ON THE POSITION OF LADAKHI AND BALTI IN THE TIBETAN LANGUAGE FAMILY

BETTINA ZEISLER

Languages are vehicles of identification, and hence their classification is always culturally and politically sensitive. But political (self-) ascriptions and their motivations are not always transparent for all those who are involved with language policy, and taking ideologies for facts does not always lead to optimal decisions. Some of the problems that any attempt to maintain, reform, or even revive the Ladakhi and Balti languages faces arise from the lack of clear concepts about what these languages are, and where they come from. In order to provide a more solid base for the discussion of language reforms among Ladakhis and Baltis, I will discuss the position of Ladakhi and Balti within the Tibetan language family from linguistic and historical perspectives.

Ladakhi and Balti are often said to come closest to the 'original' Tibetan language (for example, Thubten Dpalldan 2002:237-238), but on the other hand, one may also come across the idea that the spoken language or 'phalshat' is but a deviation of the 'original' language, lacking any grammar and thus not worthy to be written down. The 'original' language is generally understood to be the language of the religious books or 'choskat' (i.e. Classical Tibetan). In order to know what the 'original' language was like, it is necessary to look at the earliest documents available and to discuss the origins of the 'Tibetan art of writing. It is unavoidable that certain 'truths' of Tibetan historiography have to be critically reviewed and challenged.

Thouni Sambhoṭa and the introduction of the Tibetan script

The story

According to Tibetan tradition, Emperor Sneṅbrtan Sgampu (617- or 569-649)2 sent his (future) minister Thouni Sambhoṭa to India to study the art

---

1 Similar arguments will be found, independently, in Christina Scherrer-Schaub's lecture on "Imperial Tibet. An archaeology of the written" (Tenth seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, Oxford 2003).
of writing. *Thonmi* introduced the Tibetan script and composed eight grammatical treatises, of which only two, the *Samgupta* and the *Rtagshyi hyung* survived. In the popular view, the main reason for the introduction of the script was to translate and to write down the sacred texts of Buddhism. Thus the Tibetan script itself has become sacrosanct, and hence its orthography should not be altered even when used for secular purposes (and some people might even think that the Tibetan script should not be used for secular purposes at all).

The narrative of *Thonmi* and his mission to India seems to have taken shape between the 11th and the 13th centuries AD. It appears in the *Bhavindrana kalholma*, a 'Testament' allegedly written by *Srongbtsan Gsangpo* himself, brought into light as a *germa* in 1050 by *Alik*, the *Manabkhalbum*, likewise ascribed to *Srongbtsan Gsangpo*, possibly compiled between 1170-1200; the *Mnyambdagiang chosshyur* (c.1175-1190); the *Lde'u chosshyur* (1230-1249); and the *Rgya-Budgyi chosshyur rgyaspa* (1260). With *Bo dhams Rgyalmtshan*’s elaboration in chapter 10 of his *Rgyalrabs gsalba khi melon* (1363), the narrative seems to have definitively turned into an accepted historical ‘fact’.

In the *chosshyur* of *Bston* (1323), the Emperor’s name is written as *Khridal Stongbrtan*. Miller (1963:490) takes this as evidence that *Thonmi* was involved with the so-called language reform under *Khridal Stongbrtan* alias *Sudhaleg* (c.799-815). However, the element *lde* is attested, albeit in a different position, in the 9th century genealogy PT 1286, line 62 (Bacot et al. 1940:82), which has *Sron Ldebrтан*, and it is absolutely clear from the context that *Bston* refers to the son of *Gsann Stongbrtan* i.e. *Sronlmthran*), who was born in the female fire ox year 617, ascended the throne in his 13th year, following his father’s demise, subdued all the petty kingdoms around him and ‘used to read the written messages conveyed with the tributes’ (*skyes-hbul lhphrin-yig Rgyag*). Having stated this, *Bston* (p. 182) goes on to say:

> Then, since Tibet had no script, *Thonmi* the son of *Awa*, was sent together with 16 fellows to study the script, and having studied phonetics (*gnyi*) with the *panlas Lhagyirtsa Song*, [he] assembled the 30 consonants and 4 vowels

---

2 For the early date cf. Sørensen (1994:23).
3 Stated explicitly in *Manabkhalbum, srasng*; E 199v-191v r1: ‘as there was no script in Tibet for the purpose of converting the Tibetan territory to religion’ *bo dhams dam-pa'i chos pa la ’dul ba gsal pa la bo dla yige mchog par* and 21 deeds; E 209v-3: ‘as it was necessary to have a script to study the religion and as there was no script in Tibet’ *chos shi-ba pa la yige dga spaus* | *bo dla yige mchog par*. This view is mirrored in many websites related to Tibetan, cf. www.songsen-library.org, www.turtlehillsangha.org, www.kagumedia-lab.org, www.compassion-action.net/historical.htm.
in accordance with the Tibetan language and, with respect to their form, in accordance with the Kashmiri script. After [Thonmi] had prepared it in the castle Maru of Lhasa and had also composed eight treatises on script and phonetics, the king went into retreat for four years and studied it. [The king] translated the sūtra Zanatogbholpa, Dbyanshad, and the sūtra collection Dkormcogypun. At that time, having heard that the Tibetan subjects criticized the king, he introduced the law of the ten virtues and brought all the Tibetans to the religion and became famous by the name Srojhtsan Sampa.


The earliest of the above mentioned narratives, the Bhavakshams kabphoalma, chapter 9, already presents a curious detail: among the letters not found in the Indian alphabet and invented by Thonmi are three letters of the second class: ca, cha, and ja. p. 106; cf. Manikchakhu, marthar, E 191r, 21 deeds, E 26év 4-5, Gyatsho, p. 68-69. This means by implication that the letters tsa, tha, and dza of the fifth class should have been basic and of Indian origin. Now, everybody can see that the letters of the fifth class are derived from those of the second class with the help of an additional ‘hook’.6

The Indian alphabets do not have simple letters for the dental affricates tsa etc., and the letters ca, cha, ja, and ha form the second class of consonants, corresponding to a palatal pronunciation, similar to the Tibetan ca, cha, ja, and ha. However, at a certain time and in certain places, the pronunciation of these letters changed, so that what was written as ca was pronounced as tsa etc. Based on this pronunciation, the

5 Or: ‘since the Tibetan subjects critically listened to the king’.
6 It might be less evident that the present arrangement of the alphabet violates the phonetic principles of Indian alphabets. The additional letters altogether seven, since taw is derived from ba with the help of a superscribed b- or l- show different means of derivation (we also find inversion: za < ja and reduction: zg from an older form of zg), and one possible doubling [za < Khotanese gj]. Apparently they were inserted at different times, quite probably by propagators (professional scribes) rather than being designed at one time by a single scholarly phonetician. See Römer-Tas [1985:230-260] and the summary of his arguments in the forthcoming proceedings of the 11th colloquium of the International Association of Ladakhi Studies, Choglamsar 2003.

