**Title**

The Classical Tibetan cases and their transcategoriality: From sacred grammar to modern linguistics

**Permalink**

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/94d0447c

**Journal**

**Author**

Tournadre, Nicolas

**Publication Date**

2010

**DOI**

**Copyright Information**

Peer reviewed

**Himalayan Linguistics**

*The Classical Tibetan cases and their transcategoriality*
*From sacred grammar to modern linguistics*

**Nicolas Tournadre**

University of Provence and CNRS, Lacito

## ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a new analysis of the Classical Tibetan case system. After presenting the traditional as well as modern linguistics view on cases, I introduce a new analysis of the Classical Tibetan case system in ten cases: absolutive, agentive, genitive, dative, purposive, locative, ablative, elative, associative and comparative. The present description of morphology, grammatical semantics and syntax of the cases is based on four fundamental properties of the Classical Tibetan casemarkers, namely: cliticity, multifunctionality, transcategoriality and optionality. The originality of this literary case system lies in the multifunctional, transcategorial and optional nature of the casemarkers, which largely contributes to the great syntactic complexity of this old literary language of the Tibeto-Burman family.

## KEYWORDS

# The Classical Tibetan cases and their transcategoriality: From sacred grammar to modern linguistics[*]

**Nicolas Tournadre**
University of Provence and CNRS, Lacito

## 1 "Sacred" grammars

There are few ancient grammars in the world, which are still used on a daily basis in a modern curriculum. Among these, we can mention Pāṇini's grammar, the Aṣṭādhyāyī (अष्टाध्यायी), which has been used to describe Sanskrit phonology and morphology since the 5th century B.C.[1] It comprises four thousand formula or rules written in the style of a sutra. Another famous Indian grammarian, Patañjali, composed in the 2nd century B.C a commentary of Pāṇini's grammar, the Mahābhāṣya (महाभाष्य) which is also still studied by some Brahmins in contemporary India.

The same can be said about the ancient Tibetan grammatical treatises, the Sumcupa (སུམ་ཅུ་པ་) and the Rtags'jugpa (རྟགས་འཇུག་པ་) attributed to the seventh century figure Thonmi Saṃbhoṭa in modern Tibet in the 7th century. The Sumcupa and Rtags'jugpa are written in the Tibetan script, one of very few ancient scripts of Asia, which are still in use nowadays.[2] The Sumcupa and the Rtags'jugpa[3] deal with morphology and phonology and they have been the starting point of all subsequent grammatical commentaries in Tibet until now. Just as in the case of the Indian tradition, which has heavily influenced the Tibetan grammatical tradition, the two treatises attributed to Saṃbhoṭa are written in verses and are conceived as a "sacred grammar" meant to facilitate the access to sutras and tantras.

Generally speaking, Tibetan philology had an impact, which goes well beyond Tibet itself. For example, a lama-philologist called Gromgon 'Phagspa Blogros Rgyalmtshan (alias Chosrgyal 'Phagspa), who was the nephew of the great philosopher and poet Kundga' Rgyalmtshan, better known as Saskya Paṇḍita, created the alphabet, which was named after him, 'Phagspa script,

---

[1] The uniqueness of Pāṇini's grammar lies not only in the novelty but in the fact that it was transmitted only orally for many centuries since it was prohibited to write in Sanskrit.

[2] It is derived from the Gupta variant of the Brahmi script of India. The first attested document is a stela which dates back from 764.

[3] Both treatises are reproduced in the appendix of the present article.

on the order of the Mongol Emperor Qubilai (1215–1294). This alphabet, which is a vertical variant of the Tibetan script, had a special destiny in the Chinese Empire. It was used e.g. in the famous treatise Menggu ziyun to study Chinese rhymes and phonology from the 13th century at least until the 18h century. The same 'Phagspa alphabet was later used as a source of inspiration for the creation of the Korean alphabet.[4] During the 14th century, another Tibetan Lama Choskyi 'Odzer also played a substantial role in the phonetic analysis of the Uighur alphabet used by the Mongols.[5]

In the case of Sanskrit and Tibetan languages, religion has played a fundamental role in the preservation of ancient grammatical treatises. In the various literary traditions of the word, the preservation of ancient grammars is a rare phenomenon and it is often linked to a religious tradition. In the Arabic tradition, the treatise *Muqaddimah al-aǧrrūmiyya* composed by a Berber grammarian Ibn Aǧurrūm as-Ṣanhāǧī in the 13th century played for Arabic grammar a significant role, maybe analogous to Pāṇini's or Saṃbhoṭa's grammars in Sanskrit and Tibetan traditions. The very name for "Grammar" in Arabic aǧrrumiyya is derived from Ibn Aǧurrūm's name.

However, even in the case of a "sacred language",[6] the existence of an ancient grammar is not guaranteed. For example, in the Jewish tradition, the grammarians consider the language as sacred and Hebrew *dikduk* דקדוק (or grammar) was thus an important part of the Bible exegesis. However, there is not any grammatical canon which would have been preserved until now and recited nowadays by young religious Jews in the Diaspora or in Israel.[7]

Some ancient traditions do not necessarily have a canonical grammar for specific reasons. In the case of Chinese, the ancient works such as the famous *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 (2nd c. CE) or the *Mengu ziyun*[8] 蒙古字韵 (13th century) etc. are mainly in the fields of lexicography, etymology and phonology.[9] The absence of a traditional Chinese "grammar" is due to the lack of morphology

---

[4] The precise impact of the Tibetan 'Phagspa script in the creation of the Korean alphabet is still controversial, but there is little doubt that the 'Phagspa script had some influence on the elaboration of the Korean alphabet. As Bouchez stated (2003: 135) : "A la cour de Corée, on continuait en effet à noter les prononciations [du chinois] en se servant d'un alphabet antérieur, créé en Chine en 1269, à la demande d'un empereur mongol, par le tibétain 'Phagspa [...]". On this issue see also Ledyard (1997, 1998).

[5] See P. Pelliot (1925) "Les systèmes d'écriture en usage chez les anciens Mongols".

[6] My colleague, the late Sophie Kessler-Mesguich, clearly states: "[Parmi les diverses variétés d'hébreu], seul l'hébreu biblique mérite d'être décrit. En effet, les premiers grammairiens juifs sont fortement influencés par les grammairiens arabes, auxquels ils empruntent leurs concepts théoriques et leur terminologie ; comme eux, ils estiment parfaite la langue de leur texte sacré scripturaire. La Bible prend donc naturellement chez les grammairiens juifs la place prestigieuse que le Coran occupe chez leurs prédécesseurs et contemporains arabes." (2003)

[7] Among the prominent grammarians of Biblical Hebrew one should mention gaon Sa'adia (10th century); Joseph Qimhi who lived in the 12th century Provence, his son David Qimhi and his brother Moise Qimhi. David Qimhi's grammar has become a fundamental reference in the Medieval philology both Jewish and Christian;

Elijah Levita (15th and 16th centuries) and his grammar called *Sefer ha-Bahur*; however, according to Pablo Kirtchuk and Philippe Cassuto (p.c), none of these grammars has been considered as a canon and recited by heart as it is case for the Sanskrit and Tibetan traditions.

[8] As mentioned above, this work is written in two scripts: Chinese characters and their phonetic transcription in the *'Phagspa* script.

[9] Some Chinese scholars consider however the *Shuowen jiezi* as a form of early grammar.

and to the fact that syntax, as an independent field, appeared only in the 20th century with the emergence of modern linguistics.


## 2  The Tibetan canon of Sumcupa and its classical commentaries

The *Sumcupa*[10] ("the thirty ones") is one of the two classical canons of Tibetan grammar. It deals mainly with morphology and (marginally) grammatical semantics but does not contain information about phonology or syntax. The *Sumcupa* is made of 30 slokas or stances written in verses of seven syllables and is probably conceived as a mnemonic device.

According to the traditional historiography, the *Sumcupa* was written by Thonmi Saṃbhoṭa in the 7th century, however there are still a lot of debates about the precise time of the original redaction.[11] For some authors, the style and the rules mentioned in the treatise, at least in the form which has reached us, suggest rather a later date, at least after the orthographic reforms, possibly in the 12th century.[12] As Miller states (1976: 6): "Shadowy though the figure of Thon-mi Sambhota may be, there is no reason to doubt the considerable antiquity of either the SCP [Sumcupa] or the RKHP [Rtags'jugpa] texts as such, even though their attribution to Sambhota cannot be maintained."[13]

Apart form the *Sumcupa* and *Rtags'jugpa*, another treatise deserves a special mention: *Smra-sgo Mtshoncha* "The Weapon-like introduction to speech", probably written by Dranpa Yeshes Gragspa[14] in the 11th century. According to Verhagen (2000), "The *Smra-sgo Mtshoncha* [...] is in fact the earliest reliably datable treatise devoted [...] to Tibetan grammar, which is available to us now". [15]

Incidently, the two most ancient grammatical treatises available now are the *Smra-sgo Mtshoncha* and the *Yige'i Sbyorba* (by Saskya Pandita), *which are not commentaries of the Sumcupa* (see Verhagen 2000a, 2000b; Hill, 2004).

Many commentaries have been written about the *Sumcupa* since the 12th century and a lot have been preserved until now. Among the famous ones, we find the following ones:[16] Dbuspa

---

[10] The transliteration of Literary Tibetan is noted in italics. Following Zeilser (2004), I write the polysyllabic words without space between the syllables.

[11] The contemporary text of the Sumcupa presents some contradictions between the form and content. For example, the genitive YI is not mentionned among the various allomorphs of this case but it is used in the text, as we know it (See the Sumcupa in the appendix).

[12] For example, the forms for the agentive *kyis* and the genitive *kyi* do not appear in the earliest documents (see Khubyug, 2003, 68). The same is true for the *tu* variant of the *ladon*.

[13] For this discussion, see for example Miller (1976, 1993), Bsodnams Tshering (2003) and Blodge (2003).

[14] According to Verhagen (2000), "The *smrasgo mtshoncha* [...] is in fact the earlier reliable datable treatise devoted [...] to Tibetan grammar, which is available to us now.

The authorship of the *Smrasgo Mtshoncha* is controversial but many scholars consider that it was the Indian scholar Smritijñanakirti (whose Tibetan name is Dranpa'i Yeshes Gragspa).

[15] As shown by Verhagen (2000), 17 of the 30 enclitic forms described in the Smras-go are described in the 2nd section of this treatise "are also dealt with in the Sumcupa in a different order and, more importantly, frequently in different terms".

[16] The list of commentaries is taken from Tshetan Zhabsdrung (1989).

Blogsal's commentary[17] (13th century), Panchen Kundga' Rgyalmtshan's commentary *Sumrtags kyi don'grel tshigsbcadma yige'i sbyorba* (13th century), Rinchentog's *Zamatog* (13th century), Gobo Rab'byams Bsodnams Sengge's commentary (15th century), Dpa'bo Gtsuglag Phrengba's commentary *Gsalbyed Sgronme* (16th century), Blogros Rgyalpo's commentary *Mkhaspa Dga'ston* (16th century), Prasti Rinchen Dongrup's commentary *Sumcupa'i 'Grelba Kuntu Bzangpo'i Dgongsrgyan* (17th century), Karma Situ Gtsuglag Choskyi Snangba's[18] commentary *mkhaspa'i mgulrgyan mutig phreng mdzes* often referred to as *Situ 'Grelchen* (18th century), Dngulchu Dharmabadra's commentary *Situ Zhallung* (1866), Gsertog Blobzang Tshulkhrims Rgyamtsho's commentary *Ngomtshar 'Phrul gyi Ldemig* (1891), Dbyangscan Grubpa'i Rdorje's commentary *Ljonpa'i Dbangpo* (1901). Even nowadays new commentaries are still being written nowadays in a traditional style.

In fact young Tibetans still recite by heart some commentaries of the *Sumcupa* such as the very popular *Ljonpa'i Dbangpo* "Lord of the trees" which was written by Dbyangscan Grubpa'i Rdorje in 1901. What is amazing about this treatise is that it is similar in many ways to the *Sumcupa*, which was composed at least 700 years earlier.[19] If we compare both grammars, we find the following common features:

a) Most of the grammatical topics presented are the same

b) The grammatical terminology has remained largely unchanged over the centuries

c) The grammatical topics appear in the same order (see below)

I present in the chart below a comparison of the topics and the terms used in the two treatises. As appears clearly from the chart below, the Tibetan grammatical canons have undergone only a relatively minor evolution over many centuries. I present in the chart below a comparison of the topics and the terms used in the two treatises. As appears clearly from the chart below, the Tibetan grammatical canons have undergone only a relatively minor evolution over many centuries.

| List of the topics | *Sumcupa* | *Ljonpa'i Dbangpo* (date : 1901) |
|---|---|---|
| evocation of deities | *'Jamdpaldbyangs* (Mañjuśrī) and *Rtagzhiba* (Avalokiteśvara) | *'Jamdpaldbyangs* (Mañjuśrī) |
| the four vowels | *ali ( dbyangs)* | *ali* (*dbyangs*) |
| the 30 consonants | *kali (gsal byed sum cu)* | *kali (gsal byed sum cu)* |
| the 10 final suffixes | *rjes 'jug* | *rjes 'jug* |
| the 5 prefixes | *sngon 'jug* | *sngon 'jug* |
| the final particle | *slar bsdu* | *slar bsdu* or *rdzogstshig* or *zlasdud* |
| the oblique case | *la sgra* | *la don* |
| the genitive case | *'brel ba'i sa* | *'brel sgra* |
| the agentive case (or ergative case) | *byed pa po* | *byed sgra* |
| the continuative particle | *lhag ma dang bcas* | *lhag bcas* |
| the adversative particle | *'byed sdud* | *'byed sdud* |
| the ablative case | *'byung khungs* | *'byung khungs* |

[17] According to Hill (2004), this text is the earliest available commentary on the Sumcupa.

[18] He is also known under the name of Paṇchen Choskyi Byunggnas.

[19] Or 1200 years, if we believe the tradition.

| the vocative case | *bod pa* | *bod sgra* |
|---|---|---|
| the emphatic particle | *brnan pa'i tshig* | *brnan pa'i sgra* |
| demonstrative | *de* | *de sgra* |
| correlative pronouns | *spyi la khyab* | *spyi sgra* |
| nominal suffixes | *bdag po'i sar* | *bdag sgra* |
| negation | *dgag pa'i gnas* | *dgag sgra* |
| the adjunctive particle and quotative particles | _ | *zhing* |
| orthography linked to the final *'a chung* | *rjes 'jug bcu po ma bzhugs na, ming gzhan sbyor ba yod mi srid* | _ |

**Chart 1: the topics of the Sumcupa and the Ljonpa'i Dbangpo**

The two treatises mainly differ in the presentation of the various morphemes and the number of their variants (allomorphs). For example, in the "Lord of trees" (*Ljonpa'i Dbangpo*), we find seven forms for the oblique case (*ladon*): SU, RA, RU, DU, NA, LA, TU and a description combination of these variants (depending on the final consonant of the preceding word), while in the *Sumcupa*, only SU, RU, DU, NA and LA are given. The allomorph TU is not mentioned nor is the combination of the forms (see the root text and its commentary in the appendix of this paper).[20] One additional characteristic of the *Sumcupa* is that the morphemes are usually not given directly and must be derived from the combination of one of the 10 final suffixes (*ga, nga da, na, ba, ma, 'a, ra, la, sa*) and a diacritic vowel (*i, u, e, o*).[21] Thus for example, the morpheme SU is described as "the 2nd vowel [U] attached to the 10th final suffix [SA]".

The preservation of ancient grammatical concepts is an important feature of the Tibetan tradition until today. Only during the late 20th century, did new approaches of grammar emerge and were new analyses proposed. However the traditional grammatical canons and their main commentaries are still recited and are used in the educative system.

As we have shown in the introduction, the existence of ancient grammatical canons is rare in the literary traditions of the world. Thus *Sumcupa* and *Rtags'jugpa* can rightly be considered as a great achievement of this ancient culture of High Asia. At the same time, the integration of these ancient grammatical canons in a modern Tibetan educative curriculum has some negative impacts on the teaching methods of Literary Tibetan. A lot of teachers are reluctant to use modern concepts and modern linguistics to describe Literary Tibetan. We will take the example of the case system to show that the traditional approach is not adapted for an efficient and easy description of the literary language.[22] Although the Literary Tibetan case system is very complex and quite different from the case systems found in Indo-European languages, it could be described in a

---

[20] Here is another example: only one form is mentionned for the continuative particle STE in the *Sumcupa*, while three variants STE, DE, TE are listed in the "Lord of trees" (*Ljonpa'i Dbangpo*).

[21] According to Miller (1976: XIV), there used to be 7 vowel graphs: "We now know of early stages in the development of the Tibetan system of writing, and something of the use of distinct graphs, later abandoned, for what were apparently allophones of *i* and *u* so that a total of seven vowel graphs were employed, to write as many vowels."

[22] In this paper we are dealing with Classical Tibetan. The notion of *Classical Tibetan* is understood here in a wide sense, excluding Old Literary Tibetan and Modern Literary Tibetan.

clearer and more efficient way using notions and categories derived from modern linguistics and really adapted to this literary Tibeto-Burman language.

## 3  The traditional approach of the Tibetan cases

The Tibetan traditional grammatical commentaries always mention eight cases. In the *Ljonpa'i Dbangpo* treatise, only a couple of sentences (19 verses altogether) are devoted to the case system. We reproduce them below in the same order as they appear:

● 2nd, 4th and 7th cases "oblique"

།སུ་ར་རུ་ན་ལ་ཏུ།ལ་དོན་རྣམ་པ་བདུན་ཡིན་ཏེ།།རྣམ་དབྱེ་གཉིས་བཞི་བདུན་པ་དང་། དེ་ཉིད་ཚེ་སྐབས་རྣམས་ལ་འཇུག
།ས་སུ་ག་བ་དྲག་མཐར་ཏུ། །ང་དན་མ་ར་ལ་དུ། །འ་དང་མཐའ་མེད་ར་དང་རུ།

*su ra ru du na la tu/ la don rnam pa bdun yin te / rnam dbye gnyis bzhi bdun pa dang/ de nyid tshe skabs rnams la'jug/ sa su ga ba drag mthar tu/ nga da na ma ra la du/ 'a dang mtha' med ra dang ru/*

Translation: SU RA RU DU NA LA and TU/ the seven forms all have the meaning of "LA" They mark the 2nd, 4th and 7th cases/ For time and *denyid* they are also used/ After SA use SU. After GA, BA and the second ghostly suffix DA: TU/ after NGA, DA, NA, MA, RA, LA : DU/

● 6th case "ergative" and 3rd case "agentive"

།གི་ཀྱི་གྱི་འི་ཡི་ལྔ་པོ། །རྣམ་དབྱེ་དྲུག་པ་འབྲེལ་སྒྲ་དང་། །དེ་རྣམས་ས་མཐའ་ཅན་ལྔ་ནི། །རྣམ་དབྱེ་གསུམ་པ་བྱེད་སྒྲ་སྟེ།
།སྦྱོར་ཚུལ་ན་མ་ར་ལ་གྱི། །ད་བ་ས་ཀྱི་ག་ང་གི། །འ་དང་མཐའ་མེད་འི་དང་ཡི།

*gi kyi gyi 'i yi lnga po/ rnam dbye drug pa 'brel sgra dang/ de rnams sa mtha' can lnga ni/ rnam dbye gsum pa byed sgra ste/ sbyor tshul na ma ra la gyi/ da ba sa kyi ga nga gi / 'a dang mtha' med 'i dang yi/*

Translation: the five marks GI KYI GYI 'I YI / indicate the 6th case, the relation case/ These five forms with an additional "S" mark the third case, the agentive case. Their combination is the following. After NA, MA, RA, and LA: GYI / After DA, BA, SA: KYI; after GA and NGA: GI / after 'A and vowels: 'I or YI.

