

On the etymological attribution of certain non-Tibetan lexical elements in medieval Tibetan texts

In the present article an attempt is made to etymologize certain lexemes, attributed by medieval Tibetan writers to the language of the Bruzha region. This language is widely believed to be related to Burushaski, though some scholars reject such a hypothesis as unfounded. The author demonstrates that the Bruzha vocabulary known to us from Tibetan texts is, apparently, etymologically heterogeneous, some words showing probable Burushaski cognates. The article also includes a special appendix dedicated to the etymological analysis of certain Zhangzhung lexical items for which Indo-Iranian origin seems to be the most likely.

Keywords: etymology; language contact; lexical borrowing; Bruzha language; Burushaski language; Indo-Iranian languages; Zhangzhung language; Tibetan language.

Medieval Tibetan texts of various genres contain a considerable number of non-Tibetan fragments. These fragments are of different length, ranging from a single word to a sentence. The longest of those are titles of texts and phrases of some dialogues occurring in travel accounts¹. Each fragment is always translated into Tibetan and supplied with an indication of the source language. Such languages include Sanskrit, Pali², Chinese, Mongolian as well as some lesser-known lects once predominant in areas contiguous to Tibet. The best studied of these lects is Zhangzhung, a Sino-Tibetan language³ spoken in the past in the northwest of the Tibetan Plateau and probably supplanted by Tibetan at the turn of the 1st millennium A.D. The only sources of reliable Zhangzhung data were and still are Zhangzhung-Tibetan bilinguals found in religious texts. The present article will primarily cover the lexical material of another language known exclusively from Tibetan written documents. This language, called Bruzha by the Tibetans, is alleged to have been vernacular in the area of same name usually identified with the Gilgit region of present-day North Pakistan.

The name Bruzha⁴ appears frequently in Tibetan literature, being used mostly as a toponym. Long ago Tibetologists noted the similarity of this name to the ethnonym Burusho, the self-name of Burushaski speakers. Whether or not this similarity has anything to do with linguistic relationship has for a long time remained an open question because no specimens of the Bruzha language were available to scholars. The situation changed in the mid-20th century, when the Czech orientalist Pavel Poucha discovered a Buddhist sutra with a trilingual title written in Tibetan, Sanskrit and Bruzha. The text of this title was published and studied in a special paper (Poucha 1960). Below we reproduce it in its complete form⁵:

¹ For more on such dialogues see, e.g. Roesler 2018.

² In Tibetan texts, Sanskrit is usually termed *rgya gar skad*, i.e. the language of India. This label could be applied also to Pali and even to New Indo-Aryan languages (Roesler 2018).

³ The Zhangzhung language is usually classified with the West Himalayish branch of the Tibeto-Burman group of the Sino-Tibetan language family. Its vocabulary seems to contain a number of borrowings from some Indo-Iranian, probably Dardic, source (Kogan 2021).

⁴ Alternative spellings are Bru zha, Bru sha, 'Bru shad, Bru shal, 'Bru shal and Sbru shal.

⁵ The three versions of the title are given in the same order as in the above-mentioned paper, i.e. first the Tibetan one, then the Sanskrit one, and finally the Bruzha one. Poucha's system of transcription is preserved unchanged, even though it differs in some points from the standard Tibetological and Indological transcription systems.

De-bžin-gśegs-pa thams-čad-kyi thugs gsañ-ba'i ye-śes don-gyi sñiñ-po rdo-rje bkod-pa'i rgyud rnal-'byor grub-pa'i luñ kun dus rig-pa'i mdo theg-pa čhen-po mñon-par rtogs-pa čhos-kyi rnam-grañs rnam-par bkod-pa žes-bya-ba'i mdo.

Sarva tathāgata čitta jñāna guhya artha garbha vyūha vajra tantra siddhi yoga āgama samāja sarva vidyā sutra mahāyāna abhisamaya dharmaparyāya vivyūha nāma sūtram.

Bru-ža'i skad-du. Ho na pan ril til pi bu pi til ti ta sid 'un 'ub hañ pañ ril 'ub bi su bad ri že hal pa'i ma kyañ ku'i dañ roñ ti.

Based on his analysis of the above Bruzha text, Poucha argues that Bruzha must have been a monosyllabic language. He also tries to establish lexical correspondences between Sanskrit and Bruzha, and offers the following hypothetical equations: Bruzha *pan* (*pañ*) *ril* = Skr. *sarva*, Bruzha *ti* = Skr. *sūtra*, Bruzha *'ub* = Skr. *āgama*, Bruzha *'ub bi* = Skr. *vidyā*, Bruzha *bu* = Skr. *tathāgata*, Bruzha *ta* = Skr. *tantra*, Bruzha *sid* = Skr. *siddhi*, Bruzha *su* = Skr. *sutra*⁶, Bruzha *'un* = Skr. *yoga*. Four of the listed Bruzha words, i.e. *bu*⁷, *ta*, *sid* and *su*, Poucha tentatively considers to be Sanskrit loans (Poucha 1960: 298). That is to say, he hypothesizes that Skr. *buddha*- 'Buddha', *tantra*- 'Tantra', *siddhi*- 'accomplishment, attainment' and *sūtra*- 'sutra' had been borrowed into Bruzha, the adoption in each instance being accompanied by the truncation of the second syllable, sometimes along with the coda of the first one. It cannot, however, be ruled out that we are actually dealing here not with a true phonological change but with some kind of abbreviation. If this be the case, it may mean that the monosyllabicity of the Bruzha language, supposed by Poucha, is in fact illusory. Rather, there may have existed a certain (traditional?) method of recording Bruzha material in an abbreviated form, applied perhaps not only to Sanskrit loanwords but to all lexical items irrespective of their etymology.

