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1. Introduction
Apart from underdescribed Pyu, Tibetan is the oldest documented Tibeto-Burman language with an originally phonemic script, and at the same time, Tibetan is the language that shows the most complex syllable structure in its script: (C)(C)(C)V(C)(C) or (P2) (P1) C R (G) V (F1) (F2).1 It is therefore often silently assumed that the spellings as found in the dictionaries for Classical Tibetan reflect an old stage of Tibeto-Burman, cf. Mati-
soff’s (2003: 12) suggestion for the proto-Tibeto-Burman syllable structure, which only differs in the vowel slot: (P2) (P1) C i (G) V (ː) (Cf) (s). However, the combinatory re-
strictions in Old and Classical Tibetan alike2 and the first sound change to be described below indicate that the maximally complex syllable is only of a secondary character. 

Careful diachronic and synchronic comparison of related words within Tibetan allows us to establish at least four major sound changes in the development of Old Ti-
betan or its ancestor(s). These are: 1. regressive metathesis, 2. alternation between hom-
organic nasals and oral stops, 3. jotisation, and 4. vowel alternations. The latter three sound changes are also quite common across Tibeto-Burman languages, but they are far from being exceptionless sound laws and never fully affected Tibetan, nor, as it seems, any other Tibeto-Burman language. Moreover, their direction or non-reversibility cannot be established.

In Tibetan, all four sound changes can combine. Together with dialectal variation or repeated borrowing from different Tibeto-Burman and non-Tibeto-Burman languages or from different stages of one or more Tibeto-Burman languages, this may lead to practi-
cally uncontrollable variation, preventing any serious reconstruction.

1 Here and in the following C stands for any consonant, N for nasals, O for oral stops, and V for vowels. Small letters refer to the concrete phoneme. The indexed forms C i (Matisoff) and C R stand for the root consonant or radical, which can be filled with any of the consonants represented by the 30 letters of the Tibetan alphabet. The oral stops and affricates display a triple opposition of [–voice +aspiration] : [–voice –aspiration] : [+voice –aspiration]. It is not really an initial, since it can be preceded by one or two elements, which may be derivational or grammatical prefixes or simply lexical(ised) elements. The first pre--
radical slot (P1) can be filled with 8 consonants: g, d, h, m, h, r, l, or s. The post-radical slot (G) can be filled with 4 glides or semivowels y, r, l, or v. The first final slot (F1) can be filled with 9 consonants: g, ʰ, d, n, b, m, r, l, s, plus h, the second final slot (F2) only with d or s, the distribution of which is phoneti-
cally conditioned. In Classical Tibetan, ḥ in slot F1 merely serves some orthographic purposes, but in Old Tibetan, it seems to reflect an original aspirate.

2 In binary or triple clusters, there are quite a few restrictions for slot P1: only the homorganic nasals (written as either m or ḥ – the latter originally a voiced velar or laryngal [γ] or [ɦ]) can combine with C R [–voice +aspiration]: by contrast, they cannot combine with C R [–voice –aspiration] and with nasals. All other pre-radicals can only combine with C R [+voice –aspiration]. P1 cannot have the same articulatory position as C R, except when P1 is r, l, or s. P1 and G cannot be filled with the same consonant. b cannot immediately precede a nasal, but may appear in position P2. P2 cannot be filled when C R is a labial. l does not regularly appear in triple clusters (the only attested form: ʰgyamtshva for a special type of salt might be a loan or some dialectal variant).

Ternary clusters, however, are extremely restricted: P2 can only be filled with b as a grammatical pre-
fix, and while P1 can only be filled with r or s, G can only be y or r. More particularly, C R can only be a velar [–voice –aspiration] or [+voice –aspiration]. There are thus only six possible combinations: brky, bsks, bsksr, brgy, bsgy, bsgr.
1.1 The combinatory fury: overview

One of the most interesting cases is a word root of ultimately Eastern Iranian origin, relating to the act of speaking, characteristic for human beings and particularly for rulers: *mra(o). It must have been borrowed into several Tibeto-Burman languages, as we find various ‘cognates’ for several related meanings across the Tibeto-Burman languages. This word or word family must have entered Tibetan at a very early stage or must have been borrowed repeatedly, as one can find all sorts of derivations.

Table 1
Overview: combined sound changes for the root *mra(o)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel alternations (not morphologically triggered)</th>
<th>(mye-)³</th>
<th>Mya/v (3)</th>
<th>(myi)³</th>
<th>–</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>♠mre ♠mro ♠Mra (3) ♠mri- ♠mrul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>smre (1) *smro smra (1/2) *smri *smru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>sme- (1) smo (1) Sma (3) smi- (2) Smu (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>rme- (1) rmo- (1/2) rma- (1/2/3) rmi (2) Rmu (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>*dme dmo (1) dma- (2) dmi- (2) Dmu (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>m(y)e- (2) mo (1/2) ma (2/3) m(y)i- (2/4) Mu (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 1 shows, the combination of the four sound alternations yields, without the questionable forms, more than 40 different valid combinations, attested in even more semantically related words, some of them to be found only in the most archaic layer,
some of them attested in the western-most, but certainly not most arcaic dialects, Balti and Purik. A few more combinations seem to be reflected in clan, tribal, and regional names, particularly because ethnical self-designations often intend to mean nothing else then ‘human being’ or ‘people of the same language’. However, since such names could always have had a different origin, their formal similarity might be merely accidental. They are thus given here with a question mark. A question mark follows also those forms, where the semantic relation with speech acts or humanity is least obvious.

In the table, grey shaded cells refer to hypothetical combinations, not attested in Tibetan or not attested with a meaning relevant for the discussion. The numbers added in brackets refer to the semantic groups of *verba dicendi* (1), human beings or family terms (2), clan and tribal names (3), and simian beings (4). The full word forms with their meanings will be listed towards the end of the article in § 3.5, p. 25.

1.2 Methodological considerations

I made these observations while trying to trace the origin of certain Tibetan tribal names, particularly the names Rma and Rmu/Dmu/Mu. This attempt is embedded in a larger linguistic and historical context (see Zeisler to appear). While the linguistic and historical arguments quite embarrassingly tend to circularly depend on each other, the sound changes in question were observed also by other scholars, earlier and independent of my considerations for Tibetan prehistory. The methodology applied here is that of textual and historical philology.

Both types of philological studies were the main fundament for the establishment of the Indo-European language family, the reconstruction of proto-Indo-European, and the sub-classification of the daughter languages and similarly for the Semitic and a few other well-established language families. Philology not only implies the careful comparison of lexical items, morphological systems, and syntax of languages, but also, or more importantly, the close reading of ancient documents. This allows the establishing of meanings and meaning shifts through detailed detective work and the interpretation of words, phrases, or syntactical constructions in their particular contexts. It also allows to reconstruct to a certain degree the historical and sociolinguistic background of language development. Unlike most modern more technically oriented linguistic approaches, traditional philology aims at a language in its entirety, including the level of idiosyncratic parole, and it does not restrict itself to a subset of genres or, as in the extreme case of comparative lexicostatistics, to an extremely reduced subset of the lexicon. However, detective work and interpretation, informed as they may be, are prone to subjectivity, they belong to the arts not to science in the strict sense.4

The art of textual interpretation is based on experience in reading difficult texts as much as on common sense. Like in comparative philology, difficult or occult passages may be decoded by comparing parallel attestations in the same or similar texts or contexts (sometimes also on the base of translations into other languages). In interpreting any given utterance, we may assume that its author is a rational person and uses exactly the communicative means that are necessary for making him- or herself understood, following largely the Gricean principles. That is, the communicative contribution is as informative as required, does not contradict the author’s believes (at least, if the author does not signal anything to the contrary, as in fiction), it is relevant, and finally, ambiguities are avoided and the statement is not artificially obscured (Grice: 1975: 45f.).

---

4 I do, by no means, intend to insinuate that linguistics in general and historical linguistics in particular is a science or can rely only on scientific or merely outwardly scientific looking methods.
It is true, that these principles may not fully hold in esoteric traditions, such as Indian or Tibetan tantrism. Tibetan scholars, therefore, often claim that the difficulty of Old Tibetan texts is the result of the ancient authors’ predilection to speak in riddles. Most of the oldest Tibetan documents, however, were written for administrative purposes. Some of them were political propaganda, intended to legitimise the ruling family or to construct the fiction of a ‘nation’. If, at the time of their composition, these texts were as enigmatic as they are now, they would have failed to serve their exoteric, political purpose. Therefore, if we are able, by means of careful internal analysis and cross-linguistic comparison, to establish a different meaning of a word, which, much better than the conventional dictionary meaning, fits into the particular context, we should not miss the chance to reconstruct a little piece of evidence from the ancient language.

Similarities between languages may always be due to mere chance or borrowing. To exclude such possibilities, Indo-European comparative or historical philology, particularly the Neogrammarian school, has set up very strict standards, by which sound changes must be regular (or regularly conditioned) and exceptionless. Exceptions can be accepted, if they are obviously based on analogies or if one has good evidence that the progress of change was interrupted or left unaccomplished at some point. Otherwise, such exceptions or irregularities would rather point to borrowings. Borrowing can be quite substantial and may, as in the extreme case of Brahui, affect more than 80% of the vocabulary. Borrowing is not restricted to lexical items. Morphemes and certain syntactic structures can be borrowed as well. However, the overall morphological system ultimately serves as a kind of genetic fingerprint.

More recently, objections have been raised that the Neogrammarian position is too strict, and that there are sometimes ‘spontaneous mutations’ of single words. Most of them, however, can be explained according the Neogrammarians’ principles based on established socio-linguistic circumstances, such as influences from related varieties. This, however, requires a certain amount of acquaintance with the historical methods and the willingness to leave one’s linguistic backyard. If the socio-linguistic circumstances cannot be established then it is safer to exclude the irregular forms from the set of inherited words. One should, in any case, always bear in mind that if any such exceptions grow (too) numerous or even threaten to outnumber the regularities, there is certainly something wrong with the assumption of genetic relatedness.

If the individual irregularities show some regularity, it might further be possible to establish a more sophisticated sound law or to establish a particular phonetic feature, as in the case of the laryngeal theory of early Indo-European, but this sound law should then again apply regularly and exceptionless, and it should not at all have the air of an ad hoc solution for individual words or morphemes in individual languages.

Furthermore, genetic relationship is certainly not the only possible link between two languages, and there is no need to press all known languages into family trees, descending from single proto-languages. Languages of different origin may converge and form what is known as Sprachbund or linguistic area through areal diffusion of various features in longer periods of relatively undisturbed coexistence, and in such cases, the original genetic relations can become completely blurred and a new language prototype may evolve (Dixon 1997: 15-27, 70f., 95f., and passim). Although Dixon, like most linguists, would preclude the possibility that any given language could naturally have more than one ancestor (p. 11, 72), his scenario includes the possibility that a language of an areal group A drifts towards an areal group B, contributing to the overall features of this second group, which, after some time, may give rise to a new language family (p. 100f. with fig. 7.1). Dixon (p. 92) would also not preclude “that languages from several dif-
different families came into the Australian area and have merged their character through
tens of millennia of equilibrium contact and diffusion”, which is to say, that the present
Australian languages may have had more than one ancestor. A long-term scenario is
most probably necessary for the complete merger of grammatical structures, but one
could also think of situations of intensive linguistic contact that lead to an almost com-
plete merger of vocabulary items through mutual borrowing in much shorter time spans.

All in all, Indo-European comparative philology and similar approaches in other lan-
guage families never restricted themselves to the comparison of lexical items. In fact,
the earliest theories on the relationship of Indo-European languages were based on the
eye-catching similarity of early Indo-European morphology.

By contrast, most of the comparative or reconstructive work for proto-Tibeto-Bur-
man is primarily based on more or less reliable wordlists, most of them without much
historical depth, and most of them rather unreliable, as the exact word meanings usually
depend on the context, typically not supplied in the lists. Since meaning shifts or exten-
sions are always possible, some comparativists take great licence in comparing items
only distantly related, without ever demonstrating, how the meanings developed within
each of the languages adduced. The Old Tibetan material has hardly been touched upon,
for lack of lexical resources, on the one hand, for lack of philological competence, on
the other.

So far, Tibeto-Burman reconstructions have never really met the standards of Indo-
European or Semitic comparative philology, not even in a more modest version, which
would allow some exceptions, and not even with respect to the lexicon alone. There is
little hope that this situation may change. One reason is certainly that Tibeto-Burmanists
lack the set of obviously related ancient languages that Indo-Europeanists could draw
upon. If the oldest Indo-European languages, Sanskrit, Avestan, Hittite, Ancient Greek,
and furthermore Latin, Old Church Slavonic, and Gothic had not been documented or
only in a non-phonetic rendering, it would be impossible to demonstrate the genetic re-
latedness between, say English or French and Nepali or Dakhini Hindi-Urdu.

Another reason for the difficulties in Tibeto-Burman linguistics could be that the lan-
guages in question developed and spread in a manner quite different from that of the
Indo-European languages. But the main reason could ultimately be that (some of) the
languages or branches in questions are not genetically related, but that their apparent
similarities are the result of areal convergence.

2. The formal side: not-so-regular sound changes in Tibetan and its ancestors

2.1 Regressive Metathesis

The greater part of Matisoff’s proto-Tibeto-Burman or rather Classical Tibetan complex
‘P1 Ci G’, namely the Classical Tibetan triple cluster CCr, goes back to an earlier binary
complex *Ci G (*Cr), implying metathesis of G. The main exception are causative-
factitive verbs derived from intransitive verb roots with the help of an s-prefix plus
nouns derived from such verbs.

Already Simon (1929, 1949, 1975) established a rule of regressive metathesis by
which all Classical Tibetan combinations rC and IC result from an earlier *Cr and *Cl.
The claim that the metathesis applied exceptionless might be too strong, but it is quite
conspicuous that among the words with nasal initial hardly any cluster Cr is found in
Tibetan. The most prominent exceptions are smra ‘speak’ and the possibly related smre
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'lament'.\(^5\) Coblin (1974), apparently not aware of Simon's work, gives a similar argument with respect to the cluster *mr > rm. Not all Tibeto-Burmanists would accept this hypothesis. Guillaume Jacques (p.c.), e.g., would hold that all nasal clusters Nr would have necessarily developed into a prenasalised voiced oral cluster NoR, such as *ŋgr/ or *ḥbr/, written as mOr or ḥOr. This would at least corroborate the second sound law to be discussed. It is well possible that quite a few words escaped the accelerated process of metathesis of nasal clusters by first changing into the oral counterpart.

However, one would not be able to explain the existence of the pair smra ‘speak’ and rma ‘ask, inquire’, both originally used for speech acts of persons of higher or official status, where the semantic relation cannot be disputed, and where the r quite obviously changed its position. In this case, there is no direct NoR equivalent available, such as *ḥbra ‘speak, ask’. The closest form would be the noun bro ‘oath’, but there are also the voiceless forms pra-, phra-, spra- for other types of speech acts.

Furthermore, in the case of the proto-Tibetan word for ‘snake’, no. (16) below, the expected Tibetan form would be *mbrul or *ḥbrul but not sbrul, in the case of the word for ‘monkey’ (or ‘human’), no. (14) below, the expected form would be *mbrug or *ḥbrug, and neither sprug ‘human offspring’ nor spra or spreḥu ‘monkey’ could be derived. Such words would then have to be omitted from the list of inherited words and included in the list of possibly borrowed words or chance similarities.

