

SWITCH-REFERENCE IN TIBETAN*

Felix Haller
University of Bern

Abstract: The term “switch-reference” denotes an obligatory and pervasive grammatical marking on a subordinate clause that indicates whether the subject of this subordinate clause is coreferential with the subject of the superordinate clause. It can be found primarily in New Guinea, Australia, America, and Africa, as well as in the Northeast Caucasus. The present paper provides evidence for switch-reference in Tibetan, based on materials from the western Central Tibetan dialect of Shigatse and the Biography of Milarepa, one of the most important works of autochthonous Tibetan literature. The knowledge that certain reference relations are characteristic for specific subordinators facilitates the interpretation of difficult passages and suggests that in Tibetan subordination arguments are not only deleted for reasons of context, but also because their mention is regarded as redundant due to reference relations encoded by subordinators.

Keywords: Switch-reference, subordination, temporal clause, anteriority, lophoricity, verbal classification, semantic role hierarchy, control, asyndetic sentence construction

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, I would like to give a tentative overview of switch-reference in Tibetan, restricting myself to Shigatse Tibetan and the Biography of Milarepa. Switch-reference was first defined by William H. Jacobsen in his article “Switch-reference in Hokan-Coahuiltecan” (1967) and is a term for an obligatory and pervasive grammatical marking on a subordinate clause that indicates whether the subject of this subordinate clause is coreferential with the subject of the superordinate clause. Some conceptions only consider the subject, but others also take into account additional grammatical relations or semantic roles. Switch-reference does not cross sentence boundaries, but typically holds between two linearly adjacent clauses, the subordinate clause preceding the superordinate clause. Characteristically, switch-reference is marked on the verb of the subordinate clause and not on the NPs that are related by switch-reference

* I am indebted to Roland Bielmeier, Peter Schwieger (Bonn), Randy J. LaPolla, Bettina Zeisler (Tübingen) and two anonymous referees for valuable corrections and comments. This paper has also benefited from discussions that arose during the lecture “Descriptive and historical analysis of western Tibetan dialects” and I would, therefore, like to express my thanks in particular to Veronika Hein, Thomas Preiswerk, Manuel Widmer and Marius Zemp. It was presented in condensed form in the course of my inaugural lecture “Switch Reference im Tibetischen” on March 18, 2008 and at the Transalpine Typology Meeting in Bern on January 23, 2009.

perspective of the speaker of the original utterance, but not the perspective of the speaker of the reported utterance. This topic will not be considered in the present paper.¹

2. SWITCH-REFERENCE IN SHIGATSE TIBETAN

First, I present examples from the dialect of Shigatse in western Central Tibet (Gtsang), the most important Central Tibetan dialect next to the Lhasa dialect (data from Haller 2009a). My informant for the Shigatse dialect is my wife Chungda who discussed some of the questions that emerged in the course of the collection of data with up to three further native speakers of this variety.

In Tibetan, there seem to be few useful criteria for the definition of subject except for the sentence-initial position in unmarked word order, as there is, for example, no preferred morphological marking for the subject and no agreement of the verb with the subject. I, therefore, favour a description on the level of the semantic role.² It is possible that in Tibetan, there are no obligatory arguments.

The switch-reference system of Tibetan will be described with the aid of tables that show the different verb classes in combination. This way of presentation makes it possible to include all actants in the discussion and not just the subject or the “most subject-like” actant and to exactly record which actants are coreferent in each possible combination. Therefore, the verb classes will be introduced in the following. Here I restrict myself to the classes of full verbs that are part of my verbal classification. Control is a fundamental verbal category of Tibetan. A verb is labelled as a “control verb”, if the event that it describes can be controlled by an agent. Non-control verbs do not have an imperative stem and may be divided into those that permit the formation of a prohibitive and those that do not. In Shigatse Tibetan, the prohibitive of a non-control verb may be formed by the construction negation *ma-* + verbal noun on *-pa* + imperative stem

¹ This phenomenon is treated by Givón for Sherpa who seems to be the first to mention a Tibetan language in the context of switch-reference (Givón 1983: 75-76). Stirling (1993: 128) writes that Givón’s Sherpa data appears to indicate a logophoric system.

