

Tibetan *-as > -os

Nathan W. Hill¹

Abstract: Both Jacques (2010) and Zeisler (2015) propose explanations for the synchronically unexpected past *zos* of the Tibetan verb 'eat'. After evaluating their proposals, this essay suggests that *zos* is the regular outcome of a sound change *-as > -os, the results of which were erased through analogy in almost all other verbs.

Tibetan verbs showing stem ablaut typical have -o- in the present and -a- in the past, e.g. 'kill' with present *gsod*, past *bsad*, future *gsad*, and imperative *sod*. The verb 'eat' with the stems *za*, *zos*, *bzah*, *zo* has the opposite pattern showing -a- in the present and -o- in the past. Following Meillet's (1925: 25) principle that irregular morphology preserves archaisms, Guillaume Jacques (2010) proposes that *zos* is a fragment of erstwhile agreement morphology in Tibetan. His proposal has not proven popular. Randy LaPolla (2012: 120) objects to the importance that Jacques places on this one verb.² LaPolla's objection is misplaced for two reasons. First, single verb forms are sometimes of paramount significance for an entire family; witness Vedic *śáye* 'lies' (Clackson 2007: 146). Second, 'eat' is not the only Tibetan verb to show this pattern. Hill (2014) draws attention to three further verbs that appear to show a vowel -o- in the past, viz. *ḥdeñ*, *dor*, —, — 'disappear', *ḥchah*, *ḥchos*, *ḥchah*, *ḥcho* 'chew, gnaw', and *lañ*, *loñs*, *lañ* 'finish' (cf. Hill 2010: 89, 148, 279).

In addition to LaPolla, Zeisler (2015) also rejects Jacques' explanation of *zos*, instead arguing that *zos* is borrowed into the paradigm of 'eat' from the cognate *potentialis* verb 'be able to eat'. Of the additional verbs that Hill (2014) notes, Zeisler (2015: 43-44), points to the confused and contradictory reports of the indigenous lexicographical tradition for 'disappear' and 'finish' to speculate that Hill conflates separate verbs. Zeisler finds 'chew' "most interesting, particularly as it seems to display the same pattern as the verb *za* 'eat'" but regrets that it is "not very well attested" (2015: 44). She notes two attestations of a present stem *ḥcha*, both in the phrase *rus-pa gle ḥcha* 'the bones, fodder for the *gle*' (Pt 1194, ll. 62-3 and IOL Tib J, r68).

1 I would like to thank Abel Zadoks for first proposing to me that Tibetan -a- changes to -o- in (some) closed syllables.

2 For his part, LaPolla offers no alternative explanation for *zos*.

Zeisler fails to consult the *Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache*, which provides ample attestations of this verb. The *Wörterbuch*, a research project of the Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, started in 1954, began publication in 2005, and at the time of writing in July 2015 has grown to 24 fascicles, reaching *bsñol*. This dictionary supersedes all previous Tibetan lexicographical work in coverage and scientific rigor. To showcase the excellence of this resource I quote the three relevant entries *in extenso*.

bcaḥ fut. zu ↓²*ḥchaḥ* beißen, kauen, essen; ~ *ba* Nahrung, Getränk, Saufen;

bzaḥ ~ Speisen und Getränk, Essen.

bzaḥ ~ *dañ ni na bzaḥ ... gsol* (metr.) „er gab Speisen und Getränk sowie Kleider“ (Anav 1: 89,15); *bzaḥ ba dañ ~ ba gya nom pa* „üppiges Fressen und Saufen“ (Prav 187,7); *bzaḥ ba dañ btuñ ba dañ ~ ba rnam pa sna tshogs*

„verschiedenartige Speisen, Getränke, und Nahrung (skt. *bhojya*)“ (Suv 95,21);

bzaḥ ~ *de bžin btuñ ba ñid .. rab tu bzaḥ* (metr.) „Essen und ebenso auch Triken soll man zu sich nehmen“ (Hev 1.6.20a); *so yi dag byed ~ bar bya* (metr.)

