Chapter5

The language of the medical Mss.

It will perhaps be admitted that the medical character of the texts and the connection of the language with the Western Group of Pronominalized Tibeto-Burman languages was adequately demonstrated in the notes of Thomas (1926 and 1933): and the general aspect of the language as written could to some extent be appreciated from the short specimens presented. Obviously the limitations of the substance to medical topics and in particular the fact that one of the Mss., which appears to be a list, in short paragraphs, of diseases with their treatments, is paralleled, as stated, by some Tibetan Mss. from the same 'hidden library' and therefore of approximately the same date, should greatly facilitate a translation: and the extensive literature of medicine in Tibetan should be generally helpful. The grammatical items adduced could, as based upon comparison of occurrences, be considered reasonably certain, and the four particular identifications of terms might provisionally pass muster. It may now be added that the capricious fluctuations of spelling are, perhaps, because no Central-Asian scribe was considered competent to deal with the remote and minor language, less frequent and troublesome than is the case with other languages represented in Mss. from the same library.

But any inspection of the two extracts, [...] of four short sentences tentatively translated, will have shown that the written words, nearly all monosyllabic, are mostly unrecognizable from Tibetan and many of them unlike Tibetan in form. And the divergences in the significations of apparently, and even of actually, corresponding monosyllables in related Tibeto-Burman languages are so sweeping as to render adventurous any essay at interpretation of a series of such monosyllables. In the case of the first Ms. the pitfalls noted as possible include the occurrence of Sanskrit names of medicaments, etc., reproduced not in original, but in literal translation.

It must be added that inevitably there are in the texts some loan-words from Tibetan and that in some cases they might create a perverse impression of the phonology of the language. An example of this may be seen in the expression *gdaṅ-tog* [margin: A 31], in which it is proposed to recognize the Tibetan *gdaṅs*, 'recover from illness,' 'convalesce,' a word of early occurrence.[2] By recognition of this we are rid of a nearly unique occurrence of Prefix *g-* in the texts; the other apparent instance, *gsad* [margin: III 22], being, if genuine, likewise a loan-word.

In *gdaṅ-tog* a second of the mentioned pitfalls is exemplified. The *tog* is not connected with Tibet[an] *tog*, 'top,' or with any other Tibetan *tog*: it is an inflected form of a Verb-suffix *to*, which originally was a Verb Substantive, 'be' or 'become,' so that *gdaṅ-tog* = 'recovers,' 'convalesces.' Here the monosyllabic form of *tog* disguises the fact that it is an inflected form. This does not, however,

preclude the existence in the language of an independent *tog*, a Noun-form: for there are several occurrences of a word *dog-ra* [margin: also *dog-mo*], 'bounded space,' which is evidently the term found by Professor Tucci[3] as designation of the 'dancing-ground' (perhaps = Sanskrit *sthāna*, the 'Place,' as in Khotan)[4], at Poo in Kunāwar: it may also be the *dogree* or *shumung*, 'small houses where the [Kunāwar] shepherds live,' of J. D. Cunningham.[5] [margin: See *supra*] In Tibetan also inflected forms, e.g. in Pronouns as *ḫdes, ḫder*, 'by that,' 'in that,' and Verb Preterites in *-s*, occur in certain cases; but Inflections having the value of Personal Pronouns, such as Kunāwarī, etc., *-g* are non-existent. In the Pronominalized Tibeto-Burman languages there are Verb-forms of considerable complexity; and when these are written, which is usual in Tibetan script, as a series of monosyllables, each of which may have its independent meaning or meanings, there will be, until the general sense is ascertained, a series of problems. In Tibetan, again, a dissyllabic writing is in certain cases not infrequent: thus *ya*, 'upper,' has adjective *yar*, 'on high,' etc., of which an alternative form is *ya-ru*; and this occasions variant writings, *yar, ya-ru, yaru, yar-ru*, according to caprice, style or metrical convenience; similarly the *-de* Gerund in combination with the Verb-form *chod* yields *chod-de*, but this will sometimes be written, problematically, as *chode* or *cho-de*. In the medical Mss., where provisionally nothing is ascertained, the second of these instances is frequently paralleled where the Verb-auxiliary *tad*[6], or any Verb-root which has, or can have, a final *-d*, is followed by that Gerund-Suffix: this yields alternative writings *ta-de, tade, tad-de*. In the phrase *nve-ge-rmine*, interpreted as 'by the ripening of a bad "humour" (Sk. *doṣa*),'[7] the dissyllable *rmine* has an Instrumental *-e* attached to *rmin*, 'ripening' or to the whole phrase. This, when realized, creates no difficulty; but the specimen in THOMAS (1926: 506), has in the first paragraph a form *skrigse*, which is a similar Instrumental from a Verb-form *skrigs*; the second paragraph writes *skrigs-se*, in which accordingly it would be wasted effort to look for a word *se*. In *nwe-ge* it would be a mistake to recognize a Suffix *ge,* though such in fact exists; for here it is Instrumental of *ga*, making Concord with *rmine*. The case of *rme-ge-rmine* differs from that of *nwe-ge-rmine*, if *rme* also is, as proposed, Instrumental (of *rma*, 'wound'), which however, is disputable, since an opposite *rme* actually occurs.

The punctuation in the Mss. is, of course, helpful; and in particular it appears that dissyllabically written forms in *-o* are always sentence-endings, the *-o* being merely asseverative, as in Tibetan (and in Nam). But the converse is by no means true; and the punctuation frequently errs, both by defect and by excess. Normally, no doubt or at least prevalently, the last word in a sentence or clause is a Verb-form; but in verse[8] or for other stylistic reasons, the principle can be disregarded; and, on the other hand, Verb-forms with Participial or other value can occur

anywhere in the sentence.

These considerations discourage, it may seem, a first etymological attack upon the language, which, moreover, surpasses the Tibetan in phonological curiosities and problems. Etymologizing without knowledge of meanings is, of course, a haphazard proceeding. The first requisite seems to be an insight into the articulation of the sentences, which may be attained by a consideration of form-elements in the language, Suffixes, Particles, etc., which by their recurrences permit of effective comparisons.

Here would be the place for retracting one or two definite errors in the previous attempt Thomas (1933). It was wrong, in the first place, to regard the word *mu* in the verse quoted on p. 410 as perhaps 'an article:' though in other languages of the group a *m*-Suffix, e.g. in Infinitives in -*mu* or -*mig*, is, as we have seen, well represented, not only has the *mu* of the texts certainly, as stated, other senses, but it is never an Article or Suffix, and it is, in two at least of the texts, a main topic. Then again, *gyun-ryuṅ* (pp. 408, 410) is not = Tib. *g-yuṅ-druṅ*, Sanskrit *svastika*, although *g-yuṅ-druṅ* may very well have come to Tibet, as a Bon-po expression, from Žaṅ-žuṅ: it is rather = Sanskrit *nidāna*, 'cause' (of a disease), with *gyun*, 'necessary,' seen in 'Theburskud' *geoon-mung* (*gyun-meṅ*), 'to wish,'[9] Bu-nan *gyun*, 'necessary'[10] = *goan*[11].

In view of the difficulties indicated above it may be encouraging to cite here a passage of which a part translation may be propounded with some confidence and which exhibits at any rate the general character of the language. The passage is one paragraph, ll. 86-8, of the India Office Mss., which is, as already stated, a list of diseases and their treatments: it reads as follows:-

[l. 86] // rye : tshod : ga : nweḥo // ko : ko : yag // kar : ga : na // nu : skyu : tse // sum ꞊ me : rye : tshod-tog : mar : kul : [87] thum : ca : kyero // sum : kha : na : lod : do // ru : tshod : dog : khyer : raṅ : ru : tshel : śwedo // ni : laṅ : spyel : ce : [88] khyero // ma : ni : laṅ // ti : ce : khyero // ru : khyi : nugs : na . lod . do //

Translation:-

In this translation attention is invited only to the portions not underlined, the remainder being in various degrees only tentative.

'By-bile heat' illness there is. <u>Chin awry; dried-up vitality; strength-leakage</u>—through [these] three, if there is 'by-bile heat,' melted butter, a spoonful, is taken. Three alternatives there are said to be: <u>bone (?) heat</u>,... In case it is, draughts of milk are taken: in case it is not, draughts of water are taken ....

