The term śvarabhakti is familiar to Sanskrit scholars, and to students of linguistics in general, as a means of accounting for a ‘vowel fragment’ or vowel glide, a feature of the transition, in Sanskrit, from r, and sometimes also l, to another consonant, commonly a fricative (or spirant) consonant; following in the footsteps of ‘the earliest phoneticians’ I wish to introduce the complementary term svārābhakti to account for a consonant fragment, or consonant glide, as a feature of the transition from a liquid consonant to another consonant, commonly a fricative (or spirant) consonant.

Though it is in origin a Sanskrit phonological term, śvarābhakti has been applied to comparable phenomena in other languages, as, for example, in the following passage from a grammar of Scots Gaelic: ‘THE PARASITIC OR (IN SANSKRIT) THE SVARABHAKTI VOWEL (i.e. the “voice-attachment”, “vowel portion”), or glide vowel.

Śvarabhakti is the development in the spoken language of a non-radical or inorganic vowel from the voiced sound of the preceding consonant, resulting in a repetition of the preceding vowel.

Tulaich gorm m. Green hill, is in Scottish C.S. (Common Speech) spoken and written as Tulachgorm (more correctly Tulachgòrmaid).

A close parallel to the Scots-Gaelic pronunciation of gorm ‘green’ as though it were ‘gorum’ or ‘gorim’ is provided by the well-known cry of the ch-sifid in Hindi ‘cf. — garm — garmcd’, in which garm will in all probability, at least in its first occurrence is this small quotation, be pronounced with a śvarābhakti, as though it were: ‘garam’, with two syllables to the ear though only one appears to the eye; for the śvarābhakti here has not achieved recognition in Hindi spelling.

For svārānabhaṅkṛt, on the other hand, English readily provides examples in pronunciation, and, unlike my Hindi example, even admits them into the spelling. Thus, where some speakers (including myself) pronounce Hampton and Hampstead with a sequence of two medial consonant sounds [m-] and [ms-] respectively, others pronounce them with a sequence of three consonants, [mp-] and [mp-], the [p-] being śvarānabhaṅkṛt, sharing the labial feature with the [m-] but the voicelessness...
feature with the [s.10y] or [s.10]. 3. Etymology favours the former type of speaker, and requires such spellings as 'Hamston' and 'Hamstead', compounded from Old English 'ham' 'dwell' ... case,' but the latter type of speaker has triumphed over the etymology, for the established spelling has clearly given orthographic status to the 'place' in this paper I shall suggest that in Tibetan too 'place' has triumphed, and that the incorporation of a 'rufixed' into the spelling of certain Tibetan verb forms has introduced an unnecessary air of irregularity into their paradigms.

Alternation in the spelling of the initial consonants of a considerable number of Tibetan verbs, especially between the present form and the past form, has long been something of a puzzle, and, probably, also something of an irritant, to students of Tibetan: 'Vowel rooms remain constant in most Sino-Tibetan languages. But ... diversity of form reaches the extreme in Old Bodish (classical Tibetan), where the position of the verb is necessarily constant—whether consonantal prefix, consonantal initial, medial vowel, 'final' consonant, or 'rufixed' consonant.' 4 Shaffer takes up this challenge by attempting to provide both the comparative grammarian and the beginning student in Old Bodish with 'something like 'conjunctions' instead of the apparently endless confusion of verbal forms with which he is confronted in most of the dictionaries and grammars of the language', in the course of which he refers to an alternation of 'affricate initials in the present and corresponding sibilant initials in the perfect ... -tshuk, 'harvest', 'fruits, fl 'air'; tlhun, for 'escape'; 'dlig, dgi 'be ruined'; 'dlig, sugs: im, sugs 'go in'; 'bho, m, im, on 'live'; 'dead, and be on the decline'; and probably 'cheer, see' 'say'.' 5 It is verbs of this type, in which affricate initials alternate with fricative initials (Shaffer's 'sibilant initials'), that I wish to analyse in terms of 'place'; indeed, I have already made a beginning elsewhere, though without using the term 'place'.

