

To Stephanie W. Jamison

Contents

Acknowledgements	ix
Preface	xi
Brief overview of Tibetan Verb Morphology	xv
Abbreviations	xxiii
Other Verb Lists Not Here Consulted	xxv
Bibliography	xxvii
Lexicon	1
Index	311

Acknowledgments

For their academic oversight or assistance of many kinds I would like to thank the following persons: Olivier Crabb, Christoph Cueppers, Toshitaka Ishiguchi, Stephanie W. Jamison, Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp, Simon Wickham-Smith, Yudru Tsomu, Helga Uebach. In particular I acknowledge here my gratitude to Sven Osterkamp and Philip Conquest (of Kerry Press) for their assistance in typesetting this complicated work.

Preface

The various currently available Tibetan dictionaries regularly disagree about what the four verbs stems of a particular Tibetan verb are. The dictionaries do not mention, let alone account for these discrepancies. A first step toward clarifying the stem forms of Tibetan verbs is to identify when and how such disagreements occur. Such is the goal of the present work.

Tibetan verb morphology has been the most widely researched area of the Tibetan verbal system, although few issues have been resolved (*vide* Li 1933, Shafer 1950-1951, Coblin 1976, Hahn 1994 and 1999, Zeisler 2004). One flaw of these studies has been to rely too heavily upon Jäschke (1881) or a small number of other dictionaries.¹ The compilation of more reliable data will hopefully help clarify some of the outstanding problems. A provisional description of Tibetan verb morphology is provided as part of these prefatory materials.

This dictionary provides a systematic presentation of verb stems according to Tibetan grammarians. I have compiled verb stems from eight indigenous sources favoring the oldest and most authoritative. In addition, I have given the forms and definitions from Das' (1902) dictionary because of its widespread use.²

In the future these data will be compared with collations of textual citations to trace the development of the Tibetan verbal system empirically. An understanding of the indigenous presentation of verb stems in my view is a prerequisite for such empirical research, just as Westergaard's *Radices* (1841) was a prerequisite for Whitney's *Roots* (1885).

For clarity of presentation and considerations of time I have not compiled from the more recent indigenous verb lists nor the many western dictionaries. To have selected from more would perhaps have been beneficial, but I believe that these nine sources give a good idea of the problem areas and further compilation would have merely confused matters and added little new data. However, a list of uncollated verb lists is provided for the convenience of other researchers.

¹ The most common other dictionaries used are Das (1902), Desgodins (1899), and Chos kyi grags pa (1957), the first two of which rely directly upon Jäschke (1881).

² I now regret this decision, because Jäschke's dictionary is more carefully constructed than Das' dictionary, but differs little from it in content. Initially I chose Das because of its greater size, but seeing that he introduces many errors or ambiguities not present in his predecessor, my choice is unfortunate. By the time I fully realized my mistake it was no longer feasible to correct it; however, whenever Das is unclear in his intention I have consulted Jäschke and have added the same abbreviation that Das uses (Jä), in some cases also making tacit improvements of a minor kind.

The lexicographical sources consulted for their presentation of the morphology of the Tibetan verb stems are each abbreviated by two small capital letters (e.g. DS, TC etc). A key to these abbreviations is found at the end of this preface.

The lemmata of the dictionary itself are organized alphabetically according to the present stem; other stems may be sought in the index. The sources reporting any particular piece of information appear directly after the forms they report. The abbreviations are given chronologically. When a source gives a brief note about the verb this is included in small type in parentheses directly after the two-letter abbreviation for the source. Any longer comments or peculiarities are included in the notes section of the appropriate lemma. Brackets [] indicate that the source implies the information but does not explicitly state it, such as the past or future of a verb in DS marked with a nubla, which DS uses to denote that all principle parts are identical. Accordingly, I assume that all verbs in DS have present, past, and future, but make no assumption about the presence of an imperative. Parentheses () indicate that the source has listed the particular form as an inferior, rare, or alternate form. Text critical issues have been treated in the footnotes.

The terminology of ‘transitive’ and ‘intransitive’ is not appropriate to the description of Tibetan grammar (cf. Hill 2004). Transitivity is classically defined in reference to the accusative case, a category which has no meaning in Tibetan. Even in the study of Indo-European languages ‘transitivity’ as a category collapses and confuses valence, rection, and occasionally also volition. The Tibetan indigenous grammatical tradition makes use of two equally befuddling sets of terminology *tha dad pa* versus *tha mi dad pa* and *byed ḥbrel las tshig* versus *byed med las tshig*. None of these categories is sufficiently nuanced or well elaborated to adequately describe Tibetan syntax. However, it is in the nature of this work to report the findings of previous work, whatever flaws may be contained therein. In this dictionary sources which report a verb as ‘transitive,’ ‘active,’ *tha dad pa*, or *byed ḥbrel las tshig* will be reported under the rubric ‘transitive,’ and sources which report a verb as ‘intransitive,’ ‘neutral,’ *tha mi dad pa*, or *byed med las tshig* will be reported as ‘intransitive.’

Linguistic research on the Tibetan verbal system has increasingly emphasized the category of ‘volition,’ alternatively know as ‘control.’ This is a category unknown to the indigenous grammatical tradition. When linguistic studies (esp. Hoshi 2003, and Tournadre and Dorje 2003) report a verb as ‘voluntary’ or ‘involuntary’ this is duly noted. Voluntary verbs have an imperative stem whereas involuntary verbs do not. Therefore, when the traditional sources report an imperative stem they can be understood as categorizing the verb as voluntary, and when they fail to report an imperative stem they can be understood as categorizing the verb as involuntary. Sources which report some verbs with and some verbs without an imperative are interpreted in this fashion and are listed under the headings ‘voluntary’ and ‘involuntary’ for each verb as appropriate. However, since DK and LZ give an imperative for every verb I have not considered their testimony as evidence for volition.

The English definitions from CD and DK are given throughout, though I have taken the liberty to correct obvious mistakes, change punctuation, and replace unnecessary ‘or’s with commas. The definitions from DS are my own translations, as are most definitions from TC. However, the translation of TC into English (Skorupski 2001) has been employed up until the letter ñ.

As for the *da drag*, I list forms as they appear in my sources. It should be kept in mind that only some sources give a *da drag* (KY_N, ND, TD, LZ, DK). When the stem of a particular verb is given by one of these sources as lacking a *da drag*, it should be understood that the source in question claims that that verb stem lacks a *da drag*. Other sources never report a *da drag* (KY_T, CD, DS, TC). The evidence of these sources should be understood as in no way remarking upon the question of whether a particular verb form originally had a *da drag*. The failure of these sources to mark a *da drag* on a particular verb form is a consequence of their failure to do so everywhere. Consequently rather than reporting that a *da drag* is absent they should simply be taken as silent on the question of whether a verb form originally had a *da drag*.

