
Note

Tibetan $\sqrt{\text{lan}}$ ‘reply’

NATHAN W. HILL¹ AND ABEL ZADOKS²

Recognising the parallelism between the conjugation of a verb such as $\sqrt{\text{lug}}$ ‘pour’ (pres. *ldug*, past *blugs*, fut. *blug*, imp. *lhugs* ‘pour’ and a verb such as $\sqrt{\text{kru}}$ ‘wash’ (*hkhru*, *bkrus*, *bkru*, *khru*), Li Fang-Kuei suggests deriving the present stem *ldug* from a reconstruction $*\text{h}^{\text{h}}\text{lug}$ (1933: 149). In this sub-case of Conrady’s law, the change of $*\text{h}^{\text{h}}$ to *ld-* may be analyzed into the following changes: $*\text{h}^{\text{h}} > *^{\text{h}}\text{dl} > *^{\text{h}}\text{ld} > \text{ld}$ (cf. Conrady 1896: 59, Li 1933: 149, Hill 2011: 446–447, Hill 2013: 193–195). This sound change obscures the synchronic relationship between verb forms beginning with *ld-* and other present formations, and the resultant synchronic opacity gives rise to analogical forms (e.g. the alternate present *blug*). Consequently, the dictionaries present a certain level of confusion about the paradigms of lateral initial verbs.

In many cases enough of the traditional lexicographical sources present enough of the etymologically correct stems for the pattern to emerge despite the noise. For example, a root $\sqrt{\text{lud}}$ ‘give to drink’ on the model of *hkhru*, *bkrus*, *bkru*, *khru* ‘wash’, should have the stems $*\text{ldud}$ ($< *^{\text{h}}\text{ldud}$), $*\text{blud}$, $*^{\text{h}}\text{blud}$, $*\text{lud}$. Hill (2010: 159) presents the following paradigm for this verb on the basis of nine lexicographical sources; the digit following each stem is the number of lexica which report that form.

Pres. *ldud* (5), *blud* (4), *lhud* (1)
 Past. *bldud* (1), *blud* (6), *ldud* (1)
 Fut. *ldud* (3), *blud* (5)
 Imp. *ldud* (3), *blud* (5), *lhud* (1)

Majority rule yields the paradigm *ldud*, *blud*, *blud*, *blud*, nearly what morphology predicts. The imperative *lhud* given in one source most closely matches the predicted $*\text{lud}$;¹ although majority rule in some cases yields the right answer, is not a reliable method. In other cases the traditional lexicographical sources unanimously divide a verb into two, where morphological analysis suggests that the stems originally belong to a single paradigm. Thus, the dictionaries offer *ldad*, *bldad*, *bldad*, *ldod* ‘chew’ and *blad*, *blad*, *blad*, *blod* ‘chew’ as distinct verbs, where the morphology suggests the single verb *ldad*, *blad*, *blad*, $*\text{lod}$ ‘chew’.

¹The voiceless imperatives *lhugs* (from $\sqrt{\text{lug}}$ ‘pour’) and *lhud* from ($\sqrt{\text{lud}}$ ‘give to drink’) in place of predicted $*\text{lug}$ and $*\text{lud}$, commends the devoicing of laterals in the imperative to further study. This phenomenon is perhaps to be compared with voice alternating verbs of the type *higen*, *bkan*, *dgan*, *khon* ‘fill’ (cf. Hill 2014). However, the formation of the future of voice alternating verbs with *g-* rather than *b-* weighs against this comparison.

The paradigms suggested by morphology are hypotheses; only in two cases have textual attestations confirmed the validity of such hypotheses.²

Traditional paradigm: *klog, bklags, bklag, klogs (lhogs)*

Correct paradigm: *klog, blags, klag, lhogs* (cf. de Jong 1973, Hahn 1999)

Traditional paradigm: *klub, bklubs, bklub, klubs*

Correct paradigm: *klub, blubs, *klub, *lhubs* (cf. Eimer 1987, Hahn 1999)

Attestations from Old Tibetan and the Kanjur allow $\sqrt{\text{lan}}$ ‘reply’ with the paradigm *ldon, blan, glan, lon*, to be added as a third member to the list of lateral initial verbs for which philological attestations confirm the expected morphological stems against the analysis of the dictionaries.

The dictionaries give *ldon* ‘return, answer, reply’ as an invariant verb (Hill 2010: 160); they also give a verb with the confused paradigm pres. *glan/glon*, past *glan*, fut. *glan/glon*, imp. *glan/glon* ‘patch, answer’ (Hill 2010: 39–40). Morphological analysis suggests that these stems are better arranged into one verb *ldon, blan, glan, lon* ‘answer’; appropriate attestations of all four stems are not difficult to find.³

Examples (1) and (2) show *ldon* attested as a present stem.