In his article, Poucha addresses the issue of possible relationship between Bruzha and Burushaski. He attempts to detect Burushaski lexemes phonologically similar to some Bruzha words, but finally finds his own lexical comparisons unconvincing⁸ and concludes that the theory that Bruzha is the early form of Burushaski should no longer be upheld (Poucha 1960: 299-300). Regardless of whether or not the latter statement is correct, Poucha's skepticism is quite understandable. The text fragment he has discovered, unfortunately, can by no means provide us with any material that might significantly help in the solution of the Bruzha-Burushaski problem. What is clear is that if the language of this fragment is really monosyllabic, it can hardly have anything to do with Burushaski. But if we are dealing with an abbreviated recording of a text in some non-monosyllabic lect, our ability to say anything definite about this lect is extremely limited because the only thing we know are initial syllables of certain words, whose exact meanings remain unknown. It goes without saying that in this kind of situation lexical comparison is a very risky affair. Perhaps this was the reason why studies related to the Bruzha language almost stopped for several decades after the publication of Poucha's paper. The only thing that could give new impetus to these studies is new material — and such material, albeit rather scarce, became available to scholars in the early 2000s.

In 2003 a work entitled "Zhang-zhung – Tibetan – English Contextual Dictionary", by Dagkar Namgyal Nyima, was published in Bonn (Nyima 2003). As is evident from its title, this

⁶ Poucha believes that if this equation be true, Bruzha *ti* must correspond not to Skr. *sutra* but to some other Sanskrit word (Poucha 1960: 298).

⁷ In Poucha's opinion, Bruzha *bu* is the first syllable of Skr. *buddha*- 'Buddha', and its correspondence in Sanskrit version of the title is *tathāgata* 'one of the Buddha's names (lit. 'one who has thus come')'.

⁸ Some of these comparisons really look strange. E.g. Poucha compares Bruzha *dañ* to Burushaski *dana* 'wise' (Poucha 1960: 300). The latter word is certainly a loan from Persian (cf. Classical Persian *dānā* 'knowing, wise') and must have been borrowed into Burushaski in Islamic times. The Bruzha text, however, must date back to the Buddhist period, which in the Burushaski-speaking area predated the Islamic one.

work is primarily a dictionary of the Zhangzhung language⁹. It, however, contains a number of lexical items belonging to other languages, including Bruzha. The importance of Dagkar Namgyal Nyima's dictionary is undoubtedly significant for researchers of both the Bruzha problem and Zhangzhung etymology; e.g., it provides some additional evidence on the Zhangzhung-Aryan language contact. Since this evidence has not been scrutinized thus far, I find it necessary to dedicate a special appendix to the present article to its analysis. The Bruzha material in the dictionary is represented by nine words, cited along with their Zhangzhung and Tibetan equivalents. The possible origin of each of these words will be discussed on the following pages, but before proceeding to particular etymologies, some general preliminary remarks should be made.

First of all, it should be borne in mind that the extant material is too scanty to say anything definitive regarding the origin of the Bruzha language. Indeed, one can hardly draw any final conclusion on this point, based on as little as nine etymologies¹⁰. It nevertheless seems possible to put forth a provisional hypothesis, answering the question if the source language of the words termed Bruzha in Nyima's dictionary can have anything to do with Burushaski. Another important fact is that the name Bruzha, as it is used by Tibetan authors, is apparently polysemous. Sometimes it functions as an equivalent of Skr. *dārada-* 'a Dard, Dardic'. E.g., in the Tibetan version of Lalitavistara (a Mahayana Buddhist sutra that tells the story of Gautama Buddha) Skr. *dāradalipi-* 'the Dardic script' translates into Tibetan as *bru zha'i yi ge* 'the script of Bruzha' (Laufer 1908). This means that the term in question may, at least in some cases, have been applied to certain geographical areas where Dardic languages were spoken and/or to the speakers of these languages. Therefore, the main issue addressed in the present work should be formulated as follows: do the extant lexical data give us reason to believe that the Bruzha language could have been an early form of Burushaski or some Dardic lect?

Several factors that may complicate the analysis of evidence from Nyima's dictionary are also worth mentioning. One of them is the potential loss of cognates to particular Bruzha lexemes or grammatical forms in modern Burushaski or Dardic. Another source of difficulty may turn out to be the Tibetanization of Bruzha material. This phenomenon has been attested in Zhangzhung (Martin 2010: 11–12). Essentially it consists of affixing Tibetan derivational morphemes to Zhangzhung roots, passing off certain Tibetan words as Zhangzhung ones, and last but not least, in writing some Zhangzhung words in accordance with Tibetan orthographic rules. This Tibetanized spelling cannot but make identifying the phonology of the respective word a challenging task. The way of transcribing non-Tibetan elements in Tibetan texts must have greatly depended on historical-phonological peculiarities of the author's or scribe's native dialect. The Bruzha words listed below are known to be drawn from a Bon religious text discovered, and most probably written, in Central Tibet¹¹. Therefore, sound changes characteristic of Central Tibetan varieties should be taken into account in our etymological analysis.

