

The interest of Zhangzhung for comparative Tibeto-Burman

James A. MATISOFF
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California, USA

I. Introduction

"Zhangzhung" is the old name of Western Tibet, annexed by the Tibetan kingdom as early as 645 A.D, and traditionally regarded as the sacred country whose language was the vehicle for the texts which serve as the basis of the Bon religion. These religious texts were translated into Tibetan from Zhangzhung at about the same time as Buddhist texts were translated from Indian languages, in the 6th to 9th centuries A.D. (Haarh 1968:7; Kvaerne 1971).

Thomas (1926) suggested that the unknown language of a certain manuscript, apparently a medical text, brought back by Sir Aurel Stein "from the hidden library of Ch'ieñ-fo-tung, near Tun-huang in Chinese Kansu", might be an old form of Lepcha. Later, by considering etyma like the numerals, Thomas (1933:408) concluded that the language of this MS actually belonged "to that group of languages which, by B.H. Hodgson and in Vol. I of the *Linguistic Survey of India*, is entitled the 'Western Pronominalized Group'...A dialect of the 'Western Pronominalized' group about 1,000 years older than the others (as known to us) could not fail to be instructive...It appears to resemble Tibetan more than Lepcha; but it certainly must have belonged to the Himalayan region, Western Tibet, Nepal, etc. The only language of this region which is mentioned in Tibetan books is the language of žaň-žuň, which is certainly Guge or its vicinity..."

Shafer (1937) categorically states that an examination of Thomas (1926) convinced him that Zhangzhung was not only West Himalayish, but "more definitely an archaic form of Almora".¹ Among his best examples are the numerals TWO and NINE, where he identified as specifically Almora features the final **-s** in Zh.² **nis** 'two' ("only Almora and Thami have final **-s**"), and the lack of an **s-** prefix in Zh. **gwi** 'nine', a lack which is shared by Almora ***gvi**, Bunan **gu**, but not by Kanauri (**sgui**). On the other hand, R.A. Stein (1971:253) points out that with respect to the numeral SEVEN, Zh. **snis, snes, snel** goes less well with the Western languages like Almora that lose the initial **s-** (Almora **nis**, Bunan **nyi-ži**), and better with eastern languages like Horpa **zni, zne**, Wassu (Qiang) **šnēs**, Jyarung **šnes**, Bodo **sni**.³ We may further observe that in SEVEN

(unlike in TWO), Zh. **snis** and Kanauri **stish** actually agree in both having the **s**-prefix.

One cannot but feel that observations like these, however interesting, are quite inconclusive and superficial; the presence or absence of a particular prefix on a given root in different languages is a very poor indicator of the closeness of genetic relationship of the languages as a whole.

The publication of a *Tibetan-Zhangzhung Dictionary* in Delhi (Bon-po Association 1965), a bilingual collection of phrases taken from various sacred Bon texts, marked a turning-point in Zhangzhung studies, enabling the Danish scholar Haarh (1968) to extract a nicely arranged vocabulary of several hundred items, along with English translations of the glosses.⁴ Haarh confirms Thomas' and Shafer's view that Zh. is West Himalayish. Huffman (1967), using the same data, agrees that it is Himalayish, but points to resemblances with E. Himalayish and TB languages of Nepal. For exploring connections with the modern W. Himalayish languages, Haarh and Hoffman only had the extremely limited vocabularies of Grierson's *Linguistic Survey of India* to work with.

Most of Stein's long article (1971) is devoted to a discussion of the Zh. philosophic and religious terms to be found in the Delhi *Dictionary*, most of which are calques on or outright borrowings from Sanskrit or Tibetan. Particularly interesting are cases where a compound contains elements from both donor languages, e.g. Zh. **cag-kor** 'wheel' < Skt. **cakra** plus Tib. **ḥkor-lo**.⁵ Leaving aside all this technical and learned vocabulary, Stein still feels there remains an authentic component to the lexicon found in the MSS which could go back to the 7th and 8th centuries, and which could indeed be "native Zhangzhung", but which possibly included elements of other TB languages that the Bonpo incorporated over the centuries. At the end of his article (pp. 252-4), he attempts a comparison of some of these words (the numerals and about 20 others) with forms in other TB languages, but is finally not enthusiastic about his results: "C'est tout ce que j'ai pu trouver jusqu'ici. On voit que la récolte est assez maigre."

Some new data on West Himalayish languages may now enable us to enrich this "meager harvest" somewhat. For Kanauri (=Kanawari, Kinnauri), besides Bailey's classic dictionary (1911), we now have the grammar and glossary by D.D. Sharma (1988). Accurate new data on Bunan and Pattani (=Manchad, Manchati) have been made available by S. R. Sharma, in the form of filled-out Questionnaires on bodypart terminology contributed to the STEDT project (1991). Fortunately there are a large number of bodyparts represented in the *Tibetan/zañ žuñ Dictionary*, since some of the MSS were evidently medical texts!

A few phonological developments may already be traced from PTB to Zh. on the basis of "regular correspondences", though we can hardly speak of "sound laws" at this stage (§II). After listing these, we present over 30 interesting etymologies from miscellaneous semantic areas (§III), followed by a semantically more homogeneous group of over two dozen sets relating to body parts or functions, where the Zh. form seems to have cognates elsewhere in W. Himalayish or farther afield (§IV). After listing a dozen more bodypart terms where the Zh. form cannot yet be related to anything else (§V), we attempt a tentative classification of the etymological relationships of Zh. words to forms in other TB languages (§VI, VII).