● 5th case "ablative"

།ནས་ལས་འབྱུང་ཁུངས་དགར་སྡུད་དེ། །འབྱུང་ཁུངས་དངོས་ལ་གང་སྦྱར་འཐུས། །རིགས་མཐུན་དགར་ནས་མི་མཐུན་ལས།
།སྡུད་ལ་ནས་སྒྲ་ཁོ་ན་འཇུག

*nas las 'byung khungs dgar sdud de/ 'byung khungs dngos la gang sbyar 'thus/ rigs mthun dgar nas mi mthun las / sdud la nas sgra kho na 'jug/*

Translation: NAS and LAS mark the source, the comparison or the abreviation. After the real source one can use either LAS or NAS. For the comparison of similar [entities], one

must use NAS and for dissimilar [entities] one uses LAS. One can only use NAS to indicate a [spatiotemporal origin] in the case of an abreviation.[23]

● **8th case "vocative"**

།ཀྱེ་དང་ཀུ་ཡེ་བོད་སྒྲ་སྟེ། །ཕལ་ཆེར་མིང་གི་ཐོག་མར་སྦྱོར།

*kye dang kwa ye bod sgra ste/ phal cher ming gi thog mar sbyor/*

Translation: NAS and LAS mark the source, the comparison or the abreviation. After the real source one can use either LAS or NAS. For the comparison of similar [entities], one must use NAS and for dissimilar [entities] one uses LAS. One can only use NAS to indicate a [spatiotemporal origin] in the case of an abreviation.

Note that the **1st case**, which is called *ngobotsam* "the essence alone" in most commentaries, does not appear in the mnemonic treatise of the *Ljonpa'i Dbangpo*.

For cultural and religious reasons, Tibetan grammarians of the past took as a model the Sanskrit case system, which is radically different from the Tibetan case system. They tried to match the cases of the two languages. The 8 cases (*rnamdbye brgyad*) correspond to their supposed Sanskrit "equivalents" (the kāraka):

| | **Sanskrit** <br> **Kāraka** ཀཱ་ར་ཀ[24] | **Literary Tibetan** <br> *rnamdbye* རྣམ་དབྱེ་ | **translation** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1) nominative | kartā ཀར་ཏཱ་ | *ngo bo tsam* རྣམ་དབྱེ་དང་པོ་ངོ་བོ་ཙམ། | 'essence case' |
| 2) accusative | karma ཀརྨ | *las su bya ba* རྣམ་དབྱེ་གཉིས་པ་ལས་སུ་བྱ་བ། | 'object case'[25] |
| 3) instrumental | karaṇa ཀ་ར་ཎ་ | *byed sgra* རྣམ་དབྱེ་གསུམ་པ་བྱེད་སྒྲ། | 'agent case' |
| 4) dative | sampradāna སམྤྲ་དཱན་ | *dgos ched* རྣམ་དབྱེ་བཞི་པ་དགོས་ཆེད། | 'purpose case' |
| 5) ablative | apādāna ཨ་པཱ་དཱན་ | *'byung khungs* རྣམ་དབྱེ་ལྔ་པ་འབྱུང་ཁུངས། | 'source case' |
| 6) genitive | sambandha སམ་བནྡྷ་ | *'brel sgra* རྣམ་དབྱེ་དྲུག་པ་འབྲེལ་སྒྲ། | 'relation case' |
| 7) locative | adhikaraṇa ཨ་དྷི་ཀ་ར་ཎ་ | *gnas gzhi* རྣམ་དབྱེ་བདུན་པ་གནས་གཞི། | 'location case' |
| 8) vocative | sambodhana སམ་བོ་དྷན་ | *bod sgra* རྣམ་དབྱེ་བརྒྱད་པ་བོད་སྒྲ། | 'address case' |

**Chart 2: correspondences between Sanskrit and Tibetan case**

---

[23] The notion of "abreviation" refers here to the construction "*from* X *to* Y" which allows to include all the elements of a list or a continuum by naming only the extremes.

[24] I give here the Tibetan transliterations of Sanskrit cases. These transliterations are rarely mentionned in the traditional commentaries and usually replaced by their Tibetan equivalents.

[25] *lassu byaba* can be translated litterally "activity towards a work/for a work (see Zeisler 2006: 59)

This traditional analysis in 8 cases based on the Sanskrit model has created a great deal of confusion for linguistic description as well as for the teaching of Literary Tibetan. The problems connected with the Sanskrit 8 cases model have been noted by both native and foreign scholars (see Verhagen 2000a, Zeisler 2006). A prominent grammarian from Amdo, Dorzhi Snyemblo Gdongdrug (1987), has expressed this criticism in very clear terms:

བོད་སྐད་ལ་རྣམ་དབྱེ་བརྒྱད་དུ་ཕྱེས་པ་ནི། རྒྱ་གར་གྱི་སྐད་ལ་དཔེ་བླངས་པ་ཡིན་ཀྱང་། དཔེ་དེ་དོན་ལ་མི་འཕྲོར་མི་ཉུང་བ་ཞིག་ཡོད་པ་ནི།

སྐྲ་ལ་གཟིགས་རྟོགས་གནང་བའི་མཁས་པ་སུས་ཀྱང་ཤེས། སྐད་རིགས་གཞན་པའི་ཕན་ཁོར་དུ་མ་བཅུག་པར།

བོད་སྐད་རང་གི་གྲུབ་ལུགས་དང་ཁྱད་ཆོས་མཚོན་ཐུབ་པ་ཞིག་གི་སྟེང་ནས་གཞི་རྩ་འཛིན་དགོས་སོ།།

"The analysis of Tibetan into eight cases is based on a Sanskrit model. But the model does not work in many occasions. Every scholar who pays attention to grammar knows that very well. Avoiding the bad habit of copying other languages, one should describe the Tibetan language only on the basis of its own structure and specificities".

In an effort to propose a more coherent analysis, some authors such as Skalbzang 'Gyurmed (1981: 3) stated that:

རྣམ་དབྱེ་བརྒྱད་ལས་དངོས་སུ་སྒྲུང་དུ་ཡོད་པའི་རྣམ་དབྱེའི་རྐྱེན་ནི་འབྲེལ་སྒྲ་དང་། བྱེད་སྒྲ། ལ་དོན། འབྱུང་ཁུངས་བཅས་

རྐྱེན་བཞི་རེད་ཅིང་། སྒྲའི་རྣམ་པ་དེ་དག་གིས་རྣམ་དབྱེའི་དོན་དུ་མ་ཟད། རྣམ་དབྱེ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱད་ཀྱང་གི་དོན་ཡང་སྟོན་གྱི་ཡོད་དོ།

"The 8 cases are marked only by 4 marks (*rkyen*): the **genitive** (*'brel sgra*), the **agentive** (*byed sgra*), the **oblique** (*la don*) and the **ablative** (*'byung khungs kyi sgra*). These casemarkers not only indicate grammatical meanings related to nominal cases but also other meanings not related to the cases."[26] In the Chinese edition of his grammar (1988), Skalbzang 'Gyurmed adds the **absolutive** (*ngobotsam* or zero marking), which makes 5 casemarkers. Such commentaries reflect a new analysis, which sharply departs from the traditional "Sanskrit model". However, we will see later that a five casemarkers analysis does not allow for a faithful description of Literary Tibetan grammar.

The main flaws of the traditional approach to cases relate to the differences between Sanskrit and Tibetan. The two languages differ in fundamental ways: **a) The number of cases; b) The grammatical semantics of the cases; c) The syntax of the cases.**

Most Sanskrit cases have no match in Tibetan: nominative ≠ "essence case" (absolutive), accusative ≠ "object case", instrumental ≠ agentive, dative ≠ purposive. The other cases such as ablative, genitive and locative share some common properties but they have a different function in the two languages. The so called "vocative case" (*bod sgra*) is not a case in Literary Tibetan but corresponds to a series of interjections that such as *kye, kwa ye*, etc., which precede the noun, unlike the other cases, which always follow the noun.

The correspondance between Tibetan cases and Sanskrit cases is particularly problematic for the core cases (nominative and accusative), because the fundamental morphosyntactic constructions in the two languages follow a different logic.[27] In Tibetan, the dominant construction of transitive verbs is of the ergative type, while in Sanskrit, it reflects the accusative type. The consequence is that there is no equivalent of *nominative* and *accusative* in Tibetan, and correlatively, there is no perfect match for *absolutive* and *ergative* in Sanskrit.

---

[26] Dorzhi (1987) has a similar analysis.

[27] Zeisler (2006) analyses in details the way Tibetan grammarians understood the Sanskrit case system.

Thus if we take in account these important characteristics, we can easily understand the complex relations between the two case systems, whereby a single case of Sanskrit may correspond to two core grammatical roles in Tibetan and vice versa.[28]

| Sanskrit | Classical Tibetan |
|---|---|
| kartā (nominative) | *ngo bo tsam* (absolute) |
| | *byed sgra* (ergative-instrumental) |
| karma (accusative) | *ngo bo tsam* (absolute) |
| | *las su bya ba* (oblique) |
| kartā (nominative) | *byed sgra* (ergative-instrumental) |
| karaṇa (instrumental) | |

**Chart 3**

The last significant problem of the traditional analysis is linked to the status of the "oblique case" traditionnally called *ladon*. The notion of *ladon* is very confusing in the traditional approach because it merges together 3 different casemarkers: ***du*** (and its variants *tu, su, ru, r*[29]), ***la*** and ***na*** into a kind of "supercase" which convey the functions of the 2nd "accusative", the 4th "dative" or the 7th "locative" cases. In the grammatical treatises, the *ladon* is always considered as an important notion and there are intense debates about the identification of the grammatical meaning as an instance of the 2nd, the 4th or the 7th case.

The main difficulty of the traditional approach of the *ladon* is that the differences between the 3 cases (reflecting their Sanskrit equivalents) are entirely based on *semantic* criteria, while the *morphological* and *syntactic* properties are ignored: The traditional grammarians generally consider that the 2nd, the 4th and the 7th cases may be marked by all the seven forms of the *ladon* (oblique): *su, ra, ru, du, na, la tu*, even if most authors admit that there are serious restrictions for the 2nd and 4th cases.[30] Morever, as we will show later, the seven marks not only have different case functions, but they also differ in their use as connective or adverbials.

One of the best criticisms of the concept of *ladon* has again come from a native grammarian Dorzhi Gdongdrug who has shown that the variants of the *ladon* "supercase" are by no means equivalent.

ཡི་གེ་དྲུག་པོ་འདི་མིང་གི་འཇུག་ཏུ་ཐོབ་ཚུལ་མི་འདྲ་ཡང་དོན་སྒྲོན་པའི་བྱེད་ལས་ཀྱི་ཆ་ནས་ལ་དང་ཐལ་ཆེར་འདྲ་བས།

ལ་དོན་གྱི་ཡི་གེ་ཞེས་བཏགས་སོ།  འདི་ཐལ་ཆེར་ཞེས་པ་ལ་རྒྱ་མཚན་ཡོད་དེ།  ཡི་གེ་བདུན་པོ་འདིའི་ནང་གསེས་ཀྱི་འཇུག་ཚུལ་ལ།

དོན་སྒྲོན་ཚུལ་དང་ཁྱབ་ཆེ་ཆུང་གི་ཁྱད་པར་ཆེས་ནའོ།

---

[28] This chart below corresponds to my analysis. The native grammarians usually stick to the analysis proposed in the chart 2.

[29] The allomorph *r* is pronounced /r/ but is traditionally written *ra* because of the syllabic nature of the Tibetan script: a letter without vowel diacritic sign is pronounced with the inherent vowel /a/. Thus according to the tradition, it is impossible to write a consonant without a vowel. Unlike other Brahmic scripts, Tibetan does not have a *virama*, i.e a sign which "kills" the inherent vowel.

[30] For some functions of the 2nd case, only *la* and *r* may be used. For the 4th case, *na* is usually not used.

95

"The combination rules of the 6 variants [*su, ra, ru du, na tu*] are distinct but their semantic functions are rather similar to the *la*. That is the reason why [these 7 forms] have been called *la don* [the meaning of *la*]. However, these seven forms [litt. "letters"] correspond to various [grammatical] categories and their frequency is quite distinct" (Dorzhi, ibid).

Thus it is clear from Dorzhi's commentary that the so called *ladon* should not be considered as a single "supercase" and should be divided into several cases depending on various morphological, syntactic and semantic parameters.

Even native scholars, such as Dorzhi Gdongdrug Snyemblo or Skalbzang 'Gyurmed, who are well aware of the problems generated by the canonical approach, are reluctant to abandon it and come up with a full revision or deconstruction of the traditional case system. So far, none of the native grammarians has proposed an entirely new approach of the case system of Literary Tibetan based on modern linguistic notions.

## 4  A new analysis of the case system

It is now possible to propose a new analysis of the case system based on morphological, syntactic and semantic parameters. As we will see below in 4.2, the Classical Tibetan case system is one of the most complicated literary case system of the world.[31] This complexity is not due to a great number of cases, nor is it due to a highly irregular morphology. Indeed Russian or Latin nominal morphologies are much more complex than the Tibetan one. The main reason for this complexity comes from the syntax and the grammatical semantics of the various marks.

Let us first consider the morphology of the various cases markings.

### 4.1    *Morphology of the various cases*

The casemarkers of Literary Tibetan are neither nominal suffixes like the classical cases of Latin, Russian or Greek nor adpositions like those found in French or English (e.g. the indirect object *à* in French or *to* in English): They are clitics and attach at the end of a noun phrase.[32] The casemarkers never occur independently. Another difference directly related to their clitic nature is that Tibetan cases occur only once for each NP, unlike "classical" case systems, where a case, for example dative, is marked on each constituent of the NP whether nouns, adjectives, demonstratives, quantifiers or pronouns.

Another consequence of the clitic nature of the cases is that the various constituents of the NP never undergo any morphological variation. The only morphological variation is related to the clitic morpheme itself, which may undergo a variation depending on the final consonant or vowel of the preceding word.

Some casemarkers are clearly allomorphs and represent formal variations of a single morpheme in a certain environment. The variation is linked to an old morphophonological rule and does not reflect any difference in terms of grammatical semantics.

This is for example the case for *gi, kyi, gyi, 'i* and *yi,* which are allomorphs of the *same* genitive case as well as *gis, kyis, gyis, 'is* and *yis,* which are allomorphs of the *same* ergative case, which can also be called agentive case.

---

[31] Some Tibeto-Burman languages have similarly complex case systems but none of them has an old literary tradition.

[32] For a discussion on the distinction between clitics, affixes and words in TB languages, see Genetti (1993)

Zero marking (Ø) should also be considered as a casemarker although it is formally void. The reason is that the absolute case, traditionally referred to as *ngobotsam*, plays an essential role in the ergative constructions. The absolutive is used for both the unique participant of an intransitive construction and the patient of a transitive construction.

For example: a) འབུ་བསད་དོ། *'bu* [ABS] *bsad–do* '(X) killed (the) insect' b) འབུ་ཤིའོ། *'bu* [ABS] *shi'o* '(the) insect died'. In a) the absolutive case or zero marking on *'bu* (insect) indicates the Grammatical Patient (or "Direct Object") of the transitive verb *bsad* while in b) the absolutive indicates the Single Argument (or "Subject") of the intransitive verb *shi*.

If we now consider the distribution of the seven forms of the traditional *ladon*, some are clearly not allomorphs. The forms *du* (and its variants), *la* and *na* may occur in the same phonological environment but they have distinctive semantic and syntactic functions. For some functions, only certain forms of the *ladon* are suitable. Thus for example, with the Beneficiary role (or "Indirect Object") we find only the forms *la* and its variant *r*. The other forms *su, ru, du, tu* and *na* can not normally be used for this function: གཟུགས་ལ་བལྟ། *gzugs+la blta*. 'to look at the shape', ?གཟུགས་སུ་བལྟ། *gzugs+su blta*, \*གཟུགས་ན་བལྟ། *gzugs+na blta*; སྒྲ་ལ་ཉན། *sgra la nyan* 'to listen to the sound', ?སྒྲ་རུ་ཉན། *sgra+ru nyan*, \*སྒྲ་ན་ཉན། *sgra+na nyan*, དྲི་ལ་སྣོམ། *dri+la snom* 'to smell a fragrance', ?དྲི་རུ་སྣོམ། *dri+ru snom*, \*དྲི་ན་སྣོམ། *dri+na snom*; ཁྱོད་ལ་སྟེར། *khyod+la ster* '(I) give (it) to you', ?ཁྱོད་དུ་སྟེར། *khyod+du ster*, \*ཁྱོད་ན་སྟེར། *khyod+na ster*, ཨ་མ་ལ་ཤ་ཟ་རུ་འཇུག *ama+la sha za+ru 'jug* 'to make mother eat meat', ?ཨ་མ་རུ་ཤ་ཟ་རུ་འཇུག *ama+ru sha za+ru 'jug*, \*ཨ་མ་ན་ཤ་ཟ་རུ་འཇུག *ama+na sha za+ru 'jug*; ཁྱི་ར་སྒོ་བསྲུང་དུ་བཅུག *khyi+r sgo bsrung+du bcug* 'to have the dog watch the door', ?ཁྱི་རུ་བསྒོ་བསྲུང་དུ་བཅུག *khyi+ru sgo bsrung+du bcug*, \*ཁྱི་ན་བསྒོ་བསྲུང་དུ་བཅུག *khyi+na sgo bsrung+dubcug*.[33]

The fact that for certain functions of the Beneficiary only *la* and *r* may be used has been noted by some native authors, such as Skalbzang 'Gyurmed (1981) and Dorzhi (1987):

དངོས་ཡུལ་ལ་འཇུག་པ། [...]འདིའི་རིགས་ལ་ལ་དོན་གྱི་ཡི་གེ་ནང་གི་ལ་དང་ར་གཉིས་ལས་གཞན་དག་མི་འཐོབ། [...]

བྱ་བྱེད་དུ་བཅུག་པའི་ཡུལ་ལ་འཇུག་པ། [...]ལ་དང་ར་ལས། ལ་དོན་གྱི་ཡི་གེ་གཞན་མི་འཇུག་གོ།

"For the real object (*dngos yul*), among the forms of the *ladon*, only *la* and *r* may be used. [...]. For the object of a causative construction, only *la* and *r* may be used. The other forms are not suitable."

We will call the two casemarkers *la* and *r* "dative" in English and ལ་སྒྲ་ *la sgra* in Tibetan[34]. The form *r* has somehow a problematic status. On the one hand, it is clearly an allomorph of the dative *la* in a vocalic context. On the other hand, it is also considered as an allomorph of *du* (see Hill 2004: 83) used as a free variant of *ru* in a vocalic environment.[35]

The variants *su, ru, du* and *tu* are clearly allomorphs. The distribution of the 4 marks, which is entirely complementary, has been described in the all traditional commentaries: *su* occurs after the consonant *s*, *ru* occurs after a vowel and the consonant *'a*, *du* occurs after *ng, d, n, m, r, l* and *tu* after *g, b* and the second suffix *d*. The original morpheme is probably *du* which occurs in most environments. It has undergone transformations in some phonological contexts such as a rhoticization (after vowels as *ru* or *r),* a sibilantization (after *s* as *su*) and a devoicing[36] after plosives

---

[33] These examples are taken from Dorzhi (1987).