7 Cf. Dbyi-byin rje [Vol. 20a-b]; ‘since some people in the east of India pronounce tsa, tha and dza as ca, cha and ja, [he] established these three [i.e. ca, cha and ja]: tsa tha
Tibetan spelling convention for Sanskrit words was developed. But it is clear that the spelling rule must be substantially later than the graphic derivation of the Tibetan letters tsa, tsha, and dza from their palatal counterparts.

The later narratives further state that among the various Indic alphabets, Thonmi chose the Lāṅkā and Varuṣa scripts as models for the Tibetan letters, rejecting the Nāgaru and other scripts Rigvaidās, p. 63; Maniklabbhuma manto, E 191r3-4 has Lāṅkāsa and Pāṭula, while 21 deeds, E 269r3-4 has Nāgaru and Bhandula. However, the first Indian Nāgaru scripts, of which the Kashmiri Śīra and the Nepalese Raijā (=Lāṅkāsa) are further developments, evolved from the 8th century onwards (Slage 1993:15), and the developed styles that were imported to Tibet may be as late as the 10th or 11th centuries. Obviously, this part of the story was invented some time after the introduction of the Lāṅkāsa and Varuṣa scripts into Tibet in the 10th or 11th centuries, and this introduction was projected back in the context of an overall glorification and deification of Sronbtsan Gampo.

The historical evidence

The early documents do not tell us anything about the script being introduced at a particular time, by a particular person, or for a pre-eminent religious purpose. Especially, there is no mention of a minister Thonmi during the reign of Sronbtsan Gampo nor of any of his works in the Old Tibetan documents (Rona-Tas 1985:245), in early historical accounts, or in Chinese sources (Miller 1963:488). The only man with a similar name is Māhānīyī Ḥīraṇga Rgubhṣeunma, who acted as minister under Hrṣvini L-da, the 29th king (chronicle, Bacot al. 1040:100,17-20, 101.15-16).11

---

8 Cf. the Dunhuang text, PT 849, from the 10th century (Hackin 1924, English version: Verhaegen 2000:31).
9 They differ considerably from the Tibetan script, while the similarities between the latter and the late Gupta or Brāhmī script, which flourished in Kashmir and Khotan between the 4th and the 8th century, are obvious (Gendun Choephel 1938, Ngawangthondup Narkyid 1982, Rona-Tas 1985:232f).
10 Being complete sets, these two scripts were natural candidates for a single-handed ‘invention’ J. Ph. Vogel, quoted in Francke 1912:270-271.
11 Besides not being mentioned in the early documents, the spelling of Thonmi’s name is quite inconsistent, something one would not expect for a historical person of such authority: Thonmi ~ Ḫonmi ~ Thonmi ~ Ḫonmi ~ Ḫonmi and Simhi-ṣa ~ Simhi-ṣa ~ Simhi-ṣu (Miller 1963:488) ~ Sābhā (Sorensen 1994:146, note 462), additionally Ḫhonmuni Awa (Sorensen 1994:304, appendix to note 487), which reminds us of the minister just mentioned. It is also quite astonishing that Bstan mentions “eight grammatical works” (according to Miller 1963:486 this might be nothing more than a reminiscence
The first mention of the script is the entry for the year 655 in the Old Tibetan annals (PT 1288/10750). These annals, written in a very formal square style, cover the period 641-746. The first year dated is 650. Given their reference function (see also below), it is quite possible that the annals were recorded year by year or at least from decade to decade, and it is rather unlikely that they were composed a long time after the events they describe. The beginning of the text can thus be dated into the second half of the 7th century. The entry simply states:

It came down to the year of the hare: The emperor stayed in Merbe and chief minister Stongtsan wrote down the document(s) of the constitution/law/royal order in Hgorts, with respect to this one year.

yoshiki lola kab-steg | bstan-pa Merbe shing bzhugs phyi | blanche Stongtsang phyi | Hgortur | bkab- | grimszgyi iye briphar lo gzig | [PT 1288, line 28-29].

It does not even indicate in which script the document was written. As Chinese sources describe minister Stongtsan as being illiterate (Miller 1963:489), we may perhaps conclude that he was not able to read and write the complex Chinese characters, but used some Indic alphabet.

Later entries mention various registrations, such as the ‘red register of Tsangchen’ Rtsangchen pho'i khram dmar-po 690; another ‘red register’ 692; the ‘transformation of the register of the officers’ bkab-soe khram gpos 707;
the ‘counting of the red register of the royal guard’ skor sanrgyis khram dmar-pho brtis 708; the ‘counting of the red register of the three brigades’ ru gsun gyi khram dmar-pho brtis 712; the ‘establishment of the red register of Dakpo’ Dags po khran dmar-pho bla b 718 and of the ‘great register of the provinces and the plains of the higher and lower Lung’ mnyan-dan | Skyi stdog-smad gyi lang khran chen-po bla b 721; of the ‘register of the plains of the eight great provinces counted as four’ mnyan chen-po byag-dlas | bsgs brgs pa'i lang khran bla b 723; another ‘register of the plains’ 742; the ‘enrolment of the troops of each region in a grey register’ yul yul dmog rgyi khram skyi brtis and the ‘transformation by royal order of the red register into yellow papers’ btsan-po bka' khran dmar-pa srog las ser po la spyos-pur, both for the year 744; further a ‘letter of alliance’ glio bu ihe byi gsum 692; and the ‘laying down of the inscription’ of the exchange14 phags-pa g.nyams bu bar 743. There is further frequent mention of ‘counting’ rtis of people, fields and forests, where we may safely assume that the result was written down.

