

Functions of a Written Tibetan Instrumental Particle, -*kyis*

Yasuhiko Nagano

National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka

Tibetan, a major Tibeto-Burman (TB) language that has the oldest written documents in that language family, has typologically been regarded as of the ergative type. Before this typological categorization, Tibetan was recognized by European scholars as an “exotic” language in which no passive formation was found.

However, Tibetan grammarians noticed the peculiar functions of a case particle that specifies the material, method, and origin of action. This particle was characterized as instrumental by them. A majority of TB languages have a similar case particle that specifies the agent of transitive sentences and/or well-developed systems of pronominalization in which ergativity is realized in a separate way from the above. It should also be noted that the traditional grammarians of Tibet recognized split-ergativity in Written Tibetan (WT) and made up very sophisticated split-rules.

The rules have been quite dominant over the normative WT since the middle ages and influential on the colloquial language too. Looking into the mechanism of Tibetan ergativity carefully, however, we notice the following:

- a) *It is true that Tibetan has an ergative case marker (so-called instrumental particle), -kyis (-gyis, -gis, -yis, -s or -'is), which usually marks a transitive agent.*
- b) *It marks intransitive agent too (Takeuchi & Takahashi, 1994). This phenomenon dates back to the period of Dunhuang manuscripts (ca. the 10th century A.D.).*
- c) *The ergativity in Tibetan is not so consistent in transitive sentences either, that is to say, it shows split-ergativity.*
- d) *The conditions of split are still not clear. The Tibetan traditional grammarians tried to define them from various angles, such as “tense,” emphasis, degree of subjectivity on action, and so on. But their results do not necessarily fit with linguistic facts. Nagano (1987) proposed conditions according to the transitivity or meaning of verbs, but these were not sufficient to explain every case of split.*
- e) *Tibetan has no anti-passive structure.*
- f) *The categorization of Tibetan verbs is somewhat reminiscent of the active type, although I am not saying that Tibetan is an active language.*

Tournadre (1994) claimed the “trajectory model” for Tibetan ergativity. His theory seems to be the most comfortable to accommodate several split phenomena of the Tibetan ergativity on the descriptive level of modern Tibetan. However, it does not necessarily explain those in WT.

I attempt in this paper to review, not being biased by the traditional definitions of it, the functions of the particle on the basis of actual text data. These are written according to the traditional grammar but still reflect older usages of -*kyis* (some of which are often disregarded or regarded as *ungrammatical* by grammarians).

TRADITIONAL DEFINITION

According to the traditional grammarians' sense, genitive particles (*'brel sgra*) and instrumental particles (*byed sgra*) belong to the same category, and the latter is distinguished from the former in that *byed sgra* can show the relationship of grammatical items more specifically. Thus, *khong gi yi ge* 'his letter' may mean both 'the letter he possesses' and 'the letter he writes or wrote,' whereas *khong gis bris pa' i yi ge* stands for 'the letter he wrote' only.

They explain a similar thing to the above in the following manner: the origin/source of action, cause, reason, method, instrument, and material must exist before the action is realized onto the object. For instance, when you have the three grammatical items—'hands,' 'stone,' and 'to throw'—and the action of 'to throw' is realized on 'stone,' the instrument for 'throwing stone'—'hands'—should exist before the two other items. Thus, 'hands' is supposed to be marked by *-s*.

They also say that when the origin of action and the object on which the action is realized coincide, *byed sgra* does not occur. In intransitive sentences, therefore, it never appears.

Based on these, they classified the usages of these particles into five:

1 Formal agent in active mood (*byed pa po*; Skt. **kartri**)

- (1) *bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' tsa! pa.* (Vajra.:13 > Inaba, 1986, p. 185)
'Buddha told.'
- (2) *ngas khod la bshad do.* (Vajra.: 5 > Inaba, 1986, p. 185)
'I will explain for you.'

2 Actual agent in passive mood (*byed pa po*)

- (3) *bdag gis bstan.* (SI: 18)
'(It) is explained by me.'
- (4) *ngas shing bcad par bya' o.* (Inaba, 1986, p. 187)
'A tree is cut by me.'
- (5) *des byin.* (DB > Inaba, 1986, p.187)
'(Something) was given by him.'

3 Method, means (*byed pa*; Skt. *karana*)

- (6) *gser gyis byugs.* (SI: 18)
'(Someone) gilt/plated with gold.'