² Johanna Nichols uses a similar approach in her article “Switch reference in the Northeast Caucasus” (1983: 247): “Second, although I use the terms *same subject* and *different subject*, conjuncts are nowhere strictly limited either by surface-syntactic relations or by morphological cases. Sameness or difference of reference is linked, not to a fixed cut-off point in a hierarchy of relations, but to a relative ranking of the NP’s in the individual clause. Loosely speaking, the most subject-like NP is the best focus for coreferent tracking. The notion ‘most subject-like’ begs important questions and is circular at best, as I freely admit. Below I will use the terms *subject* and *object* in a special provisional sense designed for Northeast Caucasian: they label the actants that surface as subject or object respectively in a normal English translation. In practice this terminology turns out to be equivalent to defining deep-syntactic relations of subject (or initial 1 or whatever) and object (or initial 2 or whatever); or it is equivalent to setting up a hierarchy of semantic roles (agent > experiencer > patient, in part). But the coincidence with deep-syntactic relations or semantic roles is only due to the fact that most of the survey is based on texts. Elicitation—at least detailed elicitation such as I was able to do for Chechen—reveals that subjecthood in the relevant sense is defined by a number of dimensions, among them topicality, animacy, agency, affectedness.” [italics in the original].

of the verb $t\check{c}^h\check{e}$, $t\check{c}^h\check{i}\check{e}$, $t\check{c}^h\check{i}$ ‘to do’. But this formation is normally only grammatical if the event described permits a slight amount of control on the part of the interlocutor. For example:

- (2) $r\check{a}-k^hi$ $t\check{e}m\check{i}-t^hi$ $pi\check{e}m\check{a}-la$ $t\check{s}\check{e}-c\check{u}$
 2SG-ERG [key-DEF Pema-DAT give.IPFV-NR]

$m\check{a}-t\check{c}\check{e}-wa$ $t\check{c}^h\check{i}$!³
 NEG-forget.PFV-NR do.IMP
 ‘Don’t forget to give Pema the key!’

- (3) * $m\check{a}-n\check{a}r-a$ $t\check{c}^h\check{i}$!
 NEG-be.ill.PFV-NR do.IMP
 ‘Don’t get ill!’

An important argument for the adoption of the category of control is that there are numerous etymologically related verb pairs that describe one and the same event from a “control perspective” (abbreviated as: c) and a “non-control perspective” (abbreviated as: nc). For example:

	written Tibetan (Jäschke 1990 [1881])	Shigatse dialect
‘to cut’ (c)	gcod, bcad, gcad, chod	$t\check{c}i\check{e}$, $t\check{c}i\check{e}$, $t\check{c}\check{e}$
‘to be cut’ (nc)	'chad, chad, 'chad	$t\check{c}^hi\check{e}$, $t\check{c}^hi\check{e}$
‘to break’ (c)	gcog, bcag, gcog, chog(s)	$t\check{c}\check{a}$, $t\check{c}\check{a}$, $t\check{c}\check{o}a$
‘to be broken’ (nc)	'chag, chag(s), 'chag	$t\check{c}^h\check{a}$, $t\check{c}^h\check{a}$

The verbs are classified according to control, the case marking of the arguments taken by the verbs, and the semantic roles expressed by the arguments. The semantic roles agent, experiencer, beneficiary/ recipient, patient, and stimulus are taken as relevant to the classification, leaving out of consideration the order of arguments that express these semantic roles (cf. Haller 2006). In conformity with these classification criteria, we obtain eight classes of verbs, i.e. cA, cEA, cEDA, cED, ncA, ncAD, ncDA and ncEA.