The second annals in informal handwriting, covering the period from 743 to 763, mention letters sent by the troops of the three brigades in 759 and that some ministers are given turquoise and kekhar diplomas in 763 (BM 8212).15

Both annals mention: the places where the emperors resided in a particular year; the places where the assemblies were held; births and deaths in the royal family; disloyalties and punishments as well as appointments of ministers; wars; and epidemics among cattle. But there is no mention of religious affairs. The main purpose of royal annals was to provide references for dating official documents, and the local annals such as found in Dunhuang apparently served the purpose of dating private documents and contracts (Takeuchi 1995:25, note 5 with further references).

All this shows that the administration of the Tibetan empire was highly developed and that written documents played an essential role. Such an effective system could not have been introduced overnight, and so it is very likely that the art of writing, at least in a rudimentary form, was already known in Tibet before the advent of the Tibetan empire and at first was used primarily for quite secular purposes.

---

14 Reading phags 'other side'. In the same year, there is also mention of a phar-los of wild and domesticated yaks. Cf. Baco et al. (1940:67 note to line 1).
While the annals, in accordance with their function, refer unemotionally to the bare events and thus constitute a reliable source, the great chronicle (PT 1287) is a historical narration that obviously serves a particular political purpose. It is by no means an objective account of the facts. In a section dedicated to *Sombo’i Sgrampi*, it mentions that:

In earlier times there were no letters/written documents in Tibet and when the time of this emperor came, the important orders/great constitution [based on] the (divinatory) sciences/principles of government (*gtuglag* of Tibet, the ranking of the ministers, the power of the great and the small, the enjoyment of good deeds, the punishment of wicked crimes (read *rho*), [the planning of] the cultivation and leaving fallow of fields and pastures, the equal distribution of the river water (read *khyu* for *slugs*, *byod* for *go*), the [measures of] *bm* and *phul*, weights [or money] and so on, all the excellent texts (*gzug*) of the Tibetan laws (chos) appeared in the

---

16 Baco et al. (1949:97-122, 123-170), Spanien and Inaeida (1979, pl. 557-577), *Dvargyal and Bodhams Snyder* (1992:34-66, 112-141, 157-172). I will give the line of the document as well as the page and line number in Baco et al. (1940) under the short form DTH.

17 Cf. Baco et al. (1949:161), Macdonald (1971:377) suggests the grammatically somewhat problematic translation ‘the letters which either did not exist in Tibet appeared [in] the time of this emperor’.

18 Baco et al. (1940:161): cultivation and division. I take the second element as nominaliser and the first element as belonging to the verbs *rdo* *rdo* ‘tame, cultivate’ and *pro* *pro* ‘throw away’ or ‘divide’, thus ‘what can be cultivated and what could be given up/divided’. Otherwise, ‘skus’ and ‘yokes’ have to be taken as a somewhat bewildering means of measurement, cf. Stein (1972:30, 39).


20 Given the preceding enumeration of lay arts, the term *chos* is not used in the sense of ‘Buddhist religion’, but rather in the more neutral sense of ‘civil law’ or ‘custom, manner’, cf. Jansske (1881) or other dictionaries for the different meanings of *chos*, and similarly Stein (1983:93-95). The parallelism of the praise of *khrong* *Lobsang* (below) with this one is obvious. Note there the contrast between *chos* ‘law/ legislation’ and *Sambhunath* *chos* ‘the law = religion of the Buddha’.

For the meaning of *chos* and *gtuglag* see Macdonald (1971) and Stein (1985, particularly pp. 126-129 for possible etymologies of *gtuglag*). According to Macdonald, both terms have been used for the basic principle(s) of government of the early emperors. As far as they have religious connotations Stein preduces this for *gtuglag*, these concern a royal ancestor cult centred on the mountain deity of *Yantra Simpo*. It is by virtually being a son of the gods (*lha’wa*) via the lineage of *Chakri Britanzhang*, and thus being a representative of the cosmic order, that the emperors have the legitimacy to rule over the petty kingdoms. But the legitimacy has to be proved by establishing social justice and welfare inside the empire according to traditional beliefs and customs. These principles would have prohibited the propagation of Buddhism as state religion. It was thus necessary for the Buddhist emperors, starting with *Korile Gsanthang* to perpetuate these principles outwardly while at the same time trying to re-interpret them in terms of Buddhism. However, the over-successful work of re-interpretation of ideas, words, and facts
time of the emperor Khris Snapto. As all the people felt gratitude towards
him, they called him the Clever One (Snapto).

Boe las nas yi ge nyed’o yan | btsan’po bshi the byung nas | Boda’i sngug bka’ bris chos padan | bsho’i rin po che | chechug gi dsko’i sbyam-bdan | lugs pa zin po’i bya dpal dan | ye yinshi cha po dan | snying rgya thub kyi
phrul kyi dar kyi | zla byi go bar bstan gya’i padan | bo padan | snyad ston phywa | boda’i chos la’i zla byin btsan’po ban | btsan’po Khris Snapto rgya’i byung po | nyi yon yi bka’ bris dron gnin byur bar | Snapto Snapto rgya’i mthar grol to [PT 187 line 451-455, DTH: 118/16-24].

Nothing is said about the introduction of the script, but we may safely conclude that Snapto Snapto started the official use of the script for
the codification of laws that had previously been orally transmitted
and for other administrative purposes. This could hardly have hap-
pened earlier, as, for example, the codification of the law, the “great
constitution” was accomplished only after his death in 655 (see above).
The sudden increase of writing is reflected in the Tang annals, which
mention the Tibetan emperor’s request for Chinese workmen to manu-
facture paper and ink or brushes in 648 (Lauffer 1914:34-35).

The introduction of cultural achievements is a recurrent theme in
Tibetan historical accounts and some of the more basic agricultural
achievements have been ascribed several times to different persons
(Stein 1972:53). As in Chinese historiography, the emperor receives his
full legitimacy only by being described as a cultural hero or as the model
of the just and pious emperor (Rona-Tas 1965:96). Interestingly, the
above eulogy of Snapto Snapto, as well as a preceding description of the
conquest of Zhangzhung, follow immediately after a eulogy of
Khris Snapto, although he ruled a century later (see below). The
Chronicle, obviously, does not follow a chronological order.