„mann soll [die Zweige] zum Reinigen der Zähne kauen“ (Ahs 1.2.3b); *mgo bo na bas ḥdi mi ~* (metr.) „bei Erkrankungen des Kopfes soll man dies nicht essen“ (Ahs 1.2.4b); *bzaḥ ba dañ / ~ ba ... kyis yañ dag par tshim par byas nas* „als er sie mit Speisen und Getränken völlig zufriedengestellt hatte“ (Viśṭ 76,36).

Lex. *bzaḥ ba dañ ~ ba ma ḥoñs par lhuñ bzed mi bzed* ^P *nānāgate khādaniye bojaniye pātram upanāmayiṣyāmaḥ* „solange die Zeit zu essen oder zu trinken nicht gekommen ist, werden wir nicht die Bettelschale hinhalten“ (Mvy 8569); *gžib pa ni sos ~ ba lces ḥjib pa „bžib pa: mit den Zähnen beißen, mit der Zunge saugen“* (KlonD 736,6).

²*ḥchaḥ* fut. ↑²*bcaḥ* knabbern, kauen, essen; vgl. ↓²*ḥchos*.

rtsa ba ḥbras bu ~ ba dañ (metr.) „Wurzeln und Früchte knabbern“ (Prav 51.21); *rus la ~ baḥi rus kyañ dkon* (metr.) „Knochen sind selten, sogar für diejenigen, die sie essen“ (gZer 510,6).

Lex. ~ ^P *sos ldad pa sogs* (Dagy).

²*ḥchos* essen, kauen; vgl. ↑²*ḥchaḥ*

~ *sam zos na žes bya ba ni lkog mar kham gis mid naḥo* „gekaut oder gegessen bedeutet: man schluckt die Speise den Hals hinunter“ (K5 297a6).

Lex. *khādita* „gekaut“ (in Mvy 7040); ~ *pa* ^P *carvita* (Ak 288.60); ~ *pa* ^P *myaṅs paḥam zos paḥi don du ḥaṅ snañ* „wahrgenommen oder erscheint auch i.

S. v. gegessen“ (brDa); ~ *pa*^p *zos pa* (TTC).

As the reader sees, the *Wörterbuch* falls short of labeling *ḥchos* the past of *ḥchaḥ* but the equation of *ḥchos-pa* with *zos-pa* in the sources cited provides evidence that *ḥchos* is a past stem.

A few passages from the Kanjur further confirm that *ḥchaḥ*, *ḥchos*, and *bcaḥ* belong to the same verb and are respectively present, past, and future.

*dge-sloṅ-gis rnam-pa gsum dben-par bya-ste / bśaṅ-ba-daṅ / gci-ba-daṅ / so-śiṅ
bcaḥ-baḥo / dge-sloṅ-gis so-śiṅ ḥchos-nas / de bźin-du mi dor-gyi chus bkru-bar bya
/*

A monk shall go into isolations for three purposes, defecation, urination, and chewing on toothpicks. After a monk has chewed a toothpick, he is to wash with water which has not been thus discarded. (K8, Vol. 13, 310a)

*yaṅ dge-sloṅ-ma gaṅ dus ma yin-par bcaḥ-baḥam bzaḥ-ba ḥchaḥ-ḥam za-na ltuṅ
byed-do*

Also, if a nun chews and eats what is to be chewed and eaten when the time is not full, this is a transgression. (K4, Vol. 9, 14b)

The Kanjur also attests the imperative, which the *Wörterbuch* omits.

*tshe-daṅ ldan-pa ḥdi ḥcho śig / ḥdi zo źig ces bya-ba ni bcaḥ-ba-daṅ bzaḥ-baḥo/
When (someone) says, 'O venerable sir, chew this! Eat this!' the (offering) is to
be chewed and to be eaten (K3, Vol. 7, 148a)*

These citations from the Kanjur and the occurrence of *bcaḥ* and *ḥchos* in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (Mvy), published before 814 CE, taken together with Zeisler's own citation of *ḥcha* in Dunhuang documents, guarantee that the entire paradigm is of hoary provenance. The conjugation of 'chew' *ḥchaḥ*, *ḥchos*, *bcaḥ*, *ḥcho* that these citations establish is parallel to 'eat' *za*, *zos*, *bzaḥ*, *zo*.

