# Some Tibetan verb forms that violate Dempsey's law

## Nathan W. Hill

### (SOAS)

akob Dempsey suggests that Tibetan *-i-* before velars often derives from an original *-e-* (Dempsey 2001: 217, 2003: 90, Hill 2012: 73, Hill 2013: 202-203).[1] Chinese cognates with the vowel *-e-* provide good motivation for this suggestion.[2]

> Tib. གཅིག *gčig* < *gt<sup>j</sup>ek 'one' : Chi. 隻 *tsyek* < *tek (1260c) 'one of a pair'
>
> Tib. མཇིང *mǰiṅ* < *ml<sup>j</sup>iŋ (Bodman's law) < *ml<sup>j</sup>eŋ 'neck' : Chi. 領 *ljengX* < *reŋʔ (0823f)
>
> OTib. མྱིང *myiṅ* < *m<sup>j</sup>eŋ 'name' : Chi. 名 *mjieng* < *C.meŋ (0826a)
>
> Tib. འཛིང *ḫdziṅ* < *ḫdzeŋ 'quarrel, fight v.', Ch. 爭 *tsreang* < *m-ts<sup>ʕ</sup>reŋ (0811a) 'strife, quarrel'
>
> Tib. རྫིང *rdziṅ* < *rdzeŋ 'pond' : Chi. 井 *tsjengX* < *C.tseŋʔ (0819a) 'well (n.)'
>
> Tib. སྲིང་མོ *sriṅ-mo* < *sreŋ-mo 'sister of a man' : Chi. 甥 *sraeng* < *s.reŋ (0812g) 'sister's child'

The cases where Chinese has *-i-* before a velar show that this sound change is indeed a merger.

> Tib. ཚིགས *tshigs* 'joint' : Chi. 節 *tset* < *ts<sup>ʕ</sup>ik (0399e) 'joint of

---

bamboo'

Tib. ཤིག *śig* 'louse' : Chi. 蝨 *srit* < \*sri[k] (0506a) 'louse'

Tib. འཁྱིག *ḫkhyig* 'tie, fasten, suffocate' : Chi. 縊 *'ejH* < \*qˤik-s (0849g) 'strangle'

Tib. ནཟེང *na-niṅ* 'last year' : Chi. 年 *nen* < \*C.nˤiŋ (0364a) 'harvest; year'

Tib. ཤིང *śiṅ* 'tree' : Chi. 薪 *sin* < \*si[ŋ] (0382n) 'firewood'

Tib. སྙིང *sñiṅ* 'heart' : Chi. 仁 *nyin* < \*niŋ (0388f) 'kindness'

Internal to Tibetan, Dempsey's law helps to explain the failure of some laterals to undergo Benedict's law (\*lʲ- > *ź*-). If Benedict's law preceded Dempsey's law, one can explain why all instances of *li*- appear in words with velar finals. The words ཞིང *źiṅ* 'field' and ལིངས *liṅs* 'hunt' were originally \*liŋ (with \*lʲiŋ a subphonemic pronunciation) 'field' and \*leŋs 'hunt'; after the application of Benedict's law they became \*źiŋ 'field' and \*leŋs 'hunt'; after the application of Dempsey's law they became the attested ཞིང *źiṅ* 'field' and ལིངས *liṅs* 'hunt'. Dempsey's law also accounts for the lack of palatalization in most words that contain the sequences -*di*- and -*ni*- (cf. Hill 2013: 202-203).

If all instances of inherited -*e*- before velars changed to -*i*-, then one expects to find no native Tibetan words that contain the sequences -*eṅ* or -*eg*. Nonetheless, there are many such words, both nouns (འབྲེང *ḫbreṅ* 'braid', ཕྲེང *phreṅ* 'rosary', དྲེག *dreg* 'dirt', དྲེགས *dregs* 'pride', དེང *deṅ* 'these days') and verbs (སྲེག *sreg* 'burn', གཤེགས *gśegs* 'go', འདེང *ḫdeṅ* 'go', སྙེག *sñeg* 'chase', སེང *seṅ* 'purify, clean'). Loanwords and analogical developments are the most common phenomena which lead to the apparent violation of exceptionless soundlaws (Campbell 2004: 16-120, esp. 109-111); few of the Tibetan words with rimes -*eṅ* and -*eg* are obvious loanwords, consequently, it is likely that some of the exceptions are analogical developments.