It turns out that the paper of the document was cut into several
pieces, which were glued together again, mostly before the text was writ-
ten down. But in this particular section, the paper was cut and reassem-
bled after the text had been written (Macdonald 1971:259). The
chronological mismatch does not seem to be a mere accident.21 The

21 Macdonald [1971:260f.] suggests that the compiler could have had difficulties
during the conquest of Zhangzhung because, among other reasons, the name of the con-
queror is not given. I wonder whether the compiler, who lived, say 50 to 100 years after
Khris Snapto really would not know and would have no means of finding out
compiler apparently had some reason to insist on the pattern of the ‘just emperor’ and to identify Khriṣṇa Leḍvṛtsan with Srenbṛtan Šämpo. This may have served to strengthen Khriṣṇa Leḍvṛtsan’s legitimacy. The above-mentioned addition of the element le in Srenbṛtan Šämpo’s name may have served a similar purpose.

There is some evidence, that the Tibetan intelligentsia had studied well various Chinese historical accounts, which are themselves literary constructions serving a particular purpose. The description of the evil ruler Zhou in the “shangshu paraphrase” (Goblin 1991:312), a fragmentary translation of an early Chinese historical text found in Dunhuang, might have well served as a model for the description of the evil ruler Žiparje Stagsgrabu (PT 1287, line 18ff, DTH 102.22ff), particularly since in both cases, the exaggerated description serves the purpose of legitimating a conquest by the ‘just emperor’. The passage of the controversy between Khyanpo Srenzad Zute and Senge Myichen (PT 1237 line 205-214, DTH 106.32-107.8) appears to be an almost literal translation of a Chinese anecdote found in the Shi k’i (Takeuchi 1985).

We cannot rely blindly on the earliest documents, because they do not necessarily represent the objective truth, but might be written or compiled for a special political purpose. In particular, the passages of eulogy have to be read with a certain amount of scepticism.

The oldest attested and datable documents besides the annals are the stone pillars erected in the reign of Khriṣṇa Leḍvṛtsan (755-794) in Lhasa-Žöl, Brāmyas, and Hphamgnyas, and an inscription on a bell in Bāmyas (Richardson 1965:4-41). The first one is a purely secular document, granting privileges to a minister. The other inscriptions are in fact concerned with religious matters, but their date is about 100 years later than the supposed introduction of the script.

It is under this same Khriṣṇa Leḍvṛtsan and his father Khvide Gṣaṅbṛtan that Buddhism was sponsored massively by the Emperors and became

---

22 Like his ancestor, Khriṣṇa Leḍvṛtsan is said to have composed a bhrmchod ‘testament’, where he ascribes the anchoring of Buddhism, not only its introduction, to Srenbṛtan Šämpo (Sorensen 1994:23, note 63). Sorensen (1994:9-11, 22) also points to the striking parallels in the narratives of Srenbṛtan Šämpo’s construction of Rasa Ḥphamgnyas and Khriṣṇa Leḍvṛtsan’s construction of Bāmyas. Apparently, Khriṣṇa Leḍvṛtsan had a vital interest in appearing as the exact copy of Srenbṛtan Šämpo—even if this implied that the presumed model had to be re-constructed as a copy of himself: Khriṣṇa Leḍvṛtsan’s father, Khvide Gṣaṅbṛtan had already been the victim of an anti-Buddhist reaction, and the crown prince had found it difficult to survive (MacDonald 1971:289, 370, note 609, cf. also the south face inscription of the Lhasa-Žöl pillar, Richardson 1985:6).
the state religion. This fact is reflected in the chronicle, *Khriṣṇoṇ Ldeḥraṇ* is explicitly described as the one who introduced the religion and at the same time he is pictured as the 'just emperor', whose government was so excellent that even the ministers competed only for wisdom and bravery.22

At the time of the emperor Khriṣṇoṇ Ldeḥraṇ the law/legislation (*chos*) was excellent and the dominion great. ... The great principles / sciences (*gsug* that constitute the lords of men and the owners of animals were made applicable as a rule [lit. example] for [all] men. As for the pleasure at good deeds, [the recompense] was given graciously. As for the punishment of crimes, it was made to hit with diligence. ... At that time even the ruling ministers were unanimous [in their] advice. ... They were not jealous. They never made mistakes. It was [only] bravery and wisdom that they were seeking in a competitive [lit. destructive] manner. As for the lower subjects who remained in their place, they were taught wisdom and honesty. ... After the incomparable religion of the Buddha was obtained, temples were built everywhere in the centre and in the periphery, religion was introduced, and as everybody entered [the way] of compassion and developed affection [everybody] was freed from [the circle] of birth and death.

*bta-rdo* Khriṣṇoṇ Ldeḥraṇgyi rin-la | | *chos bzaṅ* srid chetsa | ... *hgros dud* gnyis-ba n-'dang n-ma'gya'i *gsug* chen-po | myibs dpal nang bsa-mad-dok | | lde-'gyi bya dgah ni rgyal-mtshan | *vbras* chad-pa ni rgya-mi gnas bha-tong n-ma'gya-don | | ... *thabs* bta-rdo srid byed-pa rtogs-ma'i bskal-ba | ... *phug* nyan *gsum* | *thabs* dbyar-mo rgyas ni rgyal-pa bzin bštong | bhaṅs hogs na dPal-can yul-na kho-dpa ni | | *hgros* sman gnyis gsal-bzhed | ... Sem-gnyas-ba *chos bla-ma* nyal-pa bris-dets *ma'gya-don* | | dbyan-ba mtha' bstan-sku *gsug* rgya-mi stong-gstre | *chos bta-rdo* | thams-dPal byaṅ sgrug-pa la ochastic dran-bas sgyä-khams bsgrol-to | [PT 1287 line 366-376, DTH:114/10-28].

The 'great orthographic reform' in Tibet.

Under the entry skad-gsar-baṅ 'The New Language Instruction' the Tibetan-Chinese dictionary *Bod-Rgya tshigmdzing chenmo* (Zhang et al. 1993) states:

Some ancient expressions, inconvenient for writing and reading, were abolished and a more conveniently 'recitable' written language was imposed, for example the *dtag* was abolished and spellings such as ngy (‘fire’) and hgyo (‘go’) were simplified to me and hgyo.

