The term *svarabhakti* 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 a consonant, to another consonant, commonly a fricative (or spirant) consonant; following in the footsteps of 'the earliest phoneticians' I wish to introduce the complementary term *svayamabhaṅgha* 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, *svarabhakti* 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).

Svarabhakti 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.

Talvich gern m. Green hill, is in Scottish C.S. (Common Speech) spoken and written as Tuluiochgorum (more correctly Taluiochgorum).

A close parallel to the Scots Gaelic pronunciation of *gern* 'green' as though it were *gorum* or *gorim* is provided by the well-known cry of the *d* of the *d*-vowel in Hindi 'dor ... garm ... gamd', in which *garn* will in all probability, as least in its first occurrence in this small quotation, be pronounced with a *svaraḥbhakti*, as though it were: *garm* with two syllables to the ear though only one appears to the eye; for the *svaraḥbhakti* here has not achieved recognition in Hindi spelling.

For *svayamabhaṅgha*, on the other hand, English readily provides examples in pronunciation, and, unlike my Hindi examples, even admits them into the spelling. Thus, whereas some speakers (including myself) pronounce *Hammer* and *Hammered* with a sequence of two medial consonant sounds [hm] and [ms] respectively, others pronounce them with a sequence of three consonants, [mpc] and [mpn], the [p] being *svayamabhaṅgha*, sharing the labial feature with the [m] but the voicelessness
feature with the [a] or [o].

Etymology: favour the former type of speaker, and requires such spellings as *Hammen* and *Hamstead*, compounded from Old English *ham* 'dwellings' (cf. house with Old English *hæm*), *enclosure*, *farm*, *town*, and Old English *stæl* 'place', but the latter type of speaker has triumphed over the etymology, for the established spelling has clearly given orthographic status to the *ya-skun-shi* [-p-]. In this paper I shall suggest that in Tibetan too *ya-skun-shi* has triumphed, and that the incorporation of a *ya-skun-shi* 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 consonant 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: *Verb root* remain constant in most Sino-Tibetan languages. But diversity of form reaches the extreme in Old British (classical Tibetan) where 39 positional prefixes of the verb is necessarily constant—whether consonantal prefixes, consonantal initial, medial vowel, "final" consonant, or "ruffled" consonant.4 Shaffer takes up this challenge by attempting to provide both the comparative grammarian and the beginning student in Old British with "something like 'combinations' 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 initial initials in the perfect---: s'thur for 'tree'; s'fi, s'ni; st'rur; st'lor, for 'escape'; st'dig, st'i 'he roasted'; st'dag, st'gag: im. st'dag 'go-in'; st'hno, et. im. on 'live'; st'dag, and be on the decline'; and probably 'cheer, see 'say'." It is verbs of this type, in which affricate initials alternate with fricative initials (Shaffer's 'subtract initials'), that I wish to analyze in terms of *ya-skun-shi*; indeed, I have already made a beginning elsewhere, though without using the term *ya-skun-shi*, taking as my example the following four verbs, the upper line compressing the present form, and the lower line the perfect forms, of the same four verbs, except that according to Fiechter, *sng* is also an 'alternative present form'.4

*dtag* *starg* *stup* destroy *sngag* plant *sded* plant enter

In the article in which I gave these examples limitations of time and space prevented me from illustrating *ya-skun-shi* in Tibetan, with more examples than those four, which exemplify only the following two out of a total of five types:
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a. 'de: alternating with (a)dr. (a)de: (c)de:.

b. (a)dr. (b)de: (c)de: (a)dr.

The three additional types that I need to recognize are:

c. 'th: alternating with (b)dr. (c)dr.

d. 'th: (a)dr. (b)dr. (c)dr.

e. 'th: (a)dr. (b)dr. (c)dr.

In Fleckke's Dictionary I find nine verbs in which a present form in the initial two-letter group, 'de: alternates with other forms, past, future, and imperative, in which the initial either is the single letter (a)de: or contains the letter (a)dr: in the groups (a)de: and (a)de: (c)de:).