One possibility would be to postulate some weird s- prefix that infected the Tibetan words, replacing the expected prenasalisation in the case of Jacques’ hypothesis or the expected r- pre-radical in the case of Coblin (1974) and Simon (1975: 246). Somewhat in contradiction to this claim, Coblin (1974) also argues that a pre-existing s- pre-radical would have prevented the metathesis sCr > *srC. However, if, after metathesis, the resulting pre-radical r- can merge with a secondary s- pre-radical, then there is no reason why the metathesis should be blocked if the s- pre-radical exists already before the metathesis sets in. Any cluster sCr could result in either sC or rC.

For Matisoff the s- prefix would be an additional Tibeto-Burman derivative element *sya with the meaning “animal / flesh / body” which would be “pronounced with an epenthetic schwa vowel before certain stop initials” (HPTB: 102), hence *[səbrul] for ‘snake’ (ibid. p. 151). It is, however, quite strange that an s- pre-radical often appears where the reconstructed proto-form has the structure -Cr. Moreover, the s- pre-radical also appears with meanings unrelated to body, flesh, or animals, such as (4) skr og ‘fear’ (emotion, possibly related to the verb (5) skro ḡ ‘stir’), (9) sg r ‘sound’ or ‘word’ (abstract concepts), and particularly with verbs, such as (5) skr og ‘stir’, (6) skr an ‘swell’, (8) *sgran, bsgrad ‘fight’, and (17) smra ‘speak’ – where it is easily mistaken for a causative prefix.

What Simon, and with him all others, apparently overlook, is that during the process of metathesis, a cluster *Cr often, if not regularly, develops a weak reflex of the alveolar trill on the ‘left’ side of the cluster, hence *Cr > sCr (step 1). In a few cases, the reflex seems to have taken the form of a velar or uvular fricative [ɣ] or [ʁ] in combination with voiced radicals, [x] or [χ] in combination with voiceless radicals, and additionally of a palatal fricative [ç] with unvoiced radicals in triple clusters. Both cases are represented by a written d- pre-radical\(^6\) (step 1b); cf. dbre ‘be im-

---

\(^5\) Simon (1975: 246) points to the cluster snr in the names of the lunar mansions snron (18\(^{th}\)) and snrubs (19\(^{th}\)), and the compound snrelgzi ‘out of order, slant, oblique’. None of these seem to be common, and the names for the lunar mansions might be rather artificial.

\(^6\) Unlike all other prefixes, the d- prefix does not seem to have any linguistic reality, at least not as a dental fricative or stop. All attested reflexes point to velar or uvular fricatives, additional to a palatal fricative.
pure’ < *bre as related to rme ~ dme ~ sme ‘spot, be impure’ < *mre and example (7) below with CT dgra.

In Eastern Tibetan, the development must have involved a palatalisation of the velar cluster after the first step: sCr > sCy (step 1b); due to the palatalisation, the restriction against an r- pre-radical did no longer hold, so that in a further step (1c) the cluster takes the form rCy (in the phonetically conservative Amdo dialects, written rgy corresponds to /ʁdʑ/ or /ʁj/; rky- to /ʁtɕ/- or in the notation of the CDTD to /ʁtɕ/-, see the examples below). A further development (step 1d) would then yield the cluster dCy (step 1e; in some of the phonetically conservative Amdo dialects, written dgy corresponds to /ʁʃ/ or /ʁdʑ/, cf. Rkangtshsa /ʁʁi/ ‘happy’, Rngaba /ʁdʑwae/ ‘joy’ < CT dgyes(pa), CDTD; the unvoiced cluster dky corresponds to /ɾtɕ/- or /ɾɕ/-, cf. Themchen, Labrang, Rngaba /ɾtɕi/, Mkharmar, Rkangtshsa, Chabcha /ɾci/ ‘centre’ < CT dkyil, CDTD).

The cluster sCr may then further develop via sC (step 2) to rC (step 3) and the fricative pre-radicals represented by written dC (step 3b).

In a final step (4), the secondary prefix may be lost as a natural development in many modern Tibetan varieties. Clear cases are Lhasa Tibetan /půku/ ‘human offspring, child’ (14) and Mkharmar /waŋma/, Rmastod /baŋma/ ‘fly’ (15).

Except for the nasals, the metathesis process did not fully affect the Old or Classical Tibetan words. For reasons unknown to us, but possibly related to fossilisation processes in the written language, the process of metathesis came to a standstill after step 1 in many Classical Tibetan words with oral initial. Nevertheless, the process continued in several modern varieties. Particularly Balti, western Sham (Domkhar), and several Amdo dialects show some of the subsequent steps or traces thereof. Interestingly, while Balti shows a tendency to complete the metathesis of velar clusters, western Sham shows a tendency to complete the metathesis of voiceless triple clusters and even the completion of the metathesis with voiced labial clusters, cf. DOM /ɾbaka/ CT brag ‘rock’, /ɾbak/ < CT hbreg ‘shave, cut (hair)’, /ɾbaŋsa/ CT braysa ‘resting place’, /ɾbas/ CT bras ‘rice’, /ɾbɹi/ < CT hibri ‘write’, /ɾbɹi/ < CT bri ‘get less’, /ɾbu/ CT bru dig, /ɾbuk/ CT brug ‘thunder’ and ‘flow down’, /ɾbe/ CT bre ‘shy away’, /ɾbes/ CT bres ‘manger’, /ɾbo/ CT bro ‘taste of’, /ɾbokpa/ CT Brogpa; DOM, TYA /ɾbɛl/ CT sbrel ‘join’, /ɾbit/ CT sbrid ‘get numb’.7 Metathesis of CT sбр > rb can be observed also among several Amdo varieties.

Less frequently, the clusters dpr and spr may undergo metathesis in (Western) Sham, cf. Sham /ɾp̥alba/ < CT dpralba ‘forehead’ (RN; cf. example (12) above), DOM /ɾpin/ < CT sprin ‘cloud’, and /ɾpuk/ < CT sprug ‘shake off’. With respect to the cluster spr, the Amdo varieties show quite irregular correspondences: in some cases, the reflexes correspond to the stage of final metathesis rп- (/ɾf̥/-, /ɾf/-, /ɾf̥r/-, /ɾf̥p/-, /ɾf̥p̥/-, /ɾf̥p̥r/-) but in other cases, however, they correspond to the initial stage ɾп- (/ɾf̥p̥g/-, /ɾf̥r̥/-, /ɾf̥s̥g/-) or a some-

---

7 These forms are getting obsolete under the pressure of the Leh dialect, on the one hand, and written forms on the other. There is an interesting gender split: among the younger informants, women tend to use the forms with metathesis consistently, while men seem to prefer forms without metathesis (RN and own observations).
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what more developed stage ps- (/ʦs-/), note, e.g., Mkharmar /ɸʈʂo/ ‘happy’ and Themchen /ʃsɔʃsn/ sprobn ‘picnic’ (CDTD). Two more examples from CDTD may suffice (but cf. also examples (14) and (15) below):

(1) CT spraŋpo, spraŋlön, spraŋrtsun ‘beggar’, spraŋmo ‘female beggar’: Gergye, Gertse /pāŋlön/, Western Drokpa /pāŋmo/ ~ /tāŋmo/, Lhasa /pāːko/, Hor Bachen /pōŋho/, Nangchen /pāŋho/, Hor Nakchu, Hor Amdo /pāŋlɔː/, Rkangtsha /spuŋo/, Mkharmar /ʃpəŋo/, Rngaba /ʃpʊŋwo/, Sertha /ʃpəŋ/, Labrang /cpəŋo/, Arik /rpaŋpo/, Chabcha /cʈʂəŋ/, Ndzorge /tʃəŋo/ (reading style) ~ /ʃɔŋvə/, Rmastod, Mdzorganrabar /pəŋwə/

(2) CT sbra ‘(big) tent’: Gergye /npa/, Lhasa /pa/, Gertse, Hor Nakchu, Hor Amdo ba/, Nangchen /ba/, Rngaba /rwæ/, Sertha /rə/, Ndzorge /bəwæ/ – note also Skardo /rba/

According to Roland Bielmeier (p.c.), many words with an Old or Classical Tibetan cluster labial plus post-radical -r- show the ‘loss’ of the post-radical in Lhasa and in the Hor dialects spoken north of Lhasa. In a few cases, such forms have spread also to western Tibet and to Khams. In such cases, it is not always clear whether the post-radical got simply lost or underwent metathesis. The reflexes of CT (h)phr > /m/ph/ must be interpreted as simple loss (or cases of jotisation?) as long as the aspiration is preserved, cf. Gergye, Hor Bachen /phûŋma/, Nangchen /mpʰiŋma/ (?/hpʰiŋma/ ~ /mʰiŋma/ (hphriŋma) for CT phreŋba, (h)phreŋma ‘rosary’ (CDTD). In the case of CT phrug(u) ‘child’, however, the loss of aspiration, cf. GYS /trūgu/, Tabo, Nako, Namgya /tʊː/, Nesang /tūːgu/, Southern Mustang, Western Drokpa, and Dingri /tʊːku/ (plus variant or contracted forms), Ruthok, Gar, Gergye, Purang, Tshochen /tʃʊːku/, and Sertha /ptʃʊɡu/ (CDTD), can only be explained via an intermediate form /sprıɡu/ with regular loss of aspiration after s- pre-radical.

Generally, only two or three steps of the metathesis process are attested across the Tibetan varieties, and not always the same steps in different words. Only the nouns referring to human beings or monkeys and the verbs for speaking with the nouns referring to speech acts show most of the steps, and in the latter case, all variation is already found within the classical vocabulary.

The following table summarises the various steps as found in the examples listed below. Reconstructions by Coblin (STLC) are marked by (C), those by Matisoff (HPTB or STEDT – inhomogeneous renderings are kept unchanged) are marked by (M), and those by Simon are marked by (S). All other suggestions for reconstruction are mine. In these suggestions, I follow two general principles, namely that forms with nasal initials or radicals are most probably older than their oral equivalents and that rhotacised forms are most probably older than jotisised forms (see also the discussion in § 3.5, p. 26ff. below). Step 4 is not shown in the table for lack of space, but will be specified in the examples below, when the development from step 3 to step 4 is unambiguously attested.

---

8 Tournadre (2005: 30) notes the recent replacement of such forms by a standardised reading style: the Lhasa word for rice, now pronounced as /dʐɛː̀/, had the pronunciation /bɛː/ still in the 1950s.
Table 2  Overview: different steps of metathesis in Tibetan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*Cr</th>
<th>rough gloss</th>
<th>step 0 = Cr</th>
<th>step 1 &gt; sCr</th>
<th>step 2 &gt; sC</th>
<th>step 3 &gt; rC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*kra</td>
<td>‘hair’</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>skra</td>
<td>/ska/</td>
<td>/ʈka-/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*krāk (M)</td>
<td>‘fear’</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>skrag</td>
<td>1c: /ʈɾeŋ/</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*krakw (C)</td>
<td>‘stir’</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>skrog</td>
<td>1b: dkrug</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*kran</td>
<td>‘swell’</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>skrans</td>
<td>1c: /ʈɾeŋ/</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*gra (M)/ *gljaɣ (C)</td>
<td>‘enemy’</td>
<td>/ɡɾa/, /ʈɾa/</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1b: dgra</td>
<td>1d: /ɣʒa/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>*gran</td>
<td>‘fight’</td>
<td>bgrad</td>
<td>/zɡɾat/</td>
<td>1c: /ɾdʒa/</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>*grwas (M)</td>
<td>‘word’</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>sgra</td>
<td>1b: /ɣdʒa/</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*nra (S)</td>
<td>‘ear’</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>*m/pran</td>
<td>‘wild, wolf’</td>
<td>1a: spyaŋku</td>
<td>1c: /ʈɾeŋ/</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*pral</td>
<td>‘forehead’</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>/spralba/</td>
<td>1b: dpralba</td>
<td>/spalba/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>*m/prV</td>
<td>‘glue’</td>
<td>/sprin/</td>
<td>spyn&lt;*spin</td>
<td>/rpin/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>*m/praw-k</td>
<td>‘of human’</td>
<td>phru(gu)</td>
<td>spru(gu)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>spu-, Spu- ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>*bra(ŋ)</td>
<td>‘bee, fly’</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>sbraŋma</td>
<td>1c: /zbraŋ/-</td>
<td>/ʒbnaŋbu/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>*m/brul</td>
<td>‘snake’</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>sbrul</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>/ɾbul/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>*mrao</td>
<td>‘speak’</td>
<td>p(h)ra, bro</td>
<td>smra, spra</td>
<td>1a: spyo</td>
<td>smo-, sma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*m(a)ra(k)</td>
<td>‘peacock’</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) pTB *kra ‘hair’

Compare, e.g., Western Himalayish /kra/ or /kɾa/, Tamangic /kra/ (with variation in the supra-segmental features), /ɡɾa²/, /kja/, or /kja/ (STEDT; here and in HPTB: 102 the proto-form is given as *s-kra, but the s- ‘prefix’ is attested only in Tibetan).

1  > sCr  CT skra, PUR /skra/ ‘hair’ (CDTD)
2  > sC  BAL /skʃar/ ‘white hair’ (CDTD)
3  > rC  BAL /ɾkalo/ ‘plait’, /ɾkazat/ ‘woman whose hair has started to fall out’ (CDTD; with /ʃ/- for /ɾ/)
(4) pTB *krok ~ *krâk or *grok ~ *grâk ‘fear, frighten’ (STEDT; the proto-form is given as *khlak in STLC: 77)
1  > sCr  CT skrag ‘fear (n.)’, ‘be terrified’
1c  > rCy  AT: Themchen, Shando /rteγ/, Arik /rteak/ ‘be terrified’ (CDTD; with /ɣ/- for /γ/ < *rkyag<s) < *skyag<s < skrag(s)

(5) pTB *krakw ‘stir, rouse’ (STLC: 127); most probably related to the foregoing
1  > sCr  CT skrog (BRGY) ‘stir’, PUR /skrok/ > LAD /ʃrok/ (CDTD /ʂok/) ‘churn’; PUR /skruk/ > LAD /ʃruk/ (CDTD /ʂuk/) *skrug ‘stir’, PUR /skrak/ (CDTD), Shamskat /ʃrak/ skrag ‘knead properly’
1d  > dCr  CT dkrog (JĀK) ‘to stir, churn; rouse, scare up’, AT: Sertha /xtɾɔk/ ‘to stir’; dkrug ‘to stir, stir up, agitate; to trouble, disturb, confound’, AT: Themchen, Mkharmar, Rkangtsha, Chabcha, Labrang /çʈʂəʃ/ (CDTD)
3  > rC  BAL /ɾkɔk/ ‘shake (in a bottle)’ (SPR), ‘churn’ (CDTD /ʂkɔk/); /ɾkək/ ‘knead’ (SPR)

(6) pTB *kr(w)ąŋ ‘swell’
Compare Tamangic: Thakali (Marpha) /hraŋ/, Thakali (Syang) /ʧjan/, Mikir /kəŋ/, Written Burmese krwa ‘rise, arise, swell up’, causative khrwa ‘cause to rise, swell up’ (STEDT).
1  > sCr  CT skraŋ ‘swell’, Purik /skraŋs/, LAD /ɣan(s)/ (CDTD)
1c  > rCy  AT: Themchen, Chabcha /rteŋ/, Arik /rteŋj/ (CDTD; /ɣ/- for /γ/) < *rkyang<s < *skyang<s < skran
3  > rC  BAL /ɾkan<s/ (CDTD; with /ɣ/- for /γ/)

(7) pTB *gra, OC *glio (HPTB: 173, 591; cf. STLC: 72: pTB *gljaj, OC *gljagx > ljwo:) ‘stranger’ > ‘guest’ or ‘enemy’
0  Cr  *gra ‘enmity’ > ‘accusation, fine’, PUR /gra/ ‘fine’ (CDTD), GYS /tra/ < gra ‘fine, accusation’ (in the expression /tra kal/ ‘fine, impose a penalty, claim compensation, accuse’);10 perhaps also CT hgras ‘hate, bear ill will’ (cf. STLC: 72)
1d  > dCr  CT dgra ‘enemy’, Sham, Leh /drao/ < dgrabo ‘enemy’ (CDTD), Sham /dra/ < dgra ‘fine, accusation’ (in the expression /dra kal/),10 AT: Themchen /ɣɖʐa/ ‘enemy’ (CDTD)
3  > rC  BAL /ɾga/, ‘enemy’ (CDTD)

(8) pTB *gran ‘push, fight against’ or ‘spread wide apart, open’
Compare HPTB (p. 516) with *g-ra:1 ~ *g-ran ~ *ray ‘war’, ‘strife’.

