

Bettina Zeisler (Berlin)

The Development of Temporal Coding in Tibetan: Some Suggestions for a Functional Internal Reconstruction.
Part II: The Original Semantics of the ‘Past’ Stem of Controlled Action Verbs and the Reorganisation of the Proto-Tibetan Verb System¹

Abstract

The traditional Tibetan grammatical description of the Tibetan verb stems in terms of ABSOLUTE TENSE might be a mere translation of Sanskrit terminology. But the alternative description in terms of ASPECT is likewise not adequate: both the ‘present’ and the ‘past’ stem are aspectually neutral. The ‘past’ stem of control action verbs may express a mere attempt as well as the result of this attempt. This apparent anomaly offers the possibility to reconstruct its original semantics and to sketch a possible line of development from the set of up to ten derivative stem forms to the never full-fledged set of four (plus two) stems in OT and CT.

1 Preliminaries: Inadequacy of aspectual terminology for Tibetan languages

According to traditional Tibetan (as well as European) grammatical descriptions, the OT/CT verb has at most four forms or stems whose names are analogous to their presumed function: *°daspa*, ‘[what is] gone’, for ‘Past Tense’, *daltaba*, ‘[what] is now’, for ‘Present Tense’, *ma°oñspa*, ‘[what] has not [yet] come’, for ‘Future Tense’ (hence the traditional term *dusgsum*, ‘three tenses’, for the verbal system), and *skultshig*, ‘word of command’, for ‘Imperative’.² Yet, on closer inspection, it turns out that such a description in terms of ABSOLUTE TENSE is not adequate as, e.g., the so-called ‘Future Tense’ seems to be an instance of MOOD (necessitative) rather than of temporal reference. Even more disturbing is the fact that the ‘Past Tense’ might appear in future time contexts and the ‘Present

Tense' with present, past, and future orientation. Thus the indigenous concept of ABSOLUTE TENSE as a whole might be questioned as naive or as a mere translation of Sanskrit terminology which cannot be applied to a Non-Indo-European language. The question, therefore, is: do we have a better concept, namely, does the concept of ASPECT make more sense than the concept of TENSE?

As the contemporary standard opinion claims, the 'past' stem would express 'perfective' aspect, the 'present' stem 'imperfective' aspect. But a comparative and functional, rather than formal, analysis shows that it is not possible to establish an opposition in terms of ASPECT for the Tibetan verb stems. In particular, both 'present' and 'past' stem are aspectually neutral: both are used with perfective (aoristic or non-continuative) as well as imperfective functions (habitual and continuative the former, *deconatu* and habitual the latter). The basic temporal-aspectual-modal conceptualisations in Tibetan languages are thus RELATIVE TENSE, i.e. ordering with respect to a contextually given reference point as anterior, simultaneous, or posterior, and MOOD, i.e. directive and obligational. Absolute temporal reference, i.e. anteriority, simultaneity, or posteriority with respect to the communication act, can be understood as a special case of relative temporal ordering (cf. Comrie 1985: 58). In the praxis of communication, however, it seems that the communication act is not merely one of several possible reference points, which would be established by inference and exclusion of all other possibilities, but is the preferred reference point, which is always chosen unless the context provides strong clues for a different reference point (cf. Denwood 1999: 141). The communication act is, therefore, the standard or default reference point in a neutral context. For this reason (and in order to avoid confusion with aspectual notions) I will use the traditional terminology in terms of ABSOLUTE TENSE.³

1.1 'Present' stem and other 'present tense' constructions

The Simple Present/Future (SPrs/Fut), i.e. the mere 'present' stem not expanded by other morphemes, does not appear in continuative contexts, such as actual continuous present time reference or continuous past time reference, neither does it appear in conative contexts, i.e. when the action is merely attempted but not completed. The Simple Present/Future of OT and CT rather corresponds to the Slavic Perfective Present, in that it naturally refers to future time, especially with verbs that do not have a sepa-

rate ‘future’ stem. In the case of four stem verbs, the Simple Present/Future is used contrastingly to express actions the speaker is ready to perform shortly after the speech act upon his or her own decision, (1a), whereas the ‘future’ stem is used for actions the speaker feels obliged to perform, (1b). The Simple Present/Future is also used with adhortative function for actions the speaker wants to perform with the addressee, (2).

(1) a. *slob·dpon šin·tu mi·dga^oi sems skyes-nas |*
teacher-master very be-happy(Ngl-St.ntr)-Gen mind be-born(St.Ptt-cc)

«*°di ni ji·lta·bu·yis zlog·na» dgoñs |*
this θ what-manner-Instr turn-back(St.Prs-cc) think(SPtt(St.ntr))

«*klu chen Dga^o·bo bsgrubs-na Dmar·rgyan·gyi |*
nāga great Dga^obo conjure(St.Ptt-cc) Dmarrgyan-Gen

lus·la nad·du tsi·tsi·dzwa·la gtoñ | ...»
body-D/L illness-L/P leprosy send(SPrs/Fut)

The teaching master got into a very unpleasant mood. «These [people], how can/will [I] convert [them]?», [he] thought. «Having conjured the great *nāga* Dga^obo, [I] (**will/want to**) **send** leprosy to the body of [queen] Dmarrgyan...» [The teaching master is seeking revenge for himself] (CT-BTSU: 61.16-18).

b. «... *bstan·pa bšig·pa^oi dgra·bo gañ·na yod |*
teach(VNptt/fut) destroy(VNptt)-Gen enemy where exist

ña·yi tsi·tsi·dzwa·la^oi nad bzuñ gtañ» |
I-Gen leprosy-Gen disease seize(St.Ptt-ñf) send(SFut)

«... Where is the enemy who has destroyed the teaching? [I] **shall send** my leprosy disease to have [him] seized!» [The conjured *nāga* being obliged by the magic spell seeks revenge for the teaching master] (CT-BTSU: 62.11-12).

(2) «*tshur šog yu·bu·cag gñis °thab·mo·°gyed»*
here come(Imp) we two fight(SPrs/Fut)

«Come here! **Let** us two **fight!**» (OT-RAMA: 101/E77).

The Simple Present/Future further corresponds to the English Simple Present, in that it is used in performative contexts (the utterance being the act mentioned), (3), and that it can also express indefinitely quantified events,

i.e. iterative-distributive and habitual, as well as generic facts which are still occurring or valid at the present moment, (4), but beyond that it may also be used for iterative-distributive and, contrastively, for habitual events in the past.

- (3) «... <khyim·thab mdzad·par **žu**> žus·pas | ...»
marriage hon-do(VNntr-pur) ask(SPrs/Fut) ask(VNptt-cc)
 «... <[I] **request** you to marry>, when [I] asked [him] so ...» (CT-NARO: 48/12b2).

- (4) rje·btsun Ti·lo·pas
reverend Tilopa-Erg
 «<khyod ña·la **mi·rtsi** Nā·ro·pa·la **rtsi**> gsuñs·nas
you I-D/L count(Ng1-SPrs/Fut) Nāropa-D/L count(SPrs/Fut) say(St.Ptt-cc)
 The reverend Tilopa said «You **never take care** (lit. don't (ever) count) for me, **you (always) take care** [only] for Nāropa», and ... (CT-NARO: 116/45a2-3).

The Simple Present/Future is preserved in 'Lhasa Tibetan' only with adhortative function, but it is still found with present and past habitual function in Nangchenpa, further with future time reference in Nangchenpa, THEM, and WT, but in the latter case only with negation (as the regular negated equivalent of unmarked future constructions) and in some fixed expressions.

Additionally, the negated Simple Present/Future is the standard form of the Prohibitive in CT and all MT languages, with the exception of Purik and Balti (WT) where an adjustment has led to the use of the WT imperative stem or its substitute.

In all of these applications of the Simple Present/Future, the event is presented neutrally in its entirety without focussing on its internal structure, and it is thus not presented as (still) ongoing at a reference point (at, before, or after the time of speaking). These complexive uses not only violate the definition of the Slavic imperfective aspect, but also the definition of the Progressive as the marked member of an 'aspectual' opposition of the English type (FRAMING).

Besides the Simple Present/Future, OT and CT have quite a few periphrastic constructions, which are, unfortunately, not used in a systematic manner. The choice of the construction might reflect regional developments. But the periphrastic forms may also interchange for merely stylistic reasons. As far as my data is concerned, which consists of four OT texts or text groups (DTH, RAMA, AFL, and the *Early Tibetan Inscriptions*, Richardson 1985) and four CT texts (NARO, TVP, BTSU, and *Gzermyig*, Francke 1924-30), only three constructions can be described with some certainty:

- (a) **VN_{pr}-L/P + *byed/bgyid/mdzad***, i.e. the verbal noun of the ‘present’ stem marked by the Locative/Purposive Particle {*tu*} and followed by the ‘present’ stem of a verb ‘to do’;
- (b) **VN_{pr} + *yin***, i.e. the verbal noun of the ‘present’ stem followed by the auxiliary *yin* or its equivalents;
- (c) **St.Pr_s + {*kyi(n)*} + *yod* or St.Pr_s + {*ciñ*} + *yod***, i.e. the ‘present’ stem followed by a connective particle and the auxiliary *yod* or its equivalents.

The first, if read as a single clause construction related to a single ‘subject’, seems to have a similar aspectual range as the Simple Present/Future, i.e. complexive and ±habitual function. The second and the third constructions seem to have identical functions and may thus be grouped together under the label Compound Present/Future (CPrs/Fut). These constructions are typically used in continuative situations and hence seem to correspond to the English Expanded Present, (5) and (6a). But the supposed ‘aspectual’ opposition is much less clear in OT/CT than in English, and the Compound Present/Future is *not* the marked member of the opposition. It is the neutral form and can thus be found, albeit with low frequency, in generic, performative, and future time contexts as well, cf. (6b) for performative use. My data shows no iterative-distributive or habitual use, but this may, perhaps, be mere chance.

- (5) «... rgyal·srid kyañ ma·thob·ste ||
kingdom also get(Ng2-St.ntr-LC)
da·ltar °dI·na °dug·pa·yin·no» žes zer·ro
now here stay(CPrs/Fut(St.ntr))-F such say(SPtt(St.ntr))-F

«... I did not obtain the kingdom and now I **remain/am staying here**», [he] said (OT-RAMA: 122/A231).

- (6) a. «btsan·po dral·gyi ža·sña·nas <**thugs-bde·žñ-mchis·pa**>
emperor royal-brother-Gen h-presence-Abl h-be-prosperous(CPrs/Fut-nom)

glo·ba **dga°·žñ-mchis·so** |
mind be-glad(CPrs/Fut)-F

- b. btsan·pos bka°-stsal·pa nI | gum chad gñis |
emperor-Erg order(VNpt) θ; die(St.Ptt) punishment two

rño·ji-thog·gis ***tshal·žñ-mchis·so** || ...»
be-able-whatever-Instr request(CPrs/Fut)-F

«[I] **am (;being) glad** [to hear] from my royal brother, the emperor, that <[he] **is (;being) prosperous**>. [But] with respect to what the emperor has ordered, [I rather] **request** death or punishment, these two, by all means. ...» [The speaker is not willing to obey the orders] (OT-DTH: 117.2-5).

‘Present tense’ constructions are commonly used in past time contexts according to the aspectual values described for present and future time contexts. This means that the Compound Present/Future is typically found with durative verbs and presents the event as ongoing or having some duration at the reference time of the narration, whereas the Simple Present/Future and its periphrastic counterpart is typically found for indefinitely quantified events, i.e. either with contrastive habitual meaning (habitual events may be neutrally expressed by the Simple Past) or with iterative-distributive meaning, i.e. when one or more actors are performing their actions repeatedly on a certain occasion (most often these are acts of religious performance or acts of reverence towards a person of high rank). Moreover, there are a couple of rather conventional uses of the Simple and the Compound Present/Future in narrations that I have presented and discussed on another occasion (Zeisler 2000).

Nevertheless, there are some exceptions to the above description of the Simple Present/Future as complexive, i.e. as never occurring with continuative function. As far as my data is concerned, these cases are restricted to past time contexts and to particular verbs. Although these exceptions can be explained by the semantics of these verbs, and the complexive value of the Simple Present/Future can be redefined in a way to

save a kind of ‘aspectual’ opposition, this seems to be premature on the basis of only eight texts. The linguistic study of further texts might perhaps reveal continuative employment of the Simple Present/Future also in present time contexts. Thus the question whether an ‘aspectual’ opposition similar to the English simple and expanded forms could be established for the ‘present tense’ constructions in OT/CT can not yet be definitely answered. In any case, the ‘present’ stem itself is aspectually neutral as it is found with both perfective and imperfective functions in simple and periphrastic constructions.

1.2 ‘Past’ stem used as *imperfectum de conatu*

The ‘past’ stem is aspectually neutral as well. The Simple Past (SPtt), i.e. the mere stem not expanded by other morphemes, has a triple perfectic/resultative, aoristic/perfective, and imperfectic/imperfective function. As for the latter function, the Simple Past is neutrally used in OT and CT to refer to iterated or habitual events in the past. But in particular, ‘non-finite’ forms of the ‘past’ stem and even the Simple Past can appear in contexts of mere attempt and failure, where in aspect languages an imperfect(ive) construction would be necessary (cf. the Latin *imperfectum de conatu*). This use violates the definition of perfectivity as the marked member of an aspectual opposition of the Slavic or Romance type. And it would likewise not be possible in English. Compare the following French and Russian examples (7) and (8) with the OT and CT examples (9) to (11). Conative employment of the Simple Past or a ‘non-finite’ form of the ‘past’ stem can still be found in WT (Zeisler forthcoming), and a similar employment can be found with the corresponding compound constructions in other MT languages (e.g. Tournadre 1996: 204, no. 648, p. 205, no. 6.50 for LT; Haller [1997] for THEM).