II. Sound correspondences

1. Zh. *-ŋ* / other *-Ø*

There seem to be at least five cases where a Zh. final velar nasal corresponds to an open syllable elsewhere in TB:

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------|--|
| [1] | FOUR ⁶ | Zh. bing , WT bízi , Kan. pö
< PTB *b-ləy (STC #410) |
| [2] | LUNG | Zh. lung ,
WT glo-ba < *g-lwa (see [49] below) |
| [3] | VEIN/ROOT | Zh. tsang-ri , WT rtsa (see [58] below) |
| [4] | WATER ⁷ | Zh. ting ; Pat. ti ; Chamba Lahuli ti ;
Tinan and Bunan so-ti ; Rangkas,
Darmiya, Chaudangsi, Byangsi ti ;
Kan. (Bailey) röŋ-tī 'gently flowing
water', (Sharma) mig-sti ,
(Bailey) mīt-ti 'tears' ("eye-water")
< PTB *ti(y) (STC #55) |
| [5] | SOUND/VOICE | Zh. glang ~ klang ,
Lahu khô < PLB *kraŋ ²
(see [30] below) |

This phenomenon is reminiscent of the Hkauri (Hk.) dialect of Jingpho (see Hanson 1906), which has *-ŋ* in several important words where standard Jingpho (Jg.) has an open syllable:

HORSE	Jg. gùmrà , Hk. gùmràng
SILVER	Jg. gùmphrò , Hk. gùmphròng
PERSON ¹	Jg. məshà , Hk. məshàng

In HORSE, the Hkauri nasal seems original (see [24] below), but in SILVER it appears secondary (cf. Insc. Bs. **phlu**). The wider connections of the word for PERSON are still unknown.

2. *The fate of rhymes with TB *-k in Zhangzhung*

Several different correspondences have been observed between general TB rhymes ending in a velar stop and putative Zh. reflexes, though there is still insufficient data to determine whether they all represent valid native Zh. diachronic developments, or whether borrowing might have complicated matters:

2a. Zh. **-at** / other **-ak** ***-ak > Zh. -at** ?

[6] SKIN/FUR Zh. **pad**; WT **lpags**⁸

Zh. **pad** is paralleled by several other Himalayish forms with final dental stop (see [56] below), so perhaps the WT form is not cognate at all.

2b. Zh. **-ek** / other **-ak** ***-ak > Zh. -ek**

[7] BREATH Zh. **seg**, **seg-ri**; Lepcha **hak**
(Mainwaring / Grünwedel 367);
WB **sak**, Lahu **śá** (STC #485)

This word does not occur in Tibetan. The *Delhi Dictionary* gives two words for 'breath', **sad** and **seg**, but the basic meaning of the former is apparently 'god' rather than 'breath'. See [37] below.

[8] BLOOD Zh. **reg-thun**, WT **khrag**

For more on this etymology, see [34] below.

2c. Zh. **-up** / other **-uk** ***-uk > Zh. -up**

[9] POISON Zh. **dub**, WT **dug**

A widespread ST root, PTB ***duk** ≈ ***tuk** (STC #472). For a similar change in position of articulation, cf. Dafla **torub** 'ant' < PTB ***-rwak** (STC #199).

3. ***m-** > Zh. **n-**, especially before front vowel

Hoffman (cited by Stein, p. 254)⁹ already observed this phenomenon in a few etyma (PERSON², FIRE, BOUNDARY), to which we may add NAME:

- [10] PERSON² Zh. **ni**, WT **mi**
 Cf. also Dafla **nyī**, Hruso **nī-na** 'man';
 < PTB ***r-mi(y)**
 (STC pp. 107, 119, 158)
- [11] FIRE Zh. **ne**, WT **me**
 Cf. Dafla **ni**, **nyi**;
 < PTB ***mey** (STC #290)
- [12] NAME Zh. **ma-ning**, WT **ming**
 < PTB ***r-miŋ** (STC #83)
- [13] BOUNDARY Zh. **nu**, WT **mu**

In the first three of these examples the initial precedes a front vowel. This palatalization of **m-** to **n-** before yod is in fact a fairly widespread phenomenon in TB, e.g. in Loloish (Yi). Thus Proto-Lolo-Burmese ***s-myak** 'eye' > Lahu **mêʔ**, Akha **myáʔ**, etc., but also > Ahi **nie**⁴⁴, Sa. **ne**⁴⁴, Lisu (Nujiang) **nie**³, Luquan **naʔ**²², Nasu **naʔ**³².¹⁰ rGyalrong (Qiangic group) has a nice transitional reflex of this etymon, **təmnyak**. It is interesting to observe that although Zh. does not shift to a dental nasal in this root, it does show a palatalizing tendency here too. Instead of ***nig** (< PHim. ***mik**), Zh. has **mig**, **dmig**, or **yig**; the last of these variants clearly points to a development like ***mik** > ****myik** > ****nyik** > **yik**.