Syntactical information is taken from Tournadre and Dorje (2003) and Hackett (2003). Rection is marked by putting the abbreviation for the case of noun appearing in a clause first, followed by the abbreviation for the second noun to appear in the clause, e.g. [Erg. Abs.] would mean the first noun is ergative and the second absolutive. For this purpose the following abbreviations have been used: Erg. ergative, Abs. absolutive, Instr. instrumental, Ela. elative, Abl. ablative, Obl. dative, Ass. associative. Due to the idiosyncrasies of Hackett (2003) it has been necessary to reinterpret his system; for this, as well as my own understanding of the case system and verb syntax, consult Hill (2004).

Hoshi (2003) and Tournadre and Dorje (2003) refer to the spoken language of Central Tibet. However, because they are the most thorough and sophisticated works on Tibetan syntax, I felt it was appropriate to include them here. It may be found that the syntax of a particular verb will have changed from Classical Tibetan to the spoken language of Central Tibet, but in most cases it will probably be the same. These studies will at least provide a point of departure for syntactic research geared more specifically at Classical Tibetan.

The spelling of English has been regularized to conform to American habits. This was necessitated as much by the irksome interference of word processing software as by my own desire for uniformity.

I compiled this dictionary between 2000 and 2004. Apart from minimal correction of minor errors no changes have been made since 2004.

Nathan W. Hill - *Senior Lecturer in Tibetan*

University of London, Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square, London WC1H 0XG, UK

Brief overview of Tibetan Verb Morphology

The dictionary in your hands is but a small stepping stone in the long path leading to a complete description and analysis of Tibetan verb morphology. The goal of the dictionary is to present morphological data as it is reported in the grammatical tradition in a systematic way. A full digestion of these data and the subsequent comparison of them with forms attested in texts is research which remains for the future. Until such work is undertaken the best that I can do here is to present those facts which seem to have been relatively well established based on the hitherto available data.

At first glance there seems to be almost no pattern to how Tibetan verbs form their stems, however over the decades a number of researches have made progress in bringing order to this madness. In particular, strides have been made by Li Fang-kuei (1933, 1959) and his student W. S. Coblin (1976). The system I present is essentially that of W. S. Coblin. In addition to changes of presentation, the analysis presented here incorporates a discovery made by de Jong (1973) and a significant alteration put forward by Christopher Beckwith (1996).

The internal reconstruction Coblin puts forward enables Tibetan verb stems to be derived from a root through the application of a very small number of affixes. However, a number of sound changes must be applied after the affixes. Presumably the Tibetan verbal system was originally more regular than it is attested and these sound laws subsequently obscured the system. The root of a verb is most easily visible by examining the future stem, and removing a *d-*, *g-*, or *b-* prefix if there is one.

For clarity of presentation, I present the sound changes first and then discuss the application of affixes, invoking the previously presented sound changes to account for the difference between the regularly derived reconstructed form and the attested verb stem.

Sound laws

Coblin refers to a number of sound changes first proposed by Li (1933) by the cover term ‘deaspiration’. These sound changes are in fact superfluous. Aspiration is not a phonemic contrast in Old Tibetan (Hill 2007). Consequently, aspiration can be safely ignored in the analysis of Tibetan verb morphology. The remainder of this discussion will transliterate *kh*, *ch*, *th*, and *ph* as simply *k*, *c*, *t*, and *p*.

Loss of prefixes (Coblin’s law)

Prefixes are lost when the resulting cluster is not phonotactically possible.

- *ḥrk > rk, e.g. √rkam ‘long for’, present *ḥrkam > rkam
 *ḥsky > sky, e.g. √skya ‘carry, convey’, present *ḥskya > skya
 *ḥrña > rña, e.g. √rña ‘mow’, present *ḥrña > rña
 *gzl > zl, e.g. √zla ‘say, speak’, present *gzlo > zlo
 *gsk > sk, e.g. √skañ ‘fulfill’, present *gskoñ > skoñ
 *bb > b, e.g. √bya ‘do’, past *bbyas > byas
 *bp > p, e.g. √pyag ‘bow’, past *bpyags, > pyags

Epenthesis after ḥ (Li Fang kuei’s law)

When an ḥ precedes a fricative, lateral, or *r*, a dental stop is inserted between *ḥ* and the following consonant. For laterals this change is followed by metathesis (Simon’s law).

- *ḥs > ḥts, e.g. √so ‘nourish’, present *ḥso > ḥtso
 *ḥś > ḥc (=ḥtś), e.g. √śad ‘explain’, present *ḥśad > ḥcad
 *ḥz > ḥdz, e.g. √zug ‘plant’, present *ḥzugd > ḥdzugs
 *ḥž > ḥj (=ḥdž), e.g. žo ‘milk’, present *ḥžo > ḥjo
 *ḥr > ḥdr, e.g. √ri ‘write’, present *ḥri > ḥdri
 *ḥl > ḥdl > ld, e.g. √lad ‘chew’, present *ḥlad > *ḥdlad > ldad
 *ḥt > ḥtł > łt, e.g. √tuñ ‘fall’, present *ḥtuñ > *ḥtłtuñ > łtuñ

Distribution of final -s and -d

In Old Tibetan *-s* and *-d* are in complementary distribution as finals of an Auslaut cluster, *-d* appearing after *n*, *r* and *l*, and *-s* after *g*, *b*, and *m*. Formerly these two consonants were distinct in these environments. The paradigm of verbs with open roots like √bya (present *byed*, past *byas*, future *bya*, imperative *byos*) indicate that the suffix *-d* is typical of the present stem and *-s* is typical of the past stem. In a verb like √sam (*sems*, *bsams*, *bsam*, *soms*) the present was originally **semd* and subsequently changed to *sems*.

- s* > *d* after *n*, *r*, and *l*, e.g. e.g. √ñan ‘listen’, past *bñans > mñand
d > *s* after *g*, *b*, and *m*, e.g. √zug ‘plant’, present *ḥzugd > ḥdzugs

Assimilation of b before nasals (Chang’s law)

Betty Chang (1971: 738) discovered that cluster initial *b-* assimilates to the labial nasal *m* before nasals.

- *bn > mn, e.g. √nan ‘suppress’, past *bnans > mñand
 *bñ > mñ, e.g. √ñan ‘listen’, past *bñans > mñand

Loss of final ḥ

Roots ending in final *-ḥ* lose the *-ḥ* before a suffix *-s*.