Contrary to some of my earlier publications (Haller 2004, 2006, 2007), I have added the classes cEDA and ncAD to the main classification, which I formerly interpreted as subclasses (cf. Haller 2006: 65, 69-70, 72-73). Tibetan verbs have been classified in various ways. For a recent discussion of different conceptions see Zeisler (2007). The eight verb classes will be introduced in the following. (The stems of a verb are given in the order: imperfective stem, perfective stem, imperative stem.)

³ The tonemes of Shigatse Tibetan are indicated by the following tone marks: \bar{a} (high level tone), \hat{a} (high falling tone), \underline{a} (low level tone), $\underline{\hat{a}}$ (low falling tone).

The predicate of example (4) is formed with the cA verb $t\check{c}^{h\tilde{I}}$ ‘to go’. Its agent, ‘I’, is in the absolutive case.

- cA control verb (agent_{absolutive})
 (4) $t\check{c}^{h\tilde{I}}$ (only pfv.) ‘to go’ < written Tibetan *phyin*
 $\eta\grave{a}$ $t\check{s}^h\bar{o}m$ -la $t\check{c}^{h\tilde{I}}$ -pa-jĩ.
 1SG market-DAT go.PFV-NR-VOL.DIREV
 ‘I went to the market.’

In example (5), the cEA verb *kàm* ‘to dry’ is part of the predicate. The agent ‘Pema’ and the patient ‘meat’ have the cases ergative and absolutive, respectively.

- cEA control verb (agent_{ergative}, patient_{absolutive})
 (5) *kàm*, *kàm*, *kòm* ‘to dry’ < written Tibetan *bskams*
 $pi\bar{e}mi\grave{e}$ $\check{c}\bar{a}$ **kàm**-so.
 Pema:ERG meat dry.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘Pema dried meat.’

The predicate of example (6) is construed with the cEDA verb *cap* ‘to do’. The agent ‘Tashi’, the beneficiary/ recipient ‘I’ and the patient ‘answer’ are in the ergative, dative, and absolutive cases, respectively.

- cEDA control verb (agent_{ergative}, beneficiary/ recipient_{dative}, patient_{absolutive})
 (6) *cap*, *cap*, *cop* ‘to do’ < written Tibetan *brgyab*
 $t\check{s}\bar{a}\check{c}i$ -k^{hi} $\eta\grave{a}l\bar{a}$ $li\check{e}$ **cap**-t\check{c}u.
 Tashi-ERG 1SG:DAT answer do.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘Tashi answered me.’

The predicate of example (7) is formed with the cED verb *mù* ‘to bite’, the agent ‘dog’ is marked with the ergative case, and the patient ‘I’ with the dative case.

- cED control verb (agent_{ergative}, patient_{dative})
 (7) *mù*, *mù*, no imp. ‘to bite (dog, insect)’⁴ < written Tibetan *rmug*
 $c\bar{i}$ $t^h\grave{i}$ $\eta\grave{a}l\bar{a}$ **mù**-t\check{c}u.
 dog DEF:ERG 1SG:DAT bite.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘The dog bit me.’

The patient of the ncA verb $c^h\grave{a}$ ‘to freeze’ in example (8), ‘water’, is in the absolutive case.

⁴ The verb *mù* is used only with animate patients. *sō cap* is employed with inanimate patients. For example:

$c\grave{i}$ $\eta\grave{i}\check{e}$ $t^h\check{o}:\bar{m}\bar{a}$ -la $s\bar{o}$ **cap**-t\check{c}u.
 dog:ERG 1SG:GEN trousers-DAT tooth do.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘(A) dog bit into my trousers.’

ncA non-control verb (patient/ experiencer_{absolutive})

- (8) c^hà, c^hà ‘to freeze’ < written Tibetan *khyag*
 tɕ^hū c^hà-ne.
 water freeze.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘The water is frozen.’