Each of the following etymological entries includes, besides the discussion of the etymology, an extract from Nyima's dictionary where the entry word appears. Such extracts are first

⁹ The dictionary includes rich Zhangzhung lexical material drawn from 468 textual sources, mostly sacred texts of the Bon religion. The total number of dictionary entries equals to 3875.

¹⁰ The actual number of etymologies may be even smaller because certain Bruzha words may defy etymologizing.

¹¹ All the Bruzha lexical items mentioned in Dagkar Namgyal Nyima's dictionary have been extracted from a single source-text called "*Rgyud thugs rje nyima'i man ngag ye shes zang thal*" in Tibetan (Nyima 2003). This text, included in the Bon canon, is believed to have been hidden at the time of the decline of Bon in the late 8th century A.D. and rediscovered in the 12th century by one Gu ru rnon rtse (Blezer 2008). This Buddhist lama is said to have excavated a cache of Bon scriptures by the river Rta-nag, a north tributary of Gtsang-po (Brahmaputra), west of the Tashilhunpo monastery in Central Tibet (Martin 1994: 28).

quoted in Tibetan and then translated into English. In cases where the original phonology of the Bruzha lexeme is hard to identify, possible phonological reconstructions are discussed. Etymologies are numbered consecutively and arranged in alphabetical order.

1. *bcud* ‘sperm, spot, sphere, energy nucleus, drop’ (= Zhangzhung *thig le*¹²).

zhang zhung skad du thig le / me nyag skad du gdung khu / bru zha’i skad du bcud / bod skad du chu mo rgyu khrag ‘in the language of Zhangzhung *thig le*, in the language of Menyag¹³ *gdung khu*, in the language of Bruzha *bcud*, in Tibetan *chu mo rgyu khrag*’ (Nyima 2003: 200).

The syllabic structure of the Bruzha word is typically Tibetan, and we can suppose with high probability that its spelling has been Tibetanized. In Central Tibetan dialects the initial cluster *bc* has lost its first component, and the final *d* is either devoiced to *t* or changed to the glottal stop with concomitant fronting of the preceding vowel¹⁴. Thus the original Bruzha form may be reconstructed as **čut* or **čür*. The former reconstruction finds evident etymological parallels in Burushaski and Dardic: Burushaski (Hunza dialect) *čhuṭ*, (Yasin dialect) *čut* ‘Tropfen’, Khowar *čoṭ*- ‘tropfen’ (Berger 1998: 102). Since the Khowar word has no apparent Indo-Iranian etymology it seems likely to be a Burushaski loanword.

2. *ha he a* ‘enlightened one, Buddha’ (= Zhangzhung *bhu dha*, Tib. *sangs rgyas*).

zhang zhung skad du bu dha / me nyag skad du lga bu she / bru zha’i skad du ha he a / bod skad du sangs rgyas ‘in the language of Zhangzhung *bhu dha*, in the language of Menyag *lga bu she*, in the language of Bruzha *ha he a*, in Tibetan *sangs rgyas*’ (Nyima 2003: 272).

Cf. Burushaski *hei-* ‘to know, understand (present stem)’ (Lorimer 1938: 198),¹⁵ whence *henas* ‘one who knows; wise; intelligent’, *henaskoš* ‘wisdom’ (Lorimer 1938: 199). The Burushaski verb shares several meanings with the Old Indian verb *budh-* ‘to perceive, recognize; wake up; know, understand, comprehend’, whose lexicalized perfect participle *buddha-* is the source of the name Buddha. It cannot thus be ruled out that the Bruzha form in question may translate, or rather render, the Sanskrit one.¹⁶ Its exact structure and semantics, however, are not quite clear.

3. *ha ye mu* ‘goddess’ (= Zhangzhung *de ban rgyung hrangs*, Tib. *lha mo*).

zhang zhung skad du de ban rgyung hrangs / me nyag skad du sangs sal tig / bru zha’i skad du ha ye mu / bod skad du lha mo ‘in the language of Zhangzhung *de ban rgyung hrangs*, in the language of Menyag *sangs sal tig*, in the language of Bruzha *ha ye mu*, in Tibetan *lha mo*’ (Nyima 2003: 227).

Etymology unclear. The connection with Burushaski *a(i)yaš* ‘sky, heaven’ (Lorimer 1938: 37) is semantically probable but phonologically problematic.¹⁷ The final syllable of the Bruzha word may be an adaptation of the Tibetan female marker *mo*. Interestingly, this marker seems

¹² The Zhangzhung word is, perhaps, etymologically identical to Tib. *thig*, *thig pa* ‘drop, spot’, *thig le* ‘spot, semen virile’.

¹³ Menyag is traditionally believed to be the Tibetan name of the Tanguts and their kingdom (Xi Xia).