4. *Vocalic phenomena*

A couple of random observations are all that can be made in this area:

4a. *Zh. -u- / other -i-*

- [14] MIND¹ Zh. **tha-yud**, **da-yud**; WT **yid**;
 cf. also Jingpho **myìt**
 (< PTB ***m-yet**; Matisoff 1978:211)

In this set, Zh. **-u-** corresponds to WT **-i-**. Inter- and intra-lingual interplay between these high vowels in closed syllables is one of the most pervasive variational patterns in TB (see STC p. 80, Matisoff 1978:41-3).

4b. *Ablaut in verb stems*

[15] DIE/DEAD Zh. **grog** 'die', **gyag** 'dead'

These Zh. forms seem to display an ablaut similar to that in, e.g. WT **gsod** 'kill (pres.)' \approx **bsad** 'kill (past)', though this Zh. root has no obvious cognates.

5. *Tones in Zhangzhung?*

Among the enormous gaps in our knowledge of Zhangzhung is the question of whether it was tonal. The significant number of homophonous morphemes have led several scholars to suspect tonal differences:

"Dans toute langue monosyllabique dont les tons ne sont pas marqués (comme en tibétain), il y a évidemment beaucoup d'homophones." (Stein 1971:247)

"Die oftmals vielfältige Sinnbedeutung homophoner Worte könnte vermuten lassen, dass die *ḡaŋ-ḡuŋ*-Sprache ebenso tonal war wie die der Ch'iang." (Hummel 1974-5:497).

Stein's remark must apply only to modern Tibetan tonal dialects, since it is unjustifiable to assume that tones already existed in Tibetan at the time when the language came to be written, but that the writing system didn't mark them. Hummel's comment assumes that Qiang is a fully tonal language, but actually the Northern Qiang dialects (e.g. Mawo) are not tonal at all, and even in the Southern Qiang dialects (e.g. Taoping) the tone systems are on the rudimentary side. There is in fact no evidence at all that Zhangzhung was tonal.

III. **Interesting etymologies**

[16] The NUMERALS

The Zh. numerals are among the most obvious cognates with other TB languages, and are quite close to the numerals of WT, except

meaning ‘mind’. Or is there an enantiodromic confusion with **khri** ‘foot’? WT **khri**, apparently cognate with WB **khre** ‘foot’, means rather ‘seat; frame’; cf. ***krøy** (STC #38).¹³ Although the second syllable **-tse** of Zh. **khri-tse** is sometimes plausibly interpreted as a diminutive morpheme (see BELLY [33] and EAR [38]), it seems unlikely that a language would refer to a hand as a “little foot”; the hand/foot homophony is probably entirely accidental.

[23] GOLD/YELLOW/
BUTTER

Zh. **mar** ‘gold’, **mar-sang**,
ma- sang ‘yellow’,
mar-tsa ‘goldfish’ (Haarh p. 14);
WT **mar** ‘butter’;
Kan. **mǎr** ‘ghee’

For the semantic connection between ‘yellow’ and ‘butter’, cf. Mandarin **huángyóu** ‘butter’ (‘yellow oil’). This etymon appears with the meaning ‘gold’ throughout the Tamang-Gurung-Thakali-Manang group, and is reconstructed as ***mar⁴** in Proto-Tamang.

Both Zh. and WT derive their word for ‘yellow’ from their respective words for ‘gold’: WT **gser** (< Persian: Jäschke 590) ‘gold’, WT **ser-po** ‘yellow’. Kanauri **zan** ‘gold’ might possibly go with the second syllable of Zh. **mar-sang**.

[24] HORSE

Zh. **hrang**; Pat. **Hraŋ**;
Chamba Lahuli **rhang**;
Rangkas **rhang**; Bun. **śraŋs**;
Kanauri **rang**;
Darmiya, Chaudangsi, Byangsi **rang**
Old Tibetan (Tun-Huang MSS) **rmaŋ**
(Beyer 1992);¹⁴
PLB ***mraŋ²** (> WB **mrâŋ**, Lahu **í-mû**);
Jingpho (Hkauri dial.) **gùmràŋ**
(see II.1, above)

Both the ***s-** and the ***m-** prefixes are well attested in this root: PTB ***s-raŋ** ≈ ***m-raŋ** (STC #145). Benedict (n.139) tentatively suggests a semantic connection with the root for HIGH (PTB ***m-raŋ**).

[25] IRON

Zh. **zaŋs**; Rangkas **chyang**;
Almora **najang**; Darmiya **nijang**;
Chaudangsi **najang**; Byangsi **najag**

having the range of meanings “heaven, sky; area, place, region; space, sphere, universe”.

The Zh. form with prefixed **d-** (*dmu-zhag*) is paralleled by Old Tibetan **mu** and **dmu** 'sky divinities' (Stein, p.247), and in fact looks like a loan from Tibetan. Jäschke (p.423) cites **dmu**, **rmu** 'a kind of evil demon, rarely mentioned; **rmu-rgod** 'wild, angry, passionate'. Stein (p. 254) further mentions Tosu (Qiangic) **dme** 'sky' (Stein 254). These forms with prefixed **d-** justify us in revising the PTB reconstruction to something like ***r/d-məw-k**.