*ḥs > s, e.g. √caḥ ‘make, prepare’, past *bcaḥs > bcas

Spelling conventions before voiceless laterals (de Jong’s rule)

The voiceless lateral /t̥/ as a simple initial is spelled as <lh>. The prefix /g-/ is written as <k-> before a voiceless lateral. In other cases no distinction in spelling is made between the voiced and voiceless lateral, e.g. <bl> can represent /bl/ or /bɬ/. The four stems of the verbal root √lag ‘read’ are thus spelled *klog*, *blags*, *klag*, *lhogs* but have the phonemic interpretations /głog/, /błags/, /głag/, and /łogs/.

The ablauts a > e and u > i

The present suffix *-d* causes the following ablauts in the present stem.

*a(C)d > e(C)d, e.g. √bya ‘do’, present *byad > byed

*aṅd > eṅd, e.g. √laṅ ‘take’, present *laṅd > lend

*uṅd > iṅd, e.g. √byuṅ ‘take out’, present *ḥbyuṅd > ḥbyind

The change *ṅd > nd* of the second rule does not take effect in roots beginning with a velar, e.g. √gaṅ ‘fill’ present *ḥgaṅd > ḥgeṅs (and not *ḥgaṅd > *ḥgens as one might expect).

The ablauts a > o

The present prefix *g-* causes this ablaut.

*g(C)Ca > g(C)Co, e.g. √sab ‘complete’, present *gsab > gsob

The same ablaut occurs unconditioned in the imperative stem. All roots with the vowel *a* take the vowel *o* in the imperative, e.g. √rgal ‘step over,’ imperative *rgol*.

The future prefix d- > g-

The prefixes *d-* and *g-* for the future stem are in complementary distribution. We take *d-* to be underlying since *g-* has already been used as a prefix for the present.

*The devoicing prefix *X (Beckwith’s prefix)*

In the past and imperative of some verbs a devoicing prefix *X devoices the initial of the root. This prefix causes the same dental epenthesis before fricatives as *ḥ*.

*Xg > k, e.g. √gag ‘block’, past *bXgag > bkag, imperative *Xgogs > kogs

*Xd > t, e.g. √dud ‘bow to’, past *bXdud > btud, imperative *Xduds > tuds

*Xb > p, e.g. √byuṅ, ‘take out’ past *bXbyuṅ > pyuṅ, imperative *Xbyuṅs > pyuṅs

*Xž > Xdž > c (=tś), e.g. √žal ‘measure’, past *bXžald > bcald

*Xz > Xdz > ts, e.g. $\sqrt{\text{zug}}$ ‘plant’, past *bXzugs > btsugs, imperative *Xzugs > tsugs

Paradigms

Coblin classifies those Tibetan verbs with four separate stems into eight paradigms.

Paradigm 1:	h—,	b—s,	b—,	—s
Paradigm 2:	h—d,	b—s,	b—,	—s
Paradigm 3:	—d,	b—s,	b—,	—s
Paradigm 4:	g—,	b—s,	b—,	—s
Paradigm 5:	g—,	b—,	d—,	—s
Paradigm 6:	h—d,	b—,	d—,	—s
Paradigm 7:	h—,	b—s,	d—,	—s
Paradigm 8:	h—d,	b—s,	d—,	—s

Beyer divides all verbs into ‘intransitive’ and ‘transitives’ and offers one paradigm for the intransitives and four for the transitives. Beyer believes that ‘intransitive’ verbs has not future or imperative stem.

‘intransitives’				
Class 1:	h—,	—s		
‘transitives’				
Class 1:	h—,	b—s,	b—,	—s
Class 2:	h—,	b—s,	d—,	—s
Class 3:	g—,	b—s,	b—,	—s
Class 4:	g—,	b—s,	d—,	—s

Beyer’s inclusion of verbs which do not have a *b-* prefix in the past is a welcome addition. However, no study has established that there is a relationship between verbal morphology and verbal syntax. The division of Tibetan verbs into two syntactic categories is not sufficiently precise, and the terms ‘transitive’ and ‘intransitive’ are wholly inappropriate in the description of Tibetan grammar, because the traditional definition of these terms relies on the notion of the ‘accusative’ and no category of Tibetan case grammar can coherently be labeled ‘accusative’ (cf. Hill 2004). I propose that verbs which do not take a *b-* in their past stem be called ‘weak’ verbs and verbs which do be called ‘strong’ verbs.

I rather doubt that all of the weak verbs can be subsumed under Beyer’s single conjugation category, and whether they indeed lack future and imperative stems. However, since the weak verbs have never been the subject of peculiar study, Beyer’s suggestion is the only point of departure.

Beyer’s classification of the strong verbs simply ignores the present suffix *-d* and the fact that some verbs lack a present prefix altogether. His version is in no way an

improvement on Coblin’s analysis. However, Coblin’s eight paradigms are themselves not sufficiently nuanced. Coblin made his classification before Beckwith demonstrated that voicing alternation within verb paradigms is due to a lost prefix X-. Adding Beckwith’s prefix X- to Coblin’s paradigms results in a total of eleven paradigms for strong verbs.

Weak Verbs

Paradigm: ɣ—, —s

Strong Verbs

- Paradigm 1: ɣ—, b—s, b—, —s
 Paradigm 2: ɣ—d, b—s, b—, —s
 Paradigm 3: —d, b—s, b—, —s
 Paradigm 4: ɡ—, b—s, b—, —s
 Paradigm 5: ɡ—, b—, d—, —s
 Paradigm 6: ɣ—d, b—, d—, —s
 Paradigm 7: ɣ—d, b—s, d—, —s
 Paradigm 8: ɣ—, bX—s, b—, X—s
 Paradigm 9: ɣ—, bX—s, d—, X—s
 Paradigm 10: ɣ—d, bX—, d—, X—s
 Paradigm 11: ɣ—d, bX—s, d—, X—s

These paradigms can be exhibited, each with one example, as follows.

Weak Verbs

Paradigm: ɣ—, —s
 √byon ‘arrive’, ɣbyon, *byons > byond ‘go’
 √lañ ‘arise’, *ɣlañ > ldañ, lañs

Strong Verbs

Paradigm 1: ɣ—, b—s, b—, —s
 √kal ‘spin’, ɣkal, bkal, bkal, kol ‘spin’
 √rñan ‘reward’, *ɣrñan > rñan, *brñans > brñand, brñan, *rñons > rñond

Paradigm 2: ɣ—d, b—s, b—, —s
 √kru ‘bathe’, ɣkrud, bkru, bkru, krus
 √tso ‘cook’, ɣtsod, btsos, btso, tsos

Paradigm 3: —d, b—s, b—, —s
 √bya ‘do’, *byad > byed, *bbyas > byas, *bbya > bya, byos
 √sam ‘think’, *samd > sems, bsams, bsam, soms