¹⁴ In most spoken varieties of Central Tibetan, including the Lhasa dialect, the glottal stop is the regular reflex of word-final voiced dental and dorsal occlusives. However, in some dialects, traditionally classified with the Central group, e.g. in the Jirel dialect of Northeastern Nepal, Old Tibetan *d* and *g* are devoiced and reflected as *t* and *k* respectively. Cf. Jirel *sət* ‘to kill’ < Old Tibetan *bsad* (Bielmeier et al. 2018: 530), Jirel *qt* ‘is, are, has, have’ < Old Tibetan *yod* ‘to be, to exist’ (Bielmeier et al. 2018: 478), Jirel *p(h)ūk* ‘to pierce, to bore (a hole with a pointed instrument)’ < Old Tibetan *’bug, dbug, phug* (Bielmeier et al. 2018: 391). Dialects like Jirel in this particular case seem to have preserved the more archaic stage of phonological development.

¹⁵ Berger in his dictionary cites also the meanings ‘*erlernen*’, ‘*erkennen*’, ‘*wiedererkennen*’ (Berger 1998: 196).

¹⁶ The existence of derivatives meaning ‘wise’ and ‘wisdom’ may have been conducive to the choice of the root *hei-* for rendering the Sanskrit word meaning ‘enlightened’.

¹⁷ However, we cannot rule out that in some (now extinct) dialect of Burushaski earlier **ayaš* was regularly reflected as *(*h*)*aye*.

to have been borrowed into Burushaski¹⁸ where it is noted to be affixed to the Persian loan-word *khuda* ‘God’: *khuda-mo* ‘a female deity’ (Jettmar 2002).

4. lam ‘vein’ (= Zhangzhung *’dus pa*, Tib. *rtsa*).

zhang zhung skad du ’dus pa / me nyag skad du mu spungs shag / bru zha’i skad du lam / bod skad rtsa ‘in the language of Zhangzhung *’dus pa*, in the language of Menyag *mu spungs shag*, in the language of Bruzha *lam*, in Tibetan *rtsa*’ (Nyima 2003: 238).

The word is probably etymologically identical to Tib. *lam* ‘way, road’. Cf. Tib. *khrag lam* ‘vein, artery, blood vessel (lit. ‘blood way’)’.

5. rnam shes ‘mind’ (= Zhangzhung *rig pa*, Tib. *sems*).

zhang zhung skad du rig pa / me nyag skad du gsal dangs / bru zha’i skad du rnam shes / bod skad du sems (Nyima 2003: 354) ‘in the language of Zhangzhung *rig pa*, in the language of Menyag *gsal dangs*, in the language of Bruzha *rnam shes*, in Tibetan *sems*’.

Evidently, we are dealing here with yet another example of a Tibetan word passed off as a Bruzha one. Cf. Tib. *rnam shes* ‘perfect knowledge, consciousness, perceptions, cognitions’ (Jäschke 1881: 315). Zhangzhung *rig pa*, cited in the dictionary as a semantic equivalent of the Bruzha form, also seems to be of Tibetan origin (cf. Tib. *rig pa* ‘knowledge, prudence’).

6. rtsa drung ‘teacher of Bon’ (= Zhangzhung *this so rung*, Tib. *dpon gsas*).

zhang zhung skad du this so rung / me nyag skad du sheg / bru zha’i skad du rtsa drung / bod skad du dpon gsas (Nyima 2003: 201) ‘in the language of Zhangzhung *this so rung*, in the language of Menyag *sheg*, in the language of Bruzha *rtsa drung*, in Tibetan *dpon gsas*’.

Perhaps a clipped form of Tib. *rtsa ba drung po* ‘essentially wise, essentially judicious’¹⁹. For more on contraction of Tibetan polysyllabic word collocations to disyllabic words (“clips”) see, e.g. Beyer 1992: 92–95.

7. rung smar ‘Bon’ (= Zhangzhung *hos*, Tib. *bon*).

zhang zhung skad du hos / me nyag skad du rog rog / bru zha’i skad du rung smar / bod skad du bon (Nyima 2003: 415) ‘in the language of Zhangzhung *hos*, in the language of Menyag *rog rog*, in the language of Bruzha *rung smar*, in Tibetan *bon*’.

Etymology unclear.

8. se na phyod ‘breath’ (= Zhangzhung *ma ya mor ma*, Tib. *dbugs*).

zhang zhung skad du ma ya mor ma / me nyag skad du nye lo ha / bru zha’i skad du se na phyod / bod skad du dbugs ‘in the language of Zhangzhung *ma ya mor ma*, in the language of Menyag *nye lo ha*, in the language of Bruzha *se na phyod*, in Tibetan *dbugs* (Nyima 2003: 278).

In most Central Tibetan varieties, the cluster *phy* is palatalized to *čh*. In some dialects, however, this change did not take place²⁰. Since we do not know whether the extant copy of the text, in which the Bruzha word appears, was made before or after the palatalization, four alternative phonological reconstructions seem to be possible, i.e. *se na phöt*, *se na phör*, *se na čhot*, and *se na čhör*.

The first two syllables of the Bruzha lexeme may be compared with Burushaski (Yasin dialect) *šin*²¹, (Hunza dialect) *šī* ‘Atem, Schneuzen’ (Berger 1998: 407); for the last syllable cf. Burushaski *phu ét-* ‘blasen’ (Berger 1998: 334), Shina *phū thoikī* ‘to blow with mouth or bellows’

¹⁸ Cf., however, Burushaski *mu-*, *mo-* the human feminine 3 Sg pronominal prefix, and *-mo* the oblique case ending of nouns belonging to the human feminine noun class.