---

9 This is often done to make butter, hence the meaning is rather ‘churn’.
10 Voiced CT root consonants, not preceded by any pre-radical tend to become unvoiced in most Ladakhi dialects, while those that were preceded by a pre-radical in classical orthography, typically remain voiced. This is not an exceptionless rule: classical spellings can be based on misinterpretations of linguistic facts at the time of codification, while local forms may be due to a particular local development. Nevertheless, this rule can be used, by and large, to reconstruct alternative pronunciations from alternative spellings.
CT $hgran$ ‘vie, contend with, strife’; $hgrad$ ‘open wide (eyes, legs)’ ($\approx$ sound alternation 2 for the final) with a possible related form $hgrad$ ‘spread, enter’ (JÅK, based on Csoma de Kôrôs, TETT, but not listed in BRGY)

1 $\rightarrow$ sCr

PUR $/zgran/$ ‘provoke, fight, mess around’ (CDTD sub *$sgran$); CT $bsgrad$ ‘spread wide apart, spread apart, open wide (legs); put sideways’ (TETT), PUR $/zgrat/$ ‘stem against, lift’

1c $\rightarrow$ rCy

AT: Themchen $/rdzal/$ ‘straddle’ (CDTD) $< *rgyad < *sgyad < (b)$sgrad

3 $\rightarrow$ rC

BAL $/rgat/$ ‘face an enemy, push (with the body)’ (SPR), ‘stem against, to lean against, resist, fight’ (CDTD)

(9) pTB *grwas, OC $*g’wad$ ‘speak, word’ (HPTB: 437)

0 Cr

CT $gros$ ‘council, advice, speech’ (cf. also HPTB: 437), perhaps also $\sqrt{ggrags}$ (I: $hgrags$, II: $grags$) ‘sound, cry, shout’

1 $\rightarrow$ sCr

CT $sgra$ ‘sound, noise, voice, word, language’

1d $\rightarrow$ dCr

AT: Themchen, Mkharmar, Rkangtsha, Chabcha, Labrang $/zdga/$, Rngaba, Arik $/zdge/$ ‘sound’ (CDTD) $< *dgra$

(10) pTB *nra ‘ear’ (Simon 1975: 248), with jotisation $*nja [na]$ ($\approx$ sound alternation 3)

Compare Tani: Tangut $/nru(\ddot{\imath})/$; Padam Mising $/ny\dddot{e}/$ or $/ny\ddot{o}/$, Bengni $/\ddot{n}u/-$, Hill Miri $/\dddot{n}i/-$, Tagin $/\ddot{n}a/-$, Naga: Angami (Khonoma) $/nie/$, Angami (Kohima) $/u$ nyie/.

Chokri $/u$ nyi$^{35}$/; Lepcha $/a$-nyor/; Tamangic: Manang (Gyaru) $/n\ddot{a}/$ or $/nya^{1}/$, Manang (Prakaa) $^3ny/$ or $^3n\dddot{e}$/; Bai: $/n\dddot{o}^{3}/$; OC $*\ddot{n}\ddot{ja}$ (STEDT) or $*n\ddot{ja}x$ (STLC: 69). In view of this data, the Classical Tibetan verb $\ddot{n}an$ ‘listen’ might be related, as well. HPTB (p. 134, 162 and passim) assumes a proto-form $*g$-na or $*n$-na. The pre-radical $r$-, however, is attested only in Tibetan and Rgyalrongic. Many Qiangic varieties as well as some Rgyalrongic varieties show retroflex nasals, which could be the trace of either a pre-radical or a post-radical. While Rgyalrongic and Qiangic languages often borrow from Tibetan, this data may perhaps give a hint to the stage and date where the metathesis occurred. Otherwise, the word is mainly attested with a plain dental nasal, in some instances also with a plain velar nasal (which may or may not be the reflex of a velar pre-radical; cf. STEDT).

3 $\rightarrow$ rC

CT $rna$ ‘ear’

4 $\rightarrow$ C

Leh $/n\ddot{a}m\dddot{f}ok/$ ‘ear’; most Central Tibetan varieties have a high tone form $/n\ddot{a}/$, which still testifies for a pre-radical

(11) pTB $*mr\ddot{a}n$ $\sim *mj\dddot{a}n$ ($\approx$ sound alternation 3), with oral stop variants ($\approx$ sound alternation 2) $*pr\ddot{a}n$ $\sim *pj\dddot{a}n$ ‘wild (animal)’ or perhaps ‘howling (animal)’ & $^*k\dddot{w}oy$ ‘wild dog, wolf’

Compare for Burmish: Bola $/mj\dddot{a}n^{55}/$ ‘howl (wolf)’, $/mj\dddot{a}n^{55} kh\dddot{u}^{35}/$, Langsu $/mj\dddot{a}n^{31} k\dddot{h}a^{35}/$, Atsi $/mji\dddot{n}^{31} kh\dddot{u}^{21}/$, Aanchang $/pju^{31}/$; Qiangic: Zhaba $/\dddot{p}e^{55}$ nkhu$^{55}/$, Queyu (Yajiang) $/pha^{55}/$; Bodic: Tsangla, Menba $/pha/ ‘wolf’$, CT $pharba$ ‘wild dog’; other: Sak $/m\dddot{s}li\ddot{n}^{k} kvu/$, ‘wolf’, Tani $/pj\dddot{a}n$/ ‘wild dog’, Kayan $/pl\dddot{a}n$/ ‘wild, disorderly, scattered’, perhaps also MC $*mjog$, $*mj\dddot{u}$, $*m\dddot{o}g$, or $*m\dddot{u}$ ‘wild cat’ and $*b’ja$ or $*b’ji$ ‘animal (wild, possibly some kind of panther or leo)’ (STEDT); cf. also the inverted compound $/khip\dddot{ja}/ ‘wild, ferocious dog’ in Ladakhi ($< \dddot{k}hi+$)
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p-ʃaŋ < *psʃaŋ < *spʃaŋ < spyaŋ, involving yet another metathesis sp > ps with s + ʃ > j, similarly Jirel /kʰpɛan/ ‘fox, jackal’ (CDTD).

1b > sCy CT spyaŋku, ő-ki ‘wolf’, BAL /spjaŋku/, LAD /ʃaŋku/ ‘wolf’, /kʰpjaŋ/ ‘wild, ferocious dog’

1c > rCy AT: Chabcha /tʃɛŋka/, Labrang, Shando /tʃɛŋka/ Mkharmar /tʃɛŋka/, Sertha /rsʃaŋ(kə)/ (CDTD; with /ʃ-/ for /tʃ/)< *rpyaŋ(h)u

(12) proto-Tibeto-Kinnauri *pra(l) ~ *pja(l) ‘forehead’

HPTB (p. 405f.) and STEDT give pTB *d-(p)ral, but the d- pre-radical is found only in Tibetan, and apart from the Kinnauri form /phya/ there do not seem to exist obvious cognates.

1 > sCr PUR /spralba/
1d > dCr CT dpralba
2 > sC BAL /spalba/
3 > rC Sham, Leh /tpalba/ (CDTD; /ʒ/ for /ʈ/) (13)

pTB *mrV ~ *mjV ‘glue (n.)’, with oral stop variant (EXPR sound alternation 2) *prV (V = u?)

Compare Jinuo (Central Loloish) /mrɯ44/ or /mjɯ44/, Hani (Southern Loloish) /mjʌŋ31/, /mjɔ31/, or /ŋjɔ31,13 ‘glue, paste, stick’, and, if the notation ‘nj’ always corresponds to /ɲ/, Naxi /njɛ35/ ‘glue (n)’, /njʌ35/ ‘glue (v)’ (STEDT). The pre-Tibetan form must have been *pru-n or *pri-n (EXPR sound alternation 4) with a nominal derivation suffix -n. The development in Tibetan becomes evident from Purik /sprin/ and the metathesis in Western Sham to /ṛpin/, forms which, otherwise, could not be explained.

1 > sCr PUR /sprin/ ‘glue’ (CDTD)
2 > sCr CT spyan < *spin,14 BAL, Leh /spin/ ‘glue’ (CDTD)
3 > rC Western Sham /ṛpin/ ‘glue’ (cf. CDTD with /s/ for /ʈ/) 4 > C several Central Tibetan varieties /pịn/ ‘glue’

(14) pTB (EIr) *mraw ‘human being’, *mraw-k ‘(belonging to, offspring of) human being’, with semantic extension ‘human-like, monkey’

Compare HPTB: *myok (p. 67) ~ *mrú-k (pp. 39, 145) with the meaning ‘monkey’, but see the discussion below in § 3.1 – given WrB myauk (HPTB: 80) and the o-

---

12 The palatalisation of the clusters labial plus palatal glide and the retroflexivisation of clusters with an alveolar trill, apparently affected first the post-radical alone, changing it into a palatal fricative or a retroflex stop or fricative and leaving the radical unchanged. Only in a second step was the radical lost. The first or intermediate stage can be observed in several Amdo and Kham dialects word-initially, cf. Róna-Tas (1966: 179-182). More recently, this feature has been observed in Sogpho Tibetan with /pʰʈʅ/ ‘cloud’ < sprin, Sogpho */ʈso/, Lhagang */tʃa/, Rangakha */tʃa/ ‘cock’ < bya(po) (Suzuki 2011: 63, 68). Elsewhere, this stage can be observed only at the morpheme boundary of compounds, cf. Lhasa Tibetan /tʃʰ牖a/ ‘water bird’ chubya, /tʃʰ appréu/ ‘baby chicken’ byaphrug (Shefts & Chang 1967: 519 no. 7, 521 no. 26) and LAD /rɪbdi-/ ~ /rɪbdi- rɪba/ ‘mountain fowl’, LAD Shamskat /tʃo zgopiŋuks/, LAD Kenhat /tンド goŋfůk/ dagdro sgoŋphyogs ‘domestic cattle’, LAD Kenhat /ʃobdro/, ~ /ʒoptɾan/ zohбрan ~ zo- pʰrəŋ (CT zohbɾəŋ) ‘leather or silk strap for churning the curd’.

13 For the assimilation of /mj/ to /ɲ/, cf. also CT mɟ-, which generally corresponds to /ɲ-/ in the modern varieties.

14 The palatal glide is most probably triggered by the palatal vowel i and not an instance of jotisation.
forms in Intha: /mrok/ ~ /mlok/, Lahu: /mɔʔ/, Bahing: /moro/ (HPTB: 67, 145), and the a-form in CT spra ‘monkey’, one should possibly reconstruct a diphthong: *au, *ao, or *aw.

2 > sC sma-d ‘child(ren)’, with vowel alternation (≈ sound alternation 4) smi-n ‘sibling’

3/b > r/dC rma-ŋ, dma-ŋ ‘people, commoner’

With oral stop variants (≈ sound alternation 2) *praw, *pyaw-k

Compare Bhramu /pəyuk/ (HPTB: 67) < *pyaw, *pyaw-k (≈ sound alternation 3).

0 Cr CT phru-g ~ phru-gu, DOM /phrugu/, TYA /trhugu/ ‘child, human offspring’

1 > sCr CT spru-g (~ spru-gu), GYS /trugu/ ‘child, human offspring’ (the non-aspirated form indicates an original pre-radical), spra, spreḥu ‘monkey’

2 > sC spa-d ‘child(ren)’, spu-n ‘child(ren), sibling(s)’, (OT Spu, Spu-g, Spu-ŋ: clan names), Nurla, Leh /spu/ ‘monkey’

3 > rC AT: Mkharmar, Rngaba /ʂɪʔi/, Chabcha /ʂɪʔi/, Labrang /ʂɪʔi/, Sertha /ʂɪ/; /rɪ/, Arık /rɪ/ (CDTD)

4 > C Lhasa, Hor Nakchu, Hor Amdo /pūk/ ‘child’ (CDTD; note the modern spellings pugu and spugu), similarly Gertse, Lhasa /pɨʔ/, Hor Nakchu /pɨ/, Hor Amdo /pɨ:/, Ndzorge /fi/ (CDTD) < *pi(ŋu) < *rpe(ŋu) < *spehu

(15) pTB *bra(ŋ) ~ *bya(ŋ) ~ *b(r)(y)wa(ŋ) ‘bee, fly, insect’

Compare Lepcha /sum-broyŋ/ ‘fly’; HPTB (pp. 68, 641) and STEDT give the proto-form as *bya ~ *bra ‘bee’, ‘bird’, HPTB (p. 302) on the base of the Tibetan word also as *s-bran, but the s- pre-radical is restricted to Tibetan. An alternative, possibly related form is pTB *plyum ‘bee, wasp’ with Thulung /plium/, Nusu /paŋ53/, Proto-Karen *prjumA1 > Pa-o /phrūm/, Kayah Li /pli/, Kayaw /phr/, Blima/w/pológico, Pho /plha/, OC *p’iųng, MC *p’iųng (HPTB: 530), CT buŋha ‘bee’, bonŋ ‘dung-beetle’.

1 > sCr CT s布拉 ‘honey’, s布拉 ‘bee’, s布拉 ‘fly, bee, honey’


2 > sC LAD Shamskat /bzaŋbu/ ‘fly, flying insect’

3 > rC AT: Chabcha /rبراŋma/, Labrang /rبراŋma/, Rngaba /rبراŋmæ/ ‘fly’ (CDTD)

4 > C AT: Mkharmar /براŋma/, Rmastod /براŋma/ ‘fly’ (CDTD)

(16) pTB *mrul, with oral stop variant (≈ sound alternation 2) *brul

Compare pLB *m-ray1 or *m-r-wey1 (HPTB: 43, 83), WrB mrwe (Simon 1975: 250, HPTB: 80, 83), possibly OC *mljaj or *mlyar (HPTB: 81); HPTB (43 and

15 In this case, one could argue for different etymological relations, such as with pTB *rma ‘much, many’ (HPTB: 80, 169, STEDT) or with pTB *mrang > OC *mraŋ > mɛŋ ‘population, people’ (STLC: 116), but in both cases, the Tibetan word would be the result of a metathesis.
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passim), gives the proto-form as *s-b-ru:l, but the s- pre-radical is attested only in Tibetan, and most other cognates have a nasal initial.