Paradigms provide one source of inspiration for the creation of analogical forms. Tibetan nouns are invariant across the noun paradigm; examples of paradigmatic analogical changes in the nominal system will be difficult to find. However, Tibetan verbs have intricate inflectional paradigms that provide ample models for analogical innovations (Coblin 1976, Hill 2010: xv-xxii). The remainder of this essay explores analogical explanations for the forms སེང *seṅ* 'purify, clean', སྙེག *sñeg* 'chase', གཤེགས *gśegs* 'go, come', and ལྡེག *ldeg* 'teeter'.

The verb སེང *seṅ* 'purify, clean' is explainable as an alternative present to the verb (present) སངས *saṅs* / བསང *bsaṅ*, (past) བསངས *bsaṅs*, (future) བསང *bsaṅ*, (imperative) སོངས *soṅs* 'cleanse, purify'. Stems of this

verb are well known from Tibet's religious vocabulary, with སངས *saṅs* appearing in the compound སངས་རྒྱས *saṅs-rgyas* 'buddha' and the stem བསངས *bsaṅs* used as a noun 'juniper fumigation ritual' in its own right. Analogy well motivates the from སེང *seṅ* that violates Dempsey's law. A verb such as བྱེད *byed*, བྱས *byas*, བྱ *bya*, བྱོས *byos* 'do' serves as a convenient model: བྱས *byas* : བྱེད *byed* :: བསངས *bsaṅs* : X, in which X was solved for with སེང *seṅ*. The other two available present stems སངས *saṅs* and བསང *bsaṅ* are also explainable as analogical developments. The stem སངས *saṅs* is arrived at through the removal of the *b-* past prefix. The past suffix *-s* was not removed because final *-s* may appear in present stems; compare འཆགས *ḥčhags*, བཤགས *bśags*, བཤག *bśag*, ཤོགས *śogs* 'confess'. The opposite strategy results in the present stem བསང *bsaṅ*; in this case not the past suffix *-s*, but the prefix *b-* remains, this time on the model of a verb such as བགྲོ *bgro*, བགྲོས *bgros*, བགྲོ *bgro*, གྲོས *gros* 'argue, discuss'. The existence of three alternative presents སེང *seṅ*, སངས *saṅs*, and བསང *bsaṅ*, and the ease with which analogy accounts for them both suggest that an inherited present was ousted from this paradigm. In this case the etymological present གསིང *gsiṅ* < *gseŋ 'strain, purify' occurs as an independent verb; the inherited paradigm was གསིང *gsiṅ*, བསངས *bsaṅs*, བསང *bsaṅ*, སོངས *soṅs*.

The form སྙེག *sñeg* 'chase' is also explainable as an analogical development. Although Hill gives separate verbs √sñeg (སྙེག *sñeg*, བསྙེགས *bsñegs*, བསྙེག *bsñeg*, སྙོགས *sñogs*) 'chase after' and √sñag (སྙོག *sñog*, བསྙགས *bsñags*, བསྙག *bsñag*, སྙོགས *sñogs*, 2010: 108-112), a single passage from the Old Tibetan version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* attests all four forms of this verb, yielding the paradigm སྙེགས *sñegs*, བསྙགས *bsñags*, བསྙག *bsñag*, སྙོགས *sñogs*.

(1) *rǐn-po-čhe-ḫi ri-dags śig byuṅ-ba / lha-mos « ǰo-bo **sñogs** » śes gsol-pa-daṅ / rgyal-po źal-nas / « ḫu nǐ bzlu-ba-ḫǐ ri-dags yin-bas / **bsñag**-du myi ruṅ-ste / ḫdǐ **sñegs**-pa-ḫǐ pyi-na / khyod ḫphrog-pa ḫoṅ » źes bgyis-na / lha-mo mchid-nas « ri-dags kyǐs bslur ǰǐ mchis // … rgyal-po źal-nas // « ṅas ri-dags **bsñag**-gǐs // Lag-śa-na gar yaṅ ma-ḫgro-bar // lha-mo sruṅ-śig » čhes gsuṅ-ste / ri-dags **bsñagso** //*