- Paradigm 4: g—, b—s, b—, —s
 √sab ‘complete, fill’, gsob, bsabs, bsab, sobs
 √myañ ‘taste’, *gmyañ > myoñ, *bmyañs > myañs, *bmyañ > myañ, myoñs
- Paradigm 5: g—, b—, d—, —s
 √tañ ‘give, send’, *gtañ > gtoñ, btañ, *dtañ > gtañ, toñs
 √nan ‘suppress’, *gnan > gnon, *bnan > mnan, *dnan > gnan, nond
- Paradigm 6: ḥ—d, b—, d—, —s
 √zuñ ‘take’, *ḥzuñd > ḥdzind, bzuñ, *dzuñ > gzuñ, zuñs
- Paradigm 7: ḥ—d, b—s, d—, —s
 √drañ ‘take’, ḥdrañd > ḥdrend, *bdrañs > drañs, *ddrañ > drañ, droñs
- Paradigm 8: ḥ—, bX—s, b—, X—s
 √dud ‘bow to’, ḥdud, *bXduds > btud, bdud, *Xduds > tud
- Paradigm 9: ḥ—, bX—s, d—, X—s
 √gum ‘kill’, ḥgum, *bXgums > bkums, dgum, *Xgums > kums
- Paradigm 10: ḥ—d, bX—, d—, X-o-s
 √byuñ ‘remove’, *ḥbyuñd > ḥbyind, *bXbyuñ > pyuñ, dbyuñ, *Xbyuñs > pyuñs
 √gag ‘obstruct’, *ḥgagd > ḥgegs, *bXgag > bkag, dgag, *Xgag > kogs
- Paradigm 11: ḥ—d, bX—s, d—, X-o-s
 √bu ‘blow’, ḥbud, *bXbus > pus, dbu, *Xbus > pus
 √zug ‘plant’, *ḥzugd > ḥdzugs, *bXzugs > btsugs, *dzug > gzug, *Xzugs > tsugs

Irregular verbs

Some verbs, such as √za ‘eat’ (*za*, *bzas* / *zos*, *bzah*, *zos*), have conjugations which are *sui generis* and must be considered as part of a class of frequently used irregular verbs, as one would expect with any language. Other verbs, such as √zig ‘destroy’ (*ḥjig*, *bśig*, *gzig*, *śigs*), although they do not belong to any of the foregoing eleven paradigms are more likely to be misunderstood than insufficiently classified. Research on a small number of verbs, such as √tag ‘read’ (*klog*, *blags*, *klag*, *lhogs*, cf. de Jong 1973) and √ri ‘write’ (*ḥdri*, *bris*, *bri*, *ris*, cf. Hill 2005), has shown that their Old Tibetan paradigms are not what the standard dictionaries of Classical Tibetan report. Further research into individual verbs based on early textual attestations is the direction that future work on Tibetan verb morphology must take. Verb roots beginning with laterals or *r* are likely to continue to be fruitful. Another phenomenon which has not been studied but may have far reaching ramifications

for Tibeto-Burman historical linguistics in addition to an understanding Tibetan verbal morphology is the presence in Old Tibetan of the cluster *sts-* where Classical Tibetan simply has *s-*, e.g. *gtsan* / *gsan* ‘listen’, *stsogs* / *sogs* ‘gather’, *tsel* / *sel* ‘clear’. The system outlined above is as far as the classification based on dictionary entries can be taken. Philological study of verbs as used in Old Tibetan texts will doubtless refine this analysis extensively.

It may even be necessary to abandon the grammatical tradition’s classification of four stems. It seems as a working hypothesis reasonable to assume that each morpheme found in a verb paradigm has a specific meaning. The reason why some verbs take their present in *g-* while others take their present in *ʃ-* most probably has to do with a compatibility between the significance of those morphemes and the syntax and semantics of the verbal stems they prefix. The way to resolve conflicting reports in the dictionaries about the use of a present prefix *g-* or *ʃ-* may be to establish both forms as separate stems with separate meanings rather than to judge one to be erroneous.

Abbreviations

- KY_T A kya yoñs ḥdzin dbyañs can dgaḥ baḥi blo gros. “Rtags kyi ḥjug paḥi dkaḥ gnas bdag gžan dañ bya byed las gsum gyi khyad par žib tu phye ba ñuñ gsal ḥphrul gyi lde mig.” Tillemans: 39-60 [a critical edition of *The Collected Works of*: 434-446 and Sde Srid: 223-233]
- KY_N ——— “Rnam dbye brgya dañ ña bya bye las sogs kyi khyad par mdo tsam brjod pa dkaḥ gnad gsal baḥi me loñ” *The Collected Works of* [C] 447-460 and Sde srid [Z] 209-222.
- TD Ṅag dbañ Bstan dar lha rams pa. “Sum cu pa dañ rtags ḥjug gi don go sla bar bsdu paḥi bśad pa skal ldan yid kyi pa dam ḥbyed paḥi snañ paḥi mdod bya ba.” *Collected gSung ‘bum of Bstan-dar lha-ram of a-lag-sha* vol. Kha. New Delhi: Lama Guru Deva, 1971. 155-214.
- LZ Blo bzañ tshul khriḥs rgya mtsho. “Bya byed las gsum dus gsum dañ bcas dper brjod.” *Bod kyi brdaḥ sprod sum cu pa dañ rtags kyi ḥjug paḥi mchan ḥgrel mdor bsdu te brjod ba do mtshar ḥphrul gyi lde mig*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khañ, 1957. 192-249.
- CD Das, Sarat Chandra. *A Tibetan English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*. Eds. Graham Sandberg and A. William Hyde. Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Book Depôt, 1902.
- ND Ḥjigs med nam mkhaḥi rdo rje. “Bod kyi sprod brda dus gsum skul tshig reḥu mig ḥdzad med rig paḥi mdzod chen.” *Bod kyi brda skad* [A]: 223-258 and Phuntshok [B]: 81-108.
- DK Kharto, Dorje Wangchuk / Mkhar stod, Rdo rje dbañ phyug. *Thumi dgongs gter: the complete Tibetan verb forms / Dus gsum reḥu mig Thu-miḥi dgoñs gter*. Delhi: C.T. Charto, 1979.
- DS Bsam gtan. *Dag yig gsar bsgriḥs*. Xining: Mtsho sñon mi rigs dpe skrun khan, 1979.
- TC Zhang Yisun. *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo / Zang Han Da Cidian*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun kañ / Minzu Chubanshe, 1985.

Other Verb Lists Not Here Consulted

- Desgodins, Auguste (1899). *Dictionnaire thibétain-latin-français, par les missionnaires catholiques du Thibet*. Hong Kong: Impr. de la Société des Missions étrangères.
- Don grub phun tshogs ed (1981). *Bod yig gi dus gsum nam gzag*. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmañs dpe skrun khañ.
- Dpañ ris sañs rgyas (1987). “On tshan gsum pa: bya bañi miñ gi yig gzugs hgyur lugs.” *Brda sprod gsal byed ñag sgron*. Lanzhou: Kan suñu mi rigs dpe skrun khañ, 1987. [Also Xining: Mtsho sñon mi rigs dpe skrun khañ, 1998: 266-280].
- Dpal hbar dge bñes luñ rtogs ñi ma (1980). “Dus gsum rnam dbye bya hñdas gzugs gcig.” *Yul gañs can pañi thog mañi ñes bya miñ gi brda dag ka sphreñ glog gi sgron me*. Yol mo: Dge rgyas ri khrod. 266-272.
- “Dus gsum reñu mig som ñiñi dra gcod pañi ral gri.” India: 1964 [Cited by Goldstein 2001, but I have been unable to locate this text.]
- Gould, Basil and Hugh Edward Richardson (1949). *Tibetan Verb Roots*. Kalimpong: Tibet Mirror Press.
- de Kőrös, Alexander Csoma (1834). *A grammar of the Tibetan Language*. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
- Phun tshogs dbañ rgyal (1972). *Rtags kyi jug pañi dper brjod reñu mig gсар buñi gces nor*. Sña-tog.
- Semichov, B.V. et al. (1962). *Kratkii Tibetsko-Russkii slovar / Bod hu ru su miñ mdzod*. Moskva: Buriatskii kompleksnyi nauchno-issledovatel’skii institut. 549-581.
- Stobs rgyas (2000). “Rgyun mkhoñi dus gsum dper brjod.” *Bod yig brda sprod skyar sbyoñ dri ba dañ dri lan*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khañ.

Bibliography

- A kya Yoñs ḥdzin dbyañs can dgaḥ baḥi blo gros (1971). *The Collected Works of A-kya Yongs-'dzin*. New Delhi: Lama Guru Deva.
- A kya Yoñs ḥdzin dbyañs can dgaḥ baḥi blo gros (1989). “Rtags kyi ḥjug paḥi dkaḥ gnas bdag gžan dañ bya byed las gsum gyi khyad par źib tu phye ba nyuñ gsal ḥphrul gyi lde mig.” Tillemans and Herforth 1989: 39-60. [a critical edition of *The Collected Works of A-kya Yongs-'dzin*: 434-446 and Sde Srid 223-233].
- A kya Yoñs ḥdzin dbyañs can dgaḥ baḥi blo gros. “Rnam dbye brgya dañ ña bya bye las sogs kyi khyad par mdo tsam brjod pa dkaḥ gnad gsal baḥi me loñ.” [C]: *The Collected Works of A-kya Yongs-'dzin* 447-460. [Z]: Sde srid 209-222.
- Bacot, Jacques, F. W. Thomas, and C. Toussaint (1940). *Documents de Touen-houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet*. (Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Etudes 51). Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthener.
- Bacot, Jacques (1945). *Grammaire du tibétain littéraire*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient.
- Beckh, Hermann (1908). “Beiträge zur Tibetischen Grammatik, Lexikographie, Stilistik und Metrik.” *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Berlin: Verlag der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Beckwith, Christopher I. (1996). “The Morphological Argument for the Existence of Sino-Tibetan.” *Pan-Asiatic Linguistics: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Languages and Linguistics, January 8-10, 1996*. Vol. III. Bangkok, 1996. 812-826.
- Benedict, Paul (1972). *Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus*. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1972. [Reviewed: Bodman, N. *Linguistics: An International Review* 149. (1975): 89-97. Chang, Kun. *Journal of Asian Studies* 32. (1973): 335-337. Coblin, W. *Monumenta Serica* 30. (1972-3): 635-642. Haudricourt, A. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 68.2 (1973): 494-495. Lehman, F. K. *Language* 51. (1975): 215-219. Matisoff, James. “Benedict’s Sino-Tibetan: A Rejection of Millers’ Conspectus Inspection.” *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 2.1 (1975): 155-172. Miller, Roy Andrew. “Sino-Tibetan: Inspection of a Conspectus.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94. (1974): 195-209. Sedláček, Kamil. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 124. (1974): 205-206. Sprigg, W. K. *Asia Major* 19.1 (1973): 100-106].
- Beyer, Stephen (1992). *The Classical Tibetan Language*. Albany: State University of New York Press. [Reviewed: Behr, Wolfgang. *Oriens* 34 (1994): 557-564. Davidson, Ronald M. *Philosophy East and West* 46.1 (1996): 119-122. Miller, Roy Andrew. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114.1. (1994): 67-76. LaPolla, Randy J. 1994. *Language* 70.1: 195-196].
- Bielmeier, Roland (1988). “The Reconstruction of the Stop Series and the Verbal System in Tibetan.” *Languages and History in East Asia: Festschrift for Tatsuo Nishida on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*. Kyoto: Shokado. 15-27.
- Bielmeier, Roland (2004). “Shafer’s proto-West Bodish hypothesis and the formation of the Tibetan verb paradigms.” *Himalayan Languages*. Ed. Anju Saxena. (Trends in Lin-

- guistics. Studies and Monographs 149). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 395-412.
- Bodman, Nicholas C (1969). "Tibetan *sdud* 'Folds of a Garment,' the Character 卒, and the *SThypothesis." *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 39.2: 327-345.
- Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth (1855-1875). *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Blo bzañ tshul khriims rgya mtsho (1957). "Bya byed las gsum dus gsum dañ bcas dper brjod." *Bod keyi brdaḥ sprod sum cu pa dañ rtags keyi ḥjug paḥi mchan ḥgrel mdor bsdus te brjod ba do mtshar ḥphrul gyi lde mig*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khañ. 192-249.
- Byams pa rdo rje (1996). "'Bcib' dañ 'b'zön' zes pa byed med las tshig yin paḥi skor rags stam glon ba [Remarks concerning 'bcib' and 'b'zön' as intransitive verbs]." *Mtsho sñon slob gso* 4: 53-54.
- Bsam gtan (1979). *Dag yig gsar bsgrigs*. Xining: Mtsho sñon mi rigs dpe skrun khañ.
- Bzod pa rgya mtsho, ed. (1994). *Mdzañs blun zes bya ba theg pa chen poḥi mdo*. Xining: mtsho sñon mi rigs dpe skrun khañ.
- Chang, Betty Shefts (1971). "The Tibetan Causative phonology." *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 42: 623-765.
- Chang, Kun and Betty Shefts Chang (1984). "The Spoken Tibetan verb kaḥ." *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös*. Ed. L. Ligeti. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó. Vol I. 131-142.
- Chos kyi grags pa (1957). *Brda dag miñ tshig gsal ba b'zugs*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khañ.
- Cin buñ [Jin Peng 金鵬] (1988). "Bod yig gi bya tshig gzugs ḥgyur baḥi rnam pa nas gzug mi ḥgyur can baḥi rnam pa can du ḥgyur tshul skor glen ba [On the evolution of verbs in Tibetan Language from the inflectional to the agglutinative form]." *Kruñ goḥi bod keyi zes rig / 中國藏學 Zhongguo Zang Xue / China Tibetology* 1.1: 97-108.
- Coblin, W. South (1976). "Notes on Tibetan verbal morphology." *T'oung Pao* 62: 45-60.
- Coblin, W. South (1986). *A sinologist's handlist of Sino-Tibetan lexical comparisons*. Nettetal: Steyler Verlag.
- Das, Sarat Chandra (1902). *A Tibetan English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*, Eds. Graham Sandberg and A. William Hyde. Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Book Depôt, 1902.
- DeLancy, Scott Cameron (1980). "Deictic Categories in the Tibeto-Burman Verb." Diss. of Indiana University.
- Denwood, Phillip (1991). "Some Rare Words in Tibetan Documents of the Early Period." *Tibetan History & Language: Studies Dedicated to Uray Géza on his Seventieth Birthday*. Ed. Ernst Steinkellner. (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 26). Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien. 129-136.
- Desgodins, Auguste (1899). *Dictionnaire thibetain-latin-français, par les missionnaires catholiques du Thibet*. Hong Kong: Impr. de la Société des Missions étrangères.
- Eimer, Helmut (1987). "Eine alttibetische Perfektbildung." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 30: 213-214.
- Emmerick, R. E. (1978). "Some lexical Items from the rgyud-bzhi." *Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium*. Ed. Luis Ligeti. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 101-108.
- Emmerick, R. E. (1983). "Some Lexical Items from the Siddhasāra." *Contributions on Tibetan Language, History and Culture*. Eds. Ernst Steinkellner and Helmut Tauscher.

- (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 10). Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien; Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, 1995. 61-68.
- Giorgi, Antonio (2001). *Alphabetum Tibetanum, Teil 1*. Trans. Peter Lindegger. Rikon/Zürich: Tibet-Institut.
- Goldstein, Melvyn (1991). *Essentials of Modern Literary Tibetan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goldstein, Melvyn (2001). *The New Tibetan-English Dictionary of Modern Tibetan*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Reviewed: Christopher Beckwith. *Anthropological Linguistics* 43.3. (2001): 395-398.]
- Grünwedel, Albert (1933). *Die Legende des Nāropa, des Hauptvertreteres des Nekromanten- und Hexentums: Nach einer alten tibetischen Handschrift als Beweis für die Beeinflussung des nördlichen Buddhismus durch die Geheimlehre der Manichäer*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Gyurme, Kesang (1992) (= Skal bzañ ḡgyur med). *Le clair miroir: grammaire tibétaine*. Trans. Heather Stoddard and Nicolas Tournadre. Arvillard: Editions Prajña. [Translation of Skal bzañ ḡgyur-med 1981].
- Haarh, Erik (1969). *The Yar-luñ Dynasty*. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad's Forlag.
- Hackett, Paul G (2003). *A Tibetan Verb Lexicon: Verbs, Classes and Syntactic Frames*. Ithaca, Snow Lion. [Reviewed: Hill, Nathan (2004). *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 6: 78-98. Zeisler, Bettina (2005): "On the utility of the Tibetan grammatical tradition." *The Tibet Journal* 30.2: 69-92.]
- Hahn, Michael (1973). "Grundfragen der tibetischen Morphologie." *Zentralasiatische Studien* 7: 425-442. [*Schlüssel zum Lehrbuch der Klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache und Beiträge zur tibetischen Wortkunde (Miscellanea etymologica tibetica I - VI)*. (Indica et Tibetica 10a). Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2003: 75-94.]
- Hahn, Michael (1974). *Lehrbuch der Klassischen Tibetischen Schriftsprache*. (Indica et Tibetica 10). Bonn: Michael Hahn; Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1994.
- Hahn, Michael (1994). "On some rare particles, words and auxiliaries in classical Tibetan." *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the Sixth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies. Fagernes 1992*. Ed. Per Kværne. Vol. 1.2. Oslo: Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture. 288-294. [*Schlüssel zum Lehrbuch der Klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache und Beiträge zur tibetischen Wortkunde (Miscellanea etymologica tibetica I - VI)*. (Indica et Tibetica 10a). Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2003: 119-130]
- Hahn, Michael (1997). "A propos the term gtsug-lag." *Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. 341-348. [*Schlüssel zum Lehrbuch der Klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache und Beiträge zur tibetischen Wortkunde (Miscellanea etymologica tibetica I - VI)*. (Indica et Tibetica 10a). Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2003: 131]
- Hahn, Michael (1999). "Blags und Verwandtes (Miscellanea etymologica tibetica, VI)." *Studia Tibetica et Mongolica (Festschrift Manfred Taube)*. Eds. Helmut Eimer et al. (Indica et Tibetica 34). Swisttal-Odendorf, Indica et Tibetica Verlag. 123-125. [*Schlüssel zum Lehrbuch der Klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache und Beiträge zur tibetischen Wortkunde (Miscellanea etymologica tibetica I - VI)*. (Indica et Tibetica 10a). Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2003: 144-147]

- Hill, Nathan W. (2004). “Compte rendu” (of Hackett 2003). *Revue d'études tibétaines* 6: 78-98.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2005). “The verb ‘bri ‘to write’ in Old Tibetan.” アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究 *Ajia Afurika Gengo Bunka Kenkyū / Journal of Asian and African Studies* 68: 177-182.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2007). “Aspirate and non-aspirate voiceless consonants in Old Tibetan.” 語言暨語言研究 / *Languages and Linguistics* 8.2: 471-493.
- Hjigs med nam mkhañi rdo rje (1966). *Bod kyi brda skad ston pañi bstan bcos*. Dolanji: Tibetan Bonpo Foundation.
- Hjigs med nam mkhañi rdo rje. “Bod kyi sprod brda dus gsum skul tshig reñu mig ḥdzad med rig pañi mdzod chen.” [A]: *Bod kyi brda skad* 223-258. [B]: Phuntshok 81-108.
- Hoshi Izumi 星泉 (2003). 現代チベット語動詞辞典 *Gendai chibetto go dōshi jiten / A Verb Dictionary of the Modern Spoken Tibetan of Lhasa: Tibetan-Japanese*. (Asian and African Lexicon Series 62). Tokyo: Research Institute for the Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Huang Bufan 黄不凡 (1981). “古藏語動詞的形態 Gu Zangyu dongci de xingtai [The Verbal Morphology in Ancient Tibetan].” 民族語文 *Minzu Yuwen* 3: 1-13.
- Inaba Shōju 稲葉正就 (1957). “仏典に用いられたチベット語動詞の用法の研究年俵 Butten ni mochiirareta chibettogo dōshi no yōhō no kenkyū nenpō [Studies in the use of Tibetan verbs in Tibetan Buddhist literature].” 大谷大学研究年報 *Ōtani daigaku kenkyū nenpō* 9: 243-248, supplement 1-42.
- Jäschke, H. A. (1881). *A Tibetan-English dictionary*. London: Unger Brothers.
- de Jong, Jan Willem (1973). “Tibetan *blag-pa* and *blags-pa*.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 36.2: 309-312.
- de Jong, Jan Willem (1989). *The story of Rāma in Tibet: text and translation of the Tun-huang manuscripts*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Jin Peng 金鵬 (1956). “藏文動詞屈折形態在現代拉薩話裏衍變的情況 Zangwen dongci quzhe xingtai zai xiandai lasahua li yanbian de qingkuang [Verbal Inflexion in Classical Tibetan and Present-day Lhasa Dialect].” 研究語言研究 *Yuyan Yanjiu* 25-39.
- Jumian Gesang 格桑居冕 (=Skal bzañ ḥgyur med) (1982). “藏語動詞的使動範疇 Zangyu dongci de shidong fanchou [The causative category of Tibetan Verbs].” 民族語文 *Minzu yuwen* 5: 27-39.
- Kerang, Tan (1988). “On the morphology of simplex and causative verbs in Tibetan.” 民族語文 *Minzu Yuwen* 6: 42-50.
- Ko źul grags pa ḥbyuñ gnas and Rgyal ba blo bzañ mkhas grub (1992). *Gaṅs can mkhas grub rim byon miñ mdzod*. Xining: Mtsho sñon źiñ chen źin hwa dpe khañ.
- Lalou, Marcelle (1958). “Tibetain ancien Bod / Bon.” *Journal Asiatique* 241: 275-276.
- Li Fang-kuei (1933). “Certain Phonetic Influences of the Tibetan Prefixes upon the Root Initials.” *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 6.2: 135-157.
- Li Fang-kuei (1959). “Tibetan Glo-ba-'dring.” *Studia Serica Bernhard Karlgren dedicata*, Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard. 55-9.
- Li yuñ khrañ (1988). *Bya tshig tshig mdzod*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khañ. [Excerpt of Zhang 1985].
- Mkhar stod, Rdo rje dbañ phyug / Kharto, Dorje Wangchuk (1979). *Thumi dgongs gter:*

- the complete Tibetan verb forms / Dus gsum reḥu mig Thu miḥi dgoṅs gter.* Delhi: C.T. Charto.
- Ñag dbaṅ bstan dar lha rams pa (1971). "Sum cu pa daṅ rtags ḥjug gi don go sla bar bsdus paḥi bshad pa skal ldan yid kyi pa dam ḥbyed paḥi snaṅ paḥi mdod bya ba." *Collected gSung 'bum of Bstan-dar lha-ram of a-lag-sha.* Vol. Kha. New Delhi: Lama Guru Deva. 155-214.
- Ñag dbaṅ tshul khrim (1997). *Brda dkrol gser gyi me loṅ.* Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khaṅ.
- Nishi, Yoshio et al, eds. (1995). *New Horizons in Tibeto-Burman Morphosyntax.* (Senri Ethnological Studies 41). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Nishida Tatsuo (1994). "A personal view of the Sino-Tibetan Language Family." *Current issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics.* Osaka, 26th international conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics. 1-22.
- Nobel, Johannes (1950). *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra. Das Goldglanz-Sūtra. Ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. Die Tibetischen Übersetzungen mit einem Wörterbuch.* Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- Phuntshok, Tenpa [Phun tshogs rten pa], ed. (1979). *Bonpo Lexicographical Works: A collection of lexicographical and grammatical writing by two Bonpo Lamas Khyun-sprul 'Jig-med-nam-mkha'i-rdo-rje and Hor-btsun Bstan-'dzin-blo-gro.* Dolanji: Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre.
- Regamey, C. (1946-1947). "Considération sur le système morphologique du Tibétain littéraire." *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 6: 22-46.
- Richardson, Hugh E. (1985). *A corpus of Early Tibetan Inscriptions.* (James G. Forlong Series 29). Hertford: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Róna-Tas, András (1966). *Tibeto-Mongolica: The Loanwords of Mongour and the Development of the Archaic Tibetan Dialects.* (Indo-Iranian Monographs 7.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Róna-Tas, András (1978). "On a Term of Taxation in the Old Tibetan Royal Annals." *Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium.* Ed. Louis Ligeti. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 23.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 357-364.
- Róna-Tas, András (1985). *Wiener Vorlesungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte Tibets.* (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 13). Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Schneider, Johannes (1992). *Der Lobpreis der Vorzüglichkeit des Buddhas: Udbhāṣasiddhasvāmins Viśeṣastava mit Prajñāvarmans Kommentar.* (Indica et Tibetica 23). Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Sde srid saṅs rgyas rgya mtsho (1979). *Blaṅ dor gsal bar ston paḥi draṅ thig dwaṅs shel me loṅ: A treatise on the Sixteen Fundamental Principles of Tibetan Administrative Law by Sde-srid Sans-rgyas-rgya-mtsho with 16 other prints of works on Tibetan Grammar and Orthography from 20th Century Lhasa New Zhol blocks.* Dolanji: Sonam Drakpa Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre.
- Siklós, Bulcsu (1986). "The Tibetan Verb: Tense and Nonsense." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 49: 304-320.
- Simon, Walter (1971). "Tibetan 'fifteen' and 'eighteen'." *Études Tibétaines: dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou.* Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient.

