p. [...]. Though not published (posthumously) until 1842, this work was actually composed in 1819.
3. Cunningham, J. D., *Notes ...* These notes, first-hand, extensive and precise, include in the vocabularies (pp. 225-8), of moderate extent, specifications of the places where the 'Tibberkad' words are in use and also parallels in a 'sixth language or dialect; viz. that of the [helot] Kohlis or Chumars'. This last item is somewhat interesting, since the 'sixth language', 'Chamangee', is patently Indo-Āryan and proves that the two classes of outcasts, well known elsewhere, were immigrants in Kunāwar, J. D. C. mentions also (p. 230) that 'Kunu is the ordinary Bhotee for Kunawar, and Kunupa or Kunpa means Kunawaree, or a

man or thing of Kunawar'.

4. Cunningham, A., - *Ladak* .... Fairly extensive vocabularies (source J. D. C.?), with spelling more modern than that of Gerard, some entries exhibiting the Accidence, and parallel columns representing numerous outside languages, and Tibetan in place of Gerard's 'B,hoottea'.
5. Beames, J., and 6. Diack, A. H.: Minor special lists.  
[ No. 6 is lacking.]
7. Konow, Sten, - *On some facts* .... See *supra*, p. 49.
8. Bailey, Dr. Grahame, - *A Brief Grammar of the Kanauri Language*, ZDMG 63(1909), pp. 661-687.

Precise statement of areas and discrimination of Kanaurī dialects (pp. 661-2): objective grammar (firsthand) with very careful account of pronunciation, accidence, paradigms, list of Verbs, text and translation of Parable, sentences.

9. Bailey, Dr. Grahame, - *A Kanauri Vocabulary in two Parts, English-Kanaurī and Kanaurī-English* (London, 1911).

Geographical areas of Kanaurī and its dialects, bibliography, pronunciation (pp. 1-5): spelling acc. to author's refined audition: 'As will be seen, a considerable portion of the Kanaurī vocabulary is of Āryan origin' (p. 5), unfortunately not frequently pointed out in detail.

10. Bailey, Dr. Grahame, - *The Languages of the Northern Himalayas* (1908) (Chamba Dialects, pp. 37-51 [Chamba] - Lahuli) - repeated from Chamba Gazetteer 1904, Appendix II, pp. 37-51.

Grammar, similar to no. 9, with vocabulary, sentences, text and translation of Parable.

11. Bailey, Dr. Grahame, - *Linguistic Studies from the Himalayas* (pp. 46-77 'Lower Kanaurī', pp. 78-86 'Chitkhulē Dialect') (London, 1920). 'Lower Kanaurī' is 'closely allied to the standard dialect, but differs from it in a number of particulars': precise statement of area (p. 46): pronunciation, grammar, text and translation of Parable, sentences and vocabulary on the lines of no. 8. 'Chitkhulī', similar, but, owing to deficiency of materials, much more succinct and lacking the Parable.

12. Joshī, Pandit Tikā Rām, - *A Grammar and Dictionary of Kanawari* ... edited by H. O. Rose, Journal and Proceedings A.S.B. V (Extra number), (Calcutta, 1909)

Concise sketch of grammar (pp. 1-27): dictionary satisfactory in transliteration (not, indeed, on Dr. Bailey's system), consistently marking vowel length and dividing polysyllabic words into syllables showing their formation (in some classes of cases, however, quite perverting the same); 'frequent identification of loanwords from Indo-Āryan or Tibetan, and

occasional noting of dialectal differences in Kanauri itself. Work of a paṇḍit and high official in the Bashahr State, the Dictionary has considerable authority in regard to the current usage of the language.

13. Joshi, Paṇḍit Tikā Rām, - *Notes on the Ethnography of the Bashahr State*, ibid VII (1911), pp. 549-613, including a considerable collection of Kanauri songs (modern) and proverbs.

The Linguistic Survey volume gives, as usual, a version of the Parable of the Prodigal Son in the Language itself, and also a short original story.

The *Kunāwari* language is language of the Kunāwaris, i.e. the people of Kunāwar, sc. the *-āvarta* or *-āvāra* - 'abode', of the *Kun-* people: the name is accordingly of Indo-Āryan origin, like various others ending in *-aur*, *-āwar*. As adopted in Kunāwari, the word is now pronounced in a way represented by Dr. Grahame Bailey as *Kānōr*, in regard to which it should be mentioned that in 1854 Captain H. Strachey gave as variant spellings *Knor*, *Kanor*, *Kanoring*, *Kunawar*, etc.: Gerard, as we have seen, writes *Koonawur*, Hodgson *Kanāver*. The u in the first syllable has already been justified: and as regards the whole word it is not evident why in English and in scientific writing we should apply to an old country and speech a form of name following the niceties of a present-day local pronunciation: we do not write of 'England' and 'English' as 'Inglund' and 'Inglish'. The *Kanāwari* of the Linguistic Survey seems likewise to be meticulous.

The two main dialects, as described by Gerard are (1) Milchan, with subdialect of 'the small district of Zhungram' (Gerard, *Vocabulary*, p. 547) and (pp. 548-551) that of Soomchoo (*Shum-cho*, 'Three Villages', sc. Labrañ, Pilō or Yulchung, and Kānam); and (2) T.heburskud (Tibar-skad, with *skad* (Tibetan), 'speech'). The Zhungram district adjoins that of Shum-cho on its wouth-west (right bank of the Sutlej, see Gerard's map). The 'T.heburskud' of 'Soongnum' (Suñam) and 'Sheasoo' (Syasho), belongs to the Gangyul district, adjoining Shum-cho, and, as the most northern part of Kunāwar, is adjacent to the Tibetan district of Hangrang.

Milchan, written by Paṇḍit Joshi (*Ethnography*, p. 584) Manthanong, is explained by Dr. Bailey as a nickname, *minchan* or *minchānōn*, applied by Koci (Indo-Āryan) people to the neighbouring Kunāwari: the alternative, *Malhesti*, mentioned in the L.S., is not explained (*Mal* < *Mil*?). In general Milchan corresponds to Bailey's 'Kanauri proper' or 'Standard Kanauri', a term which seems acceptable, since this form of the language prevails not only on the right bank of the Sutlej, but also over the large area on the left bank. The 'Zhungram' sub-dialect is distinguished by Gerard only as having Verb Infinitives in *-ens*, which J. D. Cunningham (p. 224) would write (in Lidang or Lippa speech) as *-ent* or *-enh*. In regard to 'Soomchoo' Gerard remarks (p. 548) that it differs, 'principally in the

tenses of the verbs, but some of the words are likewise different'; and he gives a not very exiguous vocabulary, including a few such. Some items recur in Tibar-skad, which suggests that they may be derived from Tibetan (Labrang and Kanam, two of the 'Three Villages', being important Lamaist centres), more especially as *gea* (in place of *ra*), '100', and *tong*, '1000', are certainly so: the Infinitive ends, as J. D. Cunningham also notes (p. 225) for Kānam, in *-ma*. In Tīkā Rām Joshi's *Ethnography*, songs nos. IV, XII, and others on pp. 567, 570, 575, 584, are stated to be in the Sum-cho dialect.

Dr. Bailey's two additional dialects, 'Lower Kanaurī' and 'Chitkhulī', belong respectively to the extreme south-west and the extreme south-east of the Kunāwarī area. 'Lower Kanaurī', spoken over a space of about 12 miles along the right bank of the Sutlej, should appertain to the district of 'Pundrabees' (Pandrabīs), half of which Gerard allots to his 'Milchan'. Dr. Bailey's rather full grammar (with vocabulary) records a fair number of differences in detail from 'Standard Kanaurī' from which, however, he states (p. 661) that 'it does not greatly differ', and notes many words as borrowed from Kocī (an immediate neighbour) and Hindī. 'Chitkhulī', the speech of two villages situated high up in the valley of the Bāspa river, where it approaches Garhwāl, and visited long ago by Gerard and Strachey, is the subject of only a sketch, with brief vocabulary accompanied by 'Standard' and other equivalents: it differs notably from the other Kunāwarī dialects, and in the Simla Hill States Gazetteer (1912, Directory, p. xii) it is said to 'have a large admixture of Garhwālī' (Bhotiya or Pahārī?). Concerning the 'Theburskud' Gerard wrote in 1819 —

'The inhabitants of Soongnum speak a language totally different from the Koonawuree and Tartar [Tibetan] dialects, the infinitive of verbs ends in *pung* and *bung* (*pañ* and *bañ*): and on my arrival I could not understand a word they said'.

The Linguistic Survey hardly does justice to the Tibar-skad by its statement that 'The [Milchan-Kanāwarī] dialect is also known under the name of Tibarskad', whereas its note reports Dr. Bailey's information that 'Thebōrskadd is a name given by speakers of ordinary Kanāwarī, to whom the dialect is not intelligible'. Dr. Bailey's own statement is that —

'*Thābōr skad*, is spoken in the villages of Lippā, Āsrañ, Lābrāñ, Kānām, Shūnnām and Shāsō.

The name, if, as it is not unlikely, it is Tibetan (with *ti*, 'river', in place of Tib. *chu*) or even if not, could mean 'river-between (or middle) -speech' in the sense of 'between rivers (sc. two tributaries of the Sutlej) -speech' or 'as far as (sc. on right bank of) the river (Sutlej) -speech' or 'middle (stretch of) -river (Sutlej) -speech', is according to J. D. Cunningham (p. 224) also sometimes replaced by *Sungnam-pa-*

*skad* ['Su-ñam people's speech'], 'but is frequently *applied to all the dialects different from the common*': Cunningham, in fact, in the 'Tibberskad' column of his Vocabulary (pp. 225-8) notes many of the words as used in L. (Lippa) and K. (Kanam). The alternative 'Sunam dialect' is attested also by the Simla Hill States Gazetteer (1910, p. xxiv) and accords in part with Gerard's original statement (p. 551) that the language is spoken in Soongnum (Su-ñam) and Sheaspa (Shāsho). In reporting the speech of Shāsho as dialect of Gangyul, the northernmost district, the Gazetteer, which seems to ignore the term *Tibar-skad* is very likely using a term which essentially covers both. See the definition of area *supra* (p. 39), and note that Jaeschke also writes (p. 94) of the 'Tibar-skad' as belonging to a frontier district in relation to Lahul. Dr. Bailey, in reporting *loc.cit.* the Ti-bar-skad as spoken 'in the villages of Lippā, Āsrañ, Lābrañ, Kāṇām, Shūnām and Shāsō', is not supported by the Gazetteer, which attributes Kāṇām, Labrañ to the Shum-chko (Gerard's Soomchoo) dialect, Su-ñam and Shāsō as above, and does not specify in regard to Lippā and Āsrañ: the fact may be that the Sum-cho, 'Three villages' (Kāṇām, Labrañ and Pīlō) are important centres of Tibetan Lamaism with some consequent Tibetan intrusion into an essentially common dialect. The L.S., in defining 'Kanāwan', with which it mistakenly, however, regards *Tibar-skad* as synonymous, as the dialect, or dialects, spoken in the Sutlej valley from the junction of that river with the Spiti stream', is sufficiently accurate.

A decided difference of the *Tibar-skad* from the standard speech was, as we have seen (*supra*, p. 58), promptly noted by Gerard. Dr. Bailey's analogous observation —

'This dialect I have not had an opportunity of studying. Kanauris living within ten miles of where it begins to be spoken say that they cannot understand more than half of it'

would perhaps have been modified if he had been acquainted with Gerard's work.

It seems likely that Gerard himself, if he had written after compiling his vocabulary of 1000 'T,heburskud' words, with sentences and grammatical sketch, would not have laid stress upon its unintelligibility. The fact apparent in the parallel columns of the Vocabulary is the identity, or at least the etymological connection, in a majority of the instances, of the corresponding terms in the two dialects; and, where the *Tibar-skad* diverges, it is often by adopting the Bhotiya (i.e. Tibetan) term: from the parallel sentences the general grammatical construction can be seen to be the same, despite differences of particular Suffixes. The real situation was expounded in 1846 by General Alexander Cunningham, who, after adducing some eight parallel words in 'Milohan', 'Tibarskad' and Tibetan, remarks that —

'In these examples there is, as might expected, a greater admixture of Tibetan

words in the dialect of Upper Kanawar, which lies next to Tibet'.

The philological side of this conclusion can be strongly reinforced. Firstly, the mentioned Infinitives in *-pung* (*-pañ*) and *bung* (*-bañ*) can be merely the Tibetan Verb-nouns in *-pa/-ba* if not actually their Infinitive, properly Locative, forms in *-par/-bar*; for an *-ñ* Locative, corresponding to Tibetan *-r* Locative, is regular in the cognate and adjacent language of Bu-nan; and in the Milchan itself there is a Dative/Accusative Suffix *-pung* (*-pañ*). A decisive proof of the connection of the *-pung/-bung* with the Tibetan *-pa/-ba* may be seen in a number of Tibar-skad Nouns (not Infinitives) equivalent to Tibetan Nouns in *-pa/-ba*: such *za-bung* (Tib. *za-ba*), 'food'; *na-bung* (Tib. *na-ba*), 'sickness', 'sick'; *geal-bung* (Tib. *rgyal-ba*), 'victory', 'victorious'; *neeoor-pung* (Tib. *ñi-sar-ba*), 'sunrise': *sho-bung* (Tib. *śos-pa*), 'ripe': in the case of *poosh-pung*, 'knee', the only one of these occurring in Milchan also, the Tibetan has a different Suffix, *pus-mo*. The Tibar-skad has also, from *-n* -roots, a few Infinitives in *-mung* (*-mañ*), with the *-m* of Milchan (*-mig*), also Surn-cho, Bu-nan, etc., Infinitives.

Tibar-skad has also some Tibetan loan-words with the *-pa/-ba* Suffix unmodified: such are *-pakh-pa* (Tib. *lpags-pa*), 'skin'; *shok-pa* (Tib. *gsog-pa*, *śog-pa*), 'wing'; *kal-pa* (Tib. *rkyal-pa*), 'swimming-bladder'; *sil-ba* (Tib. *zil-pa*), 'drop'; *geokpa* (Tib. *rgyugs-pa*), 'quickly'; *zam-pa* (Tib. *zam-pa*), 'bridge'; *tong-pa* (Tib. *ston-pa*), 'empty'; *neen-pa* (Tib. *rñin-ma*), 'old'; etc., etc. Milchan has a few of these, e.g. *ral-pa* (Tib. *ral-pa*), 'hair-braid', *goum-pa* (Tib. *gom-pa*), 'a step'. These, which are obviously recent, serve to invest the *-pung/-bung* words with a relative antiquity.

A further case of extensive Tibetanization in the Tibar-skad is to be seen in the numerical system, where for '10' (and also in 11-19) and '100' the *sa* and *ra*, general in the whole group of languages, are replaced by *cu* (Tib. *bcu*) and *gya* (Gerard *gea*, Tib. *brgya*).

A somewhat choice feature of 'C [entral Tibetan]' and later literature' (S. C. Das' Dictionary) is an Interrogative 'e usually prefixed to Pronouns and Verbs. This appears in Tibar-skad *ene*, *eneta*, 'how many?', 'how much?', *eno*, 'when?': it is entirely wanting in Milchan, where the Interrogatives have initial *t* or *h*, and even in Bhotiya; possibly, however, Milchan has it (in common with some Nepal dialects) as a Root in 'ee-mig' (*i-mig*), 'to ask'.

The naming by both Jaeschke and Heyde, so long resident in Kye-lang and so devoted to the study of the whole region, of the Ti-bar-skad as a Kunāwar dialect closely akin to speech of Lahul (Bu-nan) accords not only with the geographical situation, but also with the historical probability and tradition that Lahul was during some period included in the Gu-ge State, which can hardly have failed to embrace also the adjoining Gangul district of Kunawar. The matter will perhaps

call for consideration hereafter: in the meantime it may be noted that in the rather important item of the Infinitive Suffix there is divergence, Bu-nan having not *-pung/-bung* (*-pañ/-bañ*), but *-cum*: see Jaschke's list (pp. 97-8, *-chum*). But the likelihood is not increased by the Tibetan intrusions in Ti-bar-skad, which may all belong to the period of advanced Tibetanization in Gu-ge: in fact the northern district of Kunāwar, included in, or adjacent to, the Tibar-skad area, is that in which are the chief centres of Lamaistic Buddhism, similarly prevalent in Lahul and Spiti. Thus in regard to the original (now extinct) Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ language of Gu-ge the Tibar-skad may be less instructive than the speech of remoter and less Buddhistic parts of Kunāwar.

In regard to the Sum-cho dialect, which by Gerard is treated under 'T,heburskuḍ', and concerning which he states that it —

'differs from the others, principally in the tenses of the verbs, but some of the words are likewise different'

the only available material, excepting the above (p. 55) -mentioned songs is his selection of c.160 Nouns, c.30 Verbs, and the numerals 1-20, the decads 30-90, and 100 and 1000, and 10 sentences. This material, partly of Indo-Āryan origin, does not suffice for a serious judgement; but a moderate scrutiny of the vocabulary shows that in cases where there is an alternative Sum-cho mostly agrees with Tibar-skad. In the numeral system there is agreement as regards *neesh* (*nis*) '7', in place of the notable *steesh* (*stis*) of Standard Kunāwarī, on which see *infra*, and in regard to the '100' and '1000'; but the Ti-bar-skad is not followed in its substitution of Tibetan *choo* (*cu*), in place of original *sa*, in '10' and its derivatives. *Hoom* (*hūm*) = Tibar-skad *soom* (*sūm*, p. 482), is peculiar.

The Infinitive *-ma* has a *m* which in Infinitives and Gerunds recurs in most of the languages, e.g. Standard Kunāwarī *-mig -m*, Tibar-skad *-mung* (*mañ*), Bu-nan *-cum*, and which accordingly is ancient: probably it is the *-ma* of Tibetan Nouns of action and Adjectives, quite distinct from *-ma* feminine and far more wide-spread in Tibeto-Burman than the specially Tibetan *-pa/-ba*, whence came Tibar-skad *-pung/-bung* (*-pañ/-bañ*).

For 'Zhungram', a small district adjoining Sum-cho (Gerard, *Account*, map), our only information concerns its above-mentioned Infinitive in *-ens* (cf. Bu-nan *-men*, Tib. *yin*, 'be?').

#### 7. Kunāwarī, a phonological item.

The most distinctive feature in phonology among the languages of the group is that exemplified in the above-cited *stish* < *stis*, '7': it is a change of initial *śñ-*, *sn-*, no doubt through *stñ-*, to *st*. Further examples are —

*sn* > *st*: Kun. *sto*, 'face' < *skno* < *sno* = Tib. *ño*, 'face'.



individual and occasion, and subject to secular evolution. Only the naive are convinced that they pronounce as their grandfathers did. The current pronunciation is requisite for those who have occasion to speak a language and also is a sound basis for philological conclusions concerning its earlier utterance, where not ascertained by direct evidence. But, if applied to earlier stages of the language, it may be grossly misleading, as is notoriously the case of Tibetan, Chinese and many other languages. Thus Dr. Bailey's *sōmudrōñ*, 'river', the loan-word which Gerard writes as *sumudrung* (*samadran*), J. D. Cunningham *samundrang*, and which in Sanskrit is transliterated *samudrah*, informs us that in current Kunāwarī the dull Indian *a* has become *o*, as in Bengali, and, further, in certain situations *ō*; but we do not know how, or during what period, the change took place. The Kunāwarī language has probably been used, at least to some extent, in writing during many centuries: in such cases any traditional spelling should be ascertained and used in dictionaries and grammars, modern pronunciations being inserted in brackets; this is the normal practice, exemplified, e.g. in the Oxford English Dictionary, whereas Dr. Bailey's writing of Kunāwarī presents the Kunāwarī in a form, which, while serviceable for intercourse, is historically and philologically disguising.

A second practical feature of Dr. Bailey's Grammar is a certain normalization in the Accidence: thus for the Datives and Ablatives of Nouns he gives respectively only the Suffixes *-pōn* and *-dok'ts*, whereas Gerard gives in Milchan Dative *-pung* (*-pañ*), Ablative *-ung* (*-añ*), *-rung* (*-rañ*), *-che* (*-ci*), *-uks* (*-aks*), *-na*, and *-no*: similarly as regards Personal Suffixes in Verb-Conjugation. Here, while recognizing the practical value of the normalization, we must admit also the philological significance of what Gerard had encountered in his journeyings.

Dr. Bailey's Vocabulary is composed mainly, no doubt, of his own collections: some words are marked as derived from Paṇḍit Joshī's work. A fair, but not more than a fair, proportion of the loan-words are referred to their sources: if that had been done in all ascertainable cases, which, so far as Indo-Āryan, at least, is concerned, would have been well within the competence of the accomplished author, there would have been an aid to discrimination of the original Kunāwarī terms, such as for Burushaskī is furnished by Colonel Lorimer's work on that language. What proportion of the terms in the Vocabularies of Paṇḍit Joshī and Dr. Bailey are, when superficial differences of transliteration, etc., are ignored, respectively identical, could not be ascertained without excessive labour; but a comparison of the two with Gerard's Milchan Vocabulary of 1819 points to a diminution of the native content and a marked increase in the foreign accessions, consequent upon the more active intercourse of the XIXth century.

### 9. Class-features and interrelations in the 'Western sub-group'.

The L.S. description of the above languages as 'Western sub-group of Complex Pronominalized Tibeto-Burman' languages involves three mutually interdependent matters which severally are somewhat imprecise. The basic Tibeto-Burman could not be specified by affinity to any particular group of the enormously wide and varied Tibeto-Burman family; the important observation of morphological resemblance to the Pronominalized languages of Nepal could not presume a common historical development rather than a merely analogous influencing by possibly different 'substrate' dialects; and the geographical term 'western' might be linguistically unessential and might tend to ignoring of any internal groupings.

In the L.S. these uncertainties are partly obviated. The Tibeto-Burman basis may be taken as fully demonstrated by the high proportion of etymological identities apparent in the several Comparative Vocabularies and in the volume (I.ii) of 'Comparative Vocabularies'. The common, or separate, origin of the pronominalization cannot indeed be said to have been considered in etymological detail. The geographical query is partly met by a moderate list (L.S. III.i, p. 428) of terms exhibiting an etymological affinity covering the whole 'Western sub-group' and partly by observations of certain specially close connections within that sub-group; but the question inevitably raised by the general geographical situation of the languages, which practically without exception occupy districts bordering on territory historically Tibetan, is not fully answered by the supposition of two lines of connection between Tibetan and Burman as respectively the northernmost and southernmost Tibetan languages, the one line leading 'from Tibetan through the Himālayan languages, into Bodo and Kuki-Chin' and then further into Burmese. The implication of a special affinity as well as geographical adjacency, of Tibetan and Himālayan invites a consideration of any relevant particulars: and, as this may simplify the problem of the Žań-žuń language, we may here premise something concerning the matter.

As regards vocabulary, even a slight comparison of the parallel versions of the Parable of the Prodigal Son will demonstrate sweeping differences between the several languages of the 'Western sub-group'. The differences seem to be, in fact, greater than those between the Indo-Āryan vernaculars of India and comparable to those between the various Teutonic or Latinic languages of Europe. The circumstance that the languages have all advanced, though not equally, from an original monosyllabism to a stage of 'inflexion' renders the partly maintained monosyllabic transliterations not infrequently misleading: thus to write Bu-nan *el-za*, 'went', and *ti-kog*, 'one-to', as if they were actually combinations of *el+za* and *ti+kog* obscures the phonetic history and actual morphology.

