Tibetan √lan ‘reply’
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Recognising the parallelism between the conjugation of a verb such as √lug ‘pour’ (pres. ldug, past blugs, fut. blug, imp. lhugs ‘pour’ and a verb such as √kru ‘wash’ (lkhrus, bkrus, bkrn, khrus), Li Fang-Kuei suggests deriving the present stem ldug from a reconstruction *hlug (1933: 149). In this sub-case of Conrady’s law, the change of *hl to ld- may be analyzed into the following changes: *hl > *hld > *ld > ld (cf. Conrady 1896: 59, Li 1933: 149, Hill 2011: 446–447, Hill 2013: 193–195). This sound change obscures the synchronic relationship between verb forms beginning with ld- and other present formations, and the resultant synchronic opacity gives rise to analogical forms (e.g. the alternate present blug). Consequently, the dictionaries present a certain level of confusion about the paradigms of lateral initial verbs.

In many cases enough of the traditional lexicographical sources present enough of the etymologically correct stems for the pattern to emerge despite the noise. For example, a root √lud ‘give to drink’ on the model of lkhrus, bkrus, bkrn, khrus ‘wash’, should have the stems *ldud (< *hlud), *blud, *blud, *lud. Hill (2010: 159) presents the following paradigm for this verb on the basis of nine lexicographical sources; the digit following each stem is the number of lexica which report that form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pres. ldud (5)</th>
<th>blud (4)</th>
<th>lhud (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past. blud (1)</td>
<td>blud (6)</td>
<td>ldud (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fut. ldud (3)</td>
<td>blud (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. lhud (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority rule yields the paradigm ldud, blud, blud, blud, nearly what morphology predicts. The imperative lhud given in one source most closely matches the predicted *lud;1 although majority rule in some cases yields the right answer, is not a reliable method. In other cases the traditional lexicographical sources unanimously divide a verb into two, where morphological analysis suggests that the stems originally belong to a single paradigm. Thus, the dictionaries offer ldad, bldad, bldad, ldod ‘chew’ and blad, blad, blad, blod ‘chew’ as distinct verbs, where the morphology suggests the single verb ldad, blad, blad, *lod ‘chew’.

1The voiceless imperatives lhugs (from √lug ‘pour’) and lhud from (√lud ‘give to drink’) in place of predicted *lug and *lud, commends the devoicing of laterals in the imperative to further study. This phenomenon is perhaps to be compared with voice alternating verbs of the type hgens, bkan, sgsan, khsn ‘fill’ (cf. Hill 2014). However, the formation of the future of voice alternating verbs with g- rather than b- weighs against this comparison.
The paradigms suggested by morphology are hypotheses; only in two cases have textual attestations confirmed the validity of such hypotheses.\(^2\)

Traditional paradigm: klog, bklags, bklag, klogs (lhogs)  
Correct paradigm: klog, blags, klag, lhogs (cf. de Jong 1973, Hahn 1999)

Traditional paradigm: klub, bklubs, bklub, klubs  

Attestations from Old Tibetan and the Kanjur allow \(\sqrt[\text{v}]{\text{lan}}\) ‘reply’ with the paradigm \(\text{ldon}, \text{blan, glan, lon}\), to be added as a third member to the list of lateral initial verbs for which philological attestations confirm the expected morphological stems against the analysis of the dictionaries.

The dictionaries give \(\text{ldon}\) ‘return, answer, reply’ as an invariant verb (Hill 2010: 160); they also give a verb with the confused paradigm pres. \(\text{glan/glon}\), past \(\text{glan}\), fut. \(\text{glan/glon}\), imp. \(\text{glan/glon}\) ‘patch, answer’ (Hill 2010: 39–40). Morphological analysis suggests that these stems are better arranged into one verb \(\text{ldon, blan, glan, lon}\) ‘answer’; appropriate attestations of all four stems are not difficult to find.\(^3\)

Examples (1) and (2) show \(\text{ldon}\) attested as a present stem.

\[(1)\quad \text{mi} \text{rtsod-ci} \text{dni-ba} \text{dris kyi} \text{inan-thos-kyi-theg-pas} \text{lan mi} \text{ldon-te ci-nas} \text{sans-rgyas-kyi ye-shes} \text{mion-par rzogz-par htsha} \text{nya-ba de Ita-bur} \text{lan} \text{ldon-no/} \]

Although they asked questions and did not argue, the Śrāvakas do not reply, they reply (with the question) how to be perfectly liberated in the manifest wisdom of the Buddha (*Saddharmapundarika-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, Derge Kanjur vol. 51, page 106a)

\[(2)\quad \text{Kau-} \text{si-ka-kyis} \text{Lha} \text{h} \text{bu-zla-ba} \text{h} \text{di-} \text{nīd-la} \text{dris-} \text{īg-da} \text{h} \text{. di-} \text{nīd-kyis khyod-la} \text{lan} \text{ldon-no/} \]

O Kaushika, ask thou this very Devaputraacandra and he will answer thee (*Trayaśtriṃśat-parivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra* Derge Kanjur vol. 63: page 141a)

In the first clause of example (1) the negation with \(\text{mi}\) ensures that \(\text{ldon}\) is either present or future; the context precludes a future reading (i.e. ‘to be replied’). In the second clause of example (1) and in example (2) the suffix \(-\text{no}\) rather than \(-\text{to}\) precludes the past and the context again weighs against the future.

