Title
Making and agreeing to requests in Old Tibetan

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6bq059cw

Journal
Himalayan Linguistics, 21(1)

Author
Hill, Nathan

Publication Date
2022

DOI
10.5070/H921156970

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

himalayan linguistics

A free refereed web journal and archive devoted to the study of the
languages of the Himalayas

Himalayan Linguistics

Making and agreeing to requests in Old Tibetan

Nathan W. Hill

Trinity College Dublin

ABSTRACT

The verbs གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' and གནང་ *gnaṅ* 'agree, grant', because of their complementary semantics and parallel syntax, provide a convenient window through which to caste light on the two forms of subordinate clauses that they both govern, namely infinitives and terminative verbal nouns.

KEYWORDS

Old Tibetan, switch reference, subordination

Making and agreeing to requests in Old Tibetan

Nathan W. Hill
Trinity College Dublin

1 Introduction

The verbs གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' and གནང་ *gnaṅ* 'agree, grant', have clearly complementary meanings; those addressed by requests either grant them or not. In addition, གནང་ *gnaṅ* is an honorific verb and གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' is a humilitic verb (Kitamura 1975). The verbs གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' and གནང་ *gnaṅ* 'agree, grant' also share a parallel syntactic ability to govern subordinate clauses.[1] These subordinate clauses take two forms, which I call 'terminative verbal nouns' and 'infinitives'.[2] The verbal nouns are those subordinated verb forms nominalized with the suffix པ་ *-pa* or བ་ *-ba*, to which the terminative case marker ར་ *-r* is added. The infinitives are subordindated verb forms followed directly by དུ་ *-du* and its allomorphs.[3] Two verb stems make themselves available to function as infinitives, namely the present and the future. Terminologically we can thus further distinguish 'future infinitives' and 'present infinitives'. The verb གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' governs the future infinitive and གནང་ *gnaṅ* 'agree, grant' governs the present infinitive (Garrett et al. 2013). To my knowledge the grounds on which verbs select either infinitives or terminative verbal nouns, and why some verbs govern present infinitives and others future infinitives, has not yet been discussed in print.

This essay attempts to elucidate these questions from the vantage point of the behavior or གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' and གནང་ *gnaṅ* 'agree, grant'. In order to ensure that we investigate a single linguistic system, the evidence examined here comes exclusively from Version I (mss. D + A) of the Old Tibetan *Rāmāyaṇa* (Jong 1989), a paraphrase in Tibetan of a well known Indic epic.[4]

---

[1] This research builds directly on unpublished work of Abel Zadoks, in particular the sixth chapter of Zadoks (2017).

[2] The reader, like one anonymous referee, may prefer a different terminology than that used here, but since the English terminology for Tibetan verbal forms remains far from conventionalized and since a subordinate verbal form by any other name smells just as sweet, I implore the reader to bear with these terminological choices.

[3] Taking inspiration from the French distinction between a "complément d'objet direct" that directly follows a verb and a "complément d'objet indirect" where an *à* or *de* interposes itself between the verb and its object, one can draw a distinction between a Tibetan 'direct infinitive' and an 'indirect infinitive'. Where the subordinate verb directly precedes the matrix verb, this is the direct infinitive. In Version 1 of the Old Tibetan *Rāmāyaṇam*, I identify only the three matrix verbs ནུས་ *nus* 'be able' དགོས་ *dgos* 'need' ཕོད་ *phod* 'dare' as governing a direct infinitive. Where the terminative converb interposes itself between the subordinate verb and the matrix verb, this is the indirect infinitive. Nonetheless, because both གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' and གནང་ *gnaṅ* 'agree, grant' govern the indirect infinitive, it suffices for the purposes of this essay to understand 'infinitive' as always meaning 'indirect infinitive'.

[4] Manuscript A has the shelf mark IOL Tib J 0737-1 and manuscript D the shelf mark IOL Tib J 0737-3.

2 The verb གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request'

Subordinate clauses governed by the verb གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' show a striking distribution, whereby infinitives occur in direct speech (§2.1) and terminative verbal nouns in the narrative frame (§2.2).