Here the unfortunate obscurity at one point spoils the connection of sense. But the following points can be remarked:-

(a) as regards vocabulary: the words *ri*, 'bile,' *nwe*, 'illness' (= Sanskrit *doṣa*, the *ñes* of Tibetan medicine), *na*, 'vitality' (= Sanskrit *āyuḥ*), *nu*, 'strength' (=

Sanskrit *bala*, Tib. *nus*), *sum*, '3,' *mar-kul*, 'melted butter' (the *mar-khu* of Tibetan medicine, with a final-*l* which recurs and has been noted *supra* as found in the Bu-nan language), *thum-ca*, 'spoonful' (= Tib. *thum*, Kunāwarī *thom-bu*, 'spoon'), *ti-ce*, 'draughts of water,' may be taken as previously expounded. And we may provisionally beg leave merely to assume here some other meanings for which we have evidence from Tibetan, etc., or from the text; e.g. from Tibetan, *tshod*, 'heat,' 'cooking,' *ko-ko* (*ko-sko*, *sko-sko*, etc., also Balti *ko-sko*), 'chin,' *yag*, 'awry' (Tib. *kyag, kyog, yo*, etc., e.g. in *kha-yo*, 'mouth awry'), *kyer, khyer*, 'take' (Tib. *hkhyer*, also common in Kunāwarī, etc.): others *kar* (also *skar*), 'dry,' *skyu*, 'leak,' 'drip;'

(2) spellings: *sum* : *me* for *sume*, 'by three,' Instrumental of *sum*, 'three,' *lod-do* for *lodo* (frequent);

(3) terminal -*o* (asseverative) in *nweḥ-o, lod-o, kyer-o, khyer-o, śwed-o*;

(4) Declension: Instrumental base in -*e*, *rye* (from *ri*), *sume* (from *sum*); Plural -*ce* (from -*ca*), *spyel-ce, ti-ce*;

(5) Conjugation: Indicative or Participle in -*g*, *to-g*, 'is,' 'becomes,' 'being,' 'becoming;' Gerund in -*laṅ*, 'in case of,' *ni-laṅ, ma-ni-laṅ*;

(6) Post-positions: -*tse*, 'through' (Causal), perhaps -*raṅ*, 'with' or 'on,'*khyer-raṅ*, 'on taking;'

(7) particular words: *ni*, 'be,' 'become,' *ma*, 'not,' *spyel*, 'milk.'

Of these items the most decisive, no doubt, is the antithesis between the two successive sentences beginning with *ni-laṅ* and *ma-ni-laṅ* respectively. In the Western sub-group *ni* and *ma-ni* are the most normal expressions for 'is,' and 'is not,' and *laṅ*, no doubt = Tib. *laṅ*, 'arise,' has been noted (*supra*) as serving in a part of the area to form a much used Gerund: in the Vayu language the Verbs have a Gerund in -*lung*[12], expressing locality of the action,[13] so that it would correspond to English 'in case of.' These particulars in themselves suffice to prove an affinity between the language of the medical Mss. and the Western sub-groups, and the participation of the Vayu (Kirānti) language of Nepal, while not necessary to prove the antiquity of the *laṅ*, extends its area. Something further can be deduced from the fact that in the Western sub-group the -*laṅ*, as distinct from the analogous -*daṅ*, -*taṅ*, -*paṅ*, -*raṅ*, -*naṅ* (with different significations), is confined to the more easterly members, nearer to Nepal.

The *spyel-ce*, 'milk-doses,' antithetic to *ti-ce*, 'water-dosis,' has an interest of its own. *Pel*, 'milk,' is given by Gerard (1842: 497) as used in the Tibar-skad and is clearly identical with Bu-nan *pel-tsi*[14], in which the -*tsi* is a common Suffix. As *pel*, 'milk,' has not been traced elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman, while Dravidian has *pāl*[15], the word may have a bearing on the Muṇḍa hypothesis.

Morphological elements

Suffixal elements

A. Sentence-closing asseveratives:

(1) -*o*, after a vowel -*ho*, the above-mentioned Suffix, of frequent occurrence, as in Tibetan; written either conjunct, as in *lodo, khyero, khyerdo, tsago, rhwyiso, khlogso, śido, nweho, triho*

or with repeated or attracted consonant (after a vowel -*ho*), as in *lod-do* and *lo-do, śid-do, stuṅ-ṅo, khlogs-so, nwe-ho.*

When this -*o* follows a noun, the asseverative force carries also, as in Tibetan, the notion of the Verb-Substantive, as in *nweho* or *nwe-ho*, 'disease there is.'

(2) ? -*i*,[16] conjunct, as in *lodi, rehusi*, or with attracted consonant, as in *lo-di*.

The doubt in regard to this -*i* is due to the circumstance that it may belong to the Verb itself rather than to the sentence, a similar -*i* occurring in conjunction with certain non-final Verb-forms.

(3) ? *ni*, the speciality of which in Tibetan and Nam is discussed in Thomas (1948: 177-178), may be rather frequent, but it can be a form of the common Verb-Substantive *na, ni*.

B. Noun (Substantive or Adjective)-forming Suffixes:

(1) -*ga*: It might seem that this -*ga* is predominantly used in forming Attributes from phrases: thus we find a number of diseases (*nwe*) described by its aid, e.g. *rab-this-ga-nweh, aṅ-ryod-ga-, laṅ-nad-ga-, rye-tshod-ga-*, and there are also other similar phrases, e.g. *rdim-len-ga*, 'disappearance(?)-causing,' *khe[.]ri-khye(r)-ga, thal-liṅs-ga, phyud-khyer-ga, si-se-buld-ga, so-ze-buld-ga, mil-purd-tal-ga*, and, several times repeated, *pud-khugs-ga(-ta-ye), skri-me-lad-ga-.*

Here it might be thought that the force of the -*ga* would be better described as Participial than as Adjectival: and probably in any case it is related to the Kunāwari Perfect Participles in -*ka*, 'Theburskud'-*ga* in *lenga*, 'done,' 'having done,' which has found its way into Bhotiyā also[17]. The *Linguistic Survey*[18] also regards the Perfects in -*k*/-*g* and the -*ka* form in the group of languages as Participles.

Probably, however, this is to put the cart before the horse: an old Adjectival Suffix -*ka*/-*ga* has been found in Nam and in Tibetan[19]; and in Kunāwari there are numerous Adjectives in -*k*/-*g*, for example[20] *shooeeg*, 'red,' *poozrak*, 'square' (Theburskud *peezoor*, Tib. *zur-bźi*), *warik*, 'far' (*war, warke*), *leehig, leeko* (Tib. *lci*), 'heavy,' *lisk*, 'cold,' *thisk*, 'lazy', *soork* (Tib. *skyur*), 'sour' (Bu-nan *shwri*) (see in Grahame Bailey's *Vocabulary*[21] *shwikh', wark, lik, liss, thiss, surkh*) where the *k*/*kh*/*g* goes back to this -*ka*/-*ga*. Similarly Bu-nan has *tunig*, 'short' = Tib. *thuṅ*.

From the medical Mss. we can cite *ti-ga*, 'watery' (?), *war-ga*, *ral-ga*, to which we shall have to make additions under *-ge* (*infra*).

(2) *-ge*: This is seen, first of all, in certain Adjectives: in three successive and parallel verses we read, at corresponding points, -

śe-ge-mu, 'white (*śe* = Bu-nan *shi*) sap'

mar-ge-mu, 'red (*mar* = Tib. *dmar*) sap'

tiṅ-ge-mu, 'blue (*tiṅ-ge* = Bu-nan *tiṅgi*, Tib. *mthiṅ*) sap'

and Bu-nan has also *maṅgi*, 'red,' while Kunāwarī has, further, *booṅgee* (*buṅ-gi*), 'full,' *shagee* and *shaee* (G. Bailey *shāgī*), 'empty.' With a different Suffix, *ni*, Kunāwarī has *maṅgnee*, 'red,' *teeṅgnee* (*tiṅ-ni*), 'blue,' *shaṅgnee* (*śaṅ-ni*), 'large,' *neooṅgnee* (*nyuṅ-ni*, Bailey *nyūg*), 'now.' There are, moreover, Adjectives in *-i* simply, very common in Bu-nan, e.g. *khyeï*, 'sweet,' *khyoï*, 'dry,' *chheï*, 'warm,' *nuï*, 'new,', *noï*, 'much,' *loï*, 'easy,' *shuri*, 'sour,' *yuï*, 'old' (= Kunāwarī *ooshk*?).

