THE TIBETAN UNDERSTANDING OF *KARMAN*: SOME PROBLEMS OF TIBETAN CASE MARKING

BETTINA ZEISLER (UNIVERSITÄT TÜBINGEN)

For western scholars, who speak accusative languages, it has always been a matter of fact that the Sanskrit term *karman* for the 'second case' has to be understood as the 'accusative' case marker or as a case-relation corresponding to the syntactic category of Direct Object. The application of the term *karman* in its Tibetan translation as *las*, *byabaḥi yul*, or *lassu byaba* to the directional case marker *la* (and its equivalents), used for RECIPIENTS, GOALS, and LOCATIONS, thus seems to be a gross error on the part of the Tibetan grammarians, due to their blind imitation of a prestigious model that can by no means be applied to an ergative language (Tournadre 1990: 192, 195, 1996: 347), except so as to create a new artificial language, which has not much to do with the "primitive" language spoken by "nomadic barbares" (Bacot 1928: I–IV, 11, 1946: 7), in any case a futile attempt "to make Tibetan fit the Procrustean bed of Sanskrit" (Tillemans 1991: 319).

This would imply, however, (a) that learned Tibetan scholars were acting like apes or parrots without any linguistic insight into their own language, or at least (b) that they did not understand the essentials of the Indian grammatical tradition, but also (c) that their teachers were not able or not willing to teach them these essentials. These are three assumptions which I am not ready to accept.[1] Even more, terminological misuse, i.e. the employment of terms with a narrow definition for only distantly related phenomena, is so common in modern linguistics, that we were hardly allowed to blame the Tibetan scholars for an apparent terminological confusion or shift in meaning.

Would it not make more sense to look at the problem with the eyes of a native Tibetan speaker, for whom the syntactic categories Subject and Direct Object do not exist (or only in a very weak form)? Looking for similarities between his language and the Sanskrit model, the grammarian might be tempted to take secondary functions of a par-

---

[1] Verhagen (2000: 322–337) notes various points where the Tibetan grammarians did not follow the Indic grammatical model but drew upon more philosophical concepts, developing these further and introducing new elements—certainly a case of "enculturation" (p. 336), although not always successful.

ticular Sanskrit *kāraka*-relation to be the main functions, or at least as being more prominent than they are from our point of view. This, of course, might still be considered to be an 'error', but one that is more plausible and even permissible, given the worldwide lack of theories on accusative and ergative languages in premodern times.

In fact, the functions of *karman* are multiple, and we cannot *a priori* presume that the Tibetan understanding of *karman* has something to do with the syntactic category Direct Object or with its prototypical logical-semantic instantiation PATIENT, because the Sanskrit *kāraka*-relation *karman* itself is neither a syntactic category nor does it correspond solely to the semantic role PATIENT.

Furthermore, the second complement of a small group of Tibetan verbs receives a directional marker, while in Sanskrit and other Indo-European languages, and even in Mongolian (Kaschewsky 1978: 173f.), it would be in the accusative case and would thus fall under the syntactic category of Direct Object, despite its inherent directional semantics. There is also some evidence that in earlier stages of the Tibetan language directional markers could be used for the PATIENT in order to emphasize its identity or in contrast to other entities (defocusing use).

1. PROLEGOMENA: THE DIFFERENT MEANINGS OF *LAS* IN THE
SUMCUPA AND THE *RTAGSKYI ḤJUGPA*

It may be noted, right from the beginning, that the grammatical term *las*, like its Sanskrit equivalent *karman*, first of all means 'deed' or 'work/activity', e.g. the activity of *going* as well as the process of *growing*, or a complex 'work' and its result such as *cutting wood* or *being in pieces* (cf. Pangžuŋ Norbu Bsamgrub 1993: 102f., 200). Besides this common denotation, two distinct technical usages are found in the commentary literature on the two root texts *Sumcupa* (=*SCP)* and *Rtagskyi ḥjugpa* (=*RKḤ*):

    1. In the context of the '*kāraka* section' of *SCP* stanzas 8c–11a and 14b/c,[2] the original term *las* is typically replaced by *byabaḥi*

---

[2] Counting each stanza as having four verses, starting always after the initial verses of praise, with *yige āli kāli* in *SCP* and with *phoyi yige* in *RKḤ*. I follow the text as given in Situ Paṇchen 1744 (ed. 1993: 1–5) and Dŋulchu Dharmabhadra 1806 (ed. 1993: 2–5) for the *SCP* and Dŋulchu Dharmabhadra (pp. 5–8) for *RKḤ* (the text given in Situ Paṇchen, pp. 6–10 has one verse inserted between 7d and 8a). There is some disagreement among Western scholars upon how to refer to the texts. Tillemans

yul 'location/direction of the activity' or *lassu byaba* 'activity towards/for a work'. Contemporary authors usually avoid the term *las*, even in the common sense, or feel compelled to explicitly gloss this (e.g., Pangžuŋ Norbu Bsamgrub 1993: 102f.).

2. By contrast, in the *bdag/gžan* section of *RKḤ* stanzas 10d–11d,[2] *las* is not used as an expression of a *kāraka*-relation, but rather in its common sense: 'the work/activity to be done' *byabaḥi las*, 'the work/activity of the actor' *byedpaḥi las*. This general meaning may be narrowed so that *las* denotes the 'essence of the sphere of the action to be accomplished by the actor' *byedpapos bsgrubpar byabaḥi yulgyi dŋospo*, as the 'essence of the work' *laskyi dŋospo*, the 'essence of the reason for acting' *lasrgyuḥi dŋospo*, or the 'essence of the sphere of activity' *byabaḥi yulgyi dŋospo* (Pangžuŋ Norbu Bsamgrub 1993: 199).[3] This "essential" entity can be understood as the PATIENT or TARGET, in both cases as an inseparable part of the work itself.

Pangžuŋ Norbu Bsamgrub (1993: 209) thus distinguishes between (a) the 'principal' (*gtsobor*) meaning of *las* in the *SCP*, namely 'the place of the insertion of the seven individual *ladon* particles'[4] *ladon*

(1989 and 1991) quotes stanza 11a–d of *RKḤ* as "verse twelve", including the introductory verse 10d (Tillemans 1991: 322), while Verhagen (2000: 236 and *passim* following Miller) refers to the single verses in question as "*TKJ* 11–15", which means that the preceding 39 (or 42) verses must have been grouped into units of variable size. Miller (1991: 372), while blaming Tillemans for having "consistently miscited" these verses, refers to them as "śl. 11–15", thus as metrical units (*śloka*-s or 'stanzas') so that one could have expected that the grouping should have been four by four. Miller and Verhagen, however, follow the edition of Bacot (1928) where "śloka" is apparently used in the sense of *sūtra* (a logical unit). Tillemans' argument for counting the four verses in question as one unit is based on the fact that they are commented upon all together by Dŋulchu Dharmabhadra. As the discussion shows, the segmentation in Tibetan commentaries might not always be the same, and it might thus be more convenient to follow the simple principle of counting four verses (or lines) as one stanza (*śloka*). I do not see any reason for deviating from this principle, particularly as the Tibetan editions usually do not show any structuring of the text into logical units to which one could refer unambiguously.
   [3] The term *byabaḥi yul* is likewise employed in quite different ways in the *SCP* and *RKḤ* (cf. Mkhyenrab Hodgsal 1996: 165).
   [4] The seven *ladon* particles consist of three groups, namely the locative marker *na*, the dative-locative marker *la*, and the five allomorphs of the locative-purposive marker *tu/du/ru/-r/su* (also known as 'terminative' in the sense of what is now called 'allative'). Based on *Sumcupa* 8c/d, Tibetan grammarians traditionally treat them as being functionally more or less equivalent and interchangeable. Only with respect to the function *deñid*, most commentators would deny the applicability of *na* and *la*. Rather exceptionally, one of the earlier texts, the *Mkhaspaḥi khargyan* assigns the three groups to three different functions: {*tu*} for the 'second', *la* for the 'fourth', and *na* for the 'seventh case' (verses 122, 130, 140, Thupten Kunga Chashab [2000: 203–210]), a distinction that comes quite close to the facts: in Old and Classical Tibetan, each of the three markers has one or more particular functions not (or rather infre-

rnampa bdungyi phrad ḥjugpaḥi yul and (b), in the context of the
RKḤ, an 'entity *las* in terms of the activity to be accomplished'
bsgrubpar byabaḥi laskyi dṇospo, that is '*las* in terms of the three [en-
tities] to-be-done, doing, and work' *bya byed las gsumgyi las* to which
'generally' *spyirbtaṇ byasna* or 'in most cases' *maṇchebaḥi dbaṇgis*
'the *ladon* particles do not apply' *ladongyi phrad miḥjuggo*. A some-
what different approach is presented in section 4. below. For Tibetan
grammarians the difference in meaning must have been obvious and
unproblematic, as it is hardly ever expressed explicitly. Perhaps for
this reason, the terminological incongruence has not been taken suffi-
ciently into account in the Western literature.[5]

The *RKḤ* also contains a '*kāraka* section', 21b–24d, which is how-
ever only cursorily treated by Situ Paṇchen or other commentators.
The case names and the *kāraka*-relations are merely listed and the

---

quently) shared by the other markers: the locative marker *na* is predominantly used
for the static LOCATION of an entity or action in space or time (locative), additionally
for the DIRECTION of a movement without destination (such as *leftwards*), the dative-
locative marker predominantly refers to a RECIPIENT or BENEFICIARY (dative), addi-
tionally also to the DIRECTION and GOAL of an action or movement (allative), and the
locative-purposive marker refers to the DIRECTION or GOAL of a movement (allative),
as well as to the purpose of an action, the resulting state after a transformation
(RESULT), and the content of a proposition.

I basically agree with Beckwith (2001: 397) that "there are no 'particles' in Ti-
betan", with the exception of a few particles in the traditional sense, such as the con-
junction {*kyaṇ*} 'again, also' or the topicaliser *ni* (which Beckwith, p.c., would count
as suffix and postposition). The syllabic appearance of the Tibetan script does not re-
flect the nature of Tibetan words, but is a graphical solution to the problem of how to
apply a script of Semitic origin to a language with complex consonant clusters and
thus how to identify the consonant bearing the unwritten vowel *a*, e.g. in words such
as *bstnpls 'from the teaching(s)'. This is done ingeniously by defining graphic units
with exactly one vowel slot with the help of a dot, thus *bstn·p·ls·*. Particular rules con-
cerning the vowel base and limited subsets of consonants that can be written before,
above, below, or behind that base define the exact position, so that one arrives at the
standard transliteration *bstan pa las* (*bstan-pa-las-*, *bstan.pa.las.*). Given the fact that
we 'transliterate' a vowel *a*, where none is written, there is actually no need for a slav-
ishly syllabic representation, which petrifies the conception that all syllabic mor-
phemes are 'particles', and thus 'words' in their own right. Phonetically, at least, the
'particles' are integrated into the unit word: most of them show assimilation features
even in the written form; in manuscripts some of them are merged into polysyllabic
graphic units. Nevertheless, since the Tibetan grammarians themselves distinguish be-
tween free lexemes *miṇ*, bound syntactic forms *tshig*, and indeclinable 'particles'
tshigphrad (corresponding to Skr. *nāman, pada*, and *nipātaḥ*, see Verhagen 1997), I
find it more convenient, in the context of the present metalinguistic discussion, to fol-
low this convention.

[5] The vagueness of the term *las* is noted, but the translation as "object (of the act)"
(Tillemans 1989: 7, note 13) or even "direct object" (Verhagen 2000: 218, note 31) is
apparently solely derived from its use in *RKḤ*.

functions are not further commented. The *kāraka*-relation of the 'second case' is again termed *las* in the technical sense.

2. THE INDIAN *KĀRAKA*-RELATIONS

At first sight, *kāraka*-relations appear as purely semantic relations between an event and the participants in the event, independent of the morphological realisation. The employment of case morphemes is only one of several possibilities to express *kāraka*-relations. First of all, the central relations *kartr̥* and *karman* are expressed by the person-related verb endings of the verb (in combination with its diathesis) and are only indicated by a morphological case when not already expressed by a person ending. In the active sentence, the relation *kartr̥* 'actor', i.e. the prototypical AGENT, is expressed by a personal ending but, in fact, not by the nominative or 'first case' (as this might be also used for the PATIENT in the passive sentence). In the passive sentence, the relation *kartr̥* is not expressed by a person ending, but by the instrumental or 'third case'. By contrast, the relation *karman* is not expressed in the active sentence by a personal ending, but by the accusative or 'second case', whereas in the passive sentence the relation is expressed by a personal ending, but not by the 'first case'. *Kāraka*-relations are also expressed by other means, such as compounds, deverbal derivations, or infinitive constructions (Butzenberger 2000: 118, 130f., Verhagen 2000: 279, 282f.).

Presuming that the *kāraka*-relation *karman* is identical with and only with the semantic role PATIENT in the strict sense (transformed by an AGENT) or at least with a comparable role (e.g. created by an AGENT), Indian case grammar should not have provided any problems for the Tibetan grammarians, and it should not have been necessary to associate the relation *karman/las* with any of the Tibetan case particles, especially not with the group of directional particles, which are subsumed under the heading *ladon* 'having the meaning/function of *la*'. But unfortunately, the *kāraka*-relation *karman* cannot be identified with the semantic role PATIENT alone.

Although the number of *kāraka*-relations (6) is less than the number of case morphemes (8), the definition of the *kāraka*-relations is *de facto* based on the employment of the case morphemes, and a semantic or functional distinction is given only with respect to the instrumental or 'third case' in terms of *kartr̥* 'actor' und *karaṇa* 'instrument or medium'. The whole range of semantic roles is, in fact, not re-

flected by the small number of *kāraka*-relations. E.g., the *kāraka*-relation *kartṛ* does not account for the differences in valency or control (e.g. AGENT vs. UNDERGOER or EXPERIENCER), and the *kāraka*-relation *karman* is used indifferently for whatever takes an accusative marking in an active sentence (which is, in fact, the only thing that the various complements discussed in section 3. below have in common).[6]

If the *kāraka*-relations were, thus, merely syntactic or formal categories, more or less abstract mathematical signs without any meaning (Butzenberger 2000: 120f.), they could be transferred freely and it would not really matter that the Tibetans have made a—for our taste—wrong association. We would only have to exchange the embarrassing terminology for a neutral one. However, despite all tendencies of abstraction in the Pāṇinian grammar, the terminology used for the *kāraka*-relations is loaded with meaning, and the Tibetan grammarians, following the somewhat more semantically oriented Buddhist schools of their time, have based their own terminology on that very semantic content and do not treat the *kāraka*-relations as empty elements in a rather arbitrary syntactic calculus.