Zeisler's explanation that *zos* and *ḥchos* are borrowed from a *potentialis* paradigm is possible, but poorly motivated. The postulated independent verbs **zo* 'to be able to eat' and **ḥcho* 'be able to chew' are as far as I know unattested. It is unclear why speakers would target the past stem and not some other form for this replacement by borrowing from a *potentialis*. It seems unlikely that an inherited *bzas* would yield to such a borrowing, since analogical pressure (e.g. *bsams*, *bsgrubs*, etc.) reinforces it as the expected

form. The distribution of *zos* in peripheral dialects versus *bzas* in the center (Zeisler 2015: 46) suggests that *zos* is the archaism. In addition, syllable structure weighs against Zeisler's proposal of borrowing the *potentialis* as a past stem. In an earlier paper, where she first draws attention to the *potentialis*, Zeisler (2002) notes the *potentialis* verbs *chod* 'able to cut', *sod* 'able to kill', *lon* 'able to take', and *sñogs* 'able to catch'. These verbs are all closed syllable whereas the two verbs that show -o- ablaut in the past have open syllable roots. Perhaps this distribution is coincidence, but, perhaps not. An account of this distribution is a plus for any explanation of the ablaut seen in 'eat' and 'chew' and Zeisler's explanation does not garner this plus.

Presuming that Jacques would see *ḥchos* as additional evidence for erstwhile agreement, his explanation accounts for the attested phonological distribution. He offers three concrete possibilities for the phonological development of the -os in *zos*; 1. **zaus* > *zos*, 2. **zau* > **-zo* with -s added by analogy, 3. **zasu* > *zos*, presumably with an intermediate phase such as **zosu* (2010: 47). None of these laws leads to -o- in closed syllable roots. Consider the verb √lañ 'take' *len*, *blañs*, *blañ*, *loñs*; the three proposals all produce the attested past: 1. **blañus* > *blañs*, 2. **blañu* > **blañ* → *blañs*, 3. **blañsu* > *blañs*. These proposals require one to consider all transitive past stems ending in -as as analogical developments. Thus, in the verb 'do' *byed*, *byas*, *bya*, *byos*, the innovative past *byas* replaced inherited **byos*, which was lost without a trace. A verb such as 'think' *sems*, *bsams*, *bsam*, *soms* serves as an analogical model for *byas*, viz. *bsam* : *bya* :: *bsams* : X = *byas*.

Each of Jacques' proposals has ramifications for Tibetan historical phonology in general. The first proposal requires a sound change **-us* > -s, that operated after **-au-* > -o-, to avoid **zaus* developing to **zas* instead of *zos*. This sound change leaves unexplained why some words still contain -us, such as *rus* 'bones'. The second and third proposal require the loss of final -u, a not implausible change per se, but one which gives rise to the problem that words such as *bu* 'son', *su* 'who', and *ḥbru* 'grain' did not undergo the change. Zeisler reasonably objects to the third proposal that if **asu* becomes -os then one might expect **isu* to develop to **esu* or another outcome other than the -is seen in verbs such as 'do' *bgyid*, *bgyis*, *bgyi*, *gyis* (2015: 46). Each of Jacques's proposals is rather complicated and partly unmotivated in its details. Ockham's razor favors abandoning the insistence on a **-u-* suffix and accepting a simpler sound change, namely **as* > -os.

The proof of a phonological account for the forms *zos* and *ḥchos* is whether the account explains idiosyncrasies other than those that served as its motivation. A change **-as* > -os

has the advantage of explaining the invariant verb *ltos* 'look to, attend to' as the inherited past of *lta*, *bltas*, *blta*, *ltos* 'look at'.³ An original paradigm *lta*, *ltos*, *blta*, *ltos* closely parallels *za*, *zos*, *bzah*, *zo* and the innovative past *bltas* parallels the innovative past *bzas*.