Despite the diversities the general structure of the sentences and the particular constructions are predominantly in accord with Tibetan; and in regard to a considerable proportion of the vocabulary and locutions - we ignore, of course, all loan-words, Indo-Āryan or other - a Tibetan affinity is commonly detectable: where substantial vocabularies are available, this is in general more immediately evident. But this may be largely due to the centuries of historical intercourse with Tibet and Western Tibet. In the more extensive vocabularies, such as those of Gerard for the Kunāwarī dialects, we find a fair number of terms which, while apparently original, are without obvious Tibetan cognates. For Bu-nan Jaeschke printed a rather considerable list of common words not traceable in Tibetan and regarded by him as of independent origin: some of these indeed must now be omitted. In the language of the medical Mss., which we have taken to be, as *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ*, an early congener of Kunāwarī, there are masses of monosyllabic words which have, apart from phonetic divergencies, a sufficiently Tibetan appearance, but for their identification require a considerable etymological effort. On the other hand, it may be said that the inadequacy of our present knowledge of popular or dialectical Tibetan speech leaves open the possibility that any one of the doubted items may actually occur therein. For this reason, and also because terms clearly cognate with Tibetan may belong nevertheless to the native heritage of the languages, any inference from the general vocabulary would be, no doubt, premature.

It was not within the scope of the Linguistic Survey to broach, except in incidental particulars, comparative or historical views concerning relations *inter se* of the several languages, or of relations between the group and other groups. The fact that the languages have no history and the view that they had an alien substratum would in any case have been difficulties: and the immense mass and variety of 'Tibeto-Burman' languages seems at present to restrict us to a geographical classification: to the L.S. we are, however, indebted for such observations as that Kanāshī is closely related to Kanāwri, and similarly the Lahul dialects and the Almora dialects have group features.

The recognition of a language as 'Tibeto-Burman' is usually a matter of ultimate vocabulary. It is hardly ever dubious: not only the Pronouns and Numerals, the two most durable classes of words, are generally identifiable, but a perhaps unexpectedly considerable proportion of the vocabulary of monosyllables is represented over wide areas; a good example is the Verb *sad* (Tib. *gsod bsad*), 'kill', which has cognates rarely lacking in the several languages. More general matters, such as forms and modifications of the monosyllables, grammatical elements and constructions, and even word-order, hardly come in for definite determination at this stage.

When individual groups are considered, obviously comparison and historical genesis are contemplated: and this suggests itself notably in the case of groups which have left the monosyllabic stage and are either passing into, or arrived at, the status of 'inflected' languages with form-elements, what Hodgson termed 'serviles', not surviving in independent use. Such is prominently the case of the 'pronominalized' groups. Here there is full scope for comparison and etymology. But so great is the multitude and complexity of such elements and so modern the acquaintance with the languages, not to mention the posited alien origin of the pronominalization, that, apart from incidental *aperçus*, this work has to be left to future investigators. On the surface we do not remark many special connections between the Nepal group and our 'Western' group.

In the case of the 'Western' group there is the further complication that all the languages have been from very early times in contact with Indo-Āryan and from the Xth century A.D. in intimate relations with the historical Tibetan. Of these two contacts the former is not very troublesome; Indo-Āryan elements in the languages, though extremely numerous, are mostly forthwith detectable, and borrowings in the reverse direction are individual, sometimes dubious, instances such as are propounded *supra*. The case of Tibetan is more uncertain. By reason of the intimacy of the intercourse any feature in the languages which can have been borrowed from Tibetan can provisionally be supposed to have actually so originated. This applies immediately and decisively to cases such as the above-cited Tibar-skad Nouns and Infinitives with the Suffixes *-pa/-ba* and the thence derived *-pañ/-bañ*. But where the history of relations between two languages is obscure there is always a possibility that the valid correspondences are due to common heritage or to borrowing from a third language. So far we are unaware of any relations between Tibetan and the 'Western Pronominalized group' prior to the historical contacts; and we have not even the certainty that the latter are genetically a group. The first necessity, therefore, is to settle this question.

#### 10. Some features of the 'Western sub-group' in relation to Tibetan.

##### (A) Vocabulary of root-forms.

Here it is necessary provisionally to disregard the actual 'pronominalization', which is far from even over the group and which has been regarded as in origin extrinsic: nor does it seem prudent, in view of the large number of the languages, the exiguity of the materials and the irregularities of the writing, to venture upon any but slight occasional consideration of phonological matters, more suitable for the conclusion than for the outset of a research. The particulars here apposite as being common, or at least wide-spread, may be specified as follows: —

The versions of the 'Parable of the Prodigal Son' and the texts of narratives,

etc., printed in the L.S. volume or in vocabularies elsewhere do not present many root-forms which cannot be forthwith recognized as of Tibetan affinity when not clearly Indo-Āryan. But this observation is of restricted range; words in the Bu-nan language cited by Jaeschke as not found in Tibetan, have in general a Tibetan or at least Tibeto-Burman appearance and might have *prima facie* claims to be regarded as survivals from a pre-Tibetan period of the language. Such a possibility remains: but, despite Jaeschke's authority, a considerable deduction should now be made, so far as root-forms are concerned, from the list; and in general it would now be hasty to assert that no root-form with the given meaning could be found in some dialect of Tibetan.

In Gerard's ample lists of Kunāwarī words there seems to be a fair number of root-forms, and even of Verb-roots, which, with the stated meanings, are not forthwith seen to be Tibetan or Indo-Āryan; but these also, being particular instances, should in prudence be left to future research.

There are, however, some groups of words which allow of solid judgements: such are —

(1) the numeral words for '1' - '10', conveniently shown in parallel columns in the L.S. volume, pp. 532-5: here the forms for 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, though variously modified in the several languages, are all easily identified with those of literary and dialectical Tibetan. But for 1, 4, 7 we find —

for '1': *id* (Kunāwarī), *idh* (Kanāshī), *idi* (Manchatī) *itti* (Chamba-Lahulī);

*iki* (Bu-nan), *tākā* (Rangkas), *tākū* (Dārmiyā), *tig* (Chaudāngsī, Byāngsī).

These do not appear in normal Tibetan; but all three, as *id* (= old Chinese *ir*), *ti* and *ta*, are abundantly found in Tibeto-Burman; and even in Tibetan *ir* must once have existed, since in *ra-ba*, 'first', it survived, while normal Tibetan *gcig* must be derived from a *gtig* (*gtyig*).

for '4': *pū* (Kunāwarī), *pū* (Kanāshī), *pī* (Manchatī, Chamba-La-hulī, Bu-nan, Rangkas, Dārmiyā, Chaudāngsī, Byāngsī).

This *pī* is whereof the variant *pū* is a dialectical form paralleled by other cases of *i* > *u* in the more westerly area, is derived from an ancient *bl̥dyi*, which in the earliest known Tibetan had become *bzi*. The *b* is a Prefix, and, like the other numeral Prefixes (e.g. *g-* in *gcig*, *gñis* and *gsum*, *b-* in *bdun*, *brgyad*, *bcu* and *brgya*, *d-* in *dgu*), it is omissible, or by rule omitted, in certain circumstances: the remaining *l̥dyi* is represented by very numerous forms, *lī*, *le*, etc., etc., in Tibeto-Burman languages and was borrowed, as also was *bl̥dyi*, by some Sino-Tibetan borderland languages outside.

for '7': *stish*, *tish* (Kunāwarī), *nyizi* (Manchatī, Bu-nan), *nhisi* (Rangkas), *nisū* (Dārmiyā), *nis* (Chaudāngsī, Byāngsī).

The development of *snish* > *stish* (Kunāwarī) is paralleled by rather numerous

other words in the same language: the prior *snis*, which in view of Mi-ñag *skwi-bi* was probably at first *sñis*, is very widely and numerous represented in Tibeto-Burman. The Tibetan *bdun* is of altogether different origin.

for '10': *sai* (Kunāwari), *sā* (Manchatī, Chamba-Lahulī), *cuī* (Bu-nan), *cī* (Rangkas, Dhārmīyā, Chaudāngsī, Byāngsī).

The *sā* forms are apparently unrepresented in Sino-Tibetan borderland languages: in the 'Western Pronominalized' group their original predominance is proved by the almost exclusive *za/sa* of *ni-za*, *na-sā*, etc., '20' ('two tens') and '30' - '90': they occur also in some Nepal languages. The *cu* and *cī* forms are related, of course, to Tib. *beu*.

(2) the Personal Pronouns: In cognate languages the Pronouns of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Persons are apt to preserve an original phonetic kernel variously modified, in part through social sentiments. The Tibetan *na*, 'I', *khy(od)*, 'thou', suffice, no doubt, for the etymology of the forms, collected in the L.S. volume, pp. 532-6, with initial *g-*, *j-*, *añg-*, *iñg-*, *ñ-*, *ng-*, for 'I', 'me', etc.; and with initial *ka-*, *ki-*, *kye-*, *ga-*, *go-*, *gu-*, for 'thou', 'thee', etc. And this pair is, no doubt, rather general, since it accounts for the bulk of the forms presented by the Nepal languages, pronominalized and unpronominalized. But for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Person several languages of the Sino-Tibetan borderlands have definitely dental *n-*, and the same is almost universal in the further eastern Tibeto-Burman. Since a *n-* apparently the same occurs in some Nepal languages, pronominalized and unpronominalized, as well as in Chaudāngsī and Byāngsī, and since in the W. pronominalized Verb-forms a *n-* Infix signifying the 2<sup>nd</sup> Person is general, it seems that this *n-* may have belonged to the ancient heritage of the group.

The matter of the Dual forms of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Persons and that of the distinction of 'inclusive' and 'exclusive' Dual and Plural forms in the case of the 1<sup>st</sup> Person may here be passed over, since their alien, not Tibeto-Burman, origin is one of the main considerations in the pronominalization doctrine.

For the 3<sup>rd</sup> Person the L.S. gives (pp. 536-7), but only for the more westerly members of the sub-group, a form which may be generalized as *do* (Bu-nan *tal*); this can be equated to Tibetan *hdi*, 'this', *de*, 'that', though these are rather Demonstrative than merely Anaphoric. Other forms (*n-*, 'that', *j(ž)*, 'this'), including the quite different set of the Rangkas and other more easterly languages, we are not prepared to discuss. But a Demonstrative, and also Interrogative, *th-*, seen in Kunāwari *thu*, 'what?' or 'why?', (also *te*, 'how great?', *tū*, 'why?'), Manchatī *tai*, 'how many?', Chamba-Lahulī *temi*, 'how many?', Bu-nan *thē*, 'this', *tha-zu*, 'that', is, no doubt, important, since the same double use of the *th-* is frequent in some languages of the Sino-Tibetan borderlands (see *Nam ...*, p. 93), and there is in the same area another, very special, idiom with *tha* (*ibid*, p. 97), which in the Western

Sub-group is unquestionably historic.

(3) the Verb Substantive: In Tibetan a plurality of words for 'is', 'be', is characteristic, involving discriminations which may be seen studied in M. Bacot's *Grammaire* (1946), pp. 73 sqq: see also Jaeschke-Francke, §40 and pp. 147-8. The most normal expressions are —

- a. *yin*, signifying 'subsistence' or identity: negative *ma-yin* or *min*, the latter being most usual in expressions such as *bzan-min*, 'not good'. Where the thing denied is a noun, as in *mthu-med*, 'without strength', *min* is commonly replaced by *med*, which had a different origin.
- b. *yod*, which usually, though not always, implies 'existence' or reality: negative usually *mi-yod* or *med*.
- c. *hdug*, literally 'sit', i.e. 'actually, or now, exists', an idiom which we see developing in the historical Tibetan and which here is unimportant, since we have agreed that its employment, as *dii*, *duk*, etc., in the 'Western sub-group' is simply a Tibetanism.

In addition to these three there are certain forms which are in some way restricted or perhaps survivals or dubious: thus we have —

- d. *mod*, in sense an emphatic equivalent of *yod*, as signifying real existence, but mostly confined to the expression *mod-kyi*, 'although (or whereas) there exists (or 'I have', etc.)'. This form, which so strongly refuses to be paralleled, as containing a negative, to *med*, with which it shares the *-d*, would suffer from etymological isolation, were it not apparent that as Verb Substantive and as a Tense-suffix it retains a considerable vogue in the 'Western sub-group' and Nepal languages: see *infra*, p. 129.
- e. *cin/sin/jin/zin*: This, which may be here cited as doubtful, is common in early Tibetan as a Postposition added to Verb-roots to constitute a Gerund: e.g. *byed-cin*, 'doing'. The possibility that originally it was not a Particle, but a Verb-root signifying 'be' is evoked by its occurrence also with Nouns and Adjectives, e.g. in *dgun-zin*, 'being winter', *phyir-zin*, 'being late', where the sense of 'being' is independently contributed by it.
- f. *de/te/ste*: These also are in early Tibetan used as appended to Verb-roots and yielding the sense of a Gerund of time present or past, e.g. *byed-de*, 'doing', *byas-te*, 'done'. Sometimes, in connection with certain Auxiliary Verbs, they are practically equivalent to Infinitives of Object.

The fact that this *de/te/ste* is common also in Nam (see pp. 188-190) proves its antiquity, which may also account for such writings, after Verb-roots in *-d*, as *chode* in place of *chod-de*, cf. *yariyaru/ya-ru/yar-ru*. In view of a circumstance to be mentioned *infra* it is to be suspected that the *-d* of *mod*, 'exist', and of its contradictory *med*, 'not exist', is an abbreviation of this *de*.

- g. *re*, sometimes, *red*, 'is': This is very common in ordinary Tibetan speech. According to S. C. Das' *Tibetan Dictionary*, it largely, in Central and Eastern Tibet, 'replaces the other auxiliaries. It rarely occurs in books, though occasionally in *Mil* [a Ras-pa]: it is found also in names of the form *Btsan-to-re* (see *Nam*, p. 185). This evidently means that it is either popular or dialectical. In fact, however, *re* in *na-re*, which S.C.D. likewise unduly restricts chronologically, is frequent in old books: the meaning, 'he (some one) says or said', is not conveyed by any Verb of saying, which, as in English and other languages, is often omitted in tales and narratives: it corresponds to our inverted commas, in direct quotation and to the use of *iti*, 'so', 'thus', in Sanskrit: the literal translation is 'so it was or is (*re*)'. In the Nam language (pp. 172-3, 200) *re* is very frequent, generally as a Gerund, 'being', but sometimes as a main Verb, 'is': it is often attached, like *te/de*, to Verb-roots, constituting a Gerund.
- h. *to*, *ta*: These two are exemplified in normal Tibetan only as Suffixes in particular expressions, the *to*, with apparently the sense of 'being' or 'becoming', in certain ancient Proper Names presumably from the N.E. of the country, the *ta* in a few words, e.g. *rgyal-ta*, 'a fine', *zal-ta*, 'a service, an instruction', *Slog-ta*, 'a returner'. In the Nam language (pp. 182 sqq.) both *to* and *ta* are in common use, e.g. in *dgu-mu-to*, 'hot become cold', *stor-to*, 'lost' or 'fled', *glo-ta*, 'intention', *hlab-ta*, 'talk', *hses-ta*, 'knower': and it seems, in fact, that in that language, which was without the *-pal-ba* Suffix of normal Tibetan, signifying action or agent, its function was discharged by *ta*, which is still so used in E. Tibet. In fact the *-pal-ba* of normal Tibetan seems to have belonged to the S.E. of the country, where that dialect originated, and was, as will appear, simply the early form of the Verb *byed*, *byas*, *bya*, 'do'.

Of these Tibetan forms of the Verb Substantive some are apparent in the 'Western sub-group', while others can be plausibly recognized in survivals: omitting the forms of *dug*, which we have regarded as borrowed from the historical Tibetan, we may note as follows: —

- a. *yin* has been recognized in Bu-nan *yen*, a normal equivalent of 'be', and further in the Bu-nan Infinitives and Nouns in *-men* < *-ma-yin*, e.g. *za-men*, 'to eat', or 'food'. It is also probably to be seen in Kunāwarī *maig*, 'I am not' (*ibid.*, p. 435, Dr. G. Bailey, *Grammar*, p. 667). Whether it can be considered accountable for the *-i* sometimes appended to Verb-roots ending in vowels, e.g. —

Manchafī *lha-i-ga*, 'I have done', *ra-i-na/gavest* Chamba-Lahulī *kū-i-g*, 'I said', *thā-i-n*, 'heardest', Rangkas *ga-i-s*, 'I did', *rha-in-sich*, 'lived', Dārmīyā *khwai-ta*, 'he digs' *gāy-ta*, 'does' Chaudāngsī *sa* (Tib. *gsod*, *bsad*)-i-tā, 'strikes', *sai-gas*, 'I have struck', *khwe* (Tib. *rko*)-tā, 'he digs'

We must leave for later consideration. At present we see that the *i*, which is somewhat widely, though unevenly, attested, is at any rate an element appended to Verb-roots, of which it is not a part. Parallels in phrase, e.g. Tib. *rko-yin-mchis* = *khwa-i-tā*, would be easily supplied from Tibetan: for *yin/in* in Bhotiya see Gerard, p. 542 (Futures in *-en = yin* and *-toen = to-yin*) and L.S., pp. 85, 87.

- b. *yod*, Bhotiya *yo-zha*, 'be', frequent in forming Passives (Gerard, p. 544), is therefore perhaps preferable to *yon* in Manchatī Passives such as *teng-za-yo-g*, 'shall be struck' (L.S., p. 458).
- c. *mod* may be ignored, as it could scarcely be disentangled from the *mu/mo*, 'be', which in fact appears in various Nepal dialects, and from the various *-m*, *-ma*, *-mo* Suffixes in the 'Western sub-group' which serve to form Infinitives, Participles and Tense-stems.
- d. *cin/sin/zin/jin* may reasonably be detected in Gerund forms where the original Tibetan would be equally in place: such are —

Bu-nan *el-ji*, 'having gone', *khom* (Tib. *khum*, *khums*) *-ji*, 'having finished', *śan-si*, 'having arisen'.

Rangkas *rā-ch*, 'coming',

Chaudāngsī *ra-chig*, 'rising', *śi-chig-aniye*, 'I am dying'.

and then also in cases where the Gerund functions, like other Gerunds, as a Finite Verb, e.g. —

Rangkas *rā-j*, 'he came'

Dārmīyā *nī-chū*, 'he was'

Chaudāngsī *tan-ch*, 'he was found'.

Some difficulty may here arise from the fact, noted in L.S. (pp. 425, 436, 482-3, 493, 508, 521), that there are, especially in the more easterly languages some instances of a conceivably merely phonetical alternation of *ch* and *s*: also the multitude of Tibeto-Burman forms of the Verb Substantive includes not a few with initial *ch*.

In the Bu-nan language there is a Suffix *de*, 'used to form an Infinitive of purpose' (L.S., p. 475), [or object] as in *el-de-ma-phod-za*, 'could not go', which seems to be the same *de*, all the more probably as *re* (see *infra*) is similarly used. Hence the *de*, *te*, *di*, *ti*, *d* of the neighbouring Manchatī and Chamba-Lahulī is probably the same: L.S. (pp. 457, 463), connects *de* with the Verb *da*, 'give', which is less likely, since there also the alternative *re* occurs. *Tū/di* occurs in Rangkas (p. 483), Dārmīyā (p. 494, also *te*) and *-d* in Chaudāngsī (p. 509): *-id* (*si-d*) and *-d* in Byāngsī (p. 522).

- e. *re*: This *re* is apparently lacking in most of the 'Western sub-group' and in the pronominalized languages of Nepal: but in the Lahul languages (Manchatī, Chamba-Lahulī and Bu-nan) *re*, *ri*, is found both in Gerunds, e.g. —

Ch.-Lahulī *dro-rē*, 'running', *tā-rī*, 'seeing' (L.S., p. 464).

Bu-nan *za-re-khom-ji*, 'having finished eating' (p. 475).

and in Indicatives, e.g. —

Manchatī *khog-sī-rī*, 'has been found', *śring-re* 'has become alive', *zea-to-re*, 'they ate' (p. 457)

Chamba-Lahuli, *khosī-rī*, 'has been found', *roshēshī-rī rosesi-ri*, 'became angry' (p. 463)

Bu-nan *roag-ka-re*, 'he is grazing', *khyed-cha-re*, 'thou strikest' (pp. 473-5). a similarly used *rē/rī*, which is all the more likely to be identical in origin with the Tibetan *re* inasmuch as, if not ancient in those languages, it can have been borrowed at any period from the Tibetan of Ladak. The *re*, which in general serves perhaps, as in Tibetan, as an alternative to *delte*, is sometimes combined therewith, e.g. in Manchatī *yhōsh-rī-te*, 'lost-been was' (L.S., p. 457) Ch.-Lahuli *hiōsh-te*. It is possible that the same *re* in a reduced form, *-ra* and *-r*, should be seen in Manchatī *roshregsh-ra*, *thoregsh-ra* (p. 457), 'having become angry', 'I transgressed', and *shu-ta-r*, 'being', *teng-zi-ta-r*, 'beating'. The preference of *-re/-r*, in Manchatī and Ch.-Lahulī (pp. 456, 463, 474) for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Person is not paradoxical; such differences of attitude to 'be' and 'being' are deep-seated in Tibetan (see Bacot, *op.cit.*, pp. 72 sqq.) and not foreign to languages such as English, which distinguish 'I am' (*ich bin*) from 'he is' (*er ist*).

The above roots having the force of the Verb Substantive have been traced by comparison with Tibetan; but for the most part they are not in the Western Group independently employed as such: they survive as Suffixes, morphological elements. The Verb-roots in normal use as signifying 'am', 'be', are in Kunāwarī *to/ta* (L.S., p. 435, cf. Gerard, p. 524, Bailey, p. 676), where we put aside *duk* as a loan from the historical Tibetan. The same *to/ta* prevails also in Kanāshī, Manchatī, and Chamba-Lahulī (along with *shu*): see L.S., pp. 445, 456, 463. In the more Westerly languages their place is taken by forms such as *nī* (used also in Kunāwarī, Bu-nam, etc.), *lhe*, *lhi* and *si*, *śi* (L.S., pp. 473, 482, 493, 507, 520).