2.1 The verb གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' in direct speech

All examples of གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' governing infinitives in Version I of the Old Tibetan *Rāmāyaṇa* occur in direct speech. In most examples, the speaker requests of the addressee that the addressee undertake some action.

(1) ཕྱིན་ཡིག་བརྫང་དུ་གསོལ་ཞེས་གསོལ་པ་དང་།།

« *prin-yig*	*brdzaṅ-du*		*gsol*	» *źes*	*gsol-pa-daṅ*	//
« letter	send\FUT-CVB.TRM		request »	QUOT	request-NMLZ-ASS	//

'I request that [you] send a letter,' he said. (Rama A 273)

(2) བདགི་བུ་མོ་མེ་ག་སི་ན་འབུལ་ན་བཞེས་སུ་གསོལ་ཞེས། བུ་མོ་ཁྲིད་དེ་ཧོངས་ནས་བུལ་བ་དང་།།

« *bdagi*	*bu-mo*	*Me-ga-sĭ-na*	*ḥbul-na*	*bźes-su*	*gsol*	»
« me.GEN	girl	Meghasenā	offer-CVB.LOC	accept.HON-CVB.TRM	request »	

źes	/ *bu-mo*	*khrid-de*	*ḥoṅs-nas*	*bul-ba-daṅ*	//
QUOT	/ girl	lead-CVB.SF	come\PST-CVB.ELA	offer-NMLZ-ASS	//

'I offer my daughter Meghasenā, I request that [you] accept her,' thus [he] brought his daughter and offered her. (Rama D 39-40)

(3) དེ་རྣམས་ལ་རྨར་གསོལ། ཞེས་མཆིནས།།

de	*rnams-la*	*rmar*	*gsol*	/ *źes*	*mčhi-nas*	//
that	PL-ALL	ask.HON.CVB.TRM	request	/ QUOT	say-CVB.ELA	//

'I request that [you] ask them,' he said. (Rama A 181-182)

In example (4) the agent of the subordinate verb is not the addressee, but generic.

(4) མྱི་སྡུག་གཟུགས་ཅན་འདི་ལས་ཕྲོག་དུ་གསོལ་ཞེས་མཆི་སྟེ།

myĭ	*sdug*	*gzugs*	*čhan*	*ḥdĭ-las*	*prog-du*	*gsol*	*źes*
NEG	pretty	form	possess	this-ABL	rob\FUT-CVB.TRM	request\HON	QUOT

mčhiste /
say\CVB.SF /

'I beg to be taken away from this ugly creature!' (Rama A 186)

Example (4) may lead us to wonder whether examples (1), (2), and (3) are also amendable to inter-pretation as passives, viz. 'request that a letter be sent', 'request that she be accepted', and 'request that they be asked'. If so, the implication in these sentences that the addressee is the one meant to undertake the action of the subordinated verb is a pragmatic result of the discourse situation rather than a syntactic consequence of the construction. Two further considerations weigh in favor of this passive interpretation. First, passives are cross-linguistically typical of the indirectness appropriate to polite requests; to say 'please be seated' lacks the impatient air of 'please sit down'. Second, a patient focused meaning characterises the future stem in general (Tillemans 1988, Tillemans and Herforth 1989, Tillemans 1991a, Tillemans 1991b). There are also considerations that speak against an analysis of examples (1)-(4) as passives; for instance, in example (2) the speaker is of course only offering his daughter to the Ṛṣi and not simply asking that she be taken of his hands. Nonetheless, if we permit outselves to entertain the hypothesis that that the future infinitive, when governed by གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request', is syntactically passive and pragmatically a polite request, this hypothesis dovetails nicely with the wider tendency for future infinitives of transitive verbs to put the patient in focus.[5] Example (5), with the unambiguous transitive subordinated verb 'hunt', makes this patient prominence clear.