Postulating an inherited paradigm *zlo*, **zlas* > *zlos*, *bzla*, *zlos* similarly reconciles the two verbs *zlo*, *bzlas*, *bzla*, *zlos* 'say, repeat' and *zlos* (invariant) 'repeat'. The pair of verbs *dgah* 'be happy' and *dgos* 'need, want', both of invariant conjugation, suggests an intransitive verb with the conjugation *dgah*, *dgos*, lacking a distinct future and imperative as non-volitional verbs do. In a more complicated case, for the verb *smra*, *smras*, *smra*, *smros* 'say' we predict an inherited past stem **smros*. Although **smros* does not exist as a separate verb, there is an invariant verb *smos* 'say, call' which the *Dag yig gсар sgrigs* sees as additionally an alternative present (sic) of *smra*. One may legitimately speculate that *smos* is a regular phonetic development from **smras*.⁴

Just as Jacques' proposals must either account for words ending in *-u* or *-us*, so too the proposal **as* > *-os* must account for all instances of *-as* in the language. Analogy within a paradigm explains verb forms ending in *-as*,⁵ but cannot explain the case markers or nouns that have this rime. The case markers *-las* and *-nas* pose no particular problem. They are derived by the suffixing of *-s* to the case markers *-la* and *-na* (Simon 1941: 385). This suffixation occurred after the change **as* > *-os*. Nouns that end in *-as* arose after the application of this sound change, whether through borrowing or through derivation. For example, a nominalizing *-s* forms the noun *ltas* 'omen' from the verbal root $\sqrt{lt}$ 'see'; compare *skyems* 'beer, libation' from $\sqrt{skyem}$ 'be thirsty' (Beyer 1992: 118). The supposition that **-as* > *-os* is an old change answers the objection that *ltas* 'omen' does not relate to 'look' transparently enough to suggest a recent formation. Similarly *zas* 'food' derives via suffixation from $\sqrt{za}$ 'eat'. Such nouns as *skas* 'stairs', *las* 'deed', *nas* 'barely', *sñas* 'pillow', and *ras* 'cotton' lack recognized cognates elsewhere in the family.⁶ Tibetan

3 The ensuing discussion proceeds with the hypothesis **-as* > *-os*, but most of the argument still holds *mutatis mutandis* using Jacques' more complicated phonological proposals.

4 The relationship between *smra*, *smos*, and the additional *verbum dicendi* with the stems *rma*, *rmas* requires further attention.

5 There are a few verbs which synchronically speaking have a root final *-s* (*mkhas* 'know' (v.), *glas* 'change one's residence', *hgas*, *bkas*, *dgas*, *khos* 'split' (vt.), *hgas*, *gas* 'split' (vi.), *hgras* 'feel revulsion, be unhappy', *brñas* 'ridicule, belittle', *hthas* 'hard, firm', *gdas* 'speak', *gnas* 'stay' (v.), place (n.), *spras*, *spras*, *spras*, *spros* 'adorn, decorate', *bas-pa* 'finished, complete', *gzas* 'prepare to, be about to'), but the possibility remains that this *-s* was originally a past tense suffix in these conjugations.

6 The words in rime *-as* in Zhang (1985) not yet mentioned here are: *klas-pa* 'boundless, huge', *gras* 'class, type', *gzas* 'song', *śas* 'some, sharecropper field', *slas* 'retinue'.

ḥbras 'rice', deriving from **ḥmras* according to Simon's law (Hill 2011: 448-449), has a Chinese cognate 糲 *ljejH* < **[m]ə-rʰats* (21-26g) 'rice'. In this case, Tibetan final *-s* likely originates from the **-ts* cluster seen in Chinese.⁷ If this explanation is correct, then final **-ts* simplified to *-s* only after the change **-as* > *-os*. The anteriority of **-as* > *-os* to **ts* > *-s* provides further support for an early operation the former. The Kurtöp cognates *bù* 'do', *jù* 'borrow', *zù* 'eat', *chú* 'devour' the generalized past forms cognate to Tibetan **byos* (replaced by *byas*), **rños* (replaced by *brñas*), *zos*, and *ḥchos* further support an early date for the change **as* > *-os* since it must have occurred prior to the split of Tibetan and the East Bodish languages (Hyslop 2011: 55-56, 1247, 143).⁸ In sum, the comparative evidence poses little obstacle to, and potentially supports, the proposed change **-as* > *-os*.