[30] SOUND/VOICE Zh. **glang** ~ **klang**;
 Lahu (Loloish) **khô**

I had been unsure of the etymology of this Lahu word, and entertained the possibility that it was a loan from Tai (cf. Shan **khɔɔ** [Cushing 1881:128]), but also cited the apparent Akha cognate **dò-khò** (cf. the Lahu compound **tô-khô**; Matisoff 1988:380). This Zh. form seems to settle the matter in favor of setting up a general PTB root.

Lahu front velars descend from earlier clusters of *velar-plus-r (i.e. Lahu **kh-** < PLB ***kr-**, Lahu **k-** < PLB ***gr-**), and the usual Akha reflex of ***kr-** is also a plain velar stop (parallel examples include SIX, CROSSBOW, FOOT). The proto-rhyme ***-aŋ** is regularly reflected as **-ɔ** in both Lahu and Akha. We may therefore reconstruct PLB ***kraŋ**².

However, Zh. distinguishes **kl-** and **kr-**, so perhaps the **-l-** is more original in TB as a whole. On the other hand, *velar-plus-laterals seem to have developed into palatal affricates in Lahu: 'fall' PTB ***gla-y** > Lh. **ce**; 'boil' PTB ***glak** ≈ ***s-glak** > PLB ***?glak** > Lh. **cá**. We may therefore posit two allofams, one with **-l-** and one with **-r-**. This seems to be confirmed by WT **sgra** (if indeed this is cognate to the Zh. form; cf. the other examples of Zh. **-ŋ** / other **-Ø**, above II.1). In this case we would have to say that the final nasal was original, and that WT innovated by losing it.

This would leave us with a word-family of the shape:

	k	l		
*s-			a	-ŋ
	g	r		

There is another, unrelated root for 'speech/language', PTB ***ka** (STC #9) > WT **bka**, etc.²⁰

[31] TIGER Zh. *la-ram*

The first syllable of the Zh. form looks remarkably like PLB ***k-la²** (cf. WB **kyâ**, Insc. Bs. **klah**, Lahu **lâ**) ultimately a loan from Mon-Khmer, exhibiting the celebrated "velar animal-prefix" (see STC p. 107, n. 301; Matisoff 1969), possibly borrowed into Chinese as well (虎 OC **χo** < ***χlo** < ***khlo**; STC p. 178). WT **stag** is unrelated.

[32] WIND Zh. *li*, WT **rdzi**; **rlung**

It is likely that the Zh. form is cognate to WT **rdzi**, ult. < PTB ***g-ləy** (STC #454), since there are several parallel examples (much discussed in the literature)²¹ of prefixed lateral initials developing before high front vowels into WT fricatives (e.g. 'four' WT **bzi**, WB **lê**).

That this fricativization is a secondary development within Tibetan is demonstrated by the fact that Zh. agrees better with the rest of TB by preserving the lateral initial.

IV. Zhangzhung cognates to body part words, in Himalayish and elsewhere

[33] BELLY¹ Zh. **khog-tse** 'belly, stomach';
WT **khog-pa** 'trunk of body',
Bun. **khog** 'belly/abdomen'

These forms belong to a complex and widespread TB word-family, with semantic connections to 'hole; hollow object', and including an allofam with final homorganic nasal (cf. WT **khon** 'inside'): ***kok** ≈ ***koŋ**. For the second syllable **-tse** see also FOOT/HAND/MIND [22] and EAR [38].

A separate Himalayish root underlies Bun. **dən** 'belly' and Pat. **gyab-don-je** 'stomach'.

[34] BLOOD Zh. **reg-thun**, WT **khrag** ²²

the general PTB root is ***s-hwəy** (STC #222), as represented by Bun. **šù**, **syu**; Pat. **šui**; Kan. **syui**, **šui**.

The Zh. and WT forms, apparently cognate to each other, are virtually isolated in terms of TB as a whole. It has been suggested²³ that WT **khrag** is cognate to Chinese 赤 (Mand. **chì** 'red').

If the Zh. and WT forms are truly cognate -- and they look different enough to preclude borrowing -- we must assume that the velar stop was treated as a separable prefix, < ***k-rak**. This set would also be an important example of a sound correspondence suggested in [8] above.

[35] BORN Zh. **srung**, WT **ḥkhrung**

There are also reflexes of this root (PTB ***kruŋ**) in Bodo-Garo (STC #382).

[36] BODY Zh. **rko**, **rko-dza**, **rko-phung**; WT **sku**

The Zh. and WT forms are definitely cognate, with the difference in prefix by no means unusual. This is a general TB root (cf. WB **kui**), with a probable Chinese cognate 驅 (Mand. **qū**; STC p. 184).

[37] BREATH Zh. **seg**, Bun. **śa wan-ca** (v.),
Pat. **sàg lèp-tsi** (v.),
Kan. **sa-səŋ**, **sā-söŋ**, **riŋ-sā**

These forms all apparently derive from PTB ***sak** (STC #485); cf. PLB ***C-sak** (Matisoff 1972, #123). The Zh. form shows the same development of PTB ***-ak** to **-eg** as in BLOOD [34]. The Zh. **sad** is also glossed 'breath' (Haarh p.42), though a homophonous word, which may or may not represent the same etymon, is glossed 'god'. (See [7] above.)