[34] This term has been used in the *Sumcupa* to refer to the *ladon*. I propose to restrict *la sgra* to the form /la/ and its variant /r/

[35] For example, it is possible to use both *r* and *ru* in the following sentence: *'dus byas ni mi rtag pa ru/ mi rtag par nges.*

[36] The allomorph *tu* is often replaced by *du* in the oldest documents and it is likely that the devoicing of *du* after the final plosives *b* and *g* respectively pronounced /p/ and /k/ took place progressively. (See Bsodnams Tshering, 2003).

(*g, b* and "hidden *d*" as *tu*). I propose to call this case ༑ྲ *du sgra* in Tibetan and *purposive* in English, following Wilson's (1992) terminology. The term of *terminative* has been proposed for this function by Jäschke (1883) but its meaning is not obvious and confusing.[37]

One of the main functions of the purposive is to indicate the aim, the purpose of performing the verbal action. For example:

1) གོས་སུ་སྣམ་བུ་འཐག *gos su snam bu 'thag* 'to weave a piece of woollen cloth **for** garment'

2) སྐུ་ཚབ་ཏུ་འདེམས་བསྐོ་བྱེད། *sku tshab tu 'dems bsko byed* 'to choose **as** a representative'

3) ཁང་པ་རུ་རྡོ་ཚིག་རྒྱག *khang pa ru rdo tshig rgyag* 'to make a wall **for** a house'

As we will see later, with this function, the case is frequently used after verbs.

Then we have the ནྲ *na sgra* which corresponds to the locative case. It can be used only for location without movement and not for direction.

The traditional approach groups together two marks ལས་ *las* and ནས་ *nas* under the term *'byung khungs* (litt. source [case marking]). These two markers correspond in reality to two different cases, which differ both in their syntax and in their semantics. DeLancey (2003) and Hill (2004) call them respectively 'elative' and 'ablative'.[38] In Tibetan they may simply be called ལས་ྲ (*las sgra*) and ནས་ྲ (*nas sgra*).

Finally, one should take in account a case marking, which so far has been considered as a variant of the agentive or simply ignored, the mark བས་ *bas*.[39] Although it is fairly marginal and functions only as a comparative, it should be recognized as a casemarker.

In summary, according to the above morphological analysis, **Literary Tibetan has ten grammatical cases:**[40] **absolutive** རོ་ཚམ་; **agentive** བྱེད་ྲ; **genitive** འབྲེལ་ྲ; **dative** ལ་ྲ; **purposive** ༑ྲ; **locative** ནྲ; **ablative** ལས་ྲ; **elative** ནས་ྲ; **associative** ༑ྲ; **and comparative** བས་ྲ.

---

The devoicing of *du* did not happen after the final *d* probably because the place of articulation is the same. This recalls the behaviour of the devoicing with *gi*, the genitive case: *kyi* occurs after the plosives *d, b* pronounced /t/ and /p/ but does not take place when the place of articulation is the same: after *g* we find *gi* and not \**ki*.

[37] Jäschke (1883: 21) proposed the following terms for the cases: "nominative-accusative, genitive, instrumental, dative, locative, ablative, **terminative** and vocative". Bacot used the term "déterminatif" in his grammar (in French). Since "purpose" is one of the main functions of the *du sgra*, Wilson's term "purposive" is a lot clearer. In French, I have proposed the term "destinatif" (seminar of typology, University of Provence, 2007-2008). The term "destinative" has also been used independently by Haller (2009) with a meaning restricted to one of the functions of the *du sgra*.

[38] For simplicity's sake, I will keep the label "ablative", although as we will see later the *las* case is somehow more complicated than a simple ablative.

[39] In synchrony the comparative mark *bas* can not be analysed as a morpheme *ba+s* (agentive), unlike the agentive *pas* or *bas*, which can easily be divided into *pa/ba* (nominalizer)+s (agentive). The form of the nominalizer *pa* or *ba* depends on the last letter of the preceding word. Moreover, the nominalizer may be followed by any of the cases: *pa+'i* (*pa*+genitive), *pa+s* or *pa+yis* (pa+agentive), *pa+la* (pa+dative), *pa+nas* (pa+elative). On the contrary, the comparative *bas* does not have a form as *pas*. Unlike what I proposed earlier (Tournadre, 2003), the morpheme *bas* can't be analysed as *ba+s* since the meaning of *ba*, which follows a noun, is not a nominalizer and remains obscure in synchrony.

[40] A similar case analysis has been proposed by Hill (2004) which was based on DeLancey (2003) and Tournadre (1996). The main difference introduced here is the inclusion in the case system of the comparative *bas* and the analysis of *la*, which is called "allative" by Hill and which I analyse as "dative".

## *4.2 Syntax and semantics of the cases*

The main characteristic of the Literary Tibetan cases is that they are **multifunctional, transcategorial** and sometimes **optional**. They are multifunctional in the sense that every case has a wide array of functions. For example, the agentive not only marks the agent, but also the instrument and the cause, etc.

This characteristic is found in most case systems around the world. That is for example true for Latin, Russian or Sanskrit. The Latin accusative indicates both the object and the direction of the predicate (allative), duration, attribute of the object, etc. Much more characteristic is the fact that the Tibetan cases are transcategorial[41], i.e most of the casemarkers may be used not only with nouns, adjectives, pronouns, quantifiers, adverbs but also with verbs and verbal auxiliaries.

Transcategoriality is variously exploited by languages. Some languages such as Baka make an intensive use of this property as shown by Heine and Kilian-Hatz (1994) and Robert (2004). For example, the morpheme *tɛ* has various uses which "are organized in a complex network of semantic and syntactic values: *tɛ* may behave like a particle, a preposition, an auxiliary, or a co-ordinating or subordinating, conjunction, involving various semantic domains such as space, time, aspect, cause, purpose, manner, instrument, case marking and more. [...]. In English, for instance, participles (such as *considering*) can be used as prepositions, inflected verb forms as subordinating conjunctions (*suppose, imagine…*), or temporal adverbs as discourse particles (*now, still*), but there is nothing comparable to the Baka *tɛ*." (Robert 2004). Well, Literary Tibetan might also be a good example that makes an extensive use of transcategoriality as we will see below!

The various cases of Literary Tibetan indicate **grammatical roles**, when occurring at the end of a noun phrase. They indicate its grammatical role or function such as Agent, Patient, Beneficiary, Instrument, Source, etc.

The casemarkers also have **connective functions**, when placed after a verb or a nominalized verb. They function as coordinators or subordinators. The functioning of casemarkers both as nominal cases and connectives seems to be a widespread feature of the Tibeto-Burman case systems (cf. Genetti (1991)). Apart from these main functions, one also encounters **adverbial functions** after nouns or adjectives and **postpositional functions** mainly after nouns.

Finally one also finds **discursive and pragmatic functions** when the casemarkers are used after an NP or at the end of a sentence.[42]

The first two functions (grammatical role and connective) as well as the discursive function belong to flexional morphology, while the latter (adverbial and postposition) belong to derivational morphology and thus are related to the construction of the lexicon. They are no longer productive in Literary Tibetan. As expected, the case-marked adverbs and postpositions have a different syntactic behaviour. While the adverbs function independently, the postpositions trigger a complement usually marked with the genitive case.

The reason for the multifunctional nature of Tibetan cases may be found in a cognitive representation of a scene whereby the participants are either interpreted as a source, as the center or as the goal of the process. This has been described within the **trajectory model** of the cases (Tournadre 1995). In order to describe ergativity and more generally the case system of Literary

---

[41] About the notion of transcategoriality, see e.g Plungian (2003) and Robert (2004).

[42] Both the agentive and the dative may have various discursive functions (emphasis, contrastive focus, topicalization) as shown by Tournadre (1994, 1996) and Zeisler (2006).

Tibetan, one should postulate the existence of the "supercases" of Source and Goal. The Source includes agentive, ablative, elative and comparative, while the Goal includes purposive, dative, locative and associative. The various Source cases share a morphological characteristic. They are compositional and exhibit a final *s* (see LaPolla 1995: 192). Historically Source cases combine the genitive, the dative, the locative and a form *ba* with a *s* (*gi+s, la+s, na+s, ba+s*) and share core grammatical semantics (spatial, temporal and agentive sources and causes).

The explanation for the transcategorial nature of the cases, especially the fact that they occur after verbs and function as connectives, is probably due in part to a nominalization of the verb. However, the nominalizer has disappeared in most instances and the verb is directly followed by the casemarker. As for the functions of postposition and adverb, it is not surprising to see that they are marked with grammatical cases, because nearly all the postpositions in Tibetan are originally nouns (and still used as such synchronically) and most adverbs are either nouns or adjectives.

Of course, it would also be possible to consider Tibetan case morphemes no longer the same morphemes when they function as connective and that it is purely homonymy (at least in synchrony). In this perspective, the *nas* as elative case 'from' and the *nas* as a connective after a verb would then be different morphemes. However, by choosing this analysis, we miss a fundamental property of the Tibetan case system that reflects a **"fractal grammar"** (see Robert, *ibid*). It is not a coincidence if 5 cases out of 10 are entirely transcategorial (see chart below) and 4 are partially transcategorial.[43]

It is also interesting to note that the contemporary native grammarians are fully aware of this transcategoriality although they lack the notion as such. Dorzhi Gdongdrug Snyemblo (1987) for example speaks of *byedsgra brtsegsma-can* 'stacked agentives' and gives the following examples:

4)  རི་མོ་མཛེས་པས་ངས་མིག་གིས་བལྟས།

    *rimo       mdzes+pa+s          nga+s  mig+gis bltas.*
    picture      be beautiful+NOM+AGT  I+AGT  eye+AGT look (Past)
'Since the pictures was nice, I looked (at it) with my (own) eyes.'

5)  ཁྲོས་པས་དབྱུག་པས་ཤེད་ཀྱིས་བརྡུངས་།

    *khros+pa+s                 dbyugpa+s        shed+kyis  brdungs*
    angry+ NOM+AGT         stick+AGT         force+AGT         beat
'Because (he/she) was angry, (he/she) beat strongly with a stick.'

6)  བྱ་བ་དཀའ་ཁག་ཆེ་བས་ང་ཚོས་ཐབས་ཀྱིས་རིམ་གྱིས་བསྒྲུབས།

    *byaba  dka'khag    che+ba+s               ngatsho+s       thabs+kyis     rim+gyis bsgrubs*
    task     hard         great+ NOM+AGT         we+AGT         method+AGT   step+AGT achieve
'Because the work was hard, we had to achieve it progressively with a skilled method.'

In the examples above, the various forms of the agentive (the allomorphs *s, gis, gyis, kyis*) appear 3 or 4 times within the same sentence with various functions, related to different categories:

---

[43] The absolute is formally zero-marked so it is difficult to apply the criterion of transcategoriality.

nouns, pronouns or verbs. We see in the above sentence that the agentive case corresponds to the definition given by Robert (2004) of a transcategorial morpheme: "By definition, a transcategorial morpheme is used on different syntactic levels with a different syntactic scope (for instance, as a noun, as a preposition, as a subordinating conjunction)."

The semantics of any transcategorial morpheme must of course be correlated at each level with a set of syntactic properties: "At each level of the syntactic hierarchy a number of specific syntactic properties are attached" (Robert 2004).

Before I list and illustrate the various functions of each case, a few additional remarks ought to be made about the syntax of the cases.

First, when marking the grammatical role, casemakers occur at the end of the noun phrase and may occur only once per NP. However a few non casual marks may occur *after the case* at the end of the NP. These are essentially *ni* (the topicalizer), *kyang*[44] (the adjunctive) and, in a marginal way, *'o*[45] (the final particle). For example, the sequences N+*gis*+*ni* (AGT+TOP), N+*gis*+*kyang* (AGT+ADJCT), N+*nas*+*ni* (ELA+TOP), N+*nas*+*kyang* (ELA+ADJCT), N+*las*+*ni* (ABL+TOP), N+*las*+*kyang* (ABL+ADJCT), N+*gis*+*so* (AGT+FP) are correct, while the reverse order (e.g *N+*ni*+CASE, *N+*kyang*+CASE, *N+FP+CASE...) is not found.

Second, one sometimes finds sequences of two cases, such as an agentive followed by a locative: *s*+*na* used after a nominalized verb (V+*ba-**s-na**)* 'since, therefore if', and adverbs such as *debasna* 'therefore, hence, for that reason'.

Third, in Literary Tibetan, just as in all the modern Tibetic languages, the verb is the only compulsory element of the sentence. There is no verbal agreement, whatsoever, with any argument, unlike many Tibetan-Burman languages, such as the Kiranti languages.[46] All the arguments whether Agent ("subject") or Patient ("object") can be omitted, so that grammatical roles are often not marked at all.

Fourth, a case is usually governed by the verb that follows the noun or the NP but in many occurrences, the case may also be governed by a subsequent verb. The governing verb is sometimes placed very far from the noun phrase it governs, after several clauses, at the end of the final clause.

Fifth, in some contexts, the grammatical cases are optional and may be dropped or exchanged. Optionality has various motivations. It is either because the verb class allows some flexibility in the case marking or because the case marking may be triggered by several verbs (usually two subsequent verbs).

I will list below the main functions of each mark and give illustrations for each function. The sentences are taken from various *rnamthar* (*Milaraspa, sNangsa 'Od'bum*, etc.) etc. or classical texts (such as *Saskya legsbshad,* etc.). For the sake of conciseness, some examples are also taken from various grammars (Skalbzang 'Gyurmed, 1981, Dorzhi, 1987, Dpa'ris Sangsrgyas, 1987). Skalbzang 'Gyurmed was probably the first native grammarian to base his analysis on the vast corpus of the Tibetan literature. New technologies applied to Tibetan already allow for automatic search which will considerably facilitate the constitution of a corpus to illustrate the evolution and the variation in the case system throughout the long history of Tibetan literature.

---

[44] or its allomorphs *'ang* and *yang*.

[45] or its allomorphs *go, ngo, do, no, bo, mo, ro, lo, so*

[46] See van Driem (2001) and Bickel (2007).

## List of the functions of ten cases

For every case, the functions will be listed in the same order: a) case functions (after nouns or NPs), b) connective functions (after verbs or nominalized verbs), c) adverbial functions d) postpositional functions, e) sentence particle functions.

### Absolutive (∅)

**A. functions:** a) <u>case functions</u>: Single Argument of monovalent verb, Patient of a bivalent verb. The other functions b), c) d) and e) are absent.

**B. illustrations:**

a1) single argument

རི་ལ་རྩྭ་ནི་མི་འདུག *ri+la rtswa+∅*[grass+ABS] *ni mi 'dug* 'There is no grass on the mountain.' ཐབ་ཏུ་མེ་འབར། *thab+tu me+∅*[fire+ABS] *'bar* 'The fire is burning in the stove.', ཁྱིམ་དུ་མི་མེད། *khyim+du mi+∅* [person+ABS] *med* 'There is nobody [litt. not a person] in the house.'.

a2) patient

བླ་མས་དཀྱིལ་འཁོར་བཞེངས་ *blama+s dkyil'khor+∅* [mandala+ABS] *bzhengs* 'The lama built a mandala.', གསེར་ཉོས་ནས་རྒྱ་གར་ལ་ཁྱེར་འགྲོ *gser+∅*[gold+ABS] *nyos+nas rgyagar+la khyer 'gro* 'Having bought some gold, [I] will bring it to India.', རིན་པོ་ཆེ་ལེན་དུ་སོང་། *rinpoche+∅* [precious (stone)+ABS] *len+du song* '(X) went to fetch precious (stones).'.

### Agentive བྱེད་སྒྲ་ (ཀྱིས་ གིས་ གྱིས་ འིས་ ཡིས་ *kyis, gis, gyis,'is, yis*)

**A. functions:** a) <u>case functions</u>: *ergative* indicating the Agent ('by', often not translated) and *instrumenta*l ('by', 'with') marking the Instrument, the Manner, the Cause or the Specification; b) <u>connective functions</u>: causal and time subordination ('because, since'). Also used after PA པས་(*pas*) (or its allomorph བས་ *bas*): causal subordinator ('because') and coordinator ('and'); adversative connector c) <u>adverbial functions</u>, d) <u>postpositional functions</u>, e) <u>sentence final particle functions</u>.

**B. illustrations:**

a1) the Agent

བླ་མས་དཀྱིལ་འཁོར་བཞེངས་ *blama+s* [lama+AGT:ERG][47] *dkyil'khor+∅ bzhengs* 'The lama built a mandala.', ཡི་གེ་སུས་བྲིས་ *yige+∅ su+s* [who+AGT:ERG] *bris* 'Who wrote this letter?' or 'This letter was written by whom?', ཨ་ཁུ་དང་ཨ་ནེས་སྡུག་པོ་བཏང་ *akhu dang ane+s* [aunt+ AGT:ERG] *sdugpo btang* '(My) uncle and aunt treated (me) badly.'.

བུ་ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་ཀྱང་གཞོན་ནུ་ནས་མཐུ་དང་སེར་བས་སྡིག་ཆེན་པོ་བསགས་ *bu khyod+kyis+kyang* [you+AGT:ERG+also] *gzhonnu+nas mthu dang serba+s sdig chenpo+∅ bsags* 'My son, you too, since your young age, have accumulated great sins because of magic and hail.', ཡུམ་གྱིས་ལེགས་པར་གཟིགས་ནས་སྤྱན་ཆབ་བསིལ་ *yum+gyis* [mother+AGT:ERG] *legspa+r gzigs nas spyanchab+∅ bsil* 'Mother looked carefully

---

[47] In the examples below, the first abreviation indicates the case and after the semi colon the second abreviation indicates the case function. Ex: AGT:ERG designates the agentive case and the ergative function.

and then cried.', བདག་གིས་རྩ་རླུང་ཐིག་ལེ་བསྒོམས་ *bdag+gis* [me+AGT:ERG] *rtsa rlung thigle+Ø bsgom* 'I medidated upon the channels, the breath, the essence.'.[48]

## a2) Instrument, Cause and Manner

ཆང་གིས་བཟི་ *chang+gis* [beer+AGT:INST] *bzi* 'X got drunk **with** the beer.' དུག་གིས་ཤི་ *dug+gis* [poison+ AGT:CAUS] *shi* 'to die **of** poison', བླ་མས་ངའི་ལག་པ་ཕྱག་གིས་བཟུང་ *blama+s nga+'i lagpa phyag+gis* [AGT:INST] *bzung* 'The lama took my hand **with** his hand.', བུ་ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་ཀྱང་གཞོན་ནུས་མཐུ་དང་སེར་བས་སྡིག་ཆེན་པོ་བསགས་ *bu khyod+kyis kyang gzhonnu+nas mthu dang serba+s* [hail+ AGT:CAUS] *sdig chenpo+Ø bsags* 'My son, you too, since your young age, have accumulated great sins **because** of magic and hail.'.