There is no reason for supposing that in the three cited occurrences the *-ge* is an inflected form of *-ga*, since a 'Nominative' is there required: moreover, the Bu-nan form in *-gi* is preferably derived from *-ge*, not *-ga*, cf. the *-i* in *shi*, 'white,' = *śe*. But it might well be that the *-ge* was produced by addition of the Adjectival *-i* to a *-ga*-form, producing a *-gai*, whence *-ge*: and this might accord with the fact that Dārmiyā, Chaudāṅgsī and Byāṅgsī, which have a Genitive in *-g*, use alternatively *-gai*[22].

(3) *-ca*: A Suffix *-ca* is manifest in the recurrent phrase *mar-kul-thum-ca-khyero* which certainly means 'brings (or gives) a spoon-full' (Tib. *thums*, 'spoon,' or *thum*, 'piece,' *thum-bu*, 'piece' or 'ladle,' *thom-bu*, 'ladle,' of butter [or oil]-fluid [Tib. *mar-khu*, common in medical texts). The same *-ca* occurs in *rma-'ag-ca*, 'wound-mouth,' *lab-ce*, *žur-ca* (perhaps = Tib. *zur-ca* [*sic*], 'side issue,' 'marginal matter'), *dag-ca*, *ti-ca-sum*, 'three water-draughts' (?). It seems likely that this *ca* is related to Tibetan *cha*, 'part,' which with the signification 'things' is used as a kind of indefinite Pluralizing Suffix, e.g. in *skad-cha*, 'talk', *dgos-cha*, 'necessaries,' *yig-cha*, 'papers,' 'documents,' *lag-cha*, 'hand-tools.' Hence, when we find *lab-ce*, *ti-ce* (*-khyero*) in place of the above *lab-ca*, *ti-ca*, an explanation is requisite.

(4) ? *-tsa*: In Tibetan a *ca*, *cha*, might often be written, or even pronounced, as *tsa*, *tsha*, so that a word *bu-tsa*, 'family,' 'offspring' (from *bu*, 'child'), may well contain the above *ca*. Hence some forms in the medical texts, such as *dro-tsa*, 'heats' (?), *bu-tsa*, 'worms' (?), *rwaṅ-tsa*, 'food' (?), *mu-tsa*, 'saps' (?), may possibly be of that nature.

C. Declensional Suffixes:

(1) *-a*: The force of a Genitive, suggested in Thomas (1933: 401), can be seen in the repeated expression, *khe-khe-no-gyun-ryuṅ* 'cause (Sanskrit *nidāna*) of *khe-*

khe (a certain disease).' The disease may not be exactly identical with the 'tetter,' 'herpes,' 'ringworm,' denoted by Tib. *khe-khye*, and the *n-* preceding the *-o*. In Kunāwarī and other languages of its group, where a Genitive in *-o* is usual,[23] such an *n-* is not infrequent, being either a latent part of the word-stem or a Plural Suffix. The latter cannot be the case in *khe-khe-no*, but a form *khe-khen* may have functioned (cf. Báhing, *kekem*, 'dirty')[24].

Genitives in *-o* will also be seen in *mu-na-so*, *infra*, while other instances may require detection.

(2) *-e*, Instrumental Suffix:[25] with repeated consonant, *skrigs-se*.

After a vowel which there is reason for keeping distinct, dissyllabic writing with inserted *y* is found, e.g. in *chwi-ye, su-ye, ta-ye, to-ye, mu-ye, kye-ye, go-ye, sa-ye, tha-ye, ti-ye, ru-ye, mo-ye, rho-ye, we-ye, gri-ye, ñu-ye, tsha-ye, rbo-ye, the-ye, ña-ye, gu-ye, pye-ye; mu-sañ-ye* is exceptional. Some further examples of variant writing are -

Dissyllabic: *grañe, thuñe, brañe, tañe, spogse, lumse, rliñse*

Monosyllabic: *grañ-ñe, grañ-se, ryuñ-ñe, byer-re, tshum-me, glañ-ñe, glañ-se, spog-se.*

It is curious that this *-e*-Instrumental is not apparent in the modern group of languages, Kunāwarī, etc.

(3) *-s*, Instrumental or Agential:

The *-s*-Agential, common to the whole group of languages and to Tibetan, may very well be seen in *ti-chas-dus*, 'by collected parts of water,' as compared with *nu-cha-du*, 'collecting parts of strength.' This *du* may have been the source of a *du*-Plural in Kunāwarī. But even here in *dus* the *-s* may be a Verbal Suffix, which elsewhere renders problematic some further possible examples of *-s*-Agential.

(4) *-ži*: A Genitive or Causal value is apparent in the consecutive and parallel expressions-

pu-ži-na, 'fire-of vitality' (Sanskrit *āyuṣ*)

ti-ži-nure, 'water-of *doṣa*'

khwe-ži-nu, 'air-of strength' (Sanskrit *bala*)

zu-ži-ci, 'earth-of energy' (Sanskrit *vīrya*)

where the four physical elements are mentioned as the sources of the four physiological qualities. There are numerous other instances of the *ži* following the same words and also similarly constituted words of allied significations, e.g., *mu*, 'sap,' *ri*, 'bile,' *bi*, 'phlegm,' *sa*, 'blood.' Whether this *ži* occurs after a consonant may be left provisionally undetermined.It seems clear that this *-ži* is connected with-

Bu-nan, *-dzi, -tsi, -zi, -tshi*, Agential Suffix[26]

Manohātī, *-tsi, -dzi, -zi*, Agential-Instrumental-Ablative Suffix[27]

Chamba Lahulī, -*ts*, -*z*, Agential Suffix[28].

(5) -*ci*: As an alternative to *ži* in certain phonetic situations, a *ci* might reasonably, on the analogy of Tibetan *cig/žig, ciṅ/žiṅ/šiṅ, ces/žes*, etc., be expected to occur: and a -*ci* with signification obviously akin to that of -*ži* is frequent; moreover, this -*ci* seems to have a preference for post-consonantal positions, whereas -*ži* is usually preceded by a vowel. But in neither case are exceptions unexampled: hence it seems advisable to await further light, especially as the syllable *ci* has also the already noted signification = Sanskrit *vīrya*, and moreover has frequent occurrences as a Verb.

(6) -*tse* with Ablatival or Causal sense, 'from,' is clear in the successive and parallel phrases-

spru- 'and-pu-tse, 'from the fire in the semen (?)'

mar- 'and-ti-tse, 'from the water in the blood'

gra- 'and-khwe-tse, 'from the air in the voice (hair?)'

myur- 'ul-zu-tse, 'from the quickly (?) collecting earth.'

These recur, and there are also occurrences after *na, nwe, mu-srub, šig, ba, grin-skrind, khwe, dram*. It seems clear that this *tse* is the Ablatival *che* (*ce*) of Kunāwarī,[29] and the *ts* of some of the other languages[30]. It seems likely that some of the instances of *ce* in the Mss. are variants of this *tse*.

(7) -*tags*, Ablatival Suffix in the repeated *ze-ma-to-tags*, 'from not having eaten'

This Suffix is known in Kunāwarī[31] and in some of the other languages, Kanāshī *dits*, Chamba Lahulī *dŏts*[32].

(8) - '*and* as a Locative Suffix has been exemplified in no. (6) *supra*. We may add *khus-mar- 'and-ge*. This may be Gerard's *en, un*[33] and the -*ṅ* of Bu-nan, -*ung* of Chaudāngsī[34].

(9) ? -*run*, Ablative? This, which seems to be different from *ruṅ*, is found not infrequently in the combination *run-ryuṅ*, where *ryuṅ* should mean 'origin,' or 'arising,' as in *gyun-ryuṅ*, 'cause:' but it often occurs without *ryuṅ*.

D. Conjugational Suffixes:

The Verb Substantive 'is,' as partaking in this function, may first be specified. Here we should take note of-

na, 'is,' with variant *ni* (perhaps = 'becomes')

ta, 'makes,' 'causes' (?)

to, 'becomes'

Concerning these in general nothing need be specified since they are all widespread in the group of languages as may be seen from the *Linguistic Survey* references given. In Kunāwarī both *n*-forms and *t*-forms are found, the *to* having as an alternative a *dū* = Tibetan *ḥdug*. It may be suspected that the original

230

signification of *ta* was 'do,' and that it is identical with a *da*, 'give,' which appears in some of the languages and a *ta*, 'place,' found in Vāyu. The antiquity of *ta* and *to* is evidenced by their occurrence in Nam,[35] where *ta* has the function of Tibetan -*pa/ba* with Verb-roots, supporting the conjecture that this *pa/ba* is really derived from the Verb-root *byed/byad/bas*, 'do.'