They also take up the possibility of making functional distinctions like that between *kartṛ* und *karaṇa*[7] and set up a three- (*RKH*) or five-fold (*SCP*) distinction of the functions of the *ladon* particles, namely (a) dynamic, oriented or located: *las* (Skr. *karman*, alternatively *āpya* or *kriyāpya* 'desired (as action)'), which is later replaced by *byabaḥi yul* 'location/direction of activity' or *lassu byaba* 'activity towards a work', (b) static location: *rtengnas* (*SCP*) or *gnas* (*RKH*) 'location', later also *gnasgži* 'local base' (Skr. *adhikaraṇa* or *ādhāra*, the 'seventh case'), (c) purposive or benefactive:[8] *ched* 'aim, goal' (*SCP*) or *sbyin* 'charity' (*RKH*; Skr. *(tād)arthya* 'purpose' or *saṃpradāna* 'reci-

---

[6] E.g., not all entities classified as *karman* could form a compound of the type PATIENT-AGENT; e.g.,PATIENT-AGENT, e.g. there is no **ādityadarśa* 'sun-seer' (Cardona 1976: 254–256). See also note 11 below.

[7] Originally, this particular distinction is not realised; there is only one term: 'actor', *byedpapo* (*SCP*) or *byedpa* (*RKH*). The commentary literature distinguishes, terminologically not very convincingly, between *byedpapo* 'actor' vs. *byedpa* 'instrument' or *byedpapo gtsobo* 'primary actor' vs. *byedpapo phalba* 'secondary actor'.

[8] In relation to these two terms, there must have been, right from the beginning, a discussion about who is the real BENEFICIARY: the RECIPIENT to which an object is transferred, e.g. the tree to which the water is drawn, or the AGENT who draws benefit from the prospering of the tree. The author of the 9th century treatise *Gnas brgyad chenpo* 'Eight [linguistic] topics, in great (detail)', Lce Khyiḥbrug, obviously belonging to the *ched* 'faction', opts for the second solution, thus although the RECIPIENT is marked by a *ladon* particle, the meaning (*don*) is that the AGENT has the profit (Verhagen 2000: 287f.).

pient', the 'fourth case'), (d) abstract correlation: *deñid* 'identity' (only *SCP*),[9] and (e) temporal correlation: *tsheskabs* (Skr. *kāla;* only *SCP*).[10]

Verhagen (2000: 291f.) argues that the Tibetan grammarians have conflated the semantic level with the *kāraka* level, which he describes in accordance with Cardona (1976: 218–222, 340, note 279) as "an intermediate level between the morphological and the semantic levels" (Verhagen 2000: 279), "allowing for bilateral mapping in (and from) both the semantic and morphological levels" (Verhagen 2000: 292). This is true only in part. If one does not want to have an incalculable number of semantic roles along with each and every verb, but a limited set of prototypical roles, this cannot be achieved on a purely semantic level but solely on an intermediate level so that the semantic prototypes are defined at least partly according to their syntactic behaviour, e.g. with respect to morphological case marking. The Sanskrit *kāraka*-relation *karman* thus categorises "participants [...] that would semantically be eligible for different classification" (Cardona 1976: 222) according to their syntactic behaviour,[11] and so does the Tibetan *kāraka*-relation *las*. But the Tibetan *kāraka*-relation *las* actually forms a subclass of *karman*, containing only those elements that have a directional component, as indicated by a directional marker. Syntactic behaviour overrides the inherent semantic notions of the

---

[9] Possibly this was intended to account for complex expressions of the type *ñam-ssu len* 'to take to heart, memorise, learn' and more particularly for cognate constructions of the type *meru ḥbar* 'to burn' where the meaning of the verb is inherent in the complement and *vice versa* (cf. Yamaguchi 1990: 251–257). Many authors, however, also include the identity of substance (in the case of an outward transformation, particularly auxiliary constructions with adverbials of the type *become/change into x* or *make/transform into x*) or identity of class membership. In face of the manifold grammatical traditions in Tibet, it does not seem to be very useful to classify this plurality of concepts as "confusion" (p. 251) and to sort it into "correct usages" and "misunderstandings" (p. 256); even less so as it is not entirely clear whether *deñid* was meant as a distinct category in the *SCP*. Some Tibetan grammarians have argued that it is used in a non-technical sense, *de khona ñid*, which according to Miller (1989: 199) would simply mean that *tsheskabs* 'time' is the same or a subclass of 'location'. One might perhaps counter that this objection has been raised merely to level off the apparent discrepancy between *SCP* and *RKḤ*.

[10] Cf. Inaba as cited by Miller (1989: 196), as well as Verhagen (2000: 290).

[11] E.g., a participant of a verb that shows different case frames with and without preverbs is assigned a *kāraka*-relation that corresponds to the particular case frame and not to its semantic role, which remains identical. E.g., the mountain where somebody dwells takes the 'seventh case' as a LOCATION with the plain verb *parvate āste* 'is seated on the mountain'; it is still a LOCATION when the verb is used with a preverb, *parvatam adhyāste* 'is seated on the mountain'; but it takes the 'second case' and thus becomes a *karman* (cf. Cardona 1976: 216). A similar reclassification may happen to an INSTRUMENT spoken of as 'actor' *kartṛ* (Cardona 1976: 219).

constituents in question as well as the seemingly descriptive meaning
(and the etymology) of the designation itself. We will see that a
merely semantic approach to distinguish the functions of the *ladon*
particles with respect to the 'fourth case' and the 'seventh case' re-
mains unsatisfactory, particularly as the descriptive terms are open to
interpretation.

3.   SECONDARY FUNCTIONS OF THE SANSKRIT 'SECOND CASE'

The Sanskrit 'second case' indicates not only the typical Direct Object
of transitive verbs—*vikriyātmaka* (PATIENT in a strict sense, i.e. the
thing transformed), *nirvartya* (PATIENT in a wider sense, i.e. the thing
created)—but inherently directional complements such as the GOAL of
a movement or the content of a sensual perception (*prāpya*, the thing
reached), the focus or TARGET of attention (*viṣayabhūta*), the focus or
TARGET of affections (*vyāpya*, the thing enjoyed or detested), and the
RESULT of transformation (*vikārya*), to use a Jainist distinction (But-
zenberger 1995: 44–49). In fact, the alternative localistic designation
byabaḥi yul 'location of the action' corresponds fairly well to the sec-
ondary directional function of the Sanskrit 'second case' as in the sen-
tence *grāmaṃ gacchati*, 's/he goes to/into the village'. The Sanskrit
'second case' is also employed for the RECIPIENT or the SOURCE in
double 'accusative' constructions.

   Tibetan and other Tibeto-Burman languages have quite a few agen-
tive and inagentive verbs, the second complement of which receives a
directional marker—typically the dative-locative marker *la*—but
would be treated as a Direct Object in Sanskrit or in other Indo-
European languages, such as *accuse, beat, observe* [+ctr] or *like, fear*
[–CTR] (see also section 6.2 below). Many of the secondary functions
of the Sanskrit 'second case' can be related to these Tibetan TARGETS:

3.1. prāpya *(attainment of goal)*

SKR   *grāmaṃ gacchati*
CT   *groṇla/du ḥgrobayin*
       'is going to the village'

SKR   *ādityaṃ paśyati*
       'sees the sun'
CT   –

Movement verbs are classified as *thamidadpa* by the Tibetan gram-
marians, but figure prominently in the examples for the 'second case',
while directional activity verbs, such as *look at/for*, classified as *tha-
dadpa*,[12] are considerably less frequent.[13] The main reason to associate

---

[12] Tibetan *thadadpa* is commonly translated as 'transitive', *thamidadpa* as 'intran-
sitive', but the Tibetan opposition does not correspond to the traditional European
syntactic distinction based on the valency of the verb and the presence of a direct ob-
ject. The exact translation is 'being with difference' or 'being without difference',
which means that actor and action can or cannot be conceptually separated. The defi-
nition implies that there is or is not an entity as part of the action that is different or
'other' *gžan* from an actor (AGENT or EXPERIENCER, both receiving the ergative
marker). The terms *thadadpa/thamidadpa* were coined only recently, but I will use
them as a convenient abbreviation for otherwise very clumsy phrases.

Traditionally, the category corresponding to *thadadpa* comprises all verbs the first
complement of which receives an ergative marker, including therefore [–control] two-
place verbs. This inclusion hardly ever becomes explicit. But [–control] two-place
verbs, such as *skyud | bskyud* 'to forget', *rgyags | brgyags | brgyag* 'to be satiated',
etc. (classified as *thamidadpa* in the BR, see below) appear among [+control] verbs in
the list of Situ Paṇchen (1744: 153ff. ad *RKḤ* 11a) for the past tense forms taking the
b- prefix. The list is introduced by an explanation that I am only able to interpret in
the sense that all the verbs listed should be 'essentially related to a differing actor hav-
ing accomplished a past action' *byedpapo gžandaŋ dŋossu ḥbrelbaḥi byaba byaszin
ḥdaspa bsgrubpaḥi phyirdaŋ | dŋospo bdag gžan gñis las gžan te byedpapo gžandaŋ
dŋossu ḥbrelbaḥi byabaḥi yuldaŋ byaba bsgrubpaḥi phyir ḥjugpa yinno |*

The 18th/19th century author Akya Yoŋshdzin Dbyangscan Dgaḥbaḥi Blogros (ed.
1989: 50, fol. 440.5) classifies the 'seer' *mthoŋbapo* as 'own', which means that there
must also be 'other', since 'own and other or actor and work [are defined] relatively to
each other so that if one exists, the other one must also exist with certainty' *bdag
gžannam | byedpodaŋ las gñis phantshun ltosgrubkyi tshuldu gcig yodna cigšos kyaŋ
ŋespar yoddgos* (Mkhyenrab Ḥodgsal *Rtagskyi ḥjugpaḥi dkaḥḥgrelgnadkyi sgronme*
'Lamp for the essentials of the commentaries on the difficult points of the *Rtagskyi
ḥjugpa*', Chengdu: Sichuan minzu chubanshe, 1979: 25f., as cited by Tillemans 1991:
316f.). Similarly, the 19th/20th century author Gsertog skuphreŋ lŋapa Blobzaŋ
Tshulkhrims Rgyamtsho chooses just the [–control] verb *thos* 'hear' as illustration of
the 'third case', the actor (EXPERIENCER) of hearing being different from the percep-
tion and its content (*Bodkyi brdasprodpa Sumcupadaŋ Rtagskyi ḥjugpaḥi mchanḥgrel
mdor bsduste brjodpa ŋomtshar ḥphrulgyi ldemig ces byaba* 'Abridged notes on Ti-
betan grammar, *Sumcupa* and *Rtagskyi ḥjugpa*, called the magic key for wonderful
speech', 1957, Kansuḥu Midmaŋs Dpeskrunkhaŋ, as cited by Tournadre 1996: 349f.).

In Western linguistics, there have been attempts to define 'transitivity' as a matter
of degrees according to semantic or pragmatic parameters, following the approach of
Hopper and Thompson (1980). Perhaps enhanced by similar discussions in modern
Chinese linguistics, the term *thadadpa* is restricted in BR to [+control] two-place
verbs and uses *thamidadpa* for the rest (i.e. [±control] 1-place and [–control] two-
place verbs). This view, although not shared by all Tibetan authors, seems to have be-
come quite authoritative and might be mistaken as the traditional one (cf. Tournadre
1996: 348, 350, who fails to give the necessary evidence).

Many commentaries are silent about [–control] two-place verbs. Tshetan Žabsdruŋ
(1988: 236) mentions *metog rñed* among a group of otherwise [–control] one-place
verbs. *rñed*, however, belongs to a very limited set of verbs that takes the dative-
locative marker for the EXPERIENCER in Modern Tibetan (DeLancey 1985: 61); this
might have been the reason for listing it in this group.

movement verbs with the 'second case' and not with the 'seventh case' is that they constitute an action (*byaba*) while the verb of existence does not. One distinguishes thus between a dynamic spatial relation of direction, the movement towards a GOAL (allative), and a static spatial relation of LOCATION (locative). For the same reason, directional activity verbs, such as *ḥbyug* 'to anoint, besmear' or *ldug* 'to fill' are associated with the 'second case' (cf. Dmudge Bsamgtan 1990: 49f.).

The idea of dynamicity is so strong that most Tibetan authors also subsume the school where one teaches, the wood where one fells trees, the factory in which machines are rotating, or the battlefield where one kills the enemy under the 'second case' (Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed 1981: 47, 1992: 29; Dmudge Bsamgtan 1990: 51, 53). This distinction is somewhat against our intuitions, and apparently it is not based on Indic grammatical theories (Klaus Butzenberger, p.c.). It is also somewhat against the distribution of the directional markers, particularly the non-dynamic connotation of *na*, which indicates a distinction in terms of dynamicity with respect to the spatial relation itself (i.e. between an orientation *towards* something and a location *at* a cer-

---

On the other hand, Dmudge Bsamgtan (1990: 60) discusses the verb pair *mthoŋ* 'to see' and *lta* 'to look at' on the same level as the verb pair *ḥjoms* 'to subdue' and *rgol* 'to fight'. In this connection, the eye that sees is treated as 'instrument' *byedpa*, thus belonging to the sphere of *bdag*; and since the eye is not claimed to be identical with the 'form' *gzugs*, which is part of the 'activity' *byaba* and thus belongs to the sphere of *gžan*, one could expect that *mthoŋ* would be classified as *thadadpa*. Dmudge Bsamgtan (p. 63) also treats *nadkyis gduŋ* 'stricken by illness' as an instance of the 'entity instrument' *byedpa dŋos*, whereas this verb is classified as *thamidadpa* in BR.

Notions of volitionality may well be related to the Indian conceptualisation of a prototypical *karman* as the thing 'most desired' *īpsitatama* by the 'actor' *kartṛ*, which implies that a prototypical *kartṛ* acts intentionally (I owe this reasoning to Mirella Lingorska, Universität Tübingen). Yet, the explicit terminological distinction between events that are 'self-controlled' *raŋdbaŋcan* and those that are 'controlled by something other' *gžandbaŋcan* has been introduced only recently (Tillemans 1989: 27f.; N. Tournadre in Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed 1992: 250). For Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed, this distinction crosscuts the classification in terms of *thadadpa* and *thamidadpa*, yielding a fourfold pattern (Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed 1981: 364ff., 1992: 250ff.). *mthoŋ* would thus be classified as *thadadpa* and *gžandbaŋcan*.

[13] Cf., e.g., Situ Paṇchen (1744: 50 ad *Sumcupa* 6c–8d): movement verbs: *šarphyogssu [ḥ]gro* 'will go to the eastern direction', *mthaḥru ḥkhyol* 'arrived at the end', *rgyagardu ḥgro* 'will go to India', *rgyabtu phyogs* 'turned back', *pharoldtu phyin* 'went on the other side', *mdunna rgyu* 'moved near'; directional activities: *gzugsla lta* 'will look at the form'; with additional location complement: *rdobar gzugsbrñan byed* 'will paint an image on the stone'. In the edition of Sarat Chandra Das (1915, II: 12) one can additionally find: *lamdu žugs* 'entered upon the road', *yuldu phyin* 'came/ went to the country(side)', *thaddu ḥgro* 'will become happy (lit. will go into happiness)'; positioning verbs: *steŋdu bžag* 'put it above'; *lagtu bzuŋ* 'hold it in the hand'.

tain place). Nevertheless, there seem to have been Tibetan voices closer to our intuitions, since Dmudge Bsamgtan (p. 49) criticises the view that the relation between an activity and a location could be expressed by the 'seventh case'. For his own position see section 4. below.