- (1) *mi rtsod-ciñ dri-ba dris kyañ ñan-thos-kyi-theg-pas lan mi ldon-te/ ci-nas sañs-rgyas-kyi ye-shes mñion-par rdzogs-par htshañ rgya-ba de lta-bur lan ldon-no/*

Although they asked questions and did not argue, the Śrāvakas do not reply, they reply (with the question) how to be perfectly liberated in the manifest wisdom of the Buddha (*Saddharmapuñḍarīka-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, Derge Kanjur vol. 51, page 106a)

- (2) *Kau-śi-ka-kyis Lhañi-bu-zla-ba ḥdi-ñid-la dris-śig-dañ / ḥdi-ñid-kyis khyod-la lan ldon-no/*
O Kauśika, ask thou this very Devaputracandra and he will answer thee (*Triyastrimśat-parivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra* Derge Kanjur vol. 63: page 141a)

In the first clause of example (1) the negation with *mi* ensures that *ldon* is either present or future; the context precludes a future reading (i.e. ‘to be replied’). In the second clause of example (1) and in example (2) the suffix *-no* rather than *-to* precludes the past and the context again weighs against the future.

Examples (3) and (4) show that *glon* is an alternate present stem to the verb ‘answer’.

- (3) *don de-lta bas-na ñas mdo-sde kun-las ñaḥi ḥkhor-du gtogs-pa ni drin-la lan glon-no*

For that reason I answer the questions of my disciplines from all the sūtras (*Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*, Derge Kanjur vol. 52, page 128a)

²A similar correction to the paradigm of one rhotic initial verb is also available. The verb ‘to write’ has the traditional paradigm: *ḥbri, bris, bri, bris*, but the etymological paradigm is: *ḥdri, bris, bri, ris* (cf. Hill 2005). Relying on the type of analysis offered here for ‘give to drink’, ‘chew’, and ‘understand’ Jacques posits four paradigms for verbs with rhotic initials, without philological confirmation: *ḥdri, brid, bri, *rid* ‘deceive’, *ḥdrud, brus, bru, *rus* ‘dig’, *ḥdreg, bregs, breg, *regs* ‘shave’, *ḥdrad, brad, brad, *rod* ‘scratch’ (cf. Jacques 2010).

³As Jäschke points out these verbs ‘answer’ are cognate to the noun *lan* ‘an answer’ (1881: 292, 543), guaranteeing that the root has a vowel ‘a’ and not a vowel ‘o’. The verb ‘answer’ often appears in a *figura etymologica* ‘answer an answer’ with this noun.

- (4) *bu tsha pha-mas gsos-te / / phaṅs-paḥi rim-ḥgro myig-dañ mtshuṅs-par byas-pa yañ / / rgas-paḥi bsel-dañ lan glon-bar dgosu zad-de / / skyes-na slar lan glan-ḥin chi nus-gyis bya-baḥi rigso / / dper-na / gchan-zan / mtshaḥ-dañ bya-rgod-gyi bu yañ / / pha-maḥi drin-gyi lan glon-na / myiḥi bu lta-chi smos*

Children are nurtured by their parents and definitely obliged to honour them accordingly, repaying with care for the elderly. Given their birth, they shall have to repay and do what they can. If for example even the children of wild animals and birds repay the kindness of their parents, why speak of the children of humans? (*Dialogue of two brothers*, PT 1283, ll. 242–245, Imaeda et al. 2007: 169)

In example (3) the suffix *-no* rather than *-to* again precludes the past and context weighs against the future. In example (4) no tell-tale syntactic sign assures that *glon* is a present, but the generic reading weights against the past (cf. Zeisler 2004: 334–337) and the occurrence of *glan* as a future in the same passage, precludes that *glon* is the future. If *glon* is not the past or the future, then it must be the present.

Examples (5) and (6) show *blan* attested as a past stem.

- (5) *byañ-chub-sems-dpaḥi gсар-du slob-pa chos-kyi yi-geḥi lugs-dañ / tshul-khrims-kyi gzhuñ ḥdrir ḥoṅs-pa-la brnyas-paḥi sems-dañ / ṅan-sems-dañ / le-loḥi sems-kyis gcig-pu gcig-pu-nas ḥdri-baḥi lan ma blan-na ltuñ-baḥo / /*

If with ill will, indolence, or scorn toward those who come to ask about the textual tradition of dharma and the code of conduct newly taught [by] Bodhisattvas, they do not answer the questions of each one, they will fall [into hell]. (*Dharmamudrā*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 66, page 83a)

- (6) *de-nas ḥjam-dpal la-sogs-paḥi byañ-chub-sems-dpaḥi tshogs de dag-gis kyañ de ḥzin-du tshigs-su bcaḍ-pa de-ñid-kyis lan blan-to /*

Then, the assembly of Bodhisattvas, Mañjuśrī etc., answered in verse like that (*Mahābherihāraka-parivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, Derge Kanjur vol. 63, page 119b)

The use of the negation prefix *ma* (in example 5) and the use of the suffix *-to* (in example 6) ensure that *blan* is a past stem form.

Examples (7) and (8) show *glan* attested as a future stem.