1. present: 'deq (a)dr
   other: (a)deq, geq (c)eq, (a)eq

2. present: 'deq (a)dr
   other: (a)deq, eq, deq

3. present: 'deq (a)dr
   other: (a)deq, eq, deq

4. present: 'deq (a)dr
   other: (a)deq, eq, deq

In the case of one of these verbs the alternation of 'de: with (a)de: is in the present form itself: 'drols and zigs (c)eq, (a)eq) 'plant'; this same verb, and two others, alternate with forms in (a)dr: in the perfect: 'drols, zigs, (a)eq, (c)eq) 'plant', 'brid, zud, eq, eq, p: 'put into', bnum, zir, eq, eq, 'shet'; and the two last also alternate with (a)de: in the imperative: 'tud, ztum (a)eq, eq) '. There is, in addition, another form, apparently not a verb, in which 'de: alternates with (a)dr: 'drols, zigs, eq, eq, eq, eq, 'braidy'.

At the time when the orthography was devised, I took 'drols: (a)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 (palatally): thus, both sounds have in common the feature of complete closure in the mouth by the tongue. I take (a)dr: on the other hand, whether alone, as (a)dr, or in the initial groups (a)dr: and (a)dr: (eq, eq) to have had the value of a fricative ([f]); and therefore no closure in the mouth. From a comparison of the nasal-and-affricate group ([d]p) with the fricative ([f]) or groups containing the fricative ([f]), I conclude
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that the non-nasal closure [t] of the [nde] group is a *syaḥpanabhati,
 a glide, sharing the closure feature with the preceding nasal ([d]) and the
 non-nasal feature with the following fricative ([z]), i.e. in [d(ə)z].

closure non-nasality
[...] [z]

Accordingly, I should have preferred to see initial 'dz. *dz.,
which is a *syaḥpanabhati spelling, replaced, at least for the nine verbs
with alternating forms in 'dz- and (g)h-je-, by *d* instead, with the result
that, for example, 'dzon and 'dzin ( *d'zun, *d'zin) would be spelt *'zon
and *'zin ( *'d'zon, *'d'zin), and that their initial letters would cease
to alternate. Their forms would then appear as follows:

*'zon (g)h'on g'on, *'zin (h)h'on h'on, h'on, h'ong h'ong nong nong
*'zin (n)h'on h'on, h'on, h'ong h'ong nong nong

In my analysis I have ascribed a nasal-and-fricative value to the
initial group 'dz-*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 Rinzing Wangpo (1956: *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 affricate ([nde]) but as a sequence of nasal and fricative ([dz-]), e.g.
'dzin not as *[nde] but as *[ndzin], without a *syaḥpanabhati. 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 *syaḥpanabhati, and therefore as
supporting my interpretation of orthographic 'dz-*dz as the *syaḥpanabhati
form of what is to be regarded simultaneously as *d* and *dz. For such
an interpretation I am obliged to assume that 'dz.* was pronounced
in former times as a voiced consonant ([z]); but this assumption presents
no great difficulty, for the *z of the orthography corresponds to the
voiced consonant [z] of the more conservative Tibetan dialects, e.g.
ram-po 'bridge', zangs 'copper', Rablal [2]: z hang 'eat', gpo 'planet', Golek
[z] 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).

Rinzing Wangpo's pronunciation of initial 'dz. *dz., not as
[nde] but as [nde] in reading and spelling written Tibetan does not

go un-supported; the Khaza dialect has [me] corresponding to the 1st of the spelling, though only in certain types of syllable junction within the word, e.g. sh- 'dein' 'eclipse', dāsidh 'smile', shān 'deing 'ladder';  So do Esh, 2x, 2x, 2x, 2x, 2x, 2x; so too does Golok, but with the difference that in Golok the [tə] features are not confined to a medial position but occur initially in such words as mde-mo (or mdo-mo) 'fingers', Nöön 'assemble', and (') 'deam-ling' 'world.' Consistently with this nasal-and-fricative pronunciation corresponding to 'tə-tə'. Golok has a nasal-and-fricative pronunciation [mə], not nasal-and-fricative (*[mde]), corresponding to the initial group mde- of th; spelling; e.g. [mə] mtra 2x 'thak' (hybrid).