3.2. visayabhūta *(focus of attention)*

SKR   *himavantam śrṇoti*
       'hears about the Himalaya'
CT   – but cf. also

CT   *gaṇrila bltas*
       'observed/looked at the glaciers'

CT   *slobdponla ñan*
       'listened to/obeyed the master of studies'

SKR   *jainendram adhīte*
       'studies the Jainendra (grammar)'

CT   *chosla/su ḥbadpayin*
       'studies / exercises with respect to religion' (cf. JÄK s.v. *ḥbad*)

Cf. also the examples in Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed (1981: 45f. and 1992: 25):

(1)   a. *dpebzaŋla slobsbyoŋ-byeddgos*
           example.good-D/L study.PRS-DES

           'It is necessary to learn <u>about/from</u>[14] the good examples/to focus <u>on</u> the good examples.' [*byabaḥi yul* or *byaba ḥjugyul*]

       b. *tshanrig-o slobsbyoŋ-byeddgos*
           science-ABS study.PRS-DES

           'It is necessary to study/acquire science.' [*byabaḥi las/byargyuḥi laska*]

       Ces deux phrases comportent le même verbe: 'faire des études', mais dans la première, 'dpe bzaŋ' est le point d'incidence de l'action. Il admet par conséquent la marque oblique. En revanche, dans la deuxième, 'la science' étant l'objet des études *á accomplir*; on ne doit pas employer la marque oblique (mais l'absolutif) (1992: 25; emphasis added).

According to this interpretation, the use of the *ladon* particle with verbs where it is not obligatory may convey a sort of partitive, atelic or unbound reading of the verb, while its non-application conveys a notion

---

[14] See also notes 18 and 27 below.

of completion, telicity or boundedness; cf. German *lernen* as unbound
activity vs. *erlernen* as accomplishment.[15]

3.3. vyāpya *(affection)*

īpsita ('desired', i.e. positive affection or action with positive outcome)

SKR   *guḍaṃ bhakṣayati*
      'enjoys a piece of sugar'

CT   *bdebadaŋ skyidpala loŋs-spyodpayin*
      'enjoys happiness and welfare' (cf. JÄK sub *loŋs*)

anīpsita ('undesired', i.e. negative affection or action with negative
outcome)

SKR   *kaṇṭakān mṛdnāti*
      'steps on thorns'
CT   – but cf.

CT   *khyila ḥjigs*
      'fears/feared the dog'

Cf. Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed (1981: 40, 1992: 24) for affections in general.
Dmudge Bsamgtan (1990: 50), by contrast, defines emotions or incli-
nations as being non-dynamic or non-action words (*byatshig min*) and
thus associates them with the 'seventh case', 'although [other authors]
have established the *ladon* particle as second [case] for positive affec-
tions, such as «to like the back (side)»' «*rgyabtu spro*» *žespaḥi ladon
gñispar bžagyod mod.* Generally, Tibetan authors seem to have been
more inclined to treat negative affections like states (cf. *Tshetan Žabs-
druŋ* 1988: 120f.).

3.4. vikriyātmaka *(transformation by essence)*

SKR   *kāṣṭhaṃ bhasma karoti*
      'makes wood into ashes'

CT   *pagspa šogšogtu byed*
      'makes skin into parchment' (JÄK sub *byed*)

---

[15] Cf. Kaschewsky (1978: 177). But this does not seem to be *opinio communis.*
According to Dmudge Bsamgtan (1990: 62), some scholars alternatively take the ab-
solutive version as 'abbreviation' *tshig cuŋzad bsduspa* or 'condensation' of two se-
parate units of an activity 'into one single activity' *tshig hrilbo byatshig.* But gener-
ally the use or non-use of the *ladon* particle cannot be predicted consistently (*mthaḥ
gcigtu khyabpa maŋes/mayin*). A contemporary native Tibetan speaker would not find
any difference in meaning; in particular, the partitive reading is not excluded by using
the absolutive (Thupten Kunga Chashab, p.c.).

Cf. Situ Paṇchen (1744: 224 ad *RKH* 24a–d for *bdudrtsir bsgyur* 'transformed into nectar'). The resulting state may also be subsumed under *dgosched* 'purpose' (Prati Rinchen Dongrub, ed. 1992: 24 for *rgyandu gser brduṇs* 'hammered gold for/into an ornament'), obviously because the resulting state is the aim of the activity, or under the abstract relation *deñid*, 'identity', because the thing transformed, i.e. the substance changing its outer form, remains the same (Skalbzaṇ Hgyurmed 1981: 68, 1992: 35 for *Rgyayig Bodyigdu bsgyur* 'converted Chinese script into Tibetan script'; cf. also Dmudge Bsamgtan 1990: 51 for *bdudrtsir bsgrub* 'transformed into nectar').[16] For some scholars, again, *deñid* is merely a 'special case of the second case' *rnamdbye gñispaḥi byebrag deñidkyi sgra* (Dṇulchu Dharmabhadra 1806: 26, ad *SCP* 9a/b).[17]

3.5. Double 'accusative' constructions

RECIPIENT:

SKR   *mānavakam dharmam brūte / anuśāsti*
CT   *bula chos stonpayin / slobpayin*
       'explains / teaches the religion to the boy'[18]

SKR   *ācāryam dharmam prcchati*
CT   *slobdponla chos žubayin*
       'asks the teacher about religion'[19]

SOURCE:

SKR   *gām dogdhi payaḥ*
       'milks milk from the cow'
CT   –

---

[16] Similarly Pangžuṇ Norbu Bsamgrub (1993: 105) for *bdudrtsir mibsgrub* 'is not to be accomplished as nectar', although his previous definition rather stands for a relation of identity or synonymity between the verb and the complement as in *meru ḥbar* 'burn' where it is the nature of fire to be burning (p. 104).

[17] Based on Situ Paṇchen's (1744: 48, ad *Sumcupa* 6c–8d) statement that *deñid* is 'in general the expression of *las*, the difference being the identity of *las* and action' *spyir btaṇ laskyi sgra yinpalas | khyadpar lasdaṇ byaba tha midadpa.* (This statement, however, risks running into a fallacy, if it turns out that it is exactly the non-identity between *las* and action that triggers the *ladon* particles; cf. section 4. below.)

[18] Note that with *slob* the construction may also convey the opposite meaning: *blonpo Thonmi des paṇḍita Lharigs Seṇgela sgrabstanbcos thamscad bslabsnas* 'Minister *Thonmi* studied all the treatises with/from the pundit *Lharigs Seṇge*' (*Bsodnams Rgyalmtshan: Gyalrabs gsalbaḥi meloṇ* 'The mirror clarifying the royal genealogy', Vogel 1981: 17). This pattern would correspond to the next examples.

[19] The act of asking might be seen as directed towards an addressee, like any other speech act. But the addressee might be also conceptualized as the SOURCE (of the answer or knowledge) as in Mongolian, where it triggers ablative case marking.

But cf. the replacement of the ablative by the dative-locative case marker in some fixed expressions:

CT   *rtala ḥbab*
        'alights from the horse' (cf. JÄK sub *ḥbab* and *la* IV)

3.6. Adverbs

SKR   *sarvakālam, triṣkālam, pūrvam, ciram*
CT   *dus kundu, lan gsumdu, sṅar, yun riṅdu*
        'all times', 'three times', 'earlier', 'long time' (Kaschewsky 1978:
        182)

SKR   *etān eva samāśritya*
CT   *ḥdidag ñidla brtennas*
        'based on just these' (Kaschewsky 1978: 183)

SKR   *pratyekam, sphuṭam, aviśrāmam*
CT   *sosor, gsalbar, miḥchadpar*
        'individually', 'clearly', 'uninterruptedly' (Kaschewsky 1978: 184)

Since all these 'accusative' complements in the Sanskrit sentences be-long to the *kāraka*-relation *karman*, the *ladon* particles in the Tibetan counterparts are, in fact, used for this very relation. Thus, in at least some cases, the Tibetan dative-locative or locative-purposive markers do correspond to the Sanskrit 'second case'. One may recall that at the time of the first contact with Sanskrit grammar, passive sentences, particularly past passive participle constructions were dominant in Buddhist Sanskrit (cf. Miller 1991: 378), and the vernaculars were al-ready developing ergative patterns. The non-prototypical types of *karman* might thus have appeared as the more natural ones.

The frequency is quite low, however. According to a rough guess (Kaschewsky 1978: 179ff.), only 11% of the *ladon* particles in transla-tions correspond to an original Sanskrit 'second case'. By far most of them concern the GOAL of a movement, followed by the RESULT of transformation (*deñid*, 'second case' or 'fourth case') and expressions of time/duration (*tsheskabs*) and other adverbs. Kaschewsky further mentions the auxiliary construction: verbal noun + -*r* + *byed*, which may translate a Sanskrit derived verb construction, and complex verb constructions with the cognate complements (again *deñid*). Directional activity verbs, the TARGET of which would correspond to a Direct Ob-ject in Sanskrit, apparently form the smallest group.

As we have seen above, not all Tibetan authors are ready to identify all such usages as 'second case', as there is in general a certain varia-tion in the classification of the cases and their semantic correlations.

In the end, all these distinctions turn out to be somewhat over-sophis-
ticated but at the same time quite harmless since they are not related to
the functional distribution of the directional markers.[20]

In this connection, it is quite striking that the traditional approaches
remain silent about the fact that the prototypical *karman*, i.e. the
PATIENT, does not receive one of the *ladon* particles, but remains un-
marked. This lacuna has its counterpart in the Indian *kāraka* theory.
The *karman* of the passive sentence does not receive a *kāraka*-relevant
case, as it is already expressed by the combination of diathesis and
person-related verb endings. It seems that the theory of *bdag* and
gžan, concerning the prefixes of the verb, was developed in analogy in
order to fill the gap.[21] But again, this is never explicitly stated, and the
prototypical *karman* disappears in a terminological *nirvāṇa*.

4. THE FUSED CONCEPT OF LAS: A CONTEMPORARY APPROACH

While traditional commentaries keep the different concepts of *las* (and
byabaḥi yul) as applied in the *kāraka* and *bdag/gžan* sections separate,
Dmudge Bsamgtan (1990: 53ff.) fuses both concepts in his discussion
of the *ladon* particles. His *las* (obviously used in the everyday sense
'work') is either 'essentially identical' *ṇobo gcigtu* with the 'activity'
byaba and 'essentially different' *ṇobo thadadpa* from the 'place (of the
activity)' *(byabaḥi) yul*, in which case it does not receive a *ladon* parti-

---

[20] E.g., as Thupten Kunga Chashab kindly pointed out to me, if one gives sweets
to a child, this might actually not be very beneficial for the child (or his/her teeth). In
particular, if the intention is to spoil the child's character, it would call for the 'second
case'. But does such insight really matter for the application of the case marker, which
according to the Tibetan theory is the same in both instances?

[21] Cf. Verhagen (2000: 297ff.), who also points out the fact that Situ Paṇchen de-
scribes the Sanskrit active/passive diathesis with the terminology of *bdag* and *gžan*
(Situ Paṇchen 1744: 233f. ad *RKḤ* 25a–27d). Ultimately, this attempt was bound to
fail, as Tibetan verb morphology is far too complex and irregular, and, of course, the
prefixes do not indicate diathesis. Thus if *las* would be expressed by the verbal mor-
phology classified as *gžan*, it would show up only in particular tenses, depending on
the particular class of verb. But following the principle of the Indian *kāraka* theory,
only a *kāraka*-relation that is not expressed by the verb can be expressed by a rela-
tional case, thus the nominal belonging to the class of *las*, whether corresponding to a
PATIENT or to a TARGET or GOAL, should not obtain a directional marker in tenses
classified as *gžan*, and, correspondingly, in tenses classified as *bdag*, all nominals be-
longing to the class of *las*, TARGETS or GOALS and PATIENTS alike, should obtain a di-
rectional marker. This is certainly not the case. While the theory of *bdag* and *gžan*
draws upon an obvious orientation of transitive verbal nouns as referring to either the
AGENT or the PATIENT or TARGET, its general application to the verb phrase does not
lead to an adequate description of the Tibetan sentence.

cle, or it differs from the activity, in which case a *ladon* particle has to be applied. This allows him first of all to solve a problem that arises from the synonymous use of *las* and *byabaḥi yul*: if there is a PATIENT as well as a place mentioned in one clause, e.g., *saw the form in the mirror*, which of the two nominal phrases is the grammatical *yul* that receives the *ladon* particle (cf. Thupten Kunga Chashab [2002: 27])?

According to Dmudge Bsamgtan (p. 53), 'the mirror is the place of the activity, and the seeing of the form is the activity, thus activity and work have become virtually identical, while work and place are expressed as [being] different' *meloŋ byabaḥi yuldaŋ gzugs mthoŋba byaba yinpas bya las ŋobo gciggi tshuldu soŋ yaŋ | lasdaŋ yul thadaddu brjoddo |* In the case of a directional activity, such as *looking at a form*, 'place and work have become identical, while activity and work are virtually different' *yuldaŋ las ŋobo gcigtu gyurciŋ bya las ŋobo thadadpaḥi tshuldu yoddo |*

So far, the concept of a *las* that is either identical with *byaba* or with *yul* seems to be superfluous, but it allows to further distinguish between a static and a dynamic relation between activity and location or, in Dmudge Bsamgtan's own words, between a 'location where one performs the activity' *byaba byedsaḥi yul* and a 'location towards which one faces' *kha gtadsaḥi yul* (p. 54f.). In the first case, *las* and *yul* are identical; in the second case, *las* and *yul* are different (and in both cases, *las* and *yul* are not identical with the activity).

The prototypical *karman*, the PATIENT, thus can be defined as a *las* which is part of, or identical with, the activity. The TARGET and the GOAL can be defined as a *las* towards which one faces and which is different from, or not a part of, the activity. The *byabaḥi yul*, thus, is no longer used synonymously with *las*, but solely describes the place where an activity takes place. Theoretically, the differentiation between *byaba byedsaḥi yul* and *kha gtadsaḥi yul* could also be applied to the clause *meloŋ(gi) naŋdu gzugsla bltas* 'observed the form in the mirror', such that 'form' is the TARGET, *las*, which is neither *byaba* nor *yul*, and 'mirror' is the place of the activity. Unfortunately no such examples are discussed. As a certainly undesired outcome, the *yul* delimited in such a way comes very close to the *(rten)gnas* or *gnasgži* the 'local base' of a state, and the upholding of the distinction seems to be motivated mainly by faith in tradition.