It should be stated that the language of the medical Mss. has a penchant for appending a -*d*, not demonstratedly etymological, to Verb-roots ending in a vowel, when a Suffix follows. Whether the Tibetan -*d* in *skyed, bgyid*, etc., has a common origin with this may be disregarded: the -*d*, which, in fact, is not confined to Verb-forms, accounts for the *tad* noted in Thomas (1933: 407), and for a corresponding *tod*, both being evidenced in Kunāwarī (*tat, tot*).

The same -*d* occurs in connection with a Verb *lo*, 'say,' which requires no attestation, being common to the whole group of languages. This *lo* is probably identical with Tibetan *zla*, 'say,' (*bzlo, bzla, zlos*, 'charm,' 'spell,' *zlos-gar*, 'drama,' *bzlas, bzlos*, 'mutter' [charms, etc.]), which in Tibetan presents no -*d*-form. This Verb is entitled to consideration here primarily as functioning together with *na* in the recurrent compound expression-

na-lo (*na-lodi, na-lodo, lo-di, lod-do, lo-do*), 'is said to be (or exist)'

na-ma-lodi, etc., 'is said not to be (or exist);'

but it will be found otherwise also serviceable.

In the Verb-system of old Tibetan the functioning of Prefixes *g, d, b, m, h, r, s* plays, of course, a very important part, while in the modern languages, where their effects survive for the most part only lexically, it is non-significant. As regards the medical texts, where only *l, r, s* are found,[36] the question whether any of the others ever existed in the language awaits consideration. In modern Kunāwarī no trace of ancient Prefixes has hitherto been noted, except a Transitive force apparent in certain Verbs with *s*-, which is also recognized in Tibetan. For this reason, and also because of difficult phonological problems in connection with groups of initial consonants, anything relating to Prefixes in the Verb may be relegated to 'Etymology.'

Similarly the Vowel-ablauts prominent in Tibetan conjugation may be left out of account, even if, apart from the special case of reduplication, they occur at all, which is provisionally doubtful. In the case of the modern languages such old Ablauts have not been discussed. It may be noted that in Kunāwarī the Tibetan *thos*, 'hear,' and *mthoṅ*, 'see,' are respectively *thas* and *taṅ*.

Attention may therefore be confined to Suffixal elements:-

(1) -*d*: The terminal *d*, seen in many Tibetan *quasi*-root words after a vowel (*skyed*, etc.) and in writing often appended, as the *drag*, to Verb-roots, and even other words, ending in *n, r*, or *l*, and, moreover, affecting, even when not written,

the forms of certain Suffixes, is frequent in the medical Mss. As an instance of its occurrence without signification may be cited the phrase-

mu... *da-phyend-min-da-phyen-nwe*, 'while *mu* does not there[?] *phyen*, there[?] *phyen*'s *nwe*'.

A somewhat different instance is *grin-skrind-ci*, 'carefully,' which though perhaps merely Tibetan (*grims-pa*, *sgrin-po*, 'dexterous,' 'careful'), has numerous occurrences. The possibility that the *-d* has in the texts (and also in Tibetan) the force of a Preterite or Aorist need not be highly rated.

(2) *-g* (after *ṅ*) and *-b* (after *m*) are likewise frequent: examples are, e.g.-

after *ṅ*:   *khlaṅg* (and *khlaṅg-khlaṅg* and *khlaṅ-khlaṅg*) = *khlaṅ*, *ryuṅg* = *ryuṅ*, *liṅg* (and *liṅg-liṅg*) = *liṅ(s)*, *żuṅg* (and *żuṅg- żuṅg*) = *żuṅ*, *lyoṅg* (and *lyoṅg-lyoṅg*) = *lyoṅ*,

after *m*: *khumb* = *khum*, *rumb* = *rum*, *gamb* = *gam*, *ryambs* (and *ryams*) = *ryam*.

There is no reason for supposing the *-g* or *-b* to be other than simply phonetic, intended to secure a full pronunciation of the *-ṅ* or *-m*: this is specially clear in the reduplicated forms, where no Suffix is apposite, and in cases like *ryambs*, where an actual Suffix, *-s*, is added.

(3) *-s*: This Aorist- or Preterite-forming Suffix, familiar in Tibetan (mostly after vowels, since after consonants it is apt to be neglected in writing) and in Nam[37] is highly frequent in the Mss. Commonly the *s*-forms declare their Verbal nature not only by clear connection with *s*-less forms manifestly Verbal, but also by position at the end of sentences or clauses. But to this order there are exceptions of two kinds, the first, a minor one, being a matter of style and emphasis, as in the above quoted verse, where three successive lines end with the three successive apodosis,

la-skams-na
tiṅ-gyuṅs-nwe
żas-sphaṅs-nu.

Here the transposition of the Verbs *skams*, *gyuṅs*, *sphaṅs* is for the purpose of pointing the double antitheses between *la*, *tiṅ*, and *żas*, and between *na*, *nwe*, *nu*; other quite similarly constructed verses could be cited. Transpositions of this nature are, no doubt, possible in any language.

The second kind of exceptions, which are numerous, is due to the circumstance that the signification of the *s*-forms is not that of a temporal Preterite, which, in fact, has in a medical text no great scope; it is Aoristic, denoting a thing done, as distinguished from a thing in progress: hence, while retaining its status as a clause (or phrase)-terminating Predicate, it can function as a Gerund or receive any Suffixes attaching a phrase to the syntax of its sentence. Instances would be:-

(a) *s*-form as sentence-terminating Aorist, *wam-skrigs, zwa-tse-rkhwas, mar-ge-tubs* (with *o*-asseverative) *rma-rhubso, rtib-ca-rhyuiso, myig-rhe-śanso* (with Verb-Substantive added) *zwa-tse-rkhwas-tog*

(b) reduplicated form constituting a Gerund (as is normally the case with Present-Participles) *gwas-gwas* (evidently Aorist of *gwa-gwa*)

(c) (without Suffix) *śnal-tshars-sa*, 'sickness-dried-blood'

   (with Suffix) *pi … gyun-ryun -rhalse*, 'by the four causes combined'

This third case, highly natural, is of great frequency, as are cases where the Participle is of the Present Tense. Case (b) is less common, a Participle (*tog*) of the Verb-Substantive being usually appended.

It need hardly be mentioned that, as in Tibetan, a number of *s*-forms have acquired the value of Substantives: in Tibetan possibly most Substantives in -*s*, e.g. *ḫbras, thabs, brgyags* had that origin.

The modern Kunāwarī seems to be without the *s*-Preterite, using mainly a form, sometimes compounded with the Verb-Substantive, ending with a *k* derived from a Participle. Of the adjacent languages, however, Dārmiyā has the -*s lhesū*, 'said' (*gas*, 'made,' *tā-yasū*, 'was,' *dēsī*, 'went') and Chaudāngsī *dayas*, '   ', *tans*, '   ', *yungsā*, '   '), and Bu-nan uses a -*zā* which perhaps is of the same origin. The examples are from the *Linguistic Survey* volume, where others may be seen.

In Participial use, mostly Preterite, the -*s* seems to run through practically all the languages: from the *Linguistic Survey* volume[38] we may cite-

   pp. 436, 438 Kunāwarī *hacis*, 'become,' *toshis*, 'seated'

   pp. 456-457 Manohāti *lhesi-tod*, 'was made'

   pp. 474-475 Bu-nan *ras-tang*, 'having-come-on,' *dās-tang*, 'being-found-on,' *lochis-tang*, 'on having said'

   p. 483   Rangkas *yans*, 'hearing,' *thukse*, 'returning'

   p. 493-495 Dārmiyā *paksī*, 'having left,' *yan-sī-chū*, 'having heard'

It will be observed that forms like Dārmiyā *tāyasū*, Chaudāngsī *deyas*, where, as in the *gwas-gwas* of the medical Ms., the -*s* is appended not to the original root, but to a Present Participle in -*a*, attest a definite feeling of the Aoristic force of the -*s*.