In the article in which I gave these examples, limitations of time and space prevented me from illustrating 'place' in Tibetan, with more examples than those four, which exemplify only the following two out of a total of five types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'dtag</td>
<td>plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dag</td>
<td>enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'gsgs</td>
<td>destroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'sgs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. 'dr. alternating with (蛆)\textsuperscript{23}. 

b. 'dr. 

c. 'drh. alternating with (蛆)\textsuperscript{23}. 

d. 'drh. 

e. 'dr. 

f. 'd. alternating with z-. 

g. 'dr. 

In Fischler's Dictionary I find nine verbs in which a present form in the initial two-letter group, 'dr., alternates with other forms, past, future, and imperative, in which the initial either is the single letter z- or contains the letter z in the groups gz and be-

\textsuperscript{23} e.g. 
i. present: "droy \textsuperscript{41}q
other: \textsuperscript{42}q\textsuperscript{myn}, \textsuperscript{43}q\textsuperscript{m}

ii. present: "droy \textsuperscript{41}q
other: \textsuperscript{42}q\textsuperscript{myn}, \textsuperscript{43}q\textsuperscript{m}

iii. present: "droy \textsuperscript{41}q
other: \textsuperscript{42}q\textsuperscript{myn}, \textsuperscript{43}q\textsuperscript{m}

iv. present: "droy \textsuperscript{41}q
other: \textsuperscript{42}q\textsuperscript{myn}, \textsuperscript{43}q\textsuperscript{m}

In the case of one of these verbs the alternation of 'dr-with z- is in the present form itself: \textsuperscript{42}q\textsuperscript{myn}, \textsuperscript{43}q\textsuperscript{m} 'plant'; this same verb, and two others, alternate with forms in be- in the perfect: \textsuperscript{42}q\textsuperscript{myn}, \textsuperscript{43}q\textsuperscript{m} 'plant', \textsuperscript{4t}z\textsuperscript{d}ad, \textsuperscript{4s}\textsuperscript{q}\textsuperscript{m}, \textsuperscript{4s} 'put into', \textsuperscript{4t}z\textsuperscript{d}um, \textsuperscript{4s}\textsuperscript{q}\textsuperscript{m}, \textsuperscript{4s} 'shut'; and the two last also alternate with be-

\textsuperscript{41}q in the imperative: \textsuperscript{4t}z\textsuperscript{d}ad, \textsuperscript{4t}z\textsuperscript{d}um ( \textsuperscript{4s}\textsuperscript{q}\textsuperscript{m}, \textsuperscript{4s} 'breathe'). At the time when the orthography was devised, I take 'dr. - to have had the phonetic value of a nasal followed by an affricate, with the nasal having the same tongue position as the affricate (\textsuperscript{4t}z\textsuperscript{d}).\textsuperscript{9} Thus, both sounds have in common the feature of complete closure in the mouth by the tongue. If we take z-. on the other hand, whether alone, as z-, or in the initial groups gz- and bz- ( \textsuperscript{4s}\textsuperscript{q}, \textsuperscript{4s}\textsuperscript{t}), to have had the value of a fricative (\textsuperscript{4s}), and therefore no closure in the mouth.\textsuperscript{9} From a comparison of the nasal-and-affricate group (\textsuperscript{4t}z\textsuperscript{d}) with the fricative (\textsuperscript{4s}), or groups containing the fricative (\textsuperscript{4s}), I conclude...
that the non-nasal closure [t] of the [nde-] group is a *syffonabhatki*, a glide, sharing the closure feature with the preceding nasal ([d]) and the non-nasal feature with the following fricative ([f]), i.e., *v(d)dz*

Accordingly, I should have preferred to see initial *’dz* [*dz*], which is a *syffonabhatki* spelling, replaced, at least for the nine verbs with alternating forms in *’dz*- and *(g)dz*- by *’*,[*dz*], with the result that, for example, *’dzuug* and *’dza* ([*dz*] or [*dz*]) would be spelt *’zag* and *’zn* ([*zn*] or [*zn*]), and that their initial letters would cease to alternate. Their forms would then appear as follows:

1. *’zag* *(g)dzg* 2. *’dzuug* *(g)dzg* 3. *’zn* *(g)zn* 4. *’dza* *(g)zn* 5. *’dza* *(g)zn*