(5)   ཧུ་ནི་བཟླུ་བའི་རི་དགས་ཡིན་བས། བསྙག་དུ་མྱི་རུང་སྟེ།

ḫu	*nĭ*	*bzlu-baḫĭ*	*ri-dags*	*yin-bas*/	*bsñag-du*
this	NF	deceive-NMLZ.GEN	deer	to be-NMLZ.ERG/	hunt-CVB.TRM

myi ruṅ-ste   /
NEG suitable-CVB.SF /

This is a deceptive deer and is not suitable to be hunted (Rama A 145-146)

The clause བསྙག་དུ་མྱི་རུང་ *bsñag-du myi ruṅ* 'is not suitable to be hunted', in which མྱི་རུང་ *myi ruṅ* 'is not suitable...' governs the future infinitive, includes no overt noun phrase, neither the hunter nor the quarry, but the unsuitableness obtains only to the quarry.

2.2   The verb གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' in the narrative frame

In the narrative frame the verb གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' governs the terminative verbal noun and not the infinitive. Naturally, those making the requests, those to whom these requests are made, and

---

[5] Obviously, when the subordinated verb is intransitive it is the sole argument that is in focus, e.g. མཚོ་ལ་བརྟེན་པའི་ངང་དང་ངུར། གུད་དུ་འཕུར་དུ་གནས་མ་མཆིས།། *mtsho-la brten-paḫĭ ṅaṅ-daṅ ṅur // gud-du ḫpur-du gnas ma mčhis //* Ducks and geese which live on the lake have nowhere to fly for shelter (Rama A 348).

those who would engage in the requested activities are in the narrative frame all third person. Still, a variety of co-reference relationships are available among these parties; let us distinguish the three parties as 'speaker', 'addressee', 'undertaker'.

In example (6) the addressee and the one performing the requested activity are both the king (speaker ≠ addressee = undertaker).

(6)   རྒྱལ་པོ་གཤེགས་པར་གསོལ་ནས།

rgyal-po	*gśegs-par*	*gsol-nas*	/
king	go\HON-NMLZ.TRM	request-CVB.ELA //	

They asked the king to come. (Rama A 115)

In example (7) the one requesting and the one performing the requested activity are both Lakṣana (speaker = undertaker ≠ addressee).

(7)   གཅུང་ལག་ཤ་ནས་སྔར་བརྒལ་བར་གསོལ་ནས༎

gčuṅ	*Lag-śa-nas*	*sṅar*	*brgal-bar*
younger.brother	Lakṣana.ERG	first-TRM	cross-NMLZ-TRM

gsol-nas	//
request\HON-CVB.ELA //	

The younger brother Lakṣana ·asked to cross first.   (Rama A 314-315)

In example (8) the Devaputras are requesting a boon from Mahadeva, when the goddess of speech interferes. The request is for supernatural abilities; since no action is requested it is not meaningful for either the speaker or addresee to undertake the requested action (speaker ≠ addressee, no undertaker).

(8)   གང་ལ་མདའ་འཕངས་ཕོག་ཆིང་འགུམ་བར་གསོལ་བར་བསམས་པ་དང་། མདའ་དང་པོ་འཕང་སྟེ་འགུམ་བར། ལྷ་མོས་བསྒྱུར་ཏོ༎

gaṅ-la	*mdaḥ*	*ḥphaṅs*	*phog-čhiṅ*	*ḥgum-bar*	*gsol-bar*
who-ALL	arrow	shoot.PST	hit.PST-CVB.CONT	die-NMLZ.TRM	request-NMLZ.TRM

bsams-pa-daṅ	/	*mdaḥ*	*daṅ-po*	*ḥphaṅ-ste*	*ḥgum-bar*	/
think.PST-NMLZ-ASS	/	arrow	first	shoot.PST-CVB.SF	die-NMLZ.TRM	/

lha-mos	*bsgyur-to*	//
goddess.ERG	change.PST-FIN //	

'They intended to ask that whoever they shot would be hit lethally, but the goddess changed it so the first arrow they shot would be lethal.' (Rama A 52-54)

In sum, the co-reference relations among the speaker, addressee and undertaker are in no way encoded by this construction.