The inherited paradigms proposed here, together with brief remarks on subsequent developments, are as follows:

√*za* 'eat'

pres. *za*

past. *zos* (exists alongside analogical *bzas*)

fut. *bzah*

imp. *zo*

√*ḥcha* 'chew'

pres. *ḥchah*

past. *ḥchos*

fut. *bcah*

imp. *ḥcho*

√*lta* 'look at'

pres. *lta*

past. *ltos* (continues as separate invariant verb 'look at, attend to', replaced by analogical *bltas*)

fut. *blta*

imp. *ltos*

√*zla* 'say, repeat'

7 Sagart (2014) points to a similar correspondence in the pair Tibetan *rus*, 'bone' and Chinese 律 *lwit* < **[r]ut* (31-18c) 'pitch pipe', with the complication that Chinese is missing final **-s*.

8 Gong's (2002[1995]: 115) proposal to relate Tibetan *rdzas* 'thing, object' to Chinese 事 *dzriH* < **[m-s-]rəʔ-s* (0971a) 'serve; service, affair' is neither semantically nor phonetically compelling.

pres. *zla*

past. *zlos* (continues as separate invariant verb 'repeat', replaced by analogical *bzlas*)

fut. *bzla*

imp. *zlos*

√dga 'be happy'

pres. *dgaḥ* (continues as separate invariant verb 'be happy')

past. *dgos* (continues as separate invariant verb 'need, want')

√smra 'say'

pres. *smra*

past. *smos* (continues as separate invariant verb 'say, call', replaced by analogical *smros*)

fut. *smra*

imp. **smos* (obsolete, replaced by analogical *smras*)

√bya 'do'

pres. *byed*

past. **byos* (replaced by analogical *byas*, but compare Kurtöp cognate *bù* 'do')

fut. *bya*

imp. *byos*

√rña 'borrow'

pres. *rña*

past. **rños* (replaced by analogical *brñas*, but compare Kurtöp cognate *jù* 'borrow')

fut. *brña*

imp. *rños*

Abbreviations

Ahs = Vogel (1965)

Ak = Vidyābhuṣaṇa (1911)

Anav = Hofiinger (1982-1990)

brDa = Dge bśes chos kyi grags pa (1957)

Dagy = Dagab (1966)

Dag yig gsar sgrigs = Tsan chung (1979)

gZer = Tenzin Namdak (1965)

Hev = Snellgrove (1959)

K = Derge Kanjur,

<http://thlib.org/encyclopedias/literary/canons/kt/catalog.php#cat=d/k>

KlonD = Chandra (1973)

Mvy = Ishihama and Fukuda (1989), but following the numbering of Sakaki (1916)

Prav = Eimer (1983)

Suv = Nobel (1944)

TTC = Zhang (1985)

ViśT = Schneider (1993: 74-270)

References

- Beyer, Stephen (1992). *The Classical Tibetan language*. New York: State University of New York.
- Chandra, Lokesh, ed. (1973). “Rig gnas cha ba sgra rig pa / sñan ñag / sdabs sbyar / zlos gar / mñon brjod / brdaḥ gsar rñiñ gi khyad par rnam las byuñ baḥi miñ gi grañs.” *The Collected works of Longdol Lama*. New Delhi : International Academy of Indian culture. ba, 1-16.
- Clackson, James (2007). *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dagyab, Loden Sherab (1966). *Bod brdaḥi tshig mdzod*. Dharamsala: Dagyang.
- Dge bśes chos kyi grags pa (1957). *Brda dag miñ tshig gsal ba*. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.
- Eimer, Helmut, ed. (1983). *Rab tu 'byuñ ba'i gži: die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajyāvastu im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Gong Hwang-chenrg. 2002[1995]. "The System of Finals in Proto-Sino-Tibetan". *The Ancestry of the Chinese Language*. William S. Y. Wang, ed. (Journal of Chinese linguistics. Monograph series 8) Berkeley: Project on Linguistic Analysis, University of California: 41-92. (reprinted in:) 漢藏語研究論文集 *Collected Papers on Sino-Tibetan Linguistics*. Taipei: 中央研究院語言學研究所籌備處, 79-124.
- 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: 441-457.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2014). “Sino-Tibetan: Part 2 Tibetan.” Lieber, Rochelle and Štekauer, Pavol, (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Derivational Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 620-630.