What Dmudge Bsamgtan cannot solve (and so far Western theories also cannot) is the problem of why the AGENT of *going to the village* is treated differently from the AGENT of *looking at the village*, the first

remaining in the absolute, the second receiving the ergative marker. If the GOAL or *las* of the activity of *going* is not part of the activity and the activity is thus deprived of any entity different from the actor, so that the actor of going and the act of going can be identical (*thami-dadpa*), what kind of entity remains in the activity of *looking* that could be different from the actor (*thadadpa*), if the TARGET or *las* is likewise not a part of the activity? Or is it? (Perhaps failure to mention *looking at the form in the mirror* is part of the strategy?)

The traditional approach 'solves' the problem by discussing the *kā-raka*-s and the theory of *bdag/gžan* separately. Thus, while the first theory teaches the appropriate assignment of cases in relation to various semantic roles, the second theory identifies one particular semantic role, namely that of the differing actor or instrument, which is going to receive the ergative marker, and excludes possible competing actor roles, which, as a matter of fact, do not receive the ergative marker. The strategy in this context is to keep silent about the GOAL of a movement verb, and to redefine *las* in a manner that makes it compatible with two quite different semantic roles: the PATIENT and the TARGET. This appears as a clever stratagem in face of the facts of language, even if it is not the intellectually most satisfying solution.

5. LANGUAGE SHIFT AND THE LADON PARTICLES

In rare cases, and seemingly more often in Old Tibetan than in Classical Tibetan, the PATIENT is marked with the dative-locative marker. A quite striking case is found in a paradigmatic text on the "paradise tree", exemplifying the eight Sanskrit cases. Here, the directional case marking corresponds to the Direct Object marking in the underlying Sanskrit active sentence:

(2) *ljonpaḥi šiṇla (ni) rluṇgis bskyod*
     paradise-GEN tree-D/L (TOP) wind-ERG move.PAST
     'As for <u>this very tree</u> of paradise, the wind shook [it].'[22]

We may safely assume that the famous 9th century translator Chosgrub, alias Fa Cheng, knew what he was doing, and that perhaps he had seen this construction as the only possible equivalent for an active sentence. One may recall once again the passive and ergative tenden-

---

[22] Chosgrub alias Fa Cheng (9th century) *Ḥjugpaḥi sgra brgyad bstanpa tshiglehur byaspa* 'Versified teaching of the eight sounds [morphemes] that are applicable' (Verhagen 1992: 840).

cies in Buddhist Sanskrit and in the vernaculars. It is not unlikely then (but still has to be proven) that active sentences with a prototypical *karman* were informationally or pragmatically marked, at least in the past tense, and thus they might have been, in the eye of a competent Tibetan speaker, comparable to the defocusing employment of the directional marker for the PATIENT in Tibetan.

That the Tibetan grammarians were not just blindly copying the Sanskrit model is shown in other versions of the "paradise tree" given by the slightly earlier Lce Khyiḥbrug and the much later Saskya Paṇḍita. Here, the non-directional transitive verb *skyod* 'to move', (regularly with an absolutive PATIENT), is replaced by the directional activity verbs *ḥbad* 'care for' and *lta* 'to look at' (regularly with a directional marker for the TARGET). In a contemporary textbook, it is even replaced by the three-place verb *ḥphen* 'to throw':

(2')   *šiṅla* ḥbadde *khyodkyis* bltabar-*gyis* (ltabar-*gyi)*
        tree-D/L take.care-CC you-ERG look-do.IMP

        'You have to care for and look after the tree!'[23]

(2'')   *šiṅ dela* ltabaḥam ḥjogpa
        tree/wood that-D/L look.PRS-VN-Q put.down ~carve.PRS-VN[24]

        '*looking* at/after or *putting* [something] down at that tree'
        ~ '*looking* at/after or *carving* into that tree'[25]

(2''') *šiṅla* mdaḥ ḥphaŋ
        tree-D/L arrow-ABS shoot.FUT

        'An arrow will be /is to be *shot* at the tree.'[26]

Typically, the dative-locative marker leads either to a partitive reading 'of, from' (replacing the ablative marker *las*[27]) or to a definite or em-

---

[23] Lce Khyiḥbrug (late 8th/early 9th century) *Sgraḥi rnampar dbyeba bstanpa* 'Teaching the case-differentiation of the sounds' (Verhagen 1992: 842).

[24] The present stem *ḥjog* is ambiguous. It belongs to the verb *ḥjog | bžag | gžag | žog* 'put down, place', which takes a directional marker for the LOCATION argument, as well as to the verb *ḥjog | bžogs | gžog | žog(s)* 'cut, hew (in pieces), carve, chip' and 'strain, filter'. A directional marker might be in place for the LOCATION argument of the reading 'carve (into)', and a possible RESULT argument of 'cut (into pieces)'. Because of the conjunction 'or' I would expect the second verb to have a similar behaviour as the first one. Given that a tree or wood is more likely to be associated with carving than with putting something near it, the reading 'carving into the wood/tree' might be preferable.

[25] Saskya Paṇḍita Kundgaḥ Rgyalmtshan (1182–1251) *Mkhaspa(rnams) ḥjugpaḥi sgo* 'The entrance gate for the expert(s)' (Verhagen 1992: 842).

[26] Pangžuŋ Norbu Bsamgrub (1993: 98).

[27] Quite obviously the ablative markers *las* and *nas* are derived from the (dative)-locative markers *la* and *na*, which might have been unspecific directional markers (DeLancey 1984: 62). The original ablative function of *la* is preserved in a few fixed

phatic (identifying or contrasting, thus defocusing) reading 'that very'. Note the topic position of the PATIENT in (2) and the additional employment of a topic marker in one version of the text. Most often, the verb is related to consumption, and in such cases, both readings are possible. Kaschewsky (1978: 187) found four cases of apparent directional PATIENT marking in the Tibetan version of Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, two times with the verb *za* (*bzaḥ*) 'to eat', one time with the verb *sreg* 'to burn', and one with the verb *gsod* 'to kill'. However, two of these examples can be ruled out. In V 85c *ranpa-tsamdu(ḥaŋ) bzaḥ-bya* the first element is merely an adverbial *ranpar* 'modestly' enlarged by an indefinite quantifier *tsam* 'as much as' (3). In VI 4d the phrase *gsodpar* 'in order to kill' is embedded, and the main verb *rgol* 'to fight with/against, stand up, rebel against' regularly takes the directional marker for the TARGET (4). In IV 25b the directional marker conveys a partitive connotation of non-completedness: the fire is burning for eternities, inflicting pain *on* the body, without consuming it (5), and similarly in VI 54c the grief is gnawing *at* the self without eating it up (6).

(3) | *logpar ltuŋdaŋ mgonmeddaŋ* |
        wrongly fall.PAST-COM protectorless-COM

        | *brtulžugs gnasla bgo-byažiŋ* |
        ascetic.practise-ABS adhere-D/L divide-do.FUT-CC

        | *ranpa-tsamdu bzaḥ-byaste* |
        modest-as.much eat-do.FUT-CC

        | *chosgos gsum magtogspa sbyin* |
        religion.dress three-ABS except give.PRS

        'Distributing [one's belongings] among the pious and the protectorless who fell on the wrong side and eating only modestly, [one] should give away [everything] except the three garments [prescribed by] the religion.'[28]

---

expressions, such as *rtala ḥbab*, "alights from the horse", *bragla mchoŋ(s)*, "jumps down from the rock", *gnamla khaba ḥbab*, "snow falls from the sky" (JÄK sub *la* IV). Note that this function has not been observed for *na*. JÄK also gives *lusla khrag ḥbyin*, "draws blood from the body", but as this passage is from the story of *The hungry Tigress*, the interpretation 'makes blood appear on the body' might be more adequate here (Abel Zadoks, p.c.).

[28] Śāntideva *Byaŋchubsemsdpaḥi spyodpala ḥjugpa*. Delhi edition 1987 fol. 104 (Sanskrit: *vinipātagatānāthavratasthān saṃvibhajya ca bhuñjīta madhyamāṃ mātrāṃ tricīvarabahis tyajet*; cf. Vaidya P.L. 1960. *Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śānti-deva with the commentary Pañjikā of Prajñākaramati*. Darbhanga: The Mithila Insti-tute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning).

(4) | *gaŋdag nordaŋ bkurstiyis* |
         who-PL-ABS wealth-COM honour-ERG/INSTR

        | *drin byin dela brten-gyurpa* |
         favour-ABS give.PAST that-D/L depend-become.PAST-VN

        | *dedag kyaŋ ni sdaŋ ldanpaḥi* |
         that-PL-ABS also TOP wrath/hate-ABS possess-VN-GEN

        | *rjedpon dela* gsodpar *rgol* |
         lord that-D/L *kill.PRS-VN-CC* fight.PRS

        'Even those who had been dependent on the [lord who] bestowed
        [upon them] favour through wealth and honour—[if he is] wrathful,
        [they] will fight <u>against that (very) lord</u> *in order to kill* [him].'[29]

(5) | *dmyalme bzoddkas yunriŋdu* |
         hell-fire-ABS endure-difficult-ERG time.long

        | *bdaggi lusla bsreg-gyurna* |
         I-GEN body-D/L burn-become.PAST-CC

        | *ḥgyodpa mibzad me ḥbarbas [|]*
         remorse ceaseless fire-ABS burn[–CTR]-VN-INSTR

        [|] sems gduŋ-ḥgyurba gdon miza |
         mind-ABS suffer-become.PRS-VN doubt-ABS NG-eat.PRS

        'When the hell's fire, difficult to endure, burns and burns <u>(on) my
        body</u> for an endless time, the mind will suffer, without doubt, from the
        burning fire of ceaseless remorse.'[30]

(6) | *gžandag bdagla midgaḥba* |
         other-PL-ABS I-D/L NG-like.PRS-VN

        | *des ni tshe ḥdiḥam tshe gžanla* |
         that-ERG TOP life this-Q life other-D/L

        | *bdagla zabar-mibyedna* |
         I-D/L eat-NG-do.PRS-CC

        | *bdag ni ciphyir de miḥdod* |
         I-ABS TOP why that-ABS NG-desire.PRS

        | *rñedpaḥi barchad byedpaḥi phyir* |
         gain.PRS-VN-GEN hindrance-ABS do.PRS-VN-GEN because

        '[Given that] other people are unfavourable towards me, would this
        [fact] not <u>gnaw upon/into me</u> in this or another life? As for me, I
        would detest them, [just] because they built up hindrances to [my]
        gaining.'[31]

[29] Fol. 114f. (Sanskrit: *pūjayaty arthamānair yān ye 'pi cainaṃ samāśritāḥ te 'py
enaṃ hantum icchanti svāminaṃ dveṣadurbhagam*).

[30] Fol. 64 (Sanskrit: *ciraṃ dhakṣyati me kāyaṃ nārakāgniḥ suduḥsahaḥ paścāttā-
pānalaś cittaṃ ciraṃ dhakṣyaty aśikṣitam*).

[31] Fol. 132 (Sanskrit: *mayy aprasādo yo 'nyeṣāṃ sa māṃ kiṃ bhakṣayiṣyati iha
janmāntare vāpi yenāsau me 'nabhīpsitaḥ* VI 55a/b *lābhāntarāyakāritvād yady asau*

Such examples are not restricted to translations from Sanskrit; they appear in autochthonous Old Tibetan and Classical Tibetan grammatical and literary texts. Particularly, the partitive type is quite common.

(7)   *...ri dkargyi <u>rtswala</u> zažiŋ*
        mountain white-GEN grass-D/L eat-CC

        sribsri gnaggI [!] <u>cula</u> [!] ḥthuŋžiŋ-mchisnaḥ
        dark.mountain black-GEN water-D/L drink-CC-stay-CC

        '...when [the horse] was eating <u>from the grass</u> of the white [sunny?] mountain (side) and drinking <u>from the water</u> of the black shady mountain (side) ...'[32]

(8)   *<u>rkyagpala</u> zo*
        shit-D/L eat.IMP
        'Eat <u>that very shit/from the shit</u>!'[33]

(9)   *skomna smigrgyuḥi <u>chula</u> ḥthuŋ*
        be.thirsty-CC reflection-GEN water-D/L drink.PRS
        'When I am thirsty I drink even <u>the very water/from the water</u> of the Fata Morgana.'[34]

(10)   *<u>šiŋla</u> gcodpa*
       tree-D/L cut.PRS-VN
       'to cut a/<u>that very tree</u> (?) / cut off <u>parts of a/the tree</u> (?)'[35]

(11)   *<u>šala</u> zažiŋ <u>khragla</u> ḥthuŋba*
       meat-D/L eatPrs-CC blood-D/L drink.PRS-VN
       'to eat <u>that very flesh</u> and to drink <u>that very blood</u> / to eat <u>from the flesh</u> and to drink <u>from the blood</u>'[36]

(12) | *ŋed spreḥu sdodpaḥi nagsla yaŋ* |
       we monkey live.PRS-VN-GEN forest-D/L also

me 'nabhīpsitaḥ).

[32] Old Tibetan funeral text, PT 1136, line 36 (Imaeda et al. 2001: 47).

[33] Old Tibetan graffiti from Khotan (Takeuchi 1998 Vol. II: xvii, note 9). The 'formula' *rkyagpala zožig* also appears in Old Tibetan joking letters in Tun-Huang (Takeuchi 1990: 183, note 13).

[34] Marpa Choskyiblogros (11th century) *Tilopaḥi rnamthar* 'Biography of Tilopa' (Torricelli & Naga 1995: 16/8b2–3).

[35] Anonymous (late 18th/early 19th century), *Sumrtags gžuŋchan legsbšad norbuḥi phreŋba* 'Garland of aphoristic jewels: *Sumrtags*, the basic rules and the commentary' (Bacot 1948: 114: "Couper un arbre" given without context and source, 1957: 23: "Couper le bois"). This example as well as *šiŋgi rtsemona gcod* 'cut (at) the top of the tree' can also be found in the 11th century *Smrasgo* (*Bstanḥgyur* (Peking), vol. Le, fol. 295b, l.5 and 298b, l.5; cited after Thupten Kunga Chashab [2000: 28]) as an example for *las* or the 'second case'.

[36] "Dévorant les chairs et buvant le sang" (Bacot 1948: 114); without context and source.

| *khyod byatshogs yoŋsdaŋ yoŋbžin-yod* |
you bird.multitude-ABS come.PAST-COM come-PRS

| *šiṇbrasla zasdaŋ zabžin-yod* |
tree.fruit-D/L eat.PAST-COM eat-PRS

| *tshurzadaŋ pharza ḥdraḥdra yin* |
hither.eat-COM t*h*ither.eat-ABS equal-ABS be

| *sus sula (sdug)yus byedrgyu-med* |
who-ERG who-D/L fuss-ABS NG-make-FUT

'Into the forest where we monkeys live, you flock of birds came and still [you] are coming; [you] ate and still [you] are eating <u>the very fruits</u> of the trees/<u>from the fruits</u> of the trees. [Your] eating here and [our] eating there are [thus] equal. Nobody needs to make a fuss about anybody.'[37]

Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed (1981: 46 and 1992: 25) claims that the *ladon* particles cannot be used for the PATIENT of verbs such as *za* 'to eat' and *gcod* 'to cut', overlooking the possible partitive reading of the last example, which he gives in order to exemplify the use of the comitative marker *daŋ*.