In my analysis I have attributed a nasal-and-sonorant value to the initial group *’dz*: but I am obliged to admit that, whatever the pronunciation may have been at the time when the spelling became established, my Research Assistant Rinzin Wangpo (tib. *’dzin dbang-po*), a well-educated speaker from Lhasa, regularly pronounced this initial group of letters when spelling and reading not as a sequence of nasal and sonorant ([nde-]) but as a sequence of nasal and fricative ([dz-]), e.g., *’dzin* not as *’[ndzin]* but as *’[dzin]*, without a *syffonabhatki*. This pronunciation conflicts with the interpretation of the orthography that I gave at the beginning of this paragraph, and is therefore, at first sight, something of an embarrassment to me; but I take it to be an alternative pronunciation without *syffonabhatki*, and therefore as supporting my interpretation of the orthography *’dz*- as the *syffonabhatki* form of what is to be regarded structurally as *’dz*.*[^*dz*]*. For such an interpretation I am obliged to assume that *’*[^*dz*] was pronounced in former times as a *voiced* consonant ([dz-]), but this assumption presents no great difficulty, for the *v* of the orthography corresponds to the *voiced* consonant [*v*] of the more conservative Tibetan dialects, e.g., *ram-pa* ‘bridge’, *zangs ‘copper’, *rul* [*r*] ‘eat’, *gpo* ‘planet’, *gol* [*r*] (in the Lhasa dialect and in the pronunciation used in spelling and reading written Tibetan *z* corresponds to the voiceless consonant [*s*] in a low-tone syllable).[^10]

Rinzing Wangpo’s pronunciation of initial *’dz* [*dz*] not as [nde-] but as [nde-] in reading and spelling written Tibetan does not
go unsupported; the Khara dialect has [me] corresponding to the de of the spelling, though only in certain types of syllable junction within the word, e.g. sde 'eclipse', de 'eclipse', shes 'fog'; so too does Golok, but with the difference that in Golok the [n] features are not confined to a medial position but occur initially in such words as mden-ma (or mden-mo) 'fence', dbum 'assemble', and (') dam-ping 'world'. Consistently with this nasal-and-fricative pronunciation corresponding to th-'it'. Golok has a nasal-and-fricative pronunciation [me], not nasal-and-affricate (*[mdz]_), corresponding to the initial group mde-... of the spelling; e.g. [mde]-ma xe 'sak' (hybrid).

It may be that syllables spelt with *de-* (and mde-*mdz_) fluctuate in pronunciation from [ne] to [nde] (and [me] to [nde]) from speaker to speaker, and have done so since the early days of the orthography, is something like the way in which English words ending in -nch such as lunch, branch, and toh fluctuate between two sylphandibhakti pronunciation with nasal and affricate (*[nd]) and a pronunciation with nasal and fricative (*[nd]), as though spelt *lunch, *branch, etc.

Whatever the likelihood of a fluctuation in the pronunciation of *de-* M. between nasal and affricate and nasal and fricative, it is evident that adopting an alphabetic scheme of the Sanskrit type, the wara samde-jas, for Yietaian has had the effect of widely separating the affricate [zl] from the fricative [z], for de * in that scheme is grouped with tas and thes (4, 4), and separated from ze * which is grouped with esa, jas, and yo (*, *, *). As I hope I have been able to show, the morphology of the verbs considered in this section (3) requires them at least to be closely associated, or, preferably, unified through the representation of *de-* M. as *je-* *.

The same sort of symbolism could be extended to forms currently written with initial groups mde-* and rde-*-, e.g. mdead 'soj, mde2-love', rde 'press', rde/ be frustrated (see, rde, rds, F. yer) which would there be split *mead, mea, tro, and reog (*me, mea, *te, *twr). I am not, however, able to advocate this change of symbolism on the same grounds as for *de- and (g/j)z-, because verbs with initial mde- and rde- do not show any alternation in form as between mde- or rde- and (g/j)z-eon. The contrary, verbs with initial mde- or rde- in one form are spelt with that same initial group in all forms. The only reasons, then, for making a parallel change from mde- and rde- to *mea-
and *er- respectively are those of consistency with the proposed change from *de- to *d-; and economy; for it would then be very nearly possible to dispense with the letter de- altogether; words spelt with the single initial letter de- number, in Flock's Dictionary, only nineteen. They alone would remain.