*To* is by no means to be connected with Tibetan *sdod*, 'sit' (L.S., p. 435). Its occurrence, with the sense of 'become' or 'be' as a Participle-forming Suffix in Nam and also its analogous employment in ancient Tibetan personal names in *-to-re* is so similar to its employment to form Participles and Tenses in the 'Western sub-Group' that it must be an ancient heritage; this will be abundantly confirmed by the Žaň-žuň evidence to be adduced *infra*. But its relation to the *ta*, which as a formative of Participles and Tenses is similarly attested in Nam and in Tibetan dialects and which in the Nepal languages is, in fact, far more common than *-to*, demands discrimination. Mutual interference of the *to* and *ta* is prominent in

Chamba-Lahulī (p. 463) and apparently occurs also in Manchaī (p. 456). In Kunāwarī Tikā Rām Joshī, who perhaps is following a spelling in native script, gives the Infinitive as *tan* (< *tad*)-*miḡ* and writes *tó*, i.e. *tō*, only in the Third Person, where it may have had a special history. This cannot indicate that the *to* of Gerard, Bailey and the L.S. is merely a phonetical development of the *ta* or *vice versa*: both *to* and *ta* are in the actual modern languages, not to mention the ancient Nam, Žaržun and Tibetan, too wide-spread to have originated in a merely Kunāwarī, perhaps fairly modern, pronunciation. Two considerations point to an original difference of meaning, *to* having signified 'be', 'become', *ta* 'do' or 'make'. In Kunāwarī itself *tā-miḡ*, Tibar-skad *ta-baṅ* (Gerard, p. 521), as an independent verb, signifies an activity, 'set', 'place', 'appoint', not a 'being'; in the Vayu language of Nepal, where also *-ta* is a regular suffix of Participles, it signifies as an independent Verb 'place', 'put' (Hodgson, *Essays* (1880), I, pp. 258, 301); in Bahing 'get', 'obtain', 'find' (*ibid.*, p. 385). This Active sense of *ta*, which does not conflict with the occurrences in Nam and dialectical Tibetan, and which accords with the fact that the Tibetan *pa/ba* Suffix of Verbs, equivalent to *ta* in the other languages, was originally a Verb meaning 'do', is also connected with a Syntactical usage: as frequently stated (see L.S., pp. 432, 443, 454, 461, 471, etc.), the languages in question place the Subjects of Intransitive Verbs normally in the Nominative Case, but those of Transitives in the Agential: thus we have 'he is', but 'by him do'. The formulation is, as appears in many instances, inexact, the real distinction being not between Intransitive and Transitive, but between 'is' and 'do' predicates. When a composite Tense of any Verb is constituted by an 'is' Suffix, e.g. *to*, the Verb is naturally in Participial form, as —

*lodo-duk*, 'saying (Active Participle) is', *siyā-to*, 'dies'

whereas, when the Suffix signifies 'do', the Verb is properly a Verb-stem as a Noun of Action, as —

*lo-tag*, 'saying (Noun) do'

This well appears in Joshī's paradigm, where 'I am' is *gū* (Nominative) *-duk* (or *-tak*), 'I am writing', *gū cheo duk*, but 'I shall be' is *gūs* (Agential) *ni-tak*, 'I shall write' *gūs che-tak*. The difference, which is doubtless actual, as given by a Kunāwar official and scholar, is also in agreement with Dr. Bailey, who gives (p. 677)

'I am falling' *gōro-dūḡ* (or *-tog*), 'I shall fall' *gōr-tōḡ*. The variation in the Case of the Subject is patently connected with that of the Verb-form, which in *cheo*, *gōro* is a Participle, but in *che*, *gor*, is a Noun of Action. The forms with the Auxiliary *ta-*, which Bailey also recognizes (p. 669) in the Future Tense (only) elsewhere always writing *tog*, were, no doubt originally Aoristic Presents, 'I do' as distinct from 'I am doing', whence the transition to 'I shall do' is a thoroughly

natural one, exemplified in all the Indo-Āryan Tertiary Pākrits. The express futurity of the *ta-* form is well marked in the Parable passage where it is said —

'I go (*bī-tog*, sc. 'shall go') to my father and will say (*lo-tag*, sc. 'will say') to him'

and it is noticeable that in the same passage most of the languages likewise distinguish, by their several idioms, the times of the two actions, though Kanāshī has *tak*, and Manchatī and Chamba-Lahulī use for both their Aorist-Present forms.

But to maintain a distinction of 'be' and 'do' Auxiliaries attached to Verb-roots is, no doubt, beyond the capacity of common human speech: not to mention variations such as between French *j'ai été* and German *ich bin gewesen*, English supplies both 'I am (*or* was) saying' and 'I do (*or* did) say' and even at times 'I do (*or* did) be-': moreover, as the Kunāwarī *bī-tog* shows, there is nothing to prevent the 'is' -form *to-* from attaching to (suitable) Verbs of action (here *bī* is 'go'); and this was, no doubt, original in Nam and Tibetan also, and it is, in fact, inevitable when the sense is Passive, as in Latin *amatus sum*, 'I was loved', etc.: Where the sense is Passive, the agent is naturally in the Agential Case, 'By A was struck I'. What is not to be expected is that the 'do' form *ta* should be affixed to a Participial Verb-form such as *lodo* 'speaking', *cheo*, 'writing'; if we say 'do writing', 'writing' is a Verbal Noun, not a Participle. It may, in fact, be questioned whether with the *-o* Participle the *-ta* form is ever found, Paṇḍit Joshi's *-tak* being here perhaps, as suggested *supra*, a matter of spelling. With *-a* forms from Verbs instances such as *bura-tak*, 'comes', are found; but these *-a* forms though they still require elucidation (as do also some other particulars), are perhaps not Participles.

Confusion in the syntactical construction, i.e. between Nominative and Agential Case of the Subject, is certainly not infrequent: thus *lodo-duk*, 'saying was', in which the *-duk*, Tibetan *hdug*, is essentially, like *to*, a Verb of 'being', not of 'doing', is several times found with the 'Subject' in the Agential Case.

The other usual Verb signifying 'be', 'become', is *nī*, which is found in Kanāshī, Bu-nan and Kunāwarī, and in the more easterly languages, Rangkas, etc., which have no *to*. In the latter it is frequent also as an Auxiliary, the Subject being in all clear cases in the Nominative Case. Outside these areas *nī*, 'be', is not apparent in Tibeto-Burman, unless Lepcha *nyi* is cognate. But, being frequent, as will appear *infra*, in Žań-žurī, it is indubitably ancient, along with a *na*, form which possibly may be related to Sunwar (Nepal) *nawe* and Vayu *no*.

*Lhe, lhi, le, li*, has in the same easterly languages the two senses 'be' and 'say', the latter likely to be derived from *len*, 'do', which is wide-spread in the 'Western group': the occurrence of the two senses in the same brief texts suggests a doubt as to etymological identity. The *śi/śī* found in the same languages might phonologically (see *infra*, p. 97) be the *shu* of Manchatī and Ch.-Lahulī (L.S., pp.

456, 463). But concerning all these, and also concerning a few rarer forms, *kya*, etc., apparently signifying 'be', which might be paralleled in the Tibeto-Burman multitude, we have no occasion to venture anything.

(B) Modifications of root-forms

As matters important on the Tibetan side may here be mentioned (1) Prefixes and initial groups of consonants, (2) Ablaut of vowels, (3) Terminal consonants, (4) Added vowels.

(1) The Tibetan Consonantal Prefixes *g-*, *d-*, *b-*, *m-*, *h-*, *r-*, *l-*, *s-* were originally significant, modifying the sense of the Verb-stem, and in some cases spreading, perhaps secondarily, to Nominal forms. Even in the earliest known Tibetan a weakening of their force, with alternations and confusions due largely to phonetical causes, is ubiquitous; and subsequently they have become phonetically almost nugatory and in distinction of meaning merely lexicographical. One particular class of cases, such as *spo/hpho*, 'change', *spar/hbar*, 'burn', *ston/hthon*, 'show', in which the *s-* form has a Causative or Transitive force, has been partly maintained, probably by reason of idiomatic convenience: this explains its invasion even of some outside languages, e.g. Burushaskī, where there are several instances, e.g. *askul/rul*, 'burn', Transitive/intransitive, and even more naturally its extension to languages of the western Pronominalized group, in several of which examples have been noted without due recognition of its affinity to ancient Tibetan.

Otherwise the old Prefixes are altogether unevicenced in the modern languages of the group; and it might be argued that they have never been present, were it not that two of them, viz. *r* and *s*, have been shown to have been common in Žaŋ-žun. The total extinction of the Prefixes in the 'Pronominalized' languages is in marked contrast to the situation in the Western Colonial dialects of the Tibetan itself, where, with certain modifications, they have been preserved far more extensively than in the home-land.

It may be added that in the more easterly languages of the group there are some instances of use of a posterior kind of Prefixes, Consonant + vowel, characteristic of large groups of Tibeto-Burman elsewhere.

As will be apparent from the L.S., there have been in the languages extensive and multifarious reductions of initial consonant groups in general. The outcome may be seen in the L.S. Comparative Vocabulary of the group and more fully in Dr. Bailey's and Paṇḍit Joshī's Vocabularies of Kunāwarī. Practically the only groups are those with *y*, *r*, *l* or *w* as posterior member and a few with initial *sk*, *st*, *sp*: *ts*, *tsh* and *dz* being not compound consonants. Even the cited groups are partly delusive, since *wa* is often derived from, or merely a writing of, *o*, as in *rwag* (also *roag*), *rokshi*, 'graze' = Tib. *hbrog*: and similarly of *ya* for *e*, both which spellings

are desperately prevalent in texts of Nepal and Pahārī languages (L.S., p. 215 and IX. iv. pp. 22 sqq., 114 sqq.): the cases with *s-* are largely examples of the above-noted practice of forming Transitive Verbs. The reductions, which are by no means confined to combinations due to Prefixes, include cases such as *le*, 'tongue', = Tib. *lce*, and *lig*, 'heavy', = Tib. *lei*, *tong*, 'beat' = Tib. *rdun*.

(2) Ablaut of vowels; In Tibetan most Verb-roots containing *e* or *o* substitute for these in certain cases, especially in the Preterite and Future Tenses, *a*, e.g. *hdren*, *hdrañs*, *drañ*, 'lead': in the Imperative both *e* and *a* roots, as well as *o* roots, commonly have *o*. In Tibetan Conjugation these old Ablauts are partly rather well preserved, e.g. in *byed*, 'do', *byas* (Preterite), *bya* (Future), *byos* (Imperative): often they have given rise to alternative Verbs, e.g. *rgod/rgad*, 'laugh', *zo/za*, 'eat', and outside the Verb Conjugation they can occur miscellaneously.

In the Pronominalized group there does not seem to be any trace of such Ablauts, the vowel remaining constant as found in the Infinitive: nothing can so far be concluded in regard to their original presence in the languages, which are far more degenerate phonetically than the old Tibetan: the *a < o* in e.g. the words *tan*, 'see' (Tib. *mthoñ*), *tha*, 'hear' (Tib. *thos*), *gas*, 'clothes' (Tib. *gos*), which obscures the whole matter, is a geographically, not linguistically, determined change, of which the chronology also is indeterminate. There are also various other vocalic (and consonantal) changes of which one may be specified here. This is *i < u*, which presents itself first in Kunāwarī *pu* (Tibar-skad *puī*, *pī*), Kanāshī *pī*, '4', all the other languages having the original *i* (see Gerard, p. 506, J. D. C., p. 227, Joshī and G. Bailey, s.vv., L.S., pp. 532-5). In the great mass of Tibeto-Burman (see L.S. I.ii, Comparative Vocabularies) *u* in this word is almost non-existent; in one or two minor Nepal languages it does occur and also in Mo-so (*iū*); and in Tibetan of the Sino-Tibetan borderland, confusion of *i/u* is well attested (*Nam* ..., p. 367). Being found in Kunāwarī and Kanāshī, the change *i < -u* (and *vice versa*?) is likely to be traceable in the adjacent Bu-nan, Manchatī and Ch.-Lahulī; and this emboldens us to detect it in —

- (a) Manchatī, Ch.-Lahulī, *shu*, 'be' = *si/si* of the easterly group, Rangkas, etc. (L.S., pp. 456, 463).
- (b) the common Bu-nan Infinitives in *-chum < -chim < ch-yin* (Jaeschke, *op.cit.*, pp. 97-8).

It is patent in particular words, viz. —

Bu-nan *gyum*, 'house' = Tib. *khyim*, Kunāwarī *kim*, *kyum*, Tibar-skad *kyum* (Gerard, p. 492), Manchatī *chum*, etc. Ch.-Lahulī *cumh* (L.S., p. 540) *byu-tsi*, Kunāwarī *piū*, 'rat' = Tib. *byi-ba* (Jaeschke p. 95). Kanāshī *burāri*, 'cat' = Sk. *biḍāla* (L.S., p. 540) Kunāwarī *zūr*, Tibar-skad *zur*, 'comer', = Tib. *zur*, *id.*

(3) Terminal Consonants of roots: The Prominalized languages having ceased to be monosyllabic and having attained the 'inflected' stage, the root-forms no longer stand out clear; their final consonants are affected by miscellaneous Sandhi-combinations as is the case, e.g., in Latin. A terminal consonant lost in the Infinitive, which is the base of Conjugation, sometimes in favourable circumstances reappears in other parts of the Verb-system: thus *san-mig/san-nig*, 'to kill', has the *d* of the old root *sad* (Tib. *gsod*, *bsad*) changed to *n*, loses it in *sa-tak*, 'I kill', and recovers it in *sat-ka*, 'killed'. Such cases are frequent in connection with other consonants and philologically they may prove useful: thus *sat-ka* proves the antiquity of the Participle in *-ka*. The double finals which Tibetan allows only in cases of *-gs*, *-ñs*, *-ds* (very rare), *-bs*, *-ms*, mostly themselves also unstable, and of the archaic 'd-drag' in *-nd*, *-rd*, *-ld*, are wanting in the 'Western sub-group'. They were current in the old *Žaň-žurň*, which even added *-ñg* and *-mb*. The prehistoric 'root-determinative' *-d* of Tibetan *skyed*, 'beget', 'increase' (from *skye*, 'be born'), *hbyed*, 'divide' (*hbye*), *byed* and *bgyid*, 'do', *yod* and *mod*, 'be', is perhaps exemplified in the *tod-* and *tad-* forms of the modern Verb Substantive and Auxiliary, *to-*, *ta-*, 'be', 'do'. In the Verb-system, as will be seen, there are numerous other accretions.

(4) Stem-bases for Declension and Conjugation.

In Tibetan these are usually mere root-forms (or compounds) with such Suffixes, e.g. *-pa/-ba/-ma*, *-po/-phol/-bo/-mo*, more rarely *-u/-gu*, *-cal/-tsa*, *-ta*, etc., in the Noun, *-pa/-ba*, in the Verb, as belong to the meaning of the particular Noun or Verb as base for Declension or Conjugation. Such Suffixes are liable to omission, when other Suffixes follow and in Compounds.

In the modern languages of the 'Western sub-group' the Nouns, if we exclude the very numerous loan-words from Indo-Āryan, are still, as the vocabularies show, prevalently monosyllabic, derivable from Tibetan by mere phonology: the Tibetan *-pa/-ba* Suffix (with a thence derived *-pañ/-bañ*) is lacking, and any of the others occur only when 'fixtures'. There are, however, instances of appended vowels, e.g.,

Rangkas, etc., *like*, *lakō*, *likī*, 'foot', = Tib. *lag*.

Dārmiyā, etc. *sinā*, 'devil' = Tib. *gśin*.

The case of *-i*, being common and wide-spread, deserves mention. Many examples of Adjectives in Bu-nan with appended *-i*, e.g. *kyüi*, 'long', *tīgi*, 'blue', *noi*, 'much', *zīi*, 'bright', were adduced by Jaeschke (*op.cit.*, pp. 96-7); and in the L.S. volume (p. 472) notice was taken of some, and it was suggested that they were really Genitives, which Case in the language has after vowels this Suffix and after consonants the likewise corresponding Tibetan Suffixes *gyi*, *kyi*, *gi*). As appended to numerals, it is found sporadically in nearly all the languages, e.g. in —

Kunāwarī *rai*, '8', *gūi*, '9', *sai*, '10';

Manchatī *idi*, '1', *truī*, '6', *nyizhi*, '7';  
 Chamba-Lahulī *itti*, '1', *truī*, '6';  
 Bu-nan *tiki*, '1', *sumi*, '3', *ngai*, '5', *truī*, '6', *nyizhi*, '7', *gyeī*, '8', *chui*, '10';  
 Rangkas *nisi*, '2', *nai*, '5', *nhisi*, '7', *gvi*, '9';  
 Dārmiyā *ngaiī*, '5', *gvi*, '9';  
 Chaudāngsī *ngaiī*, '5', *gvi*, '9', *saiī*, '100';  
 Byāngsī *nisi*, '2', *nge* (<*ngai*>), '5', *gvi*, '9', *saiī*, '100'.

In the more easterly languages, where the Genitive Suffix is commonly -*g*, presumably derived from -*ga*, the latter sometimes appears as -*gai*. The Tibetan itself has after vowels -*hi*, which cannot have been derived from -*gyi/-kyi*: it is likely therefore that -*gyi/-kyi* itself is secondary to a -*gai*.

For a comparable -*i* -Suffix common in ancient N.E. Tibet see *Nam ...*, pp. 190-2: it is hardly dubitable that the two are historically identical.

Consonantal Affixes constituting noun-themes are not cited in the L.S., and any that may be traceable are likely to have resulted from loss of final vowels. The -*ñ* final in loan-words from Indo-Āryan and from Tibetan has been noted *supra* (p. [...]). Its use to form Locatives in Bu-nan is not explained. We may slightly mention a *l* in Bu-nan *tal*, 'he', 'that', *dal-tso-re*, 'they', which there is some reason for conceiving as ancient: an Adjectival *g*, doubtless < *ga*, in Bu-nan *tunig*, 'short', Kun. *shwīng*, 'red', *lisk*, 'cold', *thisk*, 'lazy', *wark*, 'far', *puzrak*, 'square' (*pu-zir* and *zur*, 'four-side'), etc., etc.; and a notable frequency of old Adjectives in -*as*, which may ultimately figure in the etymology of *Kailāsa* and *Kanāsh*[ī]. The frequent *chīts*, apparently diminutive or hypocoristic in Kun. *pyats*, 'small bird', *changts*, 'small son', (Bailey, p. 665), and many other Nouns and Adjectives (*zigits*, 'small', *nakich*, 'lean') is manifestly syllabic in origin, corresponding to the -*tsi*, very common in Bu-nan Nouns (*re-tsi*, 'ear', *am-tsi*, 'road', etc.) and Adjectives (*petse-tsi*, 'small', *dam-shi*, 'pure' = Kun. *dambash*, 'good'), *te-zi*, 'great' = Kun. *teg*, or to the *tsa* in Tib. *bu-tsa*, 'children': the same appears in other languages, e.g. Chaudāngsī *bongch*, 'ass', - Kun. *phoch*(*ts*), Tib. *boñ-bu*, Manchatī *kondza*, 'foot' - Ch.-Lahulī *kunz*, Tib. *rkañ*. The *tsi* of Bu-nan is the only such syllabic Noun-theme formative mentioned in the L.S., p. 470. In the Noun such formatives, if we exclude (a) cases of recognizable compounds such as English taskmaster, postman, etc., Tib. *śin-mkhan*, 'wood-expert', 'carpenter', *bud-med*, 'senseless', 'woman', *glaiñ-che*, 'great ox', sc. 'elephant', (b) those indicating Number and Case, which are Declensional, (c) those forming Participles, etc., which are Conjugational, the sole example seems to be that written by Dr. Bailey (pp. 665, 671) as *tsea*, *zea*, *dea*, *sea* (Fem. *tsē*, *zē*, *de*, *se*), by Joshī (p. 7) as *chyā*, *dyā*, *gyā*, *shyā* (Fem. *chē*, *dē*, *jē*, *shē*). These correspond in use to Hindi *wālā*, attached to Verb and Noun stems, and English 'writ-er', 'garden-er' Tib. -*pal-bal-ma*, -*po/bo/ma*. The etymology is not clear: the

Pandit's form is probably the more historical; the initial consonants may have been only two, viz. *ts/dz/s* and *d*; the discrimination of Gender by vowel in *-yā/e* is perhaps unique in the 'Western sub-group'.

Actions, 'eating', etc., can always be expressed by infinitives: perhaps also some Abstracts, e.g. 'goodness' by 'good-being'.

In the case of the Verb, where we have had to remark upon the frequent losses or modifications, due largely to *Sandhi*-situations, of terminal consonants, there are also numerous accretions of vowels or consonants (with or without vowels), constituting secondary Verb-stems ('themes' or bases). These, which are quite analogous to the secondary Verb-stems of Greek (*tī-mā-, ti-, deiknu-*, etc.), Latin (*fugā-, venī-, faci-*, etc.) and other Inflectional languages, differ from Conjugational Suffixes proper inasmuch as they belong to the Verb itself and not to the several Moods, Tenses, etc., and pervade these latter more or less completely. In the L.S. this distinction is not adequately recognized, so that we have some inconsistent hyphenings (a very difficult matter, indeed), as (p. 457) Manchatī —

*sīya-te*, 'he had died'

*shea-to*, 'he has killed'

*si-vā-to-g*, 'I am dying'

Chamba-Lahulī *siuāda*, 'die'

where probably in all three cases we perhaps have one common Verb-stem *shiyā* (*śiyā*), extended from *shi-*, 'die': in *si-vā-to-g vā* is treated as if it were on a level with *to*. The morphology of the language is thereby somewhat obscured.

This *-ā* Suffix is not etymologically or in meaning clear. The long *ā* has in conjugation several different employments, of which the *-ā* Preterite (Gerund and Participle), common in Kunāwarī, may be applicable here. That it belongs to the Verb-stem seems clear from the fact that it recurs before Suffixes other than the *-dāl-de*, e.g. in Ch.-Lahulī *zawā-delzawā-ni*, from *zā*, 'eat', *bhawa-ni*, (L.S., p. 464), and that the same *-dāl-de* can follow other vowels, as in Kunāwarī *porē-dā, ... , lāgē-dā, ...*, Ch.-Lahulī *shujī-de*, 'became'. The *-yā* which in Kunāwarī constitutes a very large class of secondary Verb-stems (s. *infra*), pervades the whole paradigm. The suspicion that this *-ā* is, in fact, an imitation of Indo-Āryan *-ā*, e.g. in *carṇā/carā-nā*, 'graze' (Intransitive-Transitive), common in all Pahārī languages, need not be forthwith dismissed: the *-ā* seems to be practically non-existent in the more easterly languages of the 'Western sub-group', and some of the above Verbs (also *sunchā-/sompzā-*) are, in fact, loans from Indo-Āryan, e.g. Rangkas *manai*, Dārmiyā *mane-*, 'entreat', *sunai*, 'hear' (Ind. *manā-, sunnā-*).

The *-ā* seen in —

Kanāshī *poya-k*, 'befell', *bura-k/bura-ke-k*, where the *k-* is Suffix of the Preterite;

Manchatī and Ch.-Lahulī *anja-d*, 'came', *shringa-d*, 'has become alive';  
 Rangkas *śya-ch* ( $\sqrt{śi}$ ), 'was', *pyanga-t*, 'to fill';  
 Chaudāngsī *tunga-m*, 'drinking', *syunga-m*, 'to make', *phyānga-ch*, 'was  
 dead' (-*m* Suffix of the Infinitive)

is particularly frequent in the more easterly languages, where after vocalic roots it usually inserts a *y*-, e.g. in *gāya-su*, 'did', sometimes a *k*, *g*, or *n*. There is no difficulty in recognizing an old Participle in -*ā*, which, in fact, we have in reduplication Gerunds, such as *bya-bya* ( $\sqrt{bi}$ ) 'going', slightly distinguishable in sense from *bi-bi*, *byo-byo*, the latter patently Participial. Its immediately preceding the Tense Suffix or Auxiliary, *k*, *d*, *t*, *ch*, and even the Infinitive *m*-, is quite normal as soon as it has become thematic.

Nevertheless there is good reason for inferring that in many, if not most, cases it is merely a matter of writing, as in English 'winged', 'filled', 'commissioned', etc., or an avoidance of the disliked consonant complexes. Thus *anjad* would be merely an accommodation form for *anj-d* (<*da*), *shringad* for *shring-d a*, *tungam* for *tung-m(a)*. The reasonableness of this interpretation derives from the fact that the *ā* is frequently, perhaps more often than not, omitted: thus we have —

for -*ad*: *d* in Chaud. *nāch-syung-d*, 'dancing', *tan-d-nī*, 'getting', *tang-d-alī* (or *tang-da-lī*), 'alive is', Byāngsī *tang-d-ka-lhī*.

for -*ach*: *ch* in Rangkas *gansya-ch*, 'were making', *gansi-ch*, 'made', Chaud. *tan-ch*, 'is found', following immediately after [*pa-jhāng-ach*, 'died', = Dārmiyā *pung-chū*, 'died', Byāngsī [*tab-jyāng-cho*(*t-nī*), *tāng-d-ka-lī*.

for -*am*: *m*, the Infinitive or Verb-action Suffix, quite outclasses the -*am* in frequency, both after vowels (see *infra*) and after consonants, *tung-m*, *syung-m*, *pim-m* (Manch. *ping-mog*, Bu-nan *bing-de*, Rang. *pyangat*, 'to fill'), *tung-mo*, *yang-m*, *ruāng-m* etc., etc.; Chaud. *rangam*, 'to sell', Byāngsī *rang-mo-khū*, 'in selling'.

for -*at* and -*as*: Chaud. *phu-phukāy-ta*, 'squandered', Därm. *gāy-ta*, 'made'.