3 The verb གནང་ *gnaṅ* 'agree, grant'

The verb གནང་ *gnaṅ* 'agree, grant' also governs both infinitives and terminative verbal nouns, but the obvious division of labor that worked in the case of གསོལ་ *gsol* 'request' with infinitives in direct speech and terminative verbals nouns in the narrative frame, does not here obtain. Instead, the present infinitive construction is used when the subordinate verb is intransitive and its sole argument is the same as the agent of གནང་ *gnaṅ* (§3.1), whereas if either of these criteria is not met, we instead find the terminative verbal noun construction (§3.2).

3.1 *Present infinitives with the matrix verb* གནང་ *gnaṅ*

All examples of the verb གནང་ *gnaṅ* 'agree, grant' governing infinitives in Version I of the Old Tibetan *Rāmāyaṇa* happen to take the motion verb གཤེགས་ *gśegs* 'go, come' as their subordinate verb. Nonetheless, as we will see when we look at the distribution of terminative verbal nouns governed by གནང་ *gnaṅ* 'agree, grant', it seems likely that the plot of the story and not some grammatical constraint is the reason that we see infinitives only with this verb. The intransitivity of the subordinate verb is probably the salient factor.

(9) མྱི་འགྲོ་ཆོ་ཞེས་བྱུང་ནས།། གཤེགས་སུ་མ་གནང་ངོ།།

«*myi*	*ḥgro-ḥo* »	*źes*	*byuṅ-nas*	//	*gśegsu*	*ma*
«NEG	go\PRS-FIN »	QUOT	arise\PST-CVB.ELA //	//	go\HON.CVB.TRM	NEG

gnaṅ-ṅo //
grant\HON-FIN //

He said: 'I shall not go' and did not agree to go. (Rama A 35)

(10) མ་ཧ་དེ་བ་ནི་གཤེགས་སུ་གནང་བ་ཡང་མྱི་འདྲའ་ན།།

Ma-ha-de-ba	*nĭ*	*gśegsu*	*gnaṅ-ba*	*yaṅ*	*myi*
Mahadeva	NF	go\HON.CVB.TRM	grant\HON-NMLZ	WF	NEG

ḥdraḥ-na //
seem-CVB.LOC //

'It doesn't seem like Mahadeva will agree to come.' (Rama A 37)

(11)   ཚ་བོ་རྣམས་ཚེ་གཅིག་ལང་ཀ་པུ་རར་གཤེགས་སུ་ཇི་གནང་ཞེས་

tsha-bo	*rnams*	*tshe*	*gčhig*	*Laṅ-ka-pu-rar*	*gśegs-su*	*ǰi*	*gnaṅ*	*»*
nephew	PL	time	ART	Laṅkāpūra.TRM	go\HON-CVB.TRM	what	grant\HON»	

źes
QUOT

'Would you nephews agree to go to Laṅkāpūra sometime?' (Rama A 8)

(12)   ལྷའི་བུ་རྣམས་གཤེགས་སུ་གནང་སྟེ༎

lhaḥi	*bu*	*rnams*	*gśegsu*	*gnaṅ-ste*	*//*
gods.GEN	son	PL	go\HON.CVB.TRM	grant\HON-CVB.SF //	

The Devaputras agreed to go. (Rama A 9)

Looking for other examples of the present infinitive construction in the text, we find that among the verbs that Garrett et al. (2013) give as governing this construction our text offers only བྱེད *byed* 'do' and this only in one instance.

(13)   རྟ་མགོ་ཧུད་ཅེས་བཅད་ནས། རྫུ་འཕྲུལ་སྟོར་ཏེ། ཡོ་ཡོ་ནས། མྱི་དང་སྤྲེ་ཧུ་དམག་གི་སྟེང་དུ་འགྱེལ་དུ་བྱེད་པ་དང་

rta-mgo	*ḥud*	*čhes*	*bčhad-nas*	*/ rdzu-ḥphrul*	*stor-te /*
horse-head	ḥud	QUOT	cut-CVB.ELA	/ magic	lose-CVB.SF /

yo	*yo-nas /*	*myi-daṅ*	*spre-ḥu*	*dmag-gǐ*	*steṅ-du*
teeter	teeter-CVB.ELA /	men-ASS	monkey	army-GEN	top-TRM

ḥgyel-du	*byed-pa-daṅ*
fall-CV-TRM	do-NMLZ-ASS

The horse-head 'swoosh' was cut off. [The demon] lost his magical power. He swayed to and fro and made (as if) to fall on the army of the men and monkeys. (Rama A 319-20)

So, it is fair to say that co-reference between the subject of the super-ordinate and subordinate verb is part of the meaning of the present infinitive construction.

3.2 *Terminative verbal nouns with the matrix verb* གནང་ *gnaṅ*

The terminative verbal noun is used whenever one of the two conditions (viz. coreference and intransitivity, §3.1) calling for the present infinitive construction do not obtain. Thus, we have

examples of co-reference but with transitive subordinate verbs (§3.2.1) and examples with intransitives but no co-reference (example 20).[6]

3.2.1 Examples of co-reference, but with transitive subordinate clauses

In example (14) the speaker, a Ṛṣi, agrees to himself accept in marriage Meghasenā, the daughter of Man-lya-pan-ta.

(14) ཁྱོད་ཀྱི་བུ་མོ་ཡང་།། ཁབ་དུ་བཞེས་པར་གནང་ངོ་ཞེས་བྱུང་ནས།།

khyod-kyi	bu-mo	yaṅ //	khab-du	bźes-par	gnaṅ-ṅo	źes
you-GEN	girl	WF //	wife-TRM	take-NMLZ.TRM	grant\HON-FIN QUOT	

byuṅ-nas	//
occur-CVB.ELA	//

'I consent to take your daughter as consort,' he replied. (Rama A 1)

In example (15) the addressees, the Devaputra, are asked to agree to themselves take revenge against the gods.

(15) ཚ་བོ་ཁྱེད་ཀྱིས་ལན་གླན་ཞིང་ལྷ་རྣམས་ཁ་གདག་པར་ཇི་གནང་ཞེས་གསོལ་པ་ལས།།

tsha-bo	khyed-kyis	lan	glan-źiṅ	lha	rnams //
nephew	you.HON-ERG	answer	answer-CVB.CONT	god	PL //

kha gdag-par	ǰi	gnaṅ	źes	gsol-pa-las
kha gdag-NMLZ.TRM	what	grant\HON	QUOT	request-NMLZ-ABL //

'Would you agree to take revenge and vanquish the gods?' he asked. (Rama A 20-21)

In (16) it is both Rama who does not agree and Rama who would rule (if he agreed to).

(16) རྒྱལ་སྲིད་མཛད་པར་མྱི་གནང་ན་ཡང་།། ...

rgyal-srid	mdzad-par	myĭ	gnaṅ-na	yaṅ // ···
reign	do-NMLZ.TRM	NEG	grant\HON-CVB.LOC	WF // ···

'Even if you don't agree to reign [...]   (Rama A 88-89)

---

[6] An anonymous referee proposes that examples (14)-(17) do not necessarily involve co-reference, and thus one can thus draw the stronger conclusion that the infinitive is used for coreference and the terminative verbal noun is used for switch-reference. I remain open minded about the possibility of this analysis, but believe it is appropriate for me to stay with the weaker analysis and hope that the referee will pursue this matter elsewhere.

In a letter to king Rama, Hanumān requests that Rama does not rebuke him.

(17) བཀའ་མྱི་འབུབ་པར་ཅི་གནང་ཞེས་གསོལ་ནས༎

bkaḥ	*myi*	*ḥbub-par*		*ǰĭ*	*gnaṅ*	*źes*	*gsol-nas*
word	NEG	send down.FUT-NMLZ.TRM	what	grant\HON		QUOT	request-CVB.ELA

'Would you agree not to rebuke me?' he asked. (Rama A 351-352)

3.2.2 *Examples where there is no co-reference between the one agreeing and the one acting*

In examples (18) and (19) the addressee is asked to agree to let the speaker(s) do something. In both examples the subordinate verb is transitive.

(18) བདག་ནི་ཆགས་འོག་གི་བློན་པོ་བགྱིད་པར་ཅི་གནང་ཞེས་

bdag	*nĭ*	*čhags*	*ḥog-gi*	*blon-po*	*bgyid-par*		*ǰĭ*	*gnaṅ*
me	NF	shoe	below-GEN	minister	do.PRS-NMLZ.TRM		what	grant

źes
QUOT

'... would you allow me to act as minister under your shoe?' (Rama A 88-89)

(19) ལྷ་མོ་ལ་ཕྱག་འཚལ་བར་ཅི་གནང་ཞེས་གསོལ་པ་དང་༎

lha-mo-la	*pyag*	*ḥtshal-bar*	*ǰĭ*	*gnaṅ*	*źes*	*gsol-pa-daṅ*	//
queen-ALL	salute	do-NMLZ.TRM	what	grant\HON	QUOT	request-NMLZ-ASS	//

'Would you allow us to salute the queen?' they asked. (Rama A 414-415)

In example (20) a demon accidentally asks for the boon of sleep. The one granting the boon and the one sleeping are not the same. This example is intransitive.

(20) རེ་ཤིག་ན་སྲིན་པོ་བུམ་རྣ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ༎ སྤུན་སེམས་ཤན་ཐམས་ཆད་ལ་ཟ་བར་དངོས་གྲུབ་བསྒྲུབས་པ་ལས༎ ལྷའི་དབང་པོས༎

ཆིག་ལ་དབང་བའི་ལྷ་མོ་གཆིག་སྟེའི་ཕོར་ཏོ་ལ་སྒྱུལ་ཏོ། གཉིད་ལོག་པར་ཅི་གནང་ཞེས་བསྒྱུར་ནས། དུས་ཐམས་ཆད་དུ་གཉིད་ལོག་པ།

re	*śig-na*		*srin-po*	*Bum-rna*	*źes*	*bya-ba*	//	*spun*	*sems śan*
while	ART-LOC		demon	Many-Eared	QUOT	do-NMLZ	//	fellow	creatures

thams-čhad-la	*za-bar*		*dṅos grub*	*bsgrubs-pa-las*	//	*lhaḥĭ*
all-ALL	eat-NMLZ.TRM		siddhi	achieve-NMLZ-ABL	//	god.GEN

dbaṅ pos //	*tshĭg-la*	*dbaṅ-baḫi*	*lha mo*	*gčhig*	*lčeḫi*
power.ERG //	speech-ALL	have power.NMLZ.GEN	goddess	ART	tongue.GEN

thor to-la	*sprul-to /*	*gñid log-par*	*jĭ*	*gnaṅ*	*źes*
tip-ALL	transform-FIN /	sleep-NMLZ.TRM	what	grant\HON	QUOT

bsgyur-nas	/	*dus*	*thams-śad-du*	*gñid log-pa /*
change-CVB.ELA /		time	all-TRM	sleep-NMLZ /

'Once there was a demon named 'Many-Eared' who practised to acquire the power to eat all fellow creatures but, by the power of the gods, a goddess of speech transformed onto his tongue tip and changed [his request] into 'would you allow me to sleep,' whence he would sleep all the time.' (Rama A 301-303)

The goddess of speech also interfered with the wording of a request for a boon earlier in the narrative (example (21)). This example includes both གནང་ *gnaṅ* and གསོལ་ *gsol* as matrix verbs. The verb བགྱིད་ *bgyid* 'do', which is subordinate to གནང་ *gnaṅ*, is transitive.