## a3) Specification

This function is quite peculiar and is linked to specificative adjectival or verbal predicates, which are always stative. A specificative verb or adjective governs two arguments, one in the absolutive (in some cases in the dative) and the other in the instrumental. Most adjectival predicates such as *phyug* 'rich', *mtho* 'high', *thung* 'short', *mkhas* 'expert', *ring* 'long', *che* 'big' may have an argument in the instrumental conveying specification. Some specificative verbs also trigger the same construction. Among the most frequent, one should mention: *khengs* 'to be filled (with)', *bskor* 'to be surrounded by', *g.yogs* 'to be covered by', *brgyan* 'to be adorned with, ornemented, bejeweled', *spras* 'to adorned with, decorated by' , *gtso* 'to be chieffed by¨' ('with as main figures'), *khyab* 'to encompass, to pervade, to be covered with', *mnar* 'to be oppressed by', *mchod* 'to worship with'. In English, this function is translated by various prepositions depending on the context: 'by', 'as', 'in', 'with' or 'of'.

བདེན་པས་སྟོངས། *bdenpa+s* [truth+AGT:SPEC] *stongs* 'devoid **of** truth', *yontan+gyis* [quality+AGT: SPEC] *che* 'great **in** qualities', འདོམ་གང་གིས་མཐོ། *'dom gang+gis* [fathom one+AGT: SPEC] *mtho* 'high **as** one fathom (or one armspan)', ལྷ་མོ་ལ་སྐྱབས་ཡུལ་རྣམས་ཀྱིས་བསྐོར་ནས་བཞུགས། *lhamo+la skyabsyul+rnams+kyis* [refuge deities+PL+ AGT:SPEC] *bskor+nas bzhugs* 'The goddess is surrounded **by** the various deities of the Refuge.', རིན་པོ་ཆེ་དང་པདྨ་སྣ་ཚོགས་ཀྱིས་སྤྲས། *rinpoche dang padma snatshogs rgyan+gyis* [ornament+AGT:SPEC] *spras* '[he/she] was adorned **by** various precious stones and lotus.', འབྲས་བུས་ཕྱུག་པའི་ལྗོན་པའི་ར་བས་བསྐོར། *'brasbu+s* [fruit+AGT:SPEC] *phyug+pa'i ljonpa+'i rwaba+s* [fence+AGT:SPEC] *bskor* '[the place] was surrounded **by** a fence of trees **with** abundant fruits.'.

## b1) Adjunctive and causal connective

The agentive may be used directly after the verb to indicate a connexion between two clauses. However, for this function, the agentive case alone is rarely used, while the elative case is very frequent (see elative case below).

ཡུད་ཙམ་ངལ་གསོས་ཀྱིས་བསྡད་པ་ཡིན། *yud tsam ngal gsos+kyis* [rest+ AGT:CO] *bsdad+payin* 'We stayed a while **and** rested (litt. rest and stay).'. This is equivalent to: ཡུད་ཙམ་ངལ་གསོས་ནས་བསྡད་པ་ཡིན། *yud tsam ngal gsos+nas* [rest+ ELA:CO] *bsdad+payin* 'We stayed a while **and** rested.', སེམས་འགུལ་ཆེ་ཐེབས་ཀྱིས་པོ་ཀྱི་གཏམ་དཔེ་ཞིག་ཀྱང་དན་བྱུང་། *sems 'gul che thebs+kyis* [be touched+ AGT:CO]

---

*bod+kyi gtamdpe zhig kyang dran+byung* 'I was really moved **and** I remembered a Tibetan proverb.'.

Again here the agentive *kyis* may be replaced by the elative *nas*.

b2) Adjunctive and causal connective with the nominalizer PA/BA

This function is very frequent. The *pa* or *ba* may occur after verb or an adjective functioning as a predicate.

བཅོམ་ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱི་དྲུང་དུ་ཕྱིན་པས་ཁྱེད་ཀྱིས་ལྷ་ཡུལ་མཐོང་ངམ་ *bcomldan'das+kyi drung+du phyin pa+s* [NOM+ AGT:CO] *khyed+kyi lhayul mthong+gam* 'He went in front of the Bhagavan **and** he (the Bhagavan) asked: have you seen paradise?', ཆུ་ལ་བསྐྱུར་བས་རྩ་བ་ལྗི་བས་ཐུར་དུ་སོང་ *chu+la bskyur+ba+s* [throw+ AGT:CO] *rtsaba lji+ba+s* [heavy+ NOM+AGT:CO] *thur+du song* '[he] threw them to the river and because they was heavy the roots went down.', ཤིང་བཅད་པས་མ་ཆོད། *shing bcad+pa+s* [cut+ NOM+AGT:CO] *ma chod* 'He tried to cut the wood but did not succeed.'

b3) Adversative

This adversative function is rather rare. For this function, the agentive usually appears twice in a construction involving two verbs, a causative and a resulative verb separated by a negation,[49] as in the following examples from *Milaraspa*'s Rnammgur:

ཕྱི་ལུས་སེམས་སྤང་གིས་མི་ཕོངས་ཀྱིས་ *phyi lus sems spang+gis mi phongs+kyis* '*A*lthough you try to abandon you external body, you don't succeed.', ཕྱི་སྣང་བ་བཏུལ་གྱིས་མི་ཐུལ་གྱིས་ *phyi snang ba btul+gyis mi thul+gyis* '*Y*ou try to subdue the external phenomena but you will never succeed.'[50] བདག་གིས་བཀག་ན་ཡང་མ་ཐུབ་ཀྱིས། *bdag+gis bkag+na+yang ma thub+kyis* [51] 'Although I tried to prevent it, I could not.'.

c) adverbs

The agentive is used to derive a lot of adverbs, usually from a noun, such as:

རིམ་གྱིས་ *rim+gyis* 'progressively', རང་བཞིན་གྱིས་ *rangbzhin+gyis* 'naturally', ལྷུན་གྱིས་ 'spontaneously', སྐད་ཅིག་གིས་ 'instantaneously', ངང་གིས་ *ngang-gis* 'naturally, spontaneously'.

d) postpositions

The agentive is used for the formation of various postpositions. Historically, these postpositions are made of a noun followed by the agentive case. They may also function as causal subordinators, when preceded by a clause.

Postpositions normally govern an argument (a noun, an NP or a nominalized clause) in the genitive case. སྟབས་ཀྱིས་ *stabs-kyis* 'because, since', དབང་གིས་ *dbang-gis* 'because, by means of, due to' རྐྱེན་གྱིས་ *rkyen-gyis* 'because, due to, on account of', བབས་ཀྱིས་ *babs-kyis* 'because, since'.

---

[49] The construction is : V(caus)+AGT+NEG+ V(Res)+AGT.

[50] These sentences taken from Milaraspa'i Rnammgur are mentionned in Tournadre (1991: 94) and Kesang Gyurme (1992: 20).

[51] This example is quoted by Zeisler (2004: 415).

ཐུགས་བརྗེ་ཆེ་བའི་སྟབས་ཀྱིས། *thugsbrtse che+ba+'i stabs **kyis*** '**because of** his great love', ཡུན་རིང་སོང་བའི་བབས་ཀྱིས། *yun ring song+ba+'i babs+**kyis*** '**since** a long time has elapsed...', སེམས་མ་བདེ་བའི་རྐྱེན་གྱིས། *sems ma bde+ba+'i rkyen+**gyis*** '**because** her mind was not relaxed...'

e) Sentence final particle

In some cases, the agentive may be used at the end of a sentence to express a promise. It is often used with first person Agent. Since the grammatical semantic relation with the other functions of the agentive is not obvious, it is not clear whether this marking is historically derived from the agentive. This function has first been described by Beyer (1992: 353-354) who calls it the 'promise particle'. འོན་ངས་མར་པ་དང་སྤྲད་ཀྱིས། *'ona nga+s marpa+dang sprad+**kyis*** 'Well, I will introduce you to Marpa.', མ་གནང་ན་ངས་ཞུ་ཡིས། *ma gnang+na nga+s zhu+**yis*** 'If he does not give (them), I will ask him.'.

**Genitive** འབྲེལ་སྒྲ (ཀྱི་ གི་ གྱི་ འི་ ཡི་ *kyi, gi, gyi, 'i, yi*):

**A: functions:** a) <u>case functions</u>: genitive ('of'), b) <u>connective functions</u>: marker of relative clauses ('which', 'that', etc.), adversative 'but', c) no adverbial function, d) no postpositional function, e) [no sentence final particle function.]

**B: illustrations:**

a) Noun modifier

གསེར་གྱི་བུམ་པ། *gser+**gyi*** [gold+GEN] *bumpa* 'a golden vase', ལུག་གི་པགས་པ། *lug+**gi*** [sheep+GEN] *pagspa* 'a sheep skin', རི་ཡི་རྩེ་མོ། *ri+**yi*** [moutain+GEN] *rtsemo* 'the peak of the moutain', རྒྱ་མཚོའི་ནོར་བུ། *rgyamtsho+'i* [ocean+GEN] *norbu* 'jewel from the ocean', དགེ་རྒན་གྱི་དཔེ་ཆ། *dgergan+**gyi*** [teacher+GEN] *dpecha* 'the teacher's book'; བོད་ཀྱི་འབྲོག་པ། *bod+**kyi*** [Tibet+GEN] *'brogpa* 'Tibetan nomads'.

b1) Relative clause marker (with a nominalizer)

This function may be translated in English by a past participle or a relative clause.

བསགས་པའི་ནོར། *bsags+pa+'i* [accumulate(past)+NOM+GEN] *nor* 'the accumulated wealth' or 'the wealth **that** was accumulated', བཏགས་པའི་སྣམ་བུ། *btags+pa+'i* [woove(past)+NOM+GEN] *snambu* 'The wooven cloth, the cloth **that** was woven', འདབ་མ་སྟོང་ལྡན་གྱི་མེ་ཏོག *'dabma stong+**ldan+gyi*** [thousand+NOM+GEN] *metog* 'a flower with thousand of petals, a flower **that** has a thousand petals', ལྟ་བྱེད་ཀྱི་མིག *lta+byed+**kyi*** mig [watch+NOM+GEN] 'the eye, **which** allows to watch', འབྲི་བྱེད་ཀྱི་སྨྱུག་གུ *'bri+byed+**kyi*** [write+NOM+GEN] *smyugu* 'a pen (which is) for writing', བསྲེགས་བཅད་བརྡར་བའི་གསེར་བཞིན་དུ། *bsregs bcad brdar+ba+'i* [scrape+NOM+GEN] *gser bzhin du* 'just as gold is burnt, cut and rubbed'.

b2) Adversative ('but', 'while')

ལེགས་པར་བརྟག་ལ་ང་ཡི་བཀའ། བླང་བར་བྱ་ཡི་གུས་ཕྱིར་མིན། *legspar brtag+la nga+yi bka'/ blang+barbya+**yi*** [GEN:ADVR] *gus phyir min/* 'Examine my words carefully and do not accept them simply out of respect (litt. accept them **but** not not simply out of respect).',

ཟླ་བ་ཤར་ན་ཀུ་མུ་ཏ། ཁ་འབྱེད་འགྱུར་གྱི་པདྨ་ཟུམ། *zlaba shar+na kumuta kha 'byed 'gyur+**gyi*** [GEN:ADVR] *padma zum* 'When the moon rises, water lilies are blooming, **while** lotuses are closing up.'.

105

**Dative** ལ་སྒྲ (ལ *LA* and ར *R*):

> **A. functions:** a) <u>case functions</u>: marks the role of Beneficiary ('to' or not translated) and Possessor (usually not translated), locative (superessive 'on', inessive 'in', 'at', allative 'towards', 'to'). b) <u>connective functions</u>: connective for adjectives and verbs 'and', [c) no adverbial function], d) <u>postpositional function</u>, e) <u>sentence final particle function.</u>

> **B. illustrations:**

> a1) Beneficiary[52]

> ལྷ་ལ་འབུལ་ *lha+la* '*bul* 'to offer **to** the deity', གྲོགས་ལ་ཡི་གེ་སྟོན་ *grogs+la* [friend+DAT:BEN] *yige ston* 'to show the letter **to** a friend', སློང་མོ་བར་བཟའ་བཏུང་བྱིན་ *slongmoba+r* [beggar+ DAT:BEN] *bza' btung byin* 'to give food and drink **to** the beggar'. It is also used with affect verbs: སྟག་ལ་སྐྲག་ *stag+la* [tiger+DAT: BEN] *skrag* 'to be afraid of the tiger', དགྲ་ལ་སྡང་ *dgra+la* [ennemy+DAT:BEN] *sdang* 'to hate the ennemy', གཉེན་ལ་བྱམས་ *gnyen+la* [relative+ DAT:BEN] *byams* 'to love one's relatives'.

> a2) Possessor [53]

> ཡུམ་ལ་སྲས་ཤིག་འཁྲུངས། *yum+la* [mother+ DAT:POS] *sras shig+Ø* '*khrungs* 'The mother gave birth to a son (litt. **To** the mother a son was born).', འབྲས་བུ་ལ་རྒྱུ་ཡོད། *'brasbu+la* [result+DAT:POS] *rgyu+Ø yod* 'The result (the fruit) has a cause.', བུ་མོ་བདག་ལ་ཕ་མ་ལོས་ཀྱང་ཡོད། *bumo bdag+la* [me+ DAT:POS] *phama+Ø los kyang yod* 'Of course the girl that I am has parents!'.

> The Beneficiary is marked in the same way as the Possessor but their syntactic position is different. In unmarked sentences, the Possessor occurs as the first argument while the Beneficiary occurs as the second or third argument. However in marked sentences it is possible to place the possessor in the second position: བདེན་པ་ང་ལ་ཡོད། *bden pa+Ø nga+la* [me+ DAT:POS] *yod* 'I have the truth.'. The unmarked sentence is: ང་ལ་བདེན་པ་ཡོད། *nga+la* [me+ DAT:POS] *bden pa+Ø yod* 'I have the truth.'.

> For the functions of grammatical Beneficiary and Possessor, only *r* and *la* may be used. According various authors (e.g. Skalbzang 'Gyurmed (1981) and Dorzhi (1987)), the purposive and the locative cases are not suited for this meaning.

> a3) superessive location ('on, at')

> ཁྲི་ལ་བླ་མ་བཞུགས་ *khri+la* [throne+ DAT:SUPER] *blama+Ø bzhugs* 'The lama is **on** the throne.', ས་ལ་རྩྭ་སྐྱེས་ *sa+la* [ground+ DAT:SUPER] *rtswa+Ø skyes* 'Grass grows **on** the ground.', མཁའ་ལ་ཉི་མ་ཤར་སྣང་ *mkha'+la* [sky+ DAT:SUPER] *nyima+Ø shar+snang* 'The sun has risen in the sky.', རི་ལ་རྩྭ་ནི་མི་འདུག *ri+la* [moutain+DAT] *rstwa+Ø ni mi 'dug* '**On** the mountain, there is no grass.', ཤིང་ཁྱི་ལོ་ལ་འཁྲུངས་ *shing khyi lo+la* [wood dog (year)+ DAT:SUPER] *'khrungs* 'to be born **in** the wood dog [year]'.

---

[52] Native grammarians call this function *dngos yul la 'jug pa bya ba* (Dorzhi, 1987: 16), *'jug yul dngos* or *las su bya ba gtso bo* ( Skalbzang 'Gyurmed, 1981: 40)

[53] Alternatively, the possessor can be called "recipient". Skalbzang 'Gyurmed (1981: 59) calls this function "dngos po'i bdag po la ston pa".

For this function, other cases such as the purposive (*du*) and sometimes the locative (*na*) may also be used. There is however a slight semantic difference between *na* and *la*. The locative *na* indicates rather the 'inessive' or a location inside a volume, while the spatial function of the dative *la* is more used with a superessive meaning. Thus it is difficult to accept the following sentence: ?རི་རྩྭ་ནི་མི་འདུག *ri+na* [moutain+LOC] *rstwa+Ø ni mi 'dug* 'There is no grass **in** the mountain.', ?ས་ན་རྩྭ་སྐྱེས *sa+na* [ground+DAT] *rtswa+Ø skyes* 'The grass grows **in** the earth.' Conversely, for spatial reference, *la* often conveys a "superessive" meaning, referring to an entity, which is *on* a surface rather than inside a volume.

This contrast is still found in some modern Tibetic languages such as Drengjong-ke (or Lhoke): ཨམ་བིག་ མཚོན་ ཕྱུས་ཞེ *ambig mtsho+na(?lo) bvyu*[54]*+zhe* 'A mango fell **into** the lake.' *versus* ཨམ་བིག་ ས་ལོ་ ཕྱུས་ཞེ་ *ambig sa+lo(?na) bvyu+zhe* 'A mango fell **on** the ground.'.

a4) allative ('to, in, into')

The dative case may express motion to or toward the noun it marks. For this allative function, *la* is equivalent to the purpositive case *du*.

གསེར་ཉོས་ནས་རྒྱ་གར་ལ་ཁྱེར་འགྲོ *gser+Ø nyos+nas rgyagar+la* [India+ DAT:ALLA] *khyer 'gro* 'Having bought some gold, I will bring it **to** India.', ས་ལ་མེ་ཏོག་འདེབས *sa+la* [ground+ DAT:ALLA] *metog+Ø 'debs* 'to plant flowers **in** the ground'.

The *na* case may not be used for this function: \*གསེར་ཉོས་ནས་རྒྱ་གར་ན་ཁྱེར་འགྲོ *gser+Ø nyos+nas rgyagar+na* [India+LOC] *khyer 'gro*

b) Connective for adjective and verbs

For this function, *la* can not connect nouns but may appear after adjectives or verbs: གསལ་ལ་ཟླུམ་པའི་ཟླ་བ། *gsal+la* [bright+DAT:CO] *zlumpa'i zlaba* 'a bright **and** round moon', ཉོན་ལ་ཡིད་ཟུངས་དང་། *nyon+la* [listen+DAT:CO] *yid+la zungs shig dang* 'Listen **and** remember!', ཀླུང་ཆེན་དལ་ཡང་རིང་འགྲོ་ལ། ར་རླབས་དྲག་ཀྱང་ཆེར་མི་འགྲོ *klung cheng dal yang ring 'gro+la* [go+ DAT:CO] *rbarlabs drag kyang cher mi 'gro* '[The waters of ] the big rivers are calm and go far while the waves are violent but do not go far (litt. go big).', ལེགས་པར་བརྟགས་ལ་ང་ཡི་བཀའ། བླང་བར་བྱ་ཡི་གུས་ཕྱིར་མིན། *legspar brtag+la* [DAT:CO] *nga+yi bka'/ blang+barbya+yi gus phyir min/* 'Examine my words carefully **and** do not accept them simply out of respect.'.

c) no adverbial function[55]

d) Postpositions

The dative is used for the formation of various postpositions.[56] Historically, these postpositions are made of a nominal or adjectival radical followed by the dative case. The postpositions may also function as causal subordinators, when preceded by a clause. Postpositions normally govern an argument (a noun, an NP or a nominalized clause) in the genitive case.

---

[54] The *v* is used here in the transliteration to note the labial *b* with a *tsalag*, i.e. a special sign used in Drengkong-ke to transcribe the labial pronounciation of *bya* (versus the palatal affricate , which is written without a *tsalag*)

[55] Only *r* may be used to form adverbials. I consider it in this case as an allomorph of the purposive. See below.