In example (9), the ncAD verb *ʈs^hè* ‘to be afraid’ is part of the predicate. The experiencer ‘I’ and the stimulus ‘tiger’ are in the absolutive and dative cases, respectively.

ncAD non-control verb (experiencer_{absolutive}, stimulus_{dative})

- (9) ʈs^hè, ʈs^hè ‘to be afraid’ < written Tibetan *bred*
 ŋa tà-la ʈs^hè-kì.
 1SG tiger-DAT be.afraid.IPFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘I am afraid of the tiger.’

The predicate of example (10) is construed with the ncDA verb *ɲì* ‘to find’. The beneficiary/ recipient ‘I’ is marked with the dative case and the patient ‘a key’ is in the absolutive case.

ncDA non-control verb (beneficiary/ recipient_{dative}, patient_{absolutive})

- (10) ɲì, ɲì ‘to find’ < written Tibetan *rnyed*
 ŋalā temì-tɕi ɲì-tɕu.
 1SG:DAT key-INDEF find.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘I found a key.’

The predicate of example (11) is formed with the ncEA verb *ra:* ‘to be torn’, and the experiencer ‘I’ and the patient ‘your book’ are in the ergative and absolutive cases, respectively.

ncEA non-control verb (experiencer_{ergative}, patient/ stimulus_{absolutive})

- (11) ra:, ra: ‘to be torn’⁵ < written Tibetan *ral*
 ɲiè rã-k^hi t^hɕɸ-k^ho ra:-so.
 1SG:ERG 2SG-GEN book-DEF be.torn.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘I tore your book unintentionally.’

The semantic roles agent, experiencer, beneficiary/recipient, patient, and stimulus may be arranged in the hierarchy given below:

⁵ For the classification of this verb see Goldstein (1978 [1970]: 118, 302b).

Increasing active involvement in the event		
↑	agent (Ag) experiencer (Exp) beneficiary/ recipient (Ben) patient (Pat) stimulus (Stim)	↓
Decreasing active involvement in the event		

Table 1. Hierarchy of semantic roles

In Shigatse Tibetan, there normally exists only one subordinator for a functional category (e.g. conditional, copulative, destinative). But anteriority, i.e. that the event expressed by the preceding clause takes place before the event expressed by the following clause, may be conveyed through the subordinators *-ne* (written Tibetan *nas*) or *-pata* (written Tibetan *pa dang/ ba dang*), both of which are attached to the perfective stem. *-pata* possesses the allomorphs *-ata*, *-lata*, *-ŋata*, as well as *-wata*, and can be interpreted as the combination of the nominalizer *-pa* and the conjunction *-ta*. *-ne* may also convey an elaborative relation, i.e. that the event expressed by the following clause takes place in the manner of the accompanying event expressed by the preceding clause, and *-pata* may also convey a causal relation. In the present paper, *-ne* and *-pata* will only be contrasted in their temporal function. In negation, the contrast *-ne* vs. *-pata* is neutralized in favour of *-pata*.

In traditional grammars, the subordinator is equated with the ablative case marker which is also written *nas* (cf. e.g. Hahn 1996 [1971]: 139). But in Shigatse Tibetan and Lhasa Tibetan, too, the subordinator and the ablative case marker display different phonological forms: in Shigatse Tibetan, the subordinator is *-ne*; it could also be phonologized as *-ni* since its vowel quality depends on the vowel of the preceding verb stem. The ablative case marker is *-nie*. According to Goldstein (1978 [1970]), in Lhasa Tibetan, the subordinator is *-ni* (1978 [1970]: 72) and the ablative case marker *ne* (1978 [1970]: 60, ex. 6; 285a).

In example (12), the cEA verb *ɕə̀* ‘to put’ and the cEDA verb *ɕiè* ‘to speak’ are connected with *-ne*. The agents of both clauses are coreferential (‘Pema’), i.e. denote the same participant in the situations described by the verbs, and they are those actants that occupy the highest possible position in the hierarchy mentioned above. The ungrammatical forms marked with an asterisk are given in addition.