[38] EAR Zh. **ra-tse**, Bun. **re-tsi**, Pat. **rhe-tṣa**,
Kan. **rɔc** (Sharma)

Stein (p. 253) cites Lahul **re-tṣā**, **re-tsi** and Almora **rach** (the latter very like the Kanauri form, with apocoped second syllable). Haarh (p. 26) cites Manchari **rhe-tra**, Tinan **re-tra**, Rangkas **rach**, Darmiya **racho**, Chaudangsi and Byangsi (Almora) **rach**.²⁴ All the above are perhaps related via "prefix preemption" to the general PTB root ***g/r-na** (STC #453) > WT **rna-ba**. The second syllables of the West Himalayish compounds seems to represent a common derivational suffix in Zh., perhaps with diminutive value.²⁵ (See also **khri-tse** 'hand', **khog-tse**

Several additional forms are cited under PTB ***ak** 'crack; mouth' (STC #106): WT **?ag-tshom** 'beard of chin' ("mouth-hair"), Lepcha **ók** 'to open (as door, mouth)', WB **?ak** 'crack open', **?ə-?ak** 'opening, gap'. This interesting root has so far only been attested in Himalayish and Burmese.

[52] NECK Zh. **khang**, Bun. **khã-gul**

The Zh. and Bun. forms are closely related. There are apparent cognates in many other TB languages, including Ao (Chungli) **te-kong** 'neck', Sherpa **ol-gong** 'throat', WT **lha-goŋ** 'larynx', Tujia **khon⁵⁵ti⁵⁵** 'neck', Sangkong **aŋ³³khon³¹** 'throat', etc., as well as a good Chinese comparandum, OC ***kâŋ** (GSR 698a) 'neck; throat'.

[53] NOSE Zh. **lgyum-zhi**, Bun. **gyum-pug**,
Lahul (Stein, p. 254) **gyum**

Again there is close cognacy between Zh. and Bunan, but this root is very rare in the context of TB as a whole, and seems confined to W. Himalayish. For the moment we may reconstruct it as ***l-gyum**.

The general TB root is ***s-na** (STC #101) > WT **sna**, Pat. **ña**, Kan. **sta-kuc**. As mentioned above, Kanauri **st-** < ***sn-** is regular; cf. SEVEN [28], HEART [45].

[54] RIB Zh. **hrib**, WT **rtsib-ma**, Bun. **şib**:
Pat. **rîš-pa**, Kan. **rib**

Although this is hardly to be considered a "basic" bodypart, it is represented by this remarkably stable Himalayish root, which we may reconstruct as ***s-rip** (not in STC). Pattani shows an apparent dissimilation of the final **-p** before the labial-initial suffix **-pa**.²⁸

[55] SCAPULA Zh. **tsog**; WT **sog, sog-pa**

Zh. **tsog** looks suspiciously like the WT form, and might well be a loan from Tibetan.

[56] SKIN/FUR Zh. **pad, bad**;
Bun. **bat-si**; Kan. **bod, bød**

This is still another example of a root well-attested in West Himalayish (***bat**), but so far not elsewhere. (One possible cognate is the second syllable of Muya (Qiangic) **Ꞩw³⁵mbɛ⁵³**.) It is doubtful whether WT **lpags**, **pags-pa** is to be related to this etymon. (See [6] above.)

- [57] TONGUE Zh. **lke-ri**, **rkyel**, **skyel**;
 WT **lce**; Bun. **le**; Pat. **lhe**;
 Kan. **le**:

As the internal variation within Zh. demonstrates, this is a complicated root with many alloforms, e.g. ***m/s-lay** (STC #281) and ***m/s-lya-k** (STC#211), though so far no language besides Zh. has been found to have reflexes with final **-l**. These roots have semantic associations with LICK and FLAME.

- [58] VEIN/ROOT Zh. **tsang-ri**;
 WT **rtsa(-ba)** ; Bun. **tà**

These forms reflect PTB ***r-sa** (STC #442), with widespread cognates including Lepcha **so**, Jingpho **lɔsa**, Bodo **roda** ~ **rota**, Dimasa **rada**, Chang **hau**, Lushai **tha**, Ao **teza**, Mikir **artho**.

This set looks like another good example of Zh. **-ŋ** corresponding to open syllables in other languages. (See [3] above.) The second syllable **-ri** is perhaps from ***rey** 'cane; thread; cord; string' (see [46] above). On the other hand, several other Zh. compounds, including the words for SUN and MOON, have **-ri** as their second element. (Cf. also **seg-ri** 'breath'.)

- [59] VESSEL Zh. **snu**;
 WT **snod** 'vessel', **bu-snod** 'womb'

This etymon (< PTB ***s-not**) means MOUTH or WOMB in other TB languages (STC pp. 144, 145, 150); cf. WB **hnut** 'mouth; womb', Pwo and Sgaw Karen **no?** 'mouth'.

V. **Where two or more unrelated roots are represented, or where none are cognate to the Zhangzhung form**

- [60] ARM/HAND Bun. *khyut-si*; Pat. *gù-Rə*;
 Kan. *khyuč* (all 'arm');
 Hayu *go(t)* 'hand', Kan. *gud* 'id.'

