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Tibetan daṅ, ciṅ, 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 daṅ. The same holds good of ciṅ, though punctuation is much rarer after ciṅ. In the case of ciṅ 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. daṅ

The etymon which I assume to have coalesced with na in daṅ, 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.
3 Francke, Addenda, p. 112.
of *rnams* "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*, and which can—though very rarely—be met with independently in the form *cog-ge*. 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", *goog-pa* "to break", etc. 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-grains* "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 cog* is rendered several times after a negative imperative in a song which is transmitted in the *bTsun mo bkaṭi thaṅ 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", *thag-ge* and *thag-pa* "superior", *thaṅ-he* and *thaṅ-lhaṅ* "clear", *sig-ge-ba* (also *ljig-ge-ba*, cf. Grünwedel, loc. cit., p. 180), and *sig-sig* "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: ḫdogs-pa "to bind, to fasten" can easily be connected with the meaning "assemblage". 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, and dog—dogs form a remarkable parallel to Latin angustus "narrow" and its derivative angustia, which in Vulgar Latin meant "fear". 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 ḫdogs-pa (Perf. ḫtags, Fut. ḫdag(s), Imper. ḫthogs) 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).
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 ses-na (which was included in the Mahāvyutpatti¹) 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. Foucaux ³ translates drañ sron Ila zig by “un cinq (d’) ermites”, or žag bdun zig 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 bzi zig 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 (mDzans-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, No. 6323 in Sakaki’s edition (Kyóto, 1916–1925). The Sanskrit original (yasye-dánim kdlam manyase) has clearly not influenced the Tibetan idiomatic rendering.

¹ No. 6323 in Sakaki’s edition (Kyóto, 1916–1925). The Sanskrit original (yasye-dánim kdlam manyase) has clearly not influenced the Tibetan idiomatic rendering.
² Cf. here below, p. 974.
⁵ His translation there of mi Iña tsañ zig by “some five people” is brought about by tsañ.
Mdo, Sa, pp. 328 A 7, and 328 B 1, etc.) rin po che sna bdun las byas pa'i mkar 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) 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. 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 cig 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. Mahāvyutpatti (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 lha-mchod "the five offerings" (religious service held on Tsong kha pa’s birthday), or gsum-mdo and bzi-mdo "place where three (four) roads meet," which indeed show the numeral preceding its noun. 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.

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. Tökyö-Tripitaka, vol. iv, p. 401a, l. 8.
2 The Chinese version has in fact ma pien san shih erh mei 马 鞍 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.
4 Mostly sum-mdo. Cf. Mahāvyutpatti (Sakaki), No. 5621.
5 Cf. Mahāvyutpatti (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 ké jén (“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 ston, etc.).

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. *maṅ-zig “many pieces” = “many” (which was noted by Jäschke) is then equally justified, as is nyun-zig, which can be literally translated as “little bit”, or rin-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 *hgah zig the plural meaning only is indicated by Desgodins and Jäschke (Dict., p. 93). But there can be no doubt that neither *hgah itself nor *hgah zig are exclusively used in the plural. Both mean “somebody”, or “something” as well as “some”.

1 Cf. German “(ein) Stücker 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 maṅ-po zig may be found.
4 S. Ch. Das’ Tibetan-English Dictionary incorporates neither *hgah nor *hgah zig.
5 In the case of *hgah, the use as a singular can already be inferred from the phrase *hgah yah followed by a negation, correctly rendered by Jäschke as “no, no one, not any, none”. Bacot, loc. cit., p. 95, translates *hgah, *hgah tsam by “peu”. I note from the Tibetan version corresponding to the Dīvyāvadāna (ed. by E. B. Cowell and R. A. Neil, Cambridge, 1886, p. 34, 23/4), Kanjur, Narthang print, *bDul, Kha 46 A 7, 46 B 1: *ses ldan dag . . . *khyed cag gis mthoṅ baḥam/ths pa *hgah yod dam (“Gentlemen, have you seen or heard of anyone”; bhaṇanto 'sti kaścid yushmanbhir drishṭah ıra'ta vā). From the Tibetan version of the Karmasataka (Kanjur, mDo, Sa 84 A 4): bdaq gis gtu bar *hgur ba *hgah ita ci yod (“Is there then anyone whom I have converted?”).

Examples for *hgah zig used as a singular: Saddharmapundarika-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 sms can gcig *hgah zig gis spyan ras gzigs (5) dbaṅ phyug
Even after a noun, \( \text{zig} \) 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 \( \text{cig} \), is the occurrence of \( \text{cig-gu} \) instead of \( \text{cig} \), which can hardly be anything else but its diminutive. It is true that \( \text{cig-gu} \) has apparently so far only been noted by the Tibetan grammarians, and by them only when it occurs instead of \( \text{cig} \) after an imperative.\(^2\) But, as is evident from the examples in the note,\(^3\) the usage of \( \text{cig-gu} \) is not evident from the examples in the note,\(^3\) the usage of \( \text{cig-gu} \) is not restricted to the imperative only.