Il arrive parfois que l'on confonde, dans l'analyse, l'objet marqué (objet cible) et l'objet non-marqué. Dans les deux exemples suivants: *Sha za*, Manger de la viande, *sTa res shing gcod*, Couper le bois avec une hache, il ne s'agit que de l'objet non-marqué ("objet direct"). On ne peut employer *LA* dans ces exemples *Sha la za*, *Shing la gcod*, car "la viande" et "le bois" sont respectivement la "chose" à "manger" et à "couper". Par conséquent, leur fonction n'est pas différente de celle d'un simple objet *[rôle du patient]* (Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed 1992: 25; addition by Tournadre).[38]

In earlier times, some Tibetan speakers were reluctant to use a *ladon* particle with non-directional transitive verbs, while others apparently were not. This could be a regional feature, but it could also be an indicator that in the stage of Old Tibetan or somewhat earlier, the case system of the language was in the process of changing. The possibility of emphatically marking a PATIENT, perhaps inherited from Proto-Tibeto-Burman (see also section 6.3.1 below), apparently vanished in

---

[37] XIth Dalai Lama (1838–1856), *Byasprel gtamrgyud* 'Dispute of the birds and the monkeys' (Skalbzaŋ Ḥgyurmed 1981: 212, no. 7 and 1992: 98).

[38] Similarly Bstanpa Rgyamtsho (1964) as cited by Kaschewsky (1978: 171); he adds the ungrammatical examples *lugla bsaḥ* [?=*bsad*] 'slaughter(ed) *on a sheep' and *sala rko* 'dig ?into the earth'. Dmudge Bsamgtan (1990: 52f.) mentions *dgrala bsad | bzogrwala btsugs | ḥkhorlola bskor* | 'killed *on the enemy (some of the enemies?), installed *in/*on a factory, turned *on the wheel' as being ungrammatical. This does not necessarily mean, however, that the authors refer to real utterances.

Classical Tibetan and survived only in some fixed expressions and some applications with pronouns,[39] cf. Old and Classical Tibetan: *khona* (< *kho* 's/he' + LOC) 'exactly, the very, only'; possibly only Old Tibetan: *dekana* (< *de* 'that' + NOMINALISER[40] + LOC) 'that very (spot)' (with additional directional marker -*r* in the example) in (13); likewise Central Ladakhi: /dinawo/ and /denawo/ (< *ḥdi/de* + LOC + DEFINITENESS MARKER) and Lower Ladakhi (Sham): /dia/ and /dea/ (< *ḥdi/de* + D/L) (14), (15), and (16).[41] The fixed expression 'this very' or 'that very' is, of course, not restricted to the PATIENT role (13) and (17). Note the topic position of the PATIENT in (14).

(13)   *rgyalpo yaŋ myi chad | rta ŋal |*
        king-ABS again man- ABS be.exhausted; horse-ABS be.tired

        yi chad | ga mug |
        mind-ABS be.exhausted; joy[42]-ABS be.exhausted

        munsrosla smag ḥthibspas |
        nightfall-D/L darkness-ABS grow.dark.PAST-VN-CC

        dekanar[43] *gzims ||*
        that.very(LOC)-L/P sleep.PAST

        'As for the king, on the other hand, the man was exhausted, [his] horse was tired, [his] mind was empty (of thoughts) and full of despair. As the darkness grew thick at nightfall, [he] fell asleep at that very spot.'[44]

(14)   *denas phrugu des šig khritsho-gcig phiŋste |*
        then child that-ERG louse ten.thousand-LQ-ABS take.out-CC

        aguḥi gzugspoḥi-kha btaŋspa |
        uncle-GEN body-on place.PAST-VN

        agu dela šiggis zoste
        uncle that.very(D/L)-ABS louse-ERG eat-CC

        smyonpa-mtshogs soŋste
        lunatic-like-ABS become-CC

---

[39] The comparatively frequent use of the dative-locative marker *la* as a topicaliser in the context of predications (Beyer 1992: 278f.) may be a related feature.

[40] But cf. also the West Tibetan postposition /-ka/ 'on'.

[41] A partitive reading of the dative-locative marker *la* is not possible in Ladakhi, and the locative marker *na* is not freely used in Central Ladakhi.

[42] Cf. *ga chad* 'be tired of, fed up' (Goldstein et al. 2001). As *yi* is related to *yid* 'mind' *ga* might be related to *gad(mo)* in the sense of 'joy'.

[43] Emendation by Francke: *dekhanar*.

[44] Muco Ldemdrug or Mucho Sdemdrug (not datable, parts of the text might date from the 9th or 10th century) *Gzermyig* (Francke 1924–30, Fol. 79a, 1.5).

'Then that child produced (lit. took out) some ten thousand of lice and placed them on the uncle's body, and as <u>that very uncle</u> was [almost] eaten up by the lice, [he] became like a lunatic...'[45]

(15)   <u>dia</u> zost^eaŋet, ŋas, ya
       this.very(D/L)-ABS eat-VOL-PRS I-ERG INTJ
       'This very [hail stone] I will eat, yes!'[46]

(16)   khecaraŋ <u>dea</u> zose thuŋse soŋšik!
       you-PL that.very(D/L)-ABS eat-CC drink-CC go.PAST-IMP.PL
       'Go away after you have eaten and drunk <u>that very [offering]</u>!'[46]

(17)   <u>deakat</u> chana dzamliŋ khos ld^eaok
       that.very(D/L).some-ABS go-CC world-ABS s/he-ERG lick.up-FUT

       'If <u>that very [demon]</u> could go [free] he would destroy (lit. lick up) the world.'[46]

6.   EVIDENCE FROM TIBETO-BURMAN

Tibeto-Burman languages show a great variety of case marking and agreement systems. I can thus only give a summarising overview of a few Tibeto-Burman languages.[47] Generally, case marking is governed more by pragmatic than by syntactic principles. Three main tendencies become visible:

6.1. Primary versus secondary 'object' marking

The agreement systems apparently all follow the "dechticaetiative" (Blansitt 1984) pattern of primary versus secondary object marking (Dryer 1986), shortly 'primary marking'. According to this pattern, the PATIENT/THEME of a transitive sentence (P2) is treated like the RECIPIENT/BENEFICIARY of a bi-transitive sentence (R3). There are thus two logical possibilities: (a) Both P2 and R3 receive the same case marker and P3 (the PATIENT/THEME of the bi-transitive sentence) remains in the absolutive. (b) P2 and R3 remain in the absolutive, while P3 receives a case marker. Following pattern (a), agreement—if possible—will be typically with P2 and R3,[48] but never with P3, e.g.

---

[45]   A Lower Ladakhi version from the Kesar epic (Francke 1905–41: 88.5–7).

[46]   Kesar epic, collected 1996 in Khalatse, Lower Ladakh.

[47]   I am grateful to Kristin Meier (University of Leiden) for looking through the relevant literature.

[48]   "Objects" other than speech act participants are typically not indexed. In such cases, A2/3 (the AGENT) will be indexed instead if the language shows obligatory agreement of exactly one constituent.

Westhimalayan (Kinnauri), Kiranti (Yamphu and Hayu), Gyarong, Nungish (Răwang and Trung/Dúlóng).[49]

In syntactic typology, agreement and constituent order are treated on the same level as morphological case marking on nouns (see Dixon 1994: 1, 39–69). Morphological ergativity could thus "be expressed in the case marking of nominal arguments as well as in the way such arguments are indexed in the verb" (Kepping 1994: 344). Looking at the Tibeto-Burman languages, however, I have some doubt whether agreement, constituent order, and case marking can be compared more than superficially.

Although Tibeto-Burman agreement is related to semantic roles, it is primarily concerned with the marking of speech act participants, not with the marking of particular roles. The marking of speech act participants follows the animacy hierarchy, so that a participant of the higher end might be indexed "regardless of its syntactic role," whereas a PATIENT participant at the lower end is not indexed, as for example in Tangut, where the AGENT is indexed instead (Kepping 1994: 339). Only a very small set of roles can compete for marking, namely AGENT (including EXPERIENCER and UNDERGOER), RECIPIENT/BENE-FICIARY, and PATIENT/THEME. These roles are again selected according to a hierarchy of saliency or givenness with the RECIPIENT/BENE-FICIARY (prototypically human, at least animate) being higher than the PATIENT/THEME (prototypically inanimate or rather neutral). Primary marking seems to be quite natural for a system of agreement with speech act participants, as it obviously reflects the saliency hierarchy of the roles RECIPIENT/BENEFICIARY (human, animate) > PATIENT/THEME (neutral).

This hierarchy is reflected also in the constituent order so that the RECIPIENT/BENEFICIARY or Indirect Object typically precedes the PA-TIENT/THEME or Direct Object in many languages (e.g., German, and likewise Tibetan). Constituent ordering, again, may be affected by a NP or definiteness hierarchy or prosodic principles, so that pronouns may precede nouns, and definite terms may precede indefinite terms, possibly overriding the saliency hierarchy (e.g., in German, accusative pronouns quite naturally precede dative full nouns).

Morphological case marking, on the other hand, is triggered primarily by the semantic role, quite independently from the status of the speech act participant, although in many languages pragmatic factors

---

[49] Gyarong: Nagano (1984), Hayu: Michailovsky (1988), Kinnauri: Takahashi (2001), Răwang: Sarep (1996), Trung/Dúlóng: Sūn (1982), Yamphu: Rutgers (1998).

such as givenness or definiteness can interfere, as in the case of the widely attested differential object marking.

These structural differences are often blurred by a not very convincing terminology whereby the semantically clearly distinguishable roles RECIPIENT/BENEFICIARY and PATIENT/THEME are lumped together into one category on the basis of seemingly similar syntactic behaviour. Thus the 'patient' appears to be more a syntactic than a semantic category. But even if one admits that in ergative languages PATIENTS tend to be syntactic categories as well, it does not seem to be helpful if the two categories, which due to different semantic conceptualisations show structurally different behaviour (one taking overt markers, the other none), are not differentiated by terminology. One motivation for this approach is to rescue a sort of 'inverted' ergative classification[50] for an agreement pattern where the "patient" (i.e. P2 and R3) and possibly the intransitive subject receive an overt marker, thus not really being "absolutive" (cf. van Driem 1991; Kepping 1994).

Quite obviously, the etymology of 'patient' as being something 'affected' or 'suffering' may lead to the idea that the RECIPIENT of the THEME or the BENEFICIARY (or 'maleficiary') of the action is more affected and thus more 'patient' than the thing transferred (THEME) or the thing transformed (PATIENT). But if we follow this line of argument,[51] we would end up with the conclusion that TARGETS receiving a directional marker in Tibetan, e.g. the dog being hit,[52] might be more 'patient'-like than a typical PATIENT in the absolutive, e.g. the dog being killed. After all, a dead dog cannot be much 'affected' anymore by the fact that its state has been transformed substantially. There being nothing against this kind of reasoning, we then simply need another word for what is more commonly called a PATIENT.

Particularly in the discussion of ergativity, the PATIENT is seen as something that changes its state or, more typically, as something the

---

[50] LaPolla (1992) calls it "anti-ergative."

[51] Van Driem (pp. 528f.) combines this with a somewhat tortuous reasoning why it is, after all, not mysogynous to mark the partner (if not owner) of a murdered wife as a 'maleficiary' of an action in a sentence like German *Die haben mir die Frau getötet* 'They have killed me the wife'. There is no need to worry: each widow (or mother or owner of an animal) could say the same kind of sentence about a murdered husband (child, animal). In such constructions, the dative marks an additional intentional complement (not provided by the standard frame) as being involved in the event, in one way or another. Typically such expressions indicate the helplessness and emotional afflictedness of the involuntary participant.

[52] To prevent any misunderstanding: TARGETS are not necessarily animate (e.g., one can hit (on) a table) and merely potentially affected, as in the case of an animal one aims at without shooting.

state of which is changed by external force. More specifically, a THEME is an entity that changes its place by itself or by external force (in both cases I would prefer a distinction in terms of valency, thus UNDERGOER for the sole complement of [–control] verbs). The RECIPIENT is understood as the prototypically human someone to which the PATIENT or THEME is transferred. The BENEFICIARY is the one who benefits (or as a 'maleficiary' possibly suffers) from the action. Following this definition, PATIENT/THEME and RECIPIENT/BENEFICIARY do not behave syntactically identically in a language with primary marking, since the former participant receives the morphological marker only when the latter is absent. The marking of the PATIENT or THEME depends upon valency, that of the RECIPIENT or BENEFICIARY does not.

I would expect that primary marking is less likely to be found in nominal case marking systems, although I do not wish to preclude that case marking may be affected by the patterns of agreement if both systems co-occur. But it is not self-evident that the pattern of primary marking is easily transferred from one system to the other, and I do not think we are allowed to assume that the system(s) of case marking in Proto-Tibeto-Burman showed the same pattern as the agreement system that might be reconstructed.

6.2. Case marking for TARGETS

Nevertheless, according to Dryer (1986: 817) the pattern of primary marking would also be found as a nominal case marking system in Magaric (Kham). In fact, such patterns do occur, but only under specific conditions (see the next section). In his example sentences, however, the "object" marker is found with the TARGET and the RECIPIENT, not with the typical PATIENT; see examples (18) through (20). LaPolla (1992), who presents the same examples, even claims that this pattern could be found in Ladakhi and "at least fifty" other languages (p. 3f.), while in the case of Balti and a number of other languages "the accusative [!] is generally unmarked, but the dative or dative-locative marker is sometimes or often used for accusative [!] arguments" (p. 4). Similarly, DeLancey (1984: 70, note 3) states that

> The use of allative/dative markers with definite, animate, or potentially ambiguous objects is a common phenomenon throughout the world, and occurs in a number of TB languages (e.g. Burmese, Jinghpaw, and all [!] dialects of Tibetan) [...] Moreover there is a widespread (and proba-

bly PTB) locative la [...] which serves that function in, for example,
Tibetan.

As far as Ladakhi and Balti are concerned, the directional case marker
la or an equivalent postposition can by no means be used for a typical
PATIENT (17') (and in general, with the possible exception of differen-
tial object marking, this is also true for Old and Classical Tibetan,
Lhasa Tibetan, Nangchenpa (Kham), Rebkong and Themchen (Amdo)
and quite probably a great number other modern Tibetan varieties).
However, the directional case marker is in fact used for the TARGET of
a small set of agentive and affective verbs. The agentive set (with er-
gative marking for the AGENT) typically contains verbs such as
beat/hit (at) (18'), *look at* (19'), *listen to/obey, hold on, wait for, speak
to* and most two-place realisations of communication verbs.[53] The af-

---

[53] The number may vary from variety to variety. For Ladakhi I was able to sys-
tematically document a set of—at present—828 verbs. 67 agentive verbs show a di-
rectional pattern obligatorily or alternatively in at least one version (cf. Zeisler 2003
with 47 verbs), while in Amdo Themchen only 12 such verbs have been observed
within a set of 574 verbs (Haller, 2004: 75–134, nos. 73–646). At least 20 verbs are
attested in Classical Tibetan. Unfortunately, the available dictionaries often remain si-
lent or underspecified with respect to the argument structure of the verbs, and Hackett
(2003) is of no great help either. First of all, with 688 verbs, he covers less than 60%
of the Classical Tibetan verbs (1189 in Zhang 1993). Secondly, his material is drawn
only from religious texts. Thirdly, his terminology is entirely based on Wilson (1992)
who allegedly follows the Tibetan grammatical tradition.

However useful a traditional approach might be for a language student in a Tibetan
environment, the classification of verbs into eight major or fourteen minor paradigms
is Wilson's innovation, and it is neither based on good intuitions nor on linguistic in-
sight, as all classes describe verbs with basically two arguments. E.g., the verbs of
class III are characterised in the following way: "all have nominative subjects and,
sometimes optionally, objective case qualifiers" (Wilson 1992: 228). Hackett (2003)
thus subsumes inagentive state or inchoative one-place verbs like *na* 'be ill' and *ḥchi |
ši* 'die' under class III without reflecting the difference between non-obligatory core
arguments licensed by the verb meaning, such as the goal of a movement, and addi-
tional satellite arguments of location that can combine with any verb. If his classifica-
tion is motivated by sentences like *the enemy died on the battlefield* one wonders why
gsod | bsad | gsad | sod 'kill' is still classified as V (the normal ergative pattern) but
not as VI (the directional pattern) although there might be sentences like *the king
killed in the battlefield but never at home*. The satellite argument of location is treated
as *las* (Wilson's and Hackett's "objective") in the Tibetan grammatical tradition. In
terms of Tibetan grammatical tradition, it remains debatable whether inagentive verbs
can have a *las* argument (similar to the rotating of an engine-wheel in a factory or to
the moving towards a goal, discussed in section 3.1 above). And it is by no means
self-understood that verbs like *na* 'be ill', or *ḥkhar* 'be stuck, impeded', *ḥkhol | khol*
'boil [–ctr]' (class III) have to be interpreted as dynamic verbs, while *skom | skoms*
'be thirsty', *skyo* 'be sad', *skrag* 'be afraid' (all class II, "Nominative-Locative") can
only be interpreted as state verbs.

Out of Hackett's 688 verbs, 30 are classified as "VI" or "Agentive-Objective"
(Thanks to Nicola Westermann for looking through the 'dictionary' and listing all in-
stances). But not all instances are accompanied by a valid example, and some turn out

fective set (with absolute for the BEARER of Emotion) contains verbs such as *like, be happy with/about, rejoice at, fear/be afraid of.*

(18)   *nga: zihm nga-jxy-ke.*
KHM   1SG house 1SG-build-PAST
        'I built a house.'[54]

(18')   *ŋas naŋ r̥tsikspin.*
LAD   I-ERG house-ABS build-PAST
        'I built a house.'[55]

(19)   *no-e ka:h-lay poh-ke-o.*
KHM   3SG-ERG dog-OBJ beat-PAST-3SG
        'He beat (on/against) the dog.'[56]

(19')   *khos khia rduŋs.*
LAD   s/he-ERG dog-D/L beat.PAST
        'S/he beat (on/against) the dog.'[55]

(20)   *no-e nga-lay cyu:-na-ke-o.*
KHM   3SG-ERG 1SG-OBJ watch-1SG-PAST-3SG
        'He watched/looked at me.'[57]

(20')   *ŋas khoa l̥taspin.*
LAD   I-ERG s/he-D/L watch-PAST
        'I watched/looked at him/her.'[55]

Similar verbs are attested in many Tibeto-Burman languages. Agentive: *beat* (Lhomi, Rongpo, Shǐxīng, Prinmi, Gyarong,[58] Răwang, Lahu[59]), *look at/for* (Lhomi, Răwang) and *see* [?] (Rongpo, Răwang),

---

to be three-place verbs, such as *mchod* 'offer', *hbyug | byugs* 'smear, anoint', or three place collocations, such as *yid rton* 'rely' or more literally 'place one's confidence upon' and *dbaŋ sgyur | bsgyur* 'govern, rule' or more literally 'transform someone (as to be) under one's power' (here the verb is, of course, *sgyur | bsgyur* not *dbaŋ!*). Other three-place verbs, such as *ster* 'give' or *ston | bstan* 'show' are classified as class V or "Agentive-Nominative" verbs. This categorisation might reflect the traditional Tibetan distinction between *las* and *ched/sbyin* and thus between the 'second case' and the 'fourth case'—although this is nowhere discussed—, but the choice of either the second or the third argument as a criterion for the classification and the neglect of the fact that there is another argument is unmotivated, to say the least.

All in all, there remain 20 two-place verbs showing an agentive-directional pattern in at least one reading, and some more might be hidden under false labels. A projection to the full vocabulary might yield about 40 such verbs. The percentage is apparently lower than in Ladakhi.

[54]   Dryer (1986: 817, no. 22 a); cf. Watters (1973: 44).
[55]   Elicited data from Domkhar, Lower Ladakh.
[56]   Dryer (1986: 817, no. 22 b); cf. Watters (1973: 46).
[57]   Dryer (1986: 817, no. 22 a); cf. Watters (1973: 54), who uses a plural TARGET.
[58]   The directional marker is only optionally used.
[59]   Probably only in contrastive use.

listen to (Dzongkha, Prinmi), *wait for* (Lhomi, Răwang), *help* (Thakali, Răwang, Trung/Dúlóng), *talk/speak/say to* (Shĭxīng, Trung/Dúlóng), *ask* (Trung/Dúlóng), *call* (Răwang), *name* (Thakali), *abuse, scold* (Trung/Dúlóng, Shĭxīng), *intimidate* (Trung/Dúlóng), *chase, pursue* (Răwang, Trung/Dúlóng), *search* (Trung/Dúlóng), *care for* (Prinmi), *rely on* (Dzongkha), additionally also *slaughter* and *shoot death* (Prinmi), *arrest* and *put* (Răwang). Affective: *love* (Dzongkha, Prinmi, Trung/Dúlóng), *like* (Răwang), *be afraid of* (Shĭx-īng).[60]

The prepositional complements in the English equivalents would not be classified as Direct Objects and the sentences would be considered as intransitive. In some cases, the English equivalent might have an alternative translation with a Direct Object, e.g. *observe* for *look at*, and a few verbs might only be translated into English by transitive verbs. This does not mean, however, that these verbs are transitive in Tibetan, and that there is a Direct Object or patient that receives a directional marker by accident. In the case of Tibetan, at least, the directional marker is not a "patient" or "object" marker.[61]

6.3. *Floating case marking*

In contrast to the agreement patterns, which appear to be applied quite consistently, Tibeto-Burman case marking is rather flexible or even unpredictable, as it is governed by pragmatic rather than syntactic or semantic criteria. Due to these pragmatic criteria, such as givenness and definiteness, case markers might either be omitted or used with complements that would normally not receive any case marker.

6.3.1. *Case marking on definite PATIENTS (differential object marking)*
According to Tournadre (1994: 645) directional marking could be used for particular emphasis on the PATIENT. He compares this to the

---

[60] Dzongkha: van Driem (1998), Lahu: Matisoff (1973), Lhomi: Vesalainen & Vesalainen (1980), Prinmi: Lù Shàozūn (2001), Rongpo: Sharmā (2001), Shĭxīng: Huáng Bùfán & Rénzēng Wàngmŭ (1991), Thakali: Georg (1996); for the rest see note 49 above.

[61] Although one may frequently find the terms "patient marker" (Liú Lù 1984; Huáng Bùfán & Rénzēng Wàngmŭ 1991) and "object" marker or case (Caughley 1982; Keping 1982. Lustig [2002]) in the literature on Tibeto-Burman languages, both terms are applicable only insofar as a RECIPIENT could be a "patient" (i.e. an affected entity) or indirect objects could be "objects". One should perhaps avoid such under-specified terms even for primary marking. The same holds for the "accusative" noun particle or case (Matisoff 1973, Keping 1985), and particularly for the "absolutive marker" (van Driem 1991; Kepping 1994. Note that this *contradictio in adjecto* has been formulated for an overt marker in contrast to the non-marker *zero*.

optional use of the ergative marker with intransitive verbs or with transitive verbs in present tense constructions where the ergative marker is typically omitted.

(21) a. *yā: šön̠pare:*
          male.yak-ABS ride-PAST

          '[He] rode (/sat on) a yak.'

      b. *yā:la šön̠pare:*
          male.yak-D/L ride-PAST

          'It's a yak [he] rode (/sat on) [not a horse].'[62]

(22) a. *Lōpsaŋ yāki: tuŋsoŋ*
          Lopsaŋ-ABS male.yak-ERG hit-PAST

          "Lopsaŋ was hit by a yak('s horn)." [? perhaps better: 'As for Lobsang, a yak hit him.']

      b. *yāki: Lōpsaŋla tuŋsoŋ*
          male.yak-ERG Lopsaŋ-D/L hit-PAST

          "It is Lopsaŋ who was hit by the yak." [? perhaps better: 'The yak hit (against) Lopsaŋ.'][63]

I am not sure whether this is the only possible explanation. With respect to 'riding', two alternative frames have been available in history: a transitive frame 'to ride' with an ergative AGENT and an absolutive PATIENT and an intransitive frame 'to mount/sit *on* a horse etc.' with an absolutive AGENT and a dative-locative location or GOAL (JÄK sub *žon*).[64] While in Lhasa Tibetan, it is the transitive frame that has become the standard frame, it is the intransitive frame in West Tibetan. But does this necessarily mean that the other option (or the original meaning) is no longer available? Unfortunately, Tournadre presents

---

[62] Tournadre (1994: 645, no. 18 a/b; spelling and glosses are mine).

[63] Tournadre (1994: 645, no. 19 a/b; spelling and glosses are mine).

[64] Cf. *khyodkyis ḥbrugrta sŋonpo žonla | khugla šogcig* 'You take (lit. ride/mount) the blue dragon-horse, and go and summon [him]!' (*Gzermyig* (Francke 1924–30, Fol. 87a2), but also *bagma rtala žon nas* 'as/when the bride rides/rode (on) a horse' (*Gzermyig*, Francke 1924–30, Fol. 14a4). As English *ride* vs. *ride on/get a ride*, the two constructions might perhaps express a difference in control over the horse (thanks to Christopher Beckwith for pointing this out). Francke, actually, contrasts the two phrases in his translation as 'mount a horse' and 'arrive on horse back'. Particularly in the context of a wedding, a bride might be expected not to ride a horse as she might do at other times, but to sit on it passively and let her be taken away. But the first example does not necessarily imply more than just mounting the horse. The notion of eventually getting to another place (which would be implied in the connotation of driving the horse) is typically expressed by a different motion verb. Cf. also JÄK who glosses the absolutive variant *bžonpa žonpa* as "to mount a horse or a carriage".

the example without an AGENT NP, so that it cannot be decided whether it is a case of alternative frames or, in fact, a case of emphatic marking.

In the case of 'hitting', the verb /t<u>u</u>ŋ/ follows the standard ergative pattern in Old and Classical Tibetan (*rduŋ | brduŋs | brduŋ | rduŋs*) and in many modern central and eastern varieties; apparently West Tibetan is the great exception, with /rduŋ ; rduŋs/ 'to hit, strike, beat' following the directional pattern.[65] But what is puzzling is that in contrast to Tournadre's translation, Lopsaŋ takes the topic position in the first alternative, not in the second one, so that one would expect that the emphasis on Lopsaŋ is found in the first, not in the second alternative. There is a similar example in Gyalthang (Kham) Tibetan, where rather unexpectedly the verb /daŋ/ 'to hit' (CT *rduŋ | brduŋs | brduŋ | rduŋs*) shows directional marking for the second complement, while the neighbouring dialect Bathang doesn't; see example (22). As far as I understood Hongladarom (2000), she would assume that the dative marker is triggered by the loss or neutralisation of the ergative marker for the first complement. But this is not necessarily the case, since the dative marker also appears with an ergative first complement. As the translation suggests, the verb /ɲaŋ/ 'sniff at' is a candidate for directional marking in Tibetan.[66]

(23)   a.   *khonakein ɲa-go daŋ-ɕaŋ* (Gyalthang)
             3P-all-ø 1S-DAT hit(AUX oriented towards 1)
             'All of them hit <u>me</u>.'

       b.   *khö ŋa duŋ-ɕuŋ* (Bathang)
             3S-ERG 1S-ø hit(AUX oriented towards 1)
             'He hit me.'

       c.   *tshə-ji ɲa-go ɲaŋ ʔoŋ-nə* (Gyalthang)
             dog-ERG 1S-DAT smell come(AUX oriented towards other)
             'The dog sniffed <u>at me</u>.'[67]

---

[65] Other *beating* verbs of the directional type are CT *rdeg(s) | (b)rdegs | brdeg | rdeg(s)* 'to beat, strike', Themchen /ɕtɕar, ɕtɕor/ (?< *gcar/gcor*) 'to strike' and /ɣɲoɣ/ (?< *gñog/rñog*) 'to beat up, thrash' (Felix Haller, Universität Bern, p.c.).

[66] In CT *snom | bsnams | bsnam | snoms* allows an absolutive second complement as well as a dative-locative second complement depending on whether one means 'to smell' as a mere perception: *sposkyi drima žim snar bsnams* | 'the sweet smell of the incense was smelled in the nose' or 'to sniff' as a directed activity: *mi rganpoḥi khala nyan* [!] | *za žimpoḥi drila snoms* | 'Listen to the words (lit. mouth) of an old person and sniff at the smell of the delicious food!' (BR sub *snompa*).

[67] Hongladarom (2002).

If the marking of what seems to be a PATIENT is restricted to verbs with directional connotations, and if these verbs are, in fact, attested with a directional pattern in related varieties, we should perhaps take this as an 'inheritance' from an earlier directional pattern, which resurfaces under certain conditions. This diachronic stance can only be ruled out by examples of differential object marking with verbs that do not have a directional connotation.

While we certainly need more research into this topic with respect to the Tibetan languages, differential object marking has been observed in other Tibeto-Burman languages. E.g., in Pangi-Kinnauri (Takahashi 2002), the PATIENT of a transitive sentence may receive the same case marker as the RECIPIENT in a bi-transitive sentence, under the condition that the PATIENT is highly specific. The case marker might thus be restricted to names, pronouns, and definite objects (in contrast to, e.g., mass nouns):

(24)   *gɨs <u>kinū</u> saček / nu <u>mīpɨṅ</u> sāk*
      I-ERG you-DAT kill.1/2OBJ.PAST.1SUBJ / this man-DAT kill.PAST.1SUBJ
      'I killed <u>you</u>[68] / this man.'

(25)   *ju kʰau / ?kʰaupɨṅ haes zād*
      this food-ø / ?food-DAT who-ERG eat.PAST.3SUBJ
      'Who ate this food?'

(26)   *gɨ/gɨs ju pen <u>kinū</u> ketok*
      I-ø/ERG this pen-ø you-DAT give.1/2OBJ.FUT.1SUBJ
      'I will give <u>you</u> this pen.'[69]

In Kham Magaric, an animacy hierarchy has been observed in elicitation, according to which the use of the directional marker for the PATIENT is restricted to human nouns, particularly names and pronouns. However, various principles interact in discourse. In narrations, proper names and human pronouns are highly specific and thus regularly receive the directional marker; the same holds for personified animals. Generally, definiteness and givenness trigger the directional marker. The directional marker is further obligatory in complement verb constructions (which formally, at least, correspond to bi-transitive constructions) and in transitive dependent clauses, when the matrix verb is intransitive (Watters 1973: 199–202).

Similarly, in Dolakha Newari, case marking for PATIENTS is used only for animate PATIENTS, and only if they are given and crucial to

---

[68] In some dialects the pronoun of the addressee remains in the absolutive: *ki*.
[69] Takahashi (2002).

the story, and for human PATIENTS if they are given or accessible (Genetti 1997: 48). Since the case marking on such PATIENTS is obligatory, bi-transitive sentences may show directional case marking on both the RECIPIENT and the PATIENT (28).

(27)   *āpsin ā̱m̱ṯa̱ wā hirā=e jā bir-ju*
       3PL:ERG 3SG:DAT TOP diamond.GEN rice give.3SG:PST
       'They gave <u>him</u> rice made of diamonds.'[70]

(28)   *āle* āmta *bhānche=ta bir-ju*
       then 3SG:DAT cook.DAT give.3SG:PST
       'Then he gave *her* (in marriage) <u>to the cook</u>.'[71]

This pattern can no longer be subsumed under primary marking. Genetti (1997: 38–39, 52, 53) thus argues that

> one cannot divide Dolakha objects into two separate classes based on morphosyntactic behavior. Instead [...] patients and recipients together form a single syntactic category of object, and [...] the assignment of case-marking in Dolakha is independent of grammatical relations.

> Casemarked objects in Dolakha do not fit into either a primary object, a direct object, or a split object pattern.

> There are no syntactic rules in this language that distinguish between categories of objects; that is, there are no rules which make a distinction between either DO/IO or PO/SO.

Some qualification seems to be in order. Case marking or word order *per se* might not be sufficient to determine a syntactic category or semantic relation. It might be more fruitful to view each complement with respect to its syntactic or semantic weight (i.e. its position in the salience hierarchy) and in relation to all other complements and their natural order. There might also be further criteria. But the question of whether or not a complement allows variation in case marking appears to be related to its position or weight in the frame. Variation of case marking is syntactic behaviour as well. In the case of Dolakha Newari, there is an obvious difference between RECIPIENT and PATIENT: it is only the PATIENT that may or may not receive the directional marker, whereas the RECIPIENT never appears in the absolutive. Therefore there is, in fact, a distinction, not between primary and secondary objects, but between the syntactic categories Direct and Indirect Object.

---

[70] Genetti (1997: 37, no. 1).
[71] Genetti (1997: 41, no. 8).

6.3.2. *Omission of case marking*

By contrast, other languages may opt for economy, and although there are particular case frames assigned to individual verbs, the case marker is omitted in most sentences and only applied if the sentence would otherwise be ambiguous. In the modern Tibetan varieties a general tendency can be observed to omit overt case markers, although the frequency of the omission and its motivation may vary, sometimes even between close dialects, as in Gyalthang and Bathang Tibetan, mentioned above. The Gyalthang case markers are not used "when the speaker simply reports an event without highlighting the agent or the patient" (Hongladarom 2002). So far, there is plenty of evidence for the omission of the ergative marker to de-emphasise the AGENT in cases where the AGENT is evident.[72] With respect to the omission of directional markers for TARGETS, however, the evidence is rather scanty.

In urban Lhasa Tibetan one can observe a strong tendency to omit the directional marker, cf. also Saxena 1991: 115 for optional case marking of the RECIPIENT. I encountered this feature in a language course at Lhasa University in 1994. To my questions concerning the missing marker for a LOCATION the teacher replied: "Well, you are right, theoretically it should be there, but we never use it." I do not know whether this statement could possibly also include TARGETS, since at that time I had no sensibility for this sentence pattern. On the other hand, I did not realise any unusual case marking or non-marking of RECIPIENTS that would confirm Saxena's observation.

For Ladakhi and Balti one might perhaps say that overt case markers can be omitted, particularly in narrations, but no regular pattern can be observed. Most frequently, it is the ergative marker that is deleted; in Balti one may also observe the omission of the genitive marker (Bielmeier 1985: 142). I have not yet come across the deletion of a directional marker for the EXPERIENCER, RECIPIENT, TARGET, GOAL, or LOCATION. Thus only the second alternative (b) of (21) and (22) would be acceptable.

Due to an ongoing reorganisation of the case marking system, some verbs may have alternative verb frames, so that a particular complement may or may not receive a particular case marker. E.g., the RE-

---

[72] This might be the case if the AGENT argument is in topic position or is the only animate complement (Che 1992: 55, 57; Agha 1993: 22–24; Tournadre 1996: 291). It has also been observed that the ergative marker might be omitted if the speaker talks about him- or herself (Takeuchi & Takahashi 1994: 653).

SULT of a transformation receiving the locative-purposive marker in
Old and Classical Tibetan would typically not receive any marking,
but the marking of the RESULT with the dative-locative would not be
considered to be wrong, since the marker may depend on the acciden-
talness of the transformation. Marginal patterns vary between dialects
or from speaker to speaker. Finally, there is some regular variation
that goes along with a shift of focus (verbs of the *spray/load* type) or
with a shift of meaning (see also Zeisler, Forthcoming). Definiteness
plays a role for the constituent order, but apparently not for case mark-
ing.

CONCLUSION

Case marking in Tibeto-Burman is in general much more flexible
and context sensitive than could be expected from a traditional ac-
count of case marking systems or from the classification as a nomina-
tive or ergative language. The use of case markers might always go
along with a certain (weaker or stronger) connotation of emphasis or
contrast and the non-application of case markers may always signal
the absence of such emphasis or contrast. Standard verb frames, ac-
cording to which particular case markers could be expected or not, al-
low a threefold gradation of emphasis. The connotation of emphasis or
contrast of the case markers is strongest when applied contrary to ex-
pectation; likewise, the connotation of de-emphasis is strongest when
the non-marking occurs against expectation; the application or non-
application of case markers according to the basic frame has a neutral
value.[73]   In Tibeto-Burman languages we can observe a pattern of
primary marking at the level of verb agreement, but it does not seem
to be possible to postulate a full-fledged pattern of primary marking
for morphological case marking for Proto-Tibetan, particularly since
case marking systems follow a different logic than agreement systems.
As far as I know, none of the Tibetan varieties shows a full-fledged
pattern of primary marking. The directional markers are typically re-
stricted to directional activities and affections, and differential object
marking is apparently quite rare.

But I cannot preclude the possibility that an earlier pattern of pri-
mary marking has been reorganised toward an ergative system in bi-

---

[73] This general principle does not rule out the possibility that speech economy may
lead to a shift of the neutral value toward the general omission of case marking.

valent clauses with the marking becoming optional for PATIENTS but remaining obligatory for TARGETS. As a second step in such a hypothetical development, the contrastive marking of a PATIENT would have been lost, as we can observe in the modern varieties. Finally, even the marking of TARGETS might become optional in the future. Differential object marking, however, is not necessarily the remnant of an earlier pattern of primary marking, though it may itself lead from the standard accusative or ergative pattern to a pattern of primary marking. And perhaps this direction of development is the more natural one.

Although typical PATIENT complements appear in the Tibetan grammatical literature as examples of the *kāraka*-relation *las* or *karman*, they cannot be treated as PATIENTS or Direct Objects in such contexts. The directional case marker, which inevitably has to be joined to a *las*, pushes them out of their original role and transforms them into TARGETS or LOCATIONS. The prototypical instantiation of *las* (*byabaḥi yul* or *lassu byaba*) is the GOAL of a movement verb. Despite its origin in Sanskrit terminology, *las* as a *kāraka*-relation does not refer to a prototypical PATIENT. For contemporary Tibetan scholars, at least, it is clear that the Tibetan *kāraka*-relations do not match the Sanskrit *kāraka*-relations exactly.[74] Therefore, in the context of case grammar and the *kāraka*-relations, we should no longer translate the term *las* and its equivalents *lassu byaba* and *byabaḥi yul* as 'object' or even 'direct object', but rather as 'GOAL', 'TARGET', or, taking the most common term literally, as 'location of activity'.

The *kāraka*-relation *las* cannot be delimited by the semantic notion of the original term *karman* (which itself unifies various semantic roles), but has to be defined with respect to its syntactic behaviour. In the context of the theory of *bdag* and *gžan*, the extension of *las* is expanded, introducing the entity to be transformed or accomplished, the 'object' or 'PATIENT', into the sphere of *gžan*; at the same time it is restricted, excluding the GOAL of a movement verb from the sphere of *gžan*. It is important to keep in mind that the *kāraka* section and the section on *bdag/gžan* represent two different approaches to different grammatical questions, which are only loosely interrelated.[75] One may

---

[74] One of the Tibetan scholars attending the 10th seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Oxford University, September 2003 made this point very clear in his comment on my presentation.

[75] While the theory of *bdag* and *gžan* can be used to identify those 'transitive' verbs that need the 'actor marker' *byedsgra* or 'third case', the classification of the temporal and modal verb stems and complex verb phrases as belonging to different

speculate whether or not the texts to which they primarily belong represent different epochs and/or grammatical schools. Although later commentators accept these texts as having been written by the same author, the legendary Thonmi Sambhoṭa, the two sections are typically treated independently, and with few exceptions, the terminology adopted remains context-dependent. The partial amnesia as displayed between the sections turns out to be a stratagem allowing commentators to account for instances where the AGENT of directional activities receives an ergative marker.

ABBREVIATIONS

1. Dictionaries
BR   Zhang 1993
JÄK   Jäschke (1881)

2. Texts
RKḤ   *Rtagskyi ḥjugpa*
SCP   *Sumcupa*

3. Languages
CT   Classical Tibetan
KHM   Kham (Magaric)
LAD   Ladakhi
SKR, Skr.   Sanskrit

4. Grammatical terms
ABS   absolutive (zero)
CC   clause chaining
[±CTR]   [±control]
COM   comitative
ERG   ergative (Instrumental as Subject case)

---

spheres in terms of *bdag* and *gžan* does not say anything about the applicability of the ergative marker according to a temporal or aspectual split: the actor invariably receives the marker in the example sentences, whether the actual verb form would be classified as belonging to the sphere of *bdag* (present tense forms, commands, and prohibitions), as belonging to *gžan* (future tense forms), or as belonging to no sphere at all (past tense forms). The important thing is that all tense forms of a 'transitive' verb such as *gcod | bcad | gcad | chod* 'to cut' are in one way or another essentially related to a differing actor in contrast to a [− control] 'intransitive' verb of result such as *ḥchad | chad* 'to be cut' where there is no such dichotomy (Pangžuŋ Norbu Bsamgrub 1993: 201; cf. Situ Paṇchen 1744: 145, 151 ad *RKḤ* verse 10d) or in contrast to a [+control] movement verb where actor and activity are presented as being virtually identical (Dmudge Bsamgtan 1990: 59f.; cf. Situ Paṇchen 1744: 145f., 151 ad *RKḤ* verse 10d).

D/L	dative-locative
DES	desiderative
DEF	definiteness marker
FUT	future tense (unspecified)
GEN	genitive
INSTR	instrumental
INTJ	interjection
LQ	limiting quantifier: 'one', 'some'
LOC	locative
L/P	locative-purposive
NG	negation
PAST	past tense (unspecified)
PL	plural
PRS	present tense (unspecified)
Q	alternative question marker
TOP	topic particle
VN	nominaliser (verbal noun)

REFERENCES

Agha, Asif 1993. *Structural form and utterance context in Lhasa Tibetan. Grammar and indexicality in a non-configurational language.* New York: Peter Lang.

Akya Yoṅshdzin Dbyaṅscan Dgaḥbaḥi Blogros (18th–19th century). *Rtagskyi ḥjugpaḥi dkaḥgnas bdaggžandaṅ byabyedlas gsumgyi khyadpar žibtu phyeba ñuṅgsal ḥphrulgyi ldemig* [The magical key, illuminating the few, a detailed analysis of the difficult points of the *Rtagskyi ḥjugpa*, the distinction of own and other as well as of action, actor, and work]. Ed. 1989 by Tom J.F. Tillemans and Derek D. Herforth in: *Agents and actions in Classical Tibetan. On* bdag *and* gžan *and* bya byed las gsum. (= Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhis-muskunde, 21.) Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.

Bacot, Jacques 1928. *Une grammaire tibétaine du tibétain classique. Les ślokas grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhoṭa avec leurs commentaires.* Traduits du tibétain et annotés par Jaques Bacot. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

——1946. *Grammaire du tibétain littéraire.* Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient.

——1948. *Grammaire du tibétain littéraire. Index morphologique.* Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient.

Beckwith, Christopher I. 2001. Review of Melvyn C. Goldstein, et al., eds., *The new Tibetan-English Dictionary of Modern Tibetan.* Berkeley: University of California Press. *Anthropological Linguistics* 43.3: 395–398.

Beyer, Stephan V. 1992. *The Classical Tibetan language.* New York: State University of New York. Reprint 1993 (= Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica series, 116.), Delhi: Sri Satguru.

Bielmeier, Roland 1985. *Das Märchen vom Prinzen Čobzaṅ. Eine tibetische Erzäh-lung aus Baltistan. Text, Übersetzung, Grammatik und westtibetisch verglei-chendes Glossar.* St. Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Blansitt, Edward L., Jr. 1984. Dechticaetiative and Dative. *In:* Frans Plank, ed., *Objects. Towards a theory of grammatical relation.* London: Academic Press: 127–150.

Butzenberger, Klaus 1995. Pāṇini's sūtras on karma-kāraka (Aṣṭādhyāyī 1.4.49–51) and their historical development. *Berliner Indologische Studien* 8: 9–62.

——2000. Was sind *kāraka*-s? Notizen zu einer Rekonstruktrion der *kāraka*-Theorie. *In*: Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann und Volker M. Tschannerl, eds., *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka Festgabe für Adelheid Mette.* (= Indica et Tibetica, 37.) Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica, 117–138.

Cardona, George 1976. *Pāṇini. A survey of research.* (= Trends in Linguistics, State-of-the-Art Reports, 6.) The Hague: Mouton.

Caughley, Ross Charles 1982. *The syntax and morphology of the Verb in Chepang.* (= Pacific Linguistics. Series B. Monographs, 84.) Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Che, Qian 1992. A preliminary discussion of subject marking (*byed-sgra*) in Lhasa Tibetan. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 15.1: 53–63.

DeLancey, Scott 1984. Etymological notes on Tibeto-Burman case particles. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 8.1: 59–77.