These forms reflect STEDT etymon $\sqrt{712}$ **k/g-(r)ut*.

- [61] BELLY² Zh. *thal*, *gso-byed*;
 [WT *dp̣yi*] [WT *grod-pa*]

- [62] CHEEK Zh. *ḥud*;
 [WT *khur-ba*] [Pat. *car-ni*] [Kan. *p̄iŋ*]

There is a well-attested cognate set (not in STC) in this semantic area, represented by WT *ḥgram-pa*; Bun. *grəm-pa*; Ergong *njjam³³ pa³³*; Muya *ndzə³³mbe⁵⁵*; Qiang (Mawo) *ɣdʒæ ḥuŋ* 'beard' < PTB **s-gram*.

- [63] CHEST Zh. *pring-rgyud*; [WT *brang*]
 [Bun. *kyuk-ṭoŋ*]; [Pat. *kà*] [Kan. *stug*]

The Zh. form is also glossed as 'group of demons' (WT *yi-dwags*), a puzzling semantic connection. It is possible that the Zh. first syllable *pring-* is related to WT *brang* < PTB **b-raŋ*.

- [64] CUBIT Zh. *rtsa*; [Kan. *rin*]

A newly recognized Himalayish root is represented by WT *khru*, Bun. *khru*i, Pat. *krù*.

- [65] DEAD/DIE Zh. *gyag* 'dead', *grog* 'die'

The general ST/TB root **səy* (STC #232) is reflected by WT *shi* 'dead', *ḥchi* 'die'; Bun. *ṣi-ca*; Pat. *si*; Kan. *ṣi*, *ṣi-sed*, etc. No putative cognates to the Zh. forms have yet been identified.

- [66] FINGER, RING Zh. *rtsal-gsum*;
 [WT *srin-lag*, *srin-mdzub*]
 [Bun. *mar bot-si*]

The Zh. form looks as if it means “triple power”, and the Bunan compound might mean “golden finger” (see [23] above). Since the

A general TB root (***s-wa**, STC #437).is exemplified by WT **so**:
Bun. **suà**; Pat. **tshoa, tsuă**; Thebor **soa**.

VI. **Summary: types of relationships between Zhangzhung forms and TB etyma**

We may roughly sort the above sets of forms into five categories, according to the nature of the relationship between the Zh. form and those in other TB languages:

- (1) *Where the Zh. form reflects a widespread TB root, attested not only in Himalayish*

All the **numerals** are in this category, as well as the following:

BELLY¹; BORN; BREATH; BURN/SHINE; ENEMY/WAR; EYE; FIRE;
FLESH; GALL BLADDER; HORSE; KIDNEY; LIVER; MIND¹;
MOON; MOUNTAIN; MOUTH¹; NAME; PERSON; POISON; SKY;
TONGUE; VEIN/ROOT; VESSEL; WATER; WIND

- (2) *Where the Zh. form seems isolated in Himalayish, but is cognate to an etymon found elsewhere in TB*

BIRD; TIGER; SOUND/VOICE

- (3) *Where Zh. has Tibetan (and sometimes also other Himalayish) cognates*

BLOOD; BODY; BOUNDARY; GOLD/YELLOW/BUTTER; HEAD;
LUNG; MOUTH²; RIB; SCAPULA

- (4) *Where Zh. has only West Himalayish (but not Tibetan) cognates, or where the Zh. form appears particularly close to W. Himalayish*

BARLEY; EAR; FAT/OMENTUM; HEART; INTESTINE; IRON;
NECK; NOSE; SKIN/FUR

- (5) *Where the Zh. form has no certain cognates*

This includes all the sets from [60] to [72], as well as the following:

FINGER; FISH; FOOT/HAND/MIND²

VII. Conclusion

The very existence of a category like (4) above leads me to agree with all previous students of the question that Zhangzhung belonged to the West Himalayish branch of TB. Further progress must await more copious data from modern W. Him. languages, but perhaps the basis for a more precise discussion has now been laid.

Acknowledgements

On behalf of the STEDT Project <<http://stedt.berkeley.edu/>>, I would like to gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the following U.S. funding agencies: The National Science Foundation (NSF), Division of Behavioral & Cognitive Sciences, Linguistics (Grant No. SBR-9808952); The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), Division of Research Programs (Grant No. PA-23353-99). Also, I would like to thank Richard S. Cook, for his assistance editing and formatting this paper.

Notes

- 1) "...the Almora group is quite well defined in the larger W. Him. group, and has many features which form connecting links between Bhotish and W. Himalayish, features which other W. Him. subgroups do not possess" (Šafer 1937: 296).
- 2) **Abbreviations:** Bun. **Bunan**, Him. **Himalayish**, Kan. **Kanauri**, Pat. **Pattani** (Manchati), PLB **Proto-Lolo-Burmese**, ST **Sino-Tibetan**, STC **Benedict 1972**, TB **Tibeto-Burman**, WB **Written Burmese**, WT **Written Tibetan**, Zh. **Zhangzhung**.
- 3) Stein included Classical Newari hnas as an example of a form which (like Almora and Bunan) lacked the s- prefix; but of course the voiceless nasal is an unambiguous reflection of an earlier s-prefix in Newari as well.
- 4) This was then supplemented by the publication (1966) of one of the texts on which this Dictionary was based, the mDzod-phug and its commentary, which has long parallel passages in Zhangzhung and Tibetan. Stein (1971:214) calls this work a "sorte du manuel du bon organisé".
- 5) This is rather like the many Yiddish compounds with both Germanic and Hebrew/Slavic elements; or English mixed Greek-and-Latin compounds like tele- + vision; or Japanese jū-bako-yomi compounds, where one of the elements has a Sino-Japanese reading while the other has a kun reading.