It may be that syllables spelt with 'da-mt. (and mde-mt.)' fluctuate in pronunciation from [mə] to [mət.] (and [mə] to [mdet.]), 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 -th such as lunch, branch, and rhin fluctuate between a syllabific pronunciation with nasal and fricative ([mdt]) and a pronunciation with nasal and fricative ([mt]), as though spelt *lunch, *branch, etc.

Whatever the likelihood of a fluctuation in the pronunciation of 'da-mt. between nasal and affricate and nasal and fricative, it is evident that adopting an alphabetic scheme of the Sanskrit type, the varna samanta-ya, for Yietan has had the effect of widely separating the affricate [2x] from the fricative [t], for da- is in that scheme is grouped with tri and tuba (t, t), and separated from su, which is grouped with fia, fia, and yo (y, y, y). As I hope I have been able to show, the morphology of the verbs considered in this section (a) requires them at least to be closely associated, or, preferably, unified through the representation of *da-mt as *da. *sug.

The same sort of symbolism could be extended to forms currently written with initial groups mde- and rde-*, e.g. mad 'de', mde*dove', rde* press, rde* be finished (see, rde*, rde*, rde*), which would then be spelt *mde, mde, rde, and rde* (*mde, mde, rde, rde*). I am not, however, able to advocate this change of symbolism on the same grounds as for 'da- and (g)/r-*, because verbs with initial mde- and rde do not show any alternation in form as between mde- or rde- and (g)/r (see 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 *mde-
and *Sr. respectively, are those of constancy with the proposed change from 'de-' to 'St.', 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 Jellicke's Dictionary, only nineteen. They alone would remain.

Although the initial group srde- occurs in Tibetan orthography, and is by no means rare, and although both idz- and idz- (Lz., Zt.) occur (section 68), e.g. relde 'forget', ldong 'valley', 'region' (fr., v.), there is no such initial group of letters *Idel- *Sr.,. A corresponding initial sound group to this non-existent group of letters, [Idz-] does, however, occur in the Buriat dialect; it corresponds to the existing initial group of letters zr- q., e.g. [Idz-] zla-ba 'month', [Idz-] zby 'cause to return'. This Buriat initial sound group I should analyze exactly as for *[Idel-]. In terms of yedgjanabah, the closure [z] being related to the partial closure of the preceding [l]. The appropriate spelling for this sound group would, therefore, be not the yedgjanabah spelling *Idel-. but *Sr-. The above two Buriat examples would, accordingly, be spelt *Idel-ba *Sr. (better, perhaps, *Sr.(+)-), and *Sr-.

Since, however, the corresponding spelling to this Buriat initial sound group is not *Sr- but *Sr-, the Buriat 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 *[Sr]. The spelling order zl- is itself, though, anomalous, and hardly a satisfactory basis for the postulated metathesis: while there is indeed an initial group zl-, which therefore contrasts with *Sr-, nowhere else in Tibetan orthography is there a corresponding contrast. The letter r is common in the initial groups *Sr-, *Sr-,

cr-, cr-; *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-. e.g. spn, sho, mnl, mnn, mn, mnr, *Sr-, *Sr-, cr-, cr-, cr-r; but there are no corresponding, and contrasting, initial groups *Sr- *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-, *Sr-.