Although the initial group side- te- occurs in Tibetan orthography, and is by no means rare, and although both id- and id- (d- g-) occur (section 66), e.g. idla 'forget', idlo 'valley', 'region' (v. i., 3.), there is no such initial group of letters as *ide-. sida-. A corresponding initial sound group to this non-existent group of letters, [lde-], does, however, occur in the Baltic dialect; it corresponds to the existing initial group of letters sl- s-, e.g. [lidza-] slo-ba 'month', [lidske] sbya 'cause to return'. This Baltic initial sound group I should analyse exactly as for *fris-, in terms of vyayamabhadha, the closure [l] being related to the partial closure of the preceding [l]. The appropriate spelling for this sound group would, therefore, be not the vyayamabhadha spelling *lde-s, but *lde-s. The above two Baltic examples would, accordingly, be spelt *lde-ba *** (better, perhaps, *la-ba-), and *nbe.

Since, however, the corresponding spelling to this Baltic initial sound group is not *lde-s, but *lde-s, the Baltic sound group has generally been treated as an example of metathesis, a reversal of what is taken, on the basis of the spelling order, to have been earlier *[lde-]. The spelling order sl- is itself, though, anomalous, and hardly a satisfactory basis for the postulated metathesis: while there is indeed an initial group sl-, which therefore contrasts with sl-, nowhere else in Tibetan orthography is there a corresponding contrast. The letter s is common in the initial groups *sp-, *z-, *st-, *sm-, *sr-, *st-, e.g. spun, shon, stol, ston, sew, swa, *sw-, *sw-, *sw-, *sw-, but there are no corresponding, and contrasting, initial groups *sp-, *z-, *st-, *sm-, *sr-, *st-, *sw-, *sw-, *sw-, *sw-. The initial group sl- is, clearly, without parallel in Tibetan orthography; it is not, therefore, surprising that in none of the spoken dialects is there a corresponding pronunciation *[lde-] (or, with vyayamabhadha, *[all]).

The word-initial features corresponding to sl- in the Baltic, Golok, and Lhasa dialects, well in the reading and spelling styles of pronunciation written Tibetan are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baltic</th>
<th>Golok</th>
<th>Lhasa</th>
<th>Reading-style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[lde-]</td>
<td>rde-</td>
<td>d- (low tone)</td>
<td>n- (low tone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are two explanations that occur to me for what is, orthographically speaking, a freak. They are (i) that \( \text{zl} \) might have been adopted as a digraph to symbolize voice such initial sound group as [\textit{dts}], as in the corresponding form in Baltic, a remarkably conservative dialect, and that, accordingly, \( \text{zl} \) was regarded as a single pronunciation unit, like the Greek letters \( \textit{ae} \) (for [\textit{ve}]) or \( \textit{ei} \) (for [\textit{ve}], and not as a succession of the two units \( \textit{a} \) and \( \textit{i} \) in that order); or (ii) that \( \text{zl} \) represents an early compromise symbolization of widely different pronunciation features from different dialects, is in the current phonetic diversity of the Baltic and other forms given above, and was therefore intended at the outset to symbolize more than one pronunciation, in much the same way as the \textit{Oxford English Dictionary} uses a special phonetic symbol to indicate that such words as \textit{grass}, \textit{park}, and \textit{castle} are pronounced by North-country speakers with a short vowel, the same vowel as in \textit{law}, but by other speakers with a long vowel, the same vowel as in \textit{guard}.

The same explanation might also stand for the corresponding voiceless Baltic initial group [\textit{bls}] (\textit{bl}) here used as a digraph for a single sound, a voiceless lateral, as including a \textit{zy} (\textit{zh}) (cf. \textit{blg}), e.g. \textit{blab} (Baltic \textit{blag} \textit{'shame'}, slang \textit{blag} \textit{'raisin'}, \textit{ab} \textit{blag} \textit{'reach'}, \textit{slab} \textit{blag} \textit{'reach'}). I should wish to treat these and other examples of \textit{bl} as a letter split with \textit{bl} except, e.g., \textit{plab}, \textit{plang}, \textit{plab} \textit{plag}, \textit{plab} \textit{ab}, \textit{plab} \textit{ab}. Although at first sight \textit{bl} \textit{bl} might seem a more appropriate symbolization of such forms as these, especially since \textit{bls} occurs in the orthography as an initial group, e.g. \textit{kda} \textit{kda} \textit{tions}, for which the corresponding Baltic initial is [\textit{bls}], a close parallel to [\textit{bls}], the proposed initial group \textit{bls} avoids symbolizing the \textit{zy} (\textit{zh}) and therefore seems to me to be preferable (cf. the corresponding analysis of \textit{obs} as \textit{ts}, in section (d)).

b. **\textit{bl}**- alternating with \( \textit{l} \), \textit{gl}., and \textit{ld}-

\( \textit{ge} \). **\textit{gl}**.-

A detailed account of the relations of \( \textit{d} \) and \textit{ld} (\textit{td}, \textit{ld}) (and a potential \textit{ld}-) with \( \textit{v} \), \textit{gl}, and \textit{ld}- (\textit{gl}, \textit{ld}, \textit{ld}-) has been given in order that it shall serve as a model for corresponding alternations in sections (b)–(e); these sections are, in consequence, somewhat less detailed.

Jachelle gives fourteen verbs in showing an alternation in spelling between a present form in \( \textit{dze} \) and some other form, past,
future, or imperative, with initial द- or containing द- in an initial group गः or बः (प्रशङ्कक); e.g.

i. present: दद्य
   other: दग्नि
ii. present: दो (imp. दो) दा (प्रशङ्कक) milk
   other: दग्नि
iii. present: दल (imp. द्वल) दव (प्रशङ्कक) weigh, etc.
   other: गद्वि
iv. present: दद्य
   other: बङ्गि, गङ्गि
   put
v. present: दद्य
other: देजि, गदेजि, दग्नि

For some of their forms others of the fourteen verbs go outside the four types of initial considered here, 'दः, तः, बः, and गः, and have forms in बः, दव, and (b) (प्रशङ्कक) (b) (प्रशङ्कक). Six have a perfect form in दः, three have imperatives in दः, and one has an imperative in (b) (प्रशङ्कक). All of these spellings except (b) (प्रशङ्कक) suggest affricate initials for these ten forms, either as simple sounds or as part of a group; but I shall restrict myself here to the spelling alternations exemplified at (i) - (v) above, and their phonetic implications. I might add to them a noise that shows the same type of alternation: 'देजि' (दे / देजि. "hoor'.

I take दः (प्रशङ्कक) to represent a homorganic nasal and affricate group, just as दः did in the case of दः (प्रशङ्कक); but I am on firmer phonetic grounds here, for that is the invariable pronunciation of this initial group in the current 'गः' and 'बः' pronunciation of this initial group in the current 'गः' and 'बः' (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक)

Initial तः. I interpret as fricative, whether single or grouped, in गः and बः (प्रशङ्कक) (प्रशङ्कक); and, as in the case of दः. In section (ii), I take it to have been formerly voiced. Whether simple or prefixed it is current pronunciation in spelling of गः and in reading I wish voicelessness (ि), in low-tone syllables; but voicing (ि), in former times, is supported by (ि) in the Bhat dialect of Bhat in such words as ब 'request',
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ling "field", and dam "mount", and by Sikkimese too, though only where the corresponding spelling is a group, gz- or bd- (قار-نگ-نگ). 

I analyse the dz.- or initial as containing a vayangahkhi. My grounds for doing so are the same as they were for the dz.- initial group of section (a); the vayangahkhi [dz-] of the initial group [ddz-] shares a lingual, or tongue, closure feature with the preceding nasal sound ([d]) and non-nasality with the following fricative ([z]).