When a precious deer arose, the lady requested 'lord **chase** [imperative] (it)!'. The king said, 'this is a deceitful deer, it is not appropriate to **chase** [future] (it).' If I were to **chase** [present] it, thou wouldest be absconded.' The lady said, 'how can a deer be deceitful...' The king said, 'I will **chase** [future] the deer, but Lakṣaṇa, going nowhere, guard the lady!' He **chased** [past] the deer. (I.O.L. Tib J 0737.1, ll. 144-150, cf. de Jong 1989: 113)

Even if later texts do distinguish the verbs √sñeg (སྙེག *sñeg*, བསྙེགས *bsñegs*, བསྙེག *bsñeg*, སྙོགས *sñogs*) and √sñag (སྙོག *sñog*, བསྙགས *bsñags*, བསྙག *bsñag*, སྙོགས *sñogs*), this passage makes clear that forms with the vowel 'e' started life in the present stem སྙེགས *sñegs*. The reanalysis of the final *-s* as a past suffix allows for the creation of a new present སྙེག *sñeg*, with the past བསྙེགས *bsñegs* and future བསྙེག *bsñeg*, deriving from this stem through the normal application of the affixes *b-* and *-s*. If the verbal root were in fact √sñeg, the imperative would not undergo 'o' ablaut. However, the salience of 'o' for marking the imperative led to the suppletive borrowing of the original imperative instead of an ablautless form such as *sñegs. These considerations demonstrate that that the entire paradigm of √sñeg is born from the present stem སྙེགས *sñegs*, but this stem itself is a violation of Dempsey's law and requires explanation. The inherited present *sñigs (< *sñegs) was analogically restored to སྙེགས *sñegs* just as གསིང *gsiṅ* < *gseṅ was replaced with སེང *seṅ*, but whereas གསིང *gsiṅ* enjoyed a new life as a verb with specialized semantics, the attested verb √sñig 'discard' (སྙིག *sñig*, བསྙིགས *bsñigs*, བསྙིག *bsñig*, སྙིགས *sñigs*, cf. Hill 2010: 109) blocked this possibility for *sñigs.

    Although གཤེགས *gśegs* 'go, come' is an invariant verb already in Old Tibetan, there is evidence that it originates as a present stem. Jäschke points out that the form ཤོག *śog*, synchronically the imperative of ཤོང *ḥoṅ* 'come', is "properly" the imperative of གཤེགས *gśegs* (1881: 503). With the paradigm of a verb like √laṅ 'take' (ལེན *lend*, བླངས *blaṅs*, བླང *blaṅ*, ལོང *loṅ*) 'take' in mind, one might speculate that གཤེགས *gśegs* originally had the following paradigm.

       pres. གཤེགས *gśegs*
       past. *bśags
       fut. *bśag
       imp. ཤོག *śog*

Róna-Tas reconstructs an unattested form of this verb *gśags on the basis of Balti dialect *śags* 'go' and the Monguor loan from Tibetan *śiaɡla* 'pass away' (1966: 95 #670). In a review R. A. Miller highlights that "the Monguor form and the Balti reflex are particularly important since they give evidence for an original *a-grade" (1968: 156). Sprigg confirms the Balti word *śags* with the meaning 'come, go, sit' (2002: 151).

| Written Tibetan | Balti | English |
|---|---|---|
| རེག *reg* | *rjaxs* | 'begin' |
| འཐེང *ḫtheṅ* | *thjaŋ* | 'limp' |
| ལྡེག *ldeg* | *ldjaqldjaq* | 'swinging up and down' |
| ཐེག *theg* | *thjaq* | 'be able to list' |

*Table 1: The correspondence of Written Tibetan -e- to Balti -ja-*
*(after Zemp 2006 qtd. in Jacques 2009)*

The Monguor form supports the reconstruction of a nuclear vowel *a, but it is not entirely clear that Balti also supports this reconstruction. Jacques demonstrates that western Tibetic languages undergo a change of *e > ja* before velars (2009). In general the presence of medial -j- signals whether the Balti reflex derives from Tibetan -*e*- or -*a*-, thus Balti *thjaq* < Tib. ཐེག *theg* 'be able to list' versus Balti *thaqpa* < Tib. ཐག་པ *thag-pa* 'rope' (cf. Sprigg 2002: 163, 239). However, since *ś*- is already a palatal consonant this distinction does not manifest after this consonant; the vowel of Balti *śags* reconstructs to either *-*e*- or *-*a*- with equal ease.