The initial group *Sr- is, clearly, without parallel in Tibetan orthography; it is not, therefore, surprising that in none of the spoken dialects is there a corresponding pronunciation *[Sr-] (or, with yedgjanabah, *[Sr-]). The word-initial features corresponding to *sr- in the Buriat, Golok, and Lhasa dialects, well in the reading and spelling styles of pronouncing written Tibetan are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buriat</th>
<th>Golok</th>
<th>Lhasa</th>
<th>Reading-style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Idz-]</td>
<td>rdSr-</td>
<td>d- (low tone)</td>
<td>m- (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 əl- might have been adopted as a digraph to symbolize some such initial sound group as [bts], as in the corresponding form in Balto, a remarkably conservative dialect, and that, accordingly, əl- was regarded as a single pronunciation unit, like the Greek letters αλε (for [bts] for *[db]s*) and πι (for [ps]), and not as a succession of the two units and *i* in that order; or (ii) that əl- represents an early compromise symbolization of widely different pronunciation features from different dialects, 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 Oxford English Dictionary uses a special phonetic symbol to indicate that such words as grass, past, and caste are pronounced by North-country speakers with a short vowel, the same vowel as in last, but by other speakers with a long vowel, the same vowel as in guard.

The same explanation might also stand for the corresponding voiceless Baltic initial group [bts] (ibl) here used as a digraph for a single sound, a voiceless lateral, as in including a *vjshnabchi* [ š], where this sound group corresponds to the spelling *vl*- (cf. *avl*), e.g. *svaš* (slov [svm] *reach*), clng *vla* *raise*, ibl ibl *reach*. # should then wish to treat these and other examples of əl- as better split with əl-vue, e.g. *uš* *long*, *uš* (vuv [wuv], vuv [wuv]), although at first sight it may seem to be a more appropriate symbolization of such forms as these, especially since əl- occurs in the orthography as an initial group, e.g. *tkrs* (tvo *tom*), for which the corresponding Baltic initial is [bts], a close parallel to [bts], the proposed initial group əl-xx uxx avoids symbolizing the vjshnabchi [ š] and therefore seems to me to be preferable (cf. the corresponding analysis of *svaš*- as 's-*s-* in section (i).)

b. əl-* alternating with *l-, *yl-, and *yl-

A detailed account of the relations of *dx- and *dx-* (dx-) (and a potential *dx-*) with *x-, *x-, and *dx- (x, x-, x-) has been given in order that it shall serve as a model for corresponding alternations in sections (b)- (c); these sections are, in consequence, somewhat less detailed.

Jarchke gives fourteen verbs as showing an alternation in spelling between a present form in 'əl-* and some other form, past,
future, or imperative, with initial ।- or containing ।- in an initial group ।– or ।– (\(\ddot{s}h\),\(\ddot{b}\)); e.g.

i. present: \(\ddot{d}\dot{d}g\) ।- ।- establish
other: \(\ddot{d}g\) ।-

ii. present: \(\ddot{d}\) (imp. \(\ddot{d}\)) ।- (\(\ddot{r}\)) milk
other: \(\ddot{d}\) ।-

iii. present: \(\ddot{d}\ddot{l}\) (imp. \(\ddot{d}\dot{l}\)) ।- (\(\ddot{r}\)) weigh, etc.
other: \(\ddot{d}\dot{l}\) ।-

iv. present: \(\ddot{d}\ddot{g}\) ।- ।- destroy
other: \(\ddot{g}\ddot{g}, \ddot{g}\ddot{d}\) ।-

v. present: \(\ddot{d}\ddot{d}\) ।- ।- put
other: \(\ddot{b}\ddot{d}, \ddot{g}\ddot{d}, \ddot{d}\) ।-

For some of their forms others of the fourteen verbs go outside the four types of initial considered here, \(\ddot{d}\ddot{l}\), ।-, ।-, and ।–, and have forms in ।-, ।-, and (b) ।– (\(\ddot{r}\), \(\ddot{r}\), (\(\ddot{r}\)) ।–). Six have a perfect form in ।-, three have imperfectives in ।-, and one has an imperative in (b)।-. All of these spellings except (a) 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 note that shows the same type of alternation: ।- ।- \(\ddot{d}\ddot{k}\) ।- ।- \(\ddot{k}\) ।- ।- ।- ।- ।-

I take ।- to represent a homorganic nasal-and-affricate group, just as \(\ddot{s}\ddot{d}\) in the case of ।–; but I am on firmer phonetic ground here, for that is the invariable pronunciation of this initial group in the current spelling-style and reading-style pronunciations; e.g. ।- ।- \(\ddot{d}\ddot{k}\) ।- ।- ।- ।- ।- ।- ।- ।- ।- ।- ।- ।-

I have never observed an alternative sequence comprising homorganic nasal and fricative (\(\ddot{f}\ddot{f}\)) for initial ।- (but compare section (a), \(\ddot{d}\ddot{l}\)), though such a sequence would not be un-welcome.