(4) -*si, si-na*: Not infrequently a terminal Verb-form with the -*s*-Suffix has in the Medical Mss. an appended -*i*: and, as this occurs with other Verb-forms, e.g. in *lodi* and *rburi*, it might be thought that the -*i* in such cases is simply the above-noted asseverative, sentence terminating, -*i*. This, however, is rendered doubtful by the existence of -*si-na* forms, where the -*i* is followed by a further Suffix: and, since the meaning of the -*si-na* forms is determined by peculiar occurrences which help to characterize the texts, it seems proper to dwell a little upon the matter.

In a number of passages there are accumulations of such *-si* (or *-tsi*)-*na* forms; and the passages, consisting of short sentences each ending with such, produce the impression of formulas. One such passage reads as follows-

> ... *ku-big-ñe-lo-yo* (?)
> *ku-big-yo ///* [end of line] *rul-gwi* (*nwi*?)-*si-na*
> *mans-geg-pham-phod-lag-tsi-na*
> *'a-wa-lan-skri-ti-śwald-tsi-na*
> *'a-wa-lan-skri ///* [end of line] *ti-śwald-tsi-na*
> *phra-mam-ri-lo-brum-si-na*
> *phra-man-ri-lo-bram-si-na*
> *rmo-ma-tshañ-rañ-hurd* (?*burd*)-*tsi-na*
> *rmo-ma-tshañ-rañ-hard-tsi-na*
> *li-we-khyurd-tsi-na*
> *land-rañ-khyard-tsi-na*
> *ñir-ma-mabs-si-na*

Here evidently the succession of parallel phrases ending in *-si-na* — for obviously the variant *tsi*, for *si*, is due to the preceding consonant — constitute a formula. In text C there are about a dozen such passages, and practically all are immediately preceded by the expression *ñe-lo*: even Ms. A, a list of diseases and treatments has-

> *bram-sig-śvi-phrag-loḫo //*
> *'o-'a-'u-rañ-'us-si-na //*
> *'a-rañ-'as-si-na //*
> *he-ro-mar-ge-phus-sig-swaḫ //*
> *'am-si-'um-si-bu-bañ* (*pañ*?)-*ci //*

It seems clear that this *lo* is the above particularized Verb, meaning 'say;' and we had reason for conceiving that *ñe-lo*, with *ñe* equivalent, as it is, in Kunāwarī to Tibetan *ñe*, 'under,' 'inferior,' 'near,' had in fact the sense of 'formula' or 'charm.' But Gerard's vocabulary[39] supplies the manifestly identical expression *nelote-lonmig* with the preferable signification 'whisper' (*nelote*, 'whispering' [Gerund in *-te*]) and *lonmig* (Infinitive in *-mig*), 'to speak.' Thus the formula would be a whispered communication (by the physician to the patient?); but we may take leave to suggest that the meaning is not exactly 'whisper,' but 'mutter' (Sanskrit *japa*), which accords well not only with the universal practice in connection with charms and spells, but also specially with the above propounded etymology of *lo*, as = Tibetan *zlo*. In that case the formula is not an encouraging communication by the physician, but an auto-suggestive utterance such as not very long ago had a certain vogue in Europe.

It is clear that the *-si-na*-forms are simply *-si*-forms, the Aorists of no. 3c,

with addition of *na*: if that were subject of doubt, the fact that in some of the formulas *-si* occurs without the *-na* would be decisive. It seems obvious that the *-na* is merely the Verb-Substantive *na*, 'is,' and the *-si-na*-forms are Perfect Tenses. Consequently the meaning of the several items is some (satisfactory) result attained, so that the passages furnish not only the grammatical form of a Perfect Tense, but also an orientation in regard to the significations of the expressions used.

The latter hint may be pursued under the head of etymology. Here a single particular may be noticed. The expression *skri-ti*, which frequently recurs, probably means 'foul fluid,' being *ti*, 'water,' preceded by *skri* = Kunāwarī *kri*, 'dirt,' = Tib. *dkru* (cf. *pi/pu*, 'four'). Whether *skri-ti* is, in fact, Kunāwarī *kratee*, 'spittle,'[40] may be left undetermined. In the passage *skri-ti* is said to have been *śwald*; and in other similar formulas it is said to have been *liṅg* (*-tsi-na*) and *sa* (*si-na*) and *skri-rul*, 'dirt-rot,' is said to have been *khlaṅg* (*-tsi-na*). The last two Verbs are, no doubt, the widespread *sa* (Tib. *gsad, gsod, bsad*), 'slay,' and the frequently recurring *khlaṅ* (also in Tibetan medicine), 'wipe.' *Liṅg* therefore must likewise denote some way of 'getting rid of,' and the same applies to *śwald*. *Liṅg*, which occurs also, with *r*-Prefix, as *thal-rliṅs*, may be = Tib. *liṅs*, 'banish,' 'cast out,' 'chase,' *liṅs-pa*, 'hunter;' and *thal*, which may be Tib. *thal*, 'come through' (e.g. a difficulty), 'come to an end,' 'attain (a blessed state),' occurs in the line-

rmo-ma-tshaṅ-raṅ-thald-tsi-na

which may mean-

'aspirations (Tib. *smon*) have all been attained'.

Hence, *hard* and *hurd*, which in the present passage replace *thald*, must have a kindred meaning. Is *świld* then = Western Tibetan *śil*, 'drip through'?[41]

(5) *-g*: It was proposed *supra* to understand the phrase *gdaṅ-tog* as 'convalesces,' with *tog* as appertaining to the Verb-Substantive *to*, 'is,' or rather 'becomes.' In *tog* the *-g* would be a form of the Adjectival-Participial Suffix *-ka/-ga*, discussed *supra*, which yields also the Nominal Genitive in *-g*. In Kunāwarī *-ka/-ga* forms Preterite-Aorist Participles, e.g. *satka*, 'having killed,' 'killed,' *lenga*, 'having done,' 'done,' and, as *-k*, serves to constitute Preterite-Indicatives, e.g. *sak*, 'killed,' *rak*, 'gave,' *lanok, lheg*, 'did,' including *toke*, 'was.' Cognate forms in the other languages, especially those which do not retain the old *-s/-z* Preterite, can be seen in the *Linguistic Survey* volume.[42]

In the medical Mss. the *-g* of *tog* is *prima facie* not the *-g* which in *tog* itself, both as Verb-Substantive and as Auxiliary and also in the Presents and Preterites of all other Verbs the Kunāwarī and some other languages of the group employ as Suffix of the First Person, replaced in the Second Person and in the Plural by other Suffixes. It may seem paradoxical to question the origin of this *-g* from the Pronoun of the First Person, which in the same group is *ga, gu*, etc., = Tib. *ṅa*. But

actually the other group of the languages, which has *jī* = 'I,' does not seem to employ its *jī*, or any other form as a First-Personal Suffix in Conjugation. In languages which normally express the 'I,' even when not emphatic, a Verb-Suffix in concord with it is, in fact, otiose: Latin *cano* and Greek τύπτω dispense with the *m*-Suffix even though the 'I' is not expressed, relying upon the difference from *canis*, etc., τύπτεις, etc. Hence it is conceivable that in the Kunāwarī group *tog* was originally simply the old Participle *tog*, spared the superfluous addition of a Suffix of the First Person.

In the medical Mss. the *tog*-form is found in Participial, as well as in Indicative, use: of this an example is seen in the recurrent phrase-

mar-kul-tum-ca-sum-ken-tog-khyer

'giving (*ken-tog*) three spoonfuls of ghi, he brings (*or* takes)'.

Other instances of *tog*, 'is' are-

sum-rñwa-ni-tog/

tuñ-min-nwe-tog//

(7[*sic*]) -*a*, after *a, e* (?), *o* -*ya*: This is most evident in the reduplicated forms, such as *bya-bya*, 'going,' from *bi*, 'go,' which serve as Gerunds: Verb-roots ending in a consonant dispense with it in this function, perhaps to avoid the cumbrousness of a reduplicated dissyllable, which may also account for the absence of reduplicated -*ya*-forms.