1 > sCr OT/CT sbrul, PUR /zbrul/ (CDTD)

3 > rC AT: Mkharmar, Arik /rbru/, Labrang /rwu/, Sertha /röːi/ ∼ /röːi:/ (CDTD); DOM /rbul/

3b > dC BAL /ybul/ ‘snake’ (CDTD) < *dbul

(17) Elr mrao- ‘speak, command’

The pTB root is given as *smraγ by (Simon 1929) and as *br(w)ak ∼ *(s)br(w)añ by Matisoff (HPTB: 523, 585), but the initial sibilant would only be corroborated by the Tibetan forms; ultimately, the word seems to be of Eastern Iranian origin, see also further below.

0 Cr Archaic Tibetan -mra (as attested in the mountain name Rmachen Spom.rā < Spo.mra;16 and several non-canonical spellings of tribal or personal names)

1 > sCr OT/CT smra ‘speak’, smraγ ‘speech, recitation’, smre ‘lament’17


2a > sCVr CT smar ‘talk’, cf. PUR /kha smar/ (CDTD), GYS /kha mːr/ ‘talk rude, talk too much, cry, shout a lot’ (the high-tone realisation testifies a pre-radical)

3 > rC OT/CT rma ‘inquire, ask’, CT rme (~ sme) ‘ask’; BAL /ɾmaŋsa/, PUR /ɾmaŋ/ (~ /ɾmaŋ/) (CDTD; /ʂ/ for /ɾ/) < rmaŋ ‘lawsuit’

4 > C CT mo ‘oracle’; Leh /kha mar/ ‘talk rude, talk too much, cry, shout a lot’ (CDTD)

With oral stop variant (∼ sound alternation 2) *p(h)ra, bra with alternation of glide (∼ sound alternation 3) *p(h)ya, *bya

---

16 One of the most important mountain ranges in Tibet, the most important one in Amdo. spo and mra could have been tribal designations, but both of them or at least the second one could also have had the meaning ‘speaker, human’ or ‘commander, king’. The compound would possibly yield a ‘ruler of the Spo’, a ‘ruler of the people’, an ‘overlord’ or a ‘king of kings, emperor’. The original meaning of rma-chen would be ‘great commander’ or ‘great king, emperor’, possibly as a translation or interpretation of the second part of the name, when its components became obsolete. In the case of the modern spelling Spom.ra, we most probably deal with an instance of consonant migration in compounds. In such cases, an earlier pre-radical of the following syllable gets relocated to the coda position of an open first syllable, where it may survive the process of cluster reduction, cf. the case of rdo, modern Tibetan /rdo/ (or /ɾɡ/) ‘stone’ plus rje, modern Tibetan /ɾdʒe/ (or /ɾʃ/) ‘lord’ > rdo:rje, modern Tibetan /ɾdʒor.dʒe/ (or /ɾʃor.ʃe/) ‘thunderbolt, vajra’, cf. also the case of the numerals, where, e.g., bcu, modern Tibetan /büː/ ‘10’ and bži, modern Tibetan /ʃi/ ‘4’ may yield the pronunciations /ʰʃuːpʃuː/ ‘14’ and /ʃʃptɕ/ ‘40’ respectively. P.M. Miller (1951) seems to have been the first western scholar to discuss this feature as a linguistic problem, although it is often mentioned en passant in earlier descriptions of Tibetan, e.g. Csoma de Körös (1834: 7-8 and 10) and Schmidt (1839: 16f. and 19f.), more recently Shirai (1999) and Zeisler (2009, with examples from Ladakhi).

17 Alternatively, the word might perhaps be related to rme ~ dme ~ sme ‘spot, speck, defilement, uncleanness’, if the death of a family member leads to ritual pollution, like in Ladakh.
  Cy  OT phya(v) ‘speaker, oracle, lot’, bya ‘speak’
1  > sCr  sprachal (~ prachal) ‘joke, jest’
1b > sCy  CT spyo ‘blame, scold’
1e > dCy  CT dpyas ‘offence, fault, blame’ (?)
2  > sC  LAD /spera/ (~ /fiera/ ~ /pera/) ‘speech, language’ (typically analysed or written as dpesgra) (?) (see below)
3b > dC  CT dpe ‘example’ (?)18
4  > C  CT /bo/ (I: ḫbod, II/IV: bos) ‘call invite’, OT bonpo ‘reciter, invoker’ (?)

(18) Austroasiatic *m(a)ra(k) > pre-Tibetan *mra

Laufer (1916: 464, no. 66) relates the word to Sanskrit mayūra. This would likewise imply a metathesis from a contracted form *mra. The Sanskrit word itself is a loan either of Dravidian or, perhaps more probably, Austroasiatic, where we find, among others, Santali /marak’/, Čam /amrak/, Črav /brak/, Mon /mrā/, etc., Przyluski 1929: 131). The Austroasiatic word seems to refer to the call of the bird (ibid.), and it could well be possible that the element bya in the Tibetan compound was originally not so much used in the sense ‘bird’ as an explanation for the foreign name, but as a verbum dicendi in the sense of ‘(the one who) cries “mra”’ (see § 3.4 below).

3  > rC  OT/CT rmabya ‘peacock’
4  > C  Kenhat /maba/ mabya ‘peacock’ (the low-tone realisation testifies a plain nasal)

As particularly example (14) with the Classical Tibetan variant sprug for phrug demonstrates, there is, at least in the case of an original cluster Cr, no need for an ad-hoc s-prefix or a derivative element *sya for almost everything as postulated by Matisoff (see p. 6 above). Some kind of metathesis seems to apply also across Tibeto-Burman languages, at least in the case of velars. As stated in STEDT,19

there are some proposed cognates in which PTB prefixal *r- before velars appears to correspond to medial *-r- in OC, for example PTB *r-kang ‘shin’: OC 膽 *grangs ‘shinbone’ […]. Whether this indicates that metathesis has taken place in one or both languages, or that additional variants of the root existed, is not clear.

This remark is found in connection with the words for ‘leather’, ‘skin’, ‘bark’, and ‘rind’. According to STEDT, the proto-form for CT rkoa ‘leather’ and skopa ‘bark’ would be *s/r-kok or *(r-)kwak. More probably, the proto-form is without any prefix (cf. also STLC: 134 with *khwak and HPTB: 378 with *kok as proto-form, while the corresponding note e states that several attested forms point to an original *kwak). The Old Chinese counterpart 革 is reconstructed by Karlgren as *kɛk, by Li as *krək, and by Baxter as *krik ‘hide, skin’ > Mandarin gé ‘leather’ (STEDT ibid.); cf. also pTB/plLB

18 Note the compound CT dpecha ‘book’ and the usage as ‘example, saying’ in Kyirong, Western Drokpa, and South Mustang and as ‘story, tale, model’ in Ndzorge (CTD). However, the meaning of ‘example’ might have been derived from a meaning ‘distinguishing mark’, so that the word would be ultimately related to the forms rme ~ dme ~ sme for ‘mark, mole’ and ‘impurity’ via sound alternation 2.
*m-k-ray* 'skin, outer covering' (HPTB: 189). One could, therefore, think of a development *krwa-k ~ *kro-k > *skro-k > *ko- for the Tibetan words.

A further candidate might be pTB *druŋ with OC *drung(h) > *dang (STLC: 41) or OC *trjuk (STEDT, citing W. Baxter 1992: 250) and Tibetan *rduŋ (step 3), where STCL and HPTB (309 with OC *d’uŋ), however, opt for a proto-form *rdung or *r-dunŋ.

With the insertion of an epenthetic consonant, metathesis occurred also in the clusters OT/CT sl- > */ls-/ > BAL and western Sham /lts-/ , AT /lts-/ > *lx-/ > *lx-/ > /ld-/ > eastern Sham and Leh /ld-/ > CtrT /rdz-/; AT /rdz-/ > /dz-/ (cf. Denwood 1996 and CDTD; the former with a more complex derivation). See also Sedlaček (1964: 183, n. 13 with further references) for the metathesis of an original *tlj and *dlj > *ltj and *ldj > lc and lj.

There are also cases of progressive metathesis, where a cluster CrV turns into CVr, and this may happen also after the first step sketched above, so that CrV > sCrV > sCVr (step 2a) > rCVr (step 3a) > CVr (step 4a), cf. Elr *mrao > OT/CT smra > smar ‘speak’ (17) and pTB *pr(j)aw ‘claw’ with Old and Middle Chinese b’iŋ and b’i-, Jinuo /phomega/ s‘a/, Northern Gyalrong /pri ndzu/ ‘claw’, Dimasa /dɔ /brau/ ‘maul, claw, scratch’ (STEDT), pre-Tibetan *spra- > CT sparba, sparmo ‘grasping hand, paw, claw’, PUR /sparba/, Panamik (Nubra), Leh /spara/ ‘handful’ (taking with a single hand: Ciktan, Leh, or with both hands together: Panamik; CDTD), GYS /para/ ‘handful (single handed)’ vs. /bara/ ‘handful (double handed)’.

### 2.2 Homorganic alternation between nasals and oral stops

The second sound alternation was likewise first mentioned by Simon (1929: 195-197, 1949: 14 n. 2, 1975). According to him (1929: 187, 195), the change was triggered in the case of clusters by a homorganic intrusive oral consonant and a subsequent loss of the nasal, but this does not explain the alternation of plain radicals or of the finals.

In Old and Classical Tibetan, homorganic alternation between nasals and oral stops can be observed particularly in the finals, where it might partly be due to assimilation processes to following morphemes, such as -po vs. -mo. It is much less frequent with initials, so that most Tibetologists are not aware of it. In extremely rare cases, the alternation could affect both the initial and the final consonant, as shown in example (19). Initial alternation, however, is quite common across Tibeto-Burman languages, and Matisoff (HPTB, STEDT) gives many proto-forms accordingly with alternative forms. For final alternations, cf. also HPTB (pp. 516-526).

(19) CT ɲaŋ- ~ gag-, cf. the various designations for water birds, such as ducks or water fowls, ɲampa, gagte, byagag. The latter bird (a swan, according to the definition of BDGM) takes the place of the bird element in the Tibetan calendar in some Old Tibetan documents (Pt 1084, Pt 1096, Pt 1288, ITJ 750, Or 8212.187).

(20) CT Smra, epithet of Žaŋžuŋ in Western Tibet (cf. Ladvags Rgyalrabs, ed. Francke 1926) vs. Spra or Sbra, epithet of Žaŋžuŋ in Eastern Tibet (cf. Stein 1961: 27, 28, 51, 54).

(21) CT (ma)-sma-d ‘(mother with) child(ren)’ vs. (pha)-spa-d ‘(father with) child(ren)’.

(22) CT smi-n vs. spu-n (with vowel change * sound alternation 4) ‘sibling’. 21

(23) pTB *mrul ‘snake’, (see above no. (16)) > *brul > OT/CT sbrul.

---

21 Most probably, the forms smad and smin and correspondingly spad and spun, each denoting a collective of offspring, are related as well. Final -n and -d seem to be mere variants of one and the same collective suffix.
It remains unclear which direction the development takes, and whether the alternation is unidirectional or reversible. Matisoff apparently prefers a development from oral to nasal, mostly, but not always, based on the Tibetan form. By contrast, Simon seems to suppose a unidirectional development from nasals to oral stops from Tibeto-Burman to Classical Tibetan for the alternation of initials. However, dialectal variants, re-borrowings, hyper-correct forms, intentional archaisms, word plays (cf. also the above masmad vs. phaspad), or later reinterpretations may lead to apparent anachronisms like OT dbuh-hbreν vs. CT dmu-thag, the magical cord or thread of the Dmu attached to the head (dbu), by which the defunct king ascends to heaven. – It is certainly also possible that in some or even many cases, the Old Tibetan documents show a more advanced form than the classical texts, depending on the dialect of the respective writers.

One can further well observe that in some cases, the Tibetan word has an oral stop in contrast to other Tibeto-Burman languages, e.g., the word for ‘snake’ CT sbrul vs. pLB *m-rəy or *m-r-vey (HPTB: 43, 83), WrB mrwe (Simon 1975: 250, HPTB: 80, 83), etc., while in other cases, Tibetan has a nasal where other Tibeto-Burman languages may have an oral stop, e.g. the verb ‘speak’ CT smra < *mra(o), WrB mrwak ~ prwak (HPTB: 523), Pattani /prəi/ or /präi/, Hani /pe³³/ ~ /mi³¹/ (STEDT), etc.. In this particular case, both an oral and a nasal reconstruction have been suggested, due to the individual preferences:

(25) pTB *smraγ (Simon 1929); *br(w)ak ~ *(s)br(w)əŋ (HPTB: 523, 585) ‘speak’:

*mrə > OT/CT smra ‘speak’, rma ‘ask, inquire’ (= sound alternation 1)
*pr(h)a > CT pragma ‘ritual, prognostic’, (s)prachal ‘joke, jest’, phrama ‘calumny, slander’, phramen ‘sorcery, witchcraft’, (h)phrin ‘message

*br(w)a > CT bro ‘oath’

From the perspective of Tibetan, the oral forms are secondary nominal derivations. Another reason is that most of the oral forms are voiceless, and hence unlikely the starting point for the alternation. Apart from this, there is also at least one voiced form (bro; for other cognates of the voiced type, see §§ 3.3 and 3.4 below). The alternation between voiceless and voiced forms makes it even more unlikely that the oral forms should have led to a nasal realisation. However, if the nasal forms are the older ones, then the relation to Eastern Iranian is more than obvious:

(26) pIE *mleuH, pII *mlauH ‘speak’, Avestan mrao-, Sanskrit brav- (*brao), Khotan-Saka *mrov or *mru ‘declare, order’, cf. mura ‘speech, word’; *mrautar > *mrautā > Saka murta ‘lord ruler’; *mravakā > Khotan-Saka rīka ‘commander, lord’;

One would generally expect that nasals alternate only with their homorganic voiced counterpart as in the case of the word for snake (*mrul vs. *brul > sbrul). However, the words for ‘monkey’, ‘human being’, or ‘offspring, child’ show an alternation between nasal and voiceless stop (*mraw-k vs. phrug > sprug, spra). Words related to the semantic field of ‘speaking’ show both types of oral onsets. It does not seem possible to indicate which type, the voiced or the unvoiced, is more original in Tibetan, nor is it possible to define the conditioning factors.
2.3 Jotisation or alternation of post-initial glides

Alternations among the post-initial glides (y [j], r, l, w, and 0 – or a corresponding vowel i, e for j and u, o for w) seem to be common, but unpredictable across Tibeto-Burman languages, cf., e.g., the word for ‘measure (for grain)’: Jingpho /byê/, Tangut /biej/; Kinnauri /brê/, CT bre, BAL: Skardo /ble/ (CDTD), Khapalu /bre/ (SPR), PUR, Sham /bre/ (CDTD), DOM /rbe/; Bwe /ble/; CT bo, Tshona, Bokar /bo/22, Jingpho, Hani, Karen /bo/; in Bwe the meaning has changed to ‘span’, in Tangut the word is used as classifier and general measure word (STEDT). See also Matisoff (1978: 344f) for the [j] ~ [r] alternation in Lolo-Burmese and Simon (1929: 209f.) for Chinese-Tibetan pairings.