¹⁹ Cf. similarly formed Tib. *rtsa ba chen po* ‘essentially great; really holy’ (Roerich 1986: 190).

²⁰ Cf., e.g. Southern Mustang *čhā*, *čhē* ‘to ridicule, to deride, to jeer at’, but Kyirong *phyā*, *phyè*; *phyò*: ‘to blame’ < Old Tibetan *’phyā*, *’phyas*, *’phyos* ‘to blame, to criticize, to attach a fault to others’ (Bielmeier et al. 2018: 374), Shigatse *čhār* ‘to lift’, but Kyirong *phyār* ‘to winnow, to hoist, to lift up something to show it’ < Old Tibetan *’phyar*, *’phyar*, *’phyor* ‘to raise, to lift up, to hold aloft’ (Bielmeier et al. 2018: 375).

²¹ Final *ñ* in Burushaski is sometimes interchanged with *n* (Lorimer 1935: 9).

(Bailey 1924: 157), Khowar *pho* ‘the breath’, *phuyik* ‘to blow’ (Sloan 1981: 122), Kalasha *phuṣ* ‘breath’ (Trail, Cooper 1999: 243). Since phonological correspondences are unclear, the etymology should be considered highly hypothetical.

9. *zang zang lha* ‘gShen (Bon teacher)’ (= Zhangzhung *u pa ya*, Tib. *gshen*).

zhang zhung skad du u pa ya / me nyag skad du ni lde hrangs / bru zha’i skad du zang zang lha / bod skad du gshen (Nyima 2003: 435) ‘in the language of Zhangzhung *u pa ya*, in the language of Menyag *ni lde hrangs*, in the language of Bruzha *zang zang lha*, in Tibetan *gshen*’.

The etymology is not quite clear. May be of Tibetan origin. Cf. Tib. *lha* ‘god, deity’ and *zang zang lha brag* ‘a Bon sacred site in Northern Tibet (lit. ‘the divine rock of Zangzang’)’.

As is evident from the above list, Bruzha vocabulary is by no means etymologically homogeneous. All of its sources can hardly be named because some lexemes cannot be reliably etymologized at the current state of our knowledge. It should, however, be noted that one of these sources could well have been some early form of Burushaski. Such a possibility follows from the fact that some of the Bruzha words on the above list seem more or less likely to have Burushaski cognates (see etymologies 1, 2 and 8). Certainly, the tentative and purely hypothetical nature of our etymologies, as well as their very small number, prevents us from drawing final conclusions. Nevertheless, now we have some hints as to where the probable origin of a particular newly discovered Bruzha word should be looked for. If this word is not a Tibetanism (i.e. a Tibetan loan in Bruzha or a Tibetan lexical item passed off as a Bruzha one) Burushaski material must no doubt be consulted during its etymological analysis. Therefore, Poucha’s skepticism about a possible genetic relationship between Bruzha and Burushaski does not seem justified.

Appendix: a list of probable Indo-Iranian loanwords found in Dagkar Namgyal Nyima’s “Zhang-zhung – Tibetan – English Contextual Dictionary”.

The following list of Zhangzhung words likely to be borrowed from some Indo-Iranian source(s) other than Sanskrit is an addendum to the similar list published in Kogan 2021. Apparently, it can contribute to our knowledge of language contact in the historical region of Zhangzhung. As may be concluded from the lexical comparisons below, for some words on the list Dardic origin seems to be the most probable²². Etymologies are arranged in alphabetical order. For each Zhangzhung entry word its Tibetan equivalent is given in brackets after the English translation. Most of the Dardic, Nuristani and Indo-Aryan comparanda are drawn from R. L. Turner’s comparative dictionary (Turner 1966). For material taken from elsewhere data sources are usually specified after cited lexical items.

1. *a lo ke* ‘butter lamp (*mar me*)’ (Nyima 2003: 428). Cf. OIA *ālōka-* ‘brightness, splendour’, Pali *ālōka-* ‘light’, Bengali *ālo* ‘light, lamp, candle’, Oriya *āl(u)a* ‘light, brightness’. From the same root cf. also Av. *raoča-*, Ossetic *rūχs* ‘light’, Middle Persian *’brwc-* ‘to illuminate, kindle’, Shina *čalō* ‘lighted torch’ (< **pralōka-* (Turner 1966: 493)), Kalasha *luč, loč* ‘torch’ (< **lōčya-* (Trail, Cooper 1999: 189)), Pashai *lōkan* ‘light; lamp; torch; burning’ (Morgenstierne 1956: 108).

2. *ba da [spa ta?] ya* ‘to prostrate (*phyag ’tshal ba*)’ (Nyima 2003: 265), *pa ta ya* ‘revere, salute {prostrate}’ (Martin 2010: 138). Cf. OIA *patati* ‘flies, falls’, *pranipatati* ‘prostrates’, *padyatē* ‘falls’, Av. *patānti* ‘(they) fly’, *paidya-* ‘to fall’ (*paidyāte* 3 Sg Prs Conj), Khotanese *pat-* ‘to fall’, Persian *past* ‘low’, Kati *ptā* ‘he fell’ (< **patta-*), Khowar *porik* ‘to fall asleep, to fall, to lie down, to lie’, Kalasha *pālik* ‘to fall’ (Trail, Cooper 1999: 228). The source of the Zhangzhung word may

²² For more on the presence of the Dardic etymological stratum in Zhangzhung vocabulary see Kogan 2021.

be the reflex of some derivative (e.g. the perfect participle in *-ta-* or the verbal noun in *-ti-*) of PII **pad-* ‘to fall; go, tread’ or of PII **pat-* ‘to fly, fall’²³. As is widely known, the continuants of these two roots actively contaminated with each other in different Indo-Iranian languages. Dan Martin in his dictionary declares the Zhangzhung word an Indo-Aryan (“Indic”) loan (Martin 2010: 138–139) but theoretically a Dardic source also cannot be ruled out.

