Interdisciplinary Journal of Linguistics
Volume [18] 2025, 91-108

From Ladakhi to Bhoti: Sociolinguistic and Political Dimensions of a Changing Language Identity in Ladakh

Konchok Tashi[*]

Abstract

The linguistic landscape of Ladakh has undergone significant transformation in recent years, shaped by evolving government policies and shifting cultural narratives. The shift from designating Ladakhi as the region's principal language to the more inclusive word Bhoti, which places the language within the larger Tibetic linguistic family, is crucial to this transformation. This article explores the sociolinguistic and political aspects of this change, examining the ways in which renaming practices relate to governmental acknowledgment, cultural legacy, and identity creation. Drawing on policy documents, community perspectives, and contemporary debates, the study explores the motivations behind adopting Bhoti as an official category, including aspirations for constitutional recognition, pan-Himalayan solidarity, and the pursuit of linguistic unity across Tibetic-speaking regions. At the same time, the research addresses challenges stemming from this change, specifically concerns about eliminating local language diversity and the ramifications for educational planning, resource allocation, and cultural autonomy. The paper offers a detailed explanation of how nomenclature functions as a symbolic and strategic weapon in influencing the future of linguistic identity in Ladakh by placing Ladakh's experience within larger conversations on language politics and minority rights.

Keywords: Ladakhi, Bhoti, Language and Politics, Linguistic Identity, Language Policy, Sociolinguistic Change

1. Introduction

Located in northern India's trans-Himalayan area, Ladakh boasts a complex linguistic environment that has been molded over centuries by trade, religion, cultural exchange, as well its geographic seclusion. The primary local language, known as Ladakhi, belongs to the Western Tibetic branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family. The language has several regional variants spoken across Leh, Kargil, Nubra, Changthang, and Zanskar regions. Ladakhi displays significant dialectal variations, reflecting the historical, social, and ecological peculiarities of the area, despite being frequently regarded as a single language group. For decades, “Ladakhi” served not only as a linguistic

[*] Central University of Jharkhand; konchok.tashi@cuj.ac.in.

identifier but also as a marker of regional identity and cultural belonging.

However, there has been a notable change in the nomenclature of the language in recent years. Increasingly, the name Bhoti—a larger descriptor used among numerous Tibetic-speaking populations in the Indian Himalayas has acquired awareness in political debate, cultural activism, and institutional discussions. Advocates of the name claim that "Bhoti" better expresses the linguistic and cultural links between Ladakh and the wider Tibetic world, offering support to pan-Himalayan groups seeking recognition under the Eighth Schedule of the Indian constitution. At the same time, the move from "Ladakhi" to "Bhoti" has aroused debate within the region, raising problems about identity, representation, and the potential erasure of local linguistic diversity and linguistic identity. The symbolic importance of language naming how labels may both reflect and actively create political objectives, cultural narratives, and social cohesion is highlighted by this developing dispute.

Studying this shift in nomenclature is also vital for understanding the broader sociopolitical transformations emerging in Ladakh, especially in the aftermath of its transition to a Union Territory in 2019. Changes in language labels overlap with concerns of cultural heritage, minority rights, educational planning, and regional politics, making them an important site for scholarly investigation. In order to better understand how renaming procedures affect identity formation, policy-making, and community dynamics in modern Ladakh, this article will look at the sociolinguistic and political aspects of the shift from "Ladakhi" to "Bhoti."

Guided by this aim, the article addresses the following research questions: (1) What historical, cultural, and political circumstances have led to the creation of "Bhoti" as an alternate term for the Ladakhi language? (2) How is this change interpreted and handled by various stakeholders, including members of the community, cultural institutions, religious organizations, and legislators? (3) What are the sociolinguistic implications of using a more inclusive nomenclature in Ladakh for identity creation, education, and language documentation? Therefore, the objectives of the study are to track the evolution of linguistic labels in the region, examine the reasons and conflicts underlying the shift toward "Bhoti," and estimate its potential impact on cultural and linguistic prospects in Ladakh.

2. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative interpretive approach to examine the ongoing debate surrounding the nomenclature of the Ladakhi language and its implications for linguistic identity, language policy, and cultural representation in Ladakh. Rather than investigating linguistic structure, the study focuses on the sociopolitical dimensions of language naming and official recognition through the analysis of documentary and publicly available sources. The analysis is primarily based on

qualitative document analysis (Bowen, 2009), supplemented by thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The study draws on a qualitative analysis of official policy documents, institutional statements, public representations, and media reports relevant to language policy and identity in Ladakh. The primary documentary sources include The Jammu and Kashmir Reorganisation Act, 2019 and The Ladakh Official Languages Regulation, 2025. The analysis also incorporates publicly available memoranda and representations submitted by the Ladakh Buddhist Association (LBA), statements issued by the Ladakh Academy of Art, Culture and Languages (LAACL), and public resolutions of the Apex Body, Leh, and the Kargil Democratic Alliance (KDA) concerning constitutional safeguards and language recognition. To contextualise public discourse, media reports from *The Hindu*, *The Indian Express*, *The Tribune*, *Greater Kashmir*, *Daily Excelsior*, and *Scoop News* were also examined. These materials were analysed using qualitative thematic analysis to identify recurring themes related to language policy, linguistic identity, constitutional recognition, and multilingual governance.