- (12) piēmiè k^hāpā: ɕə̀-**ne**, āmā-la kātɕā
 [Pema:ERG telephone put.PFV-ANT] mother-DAT speech

ɕiè-so. / *ɕə̀-wata
 speak.PFV-NVOL.DIREV

‘After Pema had put (down) the telephone (temporarily, she) spoke to mother.’

Example (13) is different from example (12) in that the embedded clause is subordinated with *-wata*. None of the actants of the embedded clause is coreferential with those of the embedding clause.

- (13) piēmiè k^hāpā: **çà-wata,** āmā-la kātçā
 Pema:ERG [telephone put.PFV-ANT] mother-DAT speech

çiè-so. / ***çà-ne**

speak.PFV-NVOL.DIREV

‘After (the other person) had hung up the telephone, Pema spoke to mother. (Pema spoke to a third person, and after the telephone call was finished, this person hung up the telephone and thereafter Pema hung up too.)’

The cEA verb *p^hçè* ‘to call’ and the cA verb *tç^hĩ* ‘to go’ in example (14) are connected with *-wata*. The patient of the first clause and the agent of the second clause are coreferential (‘I’), but only the agent of the second clause is in the highest possible position in the hierarchy.

- (14) k^hōtsè **p^hçè-wata,** ŋa **tç^hĩ**-pa-jĩ. / ***p^hçè-ne**
 [3PL:ERG call.PFV-ANT] 1SG go.PFV-NR-VOL.DIREV
 ‘After they had called (me), I went (into their presence).’

It seems, thus, that *-ne* is used if two actants are coreferential and occupy the highest possible position in the hierarchy respectively, and *-pata* is used in all other cases. Example (15), however, shows that yet another factor has to be taken into account.

The ncDA verb *ɲì* ‘to find’ is subordinated to the cEDA verb *tēr* ‘to present, give’ with *-wata*, although the beneficiary/ recipient and the agent of the two clauses are coreferential (‘Tashi’) and in the highest possible position in the hierarchy, respectively. In addition, the patients of both clauses are partly coreferential (‘money’ and ‘half (of the money)’).

- (15) t̥sāçì-la ŋū: **ɲì-wata,** tç^hē:kā piēmā-la
 [Tashi-DAT money find.PFV-ANT] half Pema-DAT

tēr-so. / ***ɲì-ne**

present.PFV-NVOL.DIREV

‘After Tashi had found money, (he) presented Pema with half (of it).’

To the rule stated above, therefore, the condition has to be added that the verb of the first clause must be a control verb to permit the usage of *-ne*. This is a parallel to Eastern Pomo, a Hokan language with switch-reference spoken in California. In the switch-reference system of this language, there exist, to simplify matters a bit, two groups of morphemes. If the verbs of both clauses are either control verbs or non-control verbs and the subjects are coreferential, they

are connected with one group of morphemes. In all other cases, the other group of morphemes has to be employed (Stirling 1993: 98-109, 150, 249, 325/ fn. 49).

The case of a preceding clause with a control verb and coreferential actants in the highest possible position in the hierarchy is illustrated by example (12). In the examples (13) and (14), the verbs of the preceding clauses are control verbs, but the actants are either not coreferential, or some actants are coreferential, but not all of them are in the highest possible position in the hierarchy. The verb of the preceding clause in example (15) is a non-control verb and the coreferential actants occupy the highest possible position in the hierarchy, respectively. Finally, the following example illustrates the case of a preceding clause with a non-control verb and not all of the coreferential actants in the highest possible position in the hierarchy. The ncA verb *tsà* ‘to fall’ and the cEA verb *t^hẽ* ‘to pull’ in example (16) are connected with *-wata*. The patient of the first clause and the patient of the second clause are coreferential (‘I’), but only the patient of the first clause is in the highest possible position in the hierarchy.