- Shafer, Robert (1950-1951). "Studies in the Morphology of the Bodic Verb." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 13: 702-724, 1017-1031.
- Skal bzai ḥgyur med (1981). *Bod kyi brda sprod paḥi kbrid rgyun rab gsal me loñ*. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khañ. [Translated as Kesang Gyurme 1992]
- Skorupski, Tadeusz, ed. (2001). *Bod dbyin tshig mdzod chen mo: bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo bcos snon byas paḥi deb / An encyclopaedic Tibetan-English Dictionary: A Revised Version of Bod rGya Tshig mdzod chen mo*. Beijing: mi rigs dpe skrun khañ dañ shar phyogs dañ a hphri ri khaḥi śes rig slob gliñ / The Nationalities Publishing House and The School of Oriental and African Studies, 2001. [Translation of Zhang 1985].
- Sprigg, R. K. (1970). "Vyañjanabhakti, and irregularities in the Tibetan Verb." *Bulletin of Tibetology* 7.2: 5-20.
- Sprigg, R. K. (1979). "The Golok dialect and Written Tibetan past-tense verb forms." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 42: 53-60.
- Sprigg, R. K. (1980). "'Vocalic alternation' in Balti, the Lhasa, and the Sherpa verb, as a guide to alternation in Written Tibetan, and to Proto-Tibetan Reconstruction." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43: 110-122.
- Stein, Rolf A. (1939). "Trente-fois fiches de divination Tibétaines." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 4: 306-307.
- Stein, Rolf A. (1942). "Notes d'etymologie Tibétaine." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 42.2: 203-232.
- Stein, Rolf A. (1983). "Tibetica Antiqua I: Les deux vocabulaires des traductions indo-tibétaines et sino-tibétaines dans les manuscrits Touen-Houang", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient* 62: 149-236.
- Stein, R. A. (1988). "Tibetica Antiqua V: La religion indigène et les *Bon-po* dans les manuscrits de Touen-Houang." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 77: 27-56. [A defective English translation published in *The History of Tibet*. Vol I. Ed. Alex McKay. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003: 584-614.]
- Takeuchi Tsuguhito 武内紹人 (1990a). "チベット語の述部における助動詞の機能とその発展過程 Chibettogo no jutsubu ni okeru jodōshi no kinō to sono hatten katei / The semantic functions of auxiliary verbs in Tibetan and their historical development." アジアの諸言語と一般言語学 *Ajia no shogengo to ippan gengogaku [Asian Languages and General Linguistics]* eds. Sakiyama and Satoh. Tokyo: Sanshodo. 6-16.
- Takeuchi Tsuguhito (1990b). "A Group of Old Tibetan Letters Written Under Kuei-i-chün: a Preliminary Study for the Classification of Old Tibetan Letters." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 44: 175-190.
- Takeuchi Tsuguhito (1995). *Old Tibetan Contracts from Central Asia*. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan, 1995.
- Takeuchi Tsuguhito and Takahashi Yoshiharu (1995). "Split Ergative Patterns in Transitive and Intransitive Sentences in Tibetan: a Reconsideration." *Nishi* 1995: 277-288.
- Taube, Manfred (1953-1954). "Die Wiedergabe sanskritischer Verbformen im tibetischen Texte des Bodhicaryāvatāra." *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität: Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 3.4: 393-412.
- Taube, Manfred (1978). "Zu einige Texten der tibetischen brda-gsar-rñiñ-Literatur." *Asienwissenschaftliche Beiträge: Johannes Schubert in memoriam*. Eds. Eberhardt Richter and

- Manfred Taube. (Veröffentlichungen des Museums für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig 32). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Thomas, Frederick William (1957). *Ancient Folk-Literature from North-Eastern Tibet*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Thomas, Frederick William (1935-1965). *Tibetan literary texts and documents concerning Chinese Turkestan* 4 vols. (Oriental translation fund Publication. New series. 32, 37, 40, 41). London, The Royal Asiatic Society.
- Tillemans, Tom J.F. (1991). "Gser tog blo bzang tshul khrim rgya mtsho on Tibetan verb tenses." *Tibetan History & Language: Studies Dedicated to Uray Géza on his Seventieth Birthday*. Ed. Ernst Steinkellner. (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 26). Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien. 487-496.
- Tillemans, Tom J.F. and Derek D. Herforth (1989). *Agents and Actions in Classical Tibetan: The Indigenous Grammarians on bDag and gZhan and Bya Bye Las gSum*. (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 21). Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Tournadre, Nicolas (1995). "Tibetan Ergativity and the Trajectory Model." *Nishi* 1995: 261-276.
- Tournadre, Nicolas (1996). *L'ergativité en Tibétain: Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlée*. (Bibliothèque de l'Information grammaticale 33). Louvain and Paris: Éditions Peeters.
- Tournadre, Nicolas (2001). "Final auxiliary verbs in literary Tibetan and in the dialects." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area: Person and Evidence in Himalayan Languages: Part II*. 24.1: 49-111.
- Tournadre, Nicolas and Sangda Dorje (2003). *Manuel de Tibétain standard: langue et civilisation*. Paris: Mondes et Langue, L'asiathèque.
- Uray Géza (1953). "Some problems of the ancient Tibetan verbal morphology: methodological observations on recent studies." *Acta linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 3: 37-60.
- Uray Géza (1962). "Old Tibetan dra-ma-drangs." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 14: 219-30
- Uray Géza (1964). "The Old Tibetan verb bon." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 17: 323-334.
- Uray Géza (1966). "The alleged Old Tibetan equivalent of the ethnic name C'hiang." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 17: 246-256.
- Uray Géza (1972). "The Narrative of Legislation and Organization of the Mkhas pa'i dga'ston." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 26: 11-68.
- Uray Géza (1982). "Notes on the Thousand-districts of the Tibetan Empire in the First Half of the Ninth Century." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 36: 545-548.
- Westergaard, N. L. (1841). *Radices linguae sanscritae, ad decreta grammaticorum definitivitate atque copia exemplorum exquisitorum illustravit*. Bonnæ ad Rhenum, impensis H.B. König; Havniae, typis fratrum Berling.
- Whitney, William Dwight (1885). *The roots, verb-forms, and primary derivatives of the San-*

- skrit language. A supplement to his Sanskrit grammar.* Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel.
- Yasuhiko, Nagano (1995). "Functions of a Written Tibetan Instrumental Particle, *-kyis*, Revisited." Nishi 1995: 133-142.
- Zeisler, Bettina (2000). "Narrative Conventions in Tibetan Languages: the issue of mirativity." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area: Person and Evidence in Himalayan Languages: Part I.* 23.2: 39-77.
- Zeisler, Bettina (2001). "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 Reorganization of the Proto-Tibetan Verb System." *Zentralasiatische Studien* 31: 169-216.
- Zeisler, Bettina (2002). "The development of temporal coding in Tibetan: some suggestions for a functional internal reconstruction. Part 1: 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. Henk Blezer. Leiden: Brill, 331-453.
- Zeisler, Bettina (2004). *Relative Tense and Aspectual Values in Tibetan Languages: A Comparative Study.* (Trends in Linguistics, studies and monographs 150). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zeisler, Bettina (2006): "The Tibetan understanding of karman: Some problems of Tibetan case marking." *Medieval Tibeto-Burman languages II, PIATS 2003: Tibetan studies: Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Oxford 2003.* Ed. Christopher I. Beckwith. Leiden: Brill. 57-101.
- Zhang Yisun (1985). *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo / 藏漢大詞典 Zang Han Da Cidian.* Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun kañ / Minzu Chubanshe. [Translated as Skorupski 2001, excerpted as Li 1988]
- Zimmermann, Heinz (1979). *Wortart und Sprachstruktur im Tibetischen.* (Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie 10). Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz. [Reviewed: Miller, Roy Andrew. "Linguistic Issues in the Study of Tibetan Grammar." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für Indische Philosophie* 26. (1982): 83-116.]