Initial ।-. I interpret as fricative, whether single or grouped, in ।– and ।– (\(\ddot{s}\), \(\ddot{r}\)); and, as in the case of ।–. In section (a), I take it to have been formerly voiced. Whether simple or prefixed it is current pronunciation in spelling and in reading is with voicelessness (।-), in low-tone syllables; but voicing (।-), in former times, is supported by ।- in the Skardu dialect of Balti in such words as ।- 'request',
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fng 'field', and kmt 'mount', and by Sikkimese too, though only where the corresponding spelling is a group, gh- or bh- (ghn- or bhn-). 15

I analyse the 'gh- or bh-' initials as containing a s\$i\$anabho\$iti. My grounds for doing so are the same as they were for the 'gh- or bh-' initial group of section (a): the s\$i\$anabho\$iti [-d-] of the initial group [ghn-] shares a lingual, or tongue, closure feature with the preceding nasal sound ([\$n-]) and non-nasality with the following fricative ([\$f-]).

It seems to me unlikely, therefore, that I could have been Thonmi 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 'gh- or bh-' but as 'gh- or bh-'. 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:

*fug s*\$ug s\$ug s\q\$ug s\$ug

ghn- q\n\$n- q\$n- q\$n- q\$n- q\$n-

If, then, I had been Thonmi 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 'gh- or bh-'. In that case 'gh- or bh-' 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 'gh-' from the outset.

Again assuming that I were Thonmi 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 m\$d-, r\$k-, or l\$f- (m\$d-, r\$k-, l\$f-) as md-, \$k-, or lf- respectively (md-, \$k-, l\$f-), though here again, as I stated for md- and rd- (md-, rd-) in section (a) above, there are no grammatical grounds that require this. That is to say, there is no alternation 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 [-d-] features of the initial groups *[md-], [rkd-], and symbolizing such syllables as, for example, m\$b\$l- 'meet', r\$k\$d- 'barter', and l\$f\$d- 'weight'.
If I had taken this course, there would no longer be any syllables spelt with the initial groups ạ, ạ, ạ and ṭ, but only those now spelt with the single initial letter ṭ, e.g. ṭā = 'tea', ṭo-he ṭā = 'elder brother', ṭo-pha ạu = 'robber'.

The groups ṭe- and ṭa- (ạ, ạ, ạ) contain the in other forms:

- i. present: ạhāhā, ạhāhā, ạhāhā
  other: ạhāhā, ạhāhā, ạhāhā

- ii. present: ạhāhā, ạhāhā, ạhāhā
  other: ạhāhā, ạhāhā, ạhāhā

I take 'āhāhā to represent a sound group comprising homorganic nasal and affricate of the same type as ṭe- and ṭa- considered in section (a), except that ṭe-, symbolized voice and non-aspiration, symbolized voicelessness and aspiration. My only support for this assumption comes from the second syllable of 'older brother', corresponding to ạhā, though a spelling 'ạhā' would, in my opinion, be more appropriate than ạhā; nasality [ʕn] is an initial feature of this syllable not only in Golok but also, mediately, in such a different dialect as the Lhasa; e.g. [ʕn] in ngi- ạhā 'we' ạhā-pa- ạhā 'the Bhutanese'. The pronunciation of ạ- as [ʕn] is not controversial; the spelling-style pronunciation of as 'ground', for example, is [sa], and that of gram ạ Lahore 'three' is [sum] (Balti, and Golok [sum]).

The reader, by now familiar with my vajrayānabhakti approach to alternation in the initial groups of symbols in the verb, will not be surprised to find that I analyse the initial 'ạhā' as including a vajrayānabhakti [I], whence the ẹ of the initial group of symbols 'ạhā', which I should therefore interpret as ẹh. ẹh.