A regular alternation r > j can be observed in Tibetan, but only in the case of the Classical Tibetan clusters velar plus alveolar trill and their palatal realisation in Amdo Tibetan (cf., e.g., Roerich 1958: 21-23), going back to a cluster of velar plus palatal glide. The latter is occasionally attested in Old Tibetan: ralgyi for CT ralgri ‘sword’, the names Šakhyi and Šakhri for CT Šakhri and Šakhri. In a few cases, these forms are also attested in the western-most dialects, cf. BAL and LAD /rai/ or /rayi/ for ra(l)gri ‘sword’, BAL /khit/ < *([h]khyid for hhkrid ‘lead along’, and PUR /skjaɣar/ for skradkar ‘white hair’ (CDTD).

Exceptionally, the alternation is also attested in Tibetan with a preceding labial, cf. CT sbraŋ- ‘bee’, ‘honey’, BAL /(z)bjan-/ , PUR /zbjan-/ , Dzongkha /bdzan-/23, see example (15) above. In §§ 3.3 and 3.4, I shall give evidence for Archaic Tibetan bya ‘human’ and CT bya ‘say, name’, as derived from *bra- or *mra-, while § 3.2 will discuss the jotised variant phya(/v) of the word root *p(h)ra, related to speech acts, examples (17) and (25) above.

One could expect, therefore, also an alternation between dental & r and dental & j among the Tibeto-Burman languages. The combination with palatal glides would have developed into palatal stops in Tibetan (this might be one of the reasons why the clusters tr and thr are not found in Tibetan, except in loans).

2.4 Vowel alternations that are not morphologically conditioned

Old and Classical Tibetan show certain morphologically conditioned vowel alternations, such as the notorious verbal ablaut patterns (only partially preserved in the eastern varieties) or the change of final -a & diminutive suffix ā hu > -eu (generally preserved in the modern varieties). Apart from these, one can find in Tibetan written texts as well as in the spoken languages a few word pairs (or triplets) of identical meaning that differ only with respect to the vowels (y)i, u, (and a). The ‘instability’ of these vowels may reflect various processes of phonetic change being productive in different dialects or the adaptation to a totally differing vowel system in a donor language, such as, e.g., the Turkic or Mongolian type with centralised vowels.

In some cases, the interchange of (y)i, u (and a) appears to be triggered by a preceding labial (a feature that may perhaps have a Turkic or Mongolian background). In other cases, the alternation seems to be related to a preceding alveolar trill, which might point to an original semi-vocalic character of the r. Other instances might be due to a centralised character of the original vowels ([i], [u]) and/ or to an early neutralisation process, as the one attested in Amdo Tibetan (cf. Haller 2004: 46, 48 for Themchen).

Examples with a preceding labial are found in the verb hbi(g)s ~ hbug(s) ‘pierce’ and in the nouns dbyigpa ~ dbyugpa ‘stick’ and byiru ~ byuru ‘coral’, examples for a preceding alveolar trill are found in the tribal names Rma and Rmu and the older reconstruc-

22 /br/ > /bl/ is a secondary development in several western Balti dialects.
23 See note 12, p. 12 above.
table forms for ‘man’ rmi, rme and rma\(^{24}\) (here the r~ element combines with a labial).

An example for an apparently unconditioned vowel alternation is the verb CT\(^{24}\) hus \~ las ‘remain behind, be left behind’ (JÄK), with dialectal attestations in Southern Mustang, Western Drokpa, Dingri, Shigatse, and Lhasa for the less common form las (CDTD).

Examples from the Ladakhi dialects show that the vowel of a following syllable may also play a role, leading either to assimilation (i-u/o > u-u/o) or to dissimilation (u-u/o > i-u/o): DOM /rugu/ for LAD /rigu/ ‘kid’, CT\(^{24}\) rigu (here, the Shamskat form might have been motivated as an echo form to /lugu/ ‘lamb’); Shamskat /puksmo/, Kenhat /pik(s)-mo/ ‘knee’, CT\(^{24}\) psumo; LAD /dzugu/ ~ /dzi\(^{24}\)ɣu/ ‘finger’, CT\(^{24}\) mdzugmo; LAD /zurmo/ ~ /zi\(^{24}\)r)mo/ ‘pain, illness’, CT\(^{24}\) gzug, gzer. These alternations could be due to a genuine Tibetan vowel assimilation (or dissimilation) process, which might have been unidirectional in principle, but affected different words in different varieties at different times.

Alternations between vowels e and o appear to be less common, but are attested as spelling variants in OT\(^{24}\) rjobo for CT\(^{24}\) rjebo ‘lord’ and\(^{24}\) roro for CT\(^{24}\) rere ‘each’. Similarly one can find a few dialectal variations, such as DOM /chopo/ vs. Leh /chenmo/ ‘big’. The reason for this alternation is not obvious.

Variation between a, u, and o, as we see in the case of CT\(^{24}\) spru-g ‘(human) offspring’ vs. spra ‘monkey’ and many words related to speaking (smra, rsa vs. smo-, domo-), is most probably due to an underlying original diphthong *au/*ao/*aw or *ua/*oa/*wa.

Vowel alternations may also be observed between words with different, but related meanings, cf. 1. CT\(^{24}\) sgrig (<*g-rik or perhaps *rik plus prefixes *g- and *b-) ‘put in order, arrange, etc.’, LAD: /rik/ ‘arrange, pay for’, GYS /-(b)-rik/ ‘x rows (of turquoise)’; 2. CT\(^{24}\) sgrug (<*g-ruk or perhaps *ruk plus prefixes *g- and *b-), LAD /ruk/ ‘collect, gather (nuts, wood)’, GYS, DOM /-(b)ruk/ ‘little pieces of’; 3. CT\(^{24}\) sbrag (<*b-rak or perhaps *rak plus prefixes *g- and *b-) ‘lay, put one thing above another’, DOM /rak/ ~ /rbak/ (~ /brak/), TYA /rak/ ~ /lbak/, GYS /rak/ ‘join together, attach, add’, GYS /-(b)rak/, DOM /-rbak/ ~ /-brak/ ‘x-fold lining’ (Zeisler 2011a: 266f.), where the two ‘radicals’ g- and b- might be secondary developments, and the alternation may be triggered by the alveolar trill.

Simon (1949: 7-10), under the keyword ‘vowel gradation’, gives quite a few examples for alternations between, as he thinks, semantically related words, such as lceugpa ‘flexible, pliant, thin’, lceugma ‘osier stake, rod, thin branch’, and lceag ‘rod, switch, stick, whip’, where the semantic relation is quite obvious, or cases such as √bub ‘get turned over’ with √bab ‘descend, fall down’ or grabs ‘preparation, arrangement’ and √grub ‘get accomplished’, where the relation is not so obvious and would need some corroboration from other Tibeto-Burman languages. Simon does not mention any conditioning factor, but in the last two cases, we would again have an example for a preceding labial and an alveolar trill.

Vowel alternations can also be found across the Tibeto-Burman languages. Matisoff (2008: xxxvii) mentions the following common variations: u ~ i, ya ~ i, and wa ~ u, all occurring in closed syllables. Among the etymons, he discusses, the variations may, in extreme cases, comprise almost all possible vowels, cf.

\(^{24}\) In connection with the tribal names of eastern Tibet and the neighbouring areas, taking the form rm\(\times\)V or simply m\(\times\), Stein (1951: 253, n. 6) speaks of an ‘imprecise’ vowel, the Tibetan transcriptions of which would alternate between e and i and o and u respectively. An example are the Miñag, rendered alternatively as Meñag and Moñag in Tibetan documents. Stein further mentions the alternations /mu/ (r)mu and /ɲi/ (r)mi\(\times\) for CT m\(\times\) ‘man’ in certain Amdo dialects. In the Rgyalpo bka\(\times\)i thin\(\times\)yig, the Dga\(\times\)ldan edition has Rm\(\times\)a, where the Sdedge edition has Rme for what should have been Rmu (ibid). Another interesting spelling alternation for obviously one and the same ethnical group is Smaza for Muzu or Muzi (ibid, p. 254 with n. 5).
Combinatory sound alternations in proto- pre- and real Tibetan

- *s-riŋ ~ *s-r(y)aŋ ‘live, alive, give birth, green, raw’:
  i, i’, u, u, a, ə, o, æ, e, a, o, “ö” (ø or œ) (Matisoff 2008: 52-55).
- *m/s-la(ː)y ‘navel, centre, self’:
  a, aï, aï, ay, ə, i, iɛ, e, i, wi, u, uo, o, xi (p. 58-61).

Similarly, Simon (1949: 9f.) adduces a Tibetan word family around the notions ‘round, circular’ and ‘bend’, implying, besides an alternation in articulation manner, four or even all five vowels, with, among others, *gar ‘dance’ (in a round?), *sgar ‘camp (enclosure)’, *mkhar ‘castle’ (likewise an enclosure), *gorno ‘round’, *khor ‘circle’, *skor ‘encircle’, *kyirkyir ‘round’, *hkhyir ‘turn around, rotate’, less convincingly *dgurba ‘bent, twisted’, and *sgur ‘bend, bow (head)’, and finally *hkhyer ‘carry away’, which he relates to *hkhor ‘carry’, implying that this is necessarily done by bending one’s back.

In any case, such variability makes comparison rather difficult if not arbitrary. So far, it does not seem possible to establish a general direction for any of these alternations, not to speak of conditioning factors. Even at the lowest levels, such as the Tibetan languages, it is often not possible to establish regular and exceptionless sound laws. In a few cases, we have, fortunately enough, some historical evidence that allows explaining features such as the sporadic change of Cr to Cy in Balti as being due to borrowings from Eastern Tibetan. For the time being, however, we do not have any explanation for the fact that the sound change is only sporadic in the case of labial clusters, while completely regular in Eastern Tibetan in the case of velar clusters. The further we go back in time or the broader the assumed genealogical relation becomes, the less it seems possible to establish regular sound changes. Tibeto-Burman comparative linguistics simply does not meet the philological standards mentioned above. That this field is still in an initial stage, is not really an excuse, as the standards have been set up (and followed) in the very early beginnings of Indo-European studies:

I beg leave, as a philologer, to enter my protest […] against the licentiousness of etymologists in transposing and inserting letters, in substituting, at pleasure, any consonant for another of the same order, and in totally disregarding the vowels […] I contend, that almost any word or nation, might be derived from any other, if such licenses as I am opposing, were permitted in etymological histories (Jones 1799: 431).


3.1 Human simians, simian humans

Monkeys seem to have been substitutes for human sacrifices; at least, we know that monkeys were offered by Tibetans as well as by the inhabitants of the so-called Women’s Dominion, located in the border areas of the Pamirs and in parts of the Changthang (see Zeisler 2010: 404-415). Monkeys have played an essential role as a kind of ancestral deities among the recent Qiang (Stein 1957: 7-9). According to the Chinese annals, some Qiang tribes called themselves ‘monkey’ (ibid. p. 5) and similarly, the Tibetans claim to be simian offspring mihu (often translated as ‘little men’ or ‘dwarfs’), having a monkey as father (a Bodhisattva in disguise). Yet, according to some other Qiang legends, the etymologically related self-designation Rma ~ Rme ~ Rmi signifies, among other faculties, the being able to speak, in contrast to a just conquered ‘primitive’ tribe (Stein 1957: 4). This should be enough to show the ambivalent relation between humans

25 There is a small number of words with a retroflex realisation of the former cluster velar plus alveolar trill, but these are most probably later borrowings from Central Tibetan as they are related to religious notions or to notions of similar high prestige.
and simians, at least, among Tibeto-Burman people. The Tibetan word phrug(u) ‘(human) offspring’ is certainly the closest equivalent to the alleged proto-Tibeto-Burman word for ‘monkey’ *mraw-k (*myok ~ *mruk).

The Tibetan expressions for ‘monkey’, however, form the smallest part of the derivations under discussion, and it seems that, at least in Tibetan, this meaning is a secondary extension from a more basic meaning ‘human being’. One knows from other cultures that the concept of humanity may be extended to animals able to rise on the hind legs and to walk a few steps, such as bears, apes, and monkeys, cf. e.g., the Orang Utan, which is, literally, a forest man. An opposite extension would be rather unlikely.

3.2 Human speakers, speaking rulers (and priests): the Phiao (Phya/v)

Except for metathesis, all sound changes described above are attested across Tibeto-Burman languages, particularly also for the two words for ‘speaking’ and ‘human being’. As ‘speaking’ is the activity that discriminates humans from animals, and since speaking the same language is an important factor for establishing ethnical identity (and thus for the self-assurance as ‘human’ and the disqualification of others as ‘non-human’), I would argue that the formally quite similar words for speaking and humanity are actually related, the latter being derived from the former. In the following, I shall give a few examples from STEDT for the meaning speak and for the meaning man, human, the most relevant forms for the following discussion are underlined:

– ‘speak’: WrB: mrwak ~ prwak or pro ~ prô (/pro³/), Rangoon /piə ⁵⁵/, Jinuo /piə ⁴²/ or /piə ³¹/, Lotha Naga /phyo/, Sunwar /bwaːk-/,

Lushai /biːk/, Pattani /prəi/ or /prəi/, Saker (Luish) /piː/, Tiddim /paːuʔ/,

Lisu /bəŋ/, Chokri (Naga) /p/o/ or /po ⁵⁵/, Angami, Mikir, Shixing /pi/, Athpare /piːk-/,

Simi /piː/, Gurung /biːq-m/, Lalo /biːq/, Lakhker /biː/, Lalo, Yi /biː ³¹/, Hani /mi³¹/,

Sani, Ahi, Yi /be ³³/ or /be ⁴⁴/

– ‘man, human’: Darang /mowaː/, Dimasa /miya/, Tangsa (Moshang) /miva/, Tamang (Risiangku) /piəŋ/ ‘male (human),

Darang /myai/, Old and Mid Chinese /piwo/ or /piu/, Thakali /pyung/, Pa-O /pə khɔː/,

Kayan (Pekon) /prə- ‘man’,

Northern Lisu /mɤʔ ²¹/ ‘female (human),

Guiqiong /mə ³³/ Luxi (Langsu, Lequi) /piu ³¹/, Apatani /miu/ < /mi-ju ‘human being’

One may further add the Karen classifier for human beings: Pa-O /phra ⁵³/ or /phra ³³/, Kayan /phra ³³/, E. Kayah /phrei ¹¹/ < proto-Karen *bra ‘human being’ (Theraphan Luangthongkum 2011: 12; according to the author, p.c., the medial glide /-r- changes to /-j-/ or /-l-/ in some modern languages), Manchăti or Paṭṭani /myo/ or /mio/ ‘daughter niece’ and /prai ‘speak’ (Sharma 1982: 71, 220 and 70, 219), and perhaps also Raji of Astok in Uttarakhand, according to Sharma (1990: 171, 173f.) a Munda variety, but with many Tibeto-Burman loans, with /pəau/ [pəyau] ~ /pəyo/ ‘son, boy’ (pp. 178f., 195, 203). A form closer to Tibetan is found in Jyarung to-rmi (Stein 1951: 253, n. 6 with further reference).