Ch. *dan-as*, 'gave', *dan-su*, 'gave', Rangk. *tang-n-su*, 'gottest', Byāng. *dan-anso*, 'gave', Därm. *gāya-su*, 'made' (*gāy-lhī*, 'made'), *gā-lnā-tāy-su*.

An -*i* appended to Verb-roots appears in Manchatī *lha-i-ga*, 'did', and *ra-i-na*, 'gavest', *kutī-mi*, 'to say' (Ch.-Lahulī *kūrī-mi*), *kui-ni-sai-ta*, 'saying', and in Kunāwarī *būde-rang*, 'on coming', if this is for *budai-*, as suggested by the above *bura-k*, etc. But its main area is the more easterly languages, Rangkas, etc.: we may cite —

Rangkas *rhai-ck*, 'living', *rhai-san*, 'livedest', *rhai-n-sick*, 'lived', *lai-s*, 'said', *sai-s*, 'killed', *thai-pa-ch/tā-pa-ch* (Dārmiyā *tā-chō*), 'went'.

Dārmiyā *khvai* (Chaudāngsī *khye*, Byāngsī *khva*) -*ta*, 'digs', *sai-tū-sū*, 'killed', *rai-chū* (and -*sū*), 'brought', *rai-lang*, 'bringing', *gāy-tā*, 'made', *thai-mū*,

'expelling'.

Chaudāngsī *rai-i-ya*, 'bring', *rai-g*, 'bringing', *rai-s*, 'brought', [*sī-*]*sai-tā*, 'killed', *losi-g*, 'mistaking'.

Byāngsī *rai-nī*, 'bring', *manyāi-sō*, 'entreated', [*ra-*]*rai-tā*, 'had brought'.

In the last three of these languages the *i* is found also appended to Suffixes in *ā*, e.g. in —

Dārmiyā *lhvē-thai-chū*, 'was lost', *thok-thai*, 'returning'.

Chaudāngsī *-ti-nai/ta-ne*.

Byāngsī *rachi-gai*, 'rising' (Chaud. *rachi-g*), *ro-kai*, 'grazing', *ying-gai*, 'hearing', *losi-gai*, 'mistaking'.

This seems to be complex matter, and we cannot proffer any full explanation; only some particular observations can be ventured; it seems likely that the more easterly languages, in which alone the *i*-appendage has the frequency of an idiom, exemplify a somewhat posterior stage, more affected by relatively late contacts with Tibetan or Indo-Āryan.

In the first place, the *-i* is not always equally persistent: thus in the case of Rangkas *rhai*, 'live', or 'stay', we have *rhai-ch*, 'living', *ka-rhai-ch*, 'stayed', *rhai-san*, 'lived', *rhainsi-ch*, 'lived';

and for *rā-*, 'come':

*rā-ch* and *rā-j*, 'came', 'coming', *rā-chu*, 'came', [*ka-*]*rā-ch*, 'ran', *khu-rā-ch*, 'stolen';

Dārmiyā *rā-chū*, *rā-sū*, 'came', *rā-lin-chū*, 'coming';

Chaudāngsī *rā-nī*, *rā-s*, 'came', *rā-g*, 'coming';

Byāngsī *rā-sō*, 'came', *rā-gai*, 'coming', *rā-lang*, 'on coming';

for *rai-* 'bring':

Rangkas *rhāo-nē*, 'bringing', *rhā-s*, 'brought', *rhai-s*, 'brought';

Dārmiyā *rai-tyā* (Imper.), *rai-chū*, *rai-sū*, 'brought', *rai-lin-chū*, 'bringing';

Chaudāngsī *rai-i-ya* (Imper.), *rai-g*, 'bringing', *rai-s*, 'brought', [*ri-*]*rai-ta*, 'brought', *rai-sid*, 'brought';

Byāngsī *rai-sō*, 'brought', *rā-k*, 'bringing', *rā-sīd*, 'brought', [*ra-*]*rai-ta*, 'brought';

for *ga/ka*, 'make', 'do':

Rangkas *gā-tai* (Imper.), *ga-nī*, 'doing', *gā-mō*, 'to make', *gā-tas*, 'made', *gā-s*, 'made', *gai-s*, *ge-s*, 'did';

Dārmiyā *gā-tyā* (Imper.), *gā-m*, 'to do', *gā-mō*, 'a doing', *gā-sū*, 'did', *gā-lin-chū*, 'doing', *gā-lan*, 'doing', *gā-dī-sū*, 'did', *gā-lnā-tāy-sū*; *gāya-su*, 'did', *gāy-tā* (Imper.), *gāy-lhi*, 'did';

for *da*, 'give':

Dārmiyā, Rangkas, *dā-s*, *da-s*, 'gave';

Dārmīyā *dā-sū*, 'gave'; [*ka-*]*dān-sū*, 'gave';  
 Chaudāngsī *dā-g*, 'giving'; *dā-tā*, 'gave';  
 Byāngsī *dā-gai*, 'giving', [*da-*]*dā-tā*, 'gave', [*kab-dai-*]*sō*, 'gave';  
 for *sa*, 'strike', 'kill':  
 Rangkas *sai-s*, 'killed';  
 Dārmīyā *sai-tū-sū*, 'killed';  
 Chaudāngsī [*si-*]*sai-ta*, [*si-*]*se-ta-ne*, 'killed'.

Other cases, more sporadic, are —

Rangkas *li-s*, *lai-s*, 'said', *thai-nē*, 'taking out', *khisai-chū*, 'despairing', *manai-nē*, 'entreating', *urai-s*, 'squandered';  
 Dārmīyā *lhē-sū*, 'said', *mane-lan*, 'entreating', *khisai-lan*, 'despairing'; *thai-mū*, 'expelling';  
 Chaudāngsī *lhi-s*, *lhē-s*, 'said', *tai-g*, 'knowing';  
 Byāngsī [*ka-*]*urū-ta*, 'squandered', *manyai-so*, 'entreated';

It does not seem possible to proffer a satisfactory explanation of the *-i* in these cases. The L.S. suggestion (p. 522) of a possibly causal signification distinguishing *rai*, 'bring', from *rā*, 'come', will certainly not accord with the instances, which exemplify both *i*- forms from *ā*- Verbs and *vice-versa*. Its almost complete restriction to the more easterly languages, considerably influenced by Indo-Āryan Pañāṛī (Kumaonī, or Garhwālī), from which, in fact, some of the Verb-stems are borrowed, suggests that the *i*- forms should be, at least in part, contemplated as possibly of Indo-Āryan provenance. This matter being obviously outside our scope, we can make only a few observations of fact —

(1) Clearly some allowance should be made for casual variations of spelling, or pronunciation, such as those of the vowels *ō* and *ū* in the Preterite endings *-sō/-sū*, *-chō/-chū*, the Infinitive, or Noun-Action, ending *-mo/-mu*. Such, no doubt, is the *-ai/-e* variation in Chaudāngsī [*si-*]*sai-ta* and [*si-*]*so-ta-ne*, 'killed', perhaps dialectical in Rangkas *manai-nē*, Dārmīyā *mane-lan*, 'entreating' (Byāngsī *manyāi-sō*, 'entreated'); perhaps also in Rangkas *lai-s*, *lē-s*, (Dārmīyā *lhē-su*, Chaudāngsī *lhi-s*) 'said', where the *ē* was primary: so also perhaps in Byāngsī [*pa-*]*hve-tā*, [*pā-*]*hō-tā*, 'left' (Chaudāngsī *hve-g*, 'leaving', Dārmīyā [*pi-*]*hve-thai-chu*, 'left'): but certainly not Byāngsī *hva-k*, *hva-kai*, 'leaving'; so again Chaudāngsī *khvē-tā*, Dārmīyā *khvai-tā*, but not Rangkas *khvā-da*, Byāngsī, *khva-tā*, 'digs': nor in Rangkas *urai-s*, Byāngsī *urū-tā*, 'squandered'; but again in Dārmīyā [*ka-*]*phūkai-su*, Chaudāngsī *phu-phukāy-tā*, 'squandered', for which Manchatī *phukeg-ti*, Ch.-Lahuli *phuge-ketō*, present the *e*.

(2) An *i*- Suffix, preferably of the Preterite, has been mentioned as widely

evidenced in the 'Western sub-group', occurring either sole, as in *to-i*, 'was', or attached to a Preterite Participle in *-ka*, as in *to-ke* (< *ka-i*), 'was'. In the more easterly languages the usual Genitive Suffix is *-g* or *-gai*, sometimes written with *k-*; and the L.S. infers (p. 509) that the Participial *-gai* is really a Genitive: but this does not seem at all likely; and it forthwith raises the question of the parallel *thai* of *rī-thai*, 'rising', *thok-thai*, 'returning', *khvi-thai-chū*, 'stolen', which is common in the languages in both these two situations, and is never written otherwise. *Tha*, however, is found as a Suffix in [...], and the parallelism of *-k/-kai*, *-g/-gai*, which are probably the old *-ka/-ga* Suffix, with the *-ā* vowel lost in *-k/-g*, but preserved in *-kai/-gai*, seems to indicate that the *i-* is a common element, restricted to the more easterly languages and probably not ancient. We cannot deal with the fact that Pahārī has a Participle (Gerund) in *-k* and also an emphasizing *-ai*, and Conjunctive Participles in *-i*.

(3) The fact that what in the Verb-forms immediately precedes the *-si-ch*, *-ta*, etc., is commonly a Participle, as is natural, when it is not the mere root, and that this is manifest in the case of the *-lan/-lin* Participle seems to show that the *-kai/-gai* and *-thai*, existing independently as Participles, function in the Verb-forms as such, and that that which gives them their Participial quality is, in fact, the *-i*. In that case the derivation of the *-i* from the Tibetan *yin*, 'be', 'is', which has been suggested *supra* in regard to the *-i* of the Preterite, and which is incontestable in the expressions, *maïg*, *mai*, etc., 'is not', need not be particularly ancient in its further application in the restricted area: here also we can quote definite evidence: thus 'what mine is, that thine is', where for 'is' the Western languages use their *to*, *shu*, and *nī*, Rangkas its *sī* and *lhe*, Darmiya *ni* and *lke*, Chaudāngsī *ani*, in Byāngsī is —

*ji-gai in dai nā-gai li*

'whatever mine is, that thine is'

In case this was actually the origin of the *-i*-forms, they will have had at first the 'durative' sense of the Greek and Latin Imperfect Tense, represented in Tibetan by expressions such as *byed-cin-mchis*, 'is (or was) doing', which in narrative adds to mere statement the sense of description. In Rangkas (L.S., p. 487) we find *rhain-si-ch*, 'lived' (durative), followed by *gan-sya-ch*, 'making' (durative, with definitely Participial *-sya*) and that by *gan-si-ch* (merely narrative), 'made'.

What may be regarded as proof of the conjecture is presented by the Kunāwarī *maï-g*, *maï-ts* (Bailey, p. 666-7), 'not am', 'not is', 'no', Kanāshī *mai*, etc., etc. In all these languages 'no' is expressed by 'not is', the 'is' varying with the language (see the L.S. Vocabularies, no. 99), in Tibetan *min*, *mayin*. There seems to be no doubt that *maï-g*, *maï-ts* are from *ma-yin-g*, *ma-yin-ts*.

In addition to *-ā* and *-i* singly an *-ia* or *-yā*, which may perhaps be a

combination of the two, must be mentioned as constituting secondary Verb-stems. From Paṇḍit Joshi's *Vocabulary* it will be seen that in Kunāwarī there are very numerous Verb-stems of this form, many of them, e.g. *tapyā-mig*, 'to heat', *tolya-mig*, 'to weigh', but by no means all (e.g. Kun. *rokyā-im*, 'to hinder', Ch.-Lhaufi *mēliā-dē*, 'not went'), being derived from Indo-Āryan.

The most prominent, however, of such Verb-determinants is the very frequent *-chī/-shi* exemplified by Kunāwarī *hachi-mig*, 'become', *toshi-mig*, 'sit'. Regarding the modification of the meaning it is stated by Dr. Bailey (*Grammar*, p. 666) that the *shi* expresses 'a reflexive or mutual or even passive sense': the L.S. speaks (pp. 434, 436) of 'a reflexive or reciprocal meaning'. As constituting a sort of Middle Voice, it is well exemplified in *rokshi-m*, 'to graze (of cattle)', from *rogi-m*, 'to make (cattle) graze'. The *-shi*, which belongs to the Verb-stem, is to be definitely dissociated from the *-shis* (Bailey, p. 671, L.S., p. 438) which is a Conjugational (always terminal) Suffix having the sense of a Preterite (Passive or Intransitive) Participle formed from all Verb-stems simply by replacing the *-mig* of the Infinitive: not infrequently it follows Verb-stems in *-shi* or *-chī*, e.g. in *shokshi-shis*, 'ridden', *unchi-shis*, 'begged': this *-shis* is obviously only an *-s* Preterite (on the *-s* see *infra*) of the regular (and ancient) Auxiliary Verb *shid*, which in Kunāwarī forms Preterite Indicatives (Joshi, pp. 15-6, Bailey, p. 670, L.S., p. 436); but the distinction has to be remarked because *-s* Participles can be formed also from *-shī* and *-chī* Verb-stems, e.g. *sarshi-s*, 'arisen', *hachi-s*, 'become'.

By Dr. Bailey (p. 666) and in the L.S. (pp. 434, 436) the *-shi* and *-chī* forms are distinguished, *tong-shi-g* being interpreted as 'I struck myself' and *tong-chi-g* as 'I struck thee', though the *ch* usually is said to 'indicate an object of the *first or second* person'. Dr. Bailey, however, admits (p. 682) that 'in a number of verbs whose roots end in *c* and *sh* I have not found any meaning such as that just indicated'.

The very numerous *-shi* Verbs recorded in Paṇḍit Joshi's *Dictionary* seem on the whole fairly well to harmonize with the attribution of 'a reflexive or mutual or even passive sense': and this may seem particularly clear in some instances, such as —

*rwang-shi-mig*, Kun, *rogi-m* and *rokshi-m* 'to graze', v. *rwang-mig*, 'to make (cattle) graze';

*shok-shi-mig*, 'to ride';

*stam-shi-mig*, 'to emit a smell', and *stam-mig*, 'to smell';

*tang-shi-mig*, 'to appear', v. *tang-mig*, 'to see';

*teg-shi-mig*, 'to grow', v. *teg-mig*, 'to enlarge';

*yar-shi-mig*, 'to escape', v. *yar-mig*, 'to save'.

But it is essential to remark that the *-shī*-Verb is not necessarily Intransitive: 'ride',

for instance, does not preclude 'a horse' as object, and, in fact, many -shi-Verbs are recorded by Joshi as Transitive. In the Vayu language, which has a very similar and indubitably cognate set of -che-Verbs, Hodgson, who speaks of 'a reflex form or middle voice', remarks (Essays (1880), I, p. 282) that —

'this conjugation in "chi" is very comprehensive, and admits of many fine shades of meaning. Thus, *lische*, to learn, means to teach thyself, opposed to *listo*, to teach another. Again, not only functional action, but any of which the effort returns to the agent, as in buying and taking, must be primarily expressed in this form.'

In Hodgson's list the Vayu-che-Verbs relate largely to bodily or mental action, just as in Kunāwarī, *toshi-*, 'sit', *sarshi-*, 'rise' (of sun), *gyā-shi*, 'wish', *hushi*, 'learn'. The analogy to the Greek Middle Voice, which likewise is not necessarily Intransitive, is compelling. But it will be noticed that the Vayu Suffix is not *shi*, as in Kunāwarī, but *chi/che*: and this raises a question in regard to the Kunāwarī *chi*.

Does Kunāwarī *ta-chi-mig* really mean 'to place me, us, you', etc. (Bailey, p. 660), and *tong-chi-mig*, 'to strike me' (L.S., p. 434)? It is surprising to find both the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Person indicated by the same sign, *ch*, more especially as for the 1<sup>st</sup> Person we have already *tong-shi-mig*, 'to strike oneself' and for 'I' and 'Thou' as Subjects, the signs are -g and -n, with -ch as Dual and Plural for all Persons. How again does it happen that we can have not only particular occurrences, such as —

*gō toncog*, 'I will beat thee'.

*ka' thū toncon*, 'Why wilt thou beat me?' (Bailey, p. 666).

but complete Verbs with Infinitives and full paradigms, such as —

*haci-mig*, 'to become',

*dag-chi-mig*, 'to live',

*dul-chi-mig*, 'to droop',

*gwā-chi-mig*, 'to leap up',

*pul-chi-mig*, 'to grow',

*spin-chi-mig*, 'be wet',

*yo-chi-mig*, 'to play'

Nowhere does Joshi's *Dictionary* suggest a personal signification in the -*chi*.

Turning to the L.S. texts, what we find in addition to Dr. Bailey's *tachini* is —

Kun. *angu nūkrī tachi-ny*, 'me servant place me'. *dākchē-k*, 'I lay';

Kanāshī *richi-mo*, 'asked', *picheu* ( *cheu*)-*ta -k* (and *ta-ng*), 'choose(s)', *ang-p pichi-gu-n*, 'me make-me-thou'.

Bu-nan *yen-chis-tang*, 'on having heard' *lochis-tang*, 'on having said'; *shichē-g*, 'I die', and a number of Participles, *leb-cha*, 'arriving', *shi-cha*, 'dying', *hyod-cha*, 'lost being', *skyid-po-lig-cha*, 'happy-making', *khug-sha-gyun*, 'to be got-proper', and a large number of others, *ma-gyun-shi*, 'not worthy

being', e.g. *lochi*, 'saying', where a *-chil-jül-shi* is recognized as a Gerund-Suffix (L.S., pp. 474-5);

Rangkas *sichān-sis*, 'dying was (am)';

Dārmiyā *hīchī-sī*, 'dying am', *lukch-o*, 'came', *tāch-o*, 'went';

Chaudāngsī *sichī-g-anī-ye*, 'id', *rirēchim-chu*, 'having arisen', *rachi-g*, 'rising'.

Byāngsī *hīchī-ye*, id.

Manifestly here, in Kun. *tachi* and Kan. *pichi* the 'me' of 'place me', 'make me', is otiose, having already been expressed by *angu* and *ang-pa*: moreover the sense of *ta[chi]* is not 'make', but 'set', 'place', 'appoint', as *yok-po-tā* in Dr. Bailey's own *Vocabulary* exemplifies. The impossibility of understanding *chi* in *sichī-*, 'die', common to nearly all the languages, is patent. In all the cases the value of the *-ch(i)* as equivalent to a 'Middle voice' is apposite: in *tachi-ny* the meaning will be not 'make me', but 'take for yourself', 'accept', and in *tāch-ō*, 'went', it will be 'betook himself'. It is noticeable, further, that in the 'give me' of the Parable not one of the texts uses a *chi* form. In regard to the *gō toncog*, 'I will beat thee', *ka' thū toncon*, 'why wilt thou beat me?', and other examples propounded in Dr. Bailey's Grammar (p. 666), not given as quotations, there are some particular doubts; but in general we may suggest that the object, 'me', 'you', etc., is simply not expressed, the sense of the *c (ch)* being what Hodgson defines (p. 282 n. [...]) as 'functional action', *tone* being 'give a beating'. The awkwardness of supposing that the *c (ch)* signifies sometimes 'me', sometimes 'you', cannot be overlooked.

The general conclusion is that the *chi* is simply a phonetical, 'phonematic', variation of the *shi*, as in Tibetan *cin/jin/zin/sin*. Its use in the Nepal (pronominalized) languages also proves a considerable antiquity: and this accounts for its serving as a ('Middle voice') theme forming not only Infinitives, such as *toshi-mig*, 'to sit', which it constantly does, but also the Participles in *a and o*, exemplified in the cited examples, which accordingly we propose to hyphenate as *lebeh-a*, *hyod-ch-a*, *khugsh-a*, *piche-o*, *tongch-o*, etc. The *sh* may originally have arisen chiefly in cases of *s-ch*, where in Tibetan it would be normal; but complete confusion in Bu-nan, at any rate, is seen in *grel-chi*, 'running', followed almost immediately by *khrel-shi*, 'clasping' (L.S., p. 476).

Other cases of extended Verb-stems, sometimes Denominative or borrowed or both, may be passed over as casual or otherwise non-significant here. Concerning reduplication of Verb-roots and concerning compounded Verbs, again, there is, it seems, nothing seriously distinctive to be adduced. Reduplication, though more common, no doubt, than in Tibetan, where it is perhaps restricted to onomatopoeic expressions and a frequentative or distributive sense, as in *byed-byed*, 'doing repeatedly' or 'each doing', is found by the L.S. (p. 428) to be rather characteristic of the more easterly languages, as in Chaudāngsī *syu-syung-tā*, 'made': from

Kunāwarī we may cite Paṇḍit Joshi's *tap-tap-yā-mig*, 'to feel or grope for', obviously frequentative. A syntactical use of reduplication which is non-Tibetan will be mentioned *infra*. Of Verb-compounds the usual classes, in which the second member signifies causality, possibility, necessity, wish, etc., have mostly, but not always, in Tibetan (see Jaeshke's *Grammar* (1929), p. 43, Foucaux, p. 56, and S. C. Das' Dictionary, s.v. *byed-pa*) an Infinitive Suffix (-*par*): and this is the case also with Kunāwarī (see Bailey, pp. 668-9, and *Lower Kanauri*, p. 65). In Vayu the Causatives (with -*ping*), Optatives (with -*dak*), Potentials (with -*pha*), etc. (Hodgson, *Essays*, I, pp. 278-9) dispense with the Suffix: so in Bāhing (*ibid*) pp. 390-1) the Causatives with -*pa*, 'make'. It seems possible that the -*ja*, *cha*, *za*, Infinitives of Bhotiya dialects (see Gerard, *op.cit*, p. 517-524, 539, and L.S., pp. 87, 92, 101) are all derived from a Tibetan *mdzad*, 'make', 'do'. The -*gvid-k*, -*gid-k*, -*kyid-k*, -*kid-k* used in Lower Kanauri (Bailey, *Linguistic Studies*, p. 56) to form the Preterite of Verbs, where the common dialect has *shid*, may very well be merely Tibetan *bgyid*, 'make', as a relatively modern loan.

#### 11. Suffixed elements in Declension and Conjugation.

In Tibetan the Suffixes signifying in the Noun Number and Case, are in general sufficiently constant and distinct. Mostly they are, or can be, written as separate syllables, and in some instances they are etymologically transparent: even where this is not the case, as in the instance of the Agential-Instrumental-Ablatival -*s*, the function is adequately distinct, whether the -*s* is appended to the Genitive in -*il-kyil-gil-gyi* or to the Locative -*na* or Dative -*la*. The Plural had an old Suffix -*cag/-cog*, expanded from a still earlier -*ca*; but, perhaps owing to non-expression of plurality where self-evident, this had become restricted to Pronouns of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Person, and plurality was expressed, where requisite, by new terms having substantial meanings, such as *rnams*, 'kinds' or 'instances' or 'instalments', *tsho*, 'group', *bstsogs*, 'etc', *man*, 'many'.