It seems to me unlikely, therefore, that I could have been Thommi Sambhota in a previous incarnation; for, if I had had his opportunity of pioneering the Tibetan spelling, I should have wanted to spell the initials of the present forms of the verb shown at the beginning of this section not as dz.- but as dz-. The verbs shown there at (i) and (iv), for example, would then be regularized in spelling, as far as initial consonant symbols are concerned, though not the vowel symbols of the second example, as:

*shog; shog *shag blog glog log

If, then, I had been Thommi Sambhota, I should certainly have considered instituting the spellings that I have illustrated in these two examples for all the fourteen similar verbs given by Jischke, and might well have applied it generally to all syllables, whether noun, verb, adjective, or particle, that are at present spelt with dz-. In that case dz- would never, of course, have appeared in Tibetan writing at all; for all syllables now spelt with this initial group of letters would have been spelt* from the outset.

Again assuming that I were Thommi Sambhota, with a free hand to follow my feeling for the pronunciation and grammar of Tibetan wherever it might lead me, I might have gone further, and symbolized all words that at present have initial mdz-, rdz-, or lddz- (ماز-، راز-، لاز-) as dz-, rd-, or ldz- respectively (ماز-، راز-، لاز-), though here again, as I stated for mdz- and rdz- (ماز-، راز-) in section (a) above, there are no grammatical grounds that require this. That is to say, there is no alteration of symbols in grammatically different forms of the same verb in their case; and the only argument for treating them in this way is that of identifying the [dz-] features of the initial groups *[mdz-], [rdz-], and [lddz-] as vayangahkhi, and symbolizing such syllables as, for example, mdol 'meet', rdz 'barter', and lddz 'weight'.
If I had taken this course, there would no longer be any syllables spelt with the initial groups *dhi-*, *dhi-*, *dhi-*, and *dhi-*, but only those now spelt with the single initial letter *dr-*; e.g. *dr* 'teas', *dr*-be *dr* 'elder brother', *dr*-pa *dr* 'robber'.

c. 'drh'-alternating with *r*, *g*, and *(b)*- for the present form with the single initial *s*-m, or the groups *ks*- and *g*- ( *s*, *m* - ) that contain it, in other forms:

- Present: *dr*  *s*
- Other: *dr*-baby/boys, *dr*  *s*

- Present: *dr*  *s*
- Other: *s*  *s*

- Present: *dr*  *s*
- Other: *(b)*-man, *dr*  *(s)*

I take 'drh'- to represent a sound-group comprising homorganic nasal and affricate of the same type as *drh-* considered in section (a), except that where 'drh- symbolized voice and non-aspiration rah- symbolized voicelessness and aspiration. My only support for this assumption comes from the second syllable of Golok [birtente] 'borses', corresponding to ra-ra, though a spelling 'rha', in my opinion, be more appropriate than rha; nasality [rn] is an initial feature of this syllable not only in Golok but also, medially, in such a different dialect as the Lhasa; e.g. [rn] in ngi-rha 'we' *dr*-pa-rha 'the Bhutanese'. The pronunciation of *s*-m as *s* is not controversial; the spelling style pronunciation of *s* 'ground', for example, is [sa], and that of grum *sh* 'three' is [sum] (Balti and Golok [sium]).

The reader, by now familiar with my vaishnavadasi approach to alternation in the initial groups of symbols in the verb, will not be surprised to find that I analyse the initial *h*- as including a vaishnavadasi [hl], whence the t of the initial group of symbols *thh-, which I should therefore interpret as *thh*- *sh*.

The aspiration feature (hl) of the initial sound group *ahh-, symbolized by the h component of the group of symbols *ahh-, co-occurs with the nasality, and is therefore in a close relationship with it; being
automatic, it presents no difficulty to my analysis; if nasality, then also aspiration (the converse does not quite hold, because of the alternative form *tahbat (i)). This related nasality is, in the case of *tah-, homorganic (cf. also sections (a) and (b)); it is worth remarking in passing that an initial group *nah- also occurs, and that the nasality in such groups is non-homorganic and labial (*tah-b). Such a pronunciation is supported by the Golok *tah-ba 'take *tah.e.

The case for analysing the initial group *nah- as incorporating a *yudranabhātri, [-e], and therefore for treating it as *nah- *e-nā, is precisely the same as the case presented in sections (a) and (b) for treating *safer and *safer. (and *sār, *sār, and *lār; *lā- *lā-, *lā¬) as *yudranabhātri variants of *sār and *sār ( *sār, *sāw), except that in their case it is not aspiration but non-aspiration that automatically accompanies the nasality.