3. *dKar* ‘sheep (*lug*)’ (Nyima 2003: 273). The spelling of this word is most probably Tibetanized, which is often the case in Zhangzhung, and its actual pronunciation must have been *kar*. Cf. Shina *karēlū* ‘ram’ (Bailey 1924: 146), Indus Kohistani *karā* ‘a ram whose horns are turned inwards’ (Zoller 2005: 102),²⁴ Burushaski (Nager) *karéelo* ‘Widder’ (Berger 1998: 242). If the Shina and Indus Kohistani forms are etymologically related, the element *-ēl-* in Shina must be a suffix. The Burushaski word seems to be borrowed from Shina.

4. *dza la* ‘burning (*’bar ba*)’ in *ne ram dza la tan tra da do ci* ‘the Tantra of the burning fire-mountain (Tib. *me ri ’bar ba’i rgyud*)’ (Nyima 2003: 246). Cf. OIA *jvalati* ‘burns’, *jvarati* ‘is feverish’, *jvāla-* ‘flame’, Pali *jalati* ‘burns, shines’, *jāla-* ‘glow, blaze’, Hindi, Punjabi, Nepali *jal-*, Gujarati *jal-* ‘to burn’, Marathi *jal-* ‘to burn’, *jāl* ‘flame, fire, fever, passion’, Bengali *jāl-* ‘to burn’, *jal* ‘flame of a fire’, Nepali, Kumaoni *jwālo* ‘flame’, Prasun *jur-* ‘to burn’, Pashai (Areti dialect) *ǰāel* ‘flame’ (Morgenstierne 1956: 82), Bashkarik *jūl* ‘iron lamp’, Kashmiri *zāl* ‘fever’, Persian *zuvāl* ‘live coal’, Ossetic *ʷvzaly*, *ævzalu* ‘coal’ (Abaev 1989: 25). It cannot, however, be excluded that the Zhangzhung word is an orthographic variant of *dzva la*²⁵. In this case it should apparently be considered a Sanskritism.

5. *ka ma li* ‘sword, or in some regional dialects, hoe (*ral gri’am yul skad ’gar ’jor*)’ (Nyima 2003: 96). In Dagkar Namgyal Nyima’s dictionary the transcription of this word is marked with a question, which must mean that its real phonology is not very clear. The Zhangzhung lexeme may be somehow related to words for ‘sword’ and ‘dagger’ in some Iranian and Dardic languages (cf. Sogdian *xyr* (Christian), *xnyr* (Manichaean), *γnyr* (Buddhist), Persian *xanjar* ‘dagger’, Wakhi *xingar* ‘dagger, sword’, Shina *khāñār* (Bailey 1924: 147), Indus Kohistani *kha(n)gār* (Zoller 2005: 120),²⁶ Palula *khangaár* (Lilljegen, Haider 2011: 83), Khowar *khongor* (Morgenstierne 1973) ‘sword’, Kalasha *khangár* (Trail, Cooper 1999: 159) ‘scimitar, sword’). The irregular *m* of the second syllable may have resulted from a scribal error: in the cursive *ume* (*dbu med*, lit. ‘headless’) form of the Tibetan script, in which Bon texts were commonly written, the characters conveying *ma* and *nga* are very similar and could therefore be easily confused.

6. *pi pi ling* ‘medicinal herb (*sman zhig*)’ (Nyima 2003: 252). The transcription is marked as questionable in the dictionary. Cf. Ladakhi *phololing* ‘a local variety of wild mint’ (Norman 2010: 579), Purik *phopholiñ* ‘wild type of mint’ (Zemp 2018: 47), Burushaski *filal* ‘mint’ (Lorimer 1938: 155), *phalál* (Yasin) ‘Pfefferminz’ (Berger 1998: 329), Shina *philiil* id., Indus Kohistani *phimili* ‘a kind of mint’ (Zoller 2005: 291–292). The source of the Zhangzhung as well as Northwestern Tibetan words may have been either Burushaski or some Dardic dialect.

7. *po yo* ‘ox (*glang*)’ (Nyima 2003: 280), ‘the ox, the bull’ (Tenzin et al. 2008: 141). Martin in his dictionary denies the meaning ‘ox’ and argues that the Tibetan gloss should be read as *klad* instead of *glang*, the real meaning of the word thus being ‘brain’ (Martin 2010: 141). If, how-

²³ In Old Indo-Aryan the perfect participle of *pad-* was formed with the suffix *-na-* (*panna-*) but in Old Iranian it seems to have been formed with the suffix *-ta-*. Cf. Persian *past* ‘low’ < Proto-Iranian **pasta-* ‘fallen’.