(21)   སྲིད་གསུམ་ལ་དབང་བྱེད་པར་གསོལ་བར་བསམས་པ་དང་། ལྷ་ལ་དབང་བགྱིད་པར་ཅི་གནང་ཞེས། ལྷ་མོས་བསྒྱུར་ཏོ༎

srĭd	*gsum-la*	*dbaṅ*	*byed-par*		*gsol-bar*
world	three-ALL	power	do\PRS-NMLZ.TRM		request-NMLZ.TRM

bsams-pa-daṅ	/	*lha-la*		*dbaṅ*	*bgyĭd-par*		*jĭ*	*gnaṅ*
think.PST-NMLZ-ASS /		god-ALL		power	do.PRS-NMLZ.TRM		what	grant\HON

lha-mos	*bsgyur-to*	//
goddess.ERG	change.PST-FIN //	

'They intended to ask for power over the three worlds, but the goddess changed [this request] into 'would you grant us power over the gods?'' (Rama A 50-51)

Example (22) is interesting because the second person addressee is potentially co-referenced as the subject of མཇལ་པར་ *mǰal-par* and it is not entirely obvious whether མཇལ་པར་ *mǰal-par* should be considered a transitive or intransitive verb. Nonetheless, since the terminative verbal noun is not used when both the subordinate verb is intransitive and there is coreference between the subjects of the matrix and subordinate verbs, we can conclude from the use of the terminative verbal noun that either the verb མཇལ་ *mǰal* is transitive ('you consent to meet me') or at least that there is no coreference ('you consent to us meeting').

(22)   མྱི་པྲད་དུ་མྱི་རུང་ན༎ ལན་ཅིག་མཇལ་པར་ཅི་གནང་ཞེས་

myi	*prad-du*	*myĭ*	*ruṅ-na*	//	*lan*	*čhig*
NEG	meet-CVB.TRM	NEG	be suitable-CVB.LOC	//	time	ART

mǰal-par	*ǰi*	*gnaṅ*	*źes*
meet.HON-NMLZ.TRM	what	grant\HON	QUOT

'If it were not an option not to meet, would you consent to meeting once?' (Rama A 380-381)

4 Conclusions

In conclusion, future infinitives constitute a sort of passive that can be used as a polite imperative and present infinitives require an intransitive subordinate verb and coreference between the agent of the matrix verb and the sole argument of the subordinate verb. When neither the future or present infinitive are appropriate, the terminative verbal noun is used.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative		NEG	negative
ALL	allative		NF	narrow focus
ART	article		NMLZ	nominalizer
ASS	associative		PFV	perfective
CONT	continuative		PL	plural
CVB	converb		PROX	proximate
ELA	elative		PRS	present
ERG	ergative		PRT	particle
FIN	finite suffix		PST	past
FUT	future		QUOT	quotative
GEN	genitive		SF	semifinal
HON	honorific		TRM	terminative
IMP	imperative		WF	wide focus
LOC	locative			

References

Garrett, E.; N. W. Hill; and A. Zadoks. 2013. "Disambiguating Tibetan verb stems with matrix verbs in the indirect infinitive construction". *Bulletin of Tibetology* 49.2: 35–44.

Jong, J. W. de. 1989. *The story of Rāma in Tibet: text and translation of the Tun-huang manuscripts.* Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Kitamura, H. 1975. "The honorifics in Tibetan". *Acta Asiatica* 28: 56–74.

Tillemans, T.; and D. Herforth. 1989. *Agents and actions in classical Tibetan: the indigenous grammarians on Bdag and Gzhan and Bya byed las gsum.* Wien: Universität Wien, Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien [Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 21].

Tillemans, T. J. F. 1988. "On bdag and gzhan and related notions of Tibetan grammar". *Tibetan Studies*, 491–502. Munich: Kommission für Zentralasiatische Studien, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Tillemans, T. J. F. 1991a. "Note on bdag don phal ba in Tibetan grammar". *Études Asiatiques* 45.2: 311–323. https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-146922

Tillemans, T. J. F. 1991b. "gSer tog blo bzan tshul khrims rgya mtsho on Tibetan verb tenses." In: E. Steinkellner (ed.), *Tibetan History and Language. Studies dedicated to Uray Géza on his seventieth birthday*, 487–496. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien [Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 26].

Zadoks, A. 2017. "Syntax and semantics of the Tibetan verb". Unpublished manuscript.

Nathan W. Hill
nathan.hill@tcd.ie