- (16) ŋa mà tsà-wata, t̥sāçì-k^{hi} jà t^hẽ-tçu. / *tsà-ne
 [1SG down fall.PFV-ANT] Tashi-ERG up pull.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘After I had fallen down, Tashi pulled (me) up.’

It follows from the present discussion that *-ne* is employed if the verb of the preceding clause is a control verb and two actants are coreferential and occupy the highest possible position in the hierarchy, respectively. *-pata* is used in all other cases. However, this rule is only a rule of thumb. The following two tables provide a more detailed overview and show that there are also some exceptions and cases where both *-ne* and *-pata* are grammatical. In the tables, which are to be read from left to right, the eight verb classes introduced above are shown in combination. The symbol “>” represents the subordination of a preceding subordinated clause to a following superordinate clause. The abbreviations left and right of the symbol “>” stand for the semantic roles of the actants that are coreferential, i.e. denote the same participants in the situations described by the verbs, regardless of whether they are explicitly mentioned or not. Here, I restrict myself to the semantic roles I consider relevant to the verbal classification. If there is more than one coreferred actant in a clause, these are distinguished by different subscript numerals. An underlined coreference indicates that the use of the other subordinator is also possible, but not preferred. Otherwise, the employment of the respective other subordinator is ungrammatical. If there are no coreferential actants, this is shown by a dash “-”. An empty cell in a table indicates that no example could be found for the particular combination in question.

For instance, the reader may wish to look up the reference relations attested for cEA verbs combined with cA verbs in the tables 2 and 3. In this case, then, a preceding subordinate clause that is formed with a cEA verb is followed by a superordinate clause that is construed with a cA verb. In the tables which are to be read from left to right, the class of the verb of a subordinate clause is shown in

the leftmost column and the class of the verb of a superordinate clause in the top line. The reference relations attested for a particular combination are given in the cell shared by the respective column and line. For the combination cEA + cA, we find the reference relation “Ag > Ag” in table 2, meaning that the agent of the cEA verb and the agent of the cA verb are coreferential. In table 3, two reference relations are shown: “Pat > Ag” and “-”. The reference relation “Pat > Ag” means that the patient of the cEA verb is coreferential with the agent of the cA verb. “-” indicates that two such verbs are connected with *-pata*, but there are no coreferential actants.

cA	cEA	cEDA	cED	ncA	ncAD	ncDA	ncEA
cA	Ag > Ag Ag ₁ > Ag _{1,2,3}	Ag > Ag		–		<u>Ag > Ben</u>	
cEA	Ag > Ag Ag ₁ Pat ₂ > Ag ₁ Pat ₂	Ag > Ag Ag ₁ Pat ₂ > Ag ₁ Ben ₂ Ag ₁ Pat ₂ > Ag ₁ Pat ₂				<u>Ag₁Pat₂ > Ben₁Pat₂</u> <u>Ag_{1,2,3} > Ben₁</u>	
cEDA	Ag > Ag Ag ₁ Pat ₂ > Ag ₁ Pat ₂	Ag ₁ Ben ₂ > Ag ₁ Ben ₂ Ag ₁ Ben ₂ Pat ₃ > Ag ₁ Ben ₂ Pat ₃					
cED	Ag > Ag						
ncA		Exp _{1,2} > Ag _{1,2} Ben _{1,2}	<u>Exp > Ag</u>	–			
ncAD							
ncDA				–			
ncEA							

Table 2. Reference relations attested for the subordinator -ne

	cA	cEA	cEDA	cED	ncA	ncAD	ncDA	ncEA
cA	–	Ag > Pat	Ag > Ben					
cEA	Pat > Ag	Pat > Ag	Ag ₁ Pat ₂ > Ag ₂ Ben ₁			Pat > Stim		
cEDA	Ben > Ag	Ben > Ag	Ag ₁ Ben ₂ > Ag ₂ Ben ₁		Ben > Exp		<u>Ben₁