The collected materials were analyzed using thematic analysis, whereby recurring themes relating to language naming, linguistic identity, cultural heritage, official recognition, and language policy were identified, coded, and interpreted. Particular attention was paid to the ways in which different stakeholders including government institutions, cultural organizations, civil society groups, scholars, and community members construct and negotiate linguistic identity through the use of the terms *Ladakhi* and *Bhoti*. The analytical framework draws on sociolinguistic perspectives that view language names not merely as linguistic labels but as social and political markers closely associated with identity, community affiliation, and language planning (Fishman, 1991; Edwards, 2009; Spolsky, 2009). To enhance the credibility of the findings, information obtained from official documents was compared with statements issued by community organizations and publicly available media reports. This process of triangulation enabled the study to identify areas of convergence and divergence among official policy, institutional discourse, and community perspectives. The analysis remains interpretive and descriptive, aiming to understand how language naming has emerged as a contested issue within the broader context of identity, cultural preservation, and language policy in contemporary Ladakh, rather than advocating any particular policy position.

3. Historical and Linguistic Background

3.1 The Ladakhi Language: Classification and Features

The language spoken in the Union Territory of Ladakh often referred to as “Ladakhi” belongs to the Western Tibetic subgroup of the Tibetic branch within the Tibeto-Burman language family. Ladakhi is typically positioned in linguistic studies with similar dialects spoken in nearby

areas like Spiti, Purig, and Balti, which collectively constitute a continuum of Tibetic languages molded by millennia of cross-Himalayan cultural interchange. Ladakhi retains some key traits characteristic of Tibetic languages, including a primarily monosyllabic lexicon, a tonal or quasi-tonal prosodic system in some dialects, and grammatical structures and phonetic sounds that show significant similarities with Classical Tibetan. However, Ladakhi stands apart from other Tibetic dialects due to regional modifications in phonology, lexicon, and syntax, highlighting its status as a linguistically autonomous regional language.

Within Ladakh alone, Ladakhi demonstrates remarkable dialectal variations (Koshal, 1979). The Leh dialect, spoken in the central region, is widely regarded as the prestige or standard and serves as the linguistic basis for most written works and educational content. The Nubra dialect has variances in phonetic realization and lexicon, shaped by the region's historical commerce and migration trends. In Sham dialect (spoken in the Sham district of Union Territory of Ladakh), a more conservative language profile has been noted, with certain archaic characteristics preserved due to the area's geographic isolation. The language situation becomes much more convoluted in Kargil, where the Purig variety, closely related yet distinct, is spoken, reflecting a separate historical trajectory and Islamic cultural influences. These dialectal variations underscore the significance of regional linguistic identities within the larger Tibetic heritage by illuminating the diversity within what is often referred to as "Ladakhi."

Ladakhi has historically been written in the Tibetan alphabet (Uchen), a literary tradition that links the area to the larger Tibetan Buddhist cultural realm. Monastic institutions have long been the curators of this script culture, maintaining classical texts, holy literature, and pedagogical manuals. While the Tibetan script continues to enjoy strong cultural and religious prestige, modern efforts to standardize Ladakhi for use in schools and digital media have led to the exploration of alternative orthographic practices, including phonetic transcriptions and adaptations of Roman and Devanagari scripts. These initiatives are a reflection of larger discussions concerning modernization, language accessibility, and the preservation of classical traditions.

3.2 Evolution of Language Labels in Ladakh

The language used in the area has historically been referred to both internally and internationally as "Ladakhi", a name strongly associated with geographic location and regional identity. For centuries, the term "Ladakhi" served as a linguistic and ethnic marker, indicating the uniqueness of the people living in the former kingdom of Ladakh. Colonial-era language surveys, early anthropological research, and Himalayan trip literature all adopted "Ladakhi" as the principal term, so strengthening its prominence in academic and administrative discourse.

Over time, however, the term Bhoti (alternatively spelled Bodhi) began to appear in cultural and political discourse across the Indian Himalayas. Derived from “Bhot-desha,” the Sanskrit word for Tibet country, “Bhoti” refers broadly to the family of Tibetic languages spoken in territories historically affected by Tibetan culture, religion, and scriptural traditions (Tournadre & Suzuki, 2023). The use of "Bhoti" became popular in Ladakh, especially in the early 1970s, as a result of campaigns to have Tibetic languages recognized under the Indian Constitution's Eighth Schedule (Tashi, 2023). Proponents of the word say that “Bhoti” provides a cohesive linguistic identity for a geographically dispersed and culturally connected group, boosting claims for cultural preservation and governmental recognition.

Buddhist monastic establishments have played a significant role in popularizing the “Bhoti” term. Through their intimate linkages with Tibetan liturgy, scriptural learning, and trans-Himalayan networks, monastic communities have long emphasized linguistic continuity with ancient Tibetan traditions. Ladakhi has been framed as part of a broader Tibetic linguistic and spiritual history rather than just as a regional language because of this cultural focus. Consequently, the term Bhoti has developed symbolic meaning, reflecting not just language affinity but also cultural solidarity, religious identification, and pan-Himalayan unification.

However, discussions concerning the preservation of Ladakh's unique language and cultural identity continue to coexist with the growing popularity of "Bhoti." While some perceive Bhoti as a bigger umbrella term that improves political exposure, others express concern that it may conceal Ladakhi’s particular regional character. Thus, the dynamic interaction between local identity, regional solidarity, and national politics is reflected in the creation of language labels in Ladakh; this interaction continues to influence discussions concerning linguistic identity in the Union Territory today.

4. Nomenclature and Identity

4.1 Symbolic Power of Language Naming

The name of a language is never a neutral act; it is heavily steeped in social, cultural, and political meanings. Linguistic labels are potent symbols that communities use to express their identities, assert their validity, and negotiate their position in larger social hierarchies, according to sociolinguistics research. Names shape how speakers understand their language and how it is positioned in relation to other linguistic forms. They influence everything from educational policy to cultural pride, political mobilization, and intergroup relations. As thus, language naming itself becomes a form of identity-making, an act that reflects and promotes particular ideological orientations.

A helpful theoretical framework for comprehending the dynamics at work in Ladakh is provided by Bourdieu's concept of symbolic capital. Bourdieu defined symbolic capital as the legitimacy, prestige,

and recognition that an identity or cultural practice gains within a particular social sector (Bourdieu, 1984). When applied to language, the notion highlights how particular labels have cultural authority or political weight, enabling speakers to align themselves with powerful organizations or historical traditions. In the instance of Ladakh, adopting the name "Bhoti" invokes symbolic capital derived from Tibetan literary and religious tradition, whereas "Ladakhi" takes its symbolic strength from regional rootedness and historical individuality. As a result, selection of labels reflects conflicting ideas of community, legacy, and political ambition and is not only linguistic phenomenon.

4.2 Local Understandings of "Ladakhi" vs. "Bhoti"

At the community level, the vocabulary employed to characterize the local language generates different and frequently competing meanings. Many Ladakhis associate the term "Ladakhi" with a sense of cultural uniqueness, local history, and regional identity. It represents geographical identity, resonating with the social and historical experience of living in the unique environment of the high-altitude Western Indian Himalayas. The phrase frequently holds links with regional customs, oral traditions, and everyday language practices that separate Ladakh from other Tibetic-speaking places.

The rising use of Bhoti, however, generates a different set of connections. The term's proponents frequently see it as a symbol of pan-Himalayan cultural cohesion, based on common scriptural practices and Buddhist ancestry. Bhoti represents inclusion in a larger Tibetic cultural realm that cuts across geographical limits for its speakers. It also functions as a political vehicle, notably for those seeking constitutional recognition of Tibetic languages in India, as it combines different people and communities under a common linguistic name.

However, there has been discussion in Ladakh regarding the use of Bhoti. Using an umbrella name, according to some community members, runs the risk of eroding the distinctive character contained in Ladakhi, and homogenizing the linguistic diversity of the area. These issues are especially prominent in locations where language or cultural practices diverge from the Buddhist-majority regions, such as in Kargil, where Purig speakers may not fully identify with the name Bhoti. Thus, the discussion highlights a conflict between the need to maintain regional uniqueness and the aim for cultural unification. While Bhoti may improve political visibility and cultural togetherness, it can simultaneously raise worries of losing the distinctive language heritage that differentiates Ladakh within the greater Tibetic constellation.

The nomenclature of a language is strongly related to the identity, history, and cultural continuity of its speakers and for the people of Ladakh, the name Ladakhi signifies their distinct legacy within India. Changing this established linguistic label to Bhoti risks creating confusion and blurring the distinct identity that Ladakhis have preserved for generations, especially given that Bhoti is widely

understood to mean “Tibetan language,” a classification that does not accurately represent the Indian identity of Ladakhis. While linguistic and cultural similarities among Himalayan regions are apparent, establishing a new nomenclature without broad consent can unintentionally weaken Ladakh’s own rich language legacy. The continued use of the nomenclature *Ladakhi* reflects the linguistic identity and cultural heritage of its speech community and contributes to its recognition as one of the many languages that constitute India's diverse linguistic landscape.

According to Stobdan (2019), “Most of the issues are seemingly steered by a Tibet-oriented agenda, be it sectarian, linguistic or political. For example, the agenda of getting the Bhoti (Tibetan) language included in the Schedule VIII of the Indian Constitution was initially set by Dharamshala through its proxies from the Himalayan region. The move is gaining momentum and being embedded in the agenda of local political parties.”

4.3 The Pan-Himalayan Context

The altering linguistic nomenclature in Ladakh must be viewed within a broader pan-Himalayan framework in which various Tibetic-speaking communities have chosen labels such as Bhoti, Bodhi, or Bodic to characterize their languages. These phrases stress a shared cultural lineage rooted in the Tibetan alphabet, Buddhist textual traditions, and historical exchanges across the trans-Himalayan region. To express a sense of linguistic and cultural continuity, communities in Ladakh, Himachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, and portions of Nepal also use "Bhoti" or similar terminology. However, the regions host a rich but vulnerable linguistic diversity, with endangered languages such as Ladakhi, Purgi, Balti, Tinani, Gahri, Spitian, Kinnauri, Sherpa, Tamang, Gurung, Limbu, Lepcha, Bhutia, Monpa, and Sherdukpen spoken by the local communities (UNESCO, 2010; Moseley, 2010; Devy, 2013).

A number of movements have surfaced throughout the Indian Himalayas calling for "Bhoti" to be officially recognized as a separate language in the Eighth Schedule of the Indian constitution. These initiatives maintain that a uniform nomenclature gives a stronger communal identity and increases the probability of winning state funding for language preservation, education, and cultural development. By bringing together multiple Tibetic-speaking populations under a unified banner, proponents hope to magnify their political voice and bolster claims to cultural autonomy.

At the same time, the pan-Himalayan use of “Bhoti” emphasizes difficult problems about linguistic taxonomy and identity politics. While the phrase encourages solidarity, it also embraces a vast array of separate but related languages, each with its own sociocultural context and historical history. Engaging with this more comprehensive framework presents Ladakh with both opportunities and challenges: it offers a forum for mutual cultural acknowledgment, but it also poses

important queries regarding the preservation of local identities within wider collectivities.

5. Political Dimensions of the Shift

5.1 Language Policy in Ladakh Post Union Territory Status

Language policy in the area was directly impacted by the major administrative and political changes brought about by the reorganization of Jammu and Kashmir State in 2019, which resulted in the establishment of Ladakh as a distinct Union Territory (UT). As Ladakh embraced a new governance framework under central administration, problems of language identity, cultural preservation, and formal recognition gained prominence. The move to UT status reduced the region's dependence on the previous state government and created new opportunities for local leaders, cultural organizations, and civil society groups to communicate their linguistic goals more aggressively.

The UT administration of Ladakh has consistently underlined the importance of protecting the region's cultural legacy, which is intimately linked to language, religion, and traditional knowledge systems, in the post-2019 administrative landscape. Policy discussions have underlined the necessity of promoting indigenous languages in education, public communication, and cultural initiatives. However, the absence of a constitutionally recognized official language for the UT has caused a vacuum, creating opportunity for competing claims about which linguistic identity best symbolizes Ladakh's diversity and legacy. In this context, the rising institutional reference to the term Bhoti represents an emerging trend among policymakers and powerful cultural actors to locate Ladakh's linguistic identity within a broader Tibetic framework.

The Constitution of the erstwhile State of Jammu and Kashmir recognized "Ladakhi language" as one of the regional languages of the State under Section 146 (Academy for the Development of Art, Culture, and Languages) of the Sixth Schedule (Regional Languages). In addition to Ladakhi, the other regional languages recognized under this provision included Dogri, Kashmiri, Balti, Shina, and Purgi, reflecting the State's rich linguistic and cultural diversity.[1]

The Ladakh Official Languages Regulation, 2025, a landmark decision recognizing the region's distinctive linguistic and cultural heritage designates Purgi, Bhoti, Urdu, Hindi, and English as official languages of the UT. However, despite their long-standing demands being fulfilled, the Bhoti proponents did not celebrate when the announcement recognizing Bhoti as an official language was made. This is quite unusual and suggests that the nomenclature 'Bhoti' may not have widespread support. Further, given the importance of linguistic identity in language planning, the question of whether Ladakhi should also receive explicit official recognition merits further consideration by policymakers.

The regulation has been promulgated pursuant to the powers conferred by Article 240 of the Constitution of India and Section 58(2) of the Jammu and Kashmir Reorganisation Act, 2019 (as notified in the Gazette on June 2, 2025). This significant measure acknowledges and celebrates the multilingual character of Ladakh's population, representing a decisive step towards inclusive governance.

The Gazette notification specifies:

With effect from such date as the Administrator may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint in this behalf, the English, Hindi, Urdu, Bhoti, and Purgi languages shall be the official languages to be used for all or any of the official purposes of the Union Territory: Provided that the English language shall continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union Territory for which it was being used before the date of commencement of the Regulation."

Furthermore, the notification states:

The Administrator may take such necessary steps, as may be provided by rules to be made by him, to strengthen the institutional mechanisms for the promotion and development of other languages in the Union Territory and for the establishment of the Academy of Art, Culture, and Languages. (2) The institutional mechanisms referred to in sub-section (1) shall make special efforts for the promotion and development of other native languages of Ladakh, namely, Shina (Dardic), Brokskat (Dardic), Balti, and Ladakhi."

5.2 The Push for Constitutional Recognition

Demands to include Bhoti in the Eighth Schedule of the Indian Constitution comprise a fundamental political motivation behind the shift in language nomenclature. The movement for constitutional recognition extends back several decades, gaining pace via combined efforts by diverse Himalayan populations who speak Tibetic languages. These communities contend that being included in the Eighth Schedule would guarantee more official representation in national institutions dedicated to language promotion, increased government support for language preservation, the creation of educational resources, and chances for literary advancement.

A network of political, religious, and cultural organizations—including the Ladakh Buddhist Association (LBA), the Ladakh Gonpa Association (LGA), and various civil society organizations under the Apex Body, Leh has played an important role in advocating for the inclusion of Bhoti in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution of India. Buddhist monastic organizations, with their profound historical linkages to Tibetan script and literature, have played a key role in expressing the cultural reason for adopting "Bhoti" as the language's official title. This initiative has been joined by social groups and political leaders from all throughout the Himalayan region, who have framed constitutional recognition as crucial to protecting their linguistic

legacy and increasing their political prominence inside the Indian Union.

A crucial strategic rationale for accepting the broader moniker "Bhoti" is its perceived inclusivity. Whereas "Ladakhi" is particular to the region, "Bhoti" operates as a pan-Himalayan term that combines numerous Tibetic-speaking communities under a single linguistic flag. This common identity strengthens the struggle for constitutional recognition by presenting a unified front that transcends regional borders. Thus, the use of "Bhoti" as a strategic decision indicates both cultural affinity and political pragmatism.

5.3 Implications for Governance and Representation

The increasing use of the name "Bhoti" has important ramifications for Ladakh's cultural image, education, and administration. If the term were to become institutionalized, it might have an impact on how resources are allocated for language promotion, such as curriculum development, teacher training, textbook creation, and orthographic practice standards. Under a recognized linguistic framework, cultural institutions like monasteries, municipal archives, literary groups, and arts councils stand to gain greater prominence and funding.

In educational settings, adopting "Bhoti" may facilitate the construction of unified instructional resources that fit with pan-Himalayan language traditions. However, this may provide issues for expressing local dialectal variations and potentially marginalize varieties of speech that do not closely fit with the conventional Tibetic paradigm. Similar to this, the emphasis on classical or pan-regional forms in literary composition may cause vernacular idioms that characterize Ladakh's own linguistic legacy to be marginalized.

Beyond the internal dynamics of Ladakh, the move has broader political ramifications. The adoption of "Bhoti" aligns Ladakh more closely with national discourses on cultural preservation, minority rights, and regional integration. It also connects with identity politics inside India, particularly arguments involving indigeneity, the politics of recognition, and the link between regional identities and pan-Himalayan solidarity. At the geopolitical level, the adoption of a Tibetic-associated label carries symbolic significance, gently recalling historical and cultural linkages that reach beyond national borders.

Thus, the political components of the nomenclature shift reflect a complicated interplay between local priorities, regional alliances, and national considerations. The decision between "Ladakhi" and "Bhoti" is not only a linguistic process but is profoundly ingrained in conflicting ideas for the future of governance, identity, and representation in Ladakh.

6. Sociolinguistic Implications

6.1 Language Vitality and Documentation

The move from "Ladakhi" to "Bhoti" carries substantial consequences for the viability and documentation of the region's linguistic landscape.

For successful linguistic description, revitalization, and preservation, researchers studying Tibetic languages frequently stress the importance of precise classification and unambiguous nomenclature. Adopting "Bhoti" as a general term could increase awareness and draw more institutional backing, especially for initiatives pertaining to the preservation of Indian Himalayan languages. But it also runs the risk of masking Ladakh's linguistic communities' inherent variety.

One potential result is the flattening of local language diversity. Because "Bhoti" refers to a broad variety of Tibetic languages, it may cause scholars or decision-makers to treat diverse dialects as a single, homogeneous group. This may lessen the motivation to record smaller or more endangered languages or dialects, especially those that are spoken in remote or culturally unique places like Kargil's Purig-speaking regions, Zanskar, or Changthang. Micro-level language differences that are crucial to comprehending Ladakh's social history and cultural diversity may eventually be overlooked due to the focus on a single linguistic identity. Therefore, although the new nomenclature might increase exposure at the macro level, it might also make linguistic subtleties less noticeable at the local level.

6.2 Education and Curriculum Development

The term "Bhoti" is becoming more and more popular, which poses a number of difficulties for curriculum creation and educational policy. The variety of spoken forms in Ladakh and variances within the larger Himalayan region must be taken into consideration while attempting to standardize the language. Standardization becomes more problematic when a label contains numerous related but separate languages, prompting problems regarding which dialects or varieties should serve as the normative basis for textbooks, grammar guides, and school instruction.

The choice of script is a major point of contention. The Tibetan alphabet has long been connected with classical literature, monastic education, and cultural identity in Ladakh; hence, its usage in formal education promotes ties to the region’s Buddhist legacy. However, for populations whose linguistic practices diverge from classical Tibetan norms, or for regions where the alphabet is not traditionally used (such as Purig-speaking Muslim-majority areas), a Tibetan-based orthography may bring educational issues. Furthermore, some educators support the use of Romanized or Devanagari-based orthographies in national curricula or to increase accessibility for younger students. These varying views are a reflection of larger conflicts between language inclusion, educational pragmatism, and cultural preservation.

The nomenclature change also has an impact on educational resources and teacher preparation. If “Bhoti” becomes the dominant institutional word, teaching materials may increasingly emphasize pan-Himalayan linguistic traits rather than region-specific ones. Teachers may need to adjust to standardized curriculum models, complete new

training programs, and reconcile local spoken forms with traditional Tibetan customs. Additionally, it can put strain on the already fragile educational infrastructure, which has to strike a balance between the requirements of curriculum uniformity and the necessity for culturally specific content.

6.3 Community Identity and Intergroup Relations

In Ladakh, the transition from "Ladakhi" to "Bhoti" has significant effects on intergroup relations and communal identity. While, generally portrayed as a language or cultural issue, the nomenclature dispute links with regional, religious, and ethnic identities in complex ways. The adoption of "Bhoti" resonates powerfully with monastic traditions, scriptural legacy, and trans-Himalayan cultural networks for areas with a majority of Buddhists. It strengthens a sense of belonging to a greater Tibetic world and corresponds with longstanding cultural affinities.

In contrast, populations in Kargil, where Purig and Balti variations are spoken and where Islamic cultural history predominates, may not identify as readily with the name “Bhoti,” which they may consider as intimately tied to Buddhist identity and Tibetan customs. "Ladakhi" or region-specific labels might more accurately represent local histories and sociocultural realities for these communities. These varied opinions underline the prospect that adopting a pan-Himalayan name could alienate specific groups, thereby aggravating interregional differences or reinforcing existing identity boundaries.

Pluralism and inclusivity therefore appear as major themes. As “Bhoti” has already been recognized as one of the official languages in the UT Ladakh, it must now embrace the different linguistic and cultural experiences of all Ladakhis, not primarily those linked with the Buddhist monastic tradition. Fostering a sense of shared belonging requires, making sure that the educational resources, cultural events, and policy efforts represent this variety. Without such initiatives, the nomenclature change could exacerbate social and cultural disparities, influencing intergroup relations in ways that have an impact on regional harmony and political stability.

7. Comparative Perspectives

When considered in larger regional and global contexts where language nomenclature has been crucial in forming identity, politics, and cultural representation, the discussions surrounding the transition from "Ladakhi" to "Bhoti" take on greater depth. Examining analogous cases among other Tibetic-speaking groups as well as global linguistic experiences reveals shared patterns of negotiation between local, particular and collective identity, affording vital comparative insights for understanding Ladakh’s contemporary trajectory.

Across the Indian Himalayan regions and beyond, nomenclature politics have emerged prominently in locations such as Sikkim, West Bengal (Darjeeling, Kalimpong, Siliguri), Arunachal Pradesh, Lahaul-Spiti, Nepal and Baltistan (CIIL, 2008) where language identities

connect with complicated cultural and geopolitical history. In Sikkim, for instance, the language typically referred to locally as "Bhutia" is intimately tied to Tibetan linguistic traditions, while its naming reflects the state's unique sociopolitical situation and cultural diversity. Codifying and promoting the language has required striking a balance between ties to the larger Tibetic tradition and localized identity. Similarly, in Arunachal Pradesh, numerous Tibetic-speaking groups employ designations such as Bhoti to show cultural identification with the Tibetan script and monastic traditions, while concurrently navigating the multicultural and multi-ethnic context of the state.

Communities in Spiti (Himachal Pradesh) speak a language that is closely related to Ladakhi, but they have traditionally preferred labels that are distinctive to the region, like Spiti Bhoti or Spitian (CIIL, 2008). While recognizing linguistic connection with the larger Tibetic family, these labels highlight local uniqueness. Baltistan, now entirely in Pakistan-administered territory, offers yet another instructive example. Baltis speak a Tibetic language formerly written in the Tibetan alphabet, although over time the usage of Perso-Arabic scripts and Islamic influence has transformed linguistic and cultural identification. Discussions about nomenclature in Baltistan show how language identities are shaped by script, religion, and geopolitics in ways that are similar to conflicts in Ladakh (Zeisler, B. (2011).

Comparative evidence from other multilingual contexts demonstrates that language naming and classification are often closely linked to questions of political identity, nation-building, and official recognition. Following the dissolution of Yugoslavia, the formerly unified designation *Serbo-Croatian* gradually gave way to separate standard languages Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and later Montenegrin reflecting the emergence of distinct national identities despite their high degree of mutual intelligibility. As a result of attempts to maintain indigenous identity and local linguistic variation, Quechua, which was formerly thought of as a single language across the Andes, is now acknowledged as a collection of different but related languages (Greenberg, 2004; Bugarski, 2004). Even within the Tibetan linguistic community, disagreements exist about whether regional languages such as Amdo and Khams should be recognized as dialects of Tibetan or as distinct languages. These examples mirror the tensions in Ladakh between linguistic unification (as symbolized by "Bhoti") and the preservation of regional linguistic particularities (as represented by "Ladakhi").

Comparative analysis suggests various lessons for Ladakh. First, linguistic labels work best when they strike a balance between local identity sensitivity and political prominence. Although requests for recognition may be strengthened by overly general nomenclature, it runs the risk of obscuring internal variety or marginalizing particular populations. Adopting a unified script or curriculum must be complemented by procedures that take into account regional linguistic realities. Second, script choice and educational policy constantly

emerge as crucial arenas where identity negotiations take place. Third, worldwide experiences suggest that language renaming can have unexpected repercussions, such the rigidification of identities or the loss of linguistic nuance if standardization attempts prioritize governmental objectives over community traditions.

Comparative viewpoints generally show that Ladakh's transition from "Ladakhi" to "Bhoti" is neither singular nor isolated. It is a part of a larger trend where language nomenclature is used to navigate cultural plurality, negotiate governmental acceptance, and proclaim identity. Understanding these connections can help Ladakh create tactics that foster cultural unity without jeopardizing the rich linguistic diversity that distinguishes the region.

8. Discussion

The previous analysis emphasizes the complex interaction between political factors and sociolinguistic dynamics in the transition from Ladakhi to Bhoti. On the one hand, the word "Bhoti" was used as a result of intentional political and cultural tactics meant to increase visibility, obtain constitutional recognition, and claim a common Tibetic ancestry. By connecting Ladakh's language with a broader Himalayan linguistic framework, proponents of Bhoti want to enhance the region's claims for institutional support, educational resources, and cultural preservation. The terminology transition consequently bears concrete benefits in terms of political leverage, pan-Himalayan solidarity, and the symbolic value involved with tying local identity to classical Tibetan legacy.

A number of possible disadvantages are also shown by the sociolinguistic implications. Stressing Bhoti runs the risk of homogenizing a linguistically varied region, possibly marginalizing regional dialects and diminishing the distinctive qualities of Purig, Leh, Sham, Zanskar, Nubra and Changthang variants. These conflicts may be exacerbated by curriculum development, script disputes, and educational standardization, which favour pan-regional forms over regionally particular linguistic practices. Furthermore, some communities especially those in Kargil and other minority linguistic regions may feel marginalized or alienated from a single linguistic category as a result of the transition, which poses social and cultural concerns.

The discussion revolves around this conflict between political unity and linguistic diversity. Internal distinctions that are essential to community identification, oral history, and cultural expression may be obscured by a broad name like Bhoti, even though it improves institutional recognition and promotes collective identity. Policymakers, educators, and community leaders must balance these conflicting needs in order to preserve the rich internal variety of Ladakh's linguistic environment while utilizing the benefits of a single nomenclature.

In a broader sense, Ladakh serves as an example of how language naming can influence cultural futures. Beyond just categorizing speech, linguistic labels actively shape social reality, shape educational agendas, and mediate access to cultural and political resources. A name can become a place of debate over identity, legacy, and regional affiliation, as demonstrated by the decision between Ladakhi and Bhoti. Decisions about nomenclature have long-term consequences: they impact which kinds of language are preserved, which narratives of culture obtain authority, and which populations feel recognized or ostracized. In Ladakh, as elsewhere, language naming operates simultaneously as a symbolic, political, and practical tool that can either support cultural cohesiveness or worsen internal differences.

When these results are combined, it is evident that the transition from Ladakhi to Bhoti is not just linguistic matter. It represents a difficult balancing act between policy, heritage, identity, and community goals. Recognizing the different features of this change is vital for designing inclusive methods that safeguard linguistic variety while supporting the strategic advantages of greater cultural and political recognition.

9. Conclusion

The sociolinguistic and political aspects of the transition from Ladakhi to Bhoti have been explored in this article, emphasizing how language naming serves as a platform for political strategy, cultural expression, and identity negotiation in Ladakh. The study shows that nomenclature is both symbolic and practical: it shapes how communities view themselves, how governments and institutions interact with them, and how linguistic resources are preserved and transmitted. It does this by tracing the historical and linguistic background, investigating community perspectives, analysing post-2019 policy developments, and placing Ladakh within regional and global comparative frameworks.

The article's main contributions include highlighting the significance of language naming in determining long-term cultural trajectories, identifying the advantages and disadvantages of adopting the Bhoti label, and articulating the intricate relationship between regional linguistic diversity and pan-Himalayan political unity. The discussion underlines that while Bhoti may boost political recognition and institutional backing, it also risks homogenizing diverse dialects and marginalizing distinctive community voices, underlining the necessity for careful balancing between inclusivity and uniformity.

In the future, Ladakh's language identity will probably be influenced by the continuous balancing act between local uniqueness and more general Tibetic ties. Policymakers must establish language policies that acknowledge both the aggregate importance of Bhoti and the micro-level diversity of Ladakhi dialects. Educators, cultural organizations, and community leaders play a vital role in ensuring that standardization initiatives do not swamp local linguistic patterns, while

simultaneously exploiting the symbolic and practical advantages of a single label.

For researchers, this work suggests to various avenues for additional inquiry. Ethnographic studies could provide further insight into how different cultures interpret and engage with the Bhoti term in daily life. In addition to protecting linguistic diversity, systematic documentation of dialectal variances throughout Leh, Zanskar, Sham, Nubra, Changthang, and Kargil would guide governmental and educational endeavours. The socio-political ramifications of nomenclature changes throughout time may also be made clearer by longitudinal studies of the effects of language policy and standardization initiatives.

Ultimately, the story of Ladakh reveals the enormous relevance of language naming in constructing cultural futures. It serves as a reminder that language labels are never purely descriptive; they are tools of identity building, instruments of political negotiation, and frameworks for preserving or transforming the heritage of communities in swiftly shifting social and political contexts.

References

Annamalai, E. (2001). *Managing multilingualism in India: Political and Linguistic manifestations*. Sage

Beek, M., & Bray, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Ladakh: culture, history, and development between Himalaya and Karakoram*. Brill.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.

Brass, P. (1974). *Language, religion, and politics in North India*. Cambridge University Press.

Bray, J. (Ed.). (2005). *Ladakhi histories: Local and regional perspectives*. Brill.

Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge University Press.

Driem, G. (2001). *Languages of the Himalayas*. Brill.

Goldstein, M. C. (2004). *A Tibetan revolutionary: The political life and times of Bapa Phüntso Wangye*. University of California Press.

Koshal, S. (1979). *Ladakhi grammar*. Motilal Banarsidass.

Koshal, S. (1990). The Ladakhi language and its regional perspectives. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, 44*, 13–22.

Koul, O. N. (Ed.). (2014). *People's Linguistic Survey of India: Languages of Jammu & Kashmir* (Vol. 9, pp. 233–243). Orient Blackswan.

Roche, G. (2016). The Tibetan language(s): Politics, pluralism, and identity. *Himalaya: The Journal of the Association for Nepal and Himalayan Studies.*

Roche, G., Dede, K., & Pirie, F. (Eds.). (2008). *Modern Tibetan literature and social change*. Duke University Press.

Schiffman, H. F. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. Routledge.

Tashi, K. (2016). Bhoti: The classical language of the Himalayas. In T. Namgyal (Ed.), *A Cooper approach: The Trans-Himalayan Tibet: History, language & literature (traditional & contemporary)*. Mankin Press.

Tashi, K. (2019). Preservation and development of Tibetan/Bhoti language in Indian Himalayas. In J. Samten, L. Dorjee, P. Dorjee, et al. (Eds.), *In search of truth* (Part II). Alumni Association of CIHTS. Varanasi.

Tashi, K. (2020). Classical Tibetan language and culture in Indian Himalayas. *Kalakalpa (IGNCA Journal of Arts), 5*(1), 201–216.

Tashi, K., Tournadre, N., & Norman, R. (2024). Written Ladakhi and the future of Ladakh's culture. *Forum for Linguistic Studies.*

Tashi, K. (Ed.). (2021). *Languages of Indian Himalayas*. Indu Book Services.

Tashi, K. (2023). *Understanding language attitude and linguistic ecology in Indian Himalayas: A perspective from an endangered language "Ladakhi"*. Indu Book Services.

Tashi, K. (2025). *Tibetan language for non-Tibetans: A beginner's guide to writing and speaking Tibetan*. Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-2879-7

Tournadre, N. (2009). The Tibetic languages and their classification. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, *32*(1), 105–182.

Tournadre, N., & Suzuki, H. (2023). *The Tibetic languages: An introduction to the family of languages derived from Old Tibetan*. Lacito, Cnrs.

Policy / Institutional / Community-level Sources

Bazm-e-Adab. (2022). *Letter to the Lieutenant Governor of Ladakh arguing that "Bhoti" is neither a script nor a language of Ladakh*. Voice of Ladakh

District Institute of Education and Training (DIET), Leh. (2023). *Bhoti grammar training/workshop by DIET Leh concludes* [Press release]. Peaceful Societies+2Reachladakh+2

Ladakh Administration. (2024). *Inauguration of Bhoti Cell and Language Lab at DIET Leh* [Press release].

Ladakh Buddhist Association. (2023). *Seminar on the preservation and promotion of the Bhoti language at Chokhang Vihara, Leh* [Press release].

Purig Cultural and Literary Society. (2024). *Press release demanding exclusive use of "Ladakhi" as the language of Ladakh*.

Analyses, Critiques, and Media Discussions

News report: "*Bhoti is not a language: Why parts of Ladakh have an issue with the Education Department's language plan." EdexLive*. (on objections to imposing "Bhoti" across Ladakh) EdexLive

Local media discussion: *"Ladakh Ethnic Groups Unite to Demand Multi-Language Official Status."* Voice of Ladakh, 2024. (on demands to recognise Purgi, Balti, Shina, and other languages along with or instead of Bhoti) Voice of Ladakh