4 Cause, reason

- (7) *pho brang 'phang thang chus khyer ro.* (ZY: 74)
'Palace Phangthang was carried away by flood.'
- (8) *de rnams chos byas pas lan.* (ZY: 72)
'Those occurred because they practiced Buddhism.'

5 Adverbializer

- (9) *rim* 'grade, order' ⇒ *rim gyis* 'in order, gradually'
- lhun* 'mass, bulk' ⇒ *lhun gyis* 'abruptly'

Besides these primary rules, a number of complicated split rules have been written by the Tibetan grammarians as well as foreign scholars. In spite of their energetic efforts, however, the results seem to show a number of discrepancies with linguistic facts.

DISCREPANCIES

A straightforward discrepancy occurs in one of their principles that *-kyis* never appears in intransitive sentences. Actually, the particle appears in intransitive sentences. The oldest examples are found in the Dunhoug manuscripts. Thus,

- (10) *khyo'da's dmag pon 'ong ngam.* (DH 106>TT 652)
 'You sir, are you fit to be a general?'
 (11) *myi yongs kyis skyid do.* (DH 113>TT 652)
 'Everyone is happy.'
 (12) *myang gis kyang glo ba ring ste,* (DH 109>TT 652)
 'Myang, too, became disloyal, and ...'

Chang and Chang (1980) also point out a similar phenomenon in modern Tibetan. These examples show that *-kyis* is related to the intransitive structure too.

Tibetan has three kinds of productive ways of adverbialization by suffixing the following:

- a) locative particle (except for *-na*, which does not adverbialize anything),
 b) ablative particle *-nas*, and,
 c) instrumental particle *-kyis*.

Thus,

<i>'di</i> 'this'	⇒	<i>'dir</i> 'here'
<i>gsal po</i> 'clear'	⇒	<i>gsal por</i> 'clearly'
<i>rtsa</i> 'root[rt.]'	⇒	<i>rtsa nas</i> 'totally, basically'
<i>rim</i> 'grade, order'	⇒	<i>rim gyis</i> 'in order, gradually'
<i>rang bzhin</i> 'nature'	⇒	<i>rang bzhin gyis</i> 'naturally'

These morphological procedures are regular and their results as adverbs are also quite stable in their meanings, except for one case. The exception is *rang bzhin gyis*.

This adverb is very often used in Buddhist canons as well as commentaries. Looking over about 300 usages of this particle, I find that almost all of them correspond to Sanskrit adverbs standing for 'naturally, by nature.' However, in *Prajñāpāramita-hṛdaya-sūtra*, a well-known Buddhist canon, we find the following sentence: Skt. *pañca skandhas tāṃś ca svabhāvaśūnyā vyavalokayati* (Nakamura & Kino, 1960, pp. 175–177; see Conze, 1978, pp. 31–55 for details of editions).

A widely accepted translation for this sentence would be something like "There are the five Skandhas, and those he considered as something by nature empty" (Muller, 1927, p.145). But we do not have any adverbials in this Sanskrit phrase. Instead, *svabhāva* is the object of *śūnyā*. Therefore, this Sanskrit sentence must be read as "(Avalokiteśvara) discerned that five elements of being are devoid of substance/nature." A positive meaning for *śūnyā* 'emptiness' in a later period seems to have caused the misunderstanding mentioned above (Tachikawa, 1994).

In the corresponding Tibetan text (Derge Kangyur 34 f.144b-146a), we see the following:

- (13) *phun po lnga po de dag la yang rang bzhin gyis stong par rnam par lta'o.*

It is generally believed that Tibetan translations of Buddhist canons are so exactly literal that we can even reconstruct the Sanskrit text on the basis of the Tibetan. Since philologists attested that this canon was translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan between 790 and 840 A.D. (Conze, 1978, p.24), we may be able to appropriately define the grammatical function of *rang bzhin gyis* with the aid of the Sanskrit text.

First, *rang bzhin gyis* is not an adverbial phrase, since, in the Sanskrit text, we do not find any adverbials. Secondly, *stong pa* 'empty, lacking in' does not require instrumental case. Thirdly, *rang bzhin* 'nature, substance' is a noun. What then is the function of *gyis* here? As far as these data are concerned, the only logical choice is for me to hypothesize that this *-gyis* is a focus marker or a new information carrier.