Note, in this connection, the tribal names Pyu/ Piao and Miao. It would appear that these people considered themselves as speakers and/ or human beings (or even as ‘nobles’, that is, ‘commanders’). Apart from the ethnical designations Rme ~ Me, Rmi ~ Mi, etc. in the eastern border area of Tibet, there are many other Tibeto-Burman tribal names that could equally be associated with this word root and these notions. Here, I restrict myself to these two forms, because they appear as ethnical names in Old Tibetan sources.

In the case of the Mya/v (expire), usually transcribed as Myva or Myava), it is quite apparent that the Old Tibetan documents refer to the Nanzhao kingdom, and thus to the peo-
ple commonly known as Miao. The Phya/v (ཨྭ་, usually transcribed as Phyva or Phyava)26 should thus correspond to the Pyu/ Piao of Myanmar, but the Phiao of the Old Tibetan documents are located on the upper course of the Brahmaputra in Rtsaṅ (Western Central Tibet; cf. Pt 0126, Pt 0216: Lower Rtsaṅ, Pt 1060: Upper Rtsaṅ, ITJ 0734).

In Pt 1286, the ruler of Rtsaṅ is described as rje Rtsaṅ rje ḥi Thod.kar ‘the lord, (a) Tocharian of/ among/ for the Rtsaṅ lords’. The association of the Rtsaṅ lord(s) with a Tocharian affiliation might indicate that the particular Phiao tribe or clan was actually of Indo-European (Yuezhi or Kuṣāṇa, and that means, Eastern Iranian or Scythian) origin (note that the Tocharians were most probably not speaking the so-called “Tocharian” language!).

Like other ancestral tribes, the Phiao became deified and the Tibetan emperors seem to have attempted to style themselves as descendants of the Phiao.

The Old Tibetan document Pt 1038, treating the descent of the Tibetan kings, refers to the legendary first king as a ‘ruler over all [three] existential spheres’ (sridpa kunla mṛjaḥ mdzadphā) and as a phya/vṛ ṣya ṣphya/v. In the given context, the latter phrase cannot simply mean “the Phyva of the Phyva gods” (Samten Gyaltsen Karmay 1998: 286) or “a Phyva ancestor of the Phyva” (Macdonald 1971: 216) as the previous translations have it, neglecting the focus marker ṣya/ ṭya ṣeven’. The only meaningful interpretation, accounting also for the use of the focus marker, is ‘commander even of the commanders’ or ‘ruler even of rulers’, an adaptation of the prestigious Persian title xšāyaθiya xšāyaθyānām or Šāhān Šāh, a suitable title for one who pretends to control the whole universe or all the worlds (Zeiser, to appear, § 4.2.6.4). This title would also correspond well to the already mentioned Khotan-Saka word for ‘commander, ruler, king’: murta from the root *mrav or *mrhu ‘declare, order’. The development in Tibetan (and Tibeto-Burman) could have been as follows:

- *mrava-ka ‘commander, lord’ > *mrav-o-k ~ *mrav-o-k ~ *mr(o)-k
  - via sound alternation 3 & sound alternation 2
  - or via sound alternation 2 & sound alternation 3
  - > *myao-(k) / > *phrao-(k) > phya/v ‘speaker, commander, lord’

The word phya/v or simply phya and the (diminutive?) derivations with vowel i may also refer to more ordinary human beings: OT phyi, CT phyimo or phyi refers to an ‘ancestral lady’ or simply ‘grandmother’, cf. pTB *pyid (STLC: 88) or *-p (HPTB: 191) ‘grandmother’. In Ṇārjula ṇī Ḫodzer’s Metog śīnpo, a Phyis.mi or Phyihi rgadpo, an ‘old Phyī man’, and a Phyihi rganmo, an ‘old Phyā woman’, invoke the deities so that they may send a suitable ruler to the earth. Apparently, some of the Phiao functioned as priests and/ or as media for the communication between the deities and ordinary human beings. This role qualifies them as ‘speakers’ or ‘invokers’. In this context, cf. also OC *mjag > mjū ‘magician, sorcerer, shaman’ (STLC: 107, with a proto-form *mjay).

In a related development, the word phya/v(⁄v) is also commonly used in the sense of ‘oracle’ or ‘lot’. Such prognostics are, of course, announced by a ‘speaker’. Cf. also the words pra(-mo) ‘ritual, prognostic’, phramen ‘sorcery, witchcraft’, and ḥphrin ‘message’, which likewise refer to a more abstract concept of the speech act. The forms in

---

26 My transcription reflects the assumption that the vowel sequence was in fact intended to be /-iao/ or /-yaw/ according to the sequence in the attested names, but that the final labial semivowel was written merely conventionally below the palatal semivowel, possibly to save space or for some phonological reasons. I do not think that my argument gets invalid if the Tibetans should have intended to represent an inverted order /-ioa/ or /-iwa/.
p(h)ra- or phri- and those in phya- or phyi- are semantically and formally related. The former belong to an earlier stage of the development, the latter underwent jotisation (* sound alternation 3).

3.3 Men, women, children: bya, byi

The first chapter of the Old Tibetan Chronicle shows some applications of the word bya that do not really fit the Classical Tibetan meaning ‘bird’, but it seems that at the time of the redaction of this chronicle the original meaning ‘human being’ had already become obsolete, and in later times, a whole mythology was created about bird-like rulers and deities (cf. Zeisler 2011b: 145, 150f., 185; Haarh 1969: 17f. accordingly speaks of a bird totem).

There is, however, one Old Tibetan document that clearly testifies the meaning ‘human being’, if only as ‘woman’. The diminutive byehu is used in the sense of ‘child’. In another document the word bya has likewise a somewhat negative connotation, namely as ‘meek man’. The first document, Pt 1052, a mo divination text, contains an extremely negative forecast in ll. r131-134:

{\textit{thor gcig ni mkhardan pral | gyurbu ni skamla bton | byaban ni thanla las byehu-chuŋ ni nudaŋ bral || bu gcig ni dvaru lu[s] mo ḥdi jila btagyang ŋan rabbo ||}}

‘For an individual: he will be separated (forcefully) from his castle. For the whole [clan]: they will be expelled into the desert (lit: dry land). The fearful women will be left scattered. The small children will be separated from the[mother’s] breast. A sole son will be left as orphan. This mo, thrown for which purpose ever, is extremely bad.’ (Zeisler, to appear, § 4.2.6.4)

The second document, OTC ll. 440-443 with a parallel passage, ll. 272 (given here in brackets), refers to a request for an oath of allegiance between the ruler and the Mgar clan. The phrase concerning the fearful woman byaban is apparently copied from another document, and the copyist clearly misread the word las as thas (a meaningless form). This shows that certain expressions had become commonplace and were recycled rather mechanically wherever they might have fit. The CT meaning of byaban (~byaway) ‘nighthawk’, ‘raven’, or ‘flight of bird’ does not make sense in either document. Similarly, several other difficult words in the OTC passage cannot be understood by their later classical meanings.

{\textit{rjehis ni bkah stsalpa gžahpyi ni yunkyi srid | (/ rjehis ni bkah stsalna gžahma ni yunkyi srid ||) byahis ni ŋu pubpa | lapyi ni gdaŋsu dro || (/ byahis ni ŋu pubna lapyi ni gdaŋsvu dro ||) ... rjehis ni ḥbajns magtaj || rjehis ni ḥbajns btajna | byaban ni thanla thas (recte: las) | ...}}

‘The lord having given an order, the trustworthy (gžah) word (pyi) (/ the confidence, gžahma) will last. The (meek) man having posed a request, the answer/word of gratitude (? lapyi) will be like the sun (lit. will be warm) on the forehead. … May the lord never abandon (his) subject(s). If the lord abandoned (his) subject(s), the fearful women (or effeminate men) would be left scattered. …’ (Zeisler, to appear, § 4.2.6.4)

27 BDGM: \textit{gyurbu} = m\textit{atshanba medpar} ‘not being the case that it is not complete’.

28 For \textit{baŋ} cf. \textit{bag} ‘be afraid’, \textit{bagned} ‘careless, unscrupulous’ (JÄK, TETT), hence \textit{baŋ}- ‘fear’ as an alternative form of \textit{bag}- (* sound alternation 2).

29 BRYG: \textit{thanla} = b\textit{kram} ‘scattered’; \textit{las} is an alternative form for \textit{lus} ‘be left’.
Traces of this obsolete Old Tibetan word are preserved in CT bya-n-po ‘married man’ (JÄK, TETT), with pejorative usage also ‘divorced man’ (JÄK), CT bya-n-mo ‘married woman’ (JÄK, BRGY, TETT), with pejorative usage also ‘divorced woman’ (JÄK, TETT), ‘whore’ (JÄK), and further in CT byispa ‘child’, which can be analysed as byi plus collective suffix -s (see Denwood 1986 and Uebach & Zeisler 2008) plus individualizing -pa. The form byi might either be a development from byehu ‘child’ or it might be due to vowel alternation (possibly triggered by the initial labial or by the palatal or by both). The alternation bya ~ byi mirrors that of phya(v) ~ phyi.

A further reflex of bya ~ byi is found in BAL /balbi/ ‘child’ and PUR /bazbi/ ‘wife’ (CDTD sub byis). I would think that at least the second element can be explained as being due to a metathesis from an original *bra-s as the older (rhotisised) counterpart of byi-s. The first element /ba-/ might likewise be etymologically related: it could have developed from *bra or *bya with loss of the post-radical. In that case, the first element /ba/ might have designated humanity as a more general or abstract concept.

Finally, another reflex might be found in LAD Kenhat /abi/ < *abyi vs. Shamskat /api/ < aphyi ‘old woman grandmother’. Note that in other family terms, an intervocalic unvoiced consonant does not get voiced in any of the Ladakhí dialects, hence LAD /aʧo/ < CT ajo ‘elder brother’, LAD Kenhat /aʧe/ ~ /aʧi/, Shamskat /aʧe/ ~ /aʧi/ < CT ac(h)je ‘elder sister’. For possible cognates, cf. also pTB *bar > OC *b’wâ ‘old woman’, pLB *bwa ‘grandmother’ (STLC: 114), and pTB *bwa ~ *b’wâ ‘grandmother’ > OC *b’wâ ‘old woman grandmother’ (HPTB: 174).

It seems that the forms with i were by preference used for females and/or children, with a by preference for males. This is certainly not a strict rule, but would corroborate a diminutive derivation. Cf. also HPTB (pp. 38, 187) pTB *mi > pLB *mi35/3 ‘female, girl’, with Lahu /yâ-mî/ ‘girl, daughter’, /mî-yâ/ ‘wife and children’, Maru /mji35/ ‘wife’, /mji35 ye35/ ‘daughter, and Bisu /bî/32. Nevertheless, if one looks at all the forms across Tibeto-Burman, it also seems that these words were originally gender-neutral – something that could be expected if the word referred to a specific human faculty (that is, the faculty of speaking) –, but were either filling gender-specific gaps when borrowed or got gender specific negative values when new, more prestigious items were introduced for the higher-ranking gender, and then eventually got obsolete. Interestingly enough, in Tibetan the newly introduced forms, such as mi for ‘man’ and possibly mo for ‘woman’ are taken from the pool of etymologically related words and constitute further developments of the original word.

The pejorative connotations that words denoting women as the politically less important or even despised part of the society may acquire yielded also a group of words centering around the word byi ‘promiscuity, adultery, rape’, cf. also ITJ 0734 The age of decline 1r28f., where among other bad deeds that will be performed in the future it is prophesised that myi pha logpo chuymala byiba byas ‘the having performed adultery/

---

30 /lb/- for /rb/- is occasionally attested in the Shamskat dialects, cf. TYA /lbak/ vs. DOM /rbak/ for CT sbrag ‘arrange’ and Purik, Sham /lbs/ vs. Leh, Nubri /rbs/, Balti /rbs/ ‘swell’ (CDTD). Note also the regular change of /br/- to /bl/- in Skardu Balti (Read 1934: 3).

31 Sprigg (2002: 25) suggests to analyse the Balti word as being a translational compound based on Urdu bâl ‘child’ and Tibetan byis. This analysis would not account for the quite similar Purik word, where the alleged final takes quite a different shape and where we no longer deal with mere children.

32 Perhaps also *pwi(y) ‘female’ with OC *b’ion ~ *b’ior ‘female of animals’ and Lushai /-pui/ ‘feminine affix’ (HPTB 197, 201, 448). HPTB (p. 449 note n) indicates that the usage is most probably ‘general, regardless of species; femaledom’ and the index entries on pp. 608 and 650 indicate usage for both humans and animals. It is quite possible that a word for female human beings becomes applied also to animals due to bleaching of the original meaning (this happened also with the affix -mo in Tibetan) or when the original meaning acquires some negative connotation.
rape with/to the wife of [another] fatherly man’. Finally, one may perhaps also add byipo, which, apart from a ‘lecher’, also refers to the ‘bosom’ (JAK, TETT), perhaps basically of female beings?

### 3.4 CT bya ‘to be called’, byas ‘said’

The CT verb root √bya (I: byed, II: byas, III: bya, IV: byos) has the basic meaning ‘do, make, perform’. Stem II and III, however, are often used in the sense ‘said’ (stem II) or ‘to be called’ (stem III). One could possibly derive this meaning from the basic notion ‘do’. Felix Haller (p.c.), however, suggests, that we might actually deal with two different verbs. This would again show a direct relation between speaking and humanity.

However, this analysis faces one major problem: the verb byed has a synonym CT I: bgyid, II: bgyis, III: bgyi, IV: gyis (OT also with infixed -r-, e.g., Pt 1038 brgyi and brgyis), which has exactly the same meaning ‘do, perform’ and, with stems II and III, ‘said’ and ‘to be called’. In this case, we do not have any evidence that there were two independent verbs √(r)gyi of different meaning.

Nevertheless, there might be one explanation. A given synonym S of a word A, when becoming more dominant, may also replace a semantically unrelated homophone B of A. The Romance languages provide a nice example: Latin *asinus ‘donkey’ (A) and acinus ‘berry’ (B) became homophonous aze (A, B) in the dialect of La Canourgue in southern France. When the word for ‘donkey’ (A) was replaced by saymo ‘beast of burden’ (S), the replacement affected also the word for ‘berry’ (B) (Maiden 2008: 319f).

Similarly, the synonym √(r)gyi of √bya1 ‘do’ might have been transferred to √bya2 ‘speak’, without, however, replacing any of the two forms. This could have happened rather easily if the notion of ‘speaking’ had already become obsolete.

### 3.5 The full set of words that are possibly related

In the following, I shall list the words related to (1) speaking, (2) humanity, (3) clan and tribal names, and (4) monkeys that were arguably derived from the root *mra(o) through any of the above described sound alternations and any combination thereof, see again Table 1, which is repeated as Table 3 below for convenience.