A good example of -*ya* after -*a* is seen in *ta-ya*, from *ta*, 'place,' 'cause,' which has already been encountered in the *pa-ta-ya, bha-da-ya*, of the book-titles and which the medical Mss. present in recurrent phrases ending in -*ga-ta-ye* (-*ye* Instrumental of -*ya*). The Verb is, no doubt the same as in *tad*. It is interesting to see that *ta-ye* survives in Kunāwarī as *tāiĕ*, 'for sake of,' 'on account of,' 'because of.'[43]

A Present Participle in -*a* is well attested in Kunāwarī,[44] e.g. *tosha*, 'sitting,' *lona*, 'speaking,' *lena*, 'doing,' and extends even to Bhotiyā.[45]

From *to*, 'be,' 'become,' also we have a *mu-ge-to-ye*, 'by becoming sappy.'

(8) ? -*lan*: As a Verb, signifying 'rise,' 'arise' = Tib. *lan*, the syllable *lan* occurs in cases such as -

rma-glum-lan

rma-lan-ser-thundo

ser-gyans-lan

But in the third at least of these instances it seems to follow a Verb-form, as a sort of Auxiliary, and in many, or most, of its numerous occurrences the same seems to be the case. Hence there is a possibility that it constitutes a sort of Gerund, so that the forms might correspond to the Dhārmiyā Participles, such as *tho-lang*, 'asking,' *rai-lāng*, 'bringing',[46] and then further to Vāyu *lūng* in *hālūng*, 'place of

giving,' etc., etc.[47] The frequency of the syllable suggests that it is used as a formative.

So far no indication of an Infinitive form has come to light. As merely conceivable may be noted an Infinitive value in the expression *laṅs-paṅ* A ll. 57 & 81, which, if actually an Infinitive of *laṅs*, might contain the Suffix *paṅ/baṅ*[48] normal in the Theburskud, and perhaps derived from Tibetan *pa/ba*. The other languages of the group use different formatives.

Nor is there any manifestation of the feature which has earned for the modern languages of the group the designation 'Pronominalized,' viz. the appending of Personal Suffixes to Finite forms of the Verb. That the *-g* in *tog*, 'is,' 'becomes,' is not a Suffix of the First Person has already been seen: the only matter left for consideration is the ending of two [margin: more?] of the *ñe-lo* sentence with-

 ñe-lo-ne-ni

Here, even if the *ni* is dismissed as a Particle (*supra*) there remains *ñe-lo-ne*, which conceivably might be a Conjugational form of *ñe-lo*; but in none of the languages do we find with a *n*-Suffix a form of the Third Person, Singular or Plural, which alone would here be possible. Hence the *ne* requires some other explanation.

The multitude and variety of the Declensional and Conjugational Suffixes in the modern languages of the group is but scantily foreshadowed in the above items. For the Ablative of Nouns Gerard gives-

 Milchan: *che (ce), uks (aks), na, no*

 Theburskud: *che (ce), chee (chi), soo (su), un (on)*

and for the Third Person Singular in the Present Tense-

 Milchan: *to, ta, too (tu), do* or *doo (du)*

 Theburskud: *nee (ni), tee (ti), dee (di), neela (nila), teela (tila), tala, deela (dila), dala.* And in the several Grammars by Dr. Grahame Bailey and in the *Linguistic Survey* volume, where reasonably there is an aim at normalization there is no lack of alternatives cited: the actual quotations of passages seem to manifest less caprice. When a historical treatment of the languages becomes feasible, the origins of the Declensional Suffixes, which with rare exceptions, e.g. the Agential Case in *-s*, are not recognizable from Tibetan, may be elucidated. The Conjugational Suffixes other than the Personal have been seen[49] to be largely forms of a Verb-Substantive (*ta, to, na, ni*) appended to a Participle: we may perhaps add that in some cases the Auxiliary was a Verb-Factitive.

The negative

In connection with the Verb system it may be convenient to consider the negative. The ordinary negative, as in the other Tibeto-Burman languages, is *ma*. *Min* occurs in its Tibetan signification 'not being,' e.g. in the expressions of the

form-

> *go-mu-ran-min*, 'if the head sap is not right,'

while Tibetan *med*, as in *tshar-med*, 'limitless,' does not occur at all, unless *tsamed* is an instance. *Ma* is placed between a Verb-root and its Auxiliary, as in-

> *na-lod*, 'is said to be'

> *na-ma-lodi*, 'is not said to be.'

In Kunāwarī, Manchatī, Bu-nan, possibly in the other languages of the group, if the evidence were available, and also in Vayu and two other Eastern (Nepal) Pronominalized (*L. S.* III.i, pp. 359, 393, 407) languages,[50] there is a different negative particle, *tha*, used with Imperatives— Jäschke, however, says 'in prohibitive and narrating sentences.'[51] The negative signification may have arisen as in French *pas* and Greek οὐκ. But this *tha* negative has been adduced from no other Oriental language (see the *Linguistic Survey*, 'Comparative Vocabularies'), and it is therefore highly important that we find it with exactly same prohibitive use in a language of the remote Tibeto-Chinese frontier, the Mi-ñag language, which has instances such as-

> *na-ka*, 'beat,' *na-tha-ka*, 'do not beat'

> *kho-cuo*, 'kill,' *kho-tha-cuo*, 'do not kill'.[52]

In the Medical texts it is perhaps not used with Imperatives, but it seems to be restricted to Aoristic forms. From the Bu-nan language we may cite a passage of a ritual in which-

> *pu-śag-ci-kra-ti-ki-bon-ca-tha-da*, 'from the head a single hair do not,'

is followed by two parallel sentences ending likewise in *tha-dā*.

The striking agreement between the Pronominalized languages of the west and the far eastern Mi-ñag (Hodgson's Mānyak) cannot be accidental. It calls for consideration of any other correspondences, of which accordingly the following may be cited:-

Numerals: *ta*, '1' (GRIERSON, ed. [1909], pp. 534-535 *tākā*, *tāku*, Medical Mss. *ta*)

ti, '1' (GRIERSON, ed. [1909], pp. 408-409 *thik*, *tik*, pp. 533-535 *ti-ki*, *tig*, = Hodgson's Gyarung *-ti*, Takpa *thi*) (The *ti* and *thi*-forms are found in Lo-lo, etc., and are rather widely, though sparsely, spread.)

skwi (< *sṅwi*), '7,' (Kunāwarī *stish*, *tish* < *sñis*, cf. Kun. *stil*, 'gums,' = Tib. *rnil*, etc.)

Pronouns

a, 'I' (Kunāwarī *āngū*, 'me,' *āng*, 'my,' etc., Grierson, ed. [1909], pp. 532, 408-409, 254) (*ā*, *āṅ*, forms of 'I' are not common in Tibeto-Burman)

tha, *thi*, 'he,' 'that;' *ha-*, interrogative: Both these stems occur in the Western

group, as well as in the east; but the two significations, Demonstrative and Interrogative, are in both regions subject to confusions which it would not be convenient, even if it were possible, to investigate here. Note, for instance,-

(*-t*, 'what?') Kunāwarī *thii*, 'what,' 'which,' *thi*, 'something,' *thu*, 'why,' Bunan *thĕ*, 'that,' and, on the other hand, Kunāwarī *ha-de*, 'so,' *hā-lē*, 'what?,' *hām*, 'where?,' *hat*, 'who?,' 'which,' Mānyak *ha-no*, 'what?,' *ha-mi*, 'why?,' which only moderately exemplify the actual situation.

-o, Genitive Suffix

ma, 'arrow,' (Kunāwarī *mo*, Tib. *mdaḫ*)

mali, *mli*, 'earth' (Kunāwarī *mā-tiri*?)

wūlli, 'head' (Kunāwarī and Kanāśī *bal*)

The Particle *gyin*, and Indeclinables

Another Particle, often occurring in connection with this *tha*, 'not,' is *gyin*: it is found in cases such as-

du-lug-drum-dram-skri-ti-rkyu-gyin-ti-t(h)a-rkyu

tshaṅ-mud-drum-dram-rind-śel-thig-no-ti-tha-thi

rhye-yu-gwir-gwar-ma-nu-chur-gyin-ti-tha-chur

Here the first line might mean something like-

'all together being stiffening, whereas (*gyin*) the foul fluid flows, the water does not flow'

In such sentences, perhaps more than a dozen in number, the *gyin* has clearly the adversative force, 'although,' of the Tibetan *kyin/gyin*, which functions similarly at the ends of such Subordinate clauses. It is indubitably identical with the Tibetan form, and as it perhaps does not otherwise occur, it may be an actual borrowing.

Whether a *žiṅ/śiṅ* is likewise the Tibetan Gerund-forming *ciṅ/žiṅ/śiṅ* is provisionally undetermined.