- Hofinger, Marcel, ed. (1982-1990). *Le congrès du lac Anavatapta. Vies de saints bouddhiques. Extraits du Vinaya des Mūlasarvāstivādin, Bhaiṣajyavastu*. 2 tomes. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste.
- Hyslop, Gwendolyn (2011). A grammar of Kurtöp. PhD dissertation. University of Oregon.
- Ishihama Yumiko and Fukuda Yōichi, ed. (1989). *A New critical edition of the Mahāvyutpatti: Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian dictionary of Buddhist terminology*. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.
- Jacques, Guillaume (2010). “A possible trace of verb agreement in Tibetan”. *Himalayan Linguistics* 9.1: 41-49.
- LaPolla, Randy J. (2012). “Comments on methodology and evidence in Sino-Tibetan comparative linguistics.” *Language and Linguistics* 13.1: 117-132.
- Meillet, Antoine (1925). *La méthode comparative en linguistique historique*. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & co.
- Nobel, Johannes, ed. (1944). *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra. Das Goldglanz-Sūtra: ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus*. Band 1: Tibetische Übersetzung. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Sagart, Laurent (2014). “A Note on Tibeto-Burman Bone Words and Chinese Pitch-pipes.” *Studies in Chinese and Sino-Tibetan Linguistics: Dialect, Phonology, Transcription and Text*. Richard VanNess Simmons and Newell Ann Van Auken, eds. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan. 179-183
- Sakaki Ryōzaburō 榊亮三郎 (1916). 梵藏漢和四譯對校翻譯名義大集 *Bon-Zō-Kan-Wa yon'yaku taikō hon'yaku myōgi taishū*. Kyoto: 眞言宗京都大學 Shingonshū Kyōto Daigaku.
- Schneider, Johannes, ed. (1993). *Der Lobpreis der Vorzüglichkeit des Buddha*. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Simon, Walter (1941). “Certain Tibetan suffixes and their combinations.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 5: 372-391.
- Snellgrove, David L. (1959). *The Hevajra Tantra: a critical study*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Tenzin Namdak, ed. (1965). *Ḥḍus pa rin po cheḥi rgyud gzer mig*. New Delhi. Tenzin Namdak.
- Tsan chung (1979). *Dag yig gsar sgrigs*. Xining: mtsho sñon mi rigs dpe skrun khañ.
- Vogel, Claus, ed. (1965). *Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgaḥṛdayasaṃhitā; the first five chapters of its Tibetan version*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.
- Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Satis Chandra, ed. (1911). *Amarakoṣa and its Tibetan translation: 'Chi med*

mdzod. Calcutta: Asiatic society.

- Zeisler, Bettina (2002). "The development of temporal coding in Tibetan: some suggestions for a functional internal reconstruction. (1): Unexpected use of the 'imperative' stem in Old Tibetan and Themchen (Amdo Tibetan)." Henk Blezer, ed., *Tibet, Past and Present. PIATS 2000: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*. Leiden: Brill, 441-453.
- Zeisler, Bettina (2015). "Eat and drink – if you can! A language internal explanation for the 'irregular' paradigm of Tibetan *za*, *zos*, *zo* 'eat'." *Himalayan Linguistics* 14.1: 34-62.
- Zhang Yisun (1985). *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe.