

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



Tibetan dañ, ciñ, kyin, yin "and" ḥam

Author(s): Walter Simon

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (1942), pp. 954-975

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of [School of Oriental and African Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/609136>

Accessed: 10/10/2012 10:15

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and School of Oriental and African Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Tibetan *dañ*, *ciñ*, *kyin*, *yin* and *ham*

By WALTER SIMON

THE words to be treated in this paper show one common aspect in their etymologies. It is suggested that they have arisen through coalescence of their etymons with the suffix *na* "in"—or in the case of *ham*, with the negation *ma* (or *mi*)—and that after the coalescence the final vowel was lost. The latter assumption will have to be linked up with the enclitic, or in the case of *yin*, at least unstressed nature of the words. In this connection we may note that the separating *shad*, the Tibetan comma, will invariably be found after, never before *dañ*. The same holds good of *ciñ*, though punctuation is much rarer after *ciñ*. In the case of *ciñ* and *kyin*, the enclisis is moreover strongly borne out by the phonetic changes which their initial consonants undergo in assimilation to the endings of the preceding words. For the assumed treatment of the final vowel, I may refer to my paper "Certain Tibetan Suffixes and their Combinations" (in vol. v of the *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* (*HJAS.*)), where the same change has been suggested for the instrumental suffix.¹

I. *dañ*

The etymon which I assume to have coalesced with *na* in *dañ*, is the plural suffix *dag*. In addition to the loss of the final vowel of *na* (and undoubtedly preceding it) nasalization of the final *g* of *dag* must have taken place by way of regressive assimilation. While the phonetic side of the etymology can be dismissed with these few remarks, we must enlarge on the semasiological side.

As is well known, the plural is not regularly expressed in Tibetan, and the suffixes which indicate it were "originally nouns with the common notion of plurality".² This is obvious in the case of *tsho*, for which Jäschke (*Dict.*, p. 451) notes the meanings "troop, number, host". Etymologically, *tsho* belongs to *tshogs* "assemblage of men, multitude" (Jäschke, *Dict.*, p. 451), though *tsho* can hardly be called an "abbreviated form of *tshogs*".³ *rnams*, an obvious derivation

¹ Cf. p. 386. See also here below, pp. 964 and 973.

² Jäschke, *Tibetan Grammar*, 3rd ed. (reprinted Berlin, 1929), p. 20. See also the "Addenda" to this Reprint (by A. H. Francke), pp. 112-13.

³ Francke, *Addenda*, p. 112.

of *rnam* "piece", is explained by Jäschke (*Dict.*, p. 315) as "piece by piece". Before discussing this explanation, I should like to adduce two more cases where the idea of plurality is conveyed by words which primarily seem to mean "piece, portion, fragment", or something similar, viz. *cag*, used as a plural suffix with personal pronouns, and *cog*, which we find after the demonstrative pronoun *ho*,¹ and which can—though very rarely—be met with independently in the form *cog-ge*.² Both words I should like to include in an etymological family with the basic meaning "to break", represented by *cha* "part, portion", *chag* "broken, potsherd", also "bunch", *gcog-pa* "to break", etc.³ One may, however, hesitate to accept Jäschke's explanation "piece by piece" for *rnams* and to extend it to *cag* and *cog*, in order to account for the function of the three words as plural suffixes. Jäschke is certainly right in assigning to *rnams* practically the same meaning as to *rnam*, viz. "piece". But the distributive "piece by piece" would normally be conveyed by repetition in Tibetan—cf. *re re*—and we find only a single *rnams* as plural suffix. Moreover, we are confronted with the same difficulty in the case of *rnam*, which means "whole" in the compound *rnam-graṅs* "whole amount, full number", and "entirely" as an adverb (*rnam-par*). In the latter case, Jäschke suggests "possibly an abbreviation of *rnam-pa kun-tu*", but, after all, *kun-tu* is not added. We have, however, not to look far for a similar semantic development. English *lot* combines the meanings of "portion" and "whole number". In the same way, "piece," denoting a certain quantity, could become "a definite quantity", "a good portion", and even "the whole portion".

Reverting to *dag*, I see a clue for its original meaning in an obvious derivative, viz. *dog* "bundle, clew, skein", also "ear of corn,

¹ See here below, pp. 968, etc.

² Cf. A. Grünwedel, *Legenden des Naropa* (Leipzig, 1933), p. 175. I presume that the group *cog ge zog*, occurring several times after a negative imperative in a song which is transmitted in the *bTsun mo bkahi thañ yig* (see B. Laufer, *Roman einer Tibetischen Königin* (Leipzig, 1911), p. 122, n. 2) belongs here as well, developed by reduplication from **cog ge cog*. See here later, p. 961, n. 2. For the treatment of the final *e*, cf. *yig-ge* and in compounds *yig* "letter", *lhaq-ge* and *lhaq-pa* "superior", *lhañ-ñe* and *lhañ-lhañ* "clear", *śig-ge-ba* (also *ljig-ge-ba*, cf. Grünwedel, loc. cit., p. 180), and *śig-śig* "close together", *gsal-le-ba* and *gsal-ba* "to be clear", *rtog-ge-ba* and *rtog-pa* "reasoning", *log-ge-ba* and *log-pa* "reversed, inverted".

³ The word-family is also among those adduced by St. N. Wolfenden in his paper 'Concerning the Variation of Final Consonants in the Word Families of Tibetan, Kachin, and Chinese' (*JRAS.*, 1937, pp. 629–630), though I should disagree as to the inclusion of some members (especially *lcag* "rod").

capsule, clod". These meanings clearly point to an assemblage of material, and so we find in *dag* as a plural suffix a close parallel to *tsho*, both meaning something similar to "assemblage". It stands to reason that the meaning "assemblage" would do equally well for the suggested etymology of *dañ*, which, as we will remember, means both "and" and "with". To say that something is "in the assemblage" of something else, does indeed express that it is together with it.

The assumed primary meaning of *dag* (and *dañ*) may be supported by two further relatives: *hdogs-pa* "to bind, to fasten" can easily be connected with the meaning "assemblage".¹ So can *dog* "narrow", if we think of a primary meaning "congested, closely packed, dense, serried". This latter assumption would seem to be supported by a derivative of *dog*, viz. *dogs* "fear" and "to fear". From the semasiological point of view, the French "*avoir le cœur serré*" may be compared,² and *dog—dogs* form a remarkable parallel to Latin *angustus* "narrow" and its derivative *angustia*, which in Vulgar Latin meant "fear".³ I may add that from the point of view of word-formation, *dogs* referred back to *dog sa* (or *dog so*) "narrow place" would fit in well with such nominal derivatives as *zabs* "depth" (lit. "deep place") or *nags* "forest" (lit. "dark place"), analysed in my paper in *HJAS*.

On the other hand, we are confronted with difficulties by *bdag*, which can hardly be separated from our *dag*. The meaning "self" does not seem to fit in with "assemblage", let alone the meaning "I". There is, however, no difficulty in connecting "assemblage" with the verb *bdog-pa* "to be in possession", and the noun *bdog-pa* "wealth, riches", to which belongs, as was already pointed out by Jäschke (*Dict.*, p. 271, s.v. *bdog-pa* ii), *bdag-po* "proprietor, master, lord". The three words would show that "possession" was understood as "assemblage" of something. And they throw also light on the meaning of *bdag*. "I" is evidently a secondary meaning, derived from "self", and in "self" apparently the idea of "exclusive possession" prevailed. Hence, the connection between *bdag*, *bdag-po*,

¹ With *hdogs-pa* (Perf. *btags*, Fut. *gdag(s)*, Imper. *thogs*) is connected probably *thag-pa* "rope", *thags* "texture", *tha-ga-pa* "weaver".

² I am indebted to Dr. A. Waley for recalling Japanese *kokorobosoi* ("heart-narrow") "anxious". I may also refer to Ch. Féré, "La Physiologie dans les métaphores" (*Revue de Philosophie*, xl (1895), pp. 352, etc., esp. p. 356).

³ Cf. W. Meyer-Lübke in his *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3rd ed., Heidelberg, 1935, No. 468), who renders its meaning by "*Angst*", which is itself related to *angustia*.

and *bdog-pa* can also be illustrated by a close parallel in English: *own*, *owner*, and *to own*.

Finally, *da* "now" must be discussed in this connection. From the well-known phrase *dehi dus-la bab-par šes-na* (which was included in the *Mahāvīyūtpatti*¹) it is evident that for the Tibetan mind the event is something which "comes down" to its (proper) time. So the word "now" might fix the moment when time and event "come together", and from this point of view, *da* could possibly be included in our etymological family. However, I do not think that it belongs to it. If we confront examples like *da nañ* "this morning", or *da lo* "this year" with *do nub* "this evening", or *do žag* "to-day", it seems much more likely that we have in *da* and *do* variants from the well-known pronominal stem²) which occurs in the demonstrative pronouns *de* "that", and *hdi* "this", and which probably is also hidden in *deñ*, or *diñ* "to-day".

II. *ciñ*

In accordance with the preamble to this paper, I wish to suggest that *ciñ* is to *cig* what *dañ* is to *dag*. But what is the primary meaning of *cig*? There is no doubt that it often corresponds to our indefinite article, and there is the obvious relation between *cig* (then meaning "a") and the numeral *gcig* "one". But what has puzzled grammarians is the fact that we find *cig* for instance after numerals. Foucaux³ translates *drañ sroñ lña žig* by "*un cinq (d') ermites*", or *žag bdun žig* by "*un sept (de) jours*". And Jäschke, who describes *cig* as "the numeral one (*gcig*) only deprived of its prefix", notes that "it is used even after a plurality" and tries to solve the difficulty by translating *chu mig bži žig* by "*some four wells*".⁴

In his *Dictionary* (p. 140), he has, however, given up this translation.⁵ And indeed, I think, the addition of *cig* to the numeral does not imply any idea of indefiniteness. An example from the *Dzañ-lun* (*mDzañs-blun*), which I should like to adduce in support of this statement, may at the same time prove suggestive for an explanation of the nature of *cig* (I. J. Schmidt's edition, p. 154; Narthang print,

¹ No. 6323 in Sakaki's edition (Kyōto, 1916-1925). The Sanskrit original (*yasye-dānīm kalam manyase*) has clearly not influenced the Tibetan idiomatic rendering.

² Cf. here below, p. 974.

³ *Grammaire de la langue tibétaine* (Paris, 1858), p. 20.

⁴ *Tibetan Grammar*, 3rd. ed., and reprint, pp. 19-20.

⁵ His translation there of *mi lña tsam žig* by "*some five people*" is brought about by *tsam*.

Mdo, Sa, pp. 328 A 7, and 328 B 1, etc.) *rin po che sna bdun las byas pahi mkhar ba sum cu rtsa gnyis sig byas te . . . sum cu rtsa gnyis po de la re re byin nas* ("Having thirty-two sticks made from the seven precious materials. . . , he gave one each to those thirty-two (youths)"). While the whole context (and also the Chinese version)¹ shows that we have to do here with *exactly* thirty-two sticks and youths, it would seem as if both *cig* and *po* are used in our passage much in the same way as classifiers are used in Chinese.² Since in our example *cig* and *po* are clearly contrasted as referring to things and animate beings respectively, it may be useful to point out that *cig* is not exclusively used to refer to inanimate matter. In the story about the two wives who claim the same boy, we find for instance (Jäschke, *Grammar*, 3rd ed., p. 84; cf. Schmidt's ed. of the *Dzañ-lun*, p. 275, l. 9; Narthang print, *Mdo, Sa*, p. 426 B, ll. 2-3): *der bud med gnyis sig bu gcig la rtsod de*.

There is, it is true, the difficulty that in Tibetan the numerals follow the noun to which they refer, as can be seen from our first sentence where "the seven kinds of precious materials" (*sapta-ratna*, cf. *Mahāvvyutpatti* (Sakaki), No. 3621) are rendered by *rin po che sna bdun*. If we were to think of *cig* and *po* as classifiers, we should have to assume that the numerals originally preceded the noun to which they refer, and that the positions which we observe with *cig* and *po* are vestiges of that former word-order. Support for this assumption may be found in a certain type of compounds, like *lña-mchod* "the five offerings" (religious service held on Tsong kha pa's birthday),³ or *gsum-mdo*⁴ and *bzi-mdo*⁵ "place where three (four) roads meet", which indeed show the numeral preceding its noun.⁶ Furthermore, side by side with *po* as in *gnyis-po*, *gsum-po*, *bzi-po*, etc., for "the three (four, five)", we find *gnyis-ka* (and *nyi-ga*), *gsum-ka*, etc.⁷

Thus it would seem at least possible to consider *cig* a classifier. In this case, as it is used both with things and with animate beings,

¹ Cf. *Tōkyō-Tripitaka*, vol. iv, p. 401a, l. 8.

² The Chinese version has in fact *ma pien san shih êrh mei* 馬鞭三十二枚. About the classifiers in colloquial Chinese, cf. for example C. W. Mateer, *A Course of Mandarin Lessons*, rev. ed. (Shanghai, 1900), Lesson I, p. 2. In literary Chinese the classifier follows the numeral.

³ Cf. S. Ch. Das, *Tibetan-English Dictionary* (Calcutta, 1902), p. 370.

⁴ Mostly *sum-mdo*. Cf. *Mahāvvyutpatti* (Sakaki), No. 5621.

⁵ Cf. *Mahāvvyutpatti* (Sakaki), No. 5620.

⁶ For further examples of this type see A. H. Francke in "Addenda" to Jäschke's *Grammar* (Reprint, Berlin, 1929), p. 126.

⁷ Cf. Jäschke, *Grammar*, p. 32.

the simplest assumption would be to assign to it the meaning "piece". This would not only account for the function as a classifier, but would also explain the function as an indefinite article. *mi zig* "man piece" would be "a man" in like manner as Chinese *yu kê jên* ("have piece man") means "There is (was) a man." Furthermore, it goes without saying that *gcig* "one" can easily be explained as a derivative of a word meaning "piece". The same is true of the aspirated variant of *cig* which we meet before 10, 100, 1,000, etc. (*chig bcu*, *chig brgya*, *chig stoñ*, etc.).¹

As was mentioned before, the plural is not regularly expressed in Tibetan. If *cig* is originally a noun, meaning "piece", we cannot be surprised to find it both as a singular and as a plural with adjectives and pronouns. *mañ-zig*² "many pieces" = "many" (which was noted by Jäschke) is then equally justified, as is *nyuñ-zig*, which can be literally translated as "little bit", or *riñ-zig* "long bit" = "long time". And both singular and plural meaning can be observed with *re-zig*, which would be "single piece(s)". In fact, Jäschke notes the meanings "somebody, something, some (persons), a little", and besides "a little while" (*Dict.*, p. 533). In the case of *hgañ zig* the plural meaning only is indicated by Desgodins³ and Jäschke (*Dict.*, p. 93).⁴ But there can be no doubt that neither *hgañ* itself nor *hgañ zig* are exclusively used in the plural. Both mean "somebody", or "something" as well as "some".⁵

¹ Cf. German "(ein) Stücke zehn, hundert, tausend". As is well known, also the words for two and three are found without a prefix before these numbers. Cf. Foucaux *Grammaire*, pp. 40-1.

² Also *mañ-po zig* may be found.

³ *Dictionnaire Thibétain-Latin-Français par les Missionnaires Catholiques du Thibet* (Hong Kong, 1899), p. 200: *aliqui, aliquot; quelques, plusieurs*. Also J. Bacot in the "Index des particules et locutions", included in his edition of *Les Ślokas Grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhota* (Paris, 1928), p. 95, renders *hgañ zig* by "beaucoup, plusieurs".

⁴ S. Ch. Das' *Tibetan-English Dictionary* incorporates neither *hgañ* nor *hgañ zig*.

⁵ In the case of *hgañ*, the use as a singular can already be inferred from the phrase *hgañ yañ* followed by a negation, correctly rendered by Jäschke as "no, no one, not any, none". Bacot, loc. cit., p. 95, translates *hgañ, hgañ tsam* by "peu". I note from the Tibetan version corresponding to the *Divyāvadāna* (ed. by E. B. Cowell and R. A. Neil, Cambridge, 1886, p. 34, 23/4), *Kanjur*, Narthang print, *hDul, Kha* 46 A 7, 46 B 1: *śes ldam dag . . . khyed cag gis mthoñ bañam/thos pa hgañ yod dam* ("Gentlemen, have you seen or heard of anyone": *bhavanto 'sti kaścīd yushmābhir dṛiṣṭāḥ śruto vā*). From the Tibetan version of the *Karmaśataka* (*Kanjur, mDo, Sa* 84 A 4): *bdag gis gdul bar hgyur ba hgañ lta ci yod* ("Is there then anyone whom I have converted?").

Examples for *hgañ zig* used as a singular: *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka-Sūtra* (ed. by U. Wogihara and C. Tsuchida, Tōkyō, 1934, p. 362, 20/1 = *Kanjur, Narthang print, mDo, Ja* 256 A 4/5): *de na sems can gcig hgañ zig gis spyān ras gzigs* (5) *dbañ phyug*

Even after a noun, *zig* does not necessarily denote a singular, but can also refer to a plural which is not indicated as such. It seems, however, that owing to their ambiguity such usages tend to be avoided.¹

A further argument, speaking in favour of a nominal origin of *cig*, is the occurrence of *cig-gu* instead of *cig*, which can hardly be anything else but its diminutive. It is true that *cig-gu* has apparently so far only been noted by the Tibetan grammarians, and by them only when it occurs instead of *cig* after an imperative.² But, as is evident from the examples in the note,³ the usage of *cig gu* is not restricted to the imperative only.

la bos na ("if there is anybody invoking Avalokiteśvara": *tasminś ca kaś-cid evaikah sattvah syād yo 'valokiteśvarasya . . . ākrandam kuryāt. Dzañ-lun* (Schmidt's edition, p. 128, 11 = *Kanjur*, Narthang print, *mDo, Sa* 305 B 7, 306 A 1): *gal te sna hgañ zig rnyed na* ("If you find anything" (lit. "any kind"). *Vinayavastu* (*Kanjur*, Narthang print, *hDul, Kha* 511 A 3: *Bris pas dgos pa hgañ zig gi phyir duñ gi rkañ pa gnyis la btugs pa las* ("Likhita touching Śāñkha's feet while asking him for something" (lit. "on account of some need"). For the Chinese version see *Tōkyō-Tripitaka*, vol. xxiv, p. 77 C 19; for the reconstruction of the names cf. also R. Nishio in *Kokuyaku-issaiikyō, Ritsu-bu*, vol. xxiii (1933), p. 279, notes 25-6.

Also the etymology of *hgañ* would hardly justify an exclusively plural usage. *hgañ* is evidently a prefixed derivative of *ga* which is itself the etymon of and synonymous with the interrogative-indefinite pronoun *gañ*.

¹ *Kanjur*, Narthang print, *hDul, Kha* 34 A 2: *hbab chu dañ mtsho dañ htsheshu dag gi hgram zig tu soñ ba dañ* ("when we went to the benches of the rivers, lakes, and ponds"). *Ibid.*, 411 B 1: *de nas mi zig gis . . . thos/ (2) . . . mthoñ nas / mi zig la dris pa / . . . des smras pa / šes ldan dag ci mi šes sam /* ("Thereafter some people (first *mi zig*) hearing and seeing . . . asked somebody (second *mi zig*) . . . he said: 'Gentlemen, do you not know. . . ?'").

² The Tibetan-Mongolian edition of the *Li-šihī gur khañ*, the *Bod kyī skad las gsar rnyin gi brdañ khyad par ston pa legs par bñad pa li šihī gur khañ* (see Schmidt-Boehlingk's *Verzeichniss, Tibetan-Mongolian prints*, No. 43, *Bull. Hist.-phil. Acad. St. Petersb.*, T. iv (1848), cols. 124-5) has on page 3 A 1 the remark: *gyur cig gu lta buñi gu ni smon pañi tshig*.

³ *Karmaśataka, Kanjur*, Narthang print, *mDo, Sa* 7 B 4: *sems can hdi lta bu šlon gyi ishe rabs dran la / tshigs kyañ smra zññ/ bcom ldan hdas dañ gnam zer ba su zig gu snyam mo* ("They thought, 'Who is this being that remembers his previous existence, speaks and converses with the Bhagavat?'"). *Ibid.*, 24 A 3: *. . . de nas deñi chruñ mas bsams pa / ci hdi (4) bya ba byas pa yin nam / hon te so soñi skye bo yin zig gu / gal te so soñi skye bo yin na ni . . .* (Then his wife thought: "Can he do (extraordinary) things or is he a common man, if he is a common man . . ."). *Ibid.*, 26 A 1 *de nas nag pa glañ chen gnas kyis bsams pa / hod hdi suñi yin zig gu / bcom ldan hdas kho nañi gor ma chag na / bcom ldan hdas ga la bzugs te / bdag la dgoñs zig gu snyam pa dañ* ("Then Nāgadeśa (cf. Feer, *Journ. As.*, 1901 (Janv.-Juin), p. 436) thought: 'From whom does this light emanate? (lit. whose is this light?). As it surely comes from the Bhagavat himself, may the Bhagavat remember me where(ever) he be!'). 83 A 5 *khyim bdag des bsams pa / thabs ji (6) ltar byas na / khyeñu hdiñi tshe riñ bar hgyur zig gu snyam nas* ("The householder thought: 'What can I do to ensure a long life to this boy (lit. If I do in what manner, this boy's life (is) turning into a long one)'"). *Ibid.* 143 B 3 *hjiñ rten na mi hjiñ pañi chos gañ hjiñ par mi hgyur ba hgañ lta yod dam*

To discuss the nature of *cig* after an imperative would seem to lie outside the scope of this paper, which is now concerned with the etymology of *cin*. I think, however, that the suggested meaning "piece" gives us also an explanation for this peculiar usage of *cig*, and that it may therefore be adduced in support of the etymology. *šog šig*, literally "come piece!", can hardly have meant anything else but "come a little!". So the addition of *cig* after the imperative must originally have aimed at softening its harshness.¹ There is, however, a grave objection in the way of this explanation. It would seem incompatible with the principles of Tibetan word-order that the verb should be followed by a word which not only qualifies it but, in accordance with its nominal origin, in some cases even appears to function as its very object. The latter cases can perhaps be most easily dismissed. *zos šig* "eat!", or *phul šig* "give" would, indeed, according to our suggestion, originally mean "eat piece!", or "give piece", and the usage of *cig* after an imperative may probably have started from cases of this kind. But it was equally justifiable for *cig* "piece" to be used after a neuter verb—as in *šog šig*—where it would likewise denote that the requested action or state should have only a limited extent.² Once this latter usage had become generalized, the special function as object after transitive verbs was probably no longer felt as such, much the same as in French, where the negation with *pas* has been developed by a similar process of generalization, no difference is felt between *je ne tue pas* and *je ne vais pas*, although the latter can still be literally translated by "I do not go (a) step". If in spite of the well-established Tibetan word-order which places the object and any other qualifier of the verb before it, we find *cig* after the verb, this is due, I think, to the coincidence of two factors,

šig gu snyam mo ("he thought: 'Is there in the world then (*lta*) any (*hgah*, see here above, p. 959, n. 5) imperishable doctrine which will not perish?'").

¹ Cf. A. H. Gardiner, *The Theory of Speech and Language* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 311–12 "Almost everywhere there may be observed a tendency to replace the imperative by other forms, or at least to mitigate its peremptoriness by the addition of some courteous word or phrase." I may add that A. H. Francke (*Addenda* to the repr. of Jäschke's *Grammar*, 1929, p. 154) compared the German *einmal* after the imperative. His suggestion is of course, linked up with the idea that *cig* means primarily "one".

² It would seem as if originally the limited extent requested for an action could be contrasted by a sweeping prohibition. This, at least, would account for the appearance of *cog ge šog* < **cog ge cog* in the examples referred to in note 2 on page 955. Cf. English at all with the negative imperative. (For the word-order, see below.) The usual appearance of *cig* with the negative imperative can, of course, also well be reconciled with the meaning "piece": *ma zer cig* "do not say a bit". (I do not discuss here the difference in stem of the negative imperative.)

one, that *cig* is enclitic,¹ and two, that we have to deal with its appearance after an imperative. We observe, in the Romance languages for instance, the position after the verb of toneless words which normally precede it, when the verb starts the sentence.² And if, as is often the case with imperatives, the sentence consists of nothing else but the verb in the imperative, the latter position naturally arises. I think therefore that the usage of appending *cig* to the imperative started with commands, or requests which consisted of the verb only. The meaning "a little" for *cig* must have faded at an early stage, so that, for instance, "wait a little" is generally expressed by *re zig sdod* (literally: "single piece wait," cf. above, p. 959), whereas *sdod cig* merely means "wait!"

Reverting, after this digression, to the etymology of *cig*, I find, as in the case of *dag*, further support for it in other members of the word-family. In addition to *ciñ*, which will be discussed presently, I consider *cig* (and *chig*), in the same way as *cag* and *cog*, members of the etymological family meaning "to break" which we discussed above (p. 955). Whereas the alternation *a—o*, which we find in *cag* and *cog*, occurs so frequently that it need not be exemplified, a few examples for the alternance *a—i*, which we assume when incorporating *cig* (and *chig*) in the etymological family, may be necessary to justify their inclusion. Side by side with *thañ*, primarily meaning "ground", as was shown in my paper in *HJAS.*, we have *gtiñ* "bottom",³ or side by side with *hbrañ* "to follow" we have *hbriñ* "to follow"; and *hbriñ-po* "the middle (of three sons)" is obviously "the second" and as such a remarkable parallel to Latin *secundus*, derived from **sequondos* = "the following".⁴ *rdza* "clay" belongs to *rdzi-ba* "to knead, press, tread", as does Latin *fictilis* "made of clay", *figulus* "potter", etc., with *fingo*⁵ "to knead, mould, shape". Along with *thal-mo* "palm" we find *mthil* in *lag-mthil* "palm". *ldañ* "to rise" is complemented by *ldiñ* "to be swimming, floating, soaring" = "to be on top", or *hchañ* "to take hold of" by *hchiñ* "to bind". While *nyal* means "to lie down" (also of things: *rtsva nyal* "the grass is

¹ The enclisis is again borne out by the phonetic changes; cf. here above, p. 954.

² Cf., e.g., French *tue-le !* side by side with *je le tue*.

³ See also here below, p. 974.

⁴ Cf., e.g., C. D. Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (2nd Impr., Chicago, 1937), p. 134.

⁵ Cf. A. Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed., by J. B. Hofmann (Heidelberg, 1938), p. 501. The Tibetan series includes also *rdzu-ba* "to give a deceptive appearance" and other derivatives which will be discussed on another occasion. *rdzu-ba* obviously recalls a similar meaning of Latin *fingo*.

laid down", see Jäschke, *Dict.*, p. 186), *nyil* is "to decay, to crumble to pieces (of mountains)", also "to run down, flow down". *htshar* "to be finished, consumed, spent" apparently belongs to *htshir* "to press, press out, crush out", and *sbron*, *sbran* "to inform" to *hphrin* "to inform" and *phrin*, *hphrin* "message".

Let us now, after the attempt to prove for *cig* the original meaning "piece", revert to *ciñ*. In accordance with what has been said before, it would mean "in a (one) piece", or "together with", and these meanings would indeed, I think, explain the so-called gerundial function of *ciñ*, implying simultaneousness. A confirmation of the assumed phonetic development can be found in the following Kanjur-passage,¹ where *nyin re žiñ* "on each day" clearly stands for *nyin re žig na* (Narthang print, *hDul, Kha*, 281 B 4/5): *šes ldan dag ŋas khyed cag rnamš nyin re žiñ lña brgyaḥi bzaḥ ba dañ / bcaḥ ba bsod pa rab tu mañ po sta gon gyis žig par ma bsgo* (5) *ham* ("Gentlemen, did I not order you to have good food and drink in plenty prepared daily for 500 (monks)?"²)

Our discussion of the etymology of *cig* and *ciñ* would, however, not seem complete without taking into account both *ci* and *ce*, which can hardly be excluded from the etymological family. Obviously, the link between *cig* "piece" and the interrogative-indefinite pronoun *ci* is provided by the indefinite meaning of *ci* "something",³ which occurs so often in negative sentences, followed by (and mostly contracted with) *hañ* (= *yañ*: see here below, p. 966) "also".⁴ It is then reminiscent of Chinese 一點也不 *i tien yeh pu* ("not even one dot") and can be imitated in English by "not a bit". Apparently the indefinite *ci* can even be provided with the diminutive suffix *gu*, in the same way as *cig* (see above, p. 960, n. 3), although so far I can offer only one example of this usage.⁵ The development of the

¹ For the corresponding Chinese passage see *Tōkyō-Tripitaka*, vol. xxiv, p. 47 C 19.

² Observe also the addition of *par* after *cig*. For a similar function of *pa* after numerals, cf. Jäschke, *Grammar*, pp. 32-3. A further passage with *nyin re žiñ* (= Sanskrit *dine dine*) is to be found in the Tibetan version corresponding to *Divyāvāna* (ed. Cowell and Neil), p. 540, l. 15: *Kanjur, hDul, Kha* 430 B 2.

³ Also *cig* occurs as indefinite pronoun. Laufer, *Roman e. Tib. Königin*, Leipzig, 1911, p. 57, 11. 6/7 *mi khyod re dgaḥ žig hdug pa / cig rnyed pa žig yin nam ci la dgaḥ* ("You, man, are very cheerful. Have you found anything? or why are you (so) cheerful?").

⁴ For example, in the frequent sentence about the Buddha's silently accepting an invitation, included in the *Mahāvīyūtpatti* (ed. Sakaki, No. 6451): *cañ mi gsuñ bar gyur bas gnañ (tāṣṇīm bhāvenādhivāsayati)*.

⁵ Laufer, *Tib. Königin*, p. 58, 17: *ci gu thams cad brtags nas mi zer bar / bandes brkus so rgyug cig zer zer nas* ("You would not have said anything, if you had examined everything (lit. all little bits), instead of that you kept on saying: 'The priest stole

interrogative and relational usage of *ci* from the indefinite usage, while constituting in itself a very interesting problem, which is in some way reminiscent of the development of the Chinese relational 所 *so* from the noun *so* meaning “place”),¹ need not, of course, occupy us here.

As for *ce*, which occurs mostly with the instrumental or locative suffixes attached to it (*ces*, *ce-na*), it seems nearest to *cha* “part” of the etymological family. Like the alternation *a—o*, the alternation *a—e* is so frequent that it need not be exemplified. The function of *ce* is to refer back to a name, an expression, a sentence, or a statement. It is possible that a meaning not very different from “part” fulfilled this function by pointing to the whole as “that lot”, in a similar way as *cog* and *cag* function as plural suffixes, while meaning something like “the lot” (see above, p. 955, and also below, p. 971 n. 1).

III. *kyin*

kyin (with its alternative forms *gyin*, *gin*, *hin*, *yin*) has been touched upon in my paper in *HJAS.*, where it is adduced as an exact parallel to *kyis* (with its alternative forms), as far as the loss of the final vowel is concerned (the final *s* of the instrumental suffix being referred back to an original *sa*, or *so* “place”). While this treatment of the final vowel can now be confirmed by the further examples *dañ* and *ciñ*, the nature of the genitival suffix *kyi* and its alternative forms have yet to be discussed.

So far as I am aware, Professor Sten Konow was the first to point out that we have to deal here with a demonstrative pronoun.² His statement is partly based on the similarity in sound and function with the Chinese genitival particle *chiñ*, which also occurs as a pronoun. On an earlier occasion³ he also compared the Burmese genitival suffix *i*. Both suggestions are accepted by Ch. Duroiselle, when he discusses Old Burmese *εε e'*, the predecessor of the modern *ေ i*.⁴

In view of the original form of the suffix *kyi* which I am going to suggest, the theory that *kyi* is etymologically identical with Chinese

it, pursue him!’”) The parallel version of the story in the *Gzer-myig* (ed. by A. H. Francke, *Asia Major*, vol. iv (1927), p. 500 = MS., Fol. 79 B 1) has, however, *ji dgu*, which would be “the nine pieces”, *dgu* being used in a generalizing way (see Jäschke, *Grammar*, Repr., Addenda, pp. 113 and 126) and *ji* being a (correlative) variant of *ci* (Jäschke, *Dict.*, p. 172).

¹ See my paper “Has the Chinese Language Parts of Speech?” (*Transact. Philol. Soc.*, 1937, p. 106), where this development has been touched upon.

² *Linguistic Survey of India*, vol. iii, P. i (1909), p. 26.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. iii, P. iii (1904), p. 6.

⁴ *Epigraphia Birmanica*, vol. i (1919), pp. 35–6.

chih will, if maintained, require fresh substantiation. (On the other hand, this original form would seem even more closely related to the Burmese genitival suffix.) The functional similarity between *kyi* and *chih* is indeed striking. In both Chinese and Tibetan the rule of word-order prevails that the qualifier precedes the qualified, though there are differences in the treatment of adjectival epithets, for instance or in the position of the object. The function of *kyi* and *chih* then primarily at least, merely consists in ensuring that qualification will be understood, especially in cases when it would not seem clear from itself. It goes without saying that such kind of function can very well be fulfilled by a pronoun. In the case of *kyi* the meaning seems to be "this", or perhaps even "this latter", thus clearly referring to what immediately precedes it. This pronominal meaning can also be confirmed by the correlative usage of *kyi* and *ho* which we shall discuss here later (see p. 971).

If, then, *kyi* means "this", *kyin* < *kyi-na* means "in this". This meaning, as is obvious, would well account for the "gerundial"¹ function of *kyin*, which it shares with *ciŃ*,² though it is of much rarer occurrence than the latter in literary Tibetan. Like *ciŃ*, it refers back to an action, or a state of things expressed by the preceding verb. But while *ciŃ*, as we have seen, implies simultaneousness by its etymology, *kyin* is closely related to *ho-na*, which was explained as "in this" in my paper in *HJAS*.

However, the etymology of *kyin* cannot be dismissed without an attempt to account for the four alternative forms of its etymon. As is well known, we observe *kyi* after final *d*, *b*, *s*; *gyi* after *n*, *m*, *r*, *l*; *gi* after *g* and *Ń*; and *hi* with the alternative *yi* in poetry after final vowels.³ At first sight, it looks as if *gyi* is the original form of the suffix. We could then account for *kyi* by way of assimilation, although this would seem obvious only after *s*, and we might see in *gi*, *hi*, and *yi* reduced forms of *gyi*. The latter assumption, however, is bound to cause serious difficulties. We are used to expect reduced forms of suffixes, when the usage of the full forms leads to consonantal clusters which are difficult to pronounce. But exactly the opposite takes place.

¹ Cf., e.g., Jäschke, *Grammar*, 3rd ed. (and repr.), pp. 46-7 and 60.

² Cf. also A. H. Francke in *Addenda* to Jäschke's *Grammar* (Repr., 1929), p. 156.

³ Cf. Jäschke, *Grammar*, p. 21. The rules can, of course, be found already in the works of the Tibetan grammarians. I refer to the recent editions and translations by J. Bacot (*Les Štokas grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhoṭa* (Paris, 1928), pp. 24, etc.), and J. Schubert (*Mitt. d. Sem. f. Orient. Sprachen*, 1928, I. Abt., p. 43, and *Artibus Asiae*, 1st Supplement, 1937, p. 46).

We find *kyi* added to words which end in *gs* and *bs*. From these clusters of four consonants (*gsky* and *bsky*) arise, and they are not simplified. On the other hand, we should have to suppose that *gyi*, when appended to a final vowel, or as we shall see below, rather to final *h*, had to be simplified to either *yi*, or *hi*. Nor do our difficulties end here. As will be suggested later, there is reason to regard the copula *yin* as etymologically identical with the alternative form *yin* of *kyin*. *yin*, in its function as copula, would again be very difficult to reconcile with an original *gyi-na* to which we should have to refer it back. And if we were to reject the etymology of *yin* on account of this difficulty, we should still be confronted with nearly the same facts by *yañ*, which, when isolated and stressed (in the meaning “again”) sounds *yañ*, but when enclitic (in the meaning “also”) sounds *kyañ* after *g*, *b*, *d*, *s*, and either *yañ* or *hañ* after vowels.¹ In view of these difficulties, I think it is impossible to refer *kyi*, *hi*, and *yi* back to an original *gyi*.

I suppose that the original form of what has become the genitival suffix was *'yi*, i.e. *yi* preceded by the glottal stop ʔ. The suggestion implies that I reckon with an original initial consonantal cluster “glottal stop + y” which as such no longer existed at the time when the Tibetan script was introduced, as it is never written there. Since I suppose the glottal stop to have been initial in *'yi*, I am entitled to assume certain changes when it becomes medial through enclisis. The first change which I then assume is a passing from laryngeal to guttural articulation, when *'yi* is appended to a word ending in a consonant (which is not itself laryngeal). This change would cover *kyi* and (with simultaneous or subsequent sonorization) also *gyi*. It would account also for *kyañ*, and for *gyañ*, which, though apparently not mentioned by Tibetan or European grammarians, occurs in Old-Tibetan documents.²

In the case of *gi*, which occurs after *g* and *ñ*, we must try to explain the loss of the *y*. This loss can also be observed in *hi*, which we find after vowels as an alternative of *yi*, the latter being mostly limited to poetry. In the same way, both *hañ* and *yañ* occur after vowels in the meaning “also”. Considering this post-vocalic position, we must keep in mind that the so-called final vowel was, in an earlier stage

¹ See, e.g., Jäschke, *Dictionary*, p. 505. See also his *Grammar*, p. 75, n. 1, and Bacot, *Šlokas grammaticaux*, pp. 27–8.

² See A. H. Francke, *Tibetische Handschriftenfunde aus Turfan (Sitzungsberichte d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1924, iii, p. 16.*

of the language, followed by the laryngal fricative *h*.¹ When 'yi was appended to words allegedly ending in a vowel, it seems that its laryngal plosive was either lost or assimilated to the preceding laryngal fricative. In the latter case, *y* was, I think, ousted by *h*. The fate which 'yi has suffered after a guttural is very similar. As the guttural articulation is most closely related to the laryngal, we may assume that the contact between the guttural final was closer and resulted first in a change of the glottal stop to *h* by way of sonorization. The change to *h* implied again the ousting of the *y*. The actual passing from laryngal to guttural articulation so resulted in *gi* not only after the guttural nasal (in accordance with *gyi* after *n* and *m*), but also after the guttural plosive (as opposed to *kyi* after *b* and *d*).²

IV. *yin*

We have just come across *yin* as one of the alternative forms of *kyin*, but it would seem quite different from the word *yin* which we meet so often in our texts as the copula. Nevertheless, as was intimated above, I should like to suggest that we have to do here with one and the same word. After having discussed what, I think, was the original form of *kyin*, we can easily dismiss the objection why there are no alternative forms to the copula *yin*, as there are to the gerundial suffix. Obviously *yin*, while being probably unstressed as the copula,³ is then not enclitical and stands beside the fourfold gerundial suffix, as does *yañ* "again" beside the threefold *yañ* "also".

Let us, however, consider the syntactical implications of our etymology. Since *yin*, as we have seen, is a demonstrative pronoun (provided with a locative suffix), the etymology would mean that we have to reckon, at least primarily, with nominal sentences in Tibetan. *mi hdi ston pa yin* would originally be "man this teacher this-in", i.e. "This man (belongs) in the category of teachers". There could, it is true, hardly be any objection to this translation from the point of view of meaning, and it may be added that this way of expression would even be in full accordance with a well-known logical theory of predication, the so-called "class-inclusion view".⁴ But the issue,

¹ See my *Tibetisch-chinesische Wortgleichungen* (Berlin, 1930), pp. 6-7, and p. 6, n. 6. Cf. also Bacot, *Les Ślokas grammaticaux*, p. 25, n. 1, p. 45, n. 1, and p. 187.

² I find, however, one example of *gyis* after final *g* in the Old-Tibetan texts published by A. H. Francke. See p. 9 of the paper quoted here, p. 966, n. 2. Note that so far there is no example for *gañ* as an alternative form of 'yañ.

³ See the remark in the preamble to this paper.

⁴ Cf., for instance, J. Welton, *Manual of Logic*, vol. i, 2nd ed., 6th Impr. (London, 1922), pp. 198-200, and J. N. Keynes, *Studies and Exercises in Formal Logic* (London, 1928), pp. 181, etc.

after all, is syntactical, not logical. It would seem difficult to base the alleged existence of nominal sentences in Tibetan exclusively on the evidence of our etymology. However, to quote Jäschke,¹ “*yin* itself is often omitted in daily life in Western Tibet, as well as in poetry.” Here, then, there are certainly examples of nominal sentences, whatever the nature of *yin*. And the existence of nominal sentences is by no means restricted to the two spheres indicated by Jäschke. They are not very rare in questions,² and we have in fact an abundant number of further examples in all those cases where *ciñ*, *ste*, *kyi*, or *la* occur after adjectives. According to Jäschke’s explanation, these suffixes then “include the verb *to be*” (*Dict.*, pp. 7 and 14), or “contain the copula”. But such an explanation, suspect in itself, finds at least no support in the etymological analysis of the suffixes attempted in *HJAS.* and in this paper. To my mind, there can hardly be any doubt that we have to do here with a large group of nominal sentences. If that is so, the part of *yin* can primarily have been no other than to emphasize the special structure of the sentence. And it shares this function with another pronoun, with which it can also be combined. I mean the so-called final *o*, in which I see, as was asserted in *HJAS.*, the demonstrative pronoun *ho* “that”.³ To discuss first the combination of *yin* and *ho*, it seems that the logical inclusion of the subject in the class named as predicate becomes even more manifest. Since *yin*, in like manner as *kyi*, cannot refer to anything but the immediately preceding word,⁴ it is probable that *ho* will then refer to the subject. This would also be in accordance with its meaning “that”, pointing to a more distant object. In the form *mi hdi ston pa yin no*,⁵ our sentence would therefore indicate the class-inclusion in a way which is nearing a mathematical formula. After naming first subject, then predicate, it asserts that the former belongs in the latter. From the linguistic point of view no mean achievement indeed.

Passing from the cases where we find a combination of *yin* and *ho*

¹ *Grammar*, 3rd ed., p. 52.

² Cf., e.g., the first example adduced here in n. 1 on p. 960, or the sentence *hdiñi gam tshigs gañ* (“what is the proof of this?”), included in Thonmi Sambhōṭa’s *Stokas* (ed. J. Bacot, Paris, 1928, p. 41).

³ When writing that paper, I failed to realize that *ho* itself is recognized as a demonstrative pronoun, and that only its identity with the final *o* has to be proved. I wish, however, to point out that Csoma in his *Dictionary* clearly differentiates between *hu* “this”, and *ho* “that”, though the two pronouns have been mixed up by Jäschke, who quotes Csoma as his authority (*Dict.*, pp. 499 and 500).

⁴ See above, p. 965.

⁵ About the assimilation of *h* to the final consonant of the preceding word, see here below, p. 969, n. 4.

to those where *ho*, to quote Jäschke,¹ "is found to represent the verb 'to be' in all its meanings," we shall feel inclined to see in *ho* again a reference to the subject. The function of *ho* then becomes strongly reminiscent of a similar part played by the personal pronoun of the third person in Hebrew. There, in nominal sentences "not infrequently a connection is established between subject and predicate by adding the separate pronoun of the 3rd person sg. or plur., expressly resuming and therefore strengthening the subject".² The respective spheres of *yin* and *ho* have, it is true, not yet been clearly defined. However, it is interesting to note that, according to A. H. Francke,³ *yin* is used "particularly in those cases where the predicate is a substantive". Since the usage of *yin* must have started from cases where it follows a noun denoting some kind of a class, it would be quite in accordance with the etymology of *yin*, if it is found preferably with nouns, if not with nouns denoting a class. However, this question must be left to later research.

While the etymology of *yin* is clearly supported by both the addition and the similar usage of *ho*, the identity of this *ho* with the demonstrative pronoun has still to be proved. First, it must be admitted that the form *ho* occurs only after vowels. When the preceding word ends in a consonant, either the vowel *o* is appended, or the consonant is repeated: *bdeno* or *bden no* ("it is true"). But this assimilation, or loss of the initial *h*⁴ would have hardly prevented grammarians from recognizing the identity, and in fact, they often spell the final particle as *ho* while discussing it. If so far no attempt has been made to identify the final *ho* with the demonstrative pronoun, this was the case because *ho* does not occur only after nouns, and adjectives, i.e. at the end of what we should now call nominal sentences, but also after the last verb of a sentence, which it is then said to mark as the final verb. For this latter usage which shows various degrees of frequency in different kinds of texts, a number of explanations would offer themselves. The final *ho*, while in its original sphere in nominal sentences only, may have encroached on the verbal sentences. Or, when occurring in verbal sentences, it may at first have been

¹ *Grammar*, 3rd. ed., p. 53.

² Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd English edition by A. E. Cowley (Oxford, 1910), p. 453, § 141, *g—a*.

³ "Addenda" to Jäschke's *Grammar*, repr., 1929, p. 147.

⁴ The treatment of the initial *h* here clearly differs from that suggested for *hi* < 'yi (see above, p. 966). But there we had to do with a transient sound, whereas here we are confronted by the assimilation of a word starting with *h*. See also here later.

added when it properly belonged not to the final verb, to which it was appended, but to a verb of saying, thinking, believing, hoping, etc., which followed immediately after it, in a similar manner as the English “conjunction” *that* originally belonged to the preceding verb as its object.¹ Or, the addition of *ho* may appear justified, or at least facilitated by the well-known nominal nature of the Tibetan verb (which manifests itself in the usage of the instrumental case to express the subject of a transitive verb). Especially the latter alternative would involve the discussion of the Tibetan verb, which I do not wish to attempt here. Therefore I content myself with mentioning several possible explanations for the occurrence of the demonstrative pronoun *ho* at the end of a verbal sentence, without committing myself to any of them. All of them would seem to account for it in a not wholly unsatisfactory way. On the other hand, the non-committal attitude towards them renders the allegation of additional proof for the pronominal origin of the final *ho* all the more imperative.

I find such support, above all, in the occurrence of *ho cog* in circumstances which are strongly reminiscent of the appearance of *ho* after the final verb,² and in the case of *ho cog* the pronominal character of the *ho* can hardly be doubted. It is nothing else, I think, but the demonstrative pronoun *ho* followed by the plural suffix *cog* which we discussed in the beginning of this paper.³ As is evident from the quotation just given, Jäschke, while failing to recognize the nature of *ho cog*,⁴ translated it correctly by “those” (better perhaps “all those”). *ho cog* seems to have become obsolete; expressions like *de dag thams cad* replace it in later texts.⁵

¹ “I think that he will come” < “I think that. He will come.” See also here below, p. 971, n. 1.

² Cf., e.g., the description by Jäschke, s.v. *cog* (*Dict.*, p. 142): “When affixed to a word, it must be preceded by the vowel *o*, the final consonant of the root being at the same time repeated. Affixed to verbs, it seems to convert them into participles: *hoñs so cog la* ‘to those arrived.’” On p. 499 Jäschke wrongly inserts *ho cog* under *hu cog*, giving it the meaning “we”.

³ See above, p. 955, n. 2, and p. 961, n. 2.

⁴ One must go back to the oldest European dictionary of Tibetan to find a separate entry *ho cog*. It is included in F. C. G. Schroeter’s *Dictionary of the Bhotanta or Boutan Language* (Serampore, 1826, p. 474) and translated there as “all, the whole”. This is in agreement with a gloss in the *brDañ gsar rnyid gi skor*, where it is rendered by *ma lus*, which stands evidently for *ma lus par* “entirely” (see p. 2 B of the Tibetan-Mongolian edition of the work, which constitutes the last part of the *Dag yig mkhas pañi byuñ gnas*).

⁵ In addition to the example quoted by Jäschke from the *Dzañ-lun*, or that adduced by S. Ch. Das under *cog-cig-car* (*Dict.*, p. 384), I wish to refer to a number of examples in the *Karmaśataka*, where, however, also *de dag thams cad* occurs in the same syntactical situation. A passage like *kye ma rgyal po chen po rnam thos kyi bu gnod sbyin che bar*

A further argument for the pronominal origin of the final *ho* can be seen in the fact that *ho* is correlated to another pronoun in double sentences (both being appended to the respective verbs). This is *kyi*, as we have seen, the etymon of *yin*, and as we shall see, also a close relative of the pronoun *ho*. The correlative usage of *kyi*¹ and *ho* is in a way reminiscent of Greek *μέν* and *δέ*: Kanjur, Narthang print, *hDul, Ka*, 403 A 6/7) *de lta bas na rjesu gnañ ste / khyim du khri stan mthon po la hduḡ par byaḥi der nyal bar ni mi byaḥo* (“so he allowed (the monks) to sit in a house on beds highly covered with mattresses (= *uccaśayana*: cf. *Mahāvīyutpatti*, ed. Sakaki, No. 8699), but not to sleep on them”); (*Karmaśataka*, Kanjur, Narthang print, *mDo, Sa*,

grags so cog dañ lhan (104 A) *cig tu ña blta baḥi phyir hoñs na* (“Oh, if the great Kuvera together with all the famous Yakshas came to see me”, *mDo, Sa*, p. 103 B 7, Narthang print of the Kanjur) can be compared with *bdag cag gi bzaḥ ba dañ / bcaḥ ba sta gon byas pa de dag thams cad . . . phulo* (“I gave away all the food and drink which I had prepared”, *ibid.*, p. 86 A 2). For *byas pa de dag thams cad* also *byas so cog* could be found. I give the following further examples: *bu dañ bu mo btsaso cog ḥchi bar ḥgyur ro* (“all the sons and daughters that he had died”; *ibid.*, 83 A 3); *de nas deḥi khyim bdag paḥi gos dañ rgyan bskon no cog mi snañ bar gyur te* (“then all the clothes and the adornment of a householder with which he had dressed (him) vanished”, *ibid.*, p. 83 B 5). I have only one example for *ho cog* after an adjective: *nyin cig bzin du ri dags bzañ ño cog bsad de* (“daily killing good game”, *ibid.* 140 A 6). As can be gathered from the examples, after a verb *ho cog* plays often the part of what would be the antecedent of a relational clause. This may throw light on an interesting passage of the *gZer Myig (Asia Major*, iv (1927), p. 498, l. 7): *slob dpon lhaḥis gsuñs na ci gsuñ ma nyan no chog* (or *cog*). A. H. Francke (*ibid.*, vol. v (1928), p. 13, translates: “If the divine Master does not speak, I wish to hear no other speech.” I think the passage rather means: “When the divine Master spoke I did not hear all that he said.” That the passage is difficult can also be inferred from the fact that it is changed in the version reproduced in Laufer’s *Roman einer Tibetischen Königin* (Leipzig, 1911, p. 57, ll. 2–3). [A number of examples for *ho cog* (which I discovered only after this article had gone to press) are included in A. Schiefner’s paper “Über Pluralbezeichnungen im Tibetischen” (*Mém. Acad. St. Petersb.* xxv (1878), No. I, pp. 15–16). Schiefner also explains the *ho* of *ho cog* as demonstrative pronoun.]

¹ That *kyi* is used “when two sentences are in contrast to each other”, has already been pointed out by A. H. Francke in the “*Addenda*” to Jäschke’s *Grammar* (Repr., 1929, p. 156). But his two examples fail to show the correlative usage of *kyi* and *ho*. Jäschke combines *kyi* with *kyis* both in his *Grammar* (3rd Ed., pp. 59–60) and in his *Dictionary* (pp. 6–7) without mentioning *ho* in either place. As for *kyi* and *kyis* occurring at the end of sentences and allegedly expressing the future tense (Jäschke, *Dict.*, p. 6; Francke, *Addenda*, p. 153), I should like to point out that the examples are apparently always followed by a verb of saying, so that *kyi* and *kyis* might properly belong to this verb, in the case of *kyi* in a similar way as this was suggested as a possible explanation for *ho* after a verb (see here above, p. 970, and n. 1), in the case of *kyis* in a manner which is reminiscent of *ces* (see here above, p. 964). It need hardly be said that there is, of course, no connection between *gyis* and the verb *bgyid-pa* “to make”, as suggested by A. H. Francke. To his example from the *gZer-Myig (As. Major*, iv, p. 512, 12; cf. also p. 492, 13, and Laufer, *Tib.-Königin*, p. 67, 16) add *ḥgroḥis* in *As. Major*, iv, p. 175, 15, which shows that his suggestion cannot be maintained.

134 B 1) *khyod ni rgyal pohi hos lags kyi bdag ni hos ma lags so* ("You are worthy to be king, not I"); (*Kanjur*, Narthang print, *hDul, Kha* 287 A 1) *dge sloñ mgo reg hdi dag ni tshod ma ro sna tshogs dañ ldan pa dañ / hbras chan za bar hos pa ma yin gyi / nas rul pa za bar hos pa yin no* ("These shaven-headed monks need not eat exquisite dishes and boiled rice, they should eat rotten barley"). The last example shows us the combination *yin gyi* as correlative to the combination *yin no* which has been discussed before. *lags-kyi* and *lags so*, which we find in the last but one example, are of course the honorifics for *yin gyi* and *yin no*.

Another argument for the pronominal origin of *ho* may be found in the fact that it is not only correlated to *kyi* and alternating with *yin*, but itself a close relative of the two latter words. But this will better be discussed in connection with our next particle.

V. *ham*

As was indicated in the preamble to this paper, I assume that the final *m* of *ham* is shortened from the negation *ma*, or *mi*. The first element *ha* is, I think, another demonstrative pronoun which is appended to words in the same way as *ho*, and which is even, as we shall see, etymologically closely related with it.

But before discussing the etymology of *ha*, we must consider the syntactical side of the suggestion. According to it, the Tibetan question would be formed in a way which is strongly reminiscent of Latin. There we have the negation *ne* functioning as a question-particle. And in a sphere closely connected with Tibetan, there is another parallel to this usage, viz. in Colloquial (Northern) Chinese. The particles *ma*, or *mo*, used to form the question, do not, it is true, occur as such as negation. But it can hardly be accidental that they are similar and, in certain parts, even identical in sound with the common Sinitic negation. Moreover, we have in Literary Chinese the negation 否 *fou* used as a question particle. Also the double question in the form 他好不好 *t'a hao pu hao* ("is he well?")¹ (which occurs in Tibetan as well) may be mentioned in this connection.

Let us now revert to the first element. Is *ha* then a relative of *ho* "that" (which would bring in *hu* "this" at the same time),

¹ Cf. how Professor Bacot (*Les Ślokas grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhota*, p. 31, n. 2) expresses a similar point of view concerning the Chinese and Tibetan questions, without, however, discussing the etymology of *ham*. Concerning the Chinese double question I may refer to my paper in *Sinica*, viii (1933), pp. 216-220.

and is there, furthermore, a connection between the three words and the various forms of *kyi*, for which we have reconstructed an original **yi*? Asserting that all these words are indeed closely related with one another, implies the assumption that side by side with **yi* there must have been originally **ya*, **yo*, and **yu*,¹ from which *ha*, *ho*, and *hu* have arisen in a similar way as *hi* has arisen from **yi*.

I wish first to prove the reconstruction of **ya*, **yo*, and **yu* by adducing what I assume to be other members of the etymological family. Starting with *ya*, which is the independent form of **ya* in the same way as *yin* is the independent form of **yi-na*, or *yañ* the independent form of **yañ*, we recognize that the demonstrative pronoun *ha* has an original local meaning. For *ya* means "above" (and also "one of a kind, one member of a pair"). In my paper in *HJAS*. I connected with it the word for "right side", *gyas*, explaining it as "the high side" (*gya sa* or *so*). Looking at the word *gyon* for "left", we shall now, in the light of the etymologies of this paper, separate it from *yo* "oblique"², with which I had connected it, and refer it back to *gyo-na* "on the low side". This new etymology would imply that originally a word **yo* "below" stood by the side of *ya* "above". And it is with this **yo*, arisen from **yo*, that we must connect not only the pronoun *ho* "that", as opposed to *ha* "this", but also *hog* "under", and *gyog* "servant", or "to cover", the latter having a **yog* as their etymon.³

The etymology of *gyon* would furthermore induce us to reconsider the original dental final of *ya* "above", assumed in my paper in *HJAS*. on the evidence of *yan* "above". Evidently *yan* can go back to *ya-na* "on the high side", as *gyon* is now assumed to go back to *gyo-na*, and so it would be non-committal as to the original final consonant of *ya*. On the evidence of **yo*, clearly belonging to a guttural family, we should then feel inclined to suppose a guttural final for *ya*. This would allow us to include *yañ* "again" or "also" in the family. The primary meaning would be "above, on top" which can in fact imply both "again" and "also", and can be imitated by English

¹ Note that we have *yu-bu-cag* side by side with *hu-bu-cag* ("we").

² *yo* "oblique" belongs in a series with labial final: *yom* "to swing, to totter, to be unsteady", *gyo* "to move, incline, tilt", *yob* "stirrup", perhaps also *gyo* "deceit". But the *yo* of *yo-byad* "to prepare" and *gyo* "to prepare" may belong in the local series (= "to lay the foundations").

³ According to my paper in *H.J.A.S.* also *hoñ* "to come" and *ho* in the meaning "time, turn" would belong here.

“on top of it”.¹ I suppose that *yañ* “light, lightness” belongs here as well, the idea of lightness being conveyed by the intimation that the object (for instance in water) remains “on top”.² Also the *yañ* of *yañ dag* (“most pure” = “top-pure”) and the *ya*³ of *ya mtshan* (“wonder, miracle” = “top sign”) could well be included as further members. These would conclude the list of words derived from **ya* and **yo*. As for *’yu*, it is not impossible but doubtful that *yu* “the handle, hilt, shaft”, also “leg of a boot” constitutes a derivative. If so, it would probably in some way indicate the relative position of the respective part of the utensil.

In further support of the reconstructions, I wish to adduce another word-family where alternations of the vowel coincide with differentiations as to place. In the same way as **ya* “above” and **yo* “below” are contrasted, we find *mtha* “lower end” opposed to *mtho* “high, height”.⁴ While the guttural final of *mtho* can be seen in *thog* “upper end”, I refer to my paper in *HJAS.* for *thag* “bottom end”. In this paper here (see above, p. 962) *gtiñ* “bottom” was connected with *than* “ground”. The *u*-alternation can probably be found in *thug*, *gtug* “to reach”, where again the meaning “end” is implied. With a dental final we find *stod* “the higher part” (or *stad* “to put on”, *stan* “mat, carpet”) clearly contrasted with a group of words containing the vowel *u*, which have some connection with the idea of a downward movement, as *thur* “downwards” (the *r* is a suffix), *hthu* “to gather, pick, collect”, *gtun* “pestle”, and *hdud* (perf. *btud*) “to bow, incline”. A last series would bring us back to our pronouns, although I feel unable to indicate any original meaning besides the deictic which they have now. But it is, of course, quite possible that in *da*, *de*,⁵ *do*, and *hdi* the alternations of the vowels indicate the respective distances of the objects pointed out by the speaker.

One last point must be discussed. We have reconstructed **yi* and **ya* in order to explain the variations of *kyi* and *yañ* after certain final consonants. How, then, can we account for *ha* and *ho* which are appended indiscriminately to any final consonant. I suppose that *ha* and *ho* (and in the same way *hog* and *hoñ*) do not go back directly

¹ Cf. also German *überdies*, or *obendrein*.

² Cf. above (p. 962) the etymology of *ldiñ*, originally meaning “to be on top”.

³ *ye* in *ye ðes*, etc., may be another variant, going back to **ye*.

⁴ Note, however, that there is no definite connection between the quality of the vowels and the place, as opposed, for instance, to Manchu, where we have the light *e* for *wesimbi* “to rise”, and the dark *a* for *wasimbi* “to descend”, etc.

⁵ Cf. with *de* the last but one note about *ye*.

to *'ya, *'yo, etc., but to prefixed forms of these etymons. The prefix was, I think, *h*, which we have just observed in the case of the pronoun *hdi*, and which, as we have seen before, assimilates the glottal stop, ousting the *y* at the same time.

With the etymology of *ham* I bring this paper to a conclusion. *ham* is perhaps the only ¹ case in Tibetan where an etymon has coalesced with an original final *ma*, or *mi*. But the list of words where an etymon has coalesced with *na*, will, to all probability, be much longer. To the words discussed in this paper, for instance, *hon* and *gan* can be added from my paper in *HJAS*.

I conclude with a remark which seems of importance for future etymological research in our field. As we have seen in the case of *gyon* and *yan*, we are no longer justified in inferring an original dental final for a vowel-ending word on the sole evidence of a derivative's ending in *-n*.

¹ Observe, however, the shortening of *ma* in *sña-ma kho* > *sña mkho*. The latter spelling can be observed twice in one line of the Narthang print of the *Dzañ-lun* (*mDo*, *Sa*, p 201 A 7).