——1985. Categories of non-volitional actor in Lhasa Tibetan. *In*: Arlene R. Zide, David Magier, and Eric Schiller, eds., *Proceedings of the conference on participant roles: South Asia and adjacent areas.* Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club, 58–70.

Dixon, Robert M.W. 1994. *Ergativity.* (= Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 69.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dmudge Bsamgtan 1990. *Brdasprod blogsal dgaḥston* [A clear minded celebration of grammar]. 5th edition, Kansuḥu Mirigs Dpeskrunkhaŋ [Gansu Nationalities Publishing House].

Dŋulchu Dharmabhadra (1772–1851). 1806. *Situḥi žalluŋ.* Ed. as *Sumrtags rtsaba daŋ deḥi ḥgrelpa Situḥi žalluŋ* [The root texts *Sumrtags* and the commentary on the teachings of Situ] by Bsodnams Rgyamtsho, 6th edition 1993, Běijīng: Mirigs Dpeskrunkhaŋ [Nationalities Publishing House]. Critical edition by Thubten Kunga Chashab [2002]. [Ed. also in Sarat Chandra Das 1915.]

Driem, George van 1991. Tangut verbal agreement and the patient category in Tibeto-Burman. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 54.3: 520–534.

——1998. Dzongkha. With the collaboration of Karma Tshering of Gaselô. (= Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region, 1.) Leiden: Research School CNWS.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1986. Primary objects, secondary objects, and antidative. *Language* 62: 808–845.

Francke, August Hermann 1905–1941. *Gšamyulna bšadpaḥi Kesargyi sgruŋs bžugs. A Lower Ladakhi version of the Kesar saga.* (= Bibliotheca Indica, work, 168.) Calcutta 1905–1909 (Fas. 1–4), 1941 (Fas. 5): Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.

——1924–1930. *Gzer-myig, a book of the Tibetan Bonpos. Tibetan text according to the Berlin-manuscript. Asia Major* 1 (1924): 243–346, 3 (1926): 321–339, 4.2/3 (1927): 161–239, 4.4 (1928): 481–540, 5 (1928): 1–40, 6 (1930): 299–314.

Genetti, Carol Elaine 1997. Object relations and dative case in Dolakha Newari. *Studies in Language* 21.1: 37–68.

Georg, Ralf Stefan 1996. *Marphatan Thakali: Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Dorfes Marpha im Oberen Kāli-Gaṇḍaki-Tal / Nepal.* (= Lincom Studies in Asian Linguistics, 2.) München: Lincom-Europa.

Goldstein, Melvin C., et al., eds., 2001. *The new Tibetan-English dictionary of Modern Tibetan.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hackett, Paul G. 2003. *A Tibetan verb lexicon. Verbs, classes, and syntactic frames.* Snow Lion, Ithaca, Boulder.

Haller, Felix. 2004. *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Themchen. Sprachwissenschaftliche Beschreibung eines Nomadendialektes aus Nord-Amdo.* (= Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung, 14). Bonn: VGH.

Hongladarom, Krisadawan 2002. Grammatical peculiarities of two southern Kham dialects: A study of case marking patterns and secondary verb constructions. Pa-

per presented at the 8th Himalayan Languages Symposium, 19–22 September 2002, University of Berne, Switzerland.

Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56.2: 251–299.

Huáng Bùfán and Rénzēng Wàngmǔ 1991. Shǐxīngyǔ. [The Shixing language]. *In*: Dài Qìngxià et al., eds., *Zàngmiǎnyǔ shíwǔ zhǒng* [Fifteen Tibeto-Burman Languages]. Běijīng: Yànshān Chūbǎnshè [Yanshan Press], 174–197.

Jäschke, Heinrich August 1881. *A Tibetan-English dictionary. With special reference to prevailing dialects; to which is added an English-Tibetan vocabulary.* London: Secretary of State for India in Council / Routledge & Kegan Paul. Reprinted 1992, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Kaschewsky, Roland 1978. Zur Frage des sogenannten «Akkusativs» im Tibetischen. *In*: Louis Ligeti, ed., *Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium held at Mátrafüred, Hungary 24–30 September 1976.* (= Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica, 23.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó: 169–188.

Keping, Ksenija Borisovna [= Kepping, Ksenia Borisovna] 1982. Once again on the agreement of the Tangut verb. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 7.1: 39–54.

——1985. *Tangutskij jazyk, morfologija.* Moskva: Nauka.

Kepping, Ksenia Borisovna 1994. The conjugation of the Tangut verb. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 57.2: 339–346.

LaPolla, Randy J. 1992. Anti-ergative marking in Tibeto-Burman. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 15.1: 1–9.

Liú Lù 1984. *Jǐngpōzú yǔyán jiǎnzhì (Jǐngpōyǔ)* [An outline of the language of Jǐngpō nationality (Jǐngpō language)]. [=Ēnkūn dialect]. (= Zhōngguó shǎoshù mínzú yǔyán jiǎnzhì cóngshū [Outlines of the languages of the ethnic minorities of China series]). Běijīng: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè [Nationality Press].

Lù Shàozūn 2001. *Pǔmǐyǔ fāngyán yánjiū* [A study of the dialects of Pumi. (= Zhōngguó shǎoshù mínzú yǔyán fāngyán yánjiū cóngshū [Studies of the languages and dialects of the ethnic minorities of China series]). Běijīng: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè [Nationality Press].

Lustig, Anton [2002]. *Zaiwa Grammar.* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Leiden.]

Matisoff, James Alan 1973. *The Grammar of Lahu.* (= University of California Publications in Linguistics, 75.) Berkeley: University of California Press.

Michailovsky, Boyd 1988. *La langue hayu.* (= Sciences du langage.) Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Miller, Roy Andrew 1989. Case-grammar in Tibet. *In*: Lawrence Epstein and Richard F. Sherburne, eds., *Reflections on Tibetan culture. Essays in memory of Turrell V. Wylie.* (= Studies in Asian Thought and Religion, 12.) Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 187–204.

——1991. On the utility of the Tibetan grammarians. *In*: Ernst Steinkellner, ed., *Tibetan history and language. Studies dedicated to Uray Géza on his seventieth birthday.* (= Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 26.) Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 353–381.

Mkhyenrab Ḥodgsal 1986. *Sumcupaḥi rnambšad* [On *Sumcupa*]. Sikhron Mirigs Dpeskrunkhaṅ [Sichuan National Publishing House].

Nagano, Yasuhiko 1984. *A Historical Study of the rGyarong Verb System.* Tokyo: Seishido.

Pangžuṅ Norbu Bsamgrub 1993. *Brdasprod smramkhaskyi žalluṅ yigeḥi bšadpadaṅ Sumrtagskyi driba drislan raṅmñam blogsar gžonnuḥi ñermgo* [Questions about the *Sumrtags* and the oral explanations given by the grammatically well-versed, together with the answers—a necessity for the young beginners]. Bodljoṅs Mimaṅs Dpeskrunkhaṅ [Tibetan Nationalities Publishing house].

Prati Rinchen Dongrub (17th–18th century) 1992. *Bodkyi brdaḥi bstanbcos Sumcu-paḥi žes byabaḥi rnambšad kuntu bzaṇpoḥi dgoṇspa rabtu gsalbar byedpaḥi rgyan* [The extremely clarifying ornament, the excellent commentary on the treatise on Tibetan grammar called *Sumcupa*]. Ed. by Gragspa. 4th edition, Mtshosṇon Mirigs Dpeskrunkhaṇ [Kokonor Nationalities Publishing House].

Rutgers, Leopold Roland 1998. *Yamphu*. (= Languages of the greater Himalayan region, 2.) Leiden: Research School CNWS.

Sarat Chandra Das 1915. *An introduction to the grammar of the Tibetan language with the texts of Situhi sum-rtags, Dag-je sal-wai me-long [Dagbyed gsalbaḥi meloṇ], and Situhi shal-lün [Situḥi žalluṇ]*. Darjeeling.

Sarep, Hpuṇg 1996. A study of the morphology of verbs and nouns in the Sinwal dialect of the Rawang Language. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 19 (2): 93–184.

Saxena, Anju. 1991. Pathways of development of the ergative in Central Tibetan. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 14.1: 109–116.

Sharmâ, Suhnū Rām 2001. A Sketch of Rongpo Grammar. In Yasuhiko Nagano and Randy J. LaPolla, eds., *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages*. (= Senri Ethnological Reports, 19.) Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology: 195–270.

Śāntideva. 1987. *Byaṇchubsemsdpaḥi spyodpala ḥjugpa*. Reproduced from a print from the Rdzogchen blocks. Delhi: Konchhog Lhadrepa.

Situ Paṇchen Choskyi-ḥbyuṇgnas (1699–1774). 1744. *Yul gaṇscanpaḥi brda yaṇdag-par sbyarbaḥi bstanbcoskyi byebrag Sumcupadaṇ Rtagskyi ḥjugpaḥi gžuṇgi rnampar bšadpa mkhaspaḥi mgulrgyan mutig phreṇmdzes* [The beautiful garland or necklace of pearls for the expert: The basic text of the *Sumcupa* and *Rtagskyi ḥjugpa* and the complete commentary, the class of instructions on the perfect application of the orthography of the Land of Glaciers]. Ed. as *Karma Situḥi Sumrtags ḥgrelchen Mkhaspaḥi mgulrgyan mutig phreṇmdzes* [Karma Situ's great commentary of the *Sumrtags*, The beautiful garland or necklace of pearls for the expert] by Ḥphrinlas. 6th edition 1993, Mtshosṇon Mirigs Dpeskrunkhaṇ [Kokonor Nationalities Publishing House]. [Ed. also as *Situḥi Sum-rtags* in Sarat Chandra Das 1915.]

Skalbzaṇ Ḥgyurmed 1981. *Bodkyi brdasprod rigpaḥi khridrgyun rabgsal meloṇ*. [The very clear mirror: A guide to the understanding of Tibetan grammar.] Sikhron Mirigs Dpeskrunkhaṇ [Sichuan Nationalities Publishing House].

——1992. *Bodkyi brdasprod rigpaḥi khridrgyun rabgsal meloṇ: Le clair miroir. Enseignement de la grammaire tibétaine*. Traduit, adapté et commenté par Heather Stoddard et Nicolas Tournadre. Arvillard: Editions Prajñā, Collection Tibétaine.

Sūn, Hóngkāi 1982. *Dúlóngyǔ jiǎnzhì* [A concise description of the Dulung language]. (= Zhōngguó shǎoshù mínzú yǔyán jiǎnzhì cóngshū [Outlines of the languages of the ethnic minorities of China series]). Běijīng: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè [Nationality Press].

Takahashi, Yoshiharu 2001. A descriptive study of Kinnauri (Pangi dialect): A preliminary report. *In*: Yasuhiko Nagano and Randy J. LaPolla, eds., *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 97–119.

——2002. On the deictic patterns in Kinnauri (Pangi dialect). Paper presented at the 8th Himalayan Languages Symposium, 19–22 September 2002, University of Berne, Switzerland.

Takeuchi, Tsuguhito 1998. *Old Tibetan manuscripts from East Turkestan in the Stein Collection of the British Library*. Vol. II. Tokyo, London: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco, The Toyo Bunko & The British Library.

Takeuchi, Tsuguhito and Yoshiharu Takahashi 1994. Split ergative patterns in transitive and intransitive sentences in Tibetan: A reconsideration. *In*: Hajime Kita-

mura, Tatsuo Nishida and Yasuhiko Nagano, eds., *Current Issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics*. Osaka: The Organising Committee, 649–659.

Thupten Kunga Chashab 2002. *System of Classical Tibetan Grammar. Based on Dngul chu Dharmabhadra's treatise* Si tu'i zhal lung *(1806)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Uniwersytet Warszawski.

Tillemans, Tom J.F. 1989. Introduction: Traditional Tibetan grammar on *bdag, gźan* and related notions. *In*: Tom J.F. Tillemans and Derek D. Herforth, *Agents and actions in Classical Tibetan. On* bdag *and* gźan *and* bya byed las gsum. (= Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 21.) Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.

——1991. A note on *bdag don phal ba* in Tibetan grammar. *Études asiatiques* 45: 311–323.

Torricelli, Fabrizio Torricelli and Āchārya Sangye T. Naga, trs., and Vyvyan Cayley, ed., 1995. *The life of the Mahāsiddha Tilopa by Marpa Choskyiblogros*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.

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

——1994. Tibetan ergativity and the trajectory model. *In*: Hajime Kitamura, Tatsuo Nishida and Yasuhiko Nagano, eds., *Current Issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics*. Osaka: The Organising Committee, 637–648.

——1996. *L'ergativité en tibétain. Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée*. (= Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale, 33.) Paris, Leuven: Peeters.

Tshetan Žabsdruŋ 1988. *Gaŋscan Bodkyi brdasprodpaḥi bstanbcos Sumcubadaŋ Rtagsḥjugi rnamgźag gyacher bśadpa Thonmiḥi źalluŋ źes byaba* [The elaborated system of the grammatical treatises of Tibet, the land of glaciers, *Sumcupa* and *Rtagsḥjug*, called the teachings of *Thonmi*]. 4th printing, Kansuḥu Mirigs Dpeskrunkhaŋ [Gansu Nationalities Publishing House].

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

——1997. Studies in Tibetan indigenous grammar (3): Sanskrit *nīpata*, Tibetan *tshigphrad*. *In*: Helmut Krasser, Michael Torsten Much, Ernst Steinkellner, and Helmut Tauscher, eds., *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995*, Vol. II. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1011–1022.

——2000. *A history of Sanskrit grammatical literature in Tibet*. (= Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 2, Indien, 8.) Leiden: Brill.

Vesalainen, Olavi and Marja Vesalainen 1980. *Clause Patterns in Lhomi*. (= Pacific Linguistics. Series B. Monographs, 53.) Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Vogel, Claus 1981. Thon-mi Sambho-ṭa's mission to India and Sroṅ-btsan sgam-pos legislation. *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 1981, 1: 3–49.

Watters, David E. 1973. Clause patterns in Kham. *In*: Austin Hale, ed., *Clause, sentence, and discourse patterns in selected languages of Nepal*, Vol. I. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

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

Yamaguchi, Zuiho 1990. The grammatical function of *de-nyid*. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae* 44.1–2: 251–257.

Zeisler, Bettina. 2003. Targets or 'objects' of directional action in Ladakhi and Tibetan. Paper presented at the 36th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Melbourne, 28th–30th November 2003.

——Forthcoming. Case patterns and pattern variation in Ladakhi: A field report. *In:*
     Roland Bielmeier and Felix Haller, eds., *Himalayan Linguistics and Beyond.*
     Papers submitted to the 8th Himalayan Languages Symposium, held at the Uni-
     versity of Berne, Switzerland, Sept. 19–22, 2002.
Zhang, Yisun [Kraŋ Dbyisun] et. al., eds. 1993. *Bod-Rgya tshigmdzod chenmo* [The
     great Tibetan-Chinese dictionary]. Vol. 1–2. Pecin: Mirigs Dpeskrunkhaŋ [Běi-
     jīng: Nationalities Publishing House].