In that case, why do we have an instrumental particle, *-kyis*, in the Tibetan text? The reason is that Skt. *śūnyā* requires the instrumental case for its object and the translator of this canon automatically put a Tibetan instrumental case particle before *stong pa*. In spite of this, Tibetan Buddhists understood what the original Sanskrit sentence meant, and, for instance, *Tshong kha pa*, the founder of the *dGe lugs* sect, comments on this sentence, "As for the five elements of being, they do not have any nature."

MISUSE? OR THE TRUTH?

My hypothesis above is supported by several examples from the older manuscripts which almost all the Tibetologists disregarded or wanted to delete from their grammars.

Yamaguchi (1974) cites an example from Dunhuang folk literature (whose source is not shown) as a wrong usage. It is,

- (14) *des me tog sna tshogs kyis gtor.*
 he-ERG flower various scatter (PFT)
 'He scattered various flowers.'

Jäschke shows a very similar example:

- (15) *me tog gis gtor ro.* (JA, p. 209)
 'They strewed flowers.'

In sentence (14), *-s*, an instrumental case marker, after *de* 'it, he' marks the transitive agent and *-kyis* does the patient, *me tog sna tshogs* 'various flowers.' According to the Tibetan traditional grammars, this usage of *-kyis* is totally wrong, and Yamaguchi (personal communication) claims that this Tibetan phrase is ungrammatical, although he writes in his grammar that this particle may be an "emphasizer."

Some colleagues (N. Tournadre and T. Takeuchi, personal communication) suggest that *sna tshogs kyis* may make an adverbial phrase, under the analogy of the usage 5, standing for 'in various manners.' However, no dictionary nor glossary lists that form, whereas we find *sna tshogs su/du*.

In sentence (15), the situation is simpler; the patient is marked by *-gis*.

The Dunhuang manuscripts often reflect colloquial aspects of Tibetan as a natural language, and their so-called misuses constitute precious clues to grope for the earlier stage of Tibetan, before the traditional grammar of the language was established. Now that we have this particular usage of *-kyis* in a written form, we must accept the linguistic fact as it is.

I have found several sentences that substantiate my idea. The new findings since my 1994 paper are:

- (16) *sad dang ser ba bca'dang mu ge byung gis dogs pa'i tshe*, (MN>JB 92)
'Being afraid that frost, hail and starvation should happen,'
- (17) *bdag ni rdza ma bgyid par 'gyur la 'dis kyang gcog par 'gyur ro*. (DU>JB 32)
'If I make pots, he will destroy them.'
- (18) *bgegs rigs stong phrag glud kyis 'jal, 'dre dgu sri bcu bskyas kyis 'debs*. (ZJ 70)
'(The man) pays with ransoms the thousands of obstructions, and dispatches the nine demons and ten vampires.'
- (19) *kun tu bzang po glo bur ba, tshig dang ming gis mtshon pa tsam*. (ZJ 230)
'It is the spontaneous "All Good," of whom names and terms are mere indications.'

From this evidence I hypothesize that *-kyis* is a new information carrier.

In connection with these examples above, we have the following group of sentences:

- (20) *nged la mi ster na rgyal khams mes bsreg gis*. (MN>JB 132)
'If you don't give me (the princess), I definitely am going to burn with fire the kingdom.'
- (21) *rgyal po'i zhal nas da yang rgya srang ma nor bar rang rang so so'i khyim du song cig. khyim ngo shes pa la bu mo sbyin gyis*. (MN>JB 69)
'The king said to them, "Now, go back to your own house without mistake. I will, for sure, give my daughter to a man who recognizes her house."'
- (22) *bal yul du rtol te bal rje dang mjal bas kyed gang nas 'ongs pa yin zer du 'long gis de tsa na nged mtha' 'khob kyi rgyal po srong btsan sgam po'i blon po yin gyis*. (MN>JB 131)
'When you arrive at Nepal and meet the Nepalese king, and if the king is to ask from where you are, then, at that moment, say, "I am a minister of Srong-btsan-sgam-po, a king of frontier area."'

All these examples of *-kyis* seem to simply introduce the future stem of *bsreg* and *sbyin* as well as *yin* as new information and, as a result, they "emphasize" the agent's strong intent for their action or statement.