\(^1\) Kanjur, Narthang print, \( \text{hDul}, \text{Kha 34 A 2:} \) \text{hbab chu dañ mtsho dañ ītsheñ dag gi byram zīg tu soñ ba dañ ("when we went to the benches of the rivers, lakes, and ponds").}

\(^2\) The Tibetan-Mongolian edition of the Li-sihi gur khan, the Bod kyi skad las gsar myiñ gi brdañ khyyad par ston pa legs par krad pa li siñi gur khañ (see Schmidt-Boehlingk’s \text{Verzeichnis, 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.

\(^3\) Karmanyataka, Kanjur, Narthang print, \( \text{mDo, Sa 7 B 4:} \) \text{sems can ëñi lta bu sñon gyi tshe rabs dran la / tshigs kyañ smra ëñi / boom ldan ëñas dañ gñan zer ba su ëñig gu snyam mo ("They thought, ‘Who is this being that remembers his previous existence, speaks and converses with the Bhagavat?’").}

\( \text{hDul}, \text{Kha 34 A 2:} \) \text{hbab chu dañ mtsho dañ ītsheñ dag gi byram zīg tu soñ ba dañ ("when we went to the benches of the rivers, lakes, and ponds").}

\( \text{mDo, Sa 7 B 4:} \) \text{sems can ëñi lta bu sñon gyi tshe rabs dran la / tshigs kyañ smra ëñi / boom ldan ëñas dañ gñan zer ba su ëñig gu snyam mo ("They thought, ‘Who is this being that remembers his previous existence, speaks and converses with the Bhagavat?’").}
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. $\text{šog} \text{šig}$, 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. $\text{zos} \text{šig} “ eat! “$, or $\text{phul} \text{šig} “ give “$ 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 $\text{šog} \text{šig}$—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, $\text{ziγ gu smyam mo} (“ he thought : ‘ Is there in the world then (lta) any (bya’h, 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 Jaschke’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 $\text{coγ ge zog} < \text{coγ ge coγ}$ 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, 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. 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 cín, 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 than, primarily meaning “ground”, as was shown in my paper in HJAS., we have gtiñ “bottom” or side by side with hbrañ “to follow” we have hbrañ “to follow”; and hbrañ-po “the middle (of three sons)” is obviously “the second” and as such a remarkable parallel to Latin secundus, derived from *sequondos = “the following”. rdza “clay” belongs to rdzi-ba “to knead, press, tread”, as does Latin fictilis “made of clay”, figulus “potter”, etc., with fingo “to knead, mould, shape”. Along with thal-mo “palm” we find mthil in lag-mthil “palm”. ldañ “to rise” is complemented by idiñ “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.
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 cin. 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 cin, implying simultaneousness. A confirmation of the assumed phonetic development can be found in the following Kanjur-passage, where nyin re zig na (Narthang print, hDul, Kha, 281 B 4/5): des ldan dag nas khyed cag rams nyin re zig lha brya'i bza'i ba da'n / ba'ch ba bsod pa rabs tu ma'n po sta gon gyi's zig par ma bsgo (5) ham (“Gentlemen, did I not order you to have good food and drink in plenty prepared daily for 500 (monks) ?”)

Our discussion of the etymology of cig and cin 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”, which occurs so often in negative sentences, followed by (and mostly contracted with) ha'n (= yan: see here below, p. 966) “also”. It is then reminiscent of Chinese — 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. The development of the

1 For the corresponding Chinese passage see Tökyö-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 zig (= Sanskrit dine dine) is to be found in the Tibetan version corresponding to Divyăvădadāna (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 khyed de dag' zig 'bud pa / cig rnyed pa zig yin nam ci la dag' (“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 Mahāvyutpatti (ed. Sakaki, No. 6451): ca'n mi go'n bar gyur bar go'n (tān̄ūm bhāvend̄āvind̄āvatī).
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 relatival 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 relatival 所 so from the noun so meaning “place”), need not, of course, occupy us here.

As for ce, which occurs mostly with the instrumental or locatival 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 daň and ciň, the nature of the genitival suffix kyĩ 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. His statement is partly based on the similarity in sound and function with the Chinese genitival particle chih, which also occurs as a pronoun On an earlier occasion he also compared the Burmese genitival suffix i Both suggestions are accepted by Ch. Duroiselle, when he discusses Old Burmese e e’, the predecessor of the modern Ɪ Ɪ i.