Note that final -d (alternating with -s after non-dental and non-alveolar consonants) is a derivational suffix for verb stem I, which typically leads to vowel change a > e; final -s (alternating with -d after dental and alveolar consonants) is a derivational suffix for verb stem II. Both suffixes may get lexicalised. Final -n, alternating with -d, is a common deverbalising derivational suffix, it often has a collectivising meaning, like the nominal -s suffix. Similarly, final -ŋ, alternating with -g, is an old nominal derivative suffix, possibly with the meaning ‘belonging to’ (see also further below). The a- prefix of family terms has an individualising function, like the suffixes -po/-pa and -mo/-ma. Furthermore, as stated above, the written Tibetan d- pre-radical does not represent a dental or alveodental consonant, but possibly a voiced velar or uvular fricative and an unvoiced retroflex or a palatal fricative. For a better understanding, all derivational or compositional elements that do not belong to the word root in question will be separated from the root by hyphens.

---

33 The meaning of logpo is unclear, according to BRGY it may imply ‘something extra’ or a ‘selector’. In the first case, the term may perhaps refer to the father’s younger brothers, who, in an polyandrous marriage system, are considered to be ‘younger fathers’ of the children, even if they have a wife of their own.
### Table 3: Overview: combined sound changes for the root *mra(o)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel alternations (not morphologically triggered)</th>
<th>nasal base form</th>
<th>metathesis--jotisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(mye-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mre</td>
<td>*mro</td>
<td>*Mra (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*smre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smre (1)</td>
<td>*smro</td>
<td>smra (1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sme- (1)</td>
<td>sme (1)</td>
<td>Sma (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rme- (1)</td>
<td>rme- (1/2)</td>
<td>rma- (1/2/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mre</td>
<td>*mro</td>
<td>*Mra (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*smre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*smro</td>
<td>smra (1/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sme (1)</td>
<td>Sma (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rme- (1)</td>
<td>rme- (1/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rma- (1/2/3)</td>
<td>rmi (2)</td>
<td>Rmu (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Alternation of homorganic nasals and oral stops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel alternations (not morphologically triggered)</th>
<th>nasal base form</th>
<th>metathesis--jotisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(mye-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mre</td>
<td>*mro</td>
<td>*Mra (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*smre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smre (1)</td>
<td>*smro</td>
<td>smra (1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sme- (1)</td>
<td>sme (1)</td>
<td>Sma (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rme- (1)</td>
<td>rme- (1/2)</td>
<td>rma- (1/2/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mre</td>
<td>*mro</td>
<td>*Mra (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*smre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*smro</td>
<td>smra (1/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sme (1)</td>
<td>Sma (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rme- (1)</td>
<td>rme- (1/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rma- (1/2/3)</td>
<td>rmi (2)</td>
<td>Rmu (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 1. Verba dicendi and words related to speech acts:

- **smr** (step 1): OT/CT smra ‘speak’, smra-ŋ ‘speech, recitation’; smre ‘lament’
- **smVr** (step 1a): CT smar ‘speak’, PUR /kha smar/, Leh /kha mar/ (CDTD), GYS /kha mār/ < kha smar ‘talk rude, too much, shout, cry a lot’
- **sm** (step 2): OT/CT smo ‘say, name’, smo-n-lam ‘prayer’; √sma-d (I/IV: smo-d, II/III: sma-d) ‘slander, blame, abuse, curse, etc.’
- **dm** (step 3b): CT dmo-d ‘swear, curse’
- **m** (step 4): OT/CT mo ‘oracle’
- **br** (≈ sound alternation 2): OT/CT bro ‘oath’

---

**Extended version of the presentation at the ICSTLL44 Mysore 07.-09.10.2011, draft version 02**

27.03.2012 21:11
by (∝ sound alternation 3): OT/CT /bya ‘speak’

b (∝ sound alternation 3): OT/CT /bo (1: h-bo-d, II/IV: bo-s) ‘call invite’, OT bo-n-po ‘reciter, invoker’


py (∝ sound alternation 2): OT phya/v ‘invoker, commander’, OT/CT phya/v ‘lot, prognostics’, ḥ-phya ‘blame, censure, chide, deride’

smr (step 1): OT smra a term used in older texts for proto-human, priestly, or even divine beings, on a par with the gšen (a class of priests) and the lha ‘deities’

sm (step 2): OT/CT smi-n ‘sibling’ (cf. smi-n-drug ‘Six Sisters’, the Pleiades and smi-n-bdun ‘Seven Brothers, the Great Bear’)

rm (step 3): Dzongkha /mā/, Kardze /mā/ < rmi (dmīh), Batang /mē/ < rme, Derge /pē/ < *rmye, Lithang, Cone /pē/ < *rmyi ‘man’ (CDTD and Jacques 2011: 9f. for Cone); 34 CT rmo-mo > CtrT /mō/, ‘old woman’, Southern Mustang /mōmo/ ‘(maternal) aunt’, Western Drokpa /mā/ ‘grandmother’ (CDTD); 35 OT rma-ŋ-s (~ OT/CT dma-ŋ-s) ‘people, commoner’


my (∝ sound alternation 3 or step 4): 37 OT mye-s-po, AT /ape/ < a-my-e-s, ‘old man, grandfather, ancestor’; OT myi, AT /nū/ ‘man, person’

m (step 4): OT/CT mi ‘man, person’, OT/CT mo feminine gender marker, dialectal mo ‘woman’; CT me-s-po, LAD /meme/ ‘old man, grandfather, ancestor’

br (∝ sound alternation 2): —

34 The written Tibetan spellings Rmi, Dmih, and Rme are, in fact, found for ethnical designations of Eastern Tibet (see below).

35 With nasal, high tone indicates a former pre-radical.

36 In Jacques’ notation ‘x’ indicates high tone. In the tonal varieties of Tibetan, all plain nasals are low tone by nature, but have a high tone realisation if these had been preceded by any kind of pre-radical.

37 As mentioned initially (s. note 3, p. 2), the palatal glide may be either the result of the sound alternation 3 (Cr > Cy) or the result of an Old and Eastern Tibetan development where labials became palatalised before palatal vowels.
---

28 Combinatory sound alternations in proto- pre- and real Tibetan

- *db* (step 3b): OT/CT *dbo-n* ‘nephew, grandson’

- *by* (sound alternation 2 plus sound alternation 3): OT *bya* ‘man, woman’, *

*byehu (= hya+hu) ‘child’, *byi ‘woman, child’, cf. LAD Kenhat /abi/ < a-*byi ‘grandmother’, OT *byi-s-ba*, CT *byi-s-pa*, PUR /bazbis/, BAL /balbis/ < *ba-rbi-s ‘child’, Purang /pišin/ ‘son’ < *byis-sriṅ (CDTD), cf. also CT *bya-n-po ‘married man’ (JĀK, TETT), with pejorative usage also ‘divorced man’ (JĀK), CT *bya-n-mo ‘married woman’ (JĀK, BRGY, TETT), with pejorative usage also ‘divorced woman’ (JĀK, TETT), ‘whore’ (JĀK), perhaps also OT/CT *nay-bya-n ‘servant’ (lit. ‘person for internal affairs’)39; pejorative usage is found especially with CT *byi ‘adultery’ (TETT), cf. *byi byas ‘commit adultery (a man with another man’s wife)’ (BRGY), *byi byed ‘commit adultery (man to woman), rape’ (JĀK), *byipo, *byibo ‘lewd man, adulterer’ (BRGY, TETT), *byimo ‘lewd woman, adulteress’ and ‘bald woman’40 (BRGY, TETT), cf. also Tabo /pimō/ ‘woman with bad character’ (CDTD), CT *byi_phrug ‘illegitimate child, bastard’

- *phr* (sound alternation 2, unvoiced): CT *phru-g(u) ‘child’

- *spr* (step 1): CT *spru-g(u) ‘child, offspring’

- *sp* (step 2): OT/CT *spu-n ‘brothers’; Cone /æ²pɔ/ /α-?spo ‘baby’ (?; Jacques 2011: 58)


- *phy* (sound alternation 3): OT *phyi, CA-phyi, phyi-mo ‘old woman, grand- mother, ancestress’, cf. LAD Shamskat /api/

---

38 From an anthropological perspective, grandchildren and nephews and nieces share the property of being ‘offspring’ with a distance of two steps from ‘ego’, the reference person. In the case of grandchildren the two steps lead directly vertically along the genealogical line, in the case of nephew/niece, the first step is horizontal to the sibling and then again vertically to his/her offspring. Hence, one often finds the same designation or obviously related forms for both groups. The proto-form is given in STEDT as *b-lɪ, *b-l-ɔ, or *b/m-l-ɔ, and one finds forms such as Kayan /pʰoːdɔ/ ‘niece, nephew [lit. child-big]’, which shows the relation to the words for ‘(human)offspring’, and Northern Hpun /ʃːmǐ/ ‘nephew, niece; grandchild’, Tangut /mo/ ‘nephew, mother’, which show the relation to words for women or mothers or more generally to humanity. Cf. also Taodeng /pʰi tɛ-mu/ ‘nephew, niece (maternal)’, WrB mrê ‘grandchild’, Rangoon /mje³ (mj)⁵⁄ Achang /mi⁴⁄ or /mi⁴ tǝs⁳⁄ ‘grandson’, Nusu /bi₃⁵ / ‘grandson’, /bì⁴⁵ zu₃⁵ mi₃¹ dǝ³⁄ ‘granddaughter’ (STEDT).

39 The parallelism with *naḥblon ‘minister of internal affairs’ and *phyi-blon ‘minister of external affairs’ (with *blo-n-po ultimately related to *blo ‘mind, reasoning’) is obvious, but I do not want to preclude that the element *bya refers to the faculty of doing rather than to that of speaking, even though I would have expected a form such as *naḥbyed for the ‘actor’ meaning.

40 *mgoḥi skrā mɛd pā i budmed. Perhaps a woman that has been shaved as punishment for adultery?

41 In the Rgyogchos section of the Bkahgdaams glegsجام (compiled 1302), a *dpalbo (as a model for those who meditate) is described not so much as a fighter, but as one who ‘acts as a guard, watchman, sentry, or spy’ (Herrmann 1983, fol. 265r.5). It is thus possible that the word is related to another Iranian word, referring to the army, soldiers, and watchmen: Pahlavi *spah ‘army’ (MacKenzie 1971), Parthian *spāda > Gândārī *spalu, Khotan-Saka *spāda ‘army’ (possibly < *spāda-pati); Saka *spasa ‘observer, servant’ (as appearing in several compounds), cf. Harnatta (1994: 410-412), and Niya Prakrit *spaṣa ‘sentry, watch’ (Burrow 1934: 512).
3. Clan, tribal, and ethnically related place names:

- Mya/v (Miao); Phyva/v (Phiao)
- Sma-za (~ Mu-za ~ Mu-zí, cf. Stein 1951: 254 with n. 5), Smu ~ Rmu ~ Dmu ~ Mu; Rmi ~ Dmiḥ ~ Mi, Rme ~ Me, Mo (these designations are used for Qiang tribes in Eastern Tibet, particularly for the Mi ~ Me ~ Mo-ñag, cf. Stein 1951: 253, n. 6, 1957: 5), Rma ~ Ma, Rme-ru (= rma+ru; the vowel e seems to be conditioned by the second syllable, like in the case of the diminutive suffix; cf. also Miðru < Rmeru, a place in Ladakh with further vertical vowel assimilation), Amyes Rma-chen a.k.a. Rma-chen or Rma-rgyal Spom-ra (= spo+mra)
- Bra ~ Spra ~ Sbra ~ Dbra (?)
- Spa, Spu (Spu-s, Spu-rgyal), Spu-g ~ Spu-ŋ (?); Spo-bo, Spo-(ŋ)-roŋ (?); perhaps also Spyi-ti (?)

4. Monkeys:
CT spra, OT/CT sprehu (= spra+hu) ‘monkey’, (CT origin myth: mi-hu originally ‘simian offspring’, but reinterpreted as ‘little man, dwarf’).

4. Repercussions for the reconstruction of proto-Tibeto-Burman
First of all, the attested instances of metathesis with an intermediate s- or d- pre-radical pose a challenge for previous reconstructions with triple clusters or ‘prefixes’, which where apparently biased towards the Tibetan form. The process of metathesis continued into some of the western-most dialects. From the historical background, it is rather evident that Balti, Purik, or Western Sham cannot represent the oldest stratum of Tibetan, as the western areas were originally inhabited by people speaking Indo-Aryan, perhaps also Iranian languages or even Burushaski. These areas were conquered in the mid 7th century CE, but that does not mean that the people changed their language immediately. Most probably, the shift from Tibetan as a foreign language to Tibetan as the mother tongue took place much later, perhaps only from the 11th century onwards (see also Zeisler to appear § 2). The triple clusters sCr, some instances of the cluster sCy, and many of the binary clusters sC, rC, dC are clearly the result of a secondary development. Old or Classical Tibetan words with these clusters, therefore, cannot be taken as a witness, neither for a complex syllable structure in proto-Tibeto-Burman nor for certain derivative morphemes, such as the alleged ‘body-part’ cum ‘animal’ prefix *syə (cf. p. 6 above).

As can be observed from the examples in § 2.1, previous reconstructions were not fully consistent in assigning either a nasal or an oral initial. In one case, HPTB/STEDT provide an oral form, apparently based on the Tibetan attestation (the case of ‘snake’, example (16)), in the other case, a nasal form is given, possibly because the corresponding Tibetan form was not recognised (the case of ‘monkey’, example (14)), and yet in another case, an oral form is given, despite the fact that the corresponding word in Tibetan has a nasal and the Written Burmese form shows both a nasal and an oral variant (the case of the verb ‘speak’, example (17)). We definitely need to establish some general sound laws, describing the direction of the development.

With respect to the initials, either the oral or the nasal variants should represent the earlier form. If we look at Tibetan and the fact that nasal initials may correspond to voiced as well as to unvoiced oral stops, it seems to be more logical to assume that in Tibetan the development was from nasal to oral and not the other way round. One could possibly argue that the voiced and the unvoiced forms were transmitted by different pre-
Tibetan varieties or borrowed via different channels. Since the nasal variants are also found in other branches, particularly among the Burmish languages, it is highly probable that the shift from nasals to oral stops was an innovation that affected some branches but not others, and in some branches, some words but not others. The last alternative, however, would point to mutual influences or borrowings.

On the other hand, the Tibetan finals do not show a clear pattern. Alternative endings are comparatively frequent, but just because of this, it is impossible to postulate generally which one is the older form. There might be several reasons for this situation: different dialects might have contributed different forms or the development could have become reverted in some cases under the influence of a more prestigious dialect. Finally, if at least some dialects showed a regular assimilation to following a morpheme with an oral or nasal initial, this could have contributed to a certain instability of the finals in general.

In the case of the alternations among the glides w, y [j], and r, it seems to be more likely that an alveolar and labial glide merged with a palatal glide, than that a palatal glide became sometimes a labial and sometimes an alveolar glide. Particularly the development Cy > Cr seems to be somewhat less likely than the opposite process.