Given the *yudranabhātri type of analysis, then, verbs (i) and (iii) of this section, for example, could be regularized as:

* *nah-* tahlahlahbah bah; *nah-* tahlahlahbah bah.

alt; *nah-* tahlahlahbah bah; *nah-* tahlahlahbah bah.

d. *nah*- alternating with *lā*- and *lā-.

Fischke gives live verbs in which a present form in *nah- alternates with forms in *lā- and *lā- *lā- *lā-; e.g.

i. present: *lār a *lār rise
other: *lār

ii. present: *lār a *lār explain
other: *lār, *lār, *lār

There is also a verb in which *nah- alternates not with *lā- (and *lā-), but with *lār and *lār ( *lār, *lā¬), though Fischke queries the latter: present: *lār a *lār entrust
other: *lār, *lār (?) *lār, *lā¬

I have no wish to repeat ad nauseam the details of my approach to this problem of variation in the initial letter groups of different forms of verbs, and will content myself here with stating that (a) *nah-* and (b) *nah-* alternation ( *nah-* *nah- *nah- *nah-) is parallel to that of *nah- and *nah- (section (c)), even to the alternation of aspiration *nah-* *nah- in the present form with non-aspiration ( *nah-* *nah- *nah- *nah-) in the other forms, the aspiration secure being bound to nasality here too. I therefore take
'dr. to be a syaṭṭhābhatī initial group, and treat it as *dr*; this again enables me to regularize examples (i) and (ii) of Jeshke's five verbs of this type as:

*dr* dr, *dr* dbh, *dr* dbh.

Grounds for analyzing mth*.-* too as a syaṭṭhābhatī variant of *mth, *mth, are precisely the same as those stated for mth*.-* in section (c).

e. 'dr. alternating with r*: and (b)r,


Jeshke gives only one verb as having a present form in 'dr.-*dr., alternating with other forms in r*.


2. other: dr, rd; *dr, *dr, *dr.

he states that rd is the form in general use.

The spelling-style and reading style pronunciations of *dr.-*dr. are alike [ndr.], the place of articulation being not the teeth but the alveolar ridge, further back in the mouth; the corresponding pronunciation of r, [r.], is also alveolar, and with much friction. Analysed on the same basis as the variant verb forms in sections (a) - (d) 'dr. *dr, is treated as incorporating a syaṭṭhābhatī [d], symbolized as -d; I should therefore wish to regularize this verb as with present *r. *dr, and past form rd *dr, (also dhr *dr). It must be admitted, though, that this one example is a very slender basis on which to apply the syaṭṭhābhatī concept, it has, however, some support from an association of 'dr. *dr, with r* of a rather different type from that used in sections (a) - (d).

In those *earlier sections present form in 'dr., *dr., *dr., and 'dr. (td. *dr., etc. *dr., etc.,) and in this section a present form in 'dr., *dr., were associated with some other form, past, future, or imperative, spelt with either a single initial r, rd, r, or rd, and, in this section, r, *r, *r, *r, *r, or an initial group of letters containing one or other of these five, but such an association of 'dr. with r* can be supported by more than the single example shown at (i) above only if one associates not different grammatical forms of a single verb but the same grammatical forms of two relatable but independent verbs, one transitive and the other intransitive.
Such other words, apart from pairs of verbs, as 'дроl øe' 'roll' (intens.) and ni-ba=шш 'round', also support a relationship between 'drr' and 'r'. ...; the verb forms in (a) and (iii) above would then appear as:

i. trans. *rwl *w*; intrans. rwl øe.

ii. intrans. *qwel øe; trans. (j)wet(i) øe øe; (j)wet øe øe.

and 'дроl would appear as *qwl øe øe øe.'

These examples complete the exercise in which I have usurped the role of Thonmi Sambhota, and considered how greater attention to grammar, balanced by less attention to phonetic features, might have removed at least some irregularities from the thirty-three Tibetan verbs studied here.