In the Tibeto-Burman languages the Suffixes for Number and Case, partly, no doubt from original independence, partly, as we see in the case of Greek and Latin, etc., from modifications of early common forms, partly from new combinations, e.g. for the signification of 'from among', and partly from substitution of synonyms, where there was a substantial meaning, e.g. of 'group', or 'class', for 'many' in the case of plural number. This variety is seen in Hodgson's Vayu and Bāhing (*Essays*, (1880), I, pp. 274-5, 356-7), where the divergence is complete. As regards the 'Western sub-group' the parallel Declensions in L.S., pp. 544-551, will show that the situation is not greatly different: and this is despite the fact that the L.S. schemes are naturally normalizing, whereas even in the single languages (see e.g., Gerard's Kunāwarī) there is sometimes a plethora of different Suffixes, even for

one same Case. In view of such variety and multiplicity, and also of the special liability of such Suffixal syllables to phonetical depravation, a general comparison with Tibetan, which is older than any of the languages by at least 1200 years, is here not relevant: even in the instances where a partial phonetic correspondence is possible conjecture in detail seems frivolous. Hence we may restrict ourselves to a few certainties which have indubitable significance. Such are

(1) the ancient *-r*-Locative, sometimes, with appended vowel, *ru*, seen in Tib. *der*, 'there', *hdir*, 'here', *yar/mar*, 'above/'below', *byed-par*, 'in doing', 'to do', etc., etc., and abundantly instanced in *Nam* (pp. 173-5, 193). This, exemplified also, as the 'old terminative' (see L.S., pp. 35, 42, 55), in the W. Tibetan dialects and in some Nepal languages (*ibid.*, pp. 184, 191, 286), is attested in Manchatī (p. 454), Ch.-Lahulī (p. 462), Rangkas (p. 480), Dāmiyā, Chaudāngsī (p. 505), with probable survivals elsewhere. Its apparent absence from most Nepal languages supports the conclusion that it was proper originally to Tibet. On vowels appended to the *-r* see *infra*.

(2) The regular *-s*, Agential-Instrumental, of Tibetan Nouns and Pronouns, also Ablatival when appended to *na*, 'in', and *la*, 'to', is likewise found in the W. Tibetan dialects (L.S., p. 35, Balti, p. 42, Purik (after consonants *-is*), p. 55, Ladakī (after consonants *-is*, also *-si* and *-sis*). In the W. Pronominalized group we have Kunāwarī (p. 432) *-s*, Kanāshī (p. 443) *-sh* and *-s*, Rangkas (p. 480) *-s*, *-si*, *-sō*, *-sū*, Dāmiyā (p. 491) *-s* and *-sū*, Chaudāngsī (p. 504) *-s*, *-sē*, *-si*, *-sai*, Byāngsī (p. 518) *-s*, *-sē*. The Bhotiya dialects, Nyamkat and Jāḍ (p. 87), have *-su*, which in Garhwāl (p. 101 and Gerard, p. 539), as also in the Kunāwar Tibar-skad (Gerard, p. 544), is Ablatival. Of the Nepal languages only the most Westerly, Gurung (pp. 183-4) and Murmi (p. 190), have *-si*, *-se* (with *-chi*, *-chhi*, *-di*, *-jī*), and Newārī (p. 216) has *-se-na*, *-si-na*, with a commoner *-na*, or *-ña*. Thus this *-s*, again, was not original in Nepal.

The vowels here seen appended to the ancient *-r* and *-s* Suffixes have little precedent in Tibetan. The *-r* indeed is in Tibetan sometimes *-ru*, and there is a *-su*-Locative, which, however, can hardly be connected with the *-s*-Agential: in these instances the *-u* may be a survival of the *-o* of the two ancient Nouns *ro*, '(large) area', and *so*, 'space', whence the two Suffixes will have been descended. In the actual Pronominalized languages the appending of vowels to originally final consonants is a general characteristic, which we shall encounter again in the case of Conjugation: we have the impression that the appendages are in origin not grammatical, but rhetorical, expressing variations of emphasis or interest, or feeling for sound, and that accordingly they are partly interjectional: here we recall the remarks of Gerard (*A Vocabulary*, p. 538) concerning the 'greatest regard'

which 'in the tenses of verbs, as well as in whole sentences' the Kunāwarī pay to sound, and the observation of the L.S. (p. 239) concerning some Verbal suffixes in Lepcha used 'with an indefinite meaning, without reference to time'. It seems to be a fact that some peoples are more apt than others to make play with their means of expression. But in the 'Western sub-group' we find also, both in Declension and Conjugation, a number of vocalic Suffixes with functional significance, e.g. Kunāwarī *-u/-o* Genitives and Locatives, *-ā* and *-o* -Participles, which, not being paralleled, in Tibetan, we here pass over as possibly of extraneous origin.

In Conjugation, as being the main sphere of the pronominalization, extraneous non-Tibeto-Burman elements might be expected to be most clearly detectable. But the identification of such would demand a comparison of the other 'pronominalized' groups, a large and difficult matter with which we are not prepared to deal. Provisionally it may be remarked that, even where a particular idiom, e.g. incorporation of a sign for the Object, is borrowed, the actual symbol may have been native material: thus, if for, e.g. a 1<sup>st</sup> Personal Object, a symbol, with a form such as *g*, is used, it is not likely that it is derived from anything other than Tibeto-Burman *na*, 'I'.

As regards the order of the elements in the complex Verb-forms, it would appear from various analyses in the L.S. that the symbol for the Object regularly follows the main Verb, forming with it a composite notion, e.g. 'strike me', 'strike you': then comes any formative or Auxiliary of the main Verb, with Tense or Mood Suffixes, followed by the symbols for the Subject and sometimes a terminal Suffix signifying 'is', i.e. an affirmation: an example might be *tong-sh-ō-to-n*, 'strike-self-being-art-thou' (L.S., p. 434); if the Tense were Preterite, *to-n* would be *to-ke-n*: the final 'is' is here not present, and the *ke* of *to-ke* is Suffix of the Preterite.

In this example one rather fundamental matter is involved. The *-ō* is not a separate element; save for a special purpose here the L.S. might have printed *tongsho* (cf. *lodo-du*, p. 435), which is simply a *ō*- participle of the 'Middle Voice' Verb *tong-shi-mig* (Joshī's 'to be beaten'), while from *tong-mig*, 'to beat', the form is *tongō*. This raises the whole question what is the Verb-stem of which the pronominal affix indicates the object. The regular insertion of the *sh* before the *-ō* of *tongshō*, etc., proves that the Verb-stem of the type *tongshi* had attained recognition as a complete unity; and this is, no doubt, a proof of the antiquity of the idiom. The question arises how far the recognition of such secondary Verb-stems, usually disyllabic, extends: various cases having been exemplified *supra*, the matter may here rest. In Kunāwarī Verb-compounds, such as Causatives (with *-sem*), Portentials (with *-ham*), etc., evidently do not attain this unification, since the first of the two Verbs has an Infinitive form and so is a Noun of Action: this is noticeable, since in Vayu and Bāhing (Hodgson, *Essays* (1880), pp. 279, 283, 390

-1) the causal Auxiliary, *-ping* or *-pā*, is inseparable from the main root.

The use of the Auxiliaries *to-* and *ta-*, both of early Tibetan origin and signifying respectively 'be/become' and 'make/do', has already been discussed, with the conclusion that in the 'Western sub-group' what precedes the *-to-* (also *-du-*, where this is substituted) is a Participle (Present in *-ō*, Preterite in *-s*), while what precedes *-ta-* is a Verbal Noun. With the original difference of signification will have been connected the difference of Syntax exemplified in Paṅdit Joshī's distinction of Present *gü* (etc., Nominative) *chē-tak*, 'I write', from Future *güs* (etc., Agential)-*chē-tak*, 'I will write'. Though Joshī everywhere prints *tak*, the Nominatives *gü*, etc., in the former, as also in *gü-cheō-tak* (or *duk*), 'I am writing', show that the *tak* is a verb of 'being', whereas in the Future the Agential *güs*, etc., proves that it is a Verb of doing. Dr. Bailey, who does not recognize (p. 665) the Agential Case with the Future, though he prints an example of it on p. 607, and who in the Present prints *-tog* 'and in the Preterite *-tokeg*', has in the Future *tög*, of which, in his system, the *ō* represents, as in *sömüdrön*, an ancient native *a*: he also records in the Future (p. 669) dialectical forms *-tog* 'and *tag*'. In Kanāshī also confusion can be seen (L.S., p. 445) in *royo-ta-n* (for *to-n*). 'dwellst', *royo-to*, 'he lives', *bura-tak*, 'he comes', *bura-ch-to*, 'he will come', *khuleo-to*, 'melts': in Ch. -Lahulī also the forms *tod-*, 'be', are mixed with *tad*; in Kunāwarī we have taken note of *bi-tog*, 'will go', in immediate vicinity of *lō-tag*, 'will say' (L.S., p. 439); and with *lodo-du*, 'says', or 'said', in which the *-du* (Tib. *hdug*) is essentially unactive, we have several occurrences of Agential case of the speaker's name. The confusion, therefore, is not merely phonetical, as might seem from the divergence between Joshī, Dr. Bailey and L.S. Even in English we can in some cases say 'do be', 'did be'; and a consistent discrimination of 'be' and 'do' is perhaps beyond the capacity of our frail humanity: moreover, even from the first a *-to* form was possible not only from action Verbs, if Intransitive, as in *bi-to*, 'gone', but even from Transitives, if taken as Passive, e.g. *lan-to*, 'done'. It may therefore be not superfluous to note (1) that the Auxiliary in the form *-du[k]* seems never to occur without the Participial form in *-o*, as in *lodo-duk*, and (2) that in the more easterly languages, where the *-to-*, unless occasionally represented by a *-tū-*, is entirely wanting, its place being taken by *nī-* or *lhi*, 'be, become', the numerous *ta-* forms practically always have Subjects in the Agential Case and are therefore 'do' -forms. There does not appear to be any difficulty in understanding the various *-ta-* affixes, Indicative or Participial, in the several languages (see L.S., pp. 445, 456, 463, 474, 482, 493, 507-9, 520-1) as this same; more especially as, with addition of the Preterite Suffix *-s*, e.g. in Rangkas *chhē-ta-s*, 'divided', *pukta-s*, 'gate', (Dārmiyā *pug-ta-su*), cf. Bu-nan *thit-tad*, 'gave', Dārmiyā *khwai-ta*, 'digs', they frequently serve as Preterites.

Having already renounced the notion of explaining from Tibetan the somewhat numerous Conjugational Suffixes consisting of single vowels, *a*, *o*, *u*, etc., e.g. in *lan-ā*, 'did', *lan-ō*, 'doing', we may confine our attention to two highly prolific and wide-spread Suffixes in regard to which the contrary may be confidently propounded. These are —

(1) -*m*- Suffix in Infinitive or Verbal Noun.

The Tibetan Suffix *-ma*, no doubt quite distinct from *ma*, 'mother', which is also sometimes a general Feminine Affix, is found as a formative in Adjectives, e.g. *goñ-ma*, 'superior', *bar-ma*, 'middle', *rñiñ-ma*, 'old', *bla-ma*, 'high', and also in Nouns of Verbal derivation, whether signifying an occurrence or the occurrent, e.g. *gtor-ma*, 'offering' or 'oblation', *skyel-ma*, 'escort', *mchi-ma*, 'tear', *skar-ma*, 'star', *slob-ma*, 'pupil'. It is thus supplemental to *-pa/-ba*, which in accordance with its etymology implies an activity. It is perhaps far older than *-pa/-ba*, since it did not share the restriction of these to the South-eastern dialects of Tibet, and a *mo* form of it, seen in *mod*, is in Tibetan an isolated survival: it may have been the earliest form of the Verb Substantive, 'be'. This interpretation is supported by numerous occurrences wide-spread in and beyond the 'Western sub-group'.

In the first place, some of the westerly languages of Nepal, Gurung (L.S., p. 185: see also pp. 264-7), Murmi (p. 192), have *mu* as the usual form of the Verb Substantive: and in the former it serves also, along with *-ma*, as Suffix of the Future Tense. Of the 'pronominalized' languages Rai (pp. 377, 419-420) has the same *mo/mu*, 'be'; and in Limbu (p. 420) the Infinitive Suffix is *-mā*, in Vayu (*ibid.* and Hodgson, *Essays* (1880), p. 277) it is *-mung*. In the 'Western sub-group' practically all the languages have *-m* Infinitives: thus —

Kunāwarī *-m* in *bī-m*, 'to go', *hachi-m*, 'to be', *za-m* 'to eat', *dhoyā-mo*, 'to wash', with an extended form *-mig*, and a Gerund *-mā*, *bī-mā* (Paṇḍit Joshi's 'Subjunctive'). The Sum-cho dialect has *-ma*, and the Tibar-skad sometimes *-mung* (*-mañ*) in place of its usual, Tibet-derived, *-pung/-bung* (*-pañ/-bañ*) (Gerard, pp. 544, 550); 'Lower Kanaurī' (Bailey, p. 55) *-mū/-mu*.

Kanāshī *-m* in *yang-m*, 'to live', *ruang-m*, 'to feed', etc., etc, *-mig* in *hachi-mig* (L.S., pp. 438, 440).

Manchatī sometimes *-mi*, *kuti-mi*, 'to say' (L.S., p. 45).

Ch.-Lahulī *-mi*, *kuñ-mī*, 'to say'; *-mā*, *te-mā*, 'to strike' (p. 464).

Bu-nan *-men* (*-ma-yin*), *khya-men*, 'to be';

*-chum* (< *-chim* < *chi-yim*, L.S. *cha-m*), *tig-chum*, 'to cover', etc., etc. (p. 475).

Rangkas *-m*, *sai-m*, 'to strike', *lhe-m*, 'to be', *le-mum*, 'to say', *-mo*, *di-mō-k*, 'going' (p. 483).

Dārnīyā *-m/-mō/-mū*, *gā-m*, 'to make', *jā-mā*, 'to eat', *lhe-mo*, 'to say', *pā-mū*, 'to

measure' (p. 494).

Chandāngsī -*mī*, *dī-m*, 'to go', *jā-m*, 'to eat', *rānga-m*, 'to sell' (p. 509).

Byāngsī -*mī-mo*, *pim-m*, 'to fill', *lo-m*, 'to say', *jā-mō*, 'to eat' (p. 521).

These abundant Infinitives, in which the *m*-Suffix is always attached immediately to the root or at least to the Conjugation base, are, as the L.S. constantly remarks, nothing but Verbal Nouns, and can be used as Subjects or Objects: sometimes, as in Kunāwarī *zā-mō*, Bu-nan *zā-men*, 'food', the meaning becomes quite concrete. The equivalence to the Tibetan *-ma* seems incontestable.

The vowels *ā*, *ō*, *ū*, which we find appended to the *m* are not different in form, or apparently in function, from what we have had, and shall again have, occasion to remark in connection with Nominal Suffixes: evidently they are characteristic of the languages. In the form *-mo/-mu*, used as a Tense Suffix, Future in Manchatī (p. 457, *teng-mo-g*, 'I shall strike') and Ch.-Lahulī (p. 464 *ra[n]-mo-r*, 'they will give') the *o*, if not simply descended from Tib. *mo[d]*, can hardly be other than the Participial *-o* of *lodo*, etc., used with and also without, the Auxiliaries *du-*, *to-*, as a Tense-Suffix. In Kanāshī (p. 446) *-mo* in *lon-mo*, 'said' *shan-mo-g*, 'I did', *richi-mo*, 'he asked', the *-mu* of *rai-mu-k*, 'he gave', and the *-me* of *to-me-k*, 'I struck', and in Ch.-Lahulī *ram-ma-te-r*, 'gave they', the Tense is Preterite; but such differences of Tense are unimportant in these languages: and, in fact, the *-e* of *-me* and *-te* and the *-k* may account for the Tense. The *-ma*, whether equivalent to the *-ma* of Kunāwarī Gerunds or having the *-a* of Ch.-L. *zea-to-re*, 'they ate', (p. 457, see *supra*, p. 103), belongs to the system. Bu-nan (p. 474) has the *-men* of its Infinitive and Noun forms, also in Preterites, *lig-men* (< *-ma-yin*), 'has done', etc. (L.S., p. 474).

The above is by no means a complete account of the *m*-Suffix, which is, no doubt, deeply rooted in the whole 'pronominalized' group.

## (2) -s- Preterite (or Aorist).

In Tibetan practically all Verbs, whether terminating in vowel or consonant, have, or can have, where phonetically allowable, a Preterite-Aorist in *-s*: sometimes even disallowed endings, such as *-ds*, *-rs*, *-ls*, are casually or dialectically attested: the Imperative also usually shows the *-s* or traces of it.

This ancient Verbal formation, likewise prevalent in Nam (see *Nam ...*, pp. 195, 197-8), has in Tibetan given rise to numerous Nouns in *-s*, e.g. *ḥbras*, 'rice', *rtsas*, 'harvest', *rtsis*, 'reckoning', *ḥdus*, 'assemblage', *skyed*s, 'interest', *gos*, 'garment', *zlos*, 'spell', *khirms*, 'law'. As to the W. Tibetan languages it suffices to refer to L.S., where it is reported as normal for Balti (p. 37), Purik (p. 44), Ladaki (p. 57). In the 'Western sub-group' the L.S. records it as occurring in all the languages, in some of them as the main Preterite formation. In the following selection we shall

distinguish as A the cases where the *-s* is appended to original Verb-roots, and as B those where it is appended to developed Verb-stems or Verbs compounded with Auxiliaries; we may cite —

- Kunāwarī, A *ke-so*, 'of having given';  
 B *hachi-s*, 'became', or 'having become', *parā-s*, 'got'  
*tōshi-s*, 'seated', *tong-shid-s*, 'beaten',  
*sorshi-s*, 'having arisen', *tang-shi-s*, 'having appeared',  
*rangyo-s*, 'gave', *zalgyo-s*, 'visited', etc., etc.;
- Kanāshī, A *to-z*, 'beating', *bung-s-ta*, 'going'.  
 B
- Manchatī, A *khog-si-mi*, 'the having found', *khog-si[ri]*, 'has been found',  
*lha-si[-tod]*, 'is made', *tha-zi*, 'heard'.
- Ch.-Lahulī, A *kho-si*, 'was found', *kho-sa*, 'obtained';  
 B *thuā-si*, 'rejected';
- Bu-nan, A *dā-zā*, 'gave', *el-zā*, 'went', *ni-zā*, 'was', *thir-zā*, 'gave', *lig-zā*,  
 'did', etc., etc., *ra-s[-tang]*, 'having come', *do-s[-tang]*,  
 'being found';  
 B *lochi-s[-tang]*, 'having said', *lig-ki-za*, 'have done', *yenchi-s*  
 [-*tang*], 'hearing';
- Rangkas, A *lē(lī)-s*, 'said', *pā-s*, 'sent', *si-s*, 'was', etc., *pōk-si[-chas]*,  
 'having died';  
 B *sai-s*, 'killed', *danu-s*, 'gave', *tān-gan-su*, 'got', *sunai-s*,  
 'heard', *chhēta-s*, 'divided', *pukta-s*, 'set', *rhain-si[-ch]*,  
 'lived', *gān-si(-ch, syach)*, 'did', *jān-si(-ch)*, 'ate', *dōng-n-*  
*si(ch)*, 'were grazing'.
- Dārmīyā, A *lhē-su*, 'said', *phung-sū*, 'sent', *di-si*, 'I went', *tāng-su*, 'got',  
*syong-si - chu*, 'lived', *syong-si-n*, 'body'.  
 B *gāya-su*, 'did', *dān-su*, 'gave', *tāngnū-sū*, 'got', *pugta-su*, 'set',  
*parkē-su*, 'spent'.
- Chaudāngsī, A *lhi-s*, 'said', *nī-s*, 'was', *tan-s*, 'saw', *syung-s*, 'was made';  
 B *dēya-s*, 'it went', *sēga-s*, 'struck', *bujāyē-s*, 'entreated'.
- Byāngsī, A *nī-sō*, 'was', *rā-sō*, 'came', *lō-sō*, 'said', *tāg-so*, 'am';  
 B *san-s*, 'struck', *dīya-so*, 'they went', *syūngun-sō*, 'have done',  
*yangsī-so*, 'heard', *manyāi-so*, 'entreated', *dānan-so*, 'gave'.

It appears that, except in one case, the *s-* Suffix follows immediately the Verb-stem, which is either (A) the root or (B) a secondary Verb-stem or Auxiliary, such as we have already distinguished: in *chheta-s*, *pug-ta-sū*, *pukta-s*, the *ta* is the familiar Auxiliary *ta*, which forms with the root a compound Verb: in place of *ta* the more easterly languages often use the root *nī*, 'be', 'become', e.g. in Dārmīyā

*tang-ni-su, tāngnu-ni-chu*, 'were getting', *jānu-ni-chū*, 'were eating'. In *tong-shid-s* the *shid*, regularly used in Kunāwari as formative of the Preterite, and, like *khom*, interpreted by the L.S.(pp. 474-5) as signifying 'finish', is likewise, as we shall see, an ancient Auxiliary Verb. The Preterite Indicative, given by Joshī and Bailey (p. 666) as *shid* (but p. 667, *shids*) is properly, no doubt, as frequently (L.S., p. 436), *shid-s*.

In most other cases the amplified Verb-stem is recognizable as a Participle, such as in the Present Tense is found preceding the Auxiliary *-to/-ta*: thus *-ā* -Participle (*supra*, p. 104) in *-sya-ch*, 'being', = *-si-ch*, *gāya* (= *gā-a-su*, 'made', *deyā* (and *diya*, < *di-a-sō*, 'went'; *-ka/-ga* Participle, properly Preterite, in *sēga-s*, 'struck', *tālēg-s*, 'transgressed'; *-n/-o* Participle in *dānu-s*, 'gave', *jānu-ni-chu*, 'was eating', *tāngnū-sū*, 'got'; *-lan* Participle or Gerund (frequent in Dāmiyā) in *tānglan-chu*, 'seeing', *hvilan-chū*, 'calling', etc.,etc.

In general such amplified Verb-stems present no real problem, obviously not in English, where anything that functions as a Verb can have a Proterite in *-ed*. But in regard to the cases with *n* and *g*, such as *san-s*, *jan-si-ch*, *syungan-so*, *dega-s* an interpretation has been propounded which seems to affect the general economy of the languages.

The L.S., which in dealing, very compressedly, with the specially bewildering multitude of Verb-formatives in the more westerly languages usually seems to 'hit the right nail on the head', here (p. 508) regards the *-n-* and also the *-ga-*, as a pronominal Infix, *n* signifying the 2<sup>nd</sup> (or 1<sup>st</sup>) Person, *g* only the 1<sup>st</sup>. A similar view is taken (pp. 473-4) of a Bu-nan 'infix' *ki/kyul/ku* as signifying an Object of the 1<sup>st</sup> Person, and of a *n* in *nin-za*, 'wast', as signifying the 2<sup>nd</sup>.

A *g/k* signifying a Subject of the 1<sup>st</sup> Person, and an *n* signifying a Subject of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Person have been made evident in the languages of the 'Western sub-group'; but they are always appended to the last Verbal element and are nearly always the last part of the Verbal expression. A similar employment to denote the Personal Object and a position immediately following the main Verb-stem, which was the rule, would have confused the use of the language: not to know whether *san-s* signified 'killed you' or 'you killed' would be awkward indeed; and with a *n* which, as here formulated, can denote a 1<sup>st</sup> Person, which elsewhere it never does, as well as a 2<sup>nd</sup> Person, what is the hearer to understand by *san-si-n*, 'kill me, or thee, or even him, did thou?' or why the two *n*'s in Bu-nan *danza-na*, 'gavest-thou'?