The aspiration feature [bh] of the initial sound group [ạhā], symbolized by the h component of the group of symbols ạhā, co-occurs with the nasal, 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 *ṭhaisat (i). This related nasality is, in the case of *ṭhais-, homorganic (cf. also sections (a) and (b)); but it is worth remarking in passing that an initial group *mth-. also occurs, and that the nasality in such groups is non-homorganic and labial (*mθh-). Such a pronunciation is supported by the Golok *mθwθ 'lake' *mθh-.

The case for analysing the initial group *mθh- as incorporating a *x̑aṅγaḥkāra. [-x], and therefore for treating it as *mθh- *x̑aarthi, is precisely the same as the case presented in sections (a) and (b) for treating *mθjaj-v. and *mθjaj-v. (and *x̑o-, *ȓa-, and *aţh-); *x̑o-, *x̑o-, *x̑o- as *x̑aṅγaḥkāra variants of *x̑o- and *aţh- (*mθh- *mθh-), except that in their case it is not aspiration but non-aspiration that automatically accompanies the nasality.

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

- *x̑o- *x̑o-, *x̑o-, *x̑o- *x̑o- *x̑o-, *x̑o-, *x̑o-
- *x̑o- *x̑o-, *x̑o-, *x̑o-

Jäckle gives five verbs in which a present form in *x̑o- alternates with forms in *x̑o- and *x̑o-; e.g.

i. present: *x̑o- *x̑o- rise
   other: *x̑o-

ii. present: *x̑o- *x̑o- explain
   other: *x̑o- *x̑o-

There is also a verb in which *x̑o- alternates with *x̑o- (and *x̑o-), but with *x̑o- and *x̑o- (x̑o-, *x̑o-), though Jäckle queries the latter:

present: *x̑o- *x̑o- entrust
   other: *x̑o- *x̑o-

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 noting that the (a) and (b) *x̑o- alternation (x̑o-, *x̑o-) is parallel to that of *x̑o- and (section (c)), even to the alternation of aspiration (mθh- *mθh-) in the present form with no-aspiration (mθh- *mθh-) in the other forms, the aspiration occurring being bound to nasality here too. I therefore take
to be a sycamorshahi initial group and treat it a 'dr, 'dis, 'dil, 'dil; this
again enables me to regularize examples (i) and (ii) of Jesseke's five
verbs of this type as:

\* 'dr, 'dis, 'dil, 'dil
\* s'pax, ss'k, s'pax, s'pax

Grounds for analysing mdr-ssr too as a sycamorshahi variant
of *mdr, *msr, are precisely the same as those stated for mdr-ssr in
section (c).

e. 'dr: alternating with r- and (h)dr-
\* 'dr
\* r-
\* (h)dr-

Jesseke gives only one verb as having a present form in 'dr-ssr,
alternating with other forms in r-

i. present: mdr
\* s'pax

other: ddr, r-
\* s'k, s'k;

he states that r-
- is the form in general use.

The spelling-style and reading-style pronunciations of *mdr-ssr
are alike [mdr-], 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) ddr s'pax is treated
as incorporating a sycamorshahi 'dr and symbolized as -dr-; I
should therefore wish to regularize this verb as with present
*mdr, *msr, and past form r-
s'pax (also ddr s'pax). It must be admitted, though,
that this one example is a very slender basis on which to apply the
sycamorshahi concept; it has, however, some support from an association
of *dr-ssr with r- of a rather different type from that used in
sections (a) - (d).

In those four earlier sections present form in *dr-ssr, *dr, *sr,
and *sr- (a*., s'k, s'k, s'k.), and in this section a present
form in 'dr-ssr, s'pax were associated with some other form, past, future, or
imperative, spelt with either a single initial r, s, r, or s, 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-ssr 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.
present perfect  present perfect
ii. 'dril  'dril  *sy*  sy
   ral  *sy*  be torn intrans.
iii. 'd-bris  *sy*  *sy*  be mixed intrans.
    are  black  *ó*  mix  trans.