[56] For this postpositional function, the dative may be replaced by the purposive. See below.

རིང་ལ་ *ring la* 'during', ཞོར་ལ་ *zhor la* 'on the occasion of', རྗེས་ལ་ *rjes la* 'after'

ཟླ་བ་དྲུག་གི་རིང་ལ་རྡོ་རྗེ་གླིང་ལ་བཞུགས་པ་རེད། *zlaba drug+gi ring+la rdorjegling+la bzhugs pared.* 'He stayed in Darjeeling during six months.'

e) Sentence final particle

In some cases, the dative may be used at the end of a sentence, after an adjectival predicate (often followed by the nominalizer *pa/ba*) to express an exclamation. Since the grammatical semantic relation with other functions of the dative is not obvious, it is not certain that this marking is historically derived from the dative.

དེ་རིང་འགྲོ་བའི་ལམ་བུ་རིང་བ་ལ། *dering 'gro+ba'i lambu ring+ba+la* 'Oh, the road today is so long!' རྒོད་པོ་ཡིན་ན་དགའ་ལ། *rgodpo yin na dga'+la* 'How nice it would be to be a vulture.'

**Purposive** དུ་སྒྲ་ (*DU* and its variants):

**A. functions:** a) <u>case functions</u>: purposive ('for, as'), locative (inessive: 'in, at', superessive 'on'), allative ('towards, to, into'), transformative, b) <u>connective functions</u>: final clause connective ('in order to'), c) <u>adverbial function,</u> d) <u>postpositional function,</u> [e) no sentence final particle function].

**B. illustrations:**

a.1) purposive ('for, as')

རོང་བས་ལྟོ་གོས་སུ་ཞིང་བཏབ་ *rongbas ltogos+su* [subsistence+PURP:AIM] *zhing+Ø btab* 'The farmer ploughs the field **for** his subsistence.' སྐུ་ཚབ་ཏུ་འདེམས་བསྐོ་བྱེད། *skutshab+tu* [representative+ PURP:AIM] *'dembsko byed* 'Elect X **as** representative.', ས་བོན་དུ་འབྲུ་རིགས་ཉོ། *sabon+du* [grain+PURP:AIM] *'brurigs+Ø nyo* 'to buy seeds **for** grain'.

a.2) inessive ('in, at')

ཐབ་ཏུ་མེ་འབར། *thab+tu* [stove+PURP:INES] *me+Ø 'bar* 'The fire is burning **in** the stove.', དེའི་དུས་སུ། *de+'i dus+su* [time+PURP:INES] 'at that time', ཁྱིམ་དུ་མི་མེད། *khyim+du* [house+ PURP:INESS] *mi+Ø med* 'There is nobody **in** the house', བོད་སྐད་དུ། *bod skad+du* [Tibetan language+ PURP:INESS] '**in** Tibetan (language)'.

For this inessive function, *du* may usually be replaced by the locative *na*:

ཐབ་ན་མེ་འབར། *thab+na* [stove+LOC] *me+Ø 'bar* 'The fire is burning **in** the stove.',

ཁྱིམ་ན་མི་མེད། *khyim+na* [house+ LOC] *mi+Ø med* 'There is nobody **in** the house.'.

a.3) allative ('towards', 'to')

ཞིང་དུ་ཆུ་འདྲེན། *zhing+du* [field+ PURP:ALLA] *chu 'dren* 'to bring water to the field', འཕྱི་བ་ཁུང་དུ་འཛུལ། *'phyiba khung+ du* [hole+ PURP:ALLA] *'dzul* 'The marmot entered into the hole'.

a.4) transformative

This function indicates the transformation of an entity. It is traditionnally called *denyid*. For this function, *du* (and its allomorphs) may be used and more rarely the dative, but *na* is not suitable.

དུག་ཀྱང་ཤེས་ན་སྨན་དུ་འགྱུར། *dug kyang shes+na sman+du 'gyur* 'If you know the poison, it can be changed *into* medicine.', གླུ་ཡི་གེར་བྲིས། *glu yige+r bris* 'To write down a song (litt. transcribe a song *into* letters)', ཉི་མ་འོད་དུ་འཚེར *nyima 'od+du 'tsher* 'To twinkle, glitter (litt. to burn into light).'.

b) final clause marker ('in order to, to')

The purposive case is directly attached to a verb and indicates the purpose of the action performed in the main clause. This function is very frequent.

རིན་པོ་ཆེ་ལེན་དུ་སོང་། *rinpoche len+du* [fetch+ PURP:CO] *song* '(X) went **to** fetch precious (stones)'. ཨ་མས་བདག་མཐུ་སློབ་ཏུ་བརྫངས་པ་ལགས་ *ama+s bdag mthu slob+tu* [to learn+ PURP:CO] *brdzangs+pa+lags*. 'Mother has sent me to learn magic.' For this function, along with དུ་ *DU* (or its variants), one can also use *BAR* བར་ (or its variant *PAR* པར་)

c) adverbials

The purposive case is used to form many adverbs. One both has intensity adverbs and manner adverb. For this lexical function, only *du* (and its variants) can be used. The dative *la* and the locative *na* are not normally suitable for this function:

ཤིན་ཏུ་ *shin+tu* 'very', རབ་ཏུ་ *rab+tu* 'extremely', ཁྱད་པར་དུ་ *khyadpar+du* 'especially', ལྷག་པར་དུ་ *lhagpar+du* 'particularly', ངེས་པར་དུ་ *ngespar+du* 'definitely', བློ་བུར་དུ་ *blobur+du* 'suddenly', མྱུར་དུ་ *myur+du* 'rapidly', འཕྲལ་དུ་ *'phral+du* 'immediately', *rgyun+du* 'continuously', མྱུར་བར་ *myurba+r* 'rapidly', ལེགས་པར་ *legspa+r* 'well', རིམ་པར་ *rimpa+r* 'progressively', གསལ་པོར་ *gsalpo+r* 'clearly', ཡོངས་སུ་ *yongs+su* 'entirely'.

d) postpositions

Historically, various postpositions are formed by adding the purposive case to a radical. These postpositions govern the genitive case. They may also function as causal or time subordinator when preceded by a nominalized clause.

སྔོན་དུ་ *sngon+du* 'before', རྗེས་སུ་ *rjes+su* 'after', མཇུག་ཏུ་ *mjug du* 'after', ཕྱིར་དུ་ *phyir+du* 'for', བར་དུ་ *bar+du* 'until', ཡུན་དུ་ *yun+du* 'during', དོན་དུ་ *don+du* 'for', སླད་དུ་ *slad+du* 'for', ཆེད་དུ་ *ched+du* 'for, in order to', མདུན་དུ་ *mdun+du* 'in front of', ནང་དུ་ *nang+du* 'in, inside', སྐབས་སུ་ *skabs+su* **'at the time, when'**, ཐོག་ཏུ་ *thog+tu* 'for, in order to, on', སྟེང་དུ་ *steng+tu* 'on, over', འགྲམ་དུ་ *'gram +du* 'near', དུས་སུ་ *'dus+su* 'when, at the time of', གཤམ་དུ་ *gsham+du* 'below'

Most of the postpositions are originally nouns which have undergone a grammaticalization leading to a change of grammatial category (from noun to postposition) and to a semantic derivation: ཐོག་ *thog* 'roof' > 'on, over', རྗེས་ *rjes* 'trace' > 'after', མཇུག་ *mjug* 'tail' > 'after', འགྲམ་ *'gram* 'cheek' > 'near'.

For this lexical function, *du* (or one of its variants) is sometimes omitted. Thus the two constructions below are equivalent: བོད་བཙན་པོའི་སྐབས་སུ། *bstan po'i skabs+su* 'at the time of the Tibetan Emperor' = བོད་བཙན་པོའི་སྐབས་ *bstan po'i skabs* 'idem'. ཟླ་བའི་སྟེང་དུ། *zlaba+'i steng+du* 'on the moon' = ཟླ་བའི་སྟེང་། *zlaba+'i steng* 'on the moon'.

**Locative** ན་སྒྲ་ (*NA*):

A. **functions:** a) <u>case functions</u>: inessive locative (without movement: 'in', 'at'). b) <u>connective functions</u> : conditional connective and temporal connective c) <u>adverbial function</u> d) <u>postpositional function,</u> [e) no sentence final particle function]

B. **illustrations:**

a) locative ལག་ན་འཕྲེང་བ་བཟུང་། *lag+**na** 'phrengba+Ø bzung* '(X) held a rosary in the hand.', མ་འོངས་པ་ན་ *ma'ongspa+**na*** 'in the future'

b1) conditional connective 'in the case, if'

In this function, the locative case indicates a hypothesis or a condition. In the initial position of the protasis, *galte* is often added.

གལ་ཏེ་བསྡད་ན་འདྲ་ངེས་པར་མཐོང་། *galte bsdad+**na*** [stay+ LOC:CO] *nga 'dra nges par mthong/* 'If you stay (that old) you will look like me.',

གལ་ཏེ་བུ་ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་ཡུལ་དུ་མཐུའི་རྟགས་མ་ཐོན་པར་ལོག་བྱུང་ན། ང་རྒན་ཁྱེད་རང་གི་མདུན་དུ་ལྕེབས་ནས་ཤི་སྡོད་དོ་ཟེར། *galte bu khyod+kyis yul+du mthu+'i rtags ma thon+pa+r log byung+**na*** [come back+ LOC:CO]/ *nga margan khyedrang+gi bdun+du lcebs+nas shi sdod+do zer/* 'If you boy come back to the village without showing signs of magic, your old mother will commit suicide and die right in front of you.'.

b2) temporal clause connective 'when'

For this function, the verb is followed by the nominalizer *pa/ba*.

རྒྱ་མཚོ་མཐོང་བ་ན་ཁྲོན་པའི་སྦལ་པ་ཤི་སྐད། *rgyamtsho mthong+**bana** khronpa+'i sbalpa shi skad* 'It is said that when the frog in the well saw the ocean, it died.'.

 [c) no adverbial function]

d) postposition

The locative case is used to form postpositions. For this lexical function, *na* is sometimes omitted.

ཚེ་ན་ *tshe+**na*** 'at that moment', སྟེང་ན་ *steng+**na*** 'on', ནང་ན་ *nang+**na*** 'in'

[e) no sentence final particle function]

**Ablative** ལས་སྒྲ་ (ལས་ *LAS*):

A. **functions:** a) <u>case functions</u> (after nouns): ablative ('from') and comparative ('than'). b) <u>connective functions</u> (after verbs, together with the nominalizer *BA or its allomorph PA (ba+las/ pa+las)*: temporal subordinator 'when', adversative 'but', 'although', 'other than V', 'rather than V'[57] [c), d), e) no function].

---

[57] About the connective function of *las*, Hill (2010) adds a semantic nuance of surprise in some contexts, which is frequently found in Old Tibetan and even Classical Tibetan. In this paper, *las* is described as a "converb".

**B. illustrations:**

a.1) Spatiotemporal origin

The meaning of the ablative is rather specific and much more restricted semantically than the elative *nas*. Semantically, it indicates the spatial origin when the figure is *on the surface* of the referent (and not inside). Thus for example *rta+las babs* རྟ་ལས་བབས་ '(X) dismounted the horse.', X was *on the back* of the horse (and not inside the horse!). It is the same with: བྲག་ལས་ལྷུང་ *brag+las lhung* '(X) has fallen from the rock.'. For this meaning, *las* and *nas* are pratically equivalent: བྲག་ནས་ལྷུང་ *brag+nas lhung* '(X) has fallen from the rock.' and རྟ་ནས་བབས་ *rta+nas babs* '(X) dismounted the horse.'.

However in most examples, *las* does not simply indicate the spatial origin but rather the **origin of a *transformation***: the object (or the being) from which, something is extracted, generated or produced.[58] In these cases, the replacement of *las* by *nas* is impossible as show the examples below.

བ་ལས་འོམ་བྱུང་ *ba+las na* [cow+ABL:ORI] *'oma+Ø byung* 'The milk comes **from** the cow.', འོམ་ལས་མར་བླངས་ *'oma+las* [milk+ABL:ORI] *mar+Ø blangs* 'One take (extract) butter **from** milk.', པི་ཝང་ལས་སྒྲ་སྙན་བྱུང་ *'piwang+las* [violin+ABL:ORI] *sgra snyan+Ø byung* '**Out of** the piwang (traditional Tibetan violin) came a nice sound.', མེ་ལས་དྲོད་སྐྱེས། *me+las* [fire+ ABL:ORI] *drod+Ø skyes* 'Heat comes from the fire.', མ་ལས་བུ་སྐྱེས་ *ma+las* [mother+ ABL:ORI] *bu+Ø skyes* 'The mother gave birth to a son (litt. **From** the mother a son was born).', དཔེ་ཆ་ལས་གོ་བ་རྙེད་ *dpecha+las* [book+ABLORI] *goba+Ø rnyed* 'to get understanding **from** a (traditional) book', ཁ་དོག་ཉིད་ལས་བྲོ་བ་ཤེས་ *khadog+nyid+las broba shes* 'to know the taste **by** the colour itself.'

ལེགས་བཤད་བྱིས་པ་དག་ལས་ཀྱང་། །མཁས་པ་རྣམས་ནི་ཡོངས་སུ་ལེན། *legsbshad byispa+dag+las+kyang* [child+PL+ABL:ORI+Also] *mkhaspa+rnams+ni yongssu len* 'The scholars get inspiration for their aphorisms even from children.', ས་བོན་ལས་མྱུ་གུ་སྐྱེས་ *sabon+las* [seed+ABL:ORI] *myugu skyes* 'A sprout was born from the seed.'.

For this function, the replacement of *las* by *nas* is really problematic:

˃ བ་ནས་འོམ་བྱུང་ *ba+nas 'oma+Ø byung* 'The milk comes **from** the cow.',

˃ འོམ་ནས་མར་བླངས་ *'oma+nas mar+Ø blangs* 'One take (extract) butter **from** milk.',

˃ མ་ནས་བུ་སྐྱེས་ *ma+nas bu+Ø skyes* 'A son was born **to (litt. from)** the mother.',

˃ ས་བོན་ནས་མྱུ་གུ་སྐྱེས་ *sabon+nas myugu skyes* 'A sprout was born from the seed.'.

The use of *nas* in the above sentences would be acceptable only if one wants to indicate only a spatial origin.

a.2) Comparative construction (after a NP)

སྲོག་ཆགས་གྲོག་མ་མིག་མེད་ཀྱང་། མིག་ལྡན་གཞན་ལས་ལྷག་པར་མགྱོགས། *srogchags grogma mig med+kyang mig+ldan gzhan+las* [other+ABL:COMP] *lhagpar mgyogs* 'Ants don't have eyes but are faster than

---

[58] One could say that *las* has the symmetric value of the transformative function conveyed by the purposive *du*. See the purposive section.

those who have eyes.',

ཁྲུང་ཁྲུང་ལས་རྨ་བྱ་གཟུགས་མཛེས། *khrungkhrung+las* [crane+ABL:COMP] *rmabya gzugs mdzes* 'Peacocks are more beautiful than cranes.'.

b1) adversative 'but', 'other than' (after a nominalized verb)

ང་དེ་དུས་ཨ་མ་དང་ཅིག་འཕྲད་སྙམ་པ་ལས། དགྲས་འཇིགས་ཏེ་མྱུར་དུ་བྲོས་ཏེ་གཉའ་ནམ་བསྐོར་ཕྱིན་པས། *nga dedus ama–dang lan cig 'phrad snyam+pa+las dgras 'jigs–te myurdu bros–te gnya'nam bskor phyin pas* 'I, at that time, thought of meeting with my mother one more time, but fearing my ennemies I fled quickly, I went toward Gnya'nam.', [59]

སྒོ་ང་མཁའ་ལ་འཕངས་གྱུར་ན། ཆག་པ་ཉིད་ལས་གཞན་ཅི་འབྱུང་། *sgonga mkha'+la 'phangs gyur+na chag+pa+nyid+las* [break+NOM+itself+ABL: 'other than'] *gzhan ci 'byung* 'If one throws an egg in the air, what would happen to it other than breaking?'.

b2) 'while' (after a nominalized verb)

སྙིང་རྗེ་ཆེན་པོ་ཞིག་གི་ནང་ལ་བཞུགས་པ་ལས། སྐུ་མདུན་ན་ཚུར་ཤ་བ་ནག་པོ་··· ཞིག་བྱུང་བ···། *snyingrje chenpo zhig+gi nang+la bzugs+pa+las* [stay+NOM+ABL: 'while'] *sku+mdun+na tshur shaba nagpo zhig byung+ba.* 'While he was staying in the state of great compassion, a black deer came towards him.'.

**Elative** ནས་སྣ་ (ནས་ *NAS*):

A. **functions:** a) <u>case functions</u> (after nouns): elative ('from') and ergative (indicating the Agent), b) <u>connective functions</u> (after verbs): causal and temporal subordinator ('because, since', 'after', 'and'), c) <u>adverbial function</u> d) <u>postpositional function.</u> [e) no function]

B. **illustrations:**

a.1) Spatiotemporal origin

ཚིག་ཁ་ནས་ཤོར་ *tshig kha+nas* [word+ELA:ORI] *shor* 'The word escaped from the mouth.', ཤར་ཕྱོགས་ནས་འོང་ *shar phyogs+nas 'ong* 'X came from the East.'.

a.2) Agent

བོད་དམག་ནས་རྒྱ་ནག་གི་ཡུལ་མང་པོ་བཅོམས་ *boddmag+nas* [Tibetan army+ELA:ORI] *rgyanag+gi yul mangpo bcoms* 'The Tibetan army conquered a lot of Chinese territories.'.

b) སྐྱེ་ནས་འཆི་བ་འཇིག་རྟེན་ཀུན་ལ་འདུག *skye+nas 'chi+ba 'jigrten kun la 'dug* 'one is born and then dies, that is the fate of all in this world', རྒྱལ་པོ་ས་ཕོ་ཉ་བཏང་ནས་བུ་མོ་མནའ་མ་བླངས། *rgyalpo+s phonya btang+nas bumo mna'ma blangs* 'The king sent a messenger and took the girl as his bride.'.

c) adverbs

གཞི་ནས་ *gzhi+nas* 'only just, fundamentally', གཏན་ནས་ *gtan+nas* 'absolutely, once and for all', ཙ་ནས་ *rtsa+nas* 'at all, simply', ཁྱོན་ནས་ *khyon+nas* 'thoroughly, completely'.

---

[59] This example is taken from Hill (2010) and the English translation from de Jong (1959). I had myself noticed this example, which is translated in a similar way in French by Bacot (1971:63). "A ce moment je songeai à voir une seule fois ma mère, *mais* effrayé par mes ennemis, je m'enfuis rapidement et courus à Nyanang. "[italics are mine]

d) postposition

ཐོག་ནས་ *thog+**nas*** 'from the top of, on', ནང་ནས་ *nang+**nas*** 'from inside, among', སྒང་ནས་ *sgang+**nas*** 'from above', སྟེང་ནས་ *steng+**nas*** 'from above', འོག་ནས་ *'og+**nas*** 'from under'. These postpositions are derived from nouns ཐོག་ *thog* 'roof', སྒང་ *sgang* 'hill', སྟེང་ *steng* 'upper part', འོག་ *'og* 'base', ནང་ *nang* 'inside'.