In the actual texts Nominative and Agential Cases of the Personal Pronouns, and also of other Subjects are nearly always, it may be said, except in mixed contexts involving both Transitive and Intransitive, e.g. 'coming, saw', clearly distinguished. The Nominative is regular with Verb-forms expressing 'being' or containing such Verbs as Auxiliaries e.g. *nī* or *thēllhī* in the more easterly

languages: with 'come', 'go', and sometimes 'give', also the Nominative. The Indo-Āryan restriction of the Agential Case to the Preterite is not observed.

A complication in this matter is exemplified in the following: —

In the Kunāwarī version of the Parable the terminal passage may be summarized as follows; —

'When thy son (Nom.) came (*bodā*) ... by thee (*kas*) a fattened goat was killed (*shub-shub*). By the father (*bonōs*, Agential, but it should be Nominative) saying is (*lodo-du*), 'Son, thou (*ka*) ever with me art (*to-n*) ... thy (*kan*) brother dead (*shī-shī*) was (*to-k*), again living (*shōng-gī*) is become (*hachi-s*), lost gone (*sho-bi-bī*) was (*to-ke*), again is obtained (*porē-dā*)'.

Here *bod-ā*, 'came', and *porē-dā*, 'is obtained' are Intransitive Verbs; so also *bī-bī* and *shī-shī*: they have Subjects in the Nominative. *Shub-shub* is treated as Passive, with Subject in the Agential Case. *To-ke*, Preterite of *to*, and *hachi-s*, Preterite or Past Participle of *hachi-* have no Personal ending; but *to-n*, 'art', has *-n*, signifying the 2<sup>nd</sup> Person.

In the Kanāshī version we find —

'When that son (Nom.) came (*bura-k*), thou (*ko*) gavest (*ran-ta-n*) to eat and to drink'. Him-by was said (*lon-mo*), 'My son, thou (*ko*) with me ever dwellest (*royo-ta-n*) ... thy (*kan-ka*) brother dead (*shī-go-n*), now alive-become (*shug-ashi-g*), lost (*bi-go-n*), now found (*lam-shi-g*, or *mīle-k*)'.

Here the *-n* of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Person is seen in *ran-ta-n* and *royo-ta-n*; but the *-n* of *shī-go-n* and *bi-go-n* is manifestly different; and the *k* of *bura-k* is not the *-g* of the 1<sup>st</sup> Person, but the *k* of the Preterite, and the *-g* of *ashi-g* and *lam-shi-g* is probably the same, understood as Aorist: so also *mīle-k*. These have their Subjects in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Person.

The *-g/-k* in its Personal function is certainly normal. In Kunāwarī, for example, we have *shio-g*, 'I die', *lo-ta-g*, 'will say', *maig*, 'am not', *dākchē-k*, etc., all with Nominative 'I'. So in the other western languages, but apparently not at all in the more easterly, Rangkas, etc. In Manchatī we have the normal *-g* in *sivā-to-g*, 'die', *yo-g*, 'will go', *kuo-g*, 'will say', *to-g*, 'am', *lha-to-g*, 'have done'; but also *lha-i-ga*, where, since we also find *ra-i-na*, 'gavest' and *shar-i-na*, 'killed', with a similar *-na* and a 'thou' in the Agential Case (but not so in *to-to-na*, 'art'), the *gve*. 'I', is probably likewise Agential: this is confirmed by Ch.-Lahulī, which has the *yo-g*, *ko-g*, *lha-te-g*, also *pimā-de-g*, 'I might fill', with Nominatives, but *lhe-ga* with Agential. So, again, Bu-nan *shī-chē-g*, 'I die', but *gal-len-gya*, 'transgressed', with Agential, which likewise is used in *dan-za-na*, 'gavest' (*bis*). In these cases it is apparent that the *-k/-ga* forms are really the *-ka/-ga* Participle of the Preterite, which in comparatively early times generated the Preterite Suffix *-ke* < *-ka-i*. With this would be connected the frequent *-k/-g*, *-kai/-gai*, Gerunds and Participles of

Rangkas, etc.

The *-n* has already been shown in action as 2<sup>nd</sup> Person Suffix, but also as used of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Person; and also a *-na* in Manchatī, Ch.-Lahulī and Bu-nan which is a Participle. In Ch.-Lahulī, though *to-do-n*, 'art', has a Nominative Subject, *ran-dē-n*, 'gave', and *shāiā-de-n*, 'killed', have the Agential, 'by thee'. As a preliminary to the particular point which we have to discuss, chiefly in connection with the more easterly languages, we may cite some transparent examples of the idiom: —

The heading 'Whose for another digs a pit falls into it himself' is rendered by —

Rangkas 'By whom ... pit digs (*khvā-da*), he falls(?)(*din-g*);

Dārmiyā 'By whom ... -----(*khvai-tā*), himself in it falls (*dī-nī*);

Chaudāngsī 'Who ... pit digs (*khvē-ta*), himself into [it] falls (*gan-nī*);

Byāngsī 'Who ... -----(*khva-tā*), himself that-in falls (*gang-gan*).

Here 'digs', with 'do' Suffix *ta*, partly affected by *-i* addition to root, accords with both Agential and Nominative of the Subject. The Verb 'falls' has in Rangkas its Subject in the Nominative: similarly, no doubt, the next two, since the Verb is compounded with the Auxiliary *nī*, 'be'. Neither the *-g* nor the *-n* in *gang-gan* is Personal. The *-g* of *din-g* is likely to be the frequent *-g/-k* of Gerunds and Participles; and that its *-n*, and similarly the *-n* of *-gan*, are participles we are inclined to infer from *rhain-si-ch*, 'lived', *gān-sya-ch*, 'making', *gān-si-ch*, 'made', *dōng-n-si-ch*, 'were grazing', *sin-dē-ch*, 'leaving' (cf. *si-tas ... dē-ch*, 'left and went'). In the other languages we have many more such *-n* Participles *syong-sin-nī-chu*, 'was living', *jā-gan*, 'were eating', *yāng-si-gan*, 'wished', *da-nan*, 'gave', *jānu-nī-chu*, 'were eating', *tāngnu-nī-chū*, 'were getting', *syong-si-n*, 'livedest', *jān-si-ch*, 'ate', *si-chān*, 'dying', *dānu-s*, 'gavest', *rhaisa-n*, 'livedest', *pyūsa-n*, 'filled', *tāsa-n*, 'put'. In none of these, except Dārmiyā *syong-si-n*, 'livedest', and Rangkas, *rhai-sa-n*, is there a possibility of any but the 3<sup>rd</sup> Person. These two, with Subjects in the Nominative, occur in corresponding passages; but in the same languages we find the 3<sup>rd</sup> Person *syong-si-n-nī-chū*, 'were living'; and *rhai-sa-n* is almost immediately followed by *si-n*, 'is'. The Verb-forms ending in *-ti-nan* (Byāngsī) are all of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Person. The fact that in the two neighbouring Indo-Āryan languages, Kumaonī and Garhwāli, an *-n* serves the same two functions of Participle and 3<sup>rd</sup> Person, suggests that the idiom is borrowed thence: but the above cited Kanāshī *shi-go-n*, etc., Manchatī *ra-i-na* and *shari-na* and Bu-nan *dan-za-na*, instill caution; and the supposition that Tibetan *yin* is the original is still maintainable.

In the above cases a view of the *n* as Personal Suffix would hardly have been entertained by the L.S. We would propose to exclude further all cases of the kind exemplified by —

Rangkas (p. 486) *gussu gul-pair-tā nyāpan malā-ku rach lik ma-dā-nu-s*

'by thee any time one small goat of kid even not gavest  
(read was given)'

Here, as we see, *dānu* must be the Participle *dāno* (cf. *gāno* p. 487), and the sense is Passive, and the Person not 2<sup>nd</sup> but 3<sup>rd</sup>. Similar is the case of Dārmiyā (p. 498) *ga-sū* ('by thee') ... *ma dān-sū* ('not given'), Byāngsī (p. 525), *ga-sai* ('by thee') ... *ma danan-sō*, Rangkas *ga-su* ('by thee') ... *tāngan-su* ('was got'), Chaudāngsī (p. 513) *ga-s* ('by thee') ... *ma dāna-s* ('was not given'), Byāngsī (p. 524) *jī-se* ('by me') ... *pāp syūn-gan-so* ('sit was made'), (p. 527) *gassai*, ('by thee') ... *tin-so* ('were got').

In all such cases an indication of the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> Person by the *n* is manifestly otiose, and the (Passive) Subject of the Verb is actually expressed by some word in what we should regard as the Nominative Case. If a reference is made to Indo-Āryan languages in which a similar construction of Agential Case Passive Verb is no longer so understood by the normal speaker and hearer, the indication of the Person by an infix in the Verb is still otiose: and that in the 'Western sub-group', as in Tibetan, the difference between Agential and Nominative is by no means obscured will be apparent to any one who will give particular attention to the dialogue passages in the texts.

In view of the frank recognition by the L.S. (pp. 482, 493, 520) that the *-n*-forms are not confined to the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Persons, which amounts, in fact, to an admission that they can never discriminate either of them, but must signify something common to all, it is rather difficult to deal with all the instances where, in fact, the 2.5. does expressly recognize the Personal sense. Here we are concerned only with the cases where the *n* is an Infix; but we may in passing express the view that in the more easterly group, Rangkas, etc., it is even as an ending never Personal. How can the *-n* of *rhaisa-n* and *syongsi-n* signify 'I', and that of *disi-n*, 'you', when we have *di-n*, 'he goes', *dī-n*, 'they go', *di-n-g*, 'he falls', *dī-ga-n*, 'he goes', and when *le-sa-n* signifies merely 'word' or 'said'. This difficulty covers also some cases of Infix *-n*; how can *di-n-so* mean 'wentest', *dī-nī-so*, and *de-nī-so* 'you went', *dī-nē-so*, 'we went', when *rai-nī* means 'he comes'? and how can *nī-sin-su* mean 'I was', 'we were', 'you were', *tū-nī-su*, *to-na-sū*, 'boughtest', when *nī-san-su* means 'he was'? The case of *syung-n-so*, 'I did', beside being put out of court by the above-cited *ḍōng-n-si-ch*, 'were grazing', is further disqualified by having its Person in Agential Case, wherein it is joined by *dā-nu-s*, 'gavest', *tāng-an-sū*, *tāng-nū-sū*, *tin-so*, 'gottest'. What remains, partly not derived from the actual texts and consequently perhaps explicable, is perhaps confined to *san-so*, 'we struck', *san-s*, *sen-s*, 'struckest' (*sē-s*, 'you struck', *sē-ga-s*, 'I struck', *sai-gas*, 'I have struck', *dā-ga-s*, 'I have given', *tālē-g-s*, 'I transgressed', to which we may add Byāngsī (*syang-gai*-)*tā-g-so*, 'I am doing'. In the last we should recognise the very

common Present Participle in *-g/-k*, mentioned *supra* (p. 137): so also perhaps in *tālē-g-s*, which, however, since the Person is in the Agential Case, belongs to those cited above. *Dā-ga-s*, since we have also the Participle *da-gai*, 'giving', contains, no doubt, that Participle, and the same would apply to *sē-ga-s* and *sai-ga-s*, for which we have no text. Chaudāngsī *da-na-s* and *syung-na-s* (also Rangkas *dānu-s*) have likewise their Person in the Agential: concerning *tō-na-s*, *tō-ni-s* information is lacking, as also concerning *san-s*, *san-sō*, *sen-s*, wherein, however, the *-n* may be, as in Kunāwarī, derived from the original *-d* of the root (*sad*).

We have, however, to account for the *n* of *dāna*, and the other *-na/-n-* forms, along with the *-no/-nu* Participles, *ga-no*, 'doing', *jā-nu*, 'eating', etc., and the very frequent Gerunds, *ga-nī*, 'having', 'done', *rhā-nē*, 'bringing', *sī-nē*, 'leaving', and the first *n* in Bu-nan *dan-za-na*, 'given'. This we have so far attempted by supposing either that these *n-* forms are borrowed from Indo-Āryan, which is all the more credible as the root *dā-* 'give', itself, along with *dāna*, 'gift', is likely to have been taken over thence, or else the *n* is derived from Tibetan *yin*, 'is', 'being'. There exist certain *n-* forms, such as *gan-si-ch*, 'doing', *jān-si-ch*, 'eating', in which the *n*, probably because the Subjects are of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Person, is not cited in the L.S. as exemplifying *n-* Infix. Among these forms are one or two, Rangkas *rhain-si-ch*, 'lived', *taing-si-d*, 'brought', which contain not only the *-i*, which we have proposed to derive from Tibetan *yin*, but also the *-n* of the latter. In comparison with *rhai-ch*, 'living', *nhai-ch*, 'stayed', [*ka-]**rhai-ch*, 'stopped', it looks as though the *-n-* were either a survival or an insertion of the *-n* of *yin*, which, in fact, exists in such phrases as Byāngsī *ji-gai in*, '[whatever] mine is', *jo u-sai ra-si-d in*, 'what by him had been brought', *syongh-si-d in*, 'is sitting', *in-an*, 'is' (L.S., p. 520). In the L.S. itself (*ibid*) the *-n* in some of the Verb-suffixes in *-n*, e.g. *-ga-n/-ka-n*, *-ta-n*, is conjectured to contain the Verb *in*.

Accordingly the forms such as *rhain-ch* lend some support to the view that the Verb-forms such as *rai-* contain the Verb *yin*, 'is'; the *n* may be supposed to have been in these (later) easterly languages preserved or restored through intercourse with Tibet. The earlier *-ai* forms, lacking the *-n*, have an *-i*, which is proved by more westerly forms, e.g. Bu-nan *gor-ka*, 'delaying' (cf. Byāngsī and Chaudāngsī *ro-kai*, 'grazing'), *si-cha*, 'dying', *lig-cha*, 'making' (of. Rangkas *dī-chai*, 'going'), to be an addition: it seems likely that the *-i* < *yin* was appended to make explicit the Participial function of the *-ka/-ga*, *-ca/-cha*, *-tha*, Suffixes, in themselves merely Adjectival. This would account for the constant retention of the *-i* in Verb-composition, e.g. *thok-thai-chū*, *khvi-thai-chū*. The probably early loss of the *-n* of *yin* has analogies even in Tibetan, see e.g. Jaeschke-Francke, *Grammar*, p. 120: its survival, with loss of the *-i*, in *-gan*, *-nan*, etc., requires further consideration.

The general conclusion here indicated is that what in the rather complex Verb-

forms precedes the Tense, etc., indication by the *-s/ch* is either (1) a root, as in *ga-s*, *ga-su*, 'made', *di-s*, *di-su*, *di-chu*, 'went'; or (2) an expanded root or Verbstem, as in *buda-*, 'come', *porē-* 'be obtained', *pirā-* 'return', *kudī-*, 'say', including the reflexive, or Middle-Voice, forms in *chī/shī*, such as *hachī-*, 'become', *śichī-*, 'die', *tōshī-*, 'sit'; or (3) an Auxiliary, *tā-*, 'make', *to/tu*, 'be', *nī-*, 'be' or 'become', Kunawari *gyo* (?): or (4) a Gerund, such as those in *gai*, *thai*, *-nē*, *-lan/lin*, *-k/g*, or a Participle such as *ga-no-*, 'making', *jā-nu-*, 'eating', *dīya*, 'going', *syungan-*, 'making', *dōng-n*, 'grazing', *tāng-nu* (<no), 'getting', *dā-nan/dā-na*, 'giving', *gan*, *rai[n]*.

The recognition of the Gerund or Participial character of many of the forms, which must have facilitated their actual use, may be a help in understanding them; in general, and to a considerable extent in particulars, it accords with what is constantly remarked in the L.S. Concerning the vowels, usually *-ū-ō*, found appended to the *-s/ch* nothing need be added to what has been stated *supra* (p. 122) in regard to vowels appended to Noun Suffixes: but after the *-s* an *i* is often seen, as in *syong-si-n*, 'living', *ra-sī-d*, 'brought', and in [...] there is a combination *-sē-na*, which will recur. The *-s* may also be followed by a Postposition, as in *lochī-s-tang*.

We do not find any sign for a Personal Object such as in the Nepal languages, Vayu and Bahing, follows the sign for the Subject, which itself is appended, it seems, to the root or to the Tense, etc., Suffixes, where such are present. The *chī/shī* appendages to the root may partly serve instead. The Personal Subject, as in Kunāwari *to-g*, 'I am', *tō-kē-g*, 'I was', *to-n*, 'thou art', *tō-kē-n*, 'thou wast', is well established in the more westerly languages. In the more easterly the *-g* and *-n* are perhaps not evidenced at all: new terminations, mainly vocalic and conceivably Indo-Āryan in origin, for distinguishing the Personal Subject, are expounded in L.S., pp. 493, 506-8, 520-1.

The interesting question of possible points of connection with the infinitely more complex pronominalization of the Nepal group may be studied by future etymologists.

## (2) Trans-Himalayan territories.

### (2a) General.

The fact that the whole region north of the Great Himalaya, if we disregard certain 'Brog-pa' (Ṣinā) settlements and also the Hunza-Nagar State, which appertains to the Karakoram area, is now Tibetan in speech has been stated *supra*; and this has been attributed entirely to the influence of the Western Tibetan kingdom, founded not long after 900 A.D. This may have been not quite absolutely the case; for to the east of the Indus valley there will have been perhaps from much earlier times a sparse Tibetan, or at least Tibeto-Burman, population in nomadic

occupation of the Byañ-thañ; and of the population there may have been some slight infiltration into Ladak, a possibility which in fact Dainelli seems to have contemplated. Moreover, the Tibetan armies, which, by a route which would naturally by-pass the Kailāsa-Mānasa region and reach the Indus in the Rudok-Pangong area, were from c. 700 A.D. to about 750 invading the Ladak, Baltistan and Gilgit countries, may have been not without some effect. But in the vocabulary, at any rate, of Ladak Tibetan, including those of Purik and Baltistan, there seems to be practically nothing inconsistent with the view that the language is merely a colonial continuation of the Central-Tibetan of the period indicated: in pronunciation these are certain survivals or forms which were originally dialectical, or have lapsed, in Central Tibetan; and in morphology there are some features, e.g. in Purik Dative-Accusative *-a*, Ablative in *-kana*, Infinitive of Verbs in *-cas* (Ladaki *-ces* and *-cas*), which are not forthwith accountable: the *-cas/-ces* recalls the *-ce* of Spiti and the *-ja*, *-cha*, *za* of Nyamkat, Jāḍ and Garhwāli, possibly also the *-cum* of Bu-nan. The thin line of 'Western pronominalized' languages which, immediately south of the Great Himalaya may be compared to a cushion between Indo-Āryan and Tibetan, nowhere at present transcends that axis; and there is so far no definite proof that they came from beyond it: on the other hand the sparsely populated Ladak districts of Zanskar and Rupshu (the latter perhaps with only a winter population of nomads), and the Mnah-ris-skor-gsum district of the Lha-sa state are not known to preserve any traces of pre-Tibetan culture.

## (2b) Bru-śa.

The prior ethnographical and linguistic blank is therefore unfilled. There is, however, a matter connected with the Bru-sa (*-za*, *-tsa*) language which might have a bearing upon a pre-Tibetan speech of Baltistan, since that district was known to the Chinese as 'Great Po-lü-lo (Bru-śa)'. Among the Tibetans one style of writing (the Tibetan alphabet) was known as Bru-tsha script; and there is rather frequent mention of a Bru-śa (*za*), Bru-tsa, Buddhist, country, always in association with the western states, such as Kashmir, Udyana, Tokharistan. The only known specimen of a Bru-za language consists of a book-title printed in Csoma Kőrösi's analysis of the Kanjur, but first discussed by Laufer (*Die Bru-ža Sprache und die historische Stellung des Padmasambhava*, from *T'oung-pao*, Series II, Vol.IX, no. 1), who gives (p. 7) both the Bru-ža and the Sanskrit title (see *infra* where these and also the Tibetan title are quoted), together with some slightly variant equivalents from other sources).

Laufer emphatically deprecates any unreflecting attempt to equate the elements of the Bru-ža title to those of the Sanskrit. He points out that the Bru-ža title consists of 32 syllables, while the Sanskrit has 26 words in 59 syllables and

the Tibetan 26 words in 50 syllables. Referring to his own prior observations of such foreign titles invented or blundered by ignorant copyists, and adducing further flagrant instances, he expresses a doubt as to any correspondence in the present case. A prerequisite for any attempt would be a knowledge, at present wanting, of the language, or languages, and Buddhist terminology of Dardistan, to which region he decides that the Bru-ža country belonged.

Laufer's warning is obviously justified. But the text, stated in the colophon to have been composed by the Abbot (*Mkhan-po*) Dharmabodhi and the 'great traditionalist' (*rin-lugs-chen-po*) Dānarakṣita and to have been translated, in Kham of Bru-ža land, by Che(n) Btsan-skyes, has a place in the Buddhist Tibetan Canon. If Dānarakṣita was the so-named divine who was one of the last *ācāryas* of Vikramaśīla, the composition belonged to the XIth, or at latest XIIth, century. It professes to have been dictated by Gwhyapati Pāṇivajra, on the peak of mount Maḷaya in Drag-śul-can (Rākṣasa?), to the Lord of Laṅkā (Rāvana) and other low beings: its extent (over 250 foll. of Tibetan text, in 10 sections (*bam-po*) and 75 chapters (*leḥu*) and 252 *ślokas*) and its subject, a harmony of Buddhist thought, Yoga procedure and advanced Mahāyāna doctrine, invest it with a measure of importance. It must have been from a Sanskrit original.

Adverting to a certain dubiety in regard to the Canonical status of this text and of some others, Laufer suggested (pp. 8-11) that originally it might have appertained to the Rñiñ-ma sect, which he conceived to have been connected with Padmasambhava and through him with Buddhist literature of the Bru-ža region. Upon this hint I have sought and found the text in my old (draft) catalogue of the Rñiñ-ma Canon, where it occupies foll. 1b-233a of Volume Da (XI). The text is very finely written in large *dbu-can* characters; in a few places there are notes, for insertion, etc., in a smaller, not calligraphic, hand. On fol. 1b there are three miniatures.

In-as-much-as the work is also included in the Berlin Ms. Kanjur (Rgyud XIX, foll. 111a - 364a, see Dr. H. Beckh's catalogue, pp. 133-4), in the Peking Kang-hsi Kanjur (see Otani Daigaku Library Catalogue, no. 452), and in the Sde-dge Kanjur (see the Tōhoku Imperial University Catalogue, no. 829), and as in the Bru-ža title, which is of importance for the present study, there are some differences, and even in the Sanskrit and Tibetan titles the agreement is not complete, it may be convenient to show here all three: the order adopted is Bru-ža, Tibetan, Sanskrit. As regards transcription, it should be explained that, where it is from Tibetan script of Bru-ža or Tibetan text, the original word (or syllable)- separating dots or other punctuation marks are retained, and that in Sanskrit compounds the members are separated by hyphens, with undoing of internal Sandhi of vowels. For the texts Csoma's version (ap. Laufer) is adopted as basis; the variant readings of the

different sources are distinguished by the letters B (= Beekh or Berlin), O (= Peking-Otani), S (= Sde-dge-Tohoku), R (= Rñiñ-ma Canon).

Bru; žahi skad.du, 'In Bru-ža-language'.

Ho.na. pan. ri.til. pi. bu. bi. ti.la. ti.ta.

Hon(B.O.B.R.) ban(O) |(R)bi(B.O.), pu|(R)pi (B.R.) til(B.O.S.) til(R)

siñ . ħun . ħub . hañ . pañ . ril . ħub . pi .

sid | (R) lun(B) ħub | (R) had(O) bad(O) ril | (R) bi(O.S.)