Such other words, apart from pairs of verbs, as 'dril  *sy*
'roll' (trans.) and ni-l-ba  *kwi*  'round', also support a relationship
between 'dr.' and  *sy*  ( *kwi*  *kwi*  ).

If this small list of forms in section (i) seems sufficient to warrant
it, initial 'dr.'  *sy*, when associative with r-  *sy*, could again be
handled as incorporating a syllabarylight, and therefore structurally
equivalent to  *sy*  r-  **sy**; the verb forms in (ii) and (iii) above would
then appear as:
   ii. trans.  *sy*  *sy*; intrans.  ral  *sy*;
   iii. intrans.  *sy*  ( *kwi*  *kwi* ); trans.  (i)ot(i)  (ii)  (iv).

and 'dril would appear as  *sy*  ( *kwi*  *kwi*  ).

These examples complete the exercise in which I have usurped
the role of Thomas 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 parabhati
from Sanskrit source(s) (Phonetics in ancient India, a guide to
the appreciation of the earliest phoneticians, Oxford University
Press, 1953, pp. 75-5, 86).
3. Symbols in square brackets are in the International
Phonetic Alphabet, but with certain modifications that
make for easier printing; these modifications are:
   [t̮]:  voiceless alveo-palatal affricate
   [ʃ]:  voiced  "  fricative
   [d̮]:  "  affricate
   [l̮]:  voiceless alveolar  lateral
   [ɾ]:  rolled
   [n̮]:  (voiceless) palatal  nasal

   (in the English examples [t̮]and [ʃ] have not alveolo-palatal but palato-
alveolar values).
4. Robert Shaver, 'Studies in the morphology of Bodic verbs',
5. Skafer, id., pp. 707, 704. I have re-Romanized Skafer's Tibetan examples in the following respects in order to have a uniform system of Romanization throughout this article: d' to d, t' to t, sh to sh, tsb, and ' respectively (准, တား, and ').


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 Hungarín j, f, and z respectively, dz, dz, and l (准, တား, and ').

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. Spigg, 'The role of R in the development of the modern spoken Tibetan dialects', Asia Orientalis Hungaricae, XXI, 3 (1966), pp. 310-11) 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 Balii, Sikkimese, and Golok dialects: e.g. za 'eat', Balii and Golok [r]; bang-ba 'good', Balii [ba]; opan-tas gezi 'Awalokitesvara', Golok [gi]; Sikkimese [r].

10. In this respect the Sikkimese dialect forms something of a bridge between the more conservative Balii and Golok dialects and the less conservative Lhasa dialect; it has both [r] and [l] in k-w-tone syllables, the former corresponding to the initial groups gi- and ba-, and the latter to the single initial letter l; e.g. [l] in gi-z 'sleep', bas 'make'; [r] in samb-la 'brigde', zeni 'copper', za 'eat'.

11. See also 'The role of R', p. 311. My research assistant for Goloki, Dzodrub Rinpoche, of the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, preferred the spelling 'dabb-foo to Útchke's ndab-foo;
and his pronunciation of this word, with initial [m:] rather than [mu:],
which occurs in Golok (cf. also later in this paragraph), support his preference.

13. Shafer, op. cit., p. 311: 'the common Shalti invention
of spirants and affricates in combination with [p].
14. On the pronunciation of the Greek letters see W. S. Allen,
15. For examples from the spoken dialects Golok and Lahwa
that support this conjecture see 'The role of R.' p. 311.
15. Cf. note 10, Sikkimese, [z] in dhug 'put'; dzhug 'sit',
but [ζ] in lu, 'request'; leu 'ride'.
16. I have avoided [med:] as being conjectural only, this
is because, in spite of the occurrence of med in spelling,
I have never in fact observed an initial sound group such as this in any
dialect; the only relevant example in nor Golok material is senal 'meet',
pronounced not with labial nasality ([mmed:]) but with homorganic nasality
([med:]). The other two examples here, though, are supported
by Golok [red:] and Balti [dhar], in each of which I take the [-d-]
to be yodhinashada.