Notes
1. W.S. Allen cites four different accounts of वाराहकस्ति from Sanskrit sources (Phonetics in ancient India, a guide to the appreciation of the earliest phoneticians, Oxford University Press, 1955, pp. 71-4, 84).
2. George Calloet, A Gaelic grammar, Glasgow, 1913, p. 70.
3. Symbols in square brackets are in the International Phonetic Alphabet, but with certain modifications that make for easier printing: these modifications are:

- [ts]: voiceless alveo-palatal affricate
- [f]: fricative
- [ɾ]: voiced " " affricate
- [l]: voiceless alveolar lateral
- [ɾ]: "rolled
- [n]: (voiced) palatal nasal

(in the English examples [t] and [ɾ] have not alveo-palatal but palato-alveolar values).
5. Szafier, id., pp. 703, 704. I have re-Romanized Szafier’s Tibetan examples in the following respects in order to have a uniform system of Romanization throughout this article: sh‘, sh‘, z‘ to sh, sh‘, and ‘ respectively (ě, ę, ę).  
7. R.K. Sprigg, ‘A tibeti mánalhangyaphesučalok fonetiká problémái’, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztlys Koll., 15, 1968, pp. 161-7 (trans. A. Roma-Tas), the text of a paper read before the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Budapest in May, 1963, on which occasion I learnt that the analysis I have pro-posed in the present article had also occurred to, and had the support of, G. Urasy, author of ‘Kelet-Tibeti nyelvgyársainak orszályozása’, Dissertationes Societatis Scientiarum Hungaricae, 4, Budapest, 1949. For the reason given in note 4, uniformity of symbolization, and also to emphasize the relationship between certain Tibetan initial letters that is essential to my argument, I have here re-Romanized the examples given there out of the Hungarian system of Romanization as follows: for Hungarian j, f, and ř respectively, dz, df, and t. (ě, ę, ę).  
8. Such an interpretation is supported, as far as the homorganic nasal is concerned, by the Golok and the Lhasa dialects of spoken Tibetan (R.K. Sprigg, ‘The role of A in the development of the modern spoken Tibetan dialects’, Acta Orientalis Hungaricae, XXI. 3 (1966), pp. 320-11) as well as that of the spelling-style pronunciation of written Tibetan, examples of which are given later in this section.  
9. Such an interpretation has the support of the Balti, Sikkimese, and Golok dialects: e.g. za ‘eat’, Balti and Golok [ę]: brang-ba ‘good’, Balti [ba]: opian-tsh geiz ‘Avواصلتهوأ’, Golok {gia}: Sikkimese [ř].  
10. In this respect the Sikkimese dialect forms something of a bridge between the more conservative Balti and Golok dialects and the less conservative Lhasa dialect: it has both [ř] and [ę] in k- and y- syllables, the former corresponding to the initial group y- and b-, and the latter to the single initial letter z- : e.g. [ř] in gya ‘sleep’, bu ‘make’; [ę] in zum-pa ‘bridge’, zung ‘copper’, za ‘eat’.  
11. See also ‘The role of A’, p. 311. My research assistant for Goloki, Dorep Rinpoche, of the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, preferred the spelling ‘dub-мо’ to Jacke’s mdsb-mo;
and his pronunciation of this word, with initial [mz] rather than [nz],
which occurs in Golok (cf. above later in this paragraph), supports
his preference.

12. Shafer, op. cit., p. 311: 'the common Shalti invention
of spirants and affricates in combination with 1'

13. On the pronunciation of the Greek letters see W.S. Allen,
Fax Graeca, Cambridge University Press, 1968, pp. 51-7

14. For examples from the spoken dialects Golok and Lhassa
that support this conjecture see 'The role of R' p. 311

15. Cf. note 10; Sikkimese, [z] in bday 'put', bding 'sit',
but [v] in fu 'request', fen 'ride'.

16. I have attempted [ndz] as being conjectural only, this
is because, in spite of the occurrence of ndz in spelling,
I have never in fact observed an initial sound group such as this in any
dialect; the only relevant example in my Golok material is nul or 'meet',
pronounced not with labial nasality ([ºndz]) but with homorganic nasality
([ndz]). The other two examples here, though, are supported
by Golok [ndz:] and Balti [lidiz], in each of which I take the [d:] to be
yadda madda. 
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