²⁴ The Indus Kohistani form is, perhaps, semantically influenced by some cognate of Burushaski *karóoyo* ‘mit nach innen gebogenen Hörnern’ (Berger 1998: 242).

²⁵ Cf. *tsi ti dza la / tsi tsi dzva la* ‘leprosy (*mdze nad*)’ (Nyima 2003: 318).

²⁶ The Shina and Indus Kohistani words are feminine. This fact suggests that they may have developed from an earlier form with final long *ī* (**khangarī*). This final vowel may have been reflected in the above-cited Zhangzhung form *ka ma li*.

ever, Dagkar Namgyal Nyima's interpretation is correct, the Zhangzhung lexeme may be related to Ladakhi *po-ze* 'ram, full-grown male sheep' (Norman 2010: 540) with *po-* < PII **paśu-* 'cattle' (> OIA *paśu-*, Av. *pasu-* id., Pashto *psə*, Ossetic *fis* 'sheep')²⁷. The above-cited form *po yo* has probably developed from earlier **pa yu* with *y* < *ś* in intervocalic position. The latter phonological change seems to be regular for Aryan loanwords in Zhangzhung (Kogan 2021).

8. *pri* in *pri di* 'hungry ghosts (*yi dvags*)' (Nyima 2003: 128) and *pri par* 'hungry ghost (*yi dvags*)' (Nyima 2003: 257). Cf. OIA *prēta-* 'dead, deceased; ghost, evil spirit'. The phonology of the Zhangzhung word suggests that it can hardly be a direct loan from Sanskrit. Rather it has been borrowed from some spoken Aryan language. A true Sanskritism would have sounded more like **pre ta*.

9. *she ru* 'antelope (*rna ba*)'²⁸ (Nyima 2003: 377). The Tibetan gloss of this word is homonymous with the word for 'ear'. Perhaps for this very reason the Zhangzhung lexeme was wrongly translated by some authors as 'ear' (Martin 2010: 223; Tenzin et al. 2008: 264).²⁹ In Dagkar Namgyal Nyima's dictionary, however, it is explicitly stated that "in Zhang-zhung the antelope is called either *tse-ze* or *she-ru*" (Nyima 2003: 347). Cf. OIA *śarabha-*, Pali *sarabha-* 'a kind of deer', Sindhi *sarahu* 'a kind of mountain goat', Assamese *xara* 'the swamp deer', Pashai (Laurowani dialect) *šaró*, (Areti dialect) *šarū*, Shum. *šāru* 'ibex', Gawar-Bati *sārōu*, Kalasha *šāra*, Khowar, Bashkarik *šara*, Palula *šarūi*, Shina *šārǎ* 'markhor', Kati *šurú* 'the wild goat or markhor'³⁰.

10. *sñi rtse* 'spear (*mdung*)' (Nyima 2003: 249). Phonologically, perhaps, rather = *ñi tse* with Tibetanized spelling. Cf. OIA *nikṣ-* 'to pierce' (*vi-nikṣe* 'in order to pierce'), *nekṣaṇa-* 'sharp stick, spear', Khwarezmian *nš* 'spear', Middle Persian *nyyš* 'spike', Persian *nēš* 'sting'. Indo-Aryan *kṣ* and Iranian *š* reflect here Proto-Aryan **ćš*.³¹ The latter cluster appears to have developed to a voiceless dental affricate in the Aryan lect from which the Zhangzhung word has been borrowed.

Abbreviations for language names

Av. — Avestan; OIA — Old Indo-Aryan; PIE — Proto-Indo-European; PII — Proto-Indo-Iranian; Skr. — Sanskrit; Tib. — Tibetan.

References

- Abaev, Vasily I. 1989. *Istoriko-etimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka. Tom IV*. Leningrad: Nauka.
 Bailey, T. Grahame. 1924. *Grammar of the Shina language ("Royal Asiatic Society, Prize Publication Fund", vol. VIII)*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
 Berger, Hermann. 1998. *Die Burushaski-Sprache von Hunza und Nager. Teil III. Wörterbuch Burushaski-Deutsch, Deutsch-Burushaski. Unter Mitarbeit von Nasiruddin Hunzai*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
 Beyer, Stephan V. 1992. *The classical Tibetan language*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

²⁷ For details see Kogan 2019; Kogan 2020.

²⁸ Tib. *rna ba* can also mean 'Tibetan wild sheep' (Roerich 1985: 109).

²⁹ The Zhangzhung word for 'ear' is *ra tse* (Martin 2010: 204). For its etymological connections within Tibeto-Burman see, e.g. Matisoff 2001.

³⁰ The Kati word is probably borrowed from some Dardic source. Otherwise, one should expect initial *c* instead of *š*.

³¹ According to Edelman (2015: 443), OIA *nikṣ-* 'to pierce, perforate', Proto-Iranian **naiš-* : *niš-* 'to pierce, stab, cut, sting' < Proto-Aryan **nai(ć)š-* : *ni(ć)š-* < PIE **neig'h-s-* : **nig'h-s-*.