- (7) *khyed-kyis lan glan-ḥin kha gdag-par ci gnañ ḥes*

Would you grant that [my parents] be avenged and [their enemies] vanquished? (Rama C, l. 8, cf. de Jong 1989: 97)

- (8) *skyes-na slar lan glan-ḥin chi-nus-gyis bya-baḥi rigso / /*

Given their birth, [children] shall have to repay [their parents] and do what they can. (*Dialogue of two brothers*, PT 1283, ll. 243–244, Imaeda et al. 2007: 169, cf. example 4)

In example (7) the coordination of *glan* with the future stem *gdag* (from the verb *ḥdogs*, *btags*, *gdag*, *thogs* ‘vanquish’)⁴ ensures that *glan* is itself a future stem. In example (8) the coordination

⁴Hill (2010: 149) on the basis of slim evidence divides this verb from *ḥdogs*, *btags*, *gdag*, *thogs* ‘tie, fasten’, but the two are certainly to be identified etymologically.

of *glan* with the future *bya* (from the verb *byed*, *byas*, *bya*, *byos* ‘do’) ensures that *glan* is itself a future stem.

Examples (9) and (10) show *lon* attested as an imperative stem.

- (9) *tshe-dañ-ldan-pa byams-pa gnas-brtan Rab-ḥbyor ḥdi skad-du byañ-chub sems-dpaḥ sems-dpaḥ chen-po byams-pa ḥdi don ḥdiḥi lan ldon-no žes zer-na tshe-dañ-ldan-pa ma-pham-pa don ḥdi lan lon-cig !*

The venerable beloved monk Subhūti [said] this: “bodhisattva mahāsattva Maitreya, if you say you give answers regarding the intention, then give an answer re the intention, Invincible [Maitreya]!” (*Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*, Derge Kanjur vol. 33, page 197a)

- (10) *brtan-po gañ-dañ gañ-dag rña-bo che-chen-poḥi mdo ṅan-par ḥdod-nas lhags-pa de-da bdag-gi rña-bo che bsrags-pa gsan-nas dri-ba deḥi lan lon-cig !*

Whosoever is steadfast, having come to hear the sūtra of the great drum, now, having heard the great beating of my drum, give answers to the questions! (*Mahābherīhāraka-parivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, Derge Kanjur vol. 63, page 119b)

The imperative suffix *-cig* suffixed to *lon* ensures that in both examples 9 and 10 this stem is an imperative.

These textual attestations demonstrate that paradigm of ‘answer’ is *ldon* ~ *glon*, *blan*, *glan*, *lon* ‘answer’ as morphological analysis suggests.⁵ This case study shows that morphological analysis when confirmed by philological attestations, can bring order to the apparent chaos that the dictionaries sometimes present.

References

- Conrady, August (1896). *Eine indochinesische Causativ-Denominativ-Bildung und ihr Zusammenhang mit den Tonaccenten*. Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz.
- Eimer, Helmut (1987). “Eine alttibetische Perfektbildung.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 30, pp. 213–214.
- Hahn, Michael (1999). “Blags und Verwandtes (Miscellanea etymologica tibetica, VI).” *Studia Tibetica et Mongolica (Festschrift Manfred Taube)*. Eds. Helmut Eimer et al. Swistal-Odendorf, Indica et Tibetica Verlag, pp. 123–125.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2005). “The verb ‘bri ‘to write’ in Old Tibetan.” *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 68, pp. 177–182.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2010). *A Lexicon of Tibetan Verb Stems as Reported by the Grammatical Tradition*. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2011). “An Inventory of Tibetan Sound Laws.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland (Third Series)* 21.4, pp. 441–457.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2013). “Relative order of Tibetan sound changes affecting laterals.” *Language and Linguistics* 14.1, pp. 193–209.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2014). “A Note on Voicing Alternation in the Tibetan Verbal System.” *Transactions of the Philological Society* 112.1, pp. 1–4.
- Jacques, Guillaume (2010). “Notes complémentaires sur les verbes à alternance ‘dr-/br en tibétain.” *Revue d’Etudes Tibétaines* 19, pp. 27–29.
- Jäschke, Heinrich August (1881). *A Tibetan-English dictionary*. London: Unger Brothers.

⁵Future research may explain the variation between the two forms of the present stem

- de Jong, Jan Willem (1973). "Tibetan blag-pa and blags-pa." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 36.2, pp. 309–312.
- de Jong, Jan Willem (1989). *The story of Rāma in Tibet: text and translation of the Tun-huang manuscripts*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Li, Fang-Kuei (1933). "Certain Phonetic Influences of the Tibetan Prefixes upon the Root Initials." *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 6.2, pp. 135–157.
- Imaeda, Yoshiro, et al. (2007). *Tibetan Documents from Dunhuang, kept at the bibliothèque nationale de France and the British Library*. Tokyo: ILCAA, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Zeisler, Bettina (2004). *Relative tense and aspectual values in Tibetan languages: a comparative study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. nh36@soas.ac.uk

NATHAN W. HILL

School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London

ABEL ZADOKS

School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London