Examples (3) and (4) show that \(\text{glon}\) is an alternate present stem to the verb ‘answer’.

\[(3)\quad \text{don} \text{de-} \text{lta} \text{bas-na} \text{nas} \text{mdo-sde kun-las} \text{nāhi} \text{hkhor-du} \text{gtogs-pa} \text{ni} \text{drin-la} \text{lan} \text{glon-no} \]

For that reason I answer the questions of my disciplines from all the sūtras (*Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*, Derge Kanjur vol. 52, page 128a)

\(^2\)A similar correction to the paradigm of one rhotic initial verb is also available. The verb ‘to write’ has the traditional paradigm: \(\text{h. bri, bris, bri, bris}\), but the etymological paradigm is: \(\text{h. dri, bris, bri, ris}\) (cf. Hill 2005). Relying on the type of analysis offered here for ‘give to drink’, ‘chew’, and ‘understand’ Jacques posits four paradigms for verbs with rhotic initials, without philological confirmation: \(\text{h. drid, brid, brid, *rid}\) ‘deceive’, \(\text{h. drud, brus, bru, *rus}\) ‘dig’, \(\text{h. dreg, breg, breg, *regs}\) ‘shave’, \(\text{h. drad, brad, brad, *rod}\) ‘scratch’ (cf. Jacques 2010).

\(^3\)As Jäschke points out these verbs ‘answer’ are cognate to the noun \(\text{lan}\) ‘an answer’ (1881: 292, 543), guaranteeing that the root has a vowel ‘\(a\)’ and not a vowel ‘\(o\)’. The verb ‘answer’ often appears in a figura etymologica ‘answer an answer’ with this noun.

Children are nurtured by their parents and definitely obliged to honour them accordingly, repaying with care for the elderly. Given their birth, they shall have to repay and do what they can. If for example even the children of wild animals and birds repay the kindness of their parents, why speak of the children of humans? (*Dialogue of two brothers*, PT 1283, ll. 242‒245, Imaeda et al. 2007: 169)

In example (3) the suffix *-no* rather than *-to* again precludes the past and context weighs against the future. In example (4) no tell-tale syntactic sign assures that *glon* is a present, but the generic reading weights against the past (cf. Zeisler 2004: 334‒337) and the occurrence of *glan* as a future in the same passage, precludes that *glon* is the future. If *glon* is not the past or the future, then it must be the present.

Examples (5) and (6) show *blan* attested as a past stem.


If with ill will, indolence, or scorn toward those who come to ask about the textual tradition of dharma and the code of conduct newly taught [by] Boddhisattvas, they do not answer the questions of each one, they will fall [into hell]. (*Dharmamudrā*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 66, page 83a)

(6) **de-nas hjam-dpal la-sogs-pahi bya'i-chub-sens-dpa'i tshogs de dag-gis kya ʰde ʰžin-du tshigs-su bcd-pa de-thid-kyis lan blan-to/**

Then, the assembly of Boddhisattvas, Maṇjuśrī etc., answered in verse like that (*Mahābhārata-parivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, Derge Kanjur vol. 63, page 119b)

The use of the negation prefix *ma* (in example 5) and the use of the suffix *-to* (in example 6) ensure that *blan* is a past stem form.

Examples (7) and (8) show *glan* attested as a future stem.

(7) **khyed-kyis lan glon-ziin kha gdag-par i gnañ żes**


(8) **skyes-na slar lan glon-ziin chi-nus-gyis bya-bahi rigso / /**

Given their birth, [children] shall have to repay [their parents] and do what they can. (*Dialogue of two brothers*, PT 1283, ll. 243‒244, Imaeda et al. 2007: 169, cf. example 4)

In example (7) the coordination of *glan* with the future stem *gdag* (from the verb *ḥdogs, btags, gdag,* *thogs* ‘vanquish’)⁴ ensures that *glan* is itself a future stem. In example (8) the coordination

---

⁴Hill (2010: 149) on the basis of slim evidence divides this verb from *ḥdogs, btags, gdag, thogs* ‘tie, fasten’, but the two are certainly to be identified etymologically.
of glan with the future bya (from the verb byed, byas, bya, byos ‘do’) ensures that glan is itself a future stem.

Examples (9) and (10) show lon attested as an imperative stem.


The venerable beloved monk Subhûti [said] this: “bodhisattva mahāsattva Maitreya, if you say you give answers regarding the intention, then give an answer re the intention, Invincible [Maitreya]!” (Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā, Derge Kanjur vol. 33, page 197a)

(10) brtan-po gân-dan gân-dag mía-bo che-chen-poh mdo ñan-par ḫod-nas lhags-pa de-da bdag-gi mía-bo che bsgrags-pa gsan-nas dri-ba deh. i lan lon-cig!

Whosoever is steadfast, having come to hear the sūtra of the great drum, now, having heard the great beating of my drum, give answers to the questions! (Mahābhārata-parivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra, Derge Kanjur vol. 63, page 119b)

The imperative suffix -cig suffixed to lon ensures that in both examples 9 and 10 this stem is imperative.

These textual attestations demonstrate that paradigm of ‘answer’ is ldon ∼ glon, blan, glan, lon ‘answer’ as morphological analysis suggests. This case study shows that morphological analysis when confirmed by philological attestations, can bring order to the apparent chaos that the dictionaries sometimes present.
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