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An examination of the verb *bri “to write” as it occurs in Old Tibetan texts reveals that the original conjugation was *dri (pres.), *bris (past), *bri (fut.), *ris (imp.). When Cr- clusters became retroflexes (i.e. *dri > *d and *bris > *d) the verbs *bri “to write” and *dri “to ask” became homophonous. At that point the prefix b- of *dri, *bris, *bri, *ris “to write” was reanalyzed as part of the root, and extended by analogy to the spelling of the present stem, in order to graphically differentiate *dri, *bris, *dri, *bris “to ask” from “to write” (newly spelled) *bri, *bris, *bri, *bris. This discovery is brought specifically to bear on the interpretation of line 68 of the east face of the treaty inscription of 821-822.

As the earliest attested of the Tibeto-Burman languages, Old Tibetan is not only important in the study of Tibetan language and history but also has unique importance for the entire Tibeto-Burman language family. Unfortunately most comparative studies which use Tibetan material rely on Classical Tibetan dictionaries rather than relying directly on Old Tibetan texts. Benedict in the first sentence of his discussion of the Tibeto-Burman b- prefix draws particular attention to the verb *bri “to write” as an exception to the generalisation that Tibetan “prefixes b- is characteristically found with the ‘perfect’ [past1] root of verbs” (1972: 110; brackets mine). More recently Matisoff opines that Tibeto-Burman had a root *b-ray “draw / write” (2003: 132). As will be shown here, the b- in the present stem of *bri “to write” never represented a linguistic reality in Tibetan, and should therefore not be considered in comparative research.

Many imperial Tibetan stone inscriptions refer to their own creation with a formula such as rdo rings la bris “written on the stele”. A reminiscent phrase occurs in the 68th line of the east face of the treaty inscription of 821-822, which stands before the Gtseg-lag-khang in Lhasa, but instead of bris the text has *dri. Richardson (1985: Index) sees this as an orthographic variant for *bri. He reads the text thus:

[68] rdo rings la *drl ba’i spyan yang// nga’i pho nga thabs//’gu
[69] shi cung shIn g yod pa// do tshe’e dang// thab can shan de b+’u yod pa//
[70] li khri b+’u la stogs pas byas so// (1985: 116)2).
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1) The work of Zeisler (2004) should put to rest once and for all that the semantics of the Tibetan verb stems has anything to do with “aspect”
And an examination of this inscribed stone pillar was made by the Chinese envoys Do tse’e, who has the rank of ‘Gu Shi Cung Shing, and Li Kri [sic.] B’u, who has the rank of Tsan Shan De B’u, and others (1985: 117).

Presumably one reason Richardson found his explanation persuasive is that ‘dri and ‘bri are homophonous in many modern dialects. However, it is improbable that they were homonyms at this early period. Also, the spelling bris is met with just a few lines earlier at line 65; it is unlikely both that an imperial inscription would contain a spelling mistake, and that a single scribe would change his spelling erratically. Richardson suggests comparison with Thomas (1935-65: II, 74, lines 19 and 22), where the spelling ‘dri occurs twice in a single document.


copyists for the Chinese scripture up to eighty scribes and twenty revisors were sent (1935-65: II, 76).

/ slad kyis / blon Khong bzher lastsogs [22] mngan rmams dbang po la khungs phyung ste / da dung tu Bod kyi dar ma ‘dri ba’i [y]i ge ... [23] p ... thob ste / phyag rgya nod tu gsal // (1935-65: II, 74; italics and brackets in original).

Afterwards, Councilors Khong-bzher and the other authorities having entered upon power, we once more beg to receive a signature for obtaining ... scribes copying Tibetan scripture (1935-65: II, 77).

Richardson and Thomas both give ‘dri as an equivalent of ‘bri in their indices, although nowhere in their corpora is the form ‘bri actually attested; in contrast, the past bris and the future bri occur with some frequency. In the Old Tibetan contracts studied by Takeuchi the syllables ‘bri po and ‘dri each occur only once. Takeuchi sees ‘bri as an orthographic mistake for ‘bring-po ‘the middle’ (1995: 209-11). He explains that ‘dri is a mistake for ‘bri ‘to write’:


[In order to pay the loan Shang he’do] borrowed in advance [from Bung dze-weng] two hundred bolts of long-bolt paper, which was in the hands of Bung dze-weng for the purpose of copying [sutras as] an offering (1995: 181; brackets in original, cf. also 182 n. 2).

Two dictionaries (Das 1902 and Zhang 1985) acknowledge ‘dri as an alternative pres-

2) In this and all other citations of Tibetan I follow the “extended Wylie” transcription system, with the exception that the gigu verso is here written as <f>.
ent of 'bri. Not only does this ‘alternate’ prevail in Old Tibetan, but in all of the Old Tibetan documents hitherto studied 'bri is nowhere found with the meaning ‘to write’, but 'dri is found with this meaning at least four times. 3)

In contrast to Richardson, Li and Coblin suggest that in the aforementioned inscription 'dri has its expected meaning ‘to ask’, and is part of a larger syntagme 'dri-ba'i spyan with the meaning ‘supervisor’. They read the text thus:

[68] rdo rings la 'drl ba'i spyan yang // rgya'I pho nya thabs // 'gu
[69] ... [yo]d pa // do tse'e dang // ... yod pa/
[70] ...byas so // (1987: 51 brackets in original).

As supervisors of the long stone, the Chinese envoys Do Tse’e (i.e. Tu Tsai), having the rank of ‘gu...’, and ..., having..., did ... (1987: 99; parenthetical comment in original).

The analysis of Li and Coblin is not wholly satisfactory. I am unable to confirm the meaning ‘supervisor’ for this concatenation of words. In addition, because the expression genitive it would be more likely to have the sense “the spyan of the rdo rings la ‘drl ba” instead of “‘drl ba'i spyan of the rdo rings”. If the meaning of ‘dri is indeed ‘ask’ the phrase must translate as “the Chinese envoys did the spyan (eye) of the asking to/on/at the long stone”. Finally, it is unclear how Li and Coblin would clarify the examples put forward by Thomas and Takeuchi.

I would like to suggest that Richardson’s analysis is correct, but that ‘dri is not a simple error, but rather the genuine early spelling of the present tense of the verb ‘to write’. This verb is plainly related to the noun ri-mo ‘a drawing’. The root of the verb can be either ri or bri, and if the root were bri we must account for the loss of the b- in the word ri-mo. If however the root were ri, not only would the past bris and the future bri be regular, but the present stem ‘dri would be the expected result of the epenthesis *

Li gives the following examples, and explanation to show that roots in r have a present tense in 'dr.

'drul ba “to become putrid, rot”, pf. [past] rul or drul, cf. rul ba “to rot, get rotten.”
'dral ba “to tear to pieces, rend asunder”, pf. [past] ral or dral, cf. ral “rent, cleft.”
'drud pa “to drag, pull along the ground”, pf. [past] drud, cf. rud “a falling or fallen, mass (in landslide, avalanche)”.
'dril ba “to be turned, rolled around”, pf. [past] dri, cf. ril ba “round, globular.”
'dre ba “to be mixed with”, pf. [past] 'dres, cf. sre ba, bsres “to mix with, mingle”.

3) The documents collected in Choix III and IV seem not to include relevant data. Instead we only have the words ‘dri ‘to ask’ (S1284:0005-6 and P0216,0120) and ‘bri ‘to diminish’ (S0751,37a2) and many occurrences of the word ‘bri ‘a female yak’ (e.g. P0126,0146, P1068,0082-83, P1134,0281-2 etc.).
The perfective [past] dr- forms are apparently analogical to the present ‘dr- forms, and have all but replaced the simple forms in r-. (1959: 59; brackets mine, also compare Sprigg 1970: 16).

To these one could add ‘dring, rings ‘to be far’, the topic of Li’s paper.

Most dictionaries give the imperative as bris, but Bsam Gタン (1979) gives the voiceless form pbris. However, in the previously mentioned Dunhuang document (Thomas 1935-65: II, 74) there are two instances of the imperative of ‘to write’ spelled as ris: This form of the imperative reconfirms that the root of the verb is ri and not bri.


A donation having been undertaken sometime in the Horse year, arising from the previously made communication (?) it appeared that a Tibetan Shes-rab-bum-pa (Śata-sāhasrika-Prajñā-pāramitā) in eight divisions, and a Chinese ‘bum-pa in six hundred chapters, three division, should be copied (1935-65: II, 76).

[24]//@ / ... byang ... byungste / Rgya'i Tshe dpag tu ma m[chi]s, pa ... [25] ris shig ches byung ba [de]... (1935-65: II, 74; brackets in original)
... copy a Chinese tshe-dpag-tu-ma-mchis-pa (Aparimiśīguh-sūtra) ... (1935-65: II, 77)

Thus, in Old Tibetan the verb ‘to write’ has the stems ‘dri (pres.), bris (past), bri (fut.), ris (imp.). When Cr- clusters became retroflexes (i.e. dr > d and br > d) the verbs ‘to write’ and ‘to ask’ became homophonous. After that sound change, the prefix b- of ‘dri, bris, bri, ris ‘to write’ was reanalyzed as part of the root, and extended by analogy to the spelling of the present stem, in order to graphically differentiate ‘dri, dris, ‘dri, dris ‘to ask’ from ‘to write’, spelled at that time as now ‘bri, bris, bri, bris.
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