As Indeclinables may be mentioned, further, -

da = Tibetan *da*, 'there,' 'then;' see *da-phyen*: *da-cho-min*, 'there no treatment,' [...] A 5, *da-žer-min*, 'there no pain,' A 10, 31, 32, *da-sgal-min*, A 14, *da-gral-min*, A 23, *da-tshud-min*, A 53, *da-sam-min*, A 59, *da-raṅ-yam*, A 62, *da-chud-do*, C 120.

tha-ye, 'thereby,' 'thus,' 'therefore' (B 40, C 72, 26)? Instrumental of Demonstrative *tha*?

Numerals

The first four numerals, viz. *ta* = '1,' *nis* = '2,' *sum* = '3,' *pi* = '4,' were found

together and are not open to doubt. They are widely attested in Tibeto-Burman, as may be seen from the *Linguistic Survey* volume of 'Comparative Vocabularies.' Some minor comments may be added here.

The *ta/ti* forms = '1,' independent of Tibetan *gcig*, are both (Bu-nan *ti-ki*) exemplified in the group.[53] But Kunāwarī and one or two other languages have an *id* (*i*, 'a,' 'an,' *idi*, 'the same'), which is also very ancient, being = Chinese *i*, *yi*, in Tibetan transcription *ir*, and also represented in ancient Tibetan by *ra*, 'first' (month). *Nis* (Tib. *gñis*) and *sum* (never *sam*, which is quite common elsewhere) may be passed. The *pi* = '4,' derived, like the vastly numerous variants, from a **baldi*, in which the *ba* was originally a Prefix,[54] has in Kunāwarī (not, however, in the 'Tibar-skad') the form *pu*, with a *u* < *i* otherwise also discoverable in the language.

The expected *ṅa* = '5,' is patent in the repeated *ṅa-yig*, 'fivefold,' as compared with the frequent *pi-yig*, 'fourfold,' and with *gu-yig*, 'ninefold.' A *drug/trug* (= Tib. *drug*, Kunāwarī, etc., *ṭug*, *trui*, etc.) is not at present proved. For '7' (Kunāwarī *stish* < *śnes*) the *stes* cited as a possible equivalent[55] will, it seems, not serve. Nor is any form for '8' apparent. *Gu*, '9,' is evidenced not only by the above-cited *gu-yig*, 'ninefold,' but also by the frequent recurrence of *gu-yul*, 'nine (sc. 'all,' as common in Tibetan) places.' The *sa* = '10,' of Kunāwarī, etc., does not appear, and the syllable has to do duty for 'blood' and also for 'vein' (Tib. *rtsa*). The texts afforded apparently no occasion for higher numerals, and so the interesting question whether the decades 30-90 were reckoned in 'scores' is without answer. Ordinal forms are not apparent. For 'times' (Tib. *lan*) *lan/land* is probable.

Prefixes

In the oldest known Tibetan the 'Prefixes,' *g-*, *d-*, *b-*, *m-*, *ḥ-*, *r-*, *l-*, *s-*, are, when attached to Verb-roots, still partly significant, though their use has been in part modified by phonetical rules and there are numerous particular irregularities. In other words, Nouns, Adjectives, etc., they seem to have been mainly deverbal: which may, however, not universally have been the case, since there have been some observations of classificatory use, e.g. in regard to parts of the body and an *'a* prefixed to such terms as 'father,' 'mother,' 'uncle,' etc., is still widespread in the dialects: in general the Prefixes in non-Verbal words may be regarded as simply lexical or orthographic, with phonetical significance in certain cases.

In the Žaṅ-žuṅ Mss. the Prefixes *g-*, *d-*, *b-*, *m-*, *ḥ-*, are, it has been stated,[56] unattested: Whether any of them were at any time in use and have left traces awaits etymological investigation. *R-* and *s-* are frequent, the former sometimes in combinations which in Tibetan are disallowed: and in connection with the former

there are some phonological problems which must be reserved. Here we need only to particularize the single case where the *s*- and *r*- seem to have grammatical signification.

In the Kunāwarī language there are, as has been remarked both by Dr. Grahame Bailey and in the *Linguistic Survey*, instances where the *s*-Prefix to Verb-roots seems to have a Causative value. It might have been noted that this is clearly a survival, since in Tibetan couples of the type *ḥpho*, 'change,' (used of the thing which changes), *spo*, 'change,' (used of the changer) are numerous. In THOMAS (1948) there has been an endeavour to show that in the oldest Tibetan such a value attached to both the *s*- and the *r*-. The term 'Causative' is perhaps somewhat misleading: what the *s*- seems to indicate is the actualization of the Verb-notion, not the mediacy of a second agent: thus, if *pho* signifies 'change' as a notion, or *kye*, 'birth' as a notion, *spo* (for *spho*?) signifies 'actualize a change' and *skye*, 'actualize a birth,' and the former is Transitive and the latter Intransitive from usage. It may be suspected that the *r*-Prefix in its analogous use had prevalently the Intransitive sense, and it expresses rather a becoming than a making; but there has been a confusion due to phonetical regulation which has tended to make the *s*- and *r*- into mere phonological alternatives.

In the Žaṅ-žuṅ language there is a considerable number of Verbs containing the *s*- Prefix and similarly with *r*-; but their treatment at large must await a determination of their actual meanings and etymologies. Here we may be content to cite a few instances where the texts exemplify both Prefixless forms of a root and forms with Prefixes.

(1) *S-/R*-Prefix:

gyiṅ (= Tib. *ḥgyiṅ*, *sgyiṅ*, 'yawn,' 'gape')

gyiṅ-chud-laṅ, 'gaping and coughing arise' [margin: B 14, 15, 17, 18]

rgyiṅs-go, 'place (? of gaping)' [margin: B 5]

rgyiṅs-khar, 'on occasion of gaping' [margin: B 6]

rgyiṅs-laṅs, 'gaping arisen' [margin: C IV 5]

(2) *chil* (cf. Tib. *mchil-ma*, 'saliva')

mu-chil-cib [margin: B 3, 12]

tsha-chil [margin: B 14, C IV 14, VI 24, VII 7, VIII 18, 36, [...] 11]

mu-chil [margin: C III 11]

rehils (*śel-tiṅ*, *skri-tiṅ*, *tiṅ mu*) [margin: C III 10, VI 25, VII 4]

Verb-compounds

The Kunāwarī language has regular composition of Verbs by appending to a root or form the Verb *han*, 'can,' giving a Potential, or *śen*, 'send,' etc., giving a Causative, sense, as well as others formed with the Verb *ni*, 'be,' which are

Duratives, and *śid*, which are simply Preterites. In this second group the Auxiliar Verb may be regarded simply as a Suffix, and the same applies to the forms with *to-* and *du-*.

In Žań-žuń we have already encountered *na-lo*, 'is said to he,' which is perhaps only a stylistic substitute for 'is,' cf. the *iṣyate, iṣṭa*, 'is accepted' of Sanskrit expository texts. The Verb *lań*, 'arise,' also has been noted as frequently added to Verb roots giving perhaps only the notion of occurrence and hardly more than a Suffix.

Other compounds of differing Verbs have not been noted; but Reduplication and what may be termed quasi-Reduplication are so constant and frequent as to be characteristic of the language. They normally occur as Gerunds terminating Subordinate Clauses, and this function is in the case of Verb-roots ending in a vowel by the circumstance that by addition of an *-a* they acquire Participial form: thus the Gerund of *bi*, 'go,' is *bya-bya*, 'going.' Moreover, they can show distinction of tense, *gwas-gwas* and *rlwas-rlwas* being Preterites, 'having leapt (?),' etc., of *gwa-gwa*. This use of Reduplication has previously been cited as found in Kunāwarī also. When the Verb-root ends in a consonant, the *-a* is not appended, perhaps because of the inconvenience of a reduplicated dissyllable. There is no indication that the normal Reduplication carries any implication of repeated or continuous action. But in cases, also quite frequent, of 'quasi-Reduplication,' i.e. repetition accompanied by modification of vowel, as in *dil-dal*, *blun-blan*, a duplicity of some kind by way of continuity, repetition, alternation, or the like may be signified: thus we are told that in Kunāwarī *byo-bya*, as distinct from *bya-bya*, implies continuity. Probably the particular vowel-alternations arose in various ways, as in other languages: thus in English we can have (a) difference of sounds heard, as in *ding-dong*, (b) psychological difference as in *dilly-dally*, exactly equivalent to Žań-žuń *dil-dal*, (c) actual difference of form, as in *sing-song*, (d) actual etymological difference, as in *tip-top*, [and] so forth. The common feature is merely the existence of some felt duality in the action. There may be some more or less widespread preference for *i* as the first vowel; but it cannot be said that this is a rule or that the original or dominant vowel is ordinarily the first or the second; thus in Žań-žuń *blun-blan* it is not a priori clear whether the governing sense is that of a root *blun* or of a root *blan*. A somewhat artificial character may be seen in the formulas where an originally dyadic expression is dissected, e.g. *mris-mras* in

    ce-śi-min-mris-mras

    which appears divided in

    tiń-smid-mris-ži

    tiń-smid-mras-ži

This is as if in English we said 'he dillied and he dallied' and does not necessarily imply a clear difference in etymology or signification between the *mris* and the *mras*.