O.omits pad(S) paḥi(R)

su . bañ . ri . že . hal . paḥi . ma . kyañ . kuḥi

su | (R) bad(O.S.R.) ri | (R) baḥi . kyad (O) kuḥi | (R)

(B.O.S.)

paḥi | (R)

dan . rad . ti

roñ (B.S.)

rod (O)

rod (R)

The Tibetan title —

De. bžin. gśegs. pa. thams. ead. kyi. thugs | gsañ. baḥi. ye. śes. don. gyi. sñiñ.

pe. | rdo. rje. bkod. paḥi. rgyud | mal. ħbyor. grub. paḥi. luñ | kun. ħdus. rig.

paḥi. mdo | theg. pa. oben. po. miñon. par. rtogs. pa | ohos. kyi. mam. greñs.

mam. par. bkod. pa | zes. bya. baḥi. mdo.

is given in all the sources without variation, except that R has *chen-pohi* instead of *-po*, and after *thugs*, *sñiñ-po*, *rgyud*, *luñ*, *mdo*, *rtogs-pa*, severally inserts a punctuation mark (*śad.*), which does, in fact roughly divide phrases. In the chapter colophons the title is given in abbreviated form, as —

saña. rgyas. kun. gyi. dgoñs. pa. ħdus. paḥi. mio. ohen. pd., 'Great *sūtra* of combined meditations of all Buddhas'.

The Sanskrit title —

Sarva-tathāgata-citta-jñāna-guhyā-artha-gar[...]a-vyūha-vajra-tantra-siddhi-yoga-āgama-samāja-sarva-vidyā-sūtra-mahā-yāna-sābhisamaya-dharma-paryāya-vivyūha [-nāma-sūtra]

is likewise invariable in Csoma's Kanjur analysis and in B, O and S, except that all three have, like the Tibetan title, *abhisamaya* in place of *sābhisamaya* and that in place of the concluding *vivyūha* S has *vyūha* simply, thus conflicting with its own Tibetan title, which has *nam-par-bkod-pa*, i.e. *vivyūha*. In R the Sanskrit title, in common with most other such throughout the Rñiñ-ma Canon, is partly blundered: it is presented as —

Sarba.ta.thā.ga.ta.cit.ta | gu.ya.dzñā.nā.garba | badzra.ku. la.tantra | bhi.dya.rya.

thā | bhvirgya.su | su.ti.yo.gi | mahā. ya.na.sa.ma.arbi | dhar.ma.ni.sū.tra |

Here, disregarding such ordinary miswritings as *sarba*, *gu-ya*, *dzñāna*, *garba*, *badsra*, *ya-na* in place respectively of *sarva*, *guhya*, *jñāna*, *garbhā*, *vajna*, *yāna*, we remark —

1. readings; *vajra-kula-tantra* (kuls-tantras being a kind of tantras) instead of *vyūha-vajra-tantra*; *dharmā-ni* (?) in place of *dharmā-paryāya-vivyūha*.
2. further errors of spelling; *bhirgya-su* for *vidyā-sūtra*; *mu-ti-yogi* for *siddhi-yoga*; *sā-mā-ārbī* for *sābhisamaya*.
3. transpositions; *siddhi-yoga* (*su-ti-yogi*) should have followed immediately, after *tantra*; *sā-mā-ārbī* for *abhi-samaya*.
4. there remains *bhī.dya.rya.thā*, which is provisionally obscure; since in the partly identical title of the immediately following work we find (fol.1) —  
 ...garbha-vajra-krodha-kula-tantra-*bidarya-tha*-mahā-sutra in which *bidaryatha* corresponds to the *kun-ḥdus-rig-pahi* of its accurate Tibetan equivalent, it should represent Sanskrit *sarva-vidyā*, and in the present title might be an anticipation of the immediately following *bhirgya* (i.e. *vidyā*).

The errors in the Sanskrit titles throughout the Canon are in marked contrast to the correctness of the Tibetan: in the present instance some of them, especially the transpositions, suggest even that there had been doubt or discussion. As they do not recur in the various editions of the Kanjur, it seems possible that in the Rñiñ-ma Canon they go back to an early stage in Tibetan knowledge of Sanskrit (and also of some other foreign languages) and by the editors of the Kanjur have been eliminated. The errors cannot have been due to the Bru-za script, which, being merely a style of Tibetan, cannot ever have seriously incommoded the Tibetan scribes: the present text is, in fact, an incontestable proof of this.

In contrast to the Sanskrit title, the Bru-za title in the Ms. is in practically complete accord with the several editions of the Kanjur. As will have been seen, the editions vary in some details which are frequently exemplified in Tibetan script, whether printed or in Ms.: such are (a) insertion or omission of the dot or other marks of punctuation; (b) confusion of *p* and *b*; (c) confusion of *ñ* and *d*; (d) omission of superscript vowels. These cases, which are all matters of clarity of script merely, cover practically all the divergences: and it can be seen that in nearly all cases the reading of the Ms. has the support of some of the editions; it may appear that it should be preferred as a whole. In any case the general uniformity of the title, harmonising with the abstruse character of the text, which is a work of severe Mahāyāna philosophy, separates it from the multiple and independent titles, such as will be instanced *infra*; of texts which sought to attract popular interest: it seems to present a genuine specimen of Bru-za language.

Unfortunately it does no more, except that the excellence of the Tibetan text indicates that the transcribers had, as was natural, no difficulty with the Bru-za

script, with which they, resident in Bru-za land, will have been familiarly acquainted. The conclusion, which we have already drawn, that the title only was given in Bru-za language, the text being already in Tibetan, is demonstrated not only by the regular Tibetan Buddhist expressions and terminology, which prove that no third language intervened between the original Sanskrit and the Tibetan, but also by the general usage, in which the usual exordiums, such as 'In the speech of India (or China, etc.) A B C -', concerns merely the title. In the present case we have also the definite statement of the colophon of the text, which it declares to have been rendered from Bur-za script (*yi-ge*), not speech (*skad*): this is just as if we should say 'from black letter'.

It will be, no doubt, convenient to have before us a translation of the Sanskrit-Tibetan title, which incorporates several terms of Buddhist dogmatics: it will read —

'Thunderbolt (s. decisive) Tantra, systematizing (*vyūha*) the essence (*garbha*) of the latent (*guhya*) sense of the intellectual cognitions (*citta-jñāna*) of all Tathāgatas; Sūtra of all knowledge in the competition (or compilation) of traditional doctrines (*āgama*) [concerning] Yoga [-practice] for Attainment (*siddhi*); discriminating systematization (*vi-vyūha*) of Mahāyāna treatises (*pariyāya*), with comprehensive view (*abhisamaya*)'

As indicated by the plurality of Buddhist texts with titles commencing with 'All Tathāgates', there was at one stage, or at stages, what we may term an *abhisamaya* or 'harmony' stage: perhaps we may so interpret *abhi-samaya*, 'over-creed' (of, *abhi-dharma*), although, as a reference to de la Vallée Poussin's *Abhidharma-kośa* (Index) will show, there was not in regard to the term an *abhisamaya* a 'harmony'. The term, of course, could be understood as 'a transcending view' and so put aside all others, or as 'a general view' originating in an all-comprehensive *prajñā*; there is also an interpretation as 'common or agreed view'; and the term can even have sunk into a parlance. But, where it occurs in conjunction with *vyūha*, which denotes a 'systematic arrangement', it would imply at least a critical consideration of different views: and in the title we have also the word *samāja*, which properly denotes a 'competition', rather than merely 'combination' or 'comparison'.

Without a serious study of the extensive work, which deals with many and various topics, we may thus get some conception of its nature: and from a recurrence of the expression *bla-hdags* (= Tib. *bla-btags*, Sk. *adhivacana*, 'designation', 'denominalization') we may even conjecture that its doctrine is nominalistic: but we do not find light upon the Bru-za language.

Having therefore only the title, from which, however, we may have cleared away some doubts, we must certainly not disregard Laufer's warning against any conjectural equation of its c. 38 syllables to the c. 26 words, or word-notions,

comprized in the Sanskrit and the Tibetan, which are in full agreement. But that need not preclude the possibility of some general observations concerning the unknown language.

It was partly by reason of the limited knowledge in 1898 of the Burushaskī language that Laufer, after discussing its probable connection with the Bru-ža country, forbore to seek in that language a solution of the problem of the title. If we now entertained the notion, we might quote as a preliminary excuse that the transcription of the text is stated to have taken place in 'Khrom in Bru-ža land': and, whereas in any Bru-ža land a place with name 'Khrom' is unattested and improbable, the name may well represent the 'Nagar' country of the 'Burishk' (Bru-ša) people; for evidence has been adduced to prove that the name 'Nagar' was, through folk-etymology or otherwise, currently understood to represent Sanskrit *nagara*, 'town'; and Tibetan 'Khrom', which has the same sense, may be merely a version of the same idea. Translation of foreign Proper Names was highly frequent in Tibetan: and, as regards the compilation, in the small Nagar country, of a text of abstruse Buddhist dogmatics, we may remind ourselves that in Nagar an acquaintance with Buddhism had been initiated some centuries earlier and that, owing to Buddhist cosmopolitanism and travel, even the least considerable State might include among its monastic sojourners a great divine.

With the now advanced knowledge, furnished by Colonel Lorimer's elaborate study, of the Burushaskī language, which was and is native in Hunza-Nagar, such a speculation is altogether incompatible; the language of the title is decidedly not Buroshaskī, and its Bru-ža country must be sought elsewhere.

This negative conclusion can, however, be supplemented by a positive one; the language of the title was manifestly of the monosyllabic type. This is to be inferred not simply from the set-out in inter-punctuated monosyllables, which, in fact, is frequent, or (with some irregularities) normal, in Tibetan writing, even for Sanskrit; it is manifested in the identical recurrence of certain syllables, e.g. *hub*, *ril*, *pi*, *ti*, and, further, in the circumstance that no syllable ends in a hard, tenuis or aspirate, consonant, *t*, *th*, *p*, *ph*, or in a Palatal, *c*, *ch*, *j*, *ñ*, or contains a long vowel. Taken together, these features point to a Tibeto-Burman dialect: and some further restrictions, e.g. the complete absence of compound consonants, such as *kr*, *gr*, *tr*, *dr*, *pr*, *br*, suggest an advanced stage. In the dialects of W. Tibet some such points, e.g. loss of *y* after initial consonant, have been remarked.

As speech of a Bru-ža country which nevertheless was not Hunza-Nagar, the dialect of the title might plausibly, as we have seen, be credited to Baltistan.

At this point we may, it seems, venture upon one or two details: —

1. In the first place the fact that in the Ms. even the Sanskrit title has in the expression *bhīrgya-su* = *vidyā-sūtra* of the other editions, the technical

term *sūtra* in the abbreviated form *su*, quite likely to have been current in a monosyllabic language, suggests that the *su* of the Bru-za text, which occurs at a corresponding point, is really the same loan-word in the same sense; and this encourages the conjecture that its reading *sid*, with punctuation (1), where the other editions have *siñ*, is right and is again a loan-word of technical signification, sc. Sanskrit *siddhi*.

2. The reading (B) *lun* of the syllable following *siñ*, where the Ms. and the other editions have *hun*, may, in case it is not, as it might be, an error of the scribe or printer, indicate that B knew that the meaning of *hun* was that of the next following Sanskrit word, *āgama*, 'traditional doctrine', and therefor wrote Tibetan *lun* (*luñ*), which has that meaning. If he so conceived, he could have thought of Western Tibetan *hun*, 'news', 'information', 'explanation', 'opinion', 'idea', while we can now add also Kunāwari *hun*, 'teach', 'instruct'. This gives *sidhun* = Sanskrit *siddhi-āgama*.

(3 lacking)

4. The next syllable, *hub*, which occurs a little later, we have fortunately already encountered, vis. in the expression *ubs-ti*, meaning 'united (i.e. confluent) rivers' = Sanskrit *samudra*, *Hubs* is Preterite [Participle] of *hub*, 'collect', 'gather', and it exists in both Western and Central Tibet. Accordingly we have *eig-hun-hub* = *siddhi-āgama-samāja*.
5. The next phrase, *han-pañ-ril-hub-pi* (*bi, pañi*)-*su*, should correspond to Sk. *sarva-vidyā-sūtra*, Tib. *kun-ḥdus-rig-pañi-mdo*: and here it may be noted that in S. C. Das' *Tibetan Dictionary* (s.v. *hub*) *ḥdus-pa*, Preterite [Participle] of *ḥdu*, 'collect' is given as normal equivalent of *hubs*. But *ril* also, usually written *hril*, has in Tibetan the signification 'all', 'all together', = *kun*, so that *ril-hub* corresponds exactly to Tibetan *kun-ḥdus*: accordingly *han-pañ* (R *pad*) should signify Tib. *rig*, Sanskrit *vidyā*, 'knowledge', 'science', which at present we are not in a position to confirm. *Pañ*, however, might be the *-pañ* noted *supra* (p. [...]) as the Tibar-skad suffix (= Tib. *pa*) of Infinitives + Nouns of action.

The recurrent syllable *pi* (o.s. *bī*) has here in R- the reading *pañi*, which a little later, in *halpañi* (B.O.S. *bañi*), recurs in all the texts: since in its present occurrence it plainly corresponds to the *pañi* of the Tibetan version, it looks as though the scribe had substituted Tibetan *pañi* for *pi*, knowing that the two were equivalent. In the Balti and other dialects of Western Tibet the *-a* of the Genitival or Adjectival *-pañi* disappears, leaving *-pi*, which was, no doubt, original in the title: the reading *pañi* will have been in both cases a correction by the Central-Tibetan scribe,

who recognized that here the *pi* or *bi* was not a normal word, but a Genitival-Adjectival form, which in some of the other occurrences it probably is not.

It will not fail to be observed that since, as we have several times remarked, the *-pal-ba* Suffix did not exist in Tibeto-Burman outside the Tibetan, the *ḥub-pahi* here and the subsequent *hal-pahi* must be taken as having a Tibetan Suffix. This does not create difficulty, since in the Xth or XIth century, when the title will have been first written, the Tibeto-Burman dialect of Bru-ža will probably have been already extensively invaded by Tibetan.

6. *Ril* has occurred previously in *Ho-na* (B.O.S.R.*Hon*)-*pan* (O *ban*)-*ril*, which are the opening words of the title: and, since the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions both begin with 'All Tathāgatas', which is not only a quite essential element here, but also similarly heads a considerable number of analogous titles, there is a strong, *prima facie* probability that *Ho-na* (*Hon*) -*pan* (or *ban*) is a rendering of *Tathāgata*: this can be substantiated as follows: —

In Tibetan and Chinese versions from the Sanskrit the Buddha's appellation, *Tathāgata*, is regularly, as here, represented by the literal rendering 'So-gone (or come)', Tib. *De-bzin-gsegs-pa*, Chin. *Zu-lai*, which accordingly should be the meaning of *Hon-pan* (*ban*). In the Kunāwarī language *ho-na*, (Grahame Bailey '*hone*') means 'thus', the *ho* being a pronominal root which recurs in *hōtrā*, 'so much', *hōde*, 'so', *hōdōn*, 'there', *hōnōn*, 'there', Tikā Rām Joshī's *ho-trā*, 'so much', *hun*, 'now', *hu-na*, 'just now': the *h* is found also in Kunāwarī and the other languages as an interrogative (Kun. *ham*, 'where?', *hat*, 'who?', 'which?', etc.). *Pan/ban* can be *pōn/bōn/ban* (Bailey), *pun* (Gerard (*poon* = *pan*) and Joshī), 'arrive', with *a* (from *o*, as explained *supra*, and seen in Kunāwarī *tan*, 'see', *thas*, 'hear', *gasa*, 'clothes' = Tib. *mthor/ḥtheñ*, *thos*, *gos* etc.). Possibly, since in the Western dialects post-consonantal *y* is often lost, this may be Tibetan *ḥbyon*, which is actually found applied to the 'coming' of Tathāgatas; but *ḥbyun/byun* (Guttural *ñ*, however) not seldom signifies 'arrive'.

The above particulars, suggested by actual reading in the titles, point to a fairly close correspondence, in phrases and in their order, between the Bru-ža title and the equivalents in Sanskrit and Tibetan: and they inevitably prompt an inquiry for further comparisons under the guidance of the word-order. Inasmuch as it is undesirable to record conjectural etymologies without at least some special appositeness in connection with the situation of the 'unknown' language, any such

ventures may here be reserved, in the hope that further evidence may invest them with stronger claims to acceptance.

It will perhaps be provisionally admitted that a reasonable case has been made out in regard to (a) the Tibeto-Burman character of the language of the title and (b) its connection with Baltistan, perhaps the only Bru-ža district of which the language was certainly other than Ārushaskī. The inference that in Baltistan the present Tibetan was preceded by a Tibeto-Burman dialect may be not unimportant: on the one hand, it may account for some features in the Tibetan dialects of Balti and Purig, as survivals; and on the other hand, the obvious connection with the group of Tibeto-Burman dialects whereof Kunāwari is the chief suggests an original wide trans-Himālayan extension of the Žaň-žun language, which we have already related to that group, and at which, our only remaining 'unknown' language and our leading object in the present study, we have at length arrived.

(2c) Žaň-žun.

The Žaň-žun language is somewhat less 'unknown' than that of 'Bru-ža'. In the first place it was patently the speech of the Žaň-žun State, known also during the same early period as Gu-ge, which is still sufficiently recognized to appear in modern reports and on maps; secondly, it is more frequently mentioned as furnishing titles of texts; and, thirdly, it may be detectable in old place-names or in survivals within the mainly Tibetan speech (Nyam-kat) which has replaced it.

The existence of Žaň-žun literary works during the early Tibetan period is not open to question. The evidence consists of citations not only in Bon-po literature, but also in Tibetan Buddhist texts, which give titles of particular works in their Žaň-žun (and other) versions. The critical observations of Laufer (*Die Bruža Sprache* p. 7) are not intended to cast doubt upon the existence of such versions in general, but only to question the authenticity, correctness and intelligibility of the particular titles. His remark that a version does not inevitably reflect the title, or even the entire, or exact, content of a work is true, no doubt, of all literatures and all periods, the attractiveness of a title varying with the milieu.

Of a special script or alphabet used for Žaň-žun writings the Tibetans give, it seems, no hint. That some form of Indian script may have reached the Žaň-žun country before the VIIth century, when Tibet acquired its alphabet, is not apparent; and the presumption is that in respect both of script and of Buddhism Žaň-žun followed Tibet and that any prior Bon-po compositions had at any rate no alphabetic writing. In the medical Mss. there are items which, if correctly elicited (*JRAS.* 1933, pp. 406 sqq), are probably of Indian provenance; and one of the Mss. cites in original some of the well-known terms of Sanskrit pharmacy, perhaps others also in translation, but the Mss. are of the VIIIth - Xth century and are from

Tun-huang and can have derived both the doctrines and the prescriptions from the Tibetans.

It is not very likely, or apparent, that any of the Tibetan Bon-po's from whom there are extant writings were conversant with Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ speech. In the Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ country Tibetan Buddhism was introduced, as we are informed, even before the foundation of the West Tibet State and was intensely patronized. Hence the titles which we must now *pro forma* scrutinize require lenient handling as weak tradition. In the following list, which may have some convenience for reference, the slight annotation seeks merely to clarify some superficial obscurities or errors without anticipating any possible points of substance: —

- (1) Ms. (India Office Library) purporting to be the *Klu-ḥbum -dkar-po*, i.e. the work translated by Schiefner (St. Petersburg, 1880) as *Das Bon-po sūtra, Das weisee Naga-hunderttansend*, 'The Bon-po sūtra, The white Naga-hundred-thousand': titles cited —

'In the language of the Gyuṅ-druṅ (*Svātika*) gods (*lha*), *Hlo-bi-dguṅ-nas-ḥod-rum-rnap* (for *rdab*, 'fallen', or *snaṅ*, 'shining?')

'In the language of human persons (*gaṅ-zag*), *Hgro-la-phan-paḥi-ḥbum-sde-bya*;

'In the language of the Mu-saṅ Stag-gzig (Tājik), *Mu-rgyas-khyab-rtan-ḥod-rum-rtse*.

'In the language of the Red Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ, *Da-lis-'a-ḥe-gug-ge-phyā*;

'In the language of Spu-rgyal-Bod (Tibet), *Gtsaṅ-ma-klu-ḥbum-dkar-mo*'.

In Schiefner's Ms., where apparently only the Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ alternative is given, it has (trans. p. 46) the variant form *Dang-ling-āhe-guge-bya*.

The (fabricated) Gyuṅ-druṅ title, 'From the heaven of the Devas (? *Hde-bi* = Sanskrit *deva*?) white light (*ḥod-run*, Tibetan) shining (*or* 'fallen), is practically all Tibetan. So is the 'human' language, 'To the beings of the world beneficial 100,000 group *bya* (= Kanāshī *bya* '100'). So again the 'Mu-saṅ' Tājik language 'Horizon-extended-pervading power-steadfast white light peak'; but Mu-saṅ, 'Pure ether', Tājik is perhaps a blunder, see *infra*. In the Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ title, where the *phyā* recalls the 'human' *bya*, the '*a-ḥe* (Schiefner's *ahe*) invites a comment (*infra*). The 'Spu-rgyal' Tibetan, which prefixes 'Pure' (*gtsan-ma*) to the common title, perhaps means to insist on the good ancient Tibetan of the royal dynasty.

- (2) Ms. (India Office Library) purports to be the *Klu-ḥbum-nag-po*, 'Black Nāga-hundred-thousand', and should be the so-named text which constitutes § II pp. 8-15) in Laufer's *Klu Ḥum bsdus-paḥi-sṅin-po* (Helsingfors, 1898): titles —

'In Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ language, *Saṅ-ka-ra*:

'In Sum-pa language, *Hbu-ta-ri-pad (paṅ?)*:

'In Tibetan language, *Gtsaṅ-ma* (Pure) - *Klu-hbum-nag-mo*.

Here, and also in nos. (3) and (4) *infra* there is no need to the Sum-pa language (of the 'Women's Kingdom'), which has its own problems. The *Žaṅ-žuṅ* title is wholly problematic: but *Sad*, if we may so read, will be = Kunāwarī *Sad*, 'god'; and *ra* is there, and in the group, the prevalent form of the term '100' (Tib. *rgya*): *gya* also is found.

(3) Ms. (India Office Library) of a *Kluhi-span-bkoṅ* (probably = *spa-koṅ* (*goṅ*)).

'Nāga-frightening', cf. the famous Buddhist *Dpaṅ* (*Span*)-*skoṅ-phyag-rgya-pa* of the *Me-loṅ* (Francke, *op.cit.*, II, p. 81); titles —

'In *Žaṅ-žuṅ* language, *Ta-la-pa-ta-ya-na-lā* (ta?);

'In Sum-pa language, *A-re-ha-ba-li-ya*;

'In Indian language, *Nā-ga-ra-tsa-dha-ya*;

'In Tibetan language, *Niahi-spaā-bkon*.

The Sanskrit title, as usual somewhat botched, means 'Nāga-averting-': in the *Žaṅ-žuṅ* the last syllable is not clearly legible.