The following two sentences also seem to represent 'strong intent':

- (23) *bu mo ster bas dris shog zer*. (MS 19a)
'I (have an intent to) give my daughter to him. Ask (if it is all right). So he said.'
- (24) *phyis jo bo spyen 'dren pa»i dus su gser 'tshol bar byon pas gar log gi rgyal pos bzung*. (MS 38)
'Afterwards, when Jo-bo was invited, the Qarluk, who had come in search of gold, took the king prisoner.'

AFTERWORD

Summarizing the discussion, we have found the following:

1. According to the grammars by traditional grammarians of Tibet as well as Western scholars, the WT instrumental particle, *-kyis*, is an ergative marker.
2. The facts show that the particle can mark other cases than transitive agent.
3. They also show that it can introduce verbs, with the implication of agent's "strong intent."
4. I believe that the original function of *-kyis* was that of a new information carrier, which was re-defined by the early grammarians of Tibet as the ergative-agentive marker.

My argument may also be of some help in reconsidering, on the descriptive level, the peculiar behavior of a Burmese particle, *kou_*, for instance, and in sifting through factors that might determine whether ergativity can be reconstructed on the PTB level, or that the PO/SO system was earlier.

ABBREVIATIONS

DB	Dharma-bhadra: Si tu'i shal lung.
DH	Bacot, Thomas, & Thoussant (1940).
DU	'Dul ba > JB.
JA	Jäschke (1881)..
JB	Bacot (1948).
MN	Mani bka' 'bum.
MS	Deb ther dmar po gsar ma > Tucci (1971).
PFT	perfect
SI	Si tu: Si tu'i sum rtags. > Das (1915/1983)..
TT	Takeuchi & Takahashi (1994).
Vajra.	Vajracchedika-prajñāpāramitā
ZJ	gZi brjid > Snellgrove (1980)
ZY	Yamaguchi (1974).

REFERENCES

- Bacot, J. (1948). *Grammaire du tibétain littéraire*, vol.2. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient.
- Bacot, J., Thomas, F.W., & Thoussant, C. (1940). *Documents de Touen-houng relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet*. Paris: Librairie Orientale Paul Geuthner.
- Bauman, J.J. (1979) An historical perspective on ergativity in Tibeto-Burman. In F. Plank (Ed.) (1979). *Ergativity* (pp. 419–433). London: Academic Press.
- Chang, B.S., & Chang, K. (1980). Ergativity in spoken Tibetan. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology*, 51, 15–32.
- Conze, E. (1978) *The Prajnaparamita literature*. Tokyo: Reiyukai.
- Das, S.C. (1915/1983). *An introduction to the grammar of the Tibetan*

- language*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas.
- Inaba, S. (1986). *Chibettogo koten bunpougaku* [Traditional grammars in Tibet]. Kyoto: Hozokan.
- Jäschke, H.A. (1881). *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*. London: Trübner (reprinted in 1934, 1965 by Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Müller, M. (1927). *Buddhist Mahayana Texts*, Part II. London: Oxford University Press.
- Nagano, Y. (1987). Some ergative phenomena in Tibeto-Burman. *The Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, 45, 53–74.
- Nagano, Y. (1994). On a WT instrumental particle, *-kyis*. *Current Issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics* (pp.716–722). Osaka: The Organizing Committee of the 26th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics.
- Nakamura, H & Kino, K. (1960). *Hannya Shinkyo, Kongo Hannyakyo* [in Japanese]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Snellgrove, D.L. (1980). *The Nine Ways of Bon*. Boulder: Prajna Press.
- Tachikawa, M. (1994). 'Jishoo ga Kuu de aru' wo Do Kaishaku suruka? [in Japanese]. *Bukkyo* 26, 164–186.
- Takeuchi, T., & Takahashi, Y. (1994). Split ergative patterns in transitive and intransitive sentences in Tibetan. *Current Issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics* (pp. 649–659). Osaka: The Organizing Committee of the 26th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics.
- Tournadre, N. (1994) Tibetan ergativity and the trajectory model. *Current Issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics* (pp. 637–648). Osaka: The Organizing Committee of the 26th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics.
- Tucci, G. (1971). *Deb T'er dMar po gSar ma*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per ile Medio Estremo Oriente.
- Yamaguchi, Z. (1974). *Tibetan Grammar* (tentative title). Ms.