- 6) Stein (p. 253) compares Zh. **bing** to Pahri **pingi** and Magar **banga**, pointing out that these latter look like they should mean FIVE rather than FOUR. He rejects the idea that this might be a confusion related to the Zh. "consecutive-numeral compounds" (see [16] below), since he (implausibly) thinks the consecutive-numeral compounds were "artificial", and based on a misinterpretation of "dissyllabic" (actually sesquisyllabic) forms like those of Pahri and Magar. For a discussion of transvaluation of numerals, see Matisoff 1995:176-8.
- 7) Stein (p.236) observes that Zh. **ting** usually means 'blue', and suggests that the Zh. form is borrowed from or related to Tib. **ḥchiŋ, mchiŋ** 'lapis lazuli', **mthiḡ** 'blue dye; indigo', and that the meaning 'water' is secondary. (He also relates it to Chinese 青 (Mand. qīng) 'blue-green'.) But the fact that there are several parallel examples of Zh. **-ŋ** / other **-Ø** is against this. WT **ḥchiŋ-bu** is glossed as 'a spurious, glass jewel' in Jäschke 169.
- 8) In Zhangzhung, as in WT and the transcription of other Himalayish languages, the final (voiceless) unreleased stops are conventionally written with the voiced symbols "-b -d -g". There is never a real contrast in voicing of stops in final position.
- 9) Stein makes an unfortunate lapsus calami in his discussion of this point, saying that Zh. **m-** corresponds to Tib. **n-**, instead of vice versa.
- 10) Forms from Matisoff 1972, # 145.
- 11) See Haarh (1968:18, 25), Hoffman (1967:378-9), Stein (1971:253), and Hummel (1974-5:496-7, 517-8; 1981-83:305-6).
- 12) In view of all these putative cognates, the STC indexes (pp. 200, 211) should not claim that this root is restricted to Bodo-Garo.
- 13) The WT for 'foot' is **rkang-pa** (see [67] below).
- 14) Contra my notes in STC (nn. 102 and 139), the usual WT word **rta** is quite unrelated to this etymon.
- 15) See Chang Kun 1972, who sets up a ST root ***qhleks** that is supposedly cognate to similar etyma in Proto-Tai and Proto-Hmong-Mien.
- 16) This is a highly aberrant TB language of Arunachal Pradesh. For some discussion of Sulong's relationship to other languages of the region, see J. Sun 1993.
- 17) See Matisoff 1995, §4.228 (pp. 201-2).
- 18) These genuine forms with final velar do NOT include the WB form **mûigh**, where the "gh" is a spurious product of etymologizing grammarians, influenced by Sanskrit **megha** 'cloud'.

- 19) Simple velar initials become postvelar stops in Lahu and velar fricatives in Akha: PLB ***k-** > Lh. **qh-**, Ak. **x-**; PLB ***g-** > Lh. **q-**, Ak. **ɣ-**.
- 20) The resemblance of this root to German **Klang** 'sound' is amusing, but entirely fortuitous!
- 21) Including BOW, FOUR, HEAVY, PENIS. Two more etyma in this group (BOAT, GRANDCHILD) lack WT cognates, but have parallel developments elsewhere. See Matisoff 1969.
- 22) The Delhi Dictionary also contains a semantically mysterious compound glossed 'blood head' (Zh. **reg-pu** / WT **khrag-mgo**). See [44] below.
- 23) Originally, I believe, by Nicholas C. Bodman.
- 24) On p. 40, Haahr mistakenly glosses Zhangzhung **ra-tse** and TB **rna-ba** as NOSE, a careless error.
- 25) Haahr (pp. 16-17) distinguishes five different semantic values for **tse**, **-tsa**, or **-tsu** in Zh. compounds, one of which appears to be diminutive, and suggests that this might be related to its use in bodypart terms.
- 26) The resemblance of the Zh. and Pat. forms to English lung is yet another example of the whimsical role that chance plays in linguistic comparison; see also RIB (below [54]).
- 27) Haahr (p.19) cites an actual Zh. sentence that illustrates four of the "interesting etyma" thus far discussed:
gran - gyi lung ni ne-rud ar 'A heap of fire [11] burns [19] the enemy's [20] lungs [49].'
 enemy GEN lung PRT fire heap burn
- 28) This root is still another curious example of accidental resemblance to English!

References

- BAILEY, Thomas Grahame.
 1911 *Kanauri Vocabulary in two parts: English-Kanauri and Kanauri-English*. Royal Asiatic Society, Monograph 13. London. [Reprinted from JRAS 1910:695-705, 1911:315-64.]
- BENEDICT, Paul K.
 1972 *Sino-Tibetan: a Conspectus*. Contributing Editor, James A. Matisoff. New York: Cambridge University Press. ("STC")
- BEYER, Stephan V.
 1992 *The Classical Tibetan Language*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bon-po Association.