(4) Ms. (India Office Library) of a text similar to (3): titles —

'In the language of the *Gyuṅ-druṅ* (Svastika) gods, *Mu-phyā-du-ri-kra-ye-murna-sla-ṅal* (dal?);

'In the Red *Žaṅ-žuṅ* language, *Mur-bzaṅs-rṅan-no-sla-ži-bha-da-ya*;

'In the Mur-bzaṅs Stag-gzig (Tājik) language, *A-he-gu-le-khyab*;

'In the Li (Khotan) language, *Ldoṅ-ṅa-ha-ra*;

'In the Sum-pa language, *Ru-ya-he-ṅal* (dal?);

'In the Me-ṅag language, *Hod-hbar-lhahi-nor-bu-gsal*;

'In the Spu-rgyal Bod (Tibetan) language, *Klu-gṅan-sa-bdag-gi-span-skoi*.

The Tibetan title means 'Frightening of Nāgas (Water-spirits), Gṅan (Sky-spirits), and Earth-lords (Earth-spirits), three regularly mentioned classes of dangerous powers, we may pass over the khotan language, which, though at one period it must have been very familiar to numerous Tibetans, may have at the time when the titles were written passed into a legend: of course, Nāga-worship in ancient Khotan is abundantly attested. We pass over also the Sum-pa (as previously announced) and the Na-ṅag, where the title is, not unnaturally, pure Tibetan, meaning 'Jewel-flash of the light-blazing gods'. With the Sum-pa and Mi-ṅag peoples the Bon-pos, who had, no doubt, many establishments among both, will have been fairly competent to deal. The 'Mur-bzaṅs' Tajik, like the *Mu-saṅ* Tājik in no. (1) *supra*, is perhaps a mere blunder; the expression occurs in the immediately preceding 'Red *Žaṅ-žuṅ*' title. It may, however, not have been conjured out of nothing: it is quite conceivable that Tajik Iranians of the Pamir may have worshipped, or placated, water-spirits and have been known by Tibetans to do so, and that both *Mu-saṅ* and

*Mu-rgyas* are corruptions of *Murghab*, name of the upper Oxus of the Pamir. In the 'Red *Žaň-žuň*' title the word *rñan* recalls the *gñan* of the Tibetan; and the difference of Prefix would accord with what we know: there are also some other particulars which will call for remark *infra* (p. 173).

(5) Ms. noted, but not now available: titles —

'In the *Žaň-žuň* language, *Mu-le-sad -gyer-yuňs-rin-po-smar-ma*:

'In the Spu-rgyal-Bod (Tibetan) language, *Hphrul-dag-gyuri-[druñ-] bon-kyi-luñ-ston-kyi-mdo*, 'Sūtra teaching the tradition (doctrine) of the miraculous pure Svastika Bon'.

(6) In the *Padmahi-bkah-than*, V. fol. 43-5, we hear of a, perhaps apocryphal, authoritative work entitled —

'In the language of the King-Ldoňs (Rgyal-Ldoň, perhaps a legendary tribal organization), *'I-yaň*;

'In the Red *Žaň-žuň* language, *'U-ya-'ag-tham*;

'In the Spu-rgyal-Bod (Tibetan) language, *Gsaň-ño-kha-tham* ('A secret: mouth-seal').

This is the passage previously (*JRAS*. 1933, pp. 409-410) cited as evidence of the equivalence of *Žaň-žuň 'ag* to Tibetan *kha* 'mouth', an equivalence now abundantly confirmed.

As was to be expected, not much has 'been gleaned from the first survey of the available titles. The practice of recording the original titles of translated works probably commenced in Tibet with the Buddhists; and in the canonical collections, *Bkah-hgyur* and *Bstan-hgyur*, the individual texts almost invariably append to their Tibetan titles a fairly accurate (barring some laxities of spelling, e.g. *ts*, *tsh*, *dz*, in place of Sanskrit *c*, *ch*, *j*) reproduction of the mostly Sanskrit, but occasionally Chinese, and so forth, titles. In the early Mongol period the blemishes became numerous; and there are also instances of original compositions, not translations, furnished with Sanskrit titles: in course of time treatises which made no real pretence to being translations adorned themselves with long Sanskrit titles flagrantly regardless of Sanskrit Grammar, as when, e.g., the Genitive in *-amyā* was used as if, like Tibetan *-kyi*, *-gyi*, it could constitute an Adjective. The Bon-po writers had perhaps for their multilingual titles a stimulus in the tradition recorded in no. (1) *supra* (Schiefner, *op.cit.*, trans., p. 77) that the Bons make their offerings in the five languages, those of Gods, men, Tājīk, *Žaň-žuň* and Bon, and also in others. In the above examples we see instances of fabrication (language, not necessarily quite unsystematic, of Bon divinities), blundering, confusion and wrong attribution. But this does not totally invalidate them: and we are, as already signified, postponing to a suitable context (p. [...]) some solid items of verification.

There is one rather general matter for comment here: why among so many titles of texts concerning Nāgas, the *klu* of the Tibetan versions, is there no term linguistically cognate to *klu*? In three instances (under nos. (1) and (4) we observe a word 'a-he, which, if it is the missing equivalent, is certainly the Sanskrit *aḥi*, 'serpent', = *Nāga*. In that case the original Bon-pos had no *klu* and borrowed an Indian term which would have been abundantly available in the region of their country of origin, always affirmed to be the *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* country; for, as is elaborately evidenced in Atkinson's *The Himalayan Districts of the Northwest Provinces of India* (Gazetteer of the N.W.P., Vol.XI, pp. 835-6), no region of India has a longer or more prevalent devotion to Nāga cults than Garhwāl and Kumaun, which constitute the southern limit of mṆaḥ-ris-skor (khor) -gsum/Hūna-deśa and Kunāwar. The effect of this would be to present Nāga-worship as a foreign accretion in the original Bon system, a conclusion to which indeed, considering its cosmographical system of upper and lower heavens, descents, ascents, incarnations, etc., and also its Shamanist rites, we may be not averse. But is the Tibetan *klu*, or Nāga, which in personal names had in early times a tremendous vogue, and testifies to a very widespread regard for water-spirits, really not indigenous in Tibet? We perhaps should not venture so far: but there are indications that the earliest religion of Tibet was a worship of earth-spirits vegetation-spirits, disease-devils, etc. weather (storm, hail, etc.) -spirits, mountain-spirits), and that water-spirits, if they were actually recognized, were not specially prominent. Upon this outlook supervened the Bon as a sky religion; and it may have come already infested with the Indian snake-worship or have been a vehicle for its importation. That Tibet has no special relation to snakes is obvious; and that the Tibetan *klu* is not, in fact, conceived of as a snake can be seen stated in S. C. Das' Dictionary, s.v. *Klu-hbum-khra-bo*, only a mythological creature being envisaged. It is curious to find that in the Tibeto-Burman languages of Tibet and the Himālayan countries *klu* = 'snake' is practically non-existent, the dialectical term for 'snake' being everywhere a cognate of *bu*, 'worm', or of Tib. *sbrul*, 'snake'; Tib. *hbrug*, 'dragon', is also an serial (storm), not an aqueous, being. Possibly the only cognate of *klu* is the *klu*, *kru*, 'blind', of the Nam language in conjunction with Bāhing *khleu*, 'hide', 'disappear' (Vayu *khi*?) (Hodgson, *Miscellaneous Essays* (1880), I. pp. 335, 341). The Tibetan *ldoñ* also (no. 4) means 'blind'. It may be convenient to take note of one or two particulars in the quoted book-titles.

The most promising of the titles is that in no. (4) —

*Mur-bzañs-rñan-no-sla-ṣi-bha-da-ya*

which has a fair similarity to the corresponding Tibetan

*Klu-gñan-sa-bdag-gi-spañ-skoñ*.

Hence there is a likelihood in the equations —

<i>mur-bzañs</i>	=	<i>klu</i>
<i>rñan</i>	=	<i>gñan</i>
<i>no-sla</i>	=	<i>sa-bdag</i>
<i>zi</i>	=	<i>gi</i>
<i>bha-da-ya</i>	=	<i>span-skoi</i>

Since *mur* can mean 'spring', 'well', *mur-bzañs*, 'spring-good (or great)' may well be equivalent to *klu*, 'water-power', *naga*, etc., *Rñan*, with Prefix *r*, as could have been expected (*Nam: an ancient language ...*, pp. 206, 350-1), in place of *g = gñan*, which is actually found (Tucci, III. ii, p. 100) locally in this use. *No-sla* we are not prepared to substantiate; but conceivably it might be = Tib. *ños-lha*, 'side (quarter, etc.) deity', i.e. *sa-bdag*: it will be observed that in the 'G-yuñ-druñ' title here *murna-sla* is evidently related to the *mur-bzañs ... sla* of the *Žañ-žuiñ*. The *zi*, corresponding to Tib. *gi*, 'of', is not evidenced in Kunāwarī; but as a Genitive-Dative Postposition it seems to be very frequent in the cognate language of Bu-nan (see the specimen in Francke, *op.cit.*, II, pp. 221-2), and it will be manifest again in the medical Mss. *Bha-da-ya*, evidently equivalent to the *pa-ta-ya* of no. (3), contains a *da(ta)-ya* which there will be good reason for regarding as Suffixal, a fact which accounts for the addition of it (as *dha-ya*) to Sanskrit *nāga-rakṣā* in no. (3). Accordingly there remains a *bha (pa)*, with the sense of 'frightening', or 'quelling', a dangerous supernatural being; and this brings to mind Tibetan *hbañ*, 'seizure', 'distrain', and *hbañ-po* and *-mo*, also *dbañ*, 'magician', 'sorcerer', or 'witch', of the Bon religion (S. C. Das' Dictionary): it may account for *ba-mo*, 'female demon, ogress, witch', in Lepcha (Mainwaring's Dictionary, s.v.), and, further, for Vayu *bālung*, 'exorcist' (Hodgson, *Miscellaneous Essays* (1880), I, p. 217) and the Sum-pa *ba-li-ya* in no. (3) here. The superfluous *na-lā* at the end might be = Sk. *iti*, 'so': cf. Kunāwarī *hāla*, 'how?', *n-* being Demonstrative 'that'. As a Verb-Suffix, *na-lā* is found in the Rangkas language (L.S., p. 482).

Concerning the *Da-lis/Dañ-liñ* of no. (1), and the *Ta-la* of no. (3) there is at present nothing to be said; in a part of Upper Kunāwar (J. D. Cunningham, J.A.S.B. III (1844), p. 197) a *devatā* named *Dala* is worshipped.

The *mu* in *mu-phyā* (no. (4)), *mu-le* (no. (5)), and in the lake-name *Mu-le-diñ* is entitled to some consideration. In Tibetan there is a *mu*, signifying 'boundary', 'horizon', which occurs also in a number of compounds, *mu-phyud*, 'circumference', 'hoop', *mu-bzi*, *mu-med*, etc., including *mu-sañs*, 'Pure horizon', 'sky', a Bon-po expression. *Mu-stags*, the regular Buddhist rendering of Sanskrit *ūrthika*, may not contain this *mu*. Tibetan has also a *dmu*, which seems to have signified 'hail (or rain)-storm' and which is also Proper Name of certain malignant spirits causing dropsy (*dmu-chu*). Evidently it is this (*d*)*mu* that we should recognize in *mu*, 'cold', which has been found in *Nam (N., an ancient language, Index)* and in the Bu-nan

language (Jaeschke in J.A.S.B., XXXIV (1865, p. 95) means 'snow'. In Lepcha *mūr-nyo*, 'the waters above the earth', *mūr-nyo-bu* ('snake'), 'running streams', the kinship is perhaps rather with *mur*, 'spring', 'well', than with *mu* simply.

The above does not yield any clear light in regard to *mu-le*, in which the sound syllable remains obscure. Nor is anything ascertained concerning *phya/bya* or concerning *guge/gu-le*. But *mu* may be helpful in connection with the medical Mss.

Direct testimony concerning the *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* language is afforded further (1) by a few expressions cited in Tibetan language as *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* and (2) by a number of Proper Names:

- (1) *sgo-rum*, 'immovable' or 'immobile', see Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, I, pp. 6, 251, where the Tibetan rendering, *sgul-du-mi-ruṅ-ba*, 'what is not proper to be moved', is recorded. It calls to mind the Tibetan equivalent, *Mi-skyod-pa*, or *Mi-g-yo-ba*, of Sanskrit *Aksobhya*. The negative sense is intelligible if *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ rum* corresponded to Tib. *rum*, 'empty space', 'darkness'.

*sñun-waṅ*, 'a bud' (Tucci, *Indo-Tibetica*, III, i. p. 14),

*sle-tres*, 'a certain climbing plant or its sap', see S. C. Das' Dictionary, s.v.: the word occurs not infrequently in old Tibetan medical texts.

- (2) Proper Names are - A; Personal or titular -

*Bor Yon-tse* (*supra*, p. [...]), a Pu-hraṅs (?) chief.

*Rñeḥu-chuṅ-rgyal*, *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ -za*. mentioned in a Bon-po text

(*Srid-pa-sdud*) as consort of a Tibetan king. But *chuṅ* and *rgyal* are Tibetan forms, and *Rñeḥu* may be a locality surname, in which case it might be the *Sneḥu* of Tucci, *Indo-Tibetica*, III, i, p. 12.

*Lig*, dynastic name of the *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* rulers ('nom princier', Bacot, *Documents*, p. 83, n. 1), as is definitely affirmed in a (not at present accessible) Bon-po text (a *Bstan-hbyun*), which states that the family claimed descent from a Khyuṅ (sc. 'Eagle', Sanskrit Garuḍa) and perhaps supplies a genealogy.

*Lig-myi-rhya* (Bacot, *op.cit.*, pp. 155, 158), designation, but perhaps title, with *myi-rhya* = Tib. *mi-rje*, of the last *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* king (*supra*, p. [...]).

*Lig-sñā-śur* (Bacot, *op.cit.*, pp. 29, 83, 155), in which, however, *sñā-śur* is a Tibetan official or tribal title, on which see *Tibetan Lit. Texts & Documents*, II, pp. 174, 427, III, p. 108).

- B. National, geographical or topographical —

*Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* (State or people)

*Pu(Spu)-hraṅs* (State or people)

*Maṅ (Dnaṅ)-yul* (district)

} As explained *supra*, it is provisionally not certain that Pu-hraṅs and Maṅ-yul

were included in the original *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* State. As regards *Maṅ-yul*, it may be observed that, if we substitute for the Tibetan *yul*, 'district', the *sa*, 'land',

frequent in old, and in modern, Kunāwar and the adjacent regions, the resulting *Mañ-sa* is reminiscent of Sanskrit *Mānasa*.

[*Gaṅs*, 'Ice-mountain'] *Ti-se* = Kailāsa } These may be, as  
 [*Mtsho*, 'Lake'] *Ma-pam* = Mānasa } previously suggested.

even older than *Žaṅ-žui* and are linguistically unpropitious for handling; in *Ti-se* indeed, the *se* may very well be = Tib. *rtse*, 'peak'. But that *Ti* should be = Tib. *Khri*, 'throne', as has perhaps been suggested, is impossible by reason of date.

*Gu-ge* (Bacot, *Documents*, p. 156, etc., etc.)

*Khyuñ-luñ* (*ibid.*, p. 155), royal castle in *Žaṅ-žui*. The name, which, however, may contain Tibetan *luñ*, 'valley', survives in modern *Khyuñ-luñ*, the Kyunglung of maps, on the upper Sulej, between Toling and Lake Mānsa: see Moorcroft, *Journey*, p. 482 (Kien-lung), Gerard, *Account*, p. 123 (Koongloong or Keinlung), Tucci, *Indo-Tibetica*, II, p. 56.

*Gu-rañ* in } *Supra* : otherwise unknown; possibly not  
*Žims* } in *Žaṅ-žui*, though the *rañ*, probably *rañ*, 'hill'

in *Gu-rañ* is common (Tucci, *op.cit.*, II, p. 73, n.1).

*To-yo-Chas-la*, (*supra*, p. [...])

i.e. 'Chas-pass (*la*) in To-yo', the latter, however, *Rtse* (Francke, II, p. 94)? situated in Pu-hrañs, see the Maps.

*Ñi-zuns* (Francke, *op.cit.*, p. 93), obviously the 'Nisung' of modern travellers and maps.

No further relevant names of localities have been found in the ancient texts; and any supplied by later literature are likely, if interpretable as Tibetan, to belong to that language, which had, no doubt, from the IXth or Xth century supplanted the *Žaṅ-žui* for literary uses. But in some works of moderate antiquity, the *Me-loñ* history, the colophons to Buddhist texts, in non-canonical writings, such as 'Lives' of Atiśa, and in old inscriptions there may be such names which, when not clearly Tibetan, and especially when surviving into modern times, may be evidential in regard to the local language. From the sources mentioned a number of such names have been, mainly by Professor Tucci, elicited. After excluding whole classes of them, e.g. names in *-khar* (Tib. *mkhar*, 'city' or 'fort'), Be-khar, Go-, Pur-, /Son-, those in *-dpag* (Tib. *dpag*, 'depth', 'lower'), Dkan-dpag, Grug-, Ro-, those in *-rtse* (Tib. *rtse*, 'peak'), Khwa-rtse, Rig-, and items such as Cog-ro (found also in E. Tibet), Tho-liñ or Mtho-ldiñ (on the spelling see Tucci, *op.cit.*, II, p. 64, n.2), we may provisionally retain —

'*Ag-tsar*, near Skyid-groñ (Kiron), in Mañ-yul (Cordier, *Index du Bastan-hgyur*, II, p. 145).

*Bžer-wer*, s. *Žer-sa* (Tucci, II, pp. 29, 71).

- Chumurti* (Tucci-Ghersì, p. 144) district (s. map).  
*Dam-lag*, or *Dam* and *Lag* (Francke, II, p. 93).  
*Drañ-drañ* (Tucci, II, p. 72) in Spiti ?  
*Dril-chuñ-re* (Tucci, II, p. 73, III, i, p. 12).  
*Gur-siñ* in Mañ-nañ (Tucci, II, pp. 29, 31).  
*G-yañ-skur-ri-hri*, s. *Re-hri*.  
*Hka-ḥchar* in Pu-hrañs (Tucci, II, pp. 63-4, Cordier, *op.cit.*, II, p. 377).  
*Kha-char*, *Khawa-char*.  
*Khyuñ-woñ*, near Rad-nis or Rwa-nid (Tucci-Ghersì, p. 179, Tucci, II, pp. 56, 61, 67, III,i, p. 13).  
*Kyu(skyu)-wañ*.  
*Kyi-dañ* in Cu-ge (Tucci, II, p. 53).  
*Ma-yañ* (Tucci-Ghersì, p. 178, Tucci, II, p. 57, III,i, p. 163) (Ma (Mi) -yang of map).  
*Mañ-nañ* (Tucci, II, p. 31, III,ii, p. 8) (Mangnang of map).  
*Mañ-ḥor* in Žañ-zuñ, (Tucci, II, p. 30, n. 2, p. 51) (Connected with the Manerang Pace (Gerard, (in Lloyd) II, p. 242, *Account*, p. 53, Cunningham, *Ladak*, p. 63) ?).  
*Mu-le-diñ-gi-mtsho* (Tucci, III,ii, p. 102).  
*Na-ra* (Tucci, II, p. 73) - near Káhnám in Kunāwar.  
*Ñe-wan* (Tucci, II, p. 72).  
*Pu* (Tucci, II, p. 73).  
*Pu-ri*, near Shipki (Tucci, II, p. 71-2) (Booree of map).  
*Rad-nis* } (Tucci, II, pp. 56, 64, 67, 69, 70, III,i, p. 13).  
*Rwa-nid* }  
*Re-hri* (Tucci, II, p. 72, III,i, p. 12).  
*Ro-we* = *Ro-dpag* (Tucci, III, p. 12)? (Ropeh, nr. Suñ-nám in Kunāwarī, J.D. Cunningham *op.cit.*, pp. 80, [...])  
*Roñ-chuñ* (Tucci, II, p. 73) district (s. map) (Tib.?).  
*Sañ-rañ* (Tucci, II, p. 73).  
*Stañ-mad* (Tucci, III,i, p. 11).  
*Ti-yag* (Tucci, II, p. 72) ('Theog' of maps).  
*Tsha-rañ* (Tucci, II, pp. 57, 73, III,i, p. 12) (Charang of map).  
*Weñ-gir* (Tucci, II, p. 56, III,i, p. 11).  
*Zar-žan* (Tucci, II, p. 57).  
*Žer*, *Žar-sa* in Pu-hrañs (Tucci, II, pp. 29, 71).

The place-names in this list have the merit of priority by some centuries to any modern knowledge of Kunāwar: many of them occur in the biography, or other records, of Rin-chen-bzañ-po, Xth - XIth century; but they are not demonstrably of

higher antiquity than are some of the other locality names not so attested. Some of them (e.g. Roñ-chuñ) are *prima facie* purely Tibetan, and others can quite well be so. Mixed origin, familiar elsewhere, e.g. in English *Peterborough*, *Bournville*, etc., is rather obvious in *Chumurti*, in which a local *mur-ti*, 'spring (or well) -water', has been amplified by the Tibetan *chu*, 'water', prefixed. In *Gargunsa* and *Garyarsa*, i.e. 'Gar-tog winter-station' and 'summer-station' (Sherring, *op.cit.*, p. 303. Tucci-Gherzi, p. 274) the *gun* and *yar* are Tibetan *dgun* and *dbyar*, the native words for 'winter' and 'summer' having been other; but *sa*, 'place', 'land', is frequent in native (as in Tibetan) placenames: and *Sgar*, though that also is Tibetan, 'encampment', was probably at least as early in Žaň-žui. In 'Mu-le-diñ 'lake' the *diñ* might be *diñ*, *thiñ*, 'cloud' (Kunāwari) or = Tib. *rdziñ*, 'pond', *Wen* and *Žer* are apparently non-Tibetan.

(2d) Summary.

The above indications of Tibeto-Burman, pre-Tibetan, speech in two trans-Himālayan districts, namely Baltistan and Žaň-žui, are strongly supported by the geographical consideration adduced by Sir A. Cunningham in regard to the cis-Himālayan territories, viz. the wide distribution of river (and district) names in *-ti*. In trans-Himālayan districts, Zanskar, etc., they likewise occur, as has been exemplified *supra*; and here in regard to mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum there is the very solid fact that the *ti* as meaning 'water', 'river', and as having in the names that sense, is no less current than in all the languages of the 'Western sub-group'. A curious subsidiary point here is the fact that the Sanskrit *samudram*, preserved in Kunāwar and mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum in its ancient meaning of 'river', i.e. 'river augmented by confluence', 'main river', has in the (translated) Tibetan form *rgya-mtsho*, 'ocean', the same sense, 'river', only in two of the Ladak districts, viz. Baltistan and Purik, which will be the old Bru-ža country. This seems to reflect an ancient connection between Bru-ža and Žaň-žui.

Further linguistic indications are hardly to be expected from the Balti and Purik vocabularies, which seem to be rather purely W. Tibetan. But in the Verb morphology there is one form, very frequent in both, (see the L.S. volume, pp. 37, 44, and the texts), which has already been noted as occurring in the 'Western sub-group' languages and which will recur in the idiom of the medical Mss. connected with Kunāwari. This is the 'conjunctive Participle' (Gerund) in *-e*, usually from a Preterite in *-s*, so that the common form of the Suffix is *-se*; this, and also an amplified form *-se-na*, (*ibid*), has already been exemplified from the 'Western group': it is non-Tibetan, and in the medical Mss. the recurrences of both forms are rather specially noticeable.

As to the Žaň-žui language there is no doubt: it is historically a language of

the trans-Himālayan district mÑah-ris-skor-sum; its affinity to the 'Western sub-group' of Tibeto-Burman is evident even in the meagre particulars elicited *supra*. The language of the 'medical Mss.', which has been proved to be similarly cognate to the 'Western sub-group', may be expected to supply, by its far more abundant materials, full confirmation of its identity with Žañ-žũñ and of a common relation to the group.