*khrigs-rgal* ni bde-baṅ bstan-baṅ lhag-zig gi zur dorte khog-lod bde-baṅ yig-skad gtsan-lsa phaṛ-tha dpem na dtag dar-bshad ngy dan hgyo  bzspa me dan hgyo  bs-pa zor-ay-du btag-pa la-bu |
The next entry, skad-gsar-bcad rnam-pa gsum ‘Three instructions on the new language’, relates the second of these instructions to Khrisnyj Lihrtsam and Khrj Rañcañ (i.e. to the beginning of the 9th century). The introduction of the script is implicitly counted as the first ‘reform’. The third one would be the reforms of Rinchen Bcangpo and others. It seems that after the loss of the third instruction book (see below) the idea of three instructions got a temporal connotation (Simonson 1957:228). The temporal interpretation, however, acknowledges the Bonpo tradition that writing did exist in Tibet before Thonmi, although it is not clear which kind of script was used: there is mention of the ‘heapd script’ of Persia and the small and big var of Zhangzhung (Sangs-gzig HoU-mel-ba-ring spun-lyig yen thung snar chen dañ snar chug, Phuntsogs Thsherj 1992:43). Thonmi’s ‘reform’ could then have been the addition of missing letters and the unification of different writing styles in order to make the script more universally applicable (Phuntsogs Thsherj 1992:43-44).

Western scholars take the ‘great orthographic reform’ at the beginning of the 9th century as the demarcation line between the stage of Old Tibetan and the classical book language. However, not everybody in the Tibetan scholarly circles took notice of, for example, the abolition of the dadrang, which still appears in texts of much later date (cf. the title of an 18th century manuscript: Śarabhyj phyangs phingla, Laufer 1914:60). Quite strikingly, the alleged orthographic norms are not reflected in the official inscriptions, such as the Chinese-Tibetan treaty of 821/22. By and large, the so-called reform was aimed at a standardisation of religious terminology, and the “instruction” was the publication of the three gyulpati’s ‘etymological instructions’ (Mahāgyulpati, Madhyayulpati, and the lost *Kṣadra-yulpati); the first being a Sanskrit-Tibetic dictionary, and the second a treatise on the principles of translation (Simonson 1957:227). The Mahāgyulpati was published in order to settle the competition between two different technical vocabularies supported by the two different schools of translators: those translating from Chinese sources and those translating from Indian sources. Questions of orthography seem to have been of no importance.

---

23 Cf. Bxstn [p. 191]: ‘what had earlier been translated was subjugated under the instruction of the new language and three kinds of instructions were established’ sang bcag-par-bman sngags kyangs bskyed sgyan gnyis phreng ba | bhaṅbod gnam-pa gsum mdo zin bka’ | Similarly Rylain (p. 227): ‘All the religious [writings] were revised according to the instruction of the new language. The language instruction was made into three parts:’ dos thang-rdo skad-gsar bcad/gyi gnam-pa phab | bhaṅbod (bka’i) gnam-pa gsum du mdo zin bka’.
24 e.g. rgya-bdag gShes pa vs. de bṣa gShes pa for uṭhāga, skye bka’ vs. bhiṅba for mārga, cf. Stein (1983:162-163)
The principles of translation as laid down in the *Madhyayupathā* or *Sgrub rgyan ban po gnyis* (Simonson 1957:247-259) can be summarised as: while not violating the sense of the original, one should render the translation in a way that it becomes good Tibetan. The order of the Sanskrit words should be followed as much as possible, and re-arrangements should not exceed a verse. The meaning of ambiguous words should be established according to the context, but in dubious cases one should keep the Sanskrit word. One passage deserves to be quoted in full, since it clearly states that further innovation was always possible, albeit under the strict control of the administration:

As it is not allowed that anyone should individually amend and apply a new term (miin) beyond what had been decided with respect to the linguistic methods by the [royal] order, if there should be a necessity to apply a new term individually [for] a word to be translated or explained, then one should, while keeping the term undetermined, examine in the individual schools all the arguments that may come forth with respect of whatever language (shad) from the religious texts and linguistic methods and in which language this had been applied to religion. After that [the result of the examination] has to be reported in the palace to the assembly [of] the followers of the Victorious One and to the school for the revision of the Dharma and after it has been decided it may be added to the register of language.

*shad-ba* spyi bals bke’i pha’i dbang dang ba’sa sgyar nas spyi dbang dang ba’i phyi mian gi入驻 *dbangs su mig ’byung* | bsgar-ba dang ba’i pha’i dbang dang ba’i phyi mian dbang dang ba’i phyi mian *ge’gsang* ba’i phyi pod ’byung | sgo-ba ge’gsang mian cha’i par mig ‘dgos par cher-pa dbang dang ba’i phyi mian bshad-ba dang ba’i pha’i dbang dang ba’i phyi mian *zhams* dang ba’i phyi mian gi入驻 | cha’la ji shad-ba ge’gsang pa’i phyi pod ’byung | pho-bra’-du Bsam-ltar ched-rin-ba mian dbang dang ba’i phyi mian gi入驻 | dbyangs Louchen bdag-ba’i phyi mian gi入驻 | *tshad-ba* bka’i bDetails of the prayer book which is used in the *Li在路上*trope*.

The 16th century *Zamag* states that there were at least two further revisions by *Rinchen Bzan*po (1558-1055), and *Blodan Sgrub* (1059-1109), which even affected the content of the basic grammatical texts:

Later on, excellent scholars, such as *Rinchen Bzan*po, *Blodan Sgrub*, etc. also adhered to the tradition. They also revised the meaning of the *Snyel-ba* and the *Rtag-ba* *bya’ga*, the original [text] of the very scholar *Thonmi*.

| skad nas *Rinchen Bzan*po dang | | *Blodan Sgrub* *bya’ga* | | mkha’ chos ’dod ’gsum 10 dang la brtan | | khoro mchyan po *Thonmi* gi dang | | *Snyel-ba* dang *Rtag-ba* *bya’ga* | | don yan legs ’par giams pa phab | | Lauffer 1898:547. |

Since this text was written down several hundred years after the events that it describes, one may again be sceptical about its historical accuracy. But it shows at the least that in the 16th century language change
was an accepted fact, and that one could even think of revising the basic grammatical texts. Tibetan had been a living language that constantly underwent various influences and changes.