Róna-Tas' reconstruction of a prefix *g- in the ancestor of Balti *śags* appears unmotivated. Eunice Jones, a linguist who has lived in Baltistan for many years, informs me that although some Balti dialects, such as that of Khapalu, retain many of the etymological cluster initials in verb stems, she is unaware of any dialect that has a cluster initial in the word *śaxpha* 'go' (imp. *śoxs*) (letter, 4 February 2013). Balti thus supports the reconstruction of a past stem *śags (or possibly *śegs) and an imperative *śogs.[3] More significant than the Balti form is the pronunciation of གཤེགས *gśegs* 'die' in Lhasa dialect as /ˋshaa/, which Kitamura renders orthographically as གཤགས *gśags* (1975: 60).

Even without evidence for pronunciation of the past with an 'a' vocalism, the absence of the *g*- prefix from the attested Tibetan imperative ཤོག *śog* guarantees that the *g*- and the -*e*- of the form གཤེགས *gśegs* are derivational and not elements of the root. Furthermore, the 'e' vowel and the final -*s*, which takes the form -*d* after open syllables and grave consonants, seen in གཤེགས *gśegs* are characteristic of a present stem (cf. Coblin 1976: 51-54).

The invariant verb གཤེགས *gśegs* is a generalized present stem, but this stem itself is a violation of Dempsey's law and requires

---

[3]    Bielmeier's grammar of Balti does not include this words (1985: 245).

explanation. The anticipated inherited form is \*gśigs (< \*gśegs), which is as far as known to me unattested in any meaning.

The only way to tie the two attested forms, གཤེགས gśegs and ཤོག śog is to suggest that there was once a verb with the paradigm \*gśegs, \*bśags, \*bśag, ཤོག śog, or, following the evidence of Balti for an unprefixed past, \*gśegs, \*śags, \*śag, ཤོག śog. Dempsey's law then led \*gśegs to become \*gśigs. Next, analogy replaced the present \*gśigs with གཤེགས gśegs, when \*(b)śags and \*(b)śag were still current. Finally, paradigmatic leveling led all stems except གཤེགས gśegs to fall into disuse; ཤོག śog remained as a suppletive member of another verb (viz. ཆོང ḥoṅ 'come').

The doublet of verbs ལྡེག ldeg 'shake' and ལྡིག ldig 'shake' looks like another case in which Dempsey's law changed \*-eg to -ig, only to be counteracted by analogical restoration. The *Mdzaṅs blun* provides a clear example of ལྡེག ldeg meaning 'teeter'.

> (2) *lhaḥi pho-braṅ kun ldeg-čiṅ g.yos-nas lha rnams dṅaṅs-te bltas-na/ byaṅ-chub-sems-dpas lus-kyi pags-pa sbyin-par byas mthoṅ-nas/*
>
> All the palaces of the gods teetered and shook, when the gods, afeared, looked, they saw that the Mahāsattva had offered the skin of his own body. (*Mdzaṅs blun*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 74 folio 172b)

The inherited present ལྡིག ldig occurs in the phrase མི་ལྡིག་པའི་ཆོས mi ldig paḥi chos 'unwavering dharma' (cf. Derge Kanjur, vol. 40, p. 42a, vol. 45, p. 41a).

The presents ལྡིག ldig (inherited) and ལྡེག ldeg (renewed) should derive from a root √lag, with a paradigm that includes past \*blags, future \*blag, and imperative \*logs. The verb བླགས blags 'incline', seen in the phrase རྣ་བ་བླགས rna-ba blags 'incline one's ear' (cf. de Jong 1973), is semantically close enough to 'teeter', to warrant its interpretation as the past stem of ལྡིག ldig / ལྡེག ldeg. De Jong does not provide a textual citation for རྣ་བ་བླགས rna-ba blags 'incline one's ear', instead relying on the *Mahāvyutpatti* and other lexical sources. Nonetheless, the Kanjur offers a number of attestations of རྣ་བ་བླགས rna-ba blags 'incline one's ear'.

> (3) *mdor-na dud-ḥgro-ḥi skye-gnas-su gtogs-paḥi sems-can dag kyaṅ sgra sñan-pa de-la **rna blags-te** sñan-to// de-nas bčom-ldan-ḥdas-kyis dge-sloṅ rnams-la bkaḥ-stsal-pa/*

In sum, even the beings who belong to the real of animals inclined their ears to that mellifluous sound and listened. Then the Bhagavan addressed his disciplines. (*Vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 10, 42b)

(4) *des tshe-daṅ-ldan-pa sñan-pa Bzaṅ-ldan-gyi skad-kyi gtaṅ-rag thos-nas kyaṅ yaṅ **rna-ba blags-te** mi g.yo-bar sdod-do/*

Having heard the words of the speech of the venerable and renowned Bhadrika, he inclined his ears and sat immobile. (*Vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 10, 42b)

(5) *de Rgyal-byed-kyi tshal logs-su soṅ-nas khad-kyis khad-kyis Rgyal-byed-kyi tshal-du phyin-pa-daṅ/ Rgyal-byed-kyi tshal-kyi sgo-nas **rna-blags-te** sdod-do/*

He went in the direction of the Jetavana grove, slowly arrived at the Jetavana grove, and sat inclining his ear, at the gate of the Jetavana grove (*Vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 10, 43a)

Recognizing that ལྡེག *ldeg* 'teeter' and བླགས *blags* 'incline' are two stems of the same verb permits one to notice the (lack of) parallelism between the phrases ལྡེག་ཅིང་གཡོས *ldeg-čiṅ g.yos* 'teeter and shake' in example 2 and བླགས་ཏེ་མི་གཡོ *blags-te mi g.yo* 'incline and not move' in example 4.

Not all examples of བླགས *blags* in the Kanjur are proceeded by རྣ་བ *rna-ba* 'ear'. The *Vinaya-vibhaṅga* offers two identical examples of རླུང་གིས་བླགས་པ *rluṅ-gis blags-pa* 'shaken by the wind'.

(6) *dper-na śiṅ-ljon dag-gi lo-ma sna-tshogs **rluṅ-gis blags-pa** dag gcig-tu lhuṅ-źiṅ gcig-tu ḥdug-pa de bźin-du khyed-cag kyaṅ rigs sna-tshogs-daṅ/ rus sna-tshogs-daṅ/ khyim sna-tshogs-nas rab-tu byuṅ-ba dag yin-gyi/ kho-boḥi ḥphags-pas ni byaṅ-chub thugs-su chud-pa yin-no/*

For example, like the various leaves of trees, shaken by the wind, fall and sit together, although you are monks, from various lineages, clans, and houses, because of my nobility you (all together) enter the enlightened mind

(*Vinaya-vibhaṅga*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 6, 24a-b, vo. 7, 4a-b)

Another use of བླགས *blags* is in the phrase མཆི་མ་བླགས *mchi-ma blags*, which Btsan lha ṅag dbaṅ tshul khrims equates with མཆི་མ་ཤོར *mchi-ma śor* 'cry' (1997: 185). I wonder whether, the literal meaning 'for tears to teeter' might instead more precisely mean 'to hold back tears'. Example 7 is one of many attestations of མཆི་མ་ཤོར *mchi-ma-śor* in the Kanjur that could be cited.

(7) *gcan-gzan-gyis khod ciḫi phyir ḫdi ltar mi dgaḫ źes dris-na/* **_mchi-ma blags_**-*nas rgyas-par smras-pa daṅ/*

When the creature asked 'why art thou unhappy like this', after crying, he explained in detail. (*Mdzangs blun*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 74 folio 172a)

It is difficult to locate unambiguous future stems of the verb in question. In example 8, མི་བླག *mi blag* 'not incline' is either a future or a present. If it is a present, then it is built analogically to the past བླགས *blags*, replacing the inherited present ལྡིག *ldig*.

(8) *kha-cig rna mi* **_blag_** *gus-par mi ñan-ciṅ bkaḫ-ñan-paḫi sems ñe-bar mi ḫjog-la/ čhos-kyi rjes-su ḫthun-paḫi chos-la nan-tan mi byed-na …*

If someone does not incline his ear, does not listen, does not establish a loyal and obedient mind, and does not act diligently for dharma that accords with dharma... (*Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 31, page 76b

The expected imperative *logs appears not to occur. One might explain that 'teeter' is not a voluntary verb, but at least in English one can use the imperative 'incline thine ear unto my sayings' (Proverbs 4:20). With the orthographic form ལོགས *logs* in mind, it is perhaps not too far fetched to suggest that the noun ལོགས *logs* 'the side' is derived from the same root as this verb.

This investigation of exceptions to Dempsey's law permits the conclusion that the verbs སེང *seṅ* 'purify, clean', སྙེག *sñeg* 'chase', གཤེགས *gśegs* 'go, come', and ལྡེག *ldeg* 'teeter' are analogical present formations; the inherited presents of these verbs, with -*i*- vocalism, have been replaced with the -*e*- vocalisms more typical of the present stem. The

inherited paradigms, together with brief remarks on subsequent developments, can be summarized as follows:

√saṅ 'cleanse, purify'.
　　pres. གསེང *gsiṅ* (exists alongside the analogical སེང *seṅ*)
　　past བསངས *bsaṅs*
　　fut. བསང *bsaṅ*
　　imp. སོངས *soṅs*

√sñag 'chase, pursue'
　　pres. *sñigs (replaced by analogical སྙེགས *sñegs*)
　　past བསྙགས *bsñags*
　　fut. བསྙག *bsñag*
　　imp. སྙོགས *sñogs*

√śag 'go'
　　pres. *gśigs (replaced by analogical གཤེགས *gśegs*)
　　past *(b)śags (replaced through paradigmatic leveling by
　　　　གཤེགས *gśegs*)
　　fut. *(b)śag (replaced through paradigmatic leveling by གཤེགས
　　　　*gśegs*)
　　imp. ཤོག *śog* (continues as imperative of ཧོང *ḥoṅ* 'come',
　　　　replaced in this paradigm through paradigmatic leveling
　　　　by གཤེགས *gśegs*)

√lag 'teeter, incline'
　　pres. ལྡིག *ldig* (exists alongside the analogical ལྡེག *ldeg*)
　　past བླགས *blags*
　　fut. བླག *blag* (?)
　　imp. *logs (but cf. ལོགས *logs* 'side')

## References

Baxter, William H. 1992. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baxter, William H. and Laurent Sagart. 2011. Baxter-Sagart Old Chinese reconstruction (Version 1.00). Online at: http://crlao.ehess.fr/document.php?id=1217.

Bielmeier, Roland (1985). *Das Märchen von Prinzen Čobzaṅ*. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Btsan lha ṅag dbaṅ tshul khrims (1997). *Brda dkrol gser gyi me loṅ*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khaṅ.

Campbell, Lyle (2004). *Historical linguistics: an introduction*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Coblin, W. South (1976). "Notes on Tibetan verbal morphology." *T'oung Pao* 62: 45-60.

Dempsey, Jakob (2001). "Remarks on the vowel system of old Burmese." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 24.2: 205-34. Errata 26.1: 183.

Dempsey, Jakob (2003). "Analysis of Rime-Groups in Northern-Burmish." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 26.1: 63-124.

Guillaume Jacques (2009). "Le développement du tibétain ancien -e- dans les dialectes occidentaux." *Études mongoles et sibériennes, centrasiatiques et tibétaines* 40.
 http://emscat.revues.org/index1500.html

Hill, Nathan W. (2010). *A Lexicon of Tibetan Verb Stems as Reported by the Grammatical Tradition*. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Hill, Nathan W. (2012). "Evolution of the Burmese vowel system." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 110.1: 64-79.

Hill, Nathan W. (2013). "Relative order of Tibetan sound changes affecting laterals." *Language and Linguistics* 14.1: 193-209.

Jäschke, Heinrich August (1991). *A Tibetan-English dictionary*. London: Unger Brothers.

de Jong, Jan Willem Jong (1973). "Tibetan 'blag-pa' and 'blags-pa'" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 36.2: 309-312

de Jong, Jan Willem (1989). *The story of Rāma in Tibet: text and translation of the Tun-huang manuscripts*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Karlgren, Bernhard. 1964. *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.

Kitamura, Hajime (1975). "The Honorifics in Tibetan." *Acta Asiatica* 29: 56-74.

Leumann, Manu (1977). *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Munich: Beck.

Miller, Roy Andrew (1968). (Review of Róna-Tas 1966). *Language* 44.1: 147–168.

Róna-Tas, András (1966). *Tibeto-Mongolica: the Tibetan loanwords of Monguor and the development of the archaic Tibetan dialects*. The Hague: Mouton.

Sprigg, R. K. (2002). *Balti-English English-Balti dictionary*. Richmond: RoutledgeCurzon.

Zemp, Marius (2006). Synchronic and diachronic phonology of the Tibetan dialect of Kargil. Universität Bern, MA thesis.

❖