(7) Moi, je me *noyais*(*Impf*) un beau jour dans la Tamise, tu m’as **ti-ré**(**PC**) de l’eau (Victor Hugo, cf. Weinrich 1964/1985: 104).

(8) *Dokazyval*(*Ipftv Ptt*), no **ne dokazal**(**Pftv Ptt**).
“He *tried to prove* but **didn’t**” (Thelin 1990: 53).

- (9) btsan·po Dri·gum Lde·bla Guñ·rgyal·gyis
emperor Drigum Ldebla Guñrgyal-Erg

gnam·du **drañs·na** |
sky-L/P draw(St.Ptt-cc)

Lo·ñam·gyis mchan·nas spre^ou phuñ [=phyuñ]·bas |
Loñam-Erg bosom-Abl monkey take-out(VNptt-cc)

Lde·bla Guñ·rgyal ni
Ldebla Guñrgyal θ

Ti·tse gañs·rum·du °phañ·ste gšegs·so ||
Titse glacier-womb-L/P throw(St.Fut!-LC) hon-go(SPtt(St.ntr))-F

btsan·po Dri·gum yañ de·ru bkroñs·nas |
emperor Drigum also there die(St.Ptt-cc)

As for the emperor Drigum, [his ancestor] Ldebla Guñrgyal **drew** [=tried to draw] him up to the heaven, but Loñam took a monkey out of his bosom and Ldebla Guñrgyal was thrown [by the monkey] into the womb of the glacier of Titse and died. The emperor Drigum likewise died there and ... (OT-DTH: 98.3-6).

- (10) «... nañ rañ sems **bzuñ·bas** ma·zin·na ||
*inside self mind catch-ctr(VNptt-cc) catch-nc(Ng2-St.ntr-cc)*⁴

phyi gžan lus **bzuñ·bas** ci·la phan || ...»
out other body catch-ctr(VNptt-cc) what-D/L be-useful(SPrs/Fut?(St.ntr))

«... If [you], **having caught** [= **having tried to catch**] the inner mind, did not catch it, [then] what is the use of **having caught** the outer body (i.e. prey)? ...» (CT: *Milaraspa rnammgur*, p. 433⁵).

- (11) «... phyi lus sems **spañs·kyis** mi·sponš·kyis || ...»
outer body mind give-up(St.Ptt)-Anti give-up-nc/pot(Ng1-SPrs/Fut)-emp

«... **Though having given up** [=having tried to give up] outer body and mind, [you] will never be able to give [it] up. ...» (CT: *Milaraspa^oi rnammgur*, p. 431⁶).

Because any attempt to act, whether successfully or not, requires an intentional agent, such examples are found only with controlled action verbs. Just because of their possible use in conative contexts, Tournadre (1991: 94, note 5) equates the Tibetan controlled action verbs even with the

Slavic imperfective verbs, although later on he seems to have changed his mind tacitly (cf. Tournadre 1996).

2 Unexpected and contradictory use of stem forms as an opportunity to reconstruct their former semantics

2.1 Unexpected use of the ‘imperative’ stem

In a paper read at the second project meeting of the European Cooperation Project on Himalayan languages, Paris 1997, Felix Haller drew the attention of his audience to a quite unexpected use of the THEM ‘imperative’ stem. This form, restricted to negation and questions, signifies that the attempt to act was not or will not be successful, i.e. the agent is not able to achieve the intended result, or the speaker questions the ability of the agent to attain the intended result. Apparently, this is a common feature of Amdo Tibetan (cf. Kalsang Norbu et al. 2000: 247). A similar employment of the ‘imperative’ stem can also be found in OT and, less often, in CT, cf. (11) above, or, as a mere relict, in a few so-called secondary verb forms of CT and MT, such as CT *gñid sod*, ‘to wake up’, Ladakhi /chot/ *chod*, ‘to be cut (of crops), be cutable (of substance), be able to cut (of instrument)’.

As it is quite unlikely that a command should appear in contexts of mere attempt or in questions about ability, there must have been in PrT either a secondary derivative *potentialis* stem that became homophonous with the ‘imperative’ stem or the imperative function must have emerged as a secondary function from the original *potentialis* stem. Since the *potentialis* and imperative function are almost in complementary distribution with respect to negated and affirmative statements, the second alternative seems to be more likely. The imperative use of a *potentialis* stem could be explained as a sort of polite command: ‘You can do it [therefore, do it!]. In course of time, the imperative function would then have become more and more prominent to the expense of the original function (for more details see Part I, Zeisler in print).

2.2 Resultative use of the ‘past’ stem

As already mentioned, the ‘past’ stem combines contradicting aspectual functions (imperfectic, on the one hand, aoristic and perfectic, on the

other hand). The perfectic or resultative use, i.e. the focus on the resulting state of a successful transformation, is not only found in past or present time contexts (past transformation, past or present result), (12), but particularly in future time contexts (future transformation plus future result), (13) and (14).

- (12) «gnas·brtan Bstan·pa°dzin·pa nas |
sthavira Śāsanadhara I-Erg;
- sgra·tshad luñ·rigs lcags·kyu·yis |
grammar-metrics āgama iron-hook-Instr
- rgol nan mchil·pa zas·la **drañs** |
opponent evil fishing-hook food-D/L draw(St.Ptt:fPrsPerf)
- sgra·tshad rigs·pa°i ral·gri·yis |
grammar-metrics science-Gen sword-Instr
- rgol nan sdoñ·po rtsod·nas **bcad** | [...]
opponent evil tree root-Abl cut(St.Ptt:fPrsPerf)
- Sañs·rgyas bstan·pa°i spu·gri·yis |
Buddha teach(VNpft/fut)-Gen razor-Instr
- mu·stegs rgol nan skra·rnams **bcad** |
tīrthika opponent evil hair-pl cut(St.Ptt:fPrsPerf)
- Sañs·rgyas bstan·pa°i rgyal·mtshan **btsugs**» |
Buddha teach(VNpft/fut)-Gen victory-sign plant(St.Ptt:fPrsPerf)
- ces gsuñs·nas |
such hon-speak(St.Ptt-cc)

«I, the *sthavira Śāsanadhara*, with the iron hook [of] grammar, metrics, and *āgama* (oral tradition), [I] **have pulled out** the evil opponent taking the bait. With the sword of grammar and metrics, [I] **have eradicated** the tree [of] the evil opponent. [...] With the razor of Buddha's teachings, [I] **have shaved** all the hair of the evil opponents, the *tīrthika* (heretics). [I] **have planted** the sign of victory of the teachings of Buddha», having spoken thus ... (CT-NARO: 58f/17b3-18a1).

- (13) «... ma·^oñs gdug·pa·can·gyi gliñ·rnams °byuñ | [...] *future dangerous-Gen continent-pl arise(SPrs/Fut)*
- dbus·su mi·skyid gdug·pa·can·gyi gliñ |
middle-L/P unhappy dangerous-Gen continent
- dmag stoñ·dañ·bcas |
army thousand-with
- gnod·sbyin dañ | srin·po dañ | Nag·po·chen·po |
Yakṣasa and; Rākṣasa and; Mahākāla
- bgegs dañ log·^odren bar·du·gcod·pa thams·cad °byuñ·ño |
demon with seduce(St.Prs-nf) hinder(St.Prs-nf) all arise(SPrs/Fut)-F
- Saṅs·rgyas bstan·pa ni ñams |
Buddha teach(VNptt/fut) θ be-spoiled(St.ntr: fFut~fFutPerf)
- sems·can bde·skyid ni **zad** |
creature happiness θ finish(St.Ptt:fFutPerf)
- char·chu dus·su **mi**·^o**bab** |
rain-water time-L/P fall(Ng1-SPrs/Fut)
- sa·la skyes tshad **bskams** |
earth-D/L grow(St.Ptt-nf) heat dry(St.Ptt:fFutPerf)
- mi·nad dañ phyugs·nad dañ |
man-illness and cattle-illness and
- dmag·^okhruḡ mu·ge ni °byuñ | ...»
war famine θ arise(SPrs/Fut)

«... In future, continents full of danger **arise/will arise**. [...] In the middle, there will be the continent of danger of the unhappy [beings]: with thousand armies the seducing and hindering *bgegs*-demons Mahākāla, Yakṣasa, and Rākṣasa **arise/will arise**. The doctrine [of] Buddha becomes/has become/will (have) become spoiled, the happiness [of] [all] creatures **has come/will have come to an end**. Rain **does/will not fall** in time [and] what had grown on the earth **has dried up/will have dried up** [by] the heat. Epidemics for men and cattle, war, and famine **arise/will arise ...»** (CT-BTSU: 111.1-14).

In the case of a prophecy, one could say that the future situation is shifted to an imaginary present. The ‘present’ stem would then express the (future) change neutrally (a representation as ongoing is quite unlikely with

verbs such as *°byuñ* | *byuñ*, ‘to arise’), while the ‘past’ stem apparently puts the focus on the result of such changes, and this (future) result would then be projected to the present. Thus, happiness does (will) not merely diminish, but has (will have) come to an end, the earth does (will) not merely dry up, but has (will have) dried up completely. But the assumption of a temporal shift is not requisite as the following example, expressing a wish or request, shows. Again the ‘present’ stem forms *°chi*, ‘to die’, and *°gum*, ‘to die/to kill’⁷, do not express a mere process that could well be stopped before reaching the point of transformation, rather the person speaking focuses on the event as such as a closed unit including the transformation. By contrast, the ‘past’ stem forms *ši* and *bkum* focus on the resulting stage as the desired outcome.

- (14) a. «gañ·la mda° °phags [=°phañs] phog·chiñ *ši·ba·dañ* | ...»
who-D/L arrow throw(St.Ptt-nf) hit(St.ntr-con) die(VNptt-cc)

«Upon whom [ever] an arrow is thrown [he] **shall** be hit and **be dead and ...**» (OT-RAMA: 98/A27).

- b. «gañ·la mda° °phañs de phog °*chi·ba·dañ* || ...»
who-D/L arrow throw(St.Ptt-nf) that hit(St.ntr-nf) die(VNprs-cc)

«Upon whom [ever] an arrow is thrown that [one] on being hit **shall die and ...**» (OT-RAMA: 98/C12).

- c. «gañ·la mda° °phañs phog·chiñ
who-D/L arrow throw(St.Ptt-nf) hit(St.ntr-con)
 °*gum·bar*» *gsol·bar*» *bsams·pa·dañ* |
die/kill(VNprs-cc) ask(VNntr-cc) think(VNptt-cc)

«mda° *dañ·po* °*phañ·ste* °*gum·bar*» |
arrow first throw(St.Fut!-LC) die/kill(VNprs-cc)

lha·mos *bsgyur·to* ||
goddess-Erg change(SPtt)-F

«Let [us] ask: «Upon whom [ever] an arrow is thrown [he] shall be hit and **shall die**/[we] **shall** hit and **kill** [him]», [this is how it] was intended, but «The first arrow being thrown [he = the one who is hit] **shall die**/[we] **shall kill**», [that is how] the goddess had transformed [it] (OT-RAMA: 100/A52-54).

d. «*mda° gañ °phañs·pa kun phog·ciñ **bkum·bar***
arrow who throw(VNp_{tt}) all hit(St.ntr-con) kill(VNp_{tt}-cc)

ci-gnañ» žes sñiñ·la bsams·pa·las ||
Q-hon-grant(SPrs/Fut(St.ntr)) such heart-D/L think(VNp_{tt}-cc)

lha·mos bsgyur·nas «mda° dañ·po °phañs·pa
goddess-Erg change(St.Ptt-cc) arrow first throw(VNp_{tt})

*de phog·ciñ **bkum·bar** ci-gnañ» |*
that hit(St.ntr-con) kill(VNp_{tt}-cc) Q-hon-grant(SPrs/Fut(St.ntr))

žes gsol·to ||
such ask(SPtt(St.ntr))-F

When in [their] heart [they] intended [to ask]: «Will [you] grant that <what arrow [ever] is thrown each one *shall* hit and *have* [the targets] *killed?*>», the goddess changed [it] and [they] asked: «Will [you] grant that <the first arrow thrown *shall* hit and *have* [the target] *killed?*>» (OT-RAMA: 100f/C33-34).

Prophecies, predictions (also the result clause of a conditional sequence), and wishes are the typical future time contexts for a focus on the result. Since these contexts are evident from the discourse, the standard temporal value of the ‘past’ stem: past or rather anteriority, can easily be suspended in favour of a secondary aspectual value of completion and a focus upon the result. In such cases, there is no need for an additional marker. In OT negated statements, however, we can often find Negation Particle *mi* with ‘past’ stem as a marker for inactual non-directive contexts such as future time reference as well as atemporal habitual events and generic facts. It appears that inactual non-directive contexts must have originally been the exclusive domain of the Negation Particle *mi*, and that the ‘past’ stem must have regularly combined with the Negation Particle *mi* in such inactual contexts. But already in OT, one can observe that the combination of ‘past’ stem with Negation Particle *ma*, which must have been restricted to past time reference (and double past/present time reference for the present perfect function), becomes generalised and extends to inactual contexts, (15), line 2 and (16), lines 7 and 8.