The variability of the word forms in individual word families within Tibetan and across Tibeto-Burman languages poses a great problem for the reconstruction of the assumed proto-language. Even more annoying is the fact that in most cases, we are unable to indicate a direction of change. As a result, one may find different reconstructed etyma for quite obviously related words, as in the case of 1. *bwar or *pwa ~ *bwa > OC *bar > buā or *b’wā ‘old woman, grandmother’ (STLC: 114, HPTB: 174), corresponding to OT †bya ~ †byi, Kenhat /abi/, BAL /balbis/, PUR /bazbis/ vs. 2. *pyid or *-pəy ‘grandmother’ (STLC: 88, HPTB: 191), corresponding to OT phyi, CT phyimo or apyi, Shamskat /api/. A similar case might be the above-mentioned derivation *mra- > rma ‘man’ > rmaŋ ~ dmaŋ ‘commoner’, dmag ‘soldier(s), army’ and the supposed roots OC *mræŋ < *mrang for the former and OC *mjagx for the latter.

Unfortunately, it is not always clear how old an Old Chinese word actually is. The available comparative lists do not specify the first (or last) attestation of any given word. The term Old Chinese is used for the language of the earliest oracle bone inscriptions (12th c. BCE), the Western Zhou bronze inscriptions (around 1000), and the pre-classical texts (until the late 3rd c. BCE). By the time of the oracle bone inscriptions, nomadic Indo-European tribes had already been settling in Eastern Turkestan. Archaeological evidence points to an arrival in Gansu around in the early 2nd millennium BCE. It is an open question who these tribes were and what kind of language they actually spoke. Benjamin (2007: 1-36 and 43f.) who gives a fairly good overview on the early history of the Yuezhi, like most scholars outside the field of Indo-European historical linguistics, favours the ‘Tocharian’ hypothesis, while the majority of Indo-Europeanists favour the Eastern Iranian (Scythian) hypothesis. In any case, there must have been enough opportunities for the Chinese to interact and trade with these Indo-European nomads and with this interaction, words could be borrowed in either direction.

In the case of the word *mrang, I have been told (Thomas Preiswerk p.c.) that it appears already in the Book of Songs (or Book of Odes, Shijing), which is dated to the 10th to 7th century BCE. Its final reduction, however, was made by Confucius (551–478 BCE). With the given time frame, one cannot preclude any instance of borrowing. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to find out in which context the word *mrang appears,

---

whether it could be associated with the Central Asian nomadic tribes or not, or whether a borrowing could be motivated for other reasons or rather not.

I do not want to preclude, that some originally independent words might have got fused in Tibeto-Burman or more particularly in Tibetan, as it happened in the case of the verbs √bya₁ ‘do’ and √bya₂ ‘speak’ or as it happened in the early period with the nouns OT bya₃ ‘human being’ and OT/CT bya₄ ‘bird’. But the assumption that all the 40 odd combinations, which lead to an even greater number of semantically related words, are merely the result of accidental convergence, requires a bit too much of coincidence. From the perspective of Tibetan, all forms can be derived from a single verb root.

All the words discussed here with a labial initial or root consonant and the meanings ‘speak’, ‘human being’, or ‘monkey’ seem to be deeply rooted in the Tibeto-Burman languages and are particularly associated with many tribal names. One would not generally expect such core vocabulary items to be borrowed, even less could one expect the borrowing of a core verb as verb. However, there are instances where family terms have been borrowed from another, more prestigious language, cf. Urdu valid ‘father’, validaḥ ‘mother’, valideṅ ‘parents’, borrowed via Persian from Arabic, or the omni-present mom and dad, borrowed into Ladakhi (via Hindi, Urdu, or Panjabi) and into many other languages of the world. There are also infrequent instances where verbs have been directly borrowed as verbs.⁴⁴ A rather obvious case of verb stem borrowing into Tibetan is CT hgrul ‘walk’, which, despite its spelling, is nowhere attested with a velar cluster, particularly not in Balti or Purik, where the velar is typically preserved. The orthography is thus artificial and the word most probably borrowed from an Indian language, cf. Hindi dūlnā or dōlnā ‘move, wander about’ and Kumaoni dūlu ‘wander’ (Bielmeier 1985: 171).

The Tibetan verbs smra ‘speak’, rma ‘inquire’, √sma-d (I/IV: smod, II/III: smad) ‘slander, blame, abuse, curse, etc.’, dmo-d ‘swear curse’, and the element smo-n in the word for ‘prayer’ belong to a high register (the negative notions, such as ‘blame’ or even ‘curse’ can be easily associated with the utterances of high ranking persons or of ritual specialists). With their reconstructable forms *mra- or *mro-, they have a very close equivalent, in the Eastern Iranian verb mrao-. The vowel alternation in the attested forms points to an original diphthong, and two of the related words even show the Avestan diphthong: Phya/v (Phiao) and Mya/v (Miao). What is more, even within Indo-Iranian, the word shows similar sound changes and even a similar derivative morphology: the for Indo-Iranian languages rather uncommon shift from nasal to oral stop (*brao in Indo-Aryan), the proto-Indo-Iranian shift of medial glide, here l > r (cf. again pIE *mleu̯H, pII *mlauH ‘speak’, Avestan mrao-) plus the progressive metathesis in the Saka dialects (cf. *mrautār > *mrautā > murta and *mravant > murunḍa ‘lord’), variation in the vowels, particularly reduction of diphthong ao to u, and the presence of a velar derivational suffix, which, incidentally, has almost the same semantics as one of the Tibetan or Tibeto-Burman suffixes commonly found with this root.

That is to say, some of the words discussed above show a final nasal or oral velar in some of the Tibeto-Burman varieties but not in the others. The question is then whether this final originally belongs to the word root, as suggested in many reconstructions, or whether it might not simply be a derivational suffix. E.g., in the case of the verb

---

⁴⁴ Verbs can be borrowed, not only as nominalised forms in combination with light verbs, but also indirectly (with derivational affixes) or directly as verbs (cf. Wohlgemuth 2009: 88-101). In the latter case, it is quite common, but not really necessary that an infinitive or any other kind of nominal form is borrowed. In our case, it would also be possible, that a verb was borrowed with its nominal morpheme, but that the latter got contracted or lost in the course of time.
‘speak’, Simon proposes the form *smraγ, Matisoff the form *br(w)ak or *(s)br(w)əŋ, whereas Tibetan has only smra.

It seems odd to postulate that Tibetan lost the final velar, since velar finals are quite common in Tibetan. Simon (1929: 162) assumes, that the ‘lost’ finals in Tibetan were originally voiceless or fricatives. But this is not very convincing. The voice opposition is neutralised in the final position of Tibetan words, where the consonant may appear as unreleased or delayed stop (cf. Bielmeier 1985: 66 for Balti). We have no means to establish the original voiced or voiceless character of the finals. Final nasals are generally assumed to have been voiced. Thus, where the final is reconstructed as a nasal, there is absolutely no evidence for a phonetic condition that could trigger its loss in some cases, but not in others.

Moreover, verbal morphology apart, in most, if not all, cases where we have alternations between finals and open syllables in Tibetan, the open syllable corresponds to a verb root, less frequently also to a noun, while the form with a final always corresponds to a nominal derivation. Deverbal derivations are mainly found with the -d/-n suffix (cf. CT I: rga, II: rga-s ‘get old’, rga-d-po ‘old man’, rga-n-mo ‘old woman’; CT I: lta, II: b-lta-s, III: b-lta, IV: lio-s ‘look at, observe’, lta-d-mo or lta-n-mo ‘spectacle, show’).

The -g/-ŋ suffix appears for deverbal and denominal formations. Deverbal usage is found in the case of smra ‘speak, say’ and smra-ŋ ‘ritual narrative, proclamation’ or perhaps simply ‘speech’. Denominal usage is commonly found with tribal and geographical names, such as Spu and Spu-ŋ, Spu-g, or Spu-gu; Rma and Rma-ŋ. The suffix may also have a connotation of family relations, cf. mi ‘man’ > mi-ŋ-bo ‘brother’, *sri ‘woman’ (cf. srą ‘aunt’) > sri-ŋ-mo ‘sister’.

The suffix seems to express the notion of a ‘collective, belonging to X’. Therefore, the geographical and ethnical designations Bya and Bya-ŋ appear to be related, as well. There are quite a few place names with Bya, Byan, and related forms in Tibet. It is rather evident that byaŋ cannot always have meant ‘north’, particularly when it refers to places in the south. A meaning such as ‘belonging to the Bya-tribe’ or ‘Bya-clan’ would be more likely. In the case of the Byaŋthaŋ, the Changthang of Ladakh and northern Tibet, and particularly in the case of the southern place of the same name at lake Phuma, south of the Yarḥbrog, this could mean a ‘plain of those who belong to the humans’, or ‘the plain of our folk’. In so far as the word bya had acquired the connotations of ‘female human beings’, this could have given rise to the notion of a Women’s Dominion in parts of, or all over, the Byaŋthaŋ, without there ever being such an extraordinary political entity.

The Indo-Iranian -ka suffix that we meet in the word *mrava-ka and in the corresponding Saka form rau-k ‘speaker, lord’ has the following functions in Sanskrit:

a) derivation of diminutives,
b) formation of adjectives of nouns that express the relation to a place,
c) the possession of an item,
d) the occupation with something,
e) the consistence or value,
f) infrequently also a relation with another person, possibly a relation of descent (Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 519-529).

The -ka suffix is likewise used in Iranian languages, where, due to its high frequency, it became semantically quite bleached (ibid. p. 539).

Function a) is expressed in Tibetan typically by the suffixes -bu and -gu/ -ju/ -hu (with assimilating forms), which seem to have a different origin, but apparently merge...
with the velar suffix in non-syllabic forms. Functions b), c) and f), however, seem to correspond largely to the function of the velar suffix in Tibetan, and one might possibly also identify function d) in Old Tibetan derivations. The functional and formal similarity is possibly not just accidental, and it would appear that the Tibetan non-syllabic velar suffix -g/-ŋ, and perhaps also the syllabic suffix -ka of a similar function had been borrowed from Indo-Iranian.\footnote{As an example for morpheme borrowing within and across language families, I would like to point to the instrumental-ablative morpheme *sV that was borrowed into Tibetan, possibly via a Tamangic language, to combine with the relational marker {kyi} to form an ergative marker {kyi}s and with the locational markers na and la to form the ablative markers nas and las. The syllabic form, which is preserved in some Western Tibetan varieties was further borrowed into several Dardic languages as an ergative marker in present tense constructions where there was a functional gap (as is well known, the modern Indo-Aryan languages typically display split-ergativity), see also Zeisler (2011a: 281-290).} A direct borrowing would be precluded, if a unidirectional development from nasal to oral finals in pre-Tibetan could be established. Yet, even in that case, there could still have been a merger of the Indo-Iranian suffix with an existing pre-Tibetan nasal velar suffix due to the identical articulation position.

All in all, the similarities between the Eastern Iranian \textit{verbum dicendi} and its derivatives, on the one hand, and the various Tibetan words related to speaking and humanity, on the other, is at least as strong as the similarity of the corresponding words across the Tibeto-Burman languages. What Tibetan shares with Khotan Saka, but not with Tibeto-Burman, is the notion of royalty associated with the faculty of speaking, that is, in this case, commanding. This is perhaps the strongest indicator that the word family \textit{speaker, human, lord} has been borrowed from Eastern Iranian into Tibetan. However, if that had been the case, the apparently cognate forms for `speak’ and ‘human’, ‘(old) man’, ‘(old) woman’, or particular kinship terms, such as ‘child’, ‘nephew’, etc. in the diverse Tibeto-Burman languages must have come from the same source.

The elitist connotation of royalty or at least noble status may well be the reason why an apparent item of core vocabulary, namely the self-designation as ‘speaker’, could be borrowed from one tribe to another, ending up with the Miao far in the south. Or should it be the case, that most, if not all of the present Tibeto-Burman tribes and nations originally came from an area that was dominated by ‘royal’ \textit{speakers}, namely the Royal Scythians (\textit{Sakaraukai, Saraucaec, Sakamuruda}) or the equally powerful and equally Eastern Iranian (Scythian) Yuezhi, that is, did they all come from or via the Ordos region?

And is Tibeto-Burman thus perhaps rather a warrior’s pidgin?

5. Additional remarks

The action of calling or convoking people … is characteristic of someone endowed with authority over others: a teacher, head of the house, king, prince, Buddha as head of the community, etc. (Pinault 2002: 266; here for the relation between Tocharian A kāk- ‘invoke’ and kākmārtik ‘ruler, chief, master’ and the corresponding Tocharian B forms).

More modestly, one could argue that a person who is well-versed in rhetoric as much as in poetry may naturally become, or may be selected as, a spokesman of the community. One may think of song and riddle competitions, an important component of Tibetan culture, still preserved in traditional marriage customs.

Rhetorical competence was an important factor at the court of the early Tibetan empire or its initial stages. This is attested at several points in the Old Tibetan Chronicle. The most remarkable passage is found in ll. 221-229, where one of the vassals, Khyn-
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po Spunṣad Zutse actually challenged the ruler Gnamri Slonmtshan (the father of the first emperor) with a song, asking for the royal insignia. Gnamri Slonmtshan remained speechless, and so did his closest vassals. It is only a more distant vassal, who turned down Zutse’s claim with his song – and, no wonder, became the emperor’s favourite (cf. Zeisler 2011b: 119).

Another important function of speech that may lead to an association with rulership is psychological warfare. Challenging the enemies with abusive language in order to dishearten them and to encourage or incite one’s own troops, possibly also with the function to talk oneself into a rage, was certainly an important element before the fight (cf. also Bailey 1985: 136). It is thus not very surprising that verba dicendi or verbs relating to auditory perception appear in Old Tibetan nicknames or appellations of honour, such as ‘Voice of X’ (X-sgra) or ‘Fame, Glory of X’ (X-sñan, -gzigs), ‘Speaker, Spokesman, Leader, or Commander of X’ (X-(r)ma; cf. Richardson 1998 [1967]).

Abbreviations:

1. Languages and dialects
   
   AT  Amdo Tibetan
   BAL Balti (Shamskat)
   CT  Classical Tibetan
   CtrT Central Tibetan
   DOM Domkhar (LAD, Shamskat)
   Elr Eastern Iranian
   GYS Gya-Sasoma (LAD, Kenhat)
   LAD Ladakhi
   MC  Middle Chinese

2. Dictionaries and texts
   
   BDGM  Brdadkrol gsergyi melo, Btsanlha Dägbä Tshulkhrims (1997)
   BRGY  Bod-Rgya tshigmdzod chenmo, Zhang et al. (1993)
   CTD  Comparative Dictionary of Tibetan Dialects, Bielmeier (in preparation)
   EWA  Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen, Mayrhofer 1996
   IAIL  Indo-Aryan inherited lexicon (in progress), Lubotsky & Beekes
   ITJ  (IOL Tib J) manuscripts of the Indian Office Library, now British Museum, London
   JÄK  A Tibetan-English dictionary, Jäschke 1881
   KhS  Dictionary of Khotan Saka, Bailey 1979
   OTC  The Old Tibetan Chronicle, Pt 1287, Imaeda et al. (2007)
   Pt  manuscripts of the Fonds Pelliot tibétain, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris
   RN  A dictionary of the language spoken by Ladakhis, Norman (2009)
   SPR  Balti-English English-Balti dictionary, Sprigg 2002
   STEDT  Sino-Tibetan Etymological Dictionary and Thesaurus, Matisoff (2011)
   STLC  A Sinologist’s handlist of Sino-Tibetan lexical comparisons, Coblin (1986)
   TETT  Tibetan to English Translation Tool, Pellegrini, 2006-2009
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