- Bielmeier, Roland, Chungda Haller, Felix Haller, Katrin Häslér, Veronika Hein, Brigitte Huber, Thomas Preiswerk, Nawang Tshering, Manuel Widmer, Marius Zemp. 2018. *Comparative dictionary of Tibetan dialects. Vol 2: Verbs*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Blezer, Henk. 2008. sTon pa gShen rab: six marriages and many more funerals. *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 15: 421–479.
- Edelman, Dzhoi I. 2015. *Etimologičeskij slovar' iranskix jazykov. T. 5 (l—n)*. Moskva: «Nauka – Vostochnaja literatura».
- Jäschke, Heinrich A. 1881. *A Tibetan-English dictionary with special reference to the prevailing dialects*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Jettmar, Karl 2002. The Northern Areas of Pakistan: an ethnographic sketch. In: Karl Jettmar. *Beyond the Gorges of the Indus. Archaeology before Excavation*. Oxford University Press.
- Kogan, Anton I. 2019. On possible Dardic and Burushaski influence on some Northwestern Tibetan dialects. *Journal of Language Relationship* 17/4: 263–284.
- Kogan, Anton I. 2020. Notes on the historical phonology of Indo-Iranian loanwords in Northwestern Tibetan dialects. *Journal of Language Relationship* 18/3-4: 261–275.
- Kogan, Anton I. 2021. Towards the reconstruction of language contact in the pre-Tibetan Upper Indus region. *Journal of Language Relationship* 19/3: 153–165.
- Laufer, Berthold. 1908. Die Bru-ža Sprache und die historische Stellung des Padmasambhava. T'oung Pao, Second Series 9/1: 1–46.
- Liljegren, Henrik, Naseem Haider. 2011. *Palula vocabulary*. Islamabad: Forum for Language Initiatives.
- Lorimer, David L. R. 1935. *The Burushaski language. Vol. I. Introduction and grammar*. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Lorimer, David L. R. 1938. *The Burushaski language. Vol. III. Vocabularies and index*. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Martin, Dan. 1994. *Mandala cosmogony: human body, good thought and the revelation of the secret Mother Tantras of Bon*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Martin, Dan. 2010. Zhangzhung dictionary. *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 18: 5–253.
- Matisoff, James A. 2001. The interest of Zhangzhung for comparative Tibeto-Burman. In: Y. Nagano, R. LaPolla (eds.). *Bon Studies 3, New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Morgenstierne, Georg. 1956. *Indo-Iranian frontier languages. Vol. III. The Pashai language. 3. Vocabulary*. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Morgenstierne, Georg. 1973. Sanskritic words in Khowar. In: Georg Morgenstierne. *Irano-Dardica*: 256–272. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Norman, Rebecca. 2010. *A dictionary of the language spoken by Ladakhis*. Ms. (unpublished draft).
- Nyima, Dagkar Namgyal. 2003. *Zhang-zhung – Tibetan – English contextual dictionary*. Bonn.
- Poucha, Pavel. 1960. Bruža – Burušaski? *Central Asiatic Journal* 5/4: 295–300.
- Roerich, Y. N. 1985. *Tibetan-Russian-English dictionary with Sanskrit parallels. Issue 5. Edited by Y. Parfionovich, V. Dylykova*. Moscow: Nauka Publishers, Central Department of Oriental Literature.
- Roerich, Y. N. 1986. *Tibetan-Russian-English dictionary with Sanskrit parallels. Issue 7. Edited by Y. Parfionovich, V. Dylykova*. Moscow: Nauka Publishers, Central Department of Oriental Literature.
- Roesler, Ulrike. 2018. Rgya gar skad du – “in Sanskrit”? Indian languages as reflected in Tibetan travel accounts. In: *Festschrift für Jens-Uwe Hartmann zum 65. Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von Oliver von Criegern, Gudrun Melzer und Johannes Schneider*. Wien.
- Sloan, Mohammad Ismail. 1981. *Khowar-English dictionary*. Peshawar: Printing Corporation of Frontier Ltd.
- Tenzin, Pasar Tsultrim, Changru Tritsuk Namdak Nyima, Gatsa Lodroe Rabsal. 2008. A Lexicon of Zhangzhung and Bonpo terms. In: Y. Nagano, S. G. Karmey (eds.). *Bon Studies 11, Senri Ethnological Reports 76*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Trail, Ronald L., Gregory R. Cooper. 1999. *Kalasha dictionary with English and Urdu compiled by Ronald L. Trail, Gregory R. Cooper*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaidi-Azam University, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Turner, Ralph L. 1966. *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*. Oxford University Press.
- Zemp, Marius. 2018. *A grammar of Purik Tibetan*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Zoller, Claus P. 2005. *A grammar and dictionary of Indus Kohistani. Volume 1: Dictionary*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

А. И. Коган. Об этимологической атрибуции некоторых нетибетских лексических элементов в средневековых тибетских текстах

В статье делается попытка этимологизации некоторых лексем, относимых средневековыми тибетскими авторами к языку области Бружа. По мнению многих исследователей, этот язык является родственным бурушаски, однако некоторые ученые отвергают данную гипотезу как необоснованную. Автор демонстрирует, что известная из тибетских текстов лексика языка бружа, по всей видимости, этимологически неоднородна, причем некоторые слова обнаруживают возможные соответствия в бурушаски. Статья снабжена специальным приложением, посвященным этимологическому анализу ряда слов шангшунгского языка, для которых представляется вероятным индоиранское происхождение.

Ключевые слова: этимология; языковые контакты; лексические заимствования; язык бружа; язык бурушаски; индоиранские языки; шангшунгский язык; тибетский язык.