## Associative (དང་ *DANG*):

**A. functions:** a) <u>case functions</u> (after nouns): associative ('with', 'against') and coordinative for nouns and adjectives ('and'). b) <u>connective functions</u> (after verbs): together with the nominalizer *BA* or its allomorph *PA (ba+dang/pa+dang)*, 'as soon as' or 'and' (connector for verbs). [c), d) no function] e) <u>verb imperative particle</u>.

**B. illustrations:**

a1) Associative 'with'

བླ་མ་དང་མཇལ་ *blama+**dang** mjal* 'to meet the lama (litt. to meet with the lama)', ངའམ་དང་ཡུད་ཙམ་ཞིག་འཕྲད། *nga ama+**dang** yud+tsam zhig 'phrad* 'I will meet my mother just for a short while.', འོན་ནས་མར་པ་དང་སྤྲད་ཀྱིས། *'ona nga+s marpa+**dang** sprad+kyis* 'Well, I will introduce you to Marpa.'.

a2) Noun or NP connective

རི་དང་ཆུ་ *ri+**dang** chu* 'moutains and rivers', མེ་དང་རླུང་ *me+**dang** rlung* 'fire and air'.

b.1) Clause Connective (after a nominalized verb)

བྱ་རྒོད་འཕྱི་བ་ཁུར་བ་དང་། སྲམ་གྱིས་འུག་པ་མཆོད་ལ་ལྟོས། *byargod 'phyiba khur+ba+**dang** sram+gyis 'ugpa mchod+la ltos*. 'Look at the way vultures carry marmots and otters make offering to owls.'.

b2) Temporal connective.

ཉི་མ་ཤར་བ་དང་། པདྨ་རྣམས་ཁ་ཕྱེ་བར་འགྱུར། *nyima shar+ba+**dang** padma+rnams kha phye ba+r 'gyur* 'As soon as the sun rises, the lotus flowers opens up.'.

[c), d) : no function]

e) Imperative particle

ལྷ་མོ་དྲང་པོར་སྨྲོས་དང་། *lhamo drangpo+r smros+**dang*** 'Goddess, please speak frankly!'.

## Comparative (བས་ *BAS*):

**A. functions:** a) <u>case function</u>: comparative. b) <u>connective functions</u> (after verbs): together with the nominalizer *BA (ba+pas/bas )* 'rather than'.

**B. illustrations:**

a) Comparative

ཙན་དན་གསེར་བས་རིན་ཆེབ་ *tsandan gser+**bas*** [gold+CMP] *rin cheba* 'Sandal wood is more precious that gold.', གླང་པོ་ཆེ་བས་སྟོབས་ཆེ་བ་ཞིག *glangpoche+**bas*** [elephant +CMP] *stobs cheba zhig* 'a (man) stronger than an elephant'.

b) Comparative after a nominalized verb: 'rather than', 'more than'

གཞན་དུ་ཡུན་རིང་དགེ་སྦྱོར་འབད་པ་བས།།སྡིག་པའི་ལས་སྤངས་ཆོས་དང་བླ་མ་ལ། །ཁྱོས་གུས་བྱས་ནས་གནས་འདིར་ཉལ་བ་ཡང་། *gzha+ du yun ring dge sbyor 'bad+**pabas** sdigpa+'i las spangs chos dang blama+la mosgus byas+nas gnas 'dir nyal ba yang...* 'Rather than making endeavour to pratice vertues elsewhere, (it is better) to abandon the negative acts, sleep here and develop faith for the dharma and the lama...'.

Let us summarise the various types of function of the cases in the chart below. It shows that 5 cases (agentive, dative, purposive, locative and elative) show a high degree of transcategoriality, while 3 cases (genitive, associative and ablative) only exhibit two types of functions. The absolutive case is an exception since it only indicates one type of function. However, the absolutive is zero-marked and thus is difficult to draw any conclusion from this specific behaviour.

| | grammatical role | connective function | adverbial function | postpositional function |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agentive : *gis* | + | + | + | + |
| Dative : *la* | + | + | + | + |
| Purposive: *du* | + | + | + | + |
| Locative: *na* | + | + | + | + |
| Elative: *nas* | + | + | + | + |
| Genitive: *gi* | + | + | − | − |
| Ablative: *las* | + | + | − | − |
| Associative: *dang* | + | + | − | − |
| Comparative: *bas* | + | + | − | − |
| Absolutive: Ø | + | # | # | # |

Chart 4: types of case functions

## 5   Case marking and optionality

As mentioned briefly in the section 4, one of the remarkable features of Classical Literary Tibetan is that case marking is optional in a number of contexts. There are various kinds of optionality for the Grammatical Role functions of the case. a) Case variation depends on a single verb b) Case variation depends on two or more verbs c) Case omission for metric reasons in a poetic style.

There is also some optionality and variation in the other functions of the cases as well. When used as connectives, the various case markers (*nas, las, gis, bas, gi, dang, la, na, du*) cannot normally be dropped. However, they may be replaced in many contexts, by non-case connectives

such as *ste, zhing*, *ched*, etc. The adverbial functions of cases correspond to lexicalized forms; these can not be dropped. (For example གཞི་ནས་ *gzhi-nas* 'only just, fundamentally', གཏན་ནས་ *gtan-nas* 'absolutely, once and for all', ཙ་ནས་ *rtsa-nas* 'at all, simply', ཁྱོན་ནས་ *khyon-nas* 'thoroughly, completely'). In their postpositional functions the cases may again be dropped. (See the functions of purposive in the section 4.2).

**a) Case variation depending in a single verb**

In many occurrences, the NP may receive various cases with an identical (or rather quasi identical) meaning. For example, the ergative (*gis*) may be replaced by the elative (*nas*) in some contexts especially when the agent is an authority or an institution. The ablative (*las*) is generally used for the comparative constructions but the comparative (*bas*) may replace for this function. In some contexts (location without movement), the purposive (*du*) and even the dative (*la*) may replace the locative (*na*) [see section 4].

With controllable monovalent verbs, the absolute (Ø) is normally used but it may be replaced by the ergative (*gis*) for discursive reasons [60] (see Tournadre 1996: 357-358), ང་(ས་)དེར་ལོ་མང་པོ་མ་བསྡད། *nga(–s) der lo mangpo ma bsdad* 'I+ABS (/ERG) did not stay there many years.' (*Milaraspa'i rnamthar*).

7)  ཁྭ་ཏ་ས་གཡས་ཕྱིན་སྲེག་པ་ས་གཡོན་ཕྱིན། *khwata(–s) g.yas phyin sregpa–s g.yon phyin*. 'The crow went to the right and the partridge went to the left.' (*Padma bka'thang*).

The replacement of the absolute by the dative for discursive reasons (emphasis or contrast) is also possible (see Tournadre 1994, 1996; Zeisler 2006).

While the replacement of one case by another may be strictly equivalent in some occurrences, there is generally a semantic or discursive[61] nuance between the various usages.

More generally, talking about Tibeto-Burman case systems, Zeisler (2006: 92) states that "The use of case markers might always go along with a certain (weaker or stronger) connotation of emphasis or contrast and the non-application may always signal the absence of such emphasis or contrast."

**b) Case variation depending on two or more verbs**

In Classical Tibetan, no argument is compulsory and in the case of coreference, the arguments are usually deleted. Haller (2009) has shown that "certain reference relations are characteristic for specific subordinators" but the deletion of coreferring arguments has also consequences on case variation. Two (or more) verbs belonging to different classes may govern distinct case marking on the same argument. For example, a noun phrase may be followed by two verbs, the first verb being monovalent and the second a bivalent ergative verb. In that context, the case on the noun phrase may either be absolute (if governed by the first verb) or ergative (if governed by the second verb).

Dorzhi (1987: 46-47) is, to my knowledge, the only native grammarian who has analyzed this phenomenon. He gives the following examples:

---

[60] Tibetan grammarians consider that this marking is not correct. See Skalbzang 'Gyurmed (1980), 'Phrinlas Rgyamtsho (1986), Dorzhi Gdongdrug Snyemblo (1987), Mudge Bsamgtan (1980).

[61] marking emphasis or contrast.

8) ང་(ས་)ཚོང་ཁང་ལ་སོང་ནས་ཉོས་པ་ཉོས། *nga(+s) tshongkhang–la song–nas nompa nyos/* 'I +ABS (/ERG) *went* to the shop and *bought* some items.'.

9) གླིང་དེར་སློབ་དཔོན་(གྱིས་)བཞུགས་ཏེ་འཕགས་པ་སྤྱན་རས་གཟིགས་དང་སྒྲོལ་མའི་སྐུ་རྡོ་ལ་བཞེངས། *gling der slobdpon(+gyis) bzhugs+ te 'phagspa spyanrasgzigs+dang sgrolma+'i sku rdo+la bzhengs* 'The master+ABS(/ERG) stayed on that island and built stone statues of the Noble Avalokiteśvara and Tara.'.[62] In the above examples, the use of the ergative instead of the absolutive creates an emphasis on the agent.

From a typological point of view, this second type of case variation is quite specific. It is linked to several other properties of the Tibetan case system, such as the *lack of any compulsory argument, the reluctance to repeat any cross–referenced argument and the clitic nature of the cases.*

**c) Case optionality for metric reasons**
   In many poetic or religious texts where the metrics (*tshigs bcad*) plays a significant role, the Grammatical Role case markers may be dropped. Grammatical roles then have to be interpreted from the context.

10) ལེགས་བཤད་བྱིས་པ་དག་ལས་ཀྱང་། །མཁས་པ་རྣམས་(ཀྱིས་)ནི་ཡོངས་སུ་ལེན། *legsbshad byispa+dag+las +kyang mkhaspa+rnams (+kyis)+ni yongssu len.* 'The scholars can draw aphorisms even from children's [behaviour or speech].'

11) མཁས་པ་(ལ་)ཡོན་ཏན་དཔག་མེད་ཀྱང་། གཞན་གྱི་ཡོན་ཏན་ཆུང་ངུའང་ལེན། *mkhaspa(+la) yontan dpagmed kyang gzhan gyi yontan chungngu+'ang len.* 'Even if the scholar has an immense knowledge, he takes always benefits from the small teachings he can get from others.'

## 6  Conclusions

Tibetan grammar is one of the few ancient grammars of the world, which are still used in the modern curriculum. The traditional canons of the *sumcupa* and the *rtags'jugpa* or some of their modern commentaries are still read and recited nowadays. This very ancient grammatical tradition is of course precious from a historical point of view and is even considered as sacred since it is related to the language of the sutras and tantras. Moreover, it clearly shows that the Tibetan scholars have inherited the great knowledge of their Indian predecessors in the field of phonology and morphology. Among the main topics of the traditional commentaries, one finds the case system (*rnamdbye*) of Literary Tibetan. However, the Sanskrit model of 8 cases, which native grammarians have been using until now for the description of Tibetan, is no longer suitable for a modern and scientific description of the language. It has created a lot of obstacles for the analysis and the teaching of Literary Tibetan in the schools and the universities. Some contemporary native grammarians who are trained in both modern linguistics and traditional philology are fully aware of the problem but they have not proposed, so far, a complete reanalysis of the case system based on modern linguistics.

---

[62] In the example taken from the text *Rgyagar chos'byung,* the ergative is used in the original version.

For a better understanding of the case system functioning, I have proposed an analysis in 10 cases and shown that the CLT case system has four fundamental properties: *cliticity, multifunctionality, transcategoriality* and *optionality*. The originality of the system lies much in the transcategorial and optional nature of the use of case markers, which largely contributes to the great syntactic complexity of this literary language.

I have listed the main functions of the various cases; however, this list is certainly not exhaustive and other minor functions may be added within this model.

This type of analysis should not only facilitate the syntactic description of Classical Literary Tibetan but also the teaching of this language. The modernization of the language description could thus go along with the extraordinary development of Literary Tibetan on the internet (email, wikipedia, websites, blogs, youtube, etc.) and the development of new technologies applied to this language and to this script.

## ABBREVIATIONS

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ABL | Ablative | ELA | Elative |
| ABS | Absolutive | FP | Final Particle |
| ADJCT | Adjunctive | GEN | Genitive |
| ADVR | Adversative | INES | Inessive |
| AGT | Agentive | LOC | Locative |
| AST | Associative | PURP | Purposive |
| CLT | Classical Tibetan | SUPER | Superessive |
| CMP | Comparative | SPEC | Specification |
| DAT | Dative | | |

## REFERENCES

Bacot, Jacques. 1928. *Une grammaire Tibétaine du Tibétain Classique : Les Ślokas grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhoṭa, avec leurs commentaires.* Paris: P. Geuthner [Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque d'études 37].

Bacot, Jacques. 1946. *Grammaire du Tibétain littéraire*. Paris: Paris Libraire d'Amérique et d'Orient.

Bacot, Jacques. 1948. *Grammaire du Tibétain littéraire: Index morphologique.* Paris: Paris Libraire d'Amérique et d'Orient.

Bacot, Jacques.1925 *Le poète Tibétain Milarépa : ses crimes, ses épreuves, son nirvāna.* Paris: Éditions Bossard [Classiques de l'Orient 11].

Bacot, Jacques. 1971. *Milarépa : ses méfaits, ses épreuves, son illumination* (*Le poète Tibétain Milarépa : ses crimes, ses épreuves, son nirvāna*; translation from Tibetan to French by Jacques Bacot). Paris : Fayard.

Beyer, Stephan. 2003. *The Classical Tibetan language*. New York: State University of New York.

Bickel, Balthasar. 2007. "Two ways of Suspending Object Agreement in Puma: Between Incorporation, Antipassivization, and Optional Agreement". *Himalayan Linguistics* 7: 1-19.

Blodge (བློ་དགེ་). 2003. Brda rnying phrag sbyor stangs 'ga' shas la rags tsal dpyad pa (བརྡ་རྙིང་གྱི་ཕྲ་སྦྱོར་སྟངས་འགའ་ཤས་ལ་རགས་ཚལ་དཔྱད་པ་). Pecin (པེ་ཅིན་): Bodkyi yigrnying zhib'jug Mirigs Dpeskrunkhang (བོད་ཀྱི་ཡིག་རྙིང་ཞིབ་འཇུག་ མི་རིགས་དཔེ་སྐྲུན་ཁང་).

Bouchez, Daniel. 2003. *L'écriture en Corée.* In: Actes du premier forum international du Centre de Calligraphie de la Bibliotheca Alexandrina, 24-27 avril 2003, 127-142.
http://www.ceei.univ-paris7.fr/04_bibliotheque/01/pdf/08_Daniel_Bouchez.pdf

Brocquet, Sylvain. In press. "La naissance de l'écriture en Inde". In : *Histoire générale de lécriture,* sous la direction de C. Herrenschmidt et C. Touratier. Paris: Gallimard.,

Bsodnams Tshering (བསོད་ནམས་ཚེ་རིང་). 2003. *Sumrtags kyi gzhung brtsampa'i dusrabs kyi dpyadpa : Bod kyi yig rnying* (སུམ་རྟགས་ཀྱི་གཞུང་བརྩམས་པའི་དུས་རབས་ཀྱི་དཔྱད་པ་: བོད་ཀྱི་ཡིག་རྙིང་). Pecin (པེ་ཅིན་) : Zhib'jug Mirigs Dpeskrunkhang (ཞིབ་འཇུག་ མི་རིགས་དཔེ་སྐྲུན་ཁང་).

Coblin, W. South. 2007. *A handbook of 'Phags-pa Chinese.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

DeLancey, Scott. 2003, "Tibetan". In Thurgood, Graham; and LaPolla, Randy J. (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages,* 253-267. New York: Routledge.

Desgoutte Jean-Paul; Doneux, Jean; and Inji, Chong. 2000. *L'écriture du coréen, genèse et avènement: La prunelle du dragon.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

Dorzhi Gdongdrug Snyemblo (རྡོ་ཞི་གདོང་དྲུག་སྙེམ་བློ་). 1987. *Brdasprod rigpa'i don'grel phyogsbsgrigs* (བརྡ་སྤྲོད་རིག་པའི་དོན་འགྲེལ་ཕྱོགས་བསྒྲིགས་). Lankru (ལན་གྲུ་): Kansu'u Mirigs Dpeskrunkhang (ཀན་སུའུ་མི་རིགས་དཔེ་སྐྲུན་ཁང་).

Dpa'ris Sangsrgyas (དཔའ་རིས་སངས་རྒྱས་). 1987. Brdasprod Gsalbyed Ngagsgron (བརྡ་སྤྲོད་གསལ་བྱེད་ངག་སྒྲོན་). Lankru (ལན་གྲུ་): Kansu'u Mirigs Dpeskrunkhang (ཀན་སུའུ་མི་རིགས་དཔེ་སྐྲུན་ཁང་).

Driem, van George. 2001. *Languages of the Himalayas: An ethnolinguistic handbook of the greater Himalayan region* Vol. 2. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.

Filliozat, Jean. 1939. "Note on the origin of the Tibetan script". *Journal Asiatique*: 231-283.

Genetti, Carol. 1991. "From Postposition to *Subordinator* in Newari". In: Traugott, Elizabeth; and Heine, Bernd (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization,* 227-255. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Genetti, Carol. 1993. "On the morphological status of casemarkers in Dolakha Newari". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 16.1: 57-73.

Gesang Jumian (格桑居冕). 1987. *Shiyong zangwen wenfa*（实用藏文文法). Chengdu (成都). Sichuan Minzu Chubanshe（四川民族出版社).

Haller, Felix. 2009. "Switch reference in Tibetan". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area 32.2:* 45-70.

Hahn, Michael. 1994. *Lehrbuch der Klassischen Tibetischen schriftsprache.* Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Heine, Bernd; and Christa, Kilian-Hatz. 1994. "Polysemy in African languages: An example from Baka". In Geider, Thomas; and Kastenholtz Raymond (eds.), *Sprachen und sprachzeugnisse in Afrika: Eine sammlung philologischer Beiträge Wilhem J.G. Mohlig zum 60 geburstag zugeignet,* 177-187. Köln: Rudiger Köppe Verlag.

Hill, Nathan. 2004. "Compte rendu (Review of Paul G. Hackett, *A Tibetan Verb Lexicon*, 2003) ". *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 6: 78-98.

Hill, Nathan. 2010. "The converb *-las* in Old Tibetan". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 73.2: 245-260.

Jäschke, Heinrich August. 1883. *Tibetan grammar*. London: Trubner and Co..

Kessler-Mesguich.Sophie. 2003. "L'étude de l'hébreu mishnique : Quelques repères historiques". *Bulletin du Centre de Recherche Français de Jérusalem* 12: 63-79.

Kim-Renaud, Young-key. 1997. *The Korean alphabet: Its history and structure.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

LaPolla, Randy J. 1995. "Ergative Marking in Tibeto-Burman". In Nishi, Yoshio; Matisoff, James A.; and Nagano, Yasuhiko (eds.), *New horizons in Tibeto–Burman morphoyntax,* 189-228. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology [*Senri Ethnological Studies 41*].

Laufer, Berthold. 1918. "The Origin of Tibetan Writing". *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 38: 34-46.

Ledyard, Gary K. 1998. *The Korean language reform of 1446*. Seoul: Shingu Munhwasa.

Ledyard, Gary K. 1997. "The international linguistic background of The correct sounds for the instruction of the people". In Kim-Renaud, Young-Key (ed.), *The Korean alphabet : Its history and structure,* 31-87. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Miller, Roy Andrew. 1993. *Prolegomena to the first two Tibetan grammatical treatises.* Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien [*Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde* 30].