Although the entry in the Bod-Rega thigmdozod chenmo does not represent the historical facts correctly, it does reflect the changes in orthography that had taken place. Apparently, the official language was in the beginning, dominated by the eastern dialects, particularly by Amdo Tibetan. The palatalisation of the consonant ma before a vowel i or e, written with a yabtags (yasta) and pronounced accordingly as /nyi/ or /nye/, which is so typical of the Old Tibetan Documents, can still be found in the Amdo and Kham dialects, e.g., Nangchenpa /'näik/ ~ /'näik/ < (d)mysig for mig ‘eye’ (Causemann 1909:349), Rebkong /'niglaam/ rmy- lam for rmvilam ‘dream’, /nül/ < nyid for mid ‘(to) swallow’, /ne/ < nje for me ‘fire’, etc. (Roerich 1958:122-123). In Amdo, the rbuggs (rasta) is typically realised as /-y/: /cyi/ < gyi for gn ‘knife’, /sbyag/ < *skyag for skag ‘fear’ (Roerich 1958:118). This substitution was an innovation of the Amdo dialects, and to a certain extent, such forms are even found in Balti and Ladakhi (see below). Traces of this ancient dialect variance appear also in pairs such as bbyil ‘wind, twist’ and hhkhiril ‘wind, coil round’.

Balti and Ladakhi as ‘archaic’ varieties
and the Balti-Amdo connection.

Baltis and Ladakhis take pride in the fact that their dialects represent the ‘original language’, as they pronounce most of the prefixed consonants of the written language, which have become ‘mute’ in most other Tibetan varieties. The pronunciation, however, does not always correspond to the written equivalent and varies from dialect to dialect. For example, rta ‘horse’, llaca ‘book’, and star-ba ‘walnut’ are equally pronounced as /sta-/ in Leh, but as /reta/, /llataces/, and /stara/ in the western dialects.25

A similar feature is found in some Amdo varieties, such as Rebkong or Themchen. E.g. Rebkong /syan/ or /syan/ nyan ‘wild ass’ or /xtan/ glm ‘speech’ (Roerich 1958:109, 118, 124). See also Biedmeier (1998). Because of this preservation of phonological features, both dialect groups, the western one (Ladakhi and Balti) and the north-eastern one (Amdo) have been classified as archaic dialects by various Western

25 One may add that most Baltis (and Kargils) still pronounce the rbuggs without changing the consonant into a retroflex (cf. Ikens Rabgyas 1984:43).
scholars (e.g. Biedmeier 1998:584 with further references; cf. also Sprigg 2002:viii).26

It might be quite surprising that varieties as far apart as Balti and Amdo share the same features, while all varieties in between lack them. However, such distant sharing may be found in other language families as well. The generally accepted explanation is that the varieties in the periphery, being spatially disconnected, marginal, or imposed through the centre’s colonialism, are de-linked from the developments in the centre and preserve the ancient pattern. This argument might account for the archaism of West Tibetan, but I doubt whether it accounts for the archaism of Amdo Tibetan, as the Amdo region and its language apparently were quite central in the early Tibetan empire.

On the other hand, it has been observed that most clusters of written Tibetan vanished already in the beginning of the 9th century in the central Tibetan dialects, as can be inferred from the Chinese transliteration of Tibetan names27 as well as from orthographic conventions regarding Sanskrit names and loan words (e.g., bskal-pa for Sanskrit kṣalpaḥ ‘acon’).28

It might well be that this development was restricted to an idiolect of the nobility at the royal court. But given this development, one wonders why the clusters should be as prominent as they are in the western region, which became part of the Tibetan Empire only in the middle of the 7th century. The process of colonisation was certainly not completed within a single life span and might have lasted until the break down of

26 According to Shafer [1950:51:1017ff., supported by Biedmeier 2004:396-398], West Tibetan would descend from an even more archaic variety than Old Tibetan and the eastern varieties, but this theory poses a lot of questions. The assumption that the verbal prefix b- had not yet developed contradicts the general view (also held by Shafer) that the triple phonemic opposition of voiced, unvoiced-aspirated, and unvoiced-nasalized consonants [b, bʰ, g] etc.) as typical for all modern varieties was not found in the proto-language but is the result of the influence of the prefixes. Even in Balti and Ladakh one can see traces of a former prefix in sound changes triggered by that very prefix (cf. Ladakhi /waq- ‘throw, perform’ < *’pa-d < *’pa-dab, Old Tibetan bika < *’pa-dab < *’pa-dab-d and bka < *’pa-dab < *’pa-dab-d). A remnant of the prefix shows up in compounds like /gopsker/ ‘decree < mgo-b-lur, and in bound verb forms. Similarly, the Ladakhi and Balti present tense morpheme /-et/ or /-at/ goes back to a complex form: verb + pa/ba + ed or in some of the dialects and generally in the negated form -amet/, and is thus certainly not the precursor of the Old Tibetan present tense suffix -d in verb ‘do’. This suffix, together with its effect of changing the root vowel o into e, is attested in a far greater number of verbs than Shafer assumes, e.g. len (d) < *la-erd ‘take’, or bika < *la-erd < *la-erd-d ‘throw’ (a more detailed refutation of Shafer’s hypothesis is in preparation; cf. Ziesler [2008]).

27 Cf. Lauer [1914:77-94] for the Chinese-Tibetan treaty of 821/22; all prefixes except s- appear as mark—only prefix b- is re-linked to a preceding open syllable, thus ‘khp zet/ for khp bZen, but ‘hbon tan zet/ for bMon bZen zet, cf. Elliot (1915:4-8).

28 This seems likewise to presuppose that b- as well as s- were no longer pronounced or, at least, that their pronunciation was merely optional.
the Tibetan empire. If, with the establishment of an administration, the fashionably clusterless speech of the central Tibetan nobility had been dominant, it should have left at least some imprints on the developing dialect of the community being colonised. Apparently, it was Amdo soldiers and officials who played a crucial role in West Tibet, leaving their dialectal imprint on the West Tibetan varieties, such as the prominence of consonant clusters and, particularly, the above-mentioned occasional substitution of a *rabling* by */y-*/.

Denwood (this volume) offers a complementary perspective: Since the now desert areas of the Changthang, due to a more favourable climate, had been populated by farmers in permanent settlements up to the ninth century or even later, when a change in climate led to a drying up of the region, there was a northern belt of settlements and quite possibly a cultural and linguistic continuum through which the dialectal features could be shared.