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

1 See my paper “Has the Chinese Language Parts of Speech?” (Transact. Philol. Soc., 1937, p. 106), where this development has been touched upon.
3 Ibid., vol. iii, P. iii (1904), p. 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” function of kyin, which it shares with ciñ, though it is of much rarer occurrence than the latter in literary Tibetan. Like ciñ, it refers back to an action, or a state of things expressed by the preceding verb. But while ciñ, 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 h; and hi with the alternative yi in poetry after final vowels. 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.
We find *kyi* added to words which end in *gs* and *bs*. From there 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 *hi*, 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 *yah*, which, when isolated and stressed (in the meaning "again") sounds *yah*, but when enclitic (in the meaning "also") sounds *kyaḥ* after *g*, *b*, *d*, *s*, and either *yah* or *haḥ* 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 *u*. 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 laryngal to guttural articulation, when *'yi* is appended to a word ending in a consonant (which is not itself laryngal). This change would cover *kyi* and (with simultaneous or subsequent sonorization) also *gyi*. It would account also for *kyaḥ*, and for *gyaḥ*, 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 *ḥ*, we must try to explain the loss of the *y*. This loss can also be observed in *ḥi*, which we find after vowels as an alternative of *yi*, the latter being mostly limited to poetry. In the same way, both *ḥaḥ* and *yaḥ* 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


of the language, followed by the laryngal fricative \( h \). 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 \( d \)).

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, is then not enclitical and stands beside the fourfold gerundial suffix, as does yan "again" beside the threefold yan "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. \( mi \ h\ddot{a} \ i \ s\ddot{t}o\ nn \ p\ddot{a} \ y\ddot{i}n \) 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 ".


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 gan as an alternative form of 'yan.

3 See the remark in the preamble to this paper.

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 ciṅ, 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

---

2 Cf., e.g., the first example adduced here in n. 1 on p. 960, or the sentence hdiṅi gtan tshigs gat ("what is the proof of this?"), included in Thonmi Sambhota's Šlokas (ed. J. Bacoť, 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

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.\footnote{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,\footnote{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.\footnote{3} As is evident from the quotation just given, Jäschke, while failing to recognize the nature of ho cog,\footnote{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.\footnote{5}

\footnote{1} “I think that he will come” < “I think that. He will come.” See also here below, p. 971, n. 1.
\footnote{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: ho’s so cog la ‘to those arrived.’” On p. 499 Jäschke wrongly inserts ho cog under hu cog, giving it the meaning “we”.
\footnote{3} See above, p. 955, n. 2, and p. 961, n. 2.
\footnote{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 (Scrampore, 1826, p. 474) and translated there as “all, the whole”. This is in agreement with a gloss in the brDaḥ gser rnyiṅ 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 Daḥ yiṅ mkhaṅ gpaḥ byṅ gnas).
\footnote{5} In addition to the example quoted by Jäschke from the Dzah-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 Karmakalaka, 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 άν: *Kanjur*, Narthang print, $hDul$, Ka, 403 A 6/7) de lta bas na rjesu gnañ ste / khyim du khri stan mthon po la ḡdug par byaĥi der nyal bar ni mi byaĥo (“so he allowed (the monks) to sit in a house on beds highly covered with mattresses (= uccaśayana: cf. Mahāvyutpatti, ed. Sakaki, No. 8699), but not to sleep on them’’); (Karmaśataka, *Kanjur*, Narthang print, *mDo*, Sa, grags so cog daň lhan (104 A) cig tu na bla baĥi phyir hoĥs 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 baĥ ba daň / baĥ 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 daň bu mo btsasu cog hoĉi bar hgyur ro* (“all the sons and daughters that he had died”; ibid., 83 A 3); *de nas deĥi khyim bdag paĥi gos daň ryan bekon no cog mi snaĥ bar gurur 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 baĥ ho cog bdad 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 relative clause. This may throw light on an interesting passage of the *gZer Myig* (Asia Major, iv (1927), p. 498, l. 7): slob dpon laĥis gswiñ na ci gswiñ 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. Schiefer’s paper “Über Pluralbezeichnungen im Tibetischen” (Mém. Acad. St. Petersb, xxv (1878), No. I, pp. 15–16). Schiefer 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 *kys* both in his Grammar (3rd Ed., pp. 59–60) and in his Dictionary (pp. 6–7) without mentioning *ho* in either place. As for *kys* and *kys* 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 *kys* 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 *kys* 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 *hgrohis* in *As. Major*, iv, p. 175, 15, which shows that his suggestion cannot be maintained.
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 *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 *bu* "this" at the same time),

¹ Cf. how Professor Bacot (*Les Šlokas 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 *'yi, 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, 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 yan
the independent form of *'yan, 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.
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 gyro
"deceit". But the yo of yo-byad "to prepare" and gyro "to prepare" may belong
in the local series (= "to lay the foundations").
3 According to my paper in H.J.A.S. also ho'n "to come" and ho in the meaning
"time, turn" would belong here.
“on top of it.”1 I suppose that yan “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 yan of yan dag (“most pure” = “top-pure”) and the ya3 of ya mishan (“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) gtin “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 “pebble”, 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 yan 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 hon) do not go back directly

---

1 Cf. also German überdies, or obendrein.
2 Cf. above (p. 962) the etymology of Idin, originally meaning “to be on top”.
3 ye in ye ses, 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).