Miller, Roy Andrew. 1976. *Studies in the Grammatical Tradition in Tibet.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mimaki, Katsumi. 1992. "Index to two brda gsar rnying treaises: The work of dBus pa blo gsal and lCang skya Rol pa'i rdo rje". *Naritasan Bukkyo Kenkyujo Kiyo* 15: 479-503.

Mudge Bsamgtan (སྨུ་དགེ་བསམ་གཏན་). 1980. *Brdasprod Blogsal Dga'ston* (བརྡ་སྤྲོད་བློ་གསལ་དགའ་སྟོན་). Lankru (ལན་གྲུ་): Kansu'u Midmangs Dpeskrunkhang (ཀན་སུའུ་མི་དམངས་དཔེ་སྐྲུན་ཁང་).

Nagano, Yasuhiko. 1997. *A Morphological index of Classical Tibetan.* Tokyo: Seishido.,

Pelliot, Paul. 1925. "Les Systemes d`écriture en usage chez les anciens Mongols". *Asia Major* 2 : 284-289.

Plungian, Vladimir ( Плунгян В.А). 2003. *Общая морфология: Введение в проблематику*. М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2000. (2-е изд., 2003.)

Robert, Stéphane. 2004. "The challenge of polygrammaticalization for linguistic theory: Fractal grammar and transcategorial functioning". In Frajzyngier, Zygmunt; Hodges, Adam; and Rood, David S. (eds.), *Linguistic diversity and language theories,* 119-142. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins [Studies in Language Companion Series 72].

Schubert, Johannes. 1963. "Tibetische Sprachprobleme im Lichte der einheimischen Grammatik". *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung, Leipzig* 8: 426-434.

Schwieger, Peter. 2006. *Handbuch zur grammatik der Klassischen Tibetischen schriftsprache*. Halle: Internation Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies GmbH.

Shen, Zhongwei. 2008. *Studies on the mengu ziyun.* Taipei: Institute of linguistics, Academia Sinica [Language and Linguistics monograph series A 16].

Skalbzang 'Gyurmed (སྐལ་བཟང་འགྱུར་མེད་). 1981. *Bod kyi brdasprod rigpa'i khridrgyun rabgsal melong* (བོད་ཀྱི་བརྡ་སྤྲོད་རིག་པའི་ཁྲིད་རྒྱུན་རབ་གསལ་མེ་ལོང་). Sikhron (སི་ཁྲོན་): Mirigs Dpeskrunkhang (མི་རིགས་དཔེ་སྐྲུན་ཁང་).

Skalbzang 'Gyurmed. 1992. *Le clair miroir: Enseignement de la grammaire Tibétaine* (Translation from Tibetan to French by Nicolas Tournadre and Heather Stoddard). Paris : Editions Prajña.

Tillemans, Tom; and Herforth, Derek. 1989. *Agents and actions in Classical Tibetan*: *The indigenous grammarians on bdag and gźan and bya byed las gsum*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 1990. "Présentation de la grammaire traditionnelle et des cas du tibétain : Approche classique et analyse moderne". In : *Tibet, civilisation et société : Colloque organise par la Fondation Singer-Polignac à Paris, les 27, 28, 29 Avril 1987*, 189-198. Paris : Fondation Singer-Polignac.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 1994. "Tibetan ergativity and the trajectory model". In Nishi, Yoshio; Matisoff, James A.; and Nagano, Yasuhiko (eds.), *New horizons in Tibeto-Burman Morphosyntax*, 261-275. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology [*Senri Ethnological Studies 41*].

Tournadre, Nicolas. 1996. *L'ergativité en Tibétain moderne* : *Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue Pparlée*. Paris, Leuven : Peeters [Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale 33].

Tournadre, Nicolas. 1997. "Les spécificités de l'ergativité tibétaine par rapport à celle des langues indiennes". *Faits de Langues* 5.10: 145-154.

Tournadre, Nicolas ; and Sangda Dorje. 2003. *Manual of Standard Tibetan*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion..

Tshegtan Zhabsdrung (ཚེ་གཏན་ཞབས་དྲུང་). 1989. *Sumrtags kyi bshadpa Thonmi'i Zhallung* (སུམ་རྟགས་ཀྱི་བཤད་པ་ཐོན་མིའི་ཞལ་ལུང་། ལན་གྲུ). Lankru (ལན་གྲུ): Kansu'u Mirigs Dpeskrunkhang (ཀན་སུའུ་མི་རིགས་དཔེ་སྐྲུན་ཁང་).

Uray Géza, 1955. "On the Tibetan Letters *ba* and *wa*: Contribution to the origin and history of the Tibetan alphabet". *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hubgaricae* 5.1: 101-121.

Verhagen, Pieter Cornelius. 1992. "A ninth-century Tibetan summary of the Indo-Tibetan model of case-semantics." In: Ihara, Shōren; Miyasaka, Yūshō; Watanabe, Shigeaki; and Matsumoto, Shōkei (eds.), *Tibetan studies: Proceedings of the 5th seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Narita 1989*, 833-844. Narita: Naritsan Shinshoji.

Verhagen, Pieter Cornelius. 2000a. *A History of Sanskrit grammatical literature in Tibet* Vol. 2. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill [Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 2, Indien 8].

Verhagen, Pieter Cornelius.2000b. "The Classical Tibetan Grammarians". In: Auroux, S.; Koerner, E. F. Konrad; Niederehe, Hans-Josef; and Versteegh, Kees (eds.), *History of the language sciences: An International handbook on the evolution of the study of language from the beginnings to the present* Vol. 1, 207-210. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter..

Verhagen, Pieter Cornelius. 1994. *A history of Sanskrit grammatical literature in Tibet* Vol. 1. Leiden and New York: Brill [Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section Two South Asia, 8].

Wilson, Joe. 1992. *Translating Buddhism from Tibetan*. Ithaca: Snow Lion

Zeisler, Bettina. 2007. "Case patterns and pattern variation in Ladakhi: a field report." In: Bielmeier, Roland; and Haller, Felix (eds.), *Linguistics of the Himalayas and beyond*, 399-425. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter [Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 196].

Zeisler, Bettina. 2006. "The Tibetan understanding of karman: Some problems of Tibetan case marking." In: Beckwith, Christopher I. (ed.), *Medieval Tibeto-Burman languages II, PIATS*

*2003: Tibetan studies: Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Oxford 2003*, 57-101. Leiden: Brill [Brills Tibetan Studies Library 10].

Zeisler, Bettina. 2004, *Relative tense and aspectual values in Tibetan languages*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nicolas Tournadre
tournadre.nicolas@univ-provence.fr

# APPENDIX: THE GRAMMATICAL TREATISES

This appendix contains the traditional grammatical treatises *sumcupa* and *rtags'jugpa* (7th century) as well as the famous commentary *Ljonpa'i Dbangpo* composed in 1901.

༄༅། །ལུང་སྟོན་པ་རྩ་བ་སུམ་ཅུ་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་བཞུགས་སོ། །

༄༅། །རྒྱ་གར་སྐད་དུ། བྱཱ་ཀ་ར་ཎ་མཱུ་ལ་ཏྲི་ཾཤཏ་ནཱ་མ། བོད་སྐད་དུ། ལུང་སྟོན་པ་རྩ་བ་སུམ་ཅུ་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ།
དཔལ་གི་དབང་ཕྱུག་འཇམ་པའི་དབྱངས་ལ་ཕྱག་འཚལ་ལོ། །གང་ལ་ཡོན་ཏན་མཆོག་མང་བའི།
།དཀོན་མཆོག་དེ་ལ་ཕྱག་འཚལ་ལོ། །གང་གིས་སྐྲ་དབྱངས་ཀུན་གསུངས་པའི།
།འཇམ་པའི་དབྱངས་ལ་ཕྱག་འཚལ་ལོ། །གང་གིས་མིང་གཞི་སྟོན་གསུངས་པ། །དུག་ཞི་བ་ལ་ཕྱག་འཚལ་ལོ།
།སྟིབ་སྟོར་ལེགས་མཛད་མཁས་རྣམས་དང་། །བླཱ་མ་ལ་ཡང་ཕྱག་འཚལ་ནས། །བསླབ་པ་ཀུན་གྱི་གཞི་འཛིན་ཅིང་།
།རིག་བྱེད་བླཱ་བ་རྣམས་ཀྱི་རྒྱུ། །མིང་མཆོག་བརྗོད་པ་ཀུན་གྱི་གཞི། །ཡི་གེའི་སྟོར་བ་བཤད་པར་བྱ།
།ཡི་གེ་ཨ་ལི་ཀཱ་ལི་གཉིས། །ཨུ་ལི་གསལ་བྱེད་ཨི་སོགས་བཞི། །ཀཱ་ལི་སུམ་ཅུ་ཐམ་པའོ། །དེ་ལ་རྗེས་འཇུག་བཅུ་ཡིན་ཏེ།
།དེ་ལས་ལཱ་ནི་སྟོན་དུར་འཇུག །མི་འཇུག་པ་ནི་ཉི་ཤུའོ། །ཀཱ་ལི་ཕྱེད་དང་བཀྱད་སྟེ་ནི།
།བཞི་བཞི་དག་ཏུ་ཕྱེ་བ་ལས། །དང་པོ་གསུམ་པ་བཞི་པ་ལས། །མས་གཉིས་དྲུག་པའི་གསུམ་པ་དང་།
།བདུན་པ་ལས་ནི་ཤ་མ་གཏོགས། །རྗེས་འཇུག་ཡི་གེ་བཅུ་རུ་འདོད། །རྗེས་འཇུག་ཡི་གེ་བཅུ་ཉིད་ལས།
།དང་པོ་གསུམ་པ་ལྔ་པ་དྲུག །བདུན་པ་རྣམས་ནི་སྟོན་དུར་འཇུག །མིང་གཞི་གཉིས་སམ་གསུམ་སྦྱེལ་ལས།
།དེ་ལ་དབྱངས་ཀྱི་བཞི་ལྷན་ཡང་། །གང་དུའང་འཇུག་མིན་སྦྱར་བར་མིན། །རྗེས་འཇུག་ཡི་གེ་བཅུ་པོ་ནི།
།མིང་གང་གི་ནི་མཐར་སྦྱར་བ། །དེ་ལ་ཨུ་ལི་བཞི་པ་སྦྱར། །སླར་བསྡུ་བར་ནི་ཤེས་པར་བྱ།
།རྗེས་འཇུག་ཡི་གེ་བཅུ་རྣམས་ལས། །གང་མིང་མཐའ་ན་བཅུ་པ་གནས། །དེ་ལ་ཨུ་ལི་གཉིས་པ་སྦྱར།
།གང་མིང་མཐའ་ན་བརྒྱད་པ་གནས། །དེ་ལ་གཉིས་པ་ཨུ་ཡང་སྦྱར། །གང་མིང་མཐའ་ན་གསུམ་པ་གནས།
།དེ་ལ་ཨུ་ལི་གཉིས་པ་སྦྱར། །བཞི་པ་དགུ་པ་དངོས་ཀྱང་སྟེ། །ལས་དང་ཆེད་དང་རྟེན་གནས་དང་།
།དེ་ཉིད་ཚེ་སྐབས་ལ་སྦྱ་ཡིན། །རྗེས་འཇུག་ཡི་གེ་བཅུ་པོ་ལ། །ཨི་དང་མཐུན་ལུགས་འདི་ཞེས་བྱ།
།དང་པོ་གཉིས་ལ་དང་པོ་མཐུན། །གསུམ་ལྔ་བཅུ་ལ་ཀུ་དང་སྦྱར། །བདུན་པ་ཉིད་ལ་བདུན་པ་སྟེ།
།ལྷག་མ་རྣམས་ལ་རྒྱུ་སྦྱར་བ། །དེ་དག་ཨི་སྦྱར་འབྲེལ་བའི་ས། །དེ་ཉིད་ལ་ནི་བཅུ་པ་སྦྱར། །བྱེད་པ་པོ་རུ་ཤེས་པར་བྱ།
།ཨུ་ལི་ཕྱིས་ནས་གཉིས་པ་སྦྱར། །ཚིག་རྒྱན་གཉིས་དང་སྡུད་པར་འགྱུར། །ལ་དོན་སུ་ལ་ཨུ་ཕྱིས་ནས།
།དེ་ལ་གསུམ་པའི་དང་པོ་སྦྱར། །དེ་ལ་ཨུ་ལི་གསུམ་པ་སྦྱར། །དེ་ནི་ལྷག་མ་དང་བཅས་པའོ།
།རྗེས་འཇུག་ཡི་གེ་བཅུ་པོ་ལ། །དྲུག་པ་སྦྱར་ན་འབྱེད་སྡུད་ཡིན། །རྗེས་འཇུག་ཡི་གེ་བཅུ་པོ་ཡི།
།བཞི་པ་དགུ་པ་ལ་བཅུ་བ། །སྦྱར་བ་འབྱུང་ཁུངས་ས་ཡིན་ཏེ། །དཀར་དང་སྡུད་པཨ་དེ་བཞིན་ཡིན།
།གང་མིང་བརྗོད་པའི་དང་པོ་རུ། །ཀྱི་སྦྱར་ན་ནི་བོད་པ་ཡིན། །གང་མིང་མཐའ་དང་མཐུན་པ་ཡི།
།བཞི་པ་ལ་ནི་ཨི་སྦྱར་བ། །དཀར་དང་བརྣན་པའི་ཚིག་ཏུ་འགྱུར། །མིང་གང་རུང་བའི་བར་མཆམས་སུ།
།གསུམ་པ་ལ་ནི་གཉིས་པ་སྦྱར། །དེ་ནི་སྟུད་དང་འབྱེད་པ་དང་། །རྒྱུ་མཚན་ཚེ་སྐབས་གདགས་པ་ཡིན།
།གང་མིང་གི་ནི་ཡ་མཐའ་རུ། །གསུམ་པ་ལ་ནི་ཨི་སྦྱར་བ། །ཐ་སྙད་དབང་དུ་གསུམ་ཡིན་ཏེ།
།དངོས་པོའི་དབང་དུ་བཞི་རུ་འགྱུར། །དུས་ཀྱི་དབང་དུ་གཉིས་ཡིན་ནོ། །གང་མིང་བརྗོད་པའི་དང་པོ་རུ།

།དང་པོ་ལ་ནི་གཉིས་པ་སྟུར། །སྐྱེ་ལ་ཁྱབ་པ་ཉིད་དུ་འགྱུར། །གང་མིང་གི་ནི་མ་མཐའན་ན། །ཕུ་ལི་ཞུ་ཡི་སྐྱ་མེད་པ།
དེ་ལ་སུ་ལི་ཧྲ་སྟུར་ན། །བདག་པོའི་སར་ནི་ཤེས་པར་བྱ། །གང་མིང་བརྟོད་པའི་ཡ་མཐའན་ན། །སྐྱེ་ལི་ཧྲ་ཡི་སྐྱ་མེད་པ།
དེ་ལ་སྟེ་ལི་ཧྲ་སྟུར་ན། །དགག་པའི་གནས་སུ་ཤེས་པར་བྱ། །ཚིགས་སུ་བཅད་པའི་མཚམས་སྟོར་རྣམས།
ཅུང་ཟད་བསྟུས་པ་ཡོད་ན་ཡང་། །དེ་ནི་དེ་བཞིན་སྟུར་བར་བྱ། །སྤྱན་འཛུག་ཡོད་དས་མེད་ཀྱང་རུང་།
མིང་གཞིའི་ཡི་གེ་གང་ཡིན་ལ། །ཉིས་འབྲེལ་ཡོད་དས་གསུམ་འབྲེལ་ཡོད། །ཨུ་ལི་བཞི་ལས་གང་སྦྱན་ཡང་།
རྗེས་འཛུག་བཅུ་པོ་མ་ལུགས་ན། །མིང་གཞན་སྟོར་ཡོད་མི་སྲིད། །རྗེས་འཛུག་བཅུ་ཡི་དོན་ཤེས་ན།
།འབྲི་དང་ཀློག་དང་བཤད་རྣམས་ཀྱི། །མཚམས་སྟོར་སྐྱ་ལ་ཕོགས་མེད་ཅིན། །འབྲེལ་པ་སྐྱ་བའི་མཆོག་ཏུ་འགྱུར།
།གཞན་ཡང་རྗེས་འཛུག་ཤེས་པ་ཡིས། །དོན་གྱི་སྟོར་བ་མ་མཐོང་ཡང་། །དོན་དང་མཐུན་པའི་སྟོར་བ་ཤེས།
།རྗེས་འཛུག་སྟོར་བ་མཁས་པ་ན། །ལུང་གི་དོན་དང་སྟོར་བ་དང་། །ཀླུ་མའི་མན་ངག་གསུམ་སྟུར་ནས།
།དོན་གྱི་ཕོག་ཏུ་དབབ་པར་བྱ། །བསྐབ་ལ་བཙུན་པའི་གང་ཟག་གིས། །དང་པོར་དངོ་རྣམས་ལ་སྟུང་།
།སྤྱན་འཛུག་མིང་གཞི་རྗེས་འཛུག་གསུམ། །ཀློག་གི་ཆེད་དུ་བསྟུན་པ་ཡིན།། །རྗེས་འཛུག་བཞི་ཡི་སྟོར་བ་ནི།
།མཉན་བསམ་བསྟན་པའི་དོན་དུ་སྟུར། །ཡན་ལག་དེ་དག་མཐུ་ཡིས་ནི། །འབྲས་བུའི་ཆེད་དུ་དོན་ལ་དབབ།
།བསྟབ་པའི་རིམ་པ་འདི་ཡིས་ནི། །གང་ཞིག་འབད་པ་ཆུང་དས་ཀྱང་། །ཤེས་རབ་ཨྱུར་དུ་གྲོལ་བར་འགྱུར།
།དེ་ཕྱིར་དང་པོར་འདི་ཉིད་བསྟབ།

༄༅། །ཡུང་དུ་སྟོན་པ་རྟགས་ཀྱི་འཇུག་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་ལུགས་སོ།།