(15) mo °di ni khyim·phyā dañ srog·phyā·la btab·na ||
mo this θ house-fortune and life-fortune-D/L cast(St.Ptt-CD)

lha dañ °dre °dres·te **ma·phyē** ||
god and demon be-mixed(St.Ptt-LC) separate(Ng2-StPtt:fFutPerf)

dgra dañ g.yag °dres rab·tu °jigs ||
enemy and yak be-mixed(St.Ptt-nf) very be-frightful(St.ntr)

bon·po ñan·pas ni gdon **myi·phyed** ||
Bonpo miserable-Erg θ demon separate(Ng1-St.Ptt:fFutPerf)

sdar·mas ni dgra **myi·slogs** ||
trembling-Erg θ enemy repulse(Ng1-St.Ptt:fFutPerf)

theñ·pos ni yul **myi·bsgrod** ||
lame-Erg θ country travel(Ng1-St.Ptt~St.Fut:fFutPerf~SFut)

žar·bas ni lam *myi·thub* ||
crippled-Erg θ way be-able(Ng1-St.ntr)

mo °di ci·la btab·kyañ ñan
mo this what-D/L cast(St.Ptt)-ever bad

If this *mo* is cast for the fortune of the home and for the fortune of life, gods and demons, being intermixed, **cannot be separated**. Enemy and yak, being intermixed, are very terrifying. A miserable *Bonpo* [here: exorcist] **cannot have** the demons **expelled** (lit. separated). A trembling [one] **cannot have** the enemy **repulsed**. A lame [one] **cannot have** the country **travelled** [through]. A crippled [one] *is not able* [to make] [his] way. This *mo*, cast for what [purpose ever], is bad (OT-AFL VI: 122/34-36).⁸

(16) dog·sriñ nI sbur·bu·°Is || bya ltar nI bcos·bcos·ste |
earth-worm θ ant-Erg; bird like θ act(R-St.Ptt-LC)

gnam·du nI °phur °dod·kyañ |
sky-L/P θ fly(St.Prs-nf) wish(St.ntr)-Anti

°phur·du ni °dab ma·mchIs |
fly(St.Prs-cc) θ wing Ng2-exist

°phur·du nI °dab mchis·kyañ ||
fly(St.Prs-cc) θ wing exist-Anti

dguñ sño ni phañ·mthos·ste [!] |
sky green/blue θ height-LC

sprin·kyi ni go **myi·°da°s** ||
cloud-Gen θ space pass(Ng1-St.Ptt:fGenrPerf)

ya·ru ni dguñ **ma·slebs** |
up-L/P θ heaven arrive(Ng2-St.Ptt:fGenrPerf)

ma·ru nI dog **ma·slebs** |
down-L/P θ earth arrive(Ng2-St.Ptt:fGenrPerf)

ma·mtho ni ma·dma°·ste ||
be-high(Ng2-St.ntr) θ be-low(Ng2-St.ntr-LC)

khra·°I ni gzan·du gyurd |
falcon-Gen θ devour(St.ntr-cc) become(St.Ptt:fGenrPerf)

Although the earth-worm and the ant always [try to] behave like the birds and wish to fly up to the sky, they do not have wings to fly with. And even if they had wings to fly with, the blue sky would be too high and they **could not have passed** the realm of the clouds. They **would not have arrived** at the sky above. They **would not have come back** to (lit. arrived at) the earth below. Not high, not low, they would have become the prey of the falcon (**OT-DTH**: 118.32-119.1).

The neutralisation of the former modal distinction of the Negation Particles in combination with the ‘past’ stem may have preceded or may have been connected with the gradual disuse of the ‘past’ stem for future time reference. The mere ‘past’ stem with future time reference has not been described for MT languages, but a reflex of its resultative function can still be found in compound constructions such as the LT Imminent Future where the ‘past’ stem is followed by *yon*, ‘to come’, thus expressing that the result comes about or is as good as realised.

As far as my OT data is concerned, Negation Particle *mi* with ‘past’ stem is restricted to inactual contexts, i.e. to future time reference or to habitual events and generic facts. Nevertheless, Schneider (1993) has observed some occurrences in the 9th century translation of the *Viśeṣastava* of *Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmin*, which is the first text of the *Bstodtshogs* volume of the *Bstan°gyur* (the OT orthography being revised for the greatest part). The context, the praising of Buddha as always having acted (or still acting?) in a superior way in comparison to all other religious teachers would allow an inactual, i.e. habitual or generic reading. But an inactual reading would then have to be extended to all statements about Buddha,

even those where the ‘past’ stem combines with the Negation Particle *ma* or those with no Negation Particle at all. This might perhaps be too strong a claim for the whole text on the basis of mere seven occurrences of the Negation Particle *mi*. Thus the question remains whether other cases of ‘past’ stem with Negation Particle *mi* can be observed in OT or CT in unambiguous non-habitual past time context or referring to a concrete result at the time of the speech act. In my CT data, I have come across only two examples of the ‘past’ stem combining with Negation Particle *mi*. Both appear in a comparatively early text (perhaps 14th/15th century). Again, the Negation Particle *mi* seems to be motivated by future time reference:

(17) «... bud·med °di·lta·bu cig byuñ·na
girl such one appear(St.Ptt-CD)

yab·yum·gyi bka° **mi·bcag**»
hon-father-hon-mother-Gen order break(Ng1-St.Ptt:fFutPerf)

«... If such a girl can be found (lit. appears), [I] **won’t have** the honourable parents’ order **broken** / the honourable parents’ order **won’t be broken**» (CT-NARO: 48/12a6).

(18) rje·btsun Nā·ro·pas || «deñ·nas rtsams·te bdag·ñid·kyis |
reverend Nāropa-Erg; today-Abl begin(St.Ptt!-LC) I-self-Erg

bde·mchog °kor·lo **ci·mi·grub**» ces gsuñs·te |
Śaṃvara wheel Q-get-accomplished(Ng1-St.Ptt:fFutPerf) such speak(St.Ptt-LC)

The reverend Nāropa spoke: «Beginning from today on, shouldn’t I, by myself, **have** Śaṃvara’s wheel **obtained** (lit. get accomplished)?» (CT-NARO: 68/22a2-3).

3 Conflicting values: resultative and de-resultative – reconstructing the original semantics of the ‘past’ stem and its derivational morphemes

When a form has different functions it seems to be a safe assumption that these functions are not conflicting, or, if they do, that they are bound to different temporal or modal contexts. That one and the same form should have two contradicting functions in the same temporal and modal context (here: resultative and deresultative/conative, both with assertive past time

reference) sounds odd, and it leads to some quite substantial questions: does this mean that (a) the ancient or contemporary Tibetans did and do not (cannot?) discern different phases of an event, or (b) that they were and are not concerned about whether their activity has a result? (c) Could it be that the concepts of agency and telicity of western languages are not applicable to Tibetan languages because they belong to eastern languages? (d) Does this mean, therefore, that in Tibetan, and even more so in TB, there are no verbs such as ‘to break (ctr)’, ‘to throw’, ‘to kill’, etc., but only verbs designating mere processes or mere attempts, such as ‘to undertake killing’ etc.? Do we have to rewrite our dictionaries? If the answer to all these questions were ‘yes’, than why would the ancient Tibetans make a difference between the use of the ‘present’ and the ‘past’ stem in future time context? And if they did not make a difference at all, if the use of the stem forms was arbitrary, why should there be different stem forms at all? And if the answer to the above questions is ‘no’, what then is the original function of the ‘past’ stem, if it is neither aspectual, nor modal, nor temporal?

The apparent anomaly of the ‘past’ stem offers the possibility of reconstructing the original PrT function of the ‘past’ stem and the semantics of the involved derivational morphemes. Until now, attempts to reconstruct PrT or PrTB are mainly based on a formal comparison or analysis of morphology and phonetic changes, and the functions of the morphemes in question are rather guessed at. But before one can compare, e.g. prefixes in OT/CT and, let us say: Tangut or Rgyarong, one should first establish the exact function of these prefixes in each language. Deriving the function of a prefix in one language from the function of a prefix in another language just because of formal similarity to conclude that the two languages are intrinsically related or have shared the same historical development (or presupposing a close relation to conclude that the formal similarity must be due to a shared function) is just begging the question. Caution is particularly necessary as the languages mentioned do not seem to be very closely related: Tibetan as a sub-...-sub-branch of either Western TB, Bodic, or Northern TB (Sino-Bodic), and Tangut (Qiāngic) and Rgyarong as sub-...-sub-branches of either North-eastern TB, Burmic, or Southern TB (cf. the family trees in Bradley 1994: 60, van Driem 1993: 294, and van Driem 1997: 463). The rest of the paper should, therefore, be seen as a contribution to an internal functional reconstruction of verbal morphology in PrT that may then be linked up

morphology in PrT that may then be linked up with other TB languages. As the focus is on the semantics of the stems as they are used in coherent discourse, I do not attempt to present a detailed outline of the phonetic changes which the morphemes and the verb roots must have undergone.

3.1 Tentative morphological classification of Tibetan verbs

OT/CT verbs may be classified on formal grounds roughly according to the number of their stems and to the derivation patterns of these stems. Traditionally, Tibetan grammarians distinguish between three groups of:

- (1) *dusgsum spyitsam*, ‘regular’ 4 stem verbs that show the opposition of prefix *b-* for the ‘past’ stem vs. prefix *d-/g-* for the ‘future’ stem. This is the smallest group with 61 verbs (including 17 verbs with labial radical; type 7, 8a/b of Shafer 1949, paradigm V-VIII of Coblin 1976). Only a smaller set of 9 verbs shows a postradical *-y-* or *-r-*.
- (2) *dusgsum byebragpa*, ‘special’ 4 stem verbs that show prefix *b-* for both the ‘past’ and the ‘future’ stem, about 288 verbs (including 5 verbs with prefix *m-*). These are for the most part verbs with an initial consonant cluster, and again for the most part these clusters start with the so called ‘directional infixes’ (Wolfenden 1929: 38ff) *(-)r-/(-)l-/(-)s-* that convey a transitive or factitive-causative meaning (220). A smaller part has the ‘directional infix’ *(-)g-* or a post-radical *-y-/r-/l-* (23) and the rest of this group are verbs with an affricate or fricative radical (31) and a few verbs (14) with a simple aspirated or voiced radical. There seems to be some reason to assume that the ‘future tense’ prefix *d-/g-* is not compatible with phonologically complex initials, although there are some exceptions in group (1). The affricate and fricative radicals in group (2) must have been phonetically complex in a different way from the affricate and fricative radicals of the verbs of the type *gcod* | *bcad* | *gcad* | *chod*, ‘to cut’, or *gsod* | *bsad* | *gsad* | *sod*, ‘to kill’, in group (1). The same may hold for the few verbs with a simple plosive radical, but their stems might also have been formed by analogy.
- (3) *dusgsum thorbuba*, the ‘irregular’ verbs with 1-4 differentiated stems that apparently do not follow a regular scheme (the largest group: 629 verbs—after sorting out group (4) and (5)).⁹

Group (1) may be subdivided into:

- (a) verbs that show ° - prefix and suffix *-d/-s* (if possible) plus *Ablaut* $a \rightarrow e$ (and $un^*d \rightarrow in^*d$) for the ‘present’ stem (38 verbs);
- (b) verbs that show no suffix but *g-* prefix and *Ablaut* $a \rightarrow o$ for the ‘present’ stem (8 verbs); and
- (c) verbs that show a ‘mixed’ pattern: ° - prefix, but no suffix *-d/-s* and, therefore no *Ablaut* (15 verbs).

Group (2) may be subdivided into

- (a) verbs that show the ‘directional infixes’ *(-r/-l/-s)*- (220 verbs);
- (b) (verbs that show clusters with a post-radical *-y/-r/-l-* (23 verbs);
- (c) verbs that do not show any such cluster but where the radical is an affricate, fricative (both aspirated and preceded by the ° - prefix, for the ‘present’ stem), or sibilant (31 verbs); and
- (d) verbs with simple radicals other than those mentioned above (voiced or aspirated and preceded by the ° - prefix, if possible, for the ‘present’ stem) (14 verbs).

From group (3) we can sort out those verbs with ° - prefix or ø -prefix where only the ‘present’ and the ‘past’ stem are differentiated. Typically, they have intransitive meaning and, in most cases, they do not presuppose an intentional agent, but if they do, they might have a separate ‘imperative’ stem. These verbs can be arranged into two groups, namely

- (4) verbs that show the opposition of prefix ° - for the ‘present’ stem vs. no prefix for the ‘past’ stem (again the smaller group, 62 verbs), and
- (5) verbs that do not show this opposition (97 verbs with either ° - or ø -prefix¹⁰).

About 42 verbs show a mixed (4/5) pattern, i.e. their respective ‘present’ or ‘past’ stem or both stem forms are attested with different spellings, and it seems as if verbs of group (4) have been assimilated to the pattern of group (5).

Verbs of group (2) and (5) necessarily mark the ‘past’ stem with the suffix *-s/-*d*, verbs of groups (1) and (4) do not need that marker.

In the following overview, "R" stands for an unspecified radical, "R_F" for an affricate or fricative radical, "C" for an unspecified consonant, and "V" for an unspecified vowel. This is only a quite tentative classification for the purpose of the reconstruction as presented here. Other morpho-phonemic changes, particularly other patterns of *Ablaut*, are not considered since they do not seem to be affected by the suggested developments (for the problems of (de-)voicing and (de-)aspiration see note 12).

4 stems (349)		
(1)	(a) °-Re(C)-d/s (29) °-RCeC-d/s (9)	°debs btab gdab thob, 'to throw, cast' °byed phye(d/s) dbye phye(d/s), 'to open' °grel[*d] (°grol) bkral dgrol [!] khrol, 'to comment'
	(b) g-RoC (8)	gcod bcad gcad chod, 'to cut' gtoñ btañ gtañ thoñ, 'to send, give'
	(c) °-R(C)a(C)-ø (15)	°dogs btag(s) gdag(s) thogs, 'to fasten' °jal bcal gžal °jol, 'to weigh, measure'
(2)	(a) r/l/s-R(C)V(C) (220)	rgyug brgyugs brgyug TCH: rgyugs, 'to make run' lta bltas blta ltos, 'to turn towards, look' sgrub bsgrubs bsgrub sgrub(s), 'to accomplish (ctr)'
	(b) RCV(C) / CRV(C) (23)	°gyed bgyes [?] TCH: bkyes bkye khyes, 'to divide' klog b(k)lags b(k)lag klogs, 'to read' gtig(s), TCH: gtig btigs btig gtigs, 'to drop (ctr)' gšo gšos, TCH: gšo bšos bšo šos, 'to pour out'
	(c) R _F V(C) (31)	°chañ bcañs bcañ choñs, 'to hold, keep' °tshag tsags/btsag btsags tshogs, 'to press out (liquids)' sub (b)subs bsub TCH: subs, 'to shut'
	(d) RV(C) (14)	°khal bkal bkal khol, 'to spin' ñan mñan mñan ñon, 'to listen' °ded bdas bda° ded [!], 'to pursue' (cf. JÄK!) len blañs (bloñs) blañ loñ (s)/lon, 'to take'
(3) – not classified (629)		
2 stems (+Imp) (201)		
(4)	°-R : ø-R (62)	°grub grub, 'to get accomplished' °bab bab - bob(s), 'to come down'
(5)	°-R : °-R + -s / R : R + -s (97)	°khañ °khañs, 'to resent, to bear ill will' ñom ñoms, 'to get satisfied' thar thar*d, 'to get free'
	mixed pattern, differently attested (42)	°khro (khro) khros, 'to be angry' °gum gum (°gums), 'to die'

Table I: Tentative morphological classification of Tibetan verbs

3.2 Grammaticalisation and reorganisation of Proto-Tibetan verb stems, group (1)

An important semantic distinction of the Tibetan verb (as important as the event classes in Vendler 1957, concerning telicity and duration) is the distinction between (a) volitional or controlled action verbs describing actions that are started off and controlled by an intentional agent and (b) non-volitional or accidental event verbs describing events and results of actions which are not controlled by an intentional agent. In general, the verbs of the first class belong to group (1) and (2) and are morphologically more complex than those of the second class belonging to group (4) and (5). Obviously, the former are derived from the latter.

A somewhat ethnocentric assumption would, therefore, be that in PrT, possibly even in PrTB, verbs or—perhaps better—verb roots did not so much describe activities performed by intentional and result-oriented agents, but merely states and processes that are happening independently or despite the intentions of human beings. Although this sounds very much like evolutionism, similar claims, perhaps motivated by some sort of ethnical correctness, have been made for other languages quite recently. Non-orientation towards results or agents (BECOME-type) would then be a contrastive feature of eastern languages in comparison to European languages (DO-Type) (e.g. Ikegami 1991 for Japanese and Ohori [2000] for Chinese, cf. also Uray 1953: 45 for CT). But even with respect to these proto-verbs, the PrT speakers seem to have made a distinction right from the beginning, which looks very much like a distinction between (I) the mere occurrence of an event or the development up to some kind of transformation and (II) the resulting state after some kind of transformation (inchoative-stative). This distinction is either marked by the opposition of $^{\circ}$ - prefix vs. \emptyset -prefix or by the opposition \emptyset -suffix vs. suffix $-s/-*d$. In some cases, both markers are found. Quite probably, both markers were productive at different times, and it seems that prefixation is older, belonging to a stage where, due to a different word order, auxiliary verbs and other particles could precede the main verb. In this case, however, stem form I must have been the derived one and stem form II the basic one, although it is quite unclear what the derivation might have expressed and why the non-derived stem should not denote the event neutrally, but the following result. Nevertheless, at least at the time when the stems were derived by suffixation, stem form II must have been marked

for the focus on the resulting stage. This resultative focus is the only semantic motivation for the use of stem form II of accidental event verbs in inactual contexts in (13), (14a), (16), and (18) above, as well as for the use of the derived stem form II of controlled action verbs in (14d), (15), and (17) (stem forms IIa and IIb in Table III below).

The suggested set of derivations of the proto-verb could be represented as below. Here and in the following figures, the unattested derivations and the processes that cannot yet be accounted for are given in shaded boxes.

A	B	C	D	I ?event	II result	III ?desiderat.	IV <i>potential.</i>	
	°-kheñ	kheñs	°-gañ-d →°-geñ-d →°-geñs	°-gañ	gañ	*dga-gañ →d-gañ	khoñ	getting full ↔ full
	?°-khum (to shrink)	?(°-)khums (to shrink)	°-gum-d →°-gum-s	°-gum	gum (°gums)	*dga-gum →d-gum	khum(s)	dying ↔dead
	°-thebs	thebs	°-dab-d →°-deb-d →°-debs	*°-dab	*dab	*dga-dab →g-dab	thob	getting strewn ↔strewn
	?pheb (to come)	?phebs (to come)	°-bab-d →°-beb-d →°-beb-s	°-bab	bab (babs)	*dga-bab →d-bab	phob	moving down ↔being down
g-chog →g-cog				°-chag	chag (chags)	*dga-chag →g-chag →g-cag	chog	breaking (nc) ↔broken
*g-thoñ →g-toñ	theñ	theñs		*°-th/dañ	*th/dañ	*dga-th/dañ →g-th/dañ ¹¹ →g-tañ	thoñ	getting completed ↔completed

Table II: A model of Proto-Tibetan verb derivation

I do not believe that the alternative OT spellings given here and below are mere mistakes, since there are at least two cases where traces of the postulated derivation of the voiced type are found in JÄK: St.Ptt *bgug* for *bkug* in the main entry sub °*gug(s)*, ‘to bend, gather, summon’ (but while there is no separate entry *bgug*, *bkug* is listed with a reference to °*gug(s)*), by contrast, OT-AFL IA: 15/111 has *dra bkhug*, ‘drew in the net’; St.Ptt *bgod* instead of *bkod* sub °*god*, ‘to plan, project, manufacture, compose, etc.’ (here again, there is no separate entry *bgod*, whereas *bkod* is listed with a reference to °*god*, additionally the exemplary sentence shows *bkod*), again OT-AFL IA: 16/125 shows *bkhod*. One could take this, of

course, as two of the many misprints in JÄK. But the oldest version of the TVP, the *Gunthan* block print of 1478/79 likewise has *bgod* (CT-TVP: 50/269v3). The more of these apparent ‘misspellings’ can be found, the less likely it is that they are mere errors: cf. *bgum* OT-RAMA: 124/A248 ~ *bkhum* OT-AFL IA: 15/113; *bgab*, ‘secretly, hidden’, OT-AFL IB: 17/22 ~ *bkhab* OT-AFL IIA: 14/108 (immediately followed by the canonical form *bkab*); *bdab*, ‘thrown’, OT-AFL VI: 118/*2,*4 ~ *bthab*, ‘afixed’, OT: Takeuchi 1995: 369.¹²

Besides and perhaps already before this \pm resultative distinction, other stem forms had been derived by various means, on which in some cases the \pm resultative distinction had been superimposed. As the above described modal origin of the ‘imperative’ stem shows, these stem forms were most likely purely semantic derivations to express various *Aktionsarten* and/or various modal connotations. As can be expected in the case of semantic derivations, the kind and number of these derivations depends on the basic meaning of the verb, and we hardly find the full set of all possible derivations with one verb (cf. Uray 1953, table 1, inserted between pp. 51 and 52). Ideally, it should be possible to trace all derivations of one verb in the same text or at least in one group of texts from the same period and location. Otherwise, the derivations found in the dictionaries may well turn out to be merely dialectal variants or remnants of different periods of development. Sometimes, derivations may have developed particular meanings as in the case of the pair *°khum* | *khums*, ‘to shrink’ and *°gum* | *gum* (*°gums*), ‘to die’, but such apparent relatedness could also be mere coincidence. For the present, however, we still have to contend with the stem forms as attested in texts of quite different origin.

At a certain time, either before or after the \pm resultative distinction, the speakers also started to make a distinction according to whether the event just happened naturally or because of the interference of an intentional agent. The latter was marked by two different means. The earlier, TB strategy was to mark the verb root with one of the ‘directional infixes’: *(-)r-/(-)l-/(-)s-* and perhaps also *(-)g-/(-)d-*, which seem to have originated from particles indicating orientation towards a goal. Particularly the ‘infix’ *(-)s-* developed into a quite frequent transitive-causative marker. Another strategy—probably developed much later than the ‘directional infixes’ since not found in other TB prefixing languages, such as Tangut (cf. Kepping 1971 and forthcoming), Rgyarong (cf. Nagano

1983), or in more closely related languages like Nam (cf. Thomas 1948), and apparently developed after the \pm resultative distinction—was to indicate that the *resulting state* was caused or at least aimed at by an intentional agent, and in this case only the resultative stem (IIa) was marked by a prefix **ba* \rightarrow *b-* (stem form IIb). The original form and function of the prefix are unknown (for the hypothetical form **ba* see page 25f below).

A	B	C	D	I	IIa/b	III	IV	
				event	result/attempt	?desiderative	<i>potent.</i>	
	$^{\circ}$ -kheñ	kheñ	$^{\circ}$ -gañ-d \rightarrow $^{\circ}$ -geñ-d \rightarrow $^{\circ}$ -geñ-s	$^{\circ}$ -gañ	a) gañ	*dga-gañ \rightarrow d-gañ	khoñ	getting full \leftrightarrow full
			↘		b) *ba-gañ \rightarrow *b-gañ \rightarrow b-kañ	↓	↓	act. to cause being full
	? $^{\circ}$ -khum (to shrink)	?($^{\circ}$ -)khum-s	$^{\circ}$ -gum-d \rightarrow $^{\circ}$ -gum-s	$^{\circ}$ -gum	a) gum ($^{\circ}$ gums)	*dga-gum \rightarrow d-gum	khum(s)	dying \leftrightarrow dead
			↘		b) *ba-g/khum \rightarrow b-gum \rightarrow b-khum \rightarrow b-kum	↓	↓	action to cause being dead
	$^{\circ}$ -thebs	thebs	$^{\circ}$ -dab-d \rightarrow $^{\circ}$ -deb-d \rightarrow $^{\circ}$ -debs	* $^{\circ}$ -dab	a) *dab	*dga-dab \rightarrow g-dab	thob	getting strewn \leftrightarrow strewn
			↘		b) *ba-d/thab \rightarrow b-dab \rightarrow b-thab \rightarrow b-tab	↓	↓	action to cause being strewn
	?pheb (to come)	?phebs	$^{\circ}$ -bab-d \rightarrow $^{\circ}$ -beb-d \rightarrow $^{\circ}$ -beb-s	$^{\circ}$ -bab	a) bab (babs)	*dga-bab \rightarrow d-bab	phob	moving down (ctr/nc) \leftrightarrow being down
			↘		b) *ba-bab \rightarrow b-bab \rightarrow b-pab \rightarrow \emptyset -pab \rightarrow \emptyset -phab	↓	↓	action to cause being down
g-chog \rightarrow g-cog				$^{\circ}$ -chag	a) chag (chags)	*dga-chag \rightarrow g-chag \rightarrow g-cag	chog	breaking (nc) \leftrightarrow broken
↘	→	→	→		b) *ba-chag \rightarrow b-chag \rightarrow b-cag	↓	↓	action to cause being broken
g-t(h)oñ \rightarrow g-toñ	theñ	theñs		* $^{\circ}$ -th/dañ	a) *th/dañ	*dga-th/dañ \rightarrow g-thañ \rightarrow g-dañ \rightarrow g-tañ	thoñ	getting com- pleted \leftrightarrow completed
↘	→	→	→		b) *ba-th/dañ \rightarrow *b-th/dañ \rightarrow b-tañ	↓	↓	action to cause completion

Table III: Grammaticalisation & reorganisation of Proto-Tibetan verb stems, group (1) – I

Wolfenden (1929: 15, 23, 33ff) interprets the *b-* prefix as a sort of active-part-of-the-subject-marker of transitive verbs. He refers to the notions of *bdag*, ‘self’, and *gžan*, ‘other’, in verse 12 of the early indigenous grammatical text *Rtagskyi °jugpa* (see Tillemans & Herforth 1989: 1). In this early text, the *b-* prefix is associated with ‘Past Tense’ or with *gžan* (‘Past Tense’, however, is neuter with respect to *bdag* and *gžan*). The concept of *bdag* and *gžan* applies only to transitive verbs, because it presupposes the distinction of an object argument as ‘other’ than the agent (Tillemans & Herforth 1989: 5f). Thus one could interpret the *b-* prefix as one of several markers for transitivity. Thomas (1957: ling. intr. p. 45ff), seems to follow the same track in suggesting that the *b-* prefix is related to a verb **ba*, ‘to do’, thus: “*ba-sad*, ‘do kill’, a compound verb of a type common in the language” (p. 54).

But if the *b-* prefix was a marker of transitivity or even a voice marker, then why should it have been applied only to one stem and not to stem forms I, III, and IV of the transitive-causative set as well? And why does stem form D (reinterpreted as stem form Ib of the ‘active’ or transitive set, cf. Table IV below) show, at least in some cases, such striking similarity to stem form I(a) of the intransitive and ‘passive’ set (cf. stem forms I/D *°gum/°gums*, ‘to die/to kill’)? Wolfenden’s (1929: 33ff) hypothesis that the *°-* prefix had the same transitivity/agentivity marking function as the *b-* prefix stands in contradiction with the obvious fact, that these prefixes must have been functionally distinct, otherwise they could have interchanged freely in both stem forms I and II of the transitive-causative set. Besides, this assumption would establish only two transitive stems out of four, and it further leads into inconsistencies with respect to the frequent use of the *°-* prefix with mostly intransitive accidental event verbs. Wolfenden’s suggestion that the original agentive function of the *°-* prefix was neutralised in the case of accidental event verbs (“weakening of verbal force to one descriptive of state or condition”, p. 36) is not convincing, since it obviously reverses the process of derivation.

After all, it is more probable that the two distinct sets of intransitive-inagentive and transitive-agentive verbs are the end product of a secondary development. On the basis of the attested functions of stem form IIa and IIb of accidental event and controlled action verbs in OT, the *b-* prefix originally must have had the function of expressing that the resulting stage after transformation was the aim of an agent. The marker, therefore,

could have been applied only to the resultative stem form IIa. But as the marker introduced connotations of agency that were not coded in the verb before, it set up a distinction in terms of valence and voice which opposed the marked stem IIb to all other derivative stems.¹³

At first sight, Thomas' idea of a prefixed complementary causative verb is at odds with the fact that in the documented language complementary verbs always follow the main verb, and there are further inconsistencies with his claim, that the nominaliser *pa/ba* should be derived from the same source so that in the end we would get the interpretation of the Past Participle *b-sad-pa* as 'do-kill-doing'. Nevertheless, it is, of course, possible that the word order of the proto-language was quite different and would have allowed prefixation of the same complementary verbs or particles that were later on suffixed to the verb. Comparable prefixation is, in fact, attested in Tanguit, and is still found in Rgyarong. Prefixation might thus have been a common TB feature. The Wolfenden and Thomas hypothesis that the prefixes correspond to elements that we find behind the verb in later language has a consequence which Thomas, arguing for a very late date for the *b-* prefix, seems to have overlooked: since prefixation of complementary verbs as well as directional case particles presupposes a different word order, derivations of verb stems by prefixation must be older than derivations by suffixation.

If we follow the verbal origin hypothesis for the *b-* prefix, then it is likewise possible that the *d-/g-* prefix of stem form III is not merely a directional particle (as Wolfenden 1929: 23, 40ff suggests) or the remnants of what particle ever (e.g. the connective particle {*kyi*} as suggested by Christopher Beckwith¹⁴), but could as well have been derived from a complementary verb. Given the later obligational (first person) and necessitative meaning (second and third person) and the supposed uncontrolled processual character of the event as expressed by the underlying verb root, the complementary verb might have been related to the modal verb *dgos*, 'to need', or rather to *dga°*, 'to like', expressing an order-like wish that the event may or should take place (cf. also the remarks of Thomas 1957: 58).

This admittedly quite speculative hypothesis would also account for the phonetically conditioned variation of the prefix of stem form III: the cluster *dg-* would have been reduced according to the phonetic environment to either *d-* or *g-*, and it would have been incompatible with most

initial clusters or phonetically complex radicals. If the ‘future tense’ prefix *d-/g-* was connected with the ‘directional infixes’ *(-)g-* and *(-)d-*, then we have to explain how the necessitative meaning could have developed from a particle indicating direction, and why the *d-* and *g-* prefixes should have developed the same function if the ‘infixes’ should have had different functions or why there should have been different ‘infixes’ if their function was identical. Certainly, the ‘infixes’ *(-)g-* and *(-)d-* could have been merely phonetically conditioned variants, but in such case one would expect that either the variants are phonetically related, i.e. located at close articulation points as in the case of the dissimilation patterns of ‘present tense’ suffix *-d/-s* and ‘past tense’ suffix *-s/-*d*. Or one could expect that there would be related patterns of variation or other phonetic contexts where both variants could interchange as in the case of the ‘present tense’ suffix *-d/-s* after vowels. Accordingly, we can, in fact, find variation of ‘infix’ *(-)d-* with ‘infix’ *(-)s-*, e.g. *dkrog~skrog*, ‘to stir up’, *dgyel~sgyel*, ‘to throw down’, *dpyañ~spyañ*, ‘to suspend’, but we do not find variation of ‘infix’ *(-)d-* with ‘infix’ *(-)g-*. Further, there seems to be a subtle phonetic difference between ‘infix’ *(-)d-* and the *d-/g-* prefix of the ‘future’ stem: the latter seems to be less compatible with cluster initials, and apparently for this reason it is in most of these cases replaced by the *b-* prefix (exceptions have been mentioned above).

The idea of prefixed verbs, again, seems to give PrT quite an exotic or even ‘primitive’ touch (but not more than ‘directional infixes’ or other case particles), and I do not feel very comfortable with it. But with respect to the *b-* prefix, Thomas’ theory is, indeed, suggestive, because his activity marker ‘to do’ would fit quite well with an intentionality marker and it could best account for the observed anomaly of stem form IIb of controlled action verbs. Given the presumption that the *b-* prefix was originally restricted to what later on became the ‘past’ stem for verbs of group (1), it expressed that an intentional agent was involved, acting with the aim to cause the resulting state ‘be dead’, ‘be fallen down’, ‘be broken’. But this ‘involvement of agent’ or ‘action to cause being dead’ etc. seems to have been ambiguous from the very beginning as it implies a focus on the resulting state as well as a focus on the initial stage where the agent decides to act and starts the process of transformation.¹⁵

Cross-linguistically, it can be observed that in resultative constructions which imply a double focus on the transformation and the resulting state, the focus begins to oscillate between both positions and may eventually be shifted to one position. In most cases, a resultative construction develops into a perfectic construction and further into a neutral or perfective past construction. In the case of the OT/CT *b-* prefix, the positions focussed upon, preparatory/initial and resulting stage, lie even farther apart than transformation and result. That the focus starts to oscillate should, therefore, not be surprising. When the focus lies upon the resulting stage the notion of an accomplished transformation follows quite naturally. But when the focus lies upon the preparatory and initial stages and the resulting stages are simply out of focus the ‘action to cause’ may or may not be successful, and hence the notion of mere attempt can follow, as well. The shifting focus and particularly the focus on the initial stages seems to have led to the notion of anteriority (as the attempt precedes the result). The notion of anteriority may have been further enforced by the additional and contrastive use of stem form IIa of accidental event verbs in order to make explicit whether the result was obtained or not, e.g. *rañ-gi mgo bchad-de gum-mo*, ‘he cut off his own head and died’ (OT-DTH: 101.20), or *lcebste gum-nas*, ‘having committed suicide and died’ (OT-DTH: 112.8f). In the beginning, the notion of anteriority might have been restricted to stem form IIb of controlled action verbs, but then it must have been generalised, affecting also stem form IIa of accidental event verbs. With the notion of anteriority becoming the prominent function of stem forms IIa and IIb, the remaining stem forms I(a), III, and D or A could be re-interpreted and grammaticalised in terms of RELATIVE TENSE.

It might be worth noting, in this connection, that different temporal and modal contexts enhance different focus positions with respect to the various phases of an event. E.g., when referring to our own future actions or when prescribing particular future actions to others, there is no need for a specific marker of intentionality on the side of the agent, as it is already presumed. As the expression is loaded with modal connotations of obligation and necessity, the initial stages are automatically under focus, whereas the resulting stage is out of focus, as the action has not yet taken place. Additional marking or resultative expressions are necessary to shift the focus to the final outcome. In OT and CT, therefore, besides the resul-

tative stem form IIa of accidental event verbs, stem form IIb of controlled action verbs is thus used in future time and other inactual contexts to emphasise the desired result of the action. Whereas in past time context, the focus of stem form IIb can shift more freely between initial and resulting stages.

As soon as the semantic opposition \pm intentionality or \pm control had been established by the introduction of the *b-* prefix, the new concept seems to have affected the necessitative and the *potentialis* stem as well. Someone who would like a certain event to happen shows intentionality, and if he or she requests another person to comply with that wish, he or she presupposes that the addressee him- or herself has control over the realisation of the event. Likewise the ability to achieve the desired result can be reinterpreted in terms of responsibility and control: success is no longer mere chance but the outcome of intentional agency. This reinterpretation might have enhanced the functional shift from [-control] to [+control], from mere *potentialis* to directive meaning, and the conceptual reordering of the necessitative and *potentialis* stem forms III and IV, forming the set of controlled action verb derivations. With the further reinterpretation of the derivational stems as temporal and modal stems, a gap at stem form I had to be filled for controlled action verbs.

Again, two strategies are visible: the gap was filled either with stem form A, seemingly a variant of stem form III, showing (directional?) ‘pre’- or ‘infix’ *g-* and *o-Ablaut* (this might be the more ancient pattern as it is found only with a handful of verbs, the above group (I b)), or the gap was filled with a form apparently derived from stem form Ia of the accidental event set with the help of an agentive (?) suffix *-d/-s*, leading to *Ablaut a→e* (and *un*d→in*d*). In a few cases, it appears that the original (?) stem forms Ia and IIa underlying the agentive and desiderative derivational stem forms IIb and III had been replaced by the derivative stem forms B and C, cf. *°thebs* | *thebs*, ‘to get strewn’, replacing **°dab* | **dab* (cf. IIb **b-dab~b-thab* → *b-tab*, III *g-dab*, ‘to strew’).

B	C	Ia/b simultan.	IIa/b anterior	III necess./poster.	IV 'imperat.'	OT/CT meaning
		a) °-gañ	a) gañ			to get full
		b) °-geñ-s	b) b-kañ	d-gañ	khoñ	to fill
		a) °-gum	a) gum (°gums)			to die
		b) °-gum-s	b) b-gum~b-khum →b-kum	d-gum	khum(s)	to kill
°-theb→	thebs→	a) →	a) →			to be strewn
		b) °-debs	b) b-dab~b-thab →b-tab	g-dab	thob	to throw
		a) °-bab	a) bab (babs)		→bob(s) ¹⁶	to move down (nc/ctr)
		b) °-beb-s	b) ø-pab →ø-phab	d-bab	phob	to throw down
		a) °-chag	a) chag (chags)			to break (nc)
		b) g-chog →g-cog	b) b-chag →b-cag	g-chag →g-cag	chog	to break (ctr)
theñ→	theñs→	a) →	a) →			to be completed
		b) g-ton	b) b-tañ	g-thañ~g-dañ →g-tañ	thoñ	to complete, construct

Table IV: Grammaticalisation & reorganisation of Proto-Tibetan verb stems, group (1) – II

For most readers, the grouping of the accidental event verb *theñ* | *theñs*, ‘to be completed’ (TCH), together with the controlled action verb *gton* | *btan* | *gtan* | *thoñ*, with the primary meanings ‘to let go, to abandon, to send, to give’, might be unexpected, and a digression is thus in order. JÄK gives a forth meaning for *gton*: ‘to make, to cause, to construct’, but, at first sight, this would appear to be merely secondary. However, in an OT text on funeral rites from the 9th or 10th century, AFL IB, both verbs are obviously related as inagentive-resultative and agentive counterparts. Both forms appear to be related to a nominal or verbal root *thañ* with the meaning of ‘power’ (cf. JÄK sub *thañ-po*, ‘firm’: *thañ gcod*, ‘to tire’, i.e. ‘to cut the power’, *ša thañ thañ*, ‘to the utmost of one’s power’, cf. also DTH 23.33: *mñan-gyi thañ sbyard*, ‘united the authority of government’). Occasionally, *thañ* can be found in place of *gton* as a denominaliser, cf. *bañ-thañ*, ‘to hurry, run’, *rkañ thañ-du*, ‘on foot’, and it seems thus that the corresponding use of *gton*, is based on an original relation with ‘power’ or ‘force’ rather than with the current meaning ‘to send’. This would explain the apparent peripheral meaning of ‘to construct’ for *gton*.

As TCH, the only dictionary where the verb *then* | *theñs* is listed, was not yet published, Thomas (1957) who was confronted with a highly enigmatic text fragment could only guess at the meaning of this verb and interpreted *theñs* as stem form II of the controlled action verb *then* (<**theñd*), ‘to draw’ (comparable to °*phen* (< *°*phañd*) | °*phañs* | °*phañ* | °*phoñ* (*phañs*), ‘to throw’). But in order to re-construct a coherent meaning, Thomas was not always free from doing violence to the text, e.g., translating *khrin ma-blañs* (AFL IB: 17/21) as “Take not away the authority” (p. 29), in the sense of ‘set aside’, ‘diminish’, or ‘subtract’, where the verb *len* | *blañs* ((*b*)*loñs*) | *blañ* | *loñ(s)/lon*) has the opposite meaning: ‘to receive, accept, take away [for oneself], steal, occupy’, and thus the phrase should be translated as ‘Do not assume authority’.

AFL IB begins with a dispute between six brothers, on one side, and a seventh brother, on the other side, about the funeral rites for their father. Thomas (1957: 2) holds that the meaning ‘funeral’ for *šid* is a secondary derivation from a hypothetical meaning ‘height’¹⁷, presuming an earlier custom of depositing the dead in the height of a mountain, and suggests that there is a discussion about different funeral customs and that the corpse is in danger to be “dragged down” for the sake of a new kind of burial in the plain. The accusation of *Gyimpo Ñag* Number One by his brothers would thus be that he gives up the old custom. This idea is not quite in accordance with the text, and Thomas is, at times, contradicting himself. On p. 28, he translates the speech of *Gyimpo Ñag* Number One in part (23b) as a warning that the dead should not be or should not have been “dragged down”, but then *Gyimpo Ñag* Number One would be perfectly in agreement with his brothers, and there would be no motivation to always contrast him with them. The father, by the way, is situated in an earth pit below the funeral platform, a quite miserable place preventing him from appearing in dreams (cf. part (23c)), hence there is no danger of dragging him down.

According to my interpretation, the six wealthy brothers prefer to bury or burn their father on their own (23a) without the help of the priest and without the (symbolic?) offering of a vast amount of animals. While the seventh brother complains that due to his poverty, his moral duty remains unperformed (23b), the brothers forbid him to proceed with the preparations of the funeral and forbid him to call upon their help. The accusation is thus that *Gyimpo Ñag* Number One assumes authority over

his brothers for which he is not legitimated and that he uses words that are felt like the whip used for compulsory service (23c). At the end of the fragment, the seventh brother having obtained a fine bride, his father calls upon him (from the other-world) to prepare the funeral (23d). One can guess that the rest of the manuscript described the funeral rites. In these contexts the phrases *pha^oi šid gdañ·ño*, ‘We shall prepare father’s funeral’ (23a), *pha^oi šid myi·theñs*, ‘Father’s funeral will/cannot [ever] be completed’ (23b), *pha^oi šid ma·theñs*, ‘let father’s funeral be uncompleted!’ (23c), and *pha^oi šid thon·šig*, ‘Prepare father’s funeral!’ are exact parallels to the use of *°tshugs* | *tshugs*, ‘to enter, to take root, to establish one’s self’ and its agentive counterpart *°dzugs* (*zug*) | *btsugs* (*zugs*) | *gzugs* | *zug(s)*, TCH: *tshugs*, ‘to plant, to erect, to institute’: *yab·ki ya·rmañ gzugso*, ‘We shall erect [our] honourable father’s fundament [in] the height’ (23a), *yab·ki rmañ myi·tshugs·so*, ‘The fundament of [our] honourable father’s [burial] will/cannot [ever] be established’ (23b), *yab·gyi [ʔrm]añ ma·tshugs*, ‘Let the fundament of [our] honourable father’s [burial] be unestablished!’ (23c), *yab·[ki m]dad rmañ tshugs·šig*, ‘Erect the fundament for the honourable father’s funeral repast!’ (23d). For the use of the verb *gtoñ* etc. in combination with a noun related to the funeral: *°dañ/°dad*, ‘funeral rite, funeral repast’, and *mdañ/mdad*, ‘funeral place’, cf. also OT-DTH: 99.23 *mdañ [=°dañ] gtoñ·ño*, ‘offers the funeral repast’¹⁸ and OT-DTH: 15/30, 19/57, 20/58, 20/59, 21/64, 23/74, 25/83, 26/92, 26/96 *mdad btañ*, ‘was buried (was sent to the burial place)’. Note the non-canonical form of the Ergative and Genitive Particles.

(19) a. ...kum·nas
*kill(St.Ptt-cc)*¹⁹

Rtsa·dags Snam·cig·kis °phad·bu [!] bžes
Rtsadags Snam-No.-One-Erg small-bag hon-take(St.ntr-nf)

«...» ska[du] ma·gsuñ·nas
... word-L/P hon-say(Ng2-St.Prs!-cc)

bu Gyim·po spun dr[u]g·ki mchid·nas
son Gyimpo brother six-Gen speech-Abl

«pha^oi šid **gdañ·ño**
father-Gen funeral prepare(SFut)-F

yab·ki ya·rmañ **gzugso**»

hon-father-Gen high-fundament erect(SFut)-F

[Father Stenrgan Ñerpa] having been killed, the [priest] Rtsadags Snam Number One taking the little bag did not say the [ritual] words: «...», [but] the sons, the six Gyimpo brothers said: «[We] **shall prepare** father's funeral. [We] **shall erect** [our] honourable father's high fundament» (OT-AFL IB: 16/1-7).

- b. Gyim·po Ñag·g[c]ig·ki mchid·nas «myi dbul[·du ni dbul]
Gyimpo Ñag-one-Gen speech-Abl man poor[-L/P θ poor]

g.yañ ridu na ri·da [=rid·du ni rid]
luck emaciated-L/P θ emaciated

pha^oi šid **myi·theñs**

father-Gen funeral be-completed(Ng1-St.Ptt:fFutPerf-nf)

yab·ki rmañ **myi·tshugs·so**

hon-father-Gen fundament be-established(Ng1-St.Ptt:fFutPerf)-F

btsal rgya·ru btsal·yañ

search(St.Ptt-nf) seal-L/P search(St.Ptt)-Anti

rñed šir **myi·rñed**»

find(St.ntr-nf) die(St.Ptt-nf)-L/P find(Ng1-FutPerf(St.ntr))

cis [=ces] gsuñ

such say(SPrs/Fut~St.Prs-nf)

Gyimpo Ñag Number One complains (lit. speaks from his speech): «[I am] a man, poor[er than poor (lit. with respect (i.e. in comparison) to the poor, being poor)], [with] luck, more emaciated than emaciated: [our] father's funeral **will/cannot** [ever] **be completed**, the fundament of [our] honourable father's [burial] **will/cannot** [ever] **be established**: although having searched and searched [something to be used] as a seal, no[thing] **will/can** [ever] **be found** for the dead, at all (lit. as for searching, having searched for a seal, as for obtaining, [something] for the dead will/cannot be obtained)»²⁰ (OT-AFL IB: 16f/8-10).

- c. bu Gyim·po spun [drug]·gis

son Gyimpo brother six-Erg

«[...] °on·kyañ pha^oi šid **ma·theñs**

... thus father-Gen funeral be-completed(Ng2-St.Ptt:fOpt)

mgyogs kho·de [=khod·de] byañ·rdzoñ·du ma·ruñ [...]
 swift be-arranged(St.Ptt?-LC) purified-castle-L/P suitable(Ng2-St.ntr)

pha^oi šid **ma·theñs**
father-Gen funeral be-completed(Ng2-St.Ptt:fOpt)

yab·gyi [ʔrm]añ **ma·tshugs** [...]
 hon-father-Gen fundament be-established(Ng2-St.Ptt:fOpt)

sña khrin che^oi khrin **ma·blañs**
ancient authority²¹ great-Gen authority take(Ng2-St.Ptt:fPrhb)

smra dos·drag·ki lcag **ma·btab** [...]
 speech compulsory-service-Gen whip apply(Ng2-St.Ptt:fPrhb)

pha^oi šid **ma·theñs**
father-Gen funeral be-completed(Ng2-St.Ptt:fOpt)

yab·ki rmañ **ma·tshugs**»
hon-father-Gen fundament be-established(Ng2-St.Ptt:fOpt)

yab Sten·rgan Ñer·pa ni sku mgur·cu
hon-father Stenrgan Ñerpa θ hon-body reliquary-base

man·cad sa·dog rum·du byiñ·^ogis ma·mchis
below earth-pit grave-L/P sink(St.Ptt)-Instr appear(Ng2-SPtt)

The sons, the six [other] Gyimpo brothers [replied]: «[...] Therefore: **let** father's funeral **be uncompleted!** It is not suitable to have a horse (lit. swift one) arranged and [ascend to the nine] purified [swinging] castles (i.e. planets).²² [...] **Let** father's funeral **be uncompleted!** **Let** the fundament of [our] honourable father's [burial] **be unestablished!** [...] **Do not assume** great authority [which comes from being] ancient authority! **Do not apply** words [like] the whip for compulsory service! [...] **Let** father's funeral **be uncompleted!** **Let** the fundament of [our] honourable father's [burial] **be unestablished!**»²³ As for the honourable father Stenrgan Ñerpa, because [his] body was sunk down in an earth pit below the base of the *mchodrten* (reliquary), he did not appear [any longer] (OT-AFL IB: 17/10-28).

d. pha-yab·ki žal·nas
hon-father-Gen hon-mouth-Abl

«bu Gyim·po Ñag²⁴ pha^oi drin·ma na
son Gyimpo Nag father-Gen kindness [experience]-cc

sman dags[!]-dañ mtshuñ·ste
medicine pure-I/S be-equal(St.ntr-LC)

gañs·ki ltoñ[!]-nas sky[e]so
glacier-Gen summit-Abl be-born(SPtt)-F

ma^oi drin·ma zos·na
mother-Gen kindness experience(St.Ptt-cc)

bya khu·byug·dañ mtshuñ·ste
bird cuckoo-I/S be-equal(St.ntr-LC)

tshañ·dan gžibs·na skyeso
nest-I/S arrange(St.ntr-cc) be-born(SPtt)-F

°on·kyañ pha^oi šid **thoñ·šig**
thus father-Gen burial prepare(Imp-Dir)

yab·[ki m]dad rmañ **tshugs·šig** gsuñ <...>
h-father-Gen funeral-repast fundament erect(Imp-Dir) h-say(St.Prs-nf)

The honourable father spoke (lit. from the mouth of): «[My] son Gyimpo Ńag, to [experience] the kindness of a father is like the pure medicine [plant] growing (lit. born) below the glacial summit. To experience the kindness of a mother is like the bird cuckoo growing up (lit. born) in a [well] arranged nest. Therefore: **Prepare** father's funeral! **Erect** the fundament [for] the honourable father's funeral repast! By speaking [the ritual words]: <...>» (OT-AFL IB: 19/98-101).

3.3 Reorganisation of Proto-Tibetan verb stems, group (2)

The development of the verbs with 'directional infixes' (-)l-/(-)r-/(-)s- and probably also (-)g/(-)d- seems to have been somewhat different. As the directional meaning developed into a sort of transitive-causative marker, the function of the 'infixes' is apparently quite similar to that of the *b*-prefix, i.e. they introduce an intentional agent (the one who directs the action toward a certain aim) without necessarily implying that the activity of the agent leads to the desired result. However, the scope of operation seems to have been different for the 'infixes'. While it is apparent that the *b*-prefix requires the ±resultative distinction and operates only on one stem out of a set of at least two if not eight derivational stems, the directional 'infixes' began to be productive either before the ±resultative dis-

inction was established, and in this case, the \pm resultative distinction had to be superimposed by a process of analogy, or the ‘infixes’ must have operated on both derivative stems. In the latter case, they would have led to a neutralisation of the non-resultative $^{\circ}$ - prefix. Both scenarios would lead to the same consequence: when these verbs were integrated into the set of four plus two verb stems, stem form II was in need of a new marker (with respect to either stem form I or III), and thus suffix *-s* was introduced for this purpose and then spread to the remaining verbs (alternatively, suffix *-s* might have been originally a secondary resultative marker for the verbs of group (5) spreading first to the verbs of group (2) and then to all other [+control] verbs).

A	B	C	D	I ?event	II result	III	IV	
				($^{\circ}$ -gañ)	gañ			to get full
				($^{\circ}$ -grub)	grub			to be accomplished
causative marker <i>s-</i>								
					causation of result			
s-koñ					s-kañ (-s)			to make full
				(s- $^{\circ}$ -grub) →s-grub	s-grub (-s)			to accomplish

Table V: Grammaticalisation & reorganisation of PT verb stems, group (2) – I

Note the forms *sgañ* | *bsgañs* | *bsgañ*: ‘to grow full’ (!), *sgoñ* | *bsgañs* | *bsgañ* | *sgoñ(s)*, ‘to make round’, and $^{\circ}$ *goñ* | *bkoñ*, ‘to despond’. The root $^{\circ}$ *gañ* is one of the few roots that have taken both transitive-causative markers: the ‘directional infix’ (*-*)*s-* as well as the *b-* prefix.

When these verbs were integrated into the pattern of four plus two stem forms, stem form III and IV had to be formed by analogy to group (1). Aspiration of stem form IV was blocked by the ‘directional infixes’. As for the result oriented stem form II, the *b-* prefix would have been redundant with respect to the causative function, as well as for the expression of mere attempt of causation. In 14th and 15th century texts, the *b-* prefix of stem form II is often missing with verbs of group (2) (cf. e.g. TVP and NARO), and this might be a reflection of the fact that it had been only facultative in earlier stages (as the OT data would not really support mere optionality,²⁵ one might think of a sort of ‘revival’ of an

earlier option). A missing or facultative *b-* prefix for stem form II could also explain why the *d-/g-* prefix for stem form III, apparently being phonetically or semantically incompatible with the ‘directional infixes’, could be replaced by the *b-* prefix²⁶ or a homophonous particle of a different origin (a phonetic change of *d-/g-* into *b-* seems to be quite unlikely). Nevertheless, from the 17th century on, the *b-* prefix for stem form II was reintroduced into the standard orthography, perhaps to mark off the functional distinction of stem forms II and IV where *Ablaut o* for stem form IV is missing. The four versions of the TVP are a good example for this orthographical development.

A	B	C	D	I simultan.	II anterior	III necess./posterior	IV ‘imperative’	OT/CT meaning
				°-gañ	gañ			to get full
s-koñ	→	→	→	→	(*ba-)s-kañ-s →(b-)s-kañ-s	?*dga-s-kañ →?? →b-s-kañ	s-koñ-s	to make full
				°-grub	grub			to be accomplished
				s-grub	(*ba-)s-grub-s →(b-)s-grub-s	?*dga-s-grub →?? →b-s-grub	s-grub-s	to accomplish

Table VI: Grammaticalisation & reorganisation of PT verb stems, group (2) – II

4 Conclusion

Reconstructions of PrT or even PrTB are more often than not based on formal similarities in the morphology of different TB languages on the presumption that the function of formally identical or similar elements is identical or similar. This approach is certainly valuable as a heuristic means. But since the TB morphological elements in question are often quite reduced, formal similarities may be merely accidental. To establish the original function of such elements it is not enough to rely on the meanings given in a dictionary, since the available dictionaries, such as JÄK and TCH for CT, are based on a rather late stage of language development and represent the results of several attempts of language standardisation. The entries and patterns thus have to be taken as normative constructs as long as they are not verified in their specific discursive context.

As I have hinted at in section 2.1 (and argued in more detail in part I), the function ‘command’ of the so-called ‘imperative’ stem cannot be taken for granted, as the derivation originally, in PrT, seems to have expressed the ability to perform an action. With this function, stem form IV can be found in OT as well as in early CT texts, and is still productive in non-assertive sentences (questions and negations) in Amdo Tibetan and perhaps other MT varieties. In assertive employment, stem form IV underwent a considerable shift of meaning: from the mere description of the ability to perform an action or to obtain a result via the wish that one may be able to perform and the wish that the action will be performed (optative) to the directive that the action should be performed (imperative).

Similarly, the *b*- prefix of the ‘past’ stem, as has been doubted for a long time, did not express past time reference in PrT. But neither did it express perfectivity. Instead, the original function of the prefix was to indicate the involvement of an intentional agent as responsible for a possible (but not necessarily following) resulting state of a transformation. Stem form IIb appears as a causative derivation, as a substitute of and partly in competition to the earlier causative derivation by means of the ‘directional infixes’ *(-)r-/(-)l-/(-)s-*. But in comparison to these ‘directional infixes’, the *b*- prefix seems to have emphasised somewhat more the intention of the agent and thus attracted the focus on the preparatory stages of the transformation, while the derivations by the ‘directional infixes’ became fully lexicalised. The further development of stem form IIb into an expression of anteriority and finally of past time reference in the MT languages is not quite evident, but it follows a cross-linguistically observable tendency of resultative constructions with a double focus on the transformation and the resulting state to become mere past tense constructions with a single focus on the transformation.

Although I am not able to present a reconstruction of the whole derivative set of the PrT verb, because, e.g. there is no textual evidence for an original function of the derivative suffix *-d/-s* of stem form Ib of controlled action verbs, the derivative suffix *-s/-*d* of stem form IIa/b of accidental event and controlled action verbs, or the derivative prefixes *d-/g-* and *b-* for stem form III, etc., I hope to have shown how the functional analysis of the OT/CT verb stems in their discursive context and particularly the analysis of unexpected or seemingly ‘erroneous’ stem forms in OT or CT as well as in the MT varieties can contribute to the reconstruction of the PrT verb.

Notes

- 01 This reconstruction was presented at the Ninth Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, Leiden, June 24th-30th, 2000. As the whole argument turned out to exceed the limits of the proceedings, the original section "2.1 Unexpected use of the 'imperative' stem", has been extracted for the proceedings (Zeisler in print) and is given here only in abbreviated form.
- 02 Cf. Skalbzang °Gyurmed (1992: 183ff).
- 03 A detailed discussion of the respective linguistic terms and their applicability to Tibetan is found in Zeisler forthcoming. The following cannot be but a very brief outline. Questions of diachronic development and synchronic variance of the MT varieties: LT, Nangchenpa, THEM, and particularly WT are likewise treated in that study and will not be discussed here in detail.
- 04 Perhaps, the verb *zin*₁ with the meaning 'to finish, get done with', is more commonly used, but there is a second verb *zin*₂ that is related to the controlled action verb °*dzin* etc., cf. JÄK sub °*dzin*: *bzuñ-bas mi-zin*, "capiendo non capitur, it (the soul) cannot be taken hold of", probably referring to the same passage. JÄK further mentions *nad-kyis zin-pa*, "seized with a malady", *sdig-pas zin-pa*, "to be affected by sin", *thugs-rjes zin-pa*, "to be kindly affected towards a person", *thugs ma-zin-pa*, "to be not graciously inclined", all from *Milaraspa, bu-mos zin-pa*, "taken in love with a girl", from the *Padma thañyig*. All these examples show that *zin* is, in fact, the accidental counterpart of the controlled action verb °*dzin* etc.
- 05 *Rnal°byorgyi dbañphyug chenpo Milaraspa°i rnamngur* of Gtsañsmyon Heruka Ruspa°i Rgyalchen (1488), Qinghai 2nd edition 1989: Mtshosñon žinchen Žinhua dpekhañ [Kokonor Province Qinghai publishing house].
- 06 Similarly also p. 435 *phyi snañ-ba btul-gyis*(St.Ptt-Anti) *mi-thul-gyis*(Ng1-SPrs/Fut(nc/pot)-emp), 'Though having tried to subdue the outer appearances, [you] will never be able to do so'. Note the double function of the verb final particle {kyi(s)}: following the first verb, it stands in place of the antithetical particle {kyañ}, following the second verb it is an emphatic particle, indicating (imminent) future time reference. For the *potentialis* function of the 'imperative' stem see section 2.1 below and, with more details, part I.
- 07 According to JÄK (sub °*gum*), °*gum* is the 'present' stem of both the controlled action verb 'to kill': °*gum* | *bkum* | *dgum* | *khum(s)* and the accidental event verb 'to die': °*gum* | *gum* (°*gums*). Note, however, the reference sub *bkum* to a 'present' stem °*gums*. According to TCH, 'to kill' has the stems: °*gums* | *bkums* | *dgum* | *khums*, whereas 'to die' has: °*gum* | *gum*. As the schemes below will show, the form °*gums* (<*°*gum-d*) would, indeed, better fit the controlled action verb, and the form °*gum* would better fit the accidental event verb. However, as the entry in JÄK shows, one cannot preclude the possibility of confusion of both stem forms. In our case, the reading 'to kill' for both °*gum* and *bkum* would be motivated by the contrast to the employment of °*chi/ši* for the accidental event.

- Note that the choice of ‘present’ and ‘past’ stem forms is reverted in manuscripts A and C: while A has first ‘past’ stem *ši* (a) and then ‘present’ stem *°gum* (c), C has first ‘present’ stem *°chi* (b) and then ‘past’ stem *bkum* (d).
- 08 Depending on the goal language, a neutral future or modal expression might be more appropriate in the translation. But then the focus on the resulting state has to be indicated by other means, e.g. as ‘cannot separate completely’, ‘cannot fully achieve the separation’, etc.
- 09 The numbers are based on the verb list TCH: 3147-3194, but they are only provisionally given for a rough orientation. As each dictionary and each verb list follows a different orthographic tradition (as much as the texts do), it is almost impossible to give a systematic account. Verbs with labial initial cannot take a *b*-prefix. They are, therefore, counted as ‘irregular’ by Tibetan authors. As much as 17 show the *d*- prefix for the ‘future’ stem, and I have thus classified them with group (1). There are some more ‘irregular’ verbs that could perhaps also be subsumed under group (1). Verbs with initial cluster do not all show the regular pattern of group (2). Thus, as much as 37 verbs where, due to a labial radical, the *b*- prefix is lacking are left in group (3). By contrast, the 5 verbs that, due to assimilation, show *m*- prefix before nasals in the ‘past’ and ‘future’ stem are added to group (2). For the designation of the three groups cf. Skalbzang *°Gyurmed* (1992: 191-194). His arrangement, however, does not fully suit this classification and differs somewhat from that of other authors, e.g. Dongrub Phuntshogs (1990). The latter author classifies the three groups according to which prefixes are used for which ‘tense’. His first group is thus described as: “the future word [by] ‘neutral’ [prefix] (*d*-/*g*-)”: *bya-tshig ma-niñ*, “present or agent by ‘feminine’ prefix (*°*-)”: *byed-pa mo-yis °phul*, “the past word by ‘masculine’ prefix (*b*-)”: *°das-tshig pho-yis °phul*, but he likewise includes those verbs which “for reasons of euphony [show] a ‘neutral’ [(*g*-) prefix for] the present word”: *brjod-bder byed-tshig ma-niñ*. The second group is described accordingly as: “the future word by ‘masculine’ prefix (*b*-) and the past as well”: *bya-tshig pho-yis °phul-la °das-pa°añ*, whereas “the present word is generally without prefix”: *byed-tshig phal-cher °phul-med*. The last group is described as: “some have no prefix for the words of (all) three tenses”: *gañ-šig dus-gsum-tshig-la °phul-med*, “[and] when they have one, the prefix letter does not change”: *yod-kyañ °phul-yig gcig-las °gyur-med*, “[and] even if it changes, as there is no correspondence with respect to the two [groups of] ‘regular’ and the ‘special’ [verbs], they are treated as ‘irregular’”: *°gyur-yañ spyi dañ bye-brag gñis-po-la | mi mthun-pa ni thor-bu-ba žes brjod*.
- 10 6 neutral verbs with a final *-d*, *-n*, *-r*, *-l* are added to group (5) because they show traces of an ancient *dadrag*, *-*d*.
- 11 OT-AFL IB: 16/7, cf. (23a) below. As for an aspirated root **thañ*, in correspondence with the root *chag* of the verb *gcog* etc., cf. p. 30 below.
- 12 I do not, therefore, follow Li’s (1933) rather formal analysis that the root, underlying stem form IIb, would be aspirated in *all* cases. Particularly, the so called ‘imperative’ stem cannot be taken to “present the initial in its original form, unin-

fluenced by any prefix” (p. 142), since it has turned out to be a derivative stem form itself. If the original verb roots had all been aspirated, one could not explain why it is, in quite a few cases, the derivation of the voiced type that forms the intransitive and possibly [–control] counterpart, as in the case of *°gañ* | *gañ*, ‘to fill, be filled’, *°gum* | *gum* (*°gums*), ‘to die’, or *°bab* | *bab(s)*, ‘to come down’, and, secondly, why the derivations of the aspirated type, the presumed root forms, could differ in meaning, as in the case of *°khum* | *khums*, ‘to shrink’, and *pheb* | *phebs*, ‘to come’,—if these forms are related, at all. Another difficulty would be to explain, why the various prefixes would operate on different derivational stems (*°-* and *d-/g-* prefix operating on the voiced type, *b-* prefix operating on the aspirated type) and which of these derivational stems could be identified as the verb root. The *°-* prefix itself cannot be responsible for a de-aspiration of the root since it is compatible with aspirated radicals. Likewise, the *g-* and *d-* pre-radicals are compatible with unvoiced radicals and thus not responsible for the voicing of the root (but perhaps the more complex prefix **dg-* is?). Even in my analysis, the question remains why the *b-* prefix could operate alternatively on two different derivational stems. Additionally, it seems to be quite disturbing that a seemingly voiced prefix should be responsible for the devoicing of the radical. Note, that the pre-radical *b-* is perfectly compatible with voiced radicals, as in the case of the verb *°ded* | *bdas* | *bda°* | *ded*, ‘to pursue’, mentioned above, and thus not necessarily the source of devoicing. A quite speculative suggestion might be that the original form of the prefix did, in fact, operate only on the derivational stem of the voiced type but caused some sort of aspiration of the voiced radical that fell outside the phonemic system so that this voiced and aspirated consonant could only be interpreted either as a kind of aspirated unvoiced consonant, the aspiration being omitted in due course, or as a kind of voiced and thus non-aspirated consonant, but of a rather labile character so that the voicedness could be lost in due course. Some evidence for this hypothesis might be given by the various ways by which Tibetan authors spell the aspirated voiced consonants of Sanskrit. Some of them opt for the spelling *°kha* for *gha*, e.g. Bsodnams Rtsemo, some opt for *rg*, as Tāranātha, others again for *rg* plus subscribed *h*, as Dñulchu Dharmabhadra (Verhagen [1996]). The different spellings in AFL (with an obviously non-standardised orthography), on the one side, RAMA (following a rather standardised orthography) and the CT relics, on the other side, could indicate some sort of dialectal influence in the interpretation of the non-systemic feature. Dialect variance, however, could also be responsible for the doubling of the resultative derivations and the shifts in meaning. The obvious difference in the pattern of the verbs of group (1b) seems to be due to different mechanisms of derivation (perhaps the *g-* ‘prefix’ of stem form A and III rather is a ‘directional infix’ more closely connected with the root or underlying stem form).

- 13 Perhaps, the distinction agentive : inagentive was established only as a side product of quite another function of the *b-* prefix (like the transitive-causative marking is a side product of the primarily directional function of the ‘infixes’), and before its introduction the proto-verb was simply neutral with respect to

- agency as most Indo-European verbs are. This assumption could undermine reservations against the above premise that gives PrT quite an exotic appearance. But then the questions are: for what other function had the *b-* prefix been introduced (apparently it was not a directional particle), why for only one stem, and how could it have introduced inagentive meaning to all other stem forms?
- 14 In his comments on Ksenia Kepping's paper at the Ninth Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, Leiden, June 24th-30th, 2000.
- 15 The same ambiguity is found in the somewhat more explicit construction of causation and attempt: VN + (-r) + verb of doing. This construction may be used (a) as a mere synonym of the standard temporal construction, (b) as a causative construction, or as expressing that the agent is (c) preparing to act or (d) merely pretending to act, e.g. (a) *(b)rtsod·pa·byas·pa*, 'discussed' (CT-NARO: 57/17a4-5), (b) *sdug·bsñal myoñ·bar·byas·te* 'caused [her] to feel misery' (CT-TVP: 50/269v2), (c) *nam·ka·la °pur·te·°gro·bar·bgyis·na*, 'was about to fly away into the sky', 'made preparations to fly', 'attempted to fly', (OT-RAMA: 135/A401), (d) *dku·°gañ pub·nas | btsan·po [...] ston·mo gsol·bar·byas·te*, 'having organised an ambush [he] pretended to invite the emperor [...] to a feast' (OT-DTH: 101.21-25).
- 16 Perhaps formed by analogy for the [+control] reading.
- 17 This etymology is quite speculative. By contrast, the relation between *šid*, 'funeral' and the verb *°chi | šī*, 'to die' is rather obvious, cf. also *gšin·po·mo*, 'dead man/woman'. Derivations by suffix *-d* or *-n* are quite common for vocalic verb roots (cf. Beyer 1992: 117).
- 18 Here, Bacot & Toussaint (1940) translate 'délaiissa' (abandoned), but in the short chronicle they give the correct meaning as "fit porter ... sur le lieu de sépulture", "fut porté au lieu de crémation pour les funérailles", or "est envoyé au lieu de sépulture".
- 19 *°gum | bkum | dgum | khum(s)*; the beginning is missing. Perhaps also for *gum* of *°gum | gum (°gums)*, 'to die'.
- 20 If anything is obvious here, at all, than it is the parallelism between lines 5 and 6. Thus an alternative reading of *rgya·ru* as 'antelope's horn' is ruled out. Thomas (1957: 37, note to l. 10) opts for the contrast *rgya·ru*, "on the plain" vs. *šir*, "on the height", taking *šī* as a contracted form of *šid* with the presumed meaning: "height" (but see note 17 above). The resulting interpretation: 'having searched on the plain [one] will not find it in the height' is somewhat too trivial for the context. The reading 'seal' for *rgya* in connection with a funeral, on the other hand, is corroborated by the phrase *nam·mkha·i °byañs·su rgya rgyab·pa*, "to seal up into the heavenly regions, i.e. to cause to disappear" (JÄK). The 'seal' could well consist in the offering of wealth (animals).
- 21 Lit. instruction, *khrid*; change of final *-d/-n*? Cf. Thomas (1957: 37), note to l. 21, cf. also note 17 above.
- 22 The "(nine swinging) purified castles" appear in the ritual speech that is said to have remained unspoken (part (a), omitted in the above representation). Thomas identifies them with the nine "planets", and suggests that the "swift one" was to

- bring the dead body to heaven (Thomas 1957: 28, note 8). This would imply the—apparently not merely symbolic—offering of at least one horse, which is thus opposed by the brothers. Attribute and number of the castles as well as the verb of movement ${}^{\circ}dzeg$ | ${}^{\circ}dzegs$ | ${}^{\circ}dzeg$ | ${}^{\circ}dzog$, ‘to ascend’, found in the ritual speech are skipped in the passage at hand.
- 23 Combined with the Negation Particle *ma*, the resultative forms have a negative optative meaning corresponding to the prohibitive context of part (c) (*ma·blans*, ‘do not assume’, *ma·btāb*, ‘do not apply’, and the somewhat weaker formulation *ma·ruñ*, ‘is not suitable’), and are to be translated accordingly as ‘may it be unprepared/unestablished’ or, in this case, as expressions of allowance or neglect and boredom: ‘let it be unprepared/unestablished’.
- 24 Thomas has “Ñag-cig”, but in line 98 of plate II *cig* definitely does not appear.
- 25 The *b-* prefix is quite consistently used in DTH, RAMA, and the *Early Tibetan Inscriptions*, Richardson (1985), which all appear to follow a somewhat standardised orthography. OT-RAMA: 98/C10 *sgrubs-so* and 99/C16 *sgrubs-na*^o belong to the few exceptions. The AFL texts, on the other hand, show a higher percentage of ‘missing’ *b-* prefixes, but their orthography is far from being consistent.
- 26 The double marking of intentionality could have led to an obligational or necessitative meaning corresponding to the function of the *d-/g-* prefix.

Abbreviations

(a) Sources

AFL	<i>Ancient Folk-Literature from North-Eastern Tibet</i> , Thomas (1957), OT
BTSU	<i>Btsumo Bka^oi-thaṅyig</i> , Laufer (1911), CT
DTH	<i>Documents de Touen-Houang</i> , Bacot et al. (1946), OT
NARO	<i>Die Legenden des Nāropa</i> , Grünwedel (1933), CT
RAMA	<i>The story of Rāma in Tibet</i> , De Jong (1989), OT
TVP	<i>Die tibetische Version des Papageienbuches</i> , Herrmann (1983), CT

(b) Tibetan languages

CT	Classical Tibetan (written, 11 th - 19 th century)
LT	‘Lhasa’ Tibetan (vernaculars: Lhasa dialect as well as Central Tibetan and Exile Tibetan <i>koiné</i> , 20 th century)
MT	Modern Tibetan (vernaculars without specification, 20 th century)
OT	Old Tibetan (written, mid 7 th - end of 10 th century)
PrT	Proto-Tibetan
PrTB	Proto-Tibeto-Burman
THEM	Themchen, Amdo in China (vernacular, 20 th century) - by courtesy of Felix Haller

TB	Tibeto-Burman
WT	West Tibetan: Ladakhi and Purik in India, Balti in Pakistan, (vernaculars, 20 th century, for written Ladakhi of the 19 th /20 th century see Francke 1905-41)

(c) Dictionaries and verb lists:

GOL	Goldstein (1994)
JÄK	Jäschke (1881)
TCH	Tibetan Tibetan Chinese Dictionary (1993)

(d) Grammatical terms

Abl	Ablative Particle
Anti	antithetical particle
cc	conjunctive case particle
CD	conjunctive case particle with function of: conditional
con	connective particle
CPrs/Fut	Compound Present/Future
ctr	[+control]
Dir	Directive Marker (Imperative, Optative, Prohibitive)
D/L	Dative/Locative Particle
emp	emphatic future marker
Erg	Ergative Particle
<i>f</i>	function of
F	Final Marker
Fut	Future
FutPerf	Future Perfect
Gen	Genitive Particle
GenrPerf	Generic Perfect
h, hon	honorific
Imp	Imperative
Impf	Imperfect, <i>Imparfait</i>
Instr	Instrumental Particle
intj	interjection
Ipftv	Imperfective
I/S	Instrumental/Sociative Particle
LC	<i>lhagbcas</i> , clause chaining conjunction
Loc	Locative Particle
L/P	Locative/Purposive Particle
nc	[-control]
nf	'non-finite', \emptyset -conjunction
Ng1	Negation Particle <i>mi</i>
Ng2	Negation Particle <i>ma</i>
nr	neutral (verb stem not inflecting)

Opt	Optative
PC	<i>Passé Composé</i>
Pftv	Perfective
pl	plural marker
pot	<i>potentialis</i>
Prhb	Prohibitive
Prs	present
PrsPerf	Present Perfect
Ptt	preterite/past
QF, Q	Question (Final) Marker
R	reduplication
SFut	Simple Future
SPrs/Fut	Simple Present/Future
SPtt	Simple Past
St.	stem
VN	verbal noun, participle
θ	Theme/Topic Marker
« », < »	indicate (quoted) direct, indirect speech, or thoughts, etc. in narrations or in examples of conversations, independently of the use of quotes by the authors, not to be confounded with the quotation marks: “ ” and ‘ ’
!	after stem designation indicates ‘irregular’ stem form
i	literal translation, not well formed in English
*	hypothetical form
#	non-narrative discourse

References

- Bacot, Jacques, Thomas, Frederick William et Toussaint, Ch. 1940. *Documents de Touen-houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet*. Paris.
- Beyer, Stephan V. 1992. *The Classical Tibetan Language*. New York: State University of New York Press. Reprint 1993, Delhi: Sri Satguru.
- Bradley, David. 1994. The subgrouping of Proto-Tibeto-Burman. In H. Kitamura (ed.), *Current Issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics*, pp. 59-78. Osaka: The Organizing Committee.
- Coblin, Weldon South. 1976. Notes on Tibetan verbal morphology. *T'oung Pao* 62: 45-70.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- De Jong, Jan Willem. 1989. *The Story of Rāma in Tibet. Text and Translation of the Tunhuang Manuscripts*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Denwood, Philip. 1999. *Tibetan*. Amsterdam, Phil.: Benjamins.
- Dongrub Phuntshogs. 1990. *Bodyiggi dusgsum rnamgžag* [Principle of the three tenses of written Tibetan]. S.l.: Bodljoṅs midmaṅs dpeskrunkhaṅ [Tibetan People's Publishing House].

- Driem, George van. 1993. The Proto-Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement system. *BSOAS [Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies]* LVI: 292-344.
- Driem, George van. 1997. Sino-Bodic. *BSOAS* 60: 455-488.
- Francke, August Hermann. 1905-1941. *Gšamyulna bšadpa^oi Kesargyi sgruñs bžugs. A Lower Ladakhi Version of the Kesar Saga*. Calcutta 1905-1909 (Fasc. 1-4), 1941 (Fasc. 5): Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. [Reprint 1981: *The Epic of Gesar*. Ed. by Kunzang Tobgyel and Mani Dorje, vol. 29. Thimphu, Bhutan: Druk Sherig Press.]
- Francke, August Hermann. 1924-1930. Gzer-myig, a Book of the Tibetan Bonpos. Tibetan Text According to the Berlin-Manuscript. *AM [Asia Major]* 1 (1924): 243-346 (chapter I-III), *AM* 3 (1926): 321-339 (chapter IV), *AM* 4.2/3 (1927): 161-239 (chapter V), *AM* 4.4 (1928): 481-540 (chapter VI), *AM* 5 (1928): 1-40 (chapter VI, translation), *AM* 6 (1930): 299-314 (chapter VII).
- Goldstein, Melvin C. (ed.). 1994. *Tibetan-English Dictionary of Modern Tibetan*. 4th edition. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Grünwedel, Albert. 1933. *Die Legenden des Nāropa, des Hauptvertreterers des Nekromanten- und Hexentums. Nach einer alten tibetischen Handschrift als Beweis für die Beeinflussung des nördlichen Buddhismus durch die Geheimlehre der Manichäer*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Haller, Felix. [1997]. Criteria for verb description in Themchen Tibetan. [Handout presented at the Second Project Meeting of the European Cooperation Project on Himalayan Languages, Paris, 13.-14.11.1997.]
- Herrmann, Silke. 1983. *Die tibetische Version des Papageienbuches*. St. Augustin: VGH-Wissenschaftsverlag.
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 1991. 'DO-language' and 'BECOME-language': two contrasting types of linguistic representation. In Yoshihiko Ikegami (ed.), *The Empire of Signs: Semiotic Essays on Japanese Culture*, pp. 285-326. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Jäschke, Heinrich August. 1881. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary. With Special Reference to Prevailing Dialects*. London. 4th. Reprint 1992, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Kalsang Norbu, Peet, Karl A., Dpalldan Bkrashis, and Stuart, Kevin. 2000. *Deñrabs Amdo^oi khaskad. Modern Oral Amdo Tibetan. A Language Primer*. Lewinston, NY., etc.: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Kepping, Ksenia Borisovna. 1971. A category of aspect in Tangut. Transl. by Eric Grinstead. *Acta Orientalia Soc. Orientales Danica, Norvegica, Svedica*. 33: 283-294.
- Kepping, Ksenia Borisovna. Forthcoming. The verb in Tangut. [9th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, Leiden, June 2000.]
- Laufer, Berthold. 1911. *Btsunmo bka^oi thanyig. Der Roman einer tibetischen Königin. Tibetischer Text u. Übersetzung*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Li, Fang-Kuei. 1933. Certain phonetic influences of the Tibetan prefixes upon the root initials. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica (Taipeh)* 4: 135-157.
- Nagano, Yasuhiko. 1983. *A Historical Study of the Rgyarong Verb System*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.

- Ohuri, Toshio. [2000]. Some implications of event framing typology: with particular reference to the realisation of goal orientedness. [III. Ost-West-Kolloquium für Sprachwissenschaft: 'Sprachen des Ostens – Sprachen des Westens', Berlin 25.-26.2, 17.-18.3.2000.]
- Richardson, Hugh E. 1985. *A Corpus of Early Tibetan Inscriptions*. Hertford: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Schneider, Johannes. 1993. *Der Lobpreis der Vorzüglichkeit des Buddha. Udbhāṭa-siddhasvāmins Viśeṣastava mit Prajñāvarmans Kommentar. Nach dem tibetischen Tanjur herausgegeben und übersetzt*. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica.
- Shafer, Robert. 1949. Studies in the morphology of Bodic verbs. *BSOAS* 13: 702-724, 1017-1031.
- Skalbzang °Gyurmed. 1992. *Bodkyi brdasprod rigpa°i khridrgyun rabgsal meloñ: Le clair miroir. Enseignement de la grammaire tibétaine*. Traduit, adapté et commenté par Heather Stoddard et Nicolas Tournadre. Arvillard: Editions Prajñā, Collection Tibétaine.
- Takeuchi, Tsuguhito. 1995. *Old Tibetan Contracts from Central Asia*. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan.
- Thelin, Nils B. 1990. Verbal aspect in discourse: On the state of the art. In Nils B. Thelin (ed.), *Verbal Aspect in Discourse*, pp. 3-88. Amsterdam, Phil.: Benjamins.
- Thomas, Frederick William. 1948. *Nam. An Ancient Language of the Sino-Tibetan Borderland*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, Frederick William. 1957. *Ancient Folk-Literature from North-Eastern Tibet*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Tibetan Chinese Dictionary: *Bodrgya tshigmdzod chenmo*. S.l.: Mirigs dpekskrunkhañ [National Publishing House] 1993.
- Tillemans, Tom J.F. & Herforth, Derek D. 1989. *Agents and Actions in Classical Tibetan: The Indigenous Grammarians on bdag and gžan and bya byed las gsum*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien.
- Tournadre, Nicolas. 1991. The rethorical use of the Tibetan ergative. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 14.1: 93-107.
- Tournadre, Nicolas. 1996. *L'ergativité en tibétain. Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée*. Paris: Louvain.
- Uray, Géza. 1953. Some Problems of the ancient Tibetan verbal morphology. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae* 3: 37-60.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1957. Verbs and times. *The Philosophical Review* 66: 143-160.
- Verhagen, Pieter Cornelis. [1996]. Recent findings in *Klog-thabs* texts apropos of Tibetan phonology and phonetics. [Handout presented at the First Project Meeting of the European Cooperation Project on Himalayan Languages, Zürich, 1996.]
- Weinrich, Harald. 1964. *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt*. 4th edition 1985. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Wolfenden, Stuart N. 1929. *Outline of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology. With Special Reference to the Prefixes and Suffixes of Classical Tibetan and the Languages of the Kachin, Bodo, Nāgā, Kuki-Chin and Burma Groups*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.

- Zeisler, Bettina. 2000. Narrative conventions in Tibetan languages: the issue of mirativity. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 23.2: 39-77 [indexed as 'Evidentials, inferentials, and mirativity in Nepali'].
- Zeisler, Bettina. In print. The development of temporal coding in Tibetan: some suggestions for a functional internal reconstruction. Part I: Unexpected use of the 'imperative' stem in Old Tibetan and Themchen (Amdo Tibetan). *Proceedings of the 9th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, Leiden, June 2000*. Ed. by Henk Blezer.
- Zeisler, Bettina. Forthcoming. *RELATIVE TENSE and Aspectual Values in Tibetan Languages. A Comparative Study*. Unpubl. doctoral dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin, 1999.

Bettina Zeisler <zeis@zedat.fu-berlin.de>
Liebenwalder Str. 44
D-13347 Berlin
Germany

Universität Tübingen
SFB 441
Nauklerstr. 35
D-72074 Tübingen
Germany.