In forming Gerunds the Reduplication or quasi-Reduplication discharges a grammatical function. They are much favoured by Tibeto-Burman languages, and specially favour the Verb: see for instance the cluster in Thomas (1948: 192); the Noun is by no means exempted and in the Žaṅ-žuṅ text *ṅog-ṅag* is probably a Noun, 'defilement (?)' and *kho-kha* is perhaps 'leprosy.' In the Tibeto-Chinese frontier languages the (monosyllabic) Adjective is frequently reduplicated: in Tibetan this does not seem to be common.

[1] Burrard, Hayden

[2] See F. W. THOMAS (1951), *Tibetan literary texts and documents concerning Chinese Turkestan. Part II: documents.* London: Luzac & Company, pp. 195-196, A7.

[3] G. TUCCI & E. GHERSI (1934), *Cronaca della missione scientifica Tucci nel Tibet occidentale (1933).* Roma: Reale Accademia d'Italia, p. 374.

[4] See F. W. THOMAS (1935), *Tibetan literary texts and documents concerning Chinese Turkestan. Part I: literary texts.* London: The Royal Asiatic Society, p. 25, n. 3.

[6] J. D. CUNNINGHAM (1844), " Notes on Moorcroft's travels in Ladakh, and on Gerard's account of Kunáwar, including a general description of the latter district." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* 13 (part 1), p. 209.

[6] See F. W. THOMAS (1933), "The Žaṅ-žuṅ language." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,* p. 407.

[7] *Ibid.* Note that the phrase *by the ripening of a bad 'humour'* does not occur on this page.

[8] See for example F. W. THOMAS (1933), "The Žaṅ-žuṅ language." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,* p. 410.

[9] See A. GERARD (1842), "A vocabulary of the Kunawur languages." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* 11 (part 1), p. 524.

[10] See G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, p. 475.

[11] See A. H. FRANCKE (1926), *Antiquities of Indian Tibet. Part (volume) II: the chronicles of Ladakh and minor chronicles.* Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, p. 221, text, l. 12, p. 222, l. 3.

[12] See B. H. HODGSON (1880), *Miscellaneous essays relating to Indian subjects.* London: Trübner, vol. 2, p. 277.

[13] *Ibid.,* p. 297.

[14] H. A. JÄSCHKE (1865), "Note on the pronunciation of the Tibetan language." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* 34 (part 1), p. 95.

[15] See R. CALDWELL (1913), *A comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian family of languages.* 3rd ed. revised by J. L. Wyatt and T. Ramakrishna Pillai. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co, p. 587.

[16] See F. W. THOMAS (1948), *Nam: an ancient language of the Sino-Tibetan borderland.* London: Oxford University Press, pp. 176-177.

[17] See A. GERARD (1842), "A vocabulary of the Kunawur languages." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* 11 (part 1), pp. 537, 543, 547.

[18] See G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction,*

specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group. (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, pp. 457, 475, etc.

[19] See F. W. THOMAS (1948), *Nam: an ancient language of the Sino-Tibetan borderland.* London: Oxford University Press, pp. 31-32, 182.

[20] See A. GERARD (1842), "A vocabulary of the Koonawur languages." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* 11 (part 1), pp. 478-551.

[21] G. BAILEY (1911), *A Kanauri vocabulary in two parts: English-Kanauri and Kanauri-English.* London: The Royal Asiatic Society.

[22] See G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, pp. 490, 503, 518.

[23] See A. GERARD (1842), "A vocabulary of the Kunawur languages." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* 11 (part 1), pp. 478-551, and G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, p. 432.

[24] B. H. HODGSON (1880), *Miscellaneous essays relating to Indian subjects.* London: Trübner, vol. 1, p. 327.

[25] See F. W. THOMAS (1933), "The Žaṅ-žuṅ language." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,* p. 407.

[26] See G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, p. 471; for many instances, see A. H. FRANCKE (1926), *Antiquities of Indian Tibet. Part (volume) II: the chronicles of Ladakh and minor chronicles.* Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, pp. 221-222.

[27] See G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, p. 454.

[28] See *ibid.,* III.i, p. 461.

[29] See A. GERARD (1842), "A vocabulary of the Kunawur languages." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* 11 (part 1), pp. 533, 543, and *-ch* in G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, p. 432.

[30] See G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing.

[31] See A. GERARD (1842), "A vocabulary of the Kunawur languages." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* 11 (part 1), p. 533, G. BAILEY (1909), "A brief grammar of the Kanauri language." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* 63, p. 672 (*dŏk'ts*), and G. BAILEY (1920), *Linguistic studies from the Himalayas, being studies in the grammar of fifteen Himalayan dialects.* London: The Royal Asiatic Society, pp. 52-54 (*dŏdch* [Lower Kanauri]).

[32] See G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, pp. 443,

461, and G. BAILEY (1908), *The languages of the northern Himalayas, being studies in the grammar of twenty-six Himalayan dialects*. London: The Royal Asiatic Society, p. 37.

[33] A. GERARD (1842), "A vocabulary of the Kunawur languages." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 11 (part 1), pp. 533, 544 (Dative).

[34] See G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, pp. 472, 505.

[35] See F. W. THOMAS (1948), *Nam: an ancient language of the Sino-Tibetan borderland.* London: Oxford University Press, pp. 414-415.

[36] See *ibid.*, p. 207.

[37] See *ibid.*, pp. 357-360.

[38] G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing.

[39] A. GERARD (1842), "A vocabulary of the Kunawur languages." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 11 (part 1), p. 523.

[40] See *ibid.*, p. 488.

[41] See H. A. JÄSCHKE (1881), *A Tibetan-English dictionary with special reference to the prevailing dialects*. London: The Secretary of State for India in Council, p. 559.

[42] G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, pp. 556-562.

[43] See G. BAILEY (1920), *Linguistic studies from the Himalayas, being studies in the grammar of fifteen Himalayan dialects*. London: The Royal Asiatic Society, p. 67.

[44] See A. GERARD (1842), "A vocabulary of the Kunawur languages." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 11 (part 1), pp. 537, 547.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 543.

[46] See G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, p. 494.

[47] See B. H. HODGSON (1880), *Miscellaneous essays relating to Indian subjects.* London: Trübner, vol. 1, pp. 283, 293, 297, 300, etc.

[48] See A. GERARD (1842), "A vocabulary of the Kunawur languages." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 11 (part 1), p. 544 (*pung/bung*).

[49] See G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing.

[50] *Ibid.*, pp. 359, 393, 407.

[51] H. A. JÄSCHKE (1865), "Note on the pronunciation of the Tibetan language." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 34 (part 1), p. 98.

[52] See F. W. THOMAS (1948), *Nam: an ancient language of the Sino-Tibetan borderland.* London: Oxford University Press, p. 97.

[53] See the table in G. A. GRIERSON, ed. (1909), *Tibeto-Burman family, part I: general introduction, specimens of the Tibetan dialects, the Himalayan dialects, and the north Assam group.* (Linguistic survey of India; III) Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, pp. 532 sqq.

[54] See F. W. THOMAS (1948), *Nam: an ancient language of the Sino-Tibetan borderland.* London: Oxford University Press, pp. 325-326.

[55] See F. W. THOMAS (1933), "The Žaṅ-žuṅ language." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of*

Great Britain and Ireland, p. 408.

[56] See F. W. THOMAS (1948), *Nam: an ancient language of the Sino-Tibetan borderland.* London: Oxford University Press, p. 207.