- 1965 *Tibetan žaň-žuň Dictionary*. Delhi: Lahore Press, Jama Masjid.
Mimeographed in Tibetan, with an added printed introductory note in English. 64 pp. and 2 maps.

CHANG Kun.

- 1960 On Zhang Zhung. ~ BIHP, Extra Vol. No. 4: Studies presented to Tung Tso Pin on his 64th Birthday, pp. 137-54.
1972 "Sino-Tibetan 'iron': *qhleks." JAOS 92.3:436-46.

CUSHING, J.N.

- 1881 *A Shan and English Dictionary*. Rangoon. Reprinted (1914) by Baptist Mission Press, Rangoon.

GRIERSON, Sir George Abraham and Sten KONOW, eds.

- 1903-28 *Linguistic Survey of India*. 13 vols. Vol. III, Parts 1-3, *Tibeto-Burman Family*. Calcutta: Office of Superintendent of Government Printing.
Reprinted 1967, 1973 by Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

HAARH, Erik.

- 1968 The Zhang-Zhung language: a Grammar and Dictionary of the unexplored language of the Tibetan Bonpos. ~ *Acta Jutlandica* 40.1:6-43.
Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus. København: Einar Munksgaard.

HANSON, Ola.

- 1906 *A Dictionary of the Kachin language*. Reprinted (1954) Rangoon: Baptist Board of Publications.

HOFFMAN, Helmut.

- 1967 "žaň-žuň, the holy language of the Tibetan Bonpo." ZDMG 117.2:376-81.

HUMMEL, Siegbert.

- 1974-83 "Materialen zu einem Wörterbuch der žaň-žuň-Sprache." *Monumenta Serica* (Parts I & II, 1974-5) 31:488-520; (Part III, 1976) 32:320-36; (Part IV, 1981-3) 35:305-8.
19?? "Der Ursprung der Sprache von Zhang-Zhung." *The Journal of the Tibet Society* XYZ:3-16.

JAESCHKE, Heinrich August.

- 1881 *A Tibetan-English Dictionary, with special reference to the prevailing dialects*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. Reprinted (Delhi 1975, 1982, 1995) by Motilal Banarsidass.

KVAERNE, Per.

- 1971 "A chronological table of the Bon po: the *Bstan rcis* of Nyi ma bstan 'jin." *Acta Orientalia* 33:205-48.

MAINWARING, George Byrn.

- 1898 *Dictionary of the Lepcha Language*. Revised and completed by Albert GRUENWEDEL. Berlin: Unger Bros.

- MATISOFF, James A.
 1969 "Lahu and Proto-Lolo-Burmese." *Occasional Papers of the Wolfenden Society on Tibeto-Burman Linguistics*, Vol. I, pp. 117-221.
 1972 *The Loloish Tonal Split Revisited*. Research Monograph 7, Center for South and Southeast Asia Studies, University of California, Berkeley.
 1978 *Variational Semantics in Tibeto-Burman: the "organic" approach to linguistic comparison*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
 1988 *The Dictionary of Lahu*. University of California Publications in Linguistics #111. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
 1995 "Sino-Tibetan numerals and the play of prefixes." *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology* (Osaka), pp. 105-252.
 1997 "Primary and secondary laryngeal initials in Tibeto-Burman." in Anne O. Yue and Mitsuaki Endo, eds., *In Memory of Mantaro J. Hashimoto*, pp. 29-50. Tokyo: Uchiyama Books Co.
 1998 "An extrusional approach to *p-/w- variation in Sino-Tibetan." Paper presented at the 31st ICSTLL, Lund, Sweden (October).
- mDZOD-PHUG Publication Committee.
 1966 *mDzod-phug: basic verses and commentary*. Delhi: Tenzin Namdak.
- SHAFER, Robert.
 1937 "Jangjung". In *Sino-Tibetan Linguistics*, Vol. 3: *West Himalayish*, pp. 289-96. Unpublished typescript. Berkeley.
- SHARMA, D.D.
 1988 *A Descriptive Grammar of Kinnauri*. Delhi: Mittal Publications.
- SHARMA, Suhnu Ram.
 1991 "Bunan Bodyparts". Questionnaire #1, Sino-Tibetan Etymological Dictionary and Thesaurus Project.
 1991 "Pattani (Manchati) Bodyparts". Questionnaire #1, Sino-Tibetan Etymological Dictionary and Thesaurus Project.
- STEIN, Rolf A.
 1971 "La langue *zań-źuń* du bon organisé." BEFEO 58:231-54.
 1988 "La religion indigène et les *bon-po* dans les manuscrits de Touen-houang." *Tibetica Antiqua* V. BEFEO 77:27-56.
- SUN, Jackson Tianshin.
 1993 *A Historical-Comparative Study of the Tani (Mirish) Branch of Tibeto-Burman*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- THOMAS, F. W.
 1926 "Two languages from Central Asia." JRAS 3:505-6.
 1933 "The *zań-źuń* language." JRAS 2:405-10.
 19?? "The *zań-źuń* language." Edited by A.F. Thompson. JRAS, pp. 211-217, including 4 plates. Published posthumously (Thomas died in 1956).