Even though the model of an innovating centre and a delinked periphery is not to be dismissed in total, we might perhaps better think of different varieties or strata from the very beginning: a northern one where the clusters were prominent and a southern one where the clusters were not (or no longer) prominent. The innovation of the southern variety might have had less to do with its centrality than with a possible contact or even mixing with other linguistic communities (Tibeto-Burman, Austro-Asiatic, and/or Indo-Aryan), while the lack of innovation in the north-eastern variety could have resulted from its location closer to the original ethnic centre of the Tibetan linguistic communities.

Further study of the Old Tibetan material might perhaps corroborate this hypothesis. It seems that the earliest documents from Dunhuang also show some dialectal features, namely some variance in orthography, which distinguish them from the central Tibetan inscriptions. Orthographic variance can also be found in texts of the classical period, especially those of the *germa* tradition. Some of these variants represent variations in pronunciation that can be found in the modern Tibetan varieties as well, especially assimilation features such as loss of aspiration in second syllable, loss of prefix, etc. Obviously, the early writers followed the phonetic principle of the Indian tradition, which means that they noted all subtle assimilation features, irrespective of whether a different pronunciation conveyed a different meaning or not. With the

\[29\] Note that the inhabitants of that area were most probably not speaking much Tibetan before the advent of the Tibetan empire. With the growing power of the empire, however, Old Tibetan might have been adopted as a trade language.
continuing standardisation of the written language, the phonetic principle was given up in favour of the phonemic principle, which notes differences in pronunciation only in so far as they reflect a difference of meaning (in the case of grammatical particles, however, some assimilation features were kept). One can see that even the rules of syntax of Classical Tibetan have become more rigid so that certain features common to both Old Tibetan and the modern varieties, e.g. pragmatically conditioned split ergativity, are comparatively rare in classical texts. A systematic survey of orthographic variance (typically taken as misspelling) has yet to be made, but some examples that are relevant for the present discussion may be given:\textsuperscript{31}

Assimilation of final -s and initial c -→ /sh/; than<s>s</s>al for than<sup><i>seal</i></sup> / ched 'all' (DTH, RAMA), cf. Ladakhi /semšin/ sem-san for sensean 'living being'.

Loss of aspiration in second syllable: gyap<sub>c</sub>ub for gyap-chub 'enlightenment' (ETI); <i>dhan-mchog</i> for dhan-mchog 'jewel' (DTH), cf. also above and below.

Loss of prefix in second syllable: nam-ka for nam-mchub (RAMA) 'sky'.

Replacement of dagb by rango: rgyag<sub>r</sub>ub for rgyag-chub 'siddhi, magical power' (RAMA); rgu for <i>du</i> 'nine' (GZER), cf. Ladakhi /rgu/ and the entries in JÃK; rgu (GZER) for rgu 'laugh', cf. Ladakhi /rgu/ and the entries in JÃK.

Genitive particle: chen<sub>p</sub>oe for chen-poe 'of the great' (ETI); rgya<sub>p</sub>oe for rgya-poe 'of the king' (DTH-annals), cf. the Ladakhi pronunciation.

Replacement of rabtags by yabtags after ka, kha, and ga. Šekhiyi and Nêkhiyi (names, DTH); ralgi for ral-gni 'sword' (DTH), cf. Shum /ral/ or /rai/; cf. also hhbril besides hhyl i (JÃK).

As already mentioned, this last variation, an innovation of the Amdo dialects, has found its way into the vocabulary of Balti and Ladakhi. However, it has not become a regular feature and more typically the rabtags is preserved. The few words with a former yabtags, such as Balti /go/ < bgo for bgo 'go' and /kite/ < *bbyi-d-de for bbyi-d-de 'leading, taking along', as well as Ladakhi and Balti /ragi/ or /rai/ < ra(l)-gni for ra(l)-gni 'sword',\textsuperscript{32} therefore, appear to be loanwords, and as far as these

\textsuperscript{30} i.e., the use of the instrumental marker with intransitive subjects for contrastive purposes or, the other way round, the use of the absolutive for transitive subjects in or<sup>der</sup> to de-emphasise them.


\textsuperscript{32} Loss of ancient yabtags is also attested in the case of Balti, Punik, and Shum /ba-/ 'do' < bya/bed.
three are concerned, they may well be related to the military sphere. But cf. also Nubra /thrikas/ *khrig cas = /khikas/ *khyig-cas ‘be full of smoke’ for CT khrig ‘be cloudy, flood around’. Other word forms, which are particular only to West Tibetan and Amdo are: Balti /xmit/, Purik /smit/, Sham /smit/ ~ /rhmit/, LLV rimid, Amdo (Ndzorge) /hnrd/ for CT m‘id ‘(to) swallow’; Purik /brombo/, Sham /brombo/, Leh /rombo/ or /rompo/, Amdo /rompo/ or /rwombo/ for CT shom-po ‘thick’ (Biemeler 1998).

Apart from the phonological level and a small percentage of lexical items, Balti and Ladakhi have been highly innovative, particularly on the syntactical level and with respect to the complex verb constructions.33 The most obvious innovations not shared by any of the other Tibetan varieties are the use of the past tense markers pa and pin (< peyin) as a means by which imperfect tense forms are derived from present tense forms and the regular marking of an experiencer-subject of non-volitional or non-controllable transitive verbs with the dative-locative instead of the instrumental marker.34 Both features may be due to intensive contact with the New Indo-Aryan and Dardic languages. The ‘infinite’ or gerundive morpheme *ee (or kye) is another innovation, not shared by most modern varieties. Verbal nouns with the particle mkhan, originally ‘knowing’, commonly refer to the subject or agent (doer), but in Balti and Ladakhi they may equally refer to the object or patient. Based on this change in orientation, Ladakhi has even developed a patient oriented perfect construction, which comes very close to a passive construction.35

It seems, however, that Balti is somewhat less innovative than the Purik varieties, and that these in turn are somewhat less innovative than the remaining Ladakhi varieties. Balti and the Purik varieties do not have the patient-oriented perfect construction, and the particle ee has fewer functions in Balti (only gerundive/purposeful) than in Purik and Ladakhi. Balti also differs from the latter two varieties (and most modern varieties) in that it did not develop the basic evidential distinction between knowledge based on immediate visual perception and other knowledge. On the other hand, only Balti and Purik employ the impera-

---

33 I would thus prefer to call them ‘phonetically archaic’ varieties.
34 Thus, /khoa ridaks ŋan/ ‘he was able to hunt down a deer’ instead of /*khoi
*khos ridaks ŋan/. In Old and Classical Tibetan as well as in the modern Tibetan varie-
ties, this construction is restricted to a quite limited number of verbs.
35 e.g. /i stabo bespas [bespe] somkhian-in/ ‘This horse has been sold by the travel-
leer’, but not */bespas [bespe] sisk somkhian-in/ *The traveller has sold a horse’.
tive verb form for prohibitions, while Ladakhi like all other Tibetan varieties employ the present verb form instead.

With respect to the complex verb forms, Balti and the southern varieties of Purik differ in some points from Ladakhi and the Ciktn variety of Purik. At the tenth International Association for Ladakh Studies (IALS) seminar in Oxford in 2001, Denwood suggested that the differing Balti forms would correspond to Amdo forms, indicating a continued linguistic contact, possibly through migrations. However, beyond clan and place names (see Denwood, this volume), such migrations, if they ever occurred on a larger scale, did not leave any linguistic traces, and the linguistic connection between Balti and Amdo must have come to an end with the fall of the empire.

The Balti and Purik (Kargil) future tense construction: present verb form plus pa/ha/ma plus kdiug hdiug as well as the future perfect of Khar-mang: present verb form plus se/Xe plus hdiug hdiug do not have any counterpart, the future tense construction: present verb form plus hdiug is not attested as a future tense form elsewhere, but corresponds to one of the present tense constructions found in most varieties, and the perfect construction of past verb form plus yod is shared with Lhasa Tibetan, Kham, and Amdo. Otherwise, all Balti forms are found in Ladakhi, sometimes with minimal differences in function, while not all Ladakhi forms are found in Balti (see appendix).

Amdo and Kham Tibetan dialects, for their part, show considerable variation, and one might well find a correspondence here and there, because the inventory of the complex verb forms is restricted and the semantic convergence of some auxiliaries is motivated by their basic or full verb meaning. But such correspondences would seem to be rather accidental or arbitrary, particularly when they concern only individual forms out of a whole set. Note that formally identical constructions might have quite different meanings in different varieties.

We may conclude that the Balti perfect construction is a shared heritage of an early stage of Tibetan.36 The Leh variety has replaced this construction completely by a construction based on the particle {ste}, while the Ciktn variety shows the use of both constructions with little difference in meaning. In Sham, the first construction is still in use, but rather infrequently (for more details see Zeisler 2004a).

36 Or a shared development from Classical Tibetan on, since this form precisely has not been attested for Old Tibetan so far. For Classical or “Middle” Tibetan texts such as the Milavrga manthar or the Rgyudklo s dr. Zados (2004).
Given these synchronic features and the historical facts sketched above, the following relationship emerges. Balti and Ladakhi phalskat, instead of being a derivation from choskat, have their origin in an earlier stage of the Tibetan language, possibly *Archaic\textsuperscript{37} Northeast Tibetan variety from which *Old Amdo Tibetan as well Old Tibetan developed. Balti and Ladakhi might be either linked to this archaic variety directly or via *Old Amdo Tibetan. Choskat or the classical book language turns out to be a younger cousin rather than a parent of *Old West Tibetan. Thus its orthography cannot be compulsory for the Balti and Ladakhi phalskat. The relationship can be presented roughly as follows:
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\textsuperscript{37} "Archaic" in a temporal sense: the period of a language from which we have no documents, but some traits of which might be traced back from the oldest documents.
### APPENDIX

Complex verb forms in Balti (Ba), Purik (P), Sham (S), Leh (Le), Lhasa (Lh), Nangchenpa (Na), Rebkong (Re), and Themchen (Th)\(^\text{30}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>future</th>
<th>Ba</th>
<th>P/S</th>
<th>Le</th>
<th>Lh</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-o {basic verb form}</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + gi + yin /red</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + rgu + yin /red</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + ni + yin /nd</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + yin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + {pa} + yin [Ba /yod]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + le + yin /nd</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + ca(s) /ca(s) + yin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + hudug</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + {pa} + hudug + hudug</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + {cog} /yinzag + yin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past (verb form) + yod</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>present non-past</th>
<th>Ba</th>
<th>P/S</th>
<th>Le</th>
<th>Lh</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-o + yod /hudug [Na /red; Ba only /yod] (^\text{35})</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + yin /red</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + ba + yod /ba red</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + le + yod /le</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + gi + yod + le + red</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + gi + yod + le /gzi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + ca rag /hug [P ca(s)]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + gi + yod /gi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + gi + yod /na + yin /red</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + {pa} /yog Na gil</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + {pa} + yod</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + Xin + yod /hug [Ba only /yod]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + hygro /graks + nd</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + yod + pa</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + yod /hudug + pin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + {pa} + mi/hudug</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + {pa} + yod + pin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + Xin + yod + pa</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o + Xin + yod /hug + pin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^\text{30}\) The forms are grouped together according to their function, for more details see Zeisler (2004a).

\(^\text{35}\) Originally *{pa} + /yod/hudug in West Tibetan, see note 26.
LADAKHI & BÂLTI IN THE TIBETAN LANGUAGE FAMILY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past (verb form)</th>
<th>Ba</th>
<th>P/S</th>
<th>Le</th>
<th>Lh</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past + [pa] + yin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + [pa] + yin/rel</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + [la] + yin/rel</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + gzia</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + say</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + byan/say</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + thal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + say</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Ba</th>
<th>P/S</th>
<th>Le</th>
<th>Lh</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past + yod/hdag [Ba only yod, Na /rel, Re, The yod + gi]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + yod + pa</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + yod + pin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past +  [yin /yod] /hdag [Ba only yod]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + ?na [yin] /?nas [yin]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + ben [yod] + pa</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + ben [yod] + pin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + yod [yod-pa rel]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + (b) zed</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + [pa] + hdag</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + yod + gzia</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past + gi + gelah</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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