༄༅། །རྒྱགས་སྐད་དུ། བྱཱ་ཀ་ར་ཎ་ལི་ཨི་བ་དུ་ར་ནུ་མ། བོད་སྐད་དུ། ཡུང་དུ་སྟོན་པ་རྟགས་ཀྱི་འཇུག་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ།
ཕོ་ཡི་ཡི་གེ་འབན་ཞིག་ལ། །སྟི་བ་བྱེད་དང་བཀྱུ་གནས་པ་དང་། །སྟི་ཆེན་ལྷ་དུ་དྲིལ་བྱུས་ནས། །ཕོ་དང་མ་ནེན་མོ་དང་ནི།
།ཤིན་ཏུ་མོ་དང་བཞི་བཞི་རུ། །སྟི་པ་བཞི་པ་ཡན་ཆད་དུ་བྱེ། །ཀླུག་མ་བཅུ་བཞི་གནས་པ་ལ།
།ཙ་སོགས་གསུན་ནི་ཙ་སོགས་སྟུར། །ཁ་ནི་བ་དང་སྟུར་བར་བྱ། །ཀླུག་མ་དྲུག་ནི་མོ་རུ་སྟུར།
།རལ་དུ་ནི་མོ་གཟས་སྟེ། །ཨ་ནི་མཚན་མེད་ཅེས་ཀྱང་བྱ། །མོ་ཡི་ཡི་གེའི་ནང་ནས་ནི།
།འཛུག་པའི་ཡི་གེ་བཅུ་དྲུང་བྱ། །འཛུག་པ་བཅུ་ཡི་ནང་ནས་ནི། །སྤྱན་འཛུག་ཡི་གེ་ལྔ་དབྱུང་བྱ།
།སྤྱན་འཛུག་ཡི་གེ་ལྔ་པོ་ལ། །ཕོ་དང་མ་ནེན་མོ་དང་ནི། །ཤིན་ཏུ་མོ་དང་བཞི་རུ་བྱེ། །དེ་དག་རེ་རེ་འབན་བཞི་བྱེད་དེ།
།གང་ལ་འཛུག་བྱེད་གང་གིས་བྱེད། །རྫི་ལྔར་འཛུག་བྱེད་ཅི་ཕྱིར་བྱེད། །གང་ལ་འཛུག་པ་བྱེད་ཅེན།
ཕོ་ནི་ཕོ་དང་མོ་ལ་འཛུག །མོ་ནི་མོ་དང་མ་ནིན་ལ། །མ་ནིན་ཡབ་ནི་ཕོ་མོ་ལའོ། །ཤིན་ཏུ་མོ་ནི་མ་ནིན་དང་།
།མོ་དང་ཤིན་ཏུ་མོ་ཉིད་ལའོ། །ཕོ་ནི་མ་ནིན་ལ་མི་འཛུག །མོ་ནི་ཕོ་ལ་འཛུག་པ་མིན། །མ་ནིན་རང་ལ་རང་མི་འཛུག
།རང་གི་སྟེ་དང་ཕུད་པ་ན། །ཕོ་ཡབ་མོ་ལ་འཛུག་མི་འགྱུར། །མ་ནིན་མོ་ཡབ་དེ་བཞིན་ནོ། །རྫི་ལྔར་འཛུག་པར་བྱེད་ཅེན།
ཕོ་ནི་དྲག་པའི་ཆུལ་གྱིས་ཏེ། །མ་ནིན་རན་པར་འཛུག་པ་ཡིན། །མོ་ནི་ཞན་པའི་ཆུལ་གྱིས་ཏེ།
།ཤིན་ཏུ་མོ་ནི་མཉམ་པས་སོ། །ཅི་ཕྱིར་འཛུག་པར་བྱེད་ཅེན། །ཕོ་ནི་འདས་དང་གཞན་བསྐུལ་ཕྱིར།
།མ་ནིན་གཉིས་ཀ་དུས་ལྔར་ཆེད། །མོ་ནི་བདག་དང་ངོས་འཛིན་ཕྱིར། །ཤིན་ཏུ་མོ་ནི་མཉམ་ཕྱིར་རོ། །རྗེས་འཛུག་ཡི་གེ་བཅུ་པོ་ལ།
ཕོ་མོ་མ་ནིན་གསུམ་དུ་དབྱེ། །ཕོ་ལ་སྟེས་བུ་རབ་འབྱིང་གསུམ། །མོ་ལ་མོ་དང་ཤིན་ཏུ་མོ།
།མ་ནིན་འགྱུར་དང་མཚན་གཉིས་དང་། །མཚན་མེད་དག་དང་གསུམ་དུ་འདོ། །དེ་ཡང་བྱེད་པ་བཞི་བྱེད་དེ།
།གང་ལ་འཛུག་བྱེད་གང་གིས་བྱེད། །རྫི་ལྔར་འཛུག་བྱེད་ཅི་ཕྱིར་བྱེད། །གང་ལ་ཡི་གེ་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ།

།གད་གིས་བཅུ་པོ་དེ་དག་གིས། །ཇི་ལྟར་རྣམ་པ་གཉིས་ཡིན་ཏེ། །སྐྱེ་ཡི་འཆུག་ཆུལ་དོན་གྱི་ཆུལ།

ཕོ་གསུམ་མོ་གཉིས་མ་ནིང་གསུམ། །དྲུག་ཞེན་བརམ་གསུམ་དུ་འཆུག །དྲག་པ་གསུམ་ཉིད་ནར་ཕྱད་དས།

།གལ་ཏེ་ཞེན་ནར་ཕྱད་ན། །དེ་འབར་ནར་གི་ཆ་ཤས་ཀྱིས། །དེ་ཡང་དྲག་ཞེན་གཉིས་སུ་བྲེ།

།མ་ནིང་གསུམ་དུ་གང་གཏོགས་པ། །དྲག་དང་ཕྱད་ན་དྲག་པར་འགྱུར། །ཞེན་དང་ཕྱད་ན་ཞེན་པར་འགྱུར།

།གཉིས་ཀ་དྲག་དང་ཕྱད་གྱུར་ན། །དེ་ནི་གཉིས་ཀ་ཅན་དུ་འགྱུར། །གཉིས་ཀ་དྲག་དང་མ་ཕྱད་ན། །གང་དུ་ཡང་ནི་མི་འགྱུར་རོ།

།དེས་ན་འགྱུར་དང་མཆན་གཉིས་དང༌། །མཆན་མེད་དྲག་དང་གསུམ་དུ་འདོད། །དེ་ནི་སྐྱེ་ཡི་འཆུག་ཆུལ་ལོ།

།དོན་ནི་རྣམ་པ་གཉིས་ཡིན་ཏེ། །སྤྱ་མ་གང་ལྟར་འགྱུར་བ་དང༌། །ཕྱི་མ་གང་ལྟར་འགྱུར་བའོ།

།སྤྱ་མ་སྟོན་འཆུག་ལྟ་བཞིན་སྟྱུར། །ཕྱི་མ་དག་གི་འདྲེན་ཆུལ་ནི། །ཕོ་ཡིས་ཕོ་ཡི་མིང་མཐའ་དང༌།

།མོ་ཡིས་མོ་ཡི་མིང་མཐའ་དང༌། །མ་ནིང་གིས་ནི་མ་ནིང་ངོ༌། །མིང་མཐའ་དེ་དག་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་ནི།

།དེ་ཉིད་རང་གི་སྐྱ་མཐུན་པའི། །ཆོས་དངོས་ལས་དང་བྱེད་པ་དང༌། །སྦྱིན་དང་འབྱུང་ཁུངས་འབྲེལ་བ་དང༌།

།གནས་དང་བོད་པའི་སྐྱ་ཡང་དང༌། །གཞན་ཡང་སྐྱར་བསྟུ་ལྷག་བཅས་དང༌། །འབྱེད་སྡུད་བསྣན་དང་བདག་པོ་དང༌།

།དགག་སྐྱབ་རྒྱན་དང་དུས་ལའང་འཇུག །དེ་དག་སྩུ་ཤུགས་འབྲེན་པས་འབྱུང༌། །དེ་དག་ནར་གསེས་གང་འཇུག་པ།

།མཐའ་སྦྱར་སྔོག་མའི་མིང་དོན་ལས། །སྤྱི་འཆུག་ཡོད་དམ་བྱེད་པ་ཡོད། །དེ་བཞིན་ཆེད་བྱེད་རྟེན་བྱེད་དང་།

།ལས་བྱ་བླང་བྱ་བསྨྲ་པར་བྱ། །སྤྱིན་དུ་འོས་པ་གནས་པའང༌། །གཞན་ཡང་ཚིག་དོན་འོག་མ་ལས།

།བསྟུ་རྒྱུ་ཡོད་དང་མེད་པ་དང༌། །ཁོང་མ་ལས་ཀྱང་དེ་བཞིན་ཏེ། །རྣམ་གྲངས་དག་ཀྱང་བཀོད་པ་ལས།

།བསྒྱུར་བ་ཡོད་དང་མེད་པ་དང༌། །ཕོ་སྐྱ་དང་ནི་མོ་སྐྱ་དག །མིང་གི་མཐའ་ན་ཡོད་མེད་དང༌། །རྒྱུན་དུ་སྒྱུར་བ་རྣམས་ལ་ཡང༌།

།དོན་ལ་བསྙེགས་པ་ཡོད་མེད་དང༌། །བསྒྱུན་བྱ་ལྷག་མ་ཡོད་མེད་དང༌། །ཚིག་དོན་རྟོགས་དང་མ་རྟོགས་ཀྱིས།

།དེ་དག་ནར་གསེས་རྣམ་པར་བྲེ། །ཅི་ཕྱིར་འཆུག་པར་བྱེད་ཅེ་ན། །ཡི་གེའི་ཁྱད་ནས་མི་འབྱུང་སྟེ།

།མིང་གི་ཁོངས་ནས་ཚིག་ཕྱུང་ནས། །ཚིག་གིས་དོན་རྣམས་སྟོན་པར་བྱེད། །མོ་ཡི་ཡི་གེ་མེད་པ་ན།

།ཕོ་ཡིག་བརྟོད་པ་མེད་པར་འགྱུར། །ཕོ་ཡིག་དེ་དག་རྣམས་ལ་ཡང༌། །འཇུག་པར་བཅས་པ་མེད་ན་ནི།

།མིང་དང་ཚིག་ཀུན་གསལ་མི་ནུས། །མིང་ཚིག་གསལ་བ་མེད་ན་ནི། །དོན་རྣམས་བརྟོད་པར་མི་འགྱུར་རོ།

།དེ་ལྟར་འགྱུར་འཇིག་རྟེན་དུ། །དོན་མཆོན་བརྟོད་པ་ཀུན་ཀྱང་མེད། །རིག་བྱེད་སྐྱ་བའང་ཡོད་མི་འགྱུར།

།ཉིན་ཕོས་རང་རྒྱལ་སངས་རྒྱས་ཀྱི། །བསྐུལ་པ་རྣམས་ཀྱང་མེད་པར་འགྱུར། །ཇི་ལྟར་འཇིག་རྟེན་སེམས་ཅན་རྣམས།

།ཕུང་པོ་ཁམས་དང་སྐྱེ་མཆེད་དང༌། །བརྒྱ་མཐའ་གཞན་ཡང་ཡོད་ན་ཡང༌། །རང་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་ནི་མི་ཤེས་བཞིན།

།དེ་བཞིན་ཡི་གེའི་འཆུག་ཆུལ་རྣམས། །སྐྱ་བ་ཀུན་ལ་གནས་གྱུར་ཀྱང༌། །རང་ཆུལ་དེ་ཉིད་མི་ཤེས་པས།

།དོན་ལ་སྟོར་བ་གལ་ཞེས། །དེ་ཕྱིར་སྐྱ་བའི་དབང་ཕྱུག་གི །རྗེས་སྒྱས་འདི་ཀུན་རྟོགས་གྱུར་ཅིག

།བྱུ་ཀ་ར་ཅུང་སྟོན་པ་རྩ་བ་སུམ་ཅུ་པ་དང༌། །རྟགས་ཀྱི་འཇུག་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་སྟོབ་དཔོན་ཨ་ནུས་མཛད་པ་རྫོགས་སོ།

།སརྦ་མངྒལཾ། དགེའོ །

དབྱངས་ཅན་གྲུབ་པའི་རྡོ་རྗེས་མཛད།།

ན་མོ་གུ་རུ་མཉྫུ་གྷོ་ཥ་ཡ། སྒྲ་མ་མཆོག་དང་དབྱེར་མེད་པའི། །འཇམ་དཔལ་དཔལ་དབྱངས་ལ་གུས་བཏུད་ནས།

།ཐོན་མིའི་ལེགས་བཤད་སུམ་ཅུ་པའི། །སྙིང་པོ་མདོར་བསྡུས་བཤད་པར་བྱ། །དབྱངས་ཀྱི་བྱ་བ་གསལ་པོ་རུ།

།ཁྱིད་པ་ཨི་ཨུ་ཨེ་ཨོ་བཞི། །གསལ་བྱེད་ཀ་སོགས་སུམ་ཅུ་ཡིན། །ཀ་ང་ཉ་ན་མ་ན།

།ར་ལ་ས་རྣམས་རྗེས་འཇུག་བཅུ། །དང་ས་གཉིས་ཡང་འཇུག་སྟེ། །དེ་ནི་ར་ལ་གསུམ་དང་། །ས་ནི་ག་བ་མར་འབོག

།ག་ད་མ་ན་སྔོན་འཇུག །གོ་ངོ་དོ་བོ་མོ་འོ། །ཨ་ལོ་སོ་ཏོ་སྐྱར་བསྐུ་སྟེ། །ཧྲོགས་ཆིག་སྨ་སྨྲ་སྟུ་ཚེས་ཀྱུ་བྱུ།

།དྲག་ཡོད་ཏོ་དང་མཐའ་མེད་ནོ། །གཞན་རྣམས་མིང་མཐའི་རྗེས་མཐུན་སྦྱར། །ཤུ་ར་ཏུ་ན་ལ་ཏུ།

།ལ་དོན་རྣམ་པ་བདུན་ཡིན་ཏེ། །རྣམ་དབྱེ་གཉིས་བཞི་བདུན་པ་དང་། །དེ་ཉིད་ཚེ་སྐབས་རྣམས་ལ་འཇུག །ས་སུ་གབ་དྲག་མཐར་དུ།

།དན་མ་ར་ས་དུ། །འདང་མཐའ་མེད་ར་དང་རུ། །གི་ཀྱི་གྱི་འི་ཡི་ལྷ་པོ། །རྣམ་དབྱེ་དྲུག་པ་འབྲེལ་སྒྲ་དང་།

།དེ་རྣམས་ས་མཐའ་ཅན་ལྷ་ནི། །རྣམ་དབྱེ་གསུམ་པ་བྱེད་སྒྲ་སྟེ། །སྤྱིར་ཚུལ་ནས་ར་ལ་གྱི། །ད་ནས་ཀྱི་ག་ངི

།འདང་མཐའ་མེད་དེའི་དང་ཡི། །ཀྱང་ཡང་འང་གསུམ་རྒྱན་སྡུད་དེ། །ག་ད་བ་ས་དྲག་མཐར་ཀྱང་། །དན་མ་ར་ས་མཐར་ཡང་།

།འདང་མཐའ་མེད་འང་དང་ཡང་། །ཏེ་དེ་སྟེ་གསུམ་ལྷག་བཅས་ཏེ། །ན་ར་ལ་ས་དྲག་མཐར་ཏེ། །ད་དེག་ད་མ་ན།

།མཐའ་མེད་རྣམས་ལ་ས་སྟེ་འབོ། །ག་ང་ད་ན་ནས་བས་མས་འམ། །ར་མ་ལས་སས་ཅས་འབྱེད་སྡུད་དེ།

།སྤྱིར་ཚུལ་སྣར་བསྡུའི་སྐབས་དང་མཚུངས། །ར་རུའི་ཡི་འང་ཡང་རྣམས། །ཀྱང་པ་མི་སྣོ་སྣོ་བའི་ཁྱད། །འོ་ལུ་འམ་གྱི་གོ་ད་ཚེག

།མེ་དང་ཡོ་འབད་དེ་བཞིན་ཡིན། །ནས་ལས་འབྱུང་ཁུངས་དགར་སྟུ་དེ། །འབྱུང་ཁུངས་དགོས་ལ་གང་སྦྱར་འབྱས།

།རིགས་མཐུན་དགར་ནས་མི་མཐུན་ལས། །སྐྱ་ལ་ནས་སྨ་ལོ་ན་འཇུག །ཀྱི་དང་ཀུ་ཡེ་བོ་དྲ་སྟེ།

།ཁལ་ཆེར་མི་གི་ཐོག་མར་སྦྱོར། །ཞེ་ནི་དགར་དང་བརྣན་པའི་སྒྲ། །དང་ནི་སྟུད་འབྱེད་རྒྱུ་མཚན་དང་།

།ཚེ་སྐབས་གདམས་དག་ལྷ་ལ་འཇུག །མིང་གི་ཐོག་མའི་དེ་སྒྲ་ནི། །ཕ་སྒྱུ་འདས་མ་ཐག་པ་དང་།

།རྣམ་གྲངས་གཞན་ཅན་གཉིས་ལ་འཇུག །ཅི་ཇི་སུ་གང་སྟེ་སྟ་སྟེ། །ཞིག་སྟེ་སྒྲ་འདུ་ཕྱིར་ལ་ཅི།

།སྟེ་སྟི་དང་སྟེར་བཞིན་སྐད་ལ་དེ། །སུ་ནི་གང་ཟག་གང་ཀུན་ལོ། །ཆོ་རོ་ཡོད་མེད་པ་བ་མ། །བདག་པོའི་སྒྲ་སྟེ་ག་ན།

།ཁ་མ་ས་དང་དྲག་མཐར་པ། །ད་ར་ལ་མཐའ་མེད་ལ། །བདག་སྒྲ་ཡར་གྱུར་བ་དང་ནི། །ཆལ་པ་ཉིད་སྟོར་བ་ལེགས།

།མིང་མཐའི་པ་བའར་ཕལ་ཆེར་འདི། །མ་ནི་ངེས་མེད་སྐབས་དང་སྦྱར། །མ་མི་མིན་མེད་དགག་ལྷ་སྟེ།

།མ་མི་ཐོག་མ་མིན་མེད་མཚུག །མ་ནི་བར་གྱི་གསལ་བྱེད་འང་། །ཚིག་ཕྲད་ཞིང་སོགས་ནན་མ།

།འདང་ར་ལ་མཐའ་མེད་མཐར། །ཞིང་ཞེས་ཞེ་འོ་ཞེ་ན་ཞིག །ག་ད་བ་དང་ད་དྲག་མཐར། །ཅིང་ཅེས་ཅེ་ལོ་ཅེ་ན་ཅིག

།ས་མཐར་དྲེགས་བསལ་ཞེས་མ་གཏོགས། །ཤིང་ཤིག་ཤེ་ཕོ་ཤེ་ན་འབོ། །འོན་ཀྱང་ལ་ཅིག་ལྷན་ཅིག་སོགས།

།མིང་གི་ཚ་དང་མ་ནོར་གཅེས། །ཀྱུང་པ་འཕུལ་ལ་འ་མཐའ་དགོས། །གྲུག་ཀྱི་བརྗོགས་འདགས་ཅན་ལ་སྦྱར།

།ལྷག་པའི་དོན་མང་མིང་མཚམས་དང་། །དོན་འབྲི་འབྱེད་དང་དོན་ཉུད་སྟོགས། །ཚིགས་བཅད་ག་མཐར་ཚིག་ཕད་བྱ།

།ཧྲོགས་ཆིག་མ་མཐའ་ཅན་ལྷག་པ་དང་། །ཚིགས་བཅད་ཀར་མཐར་ཉིས་ཤད་འབོ། །དོན་ཚོན་ཆེན་མོ་ཧྲོགས་ལ་དང་།

།ལེའུའི་མཚམས་སུ་བཞི་ཤད་དགོས། །ང་ཡིག་མ་གཏོགས་ཡིག་ཤད་འབར། །ཚིག་མེད་དེ་སོགས་ཞིབ་ཏུ་འབབ།

།ཚིག་གི་ལོ་མས་མ་བསྐྲིབས་ཞིང་། །དོན་གྱི་འབས་བུ་གཡུར་ཟ་བའི། །ལེགས་བཤད་སྤྱན་པའི་དབང་པོ་འདི།

།དབྱངས་ཅན་གྲུབ་པའི་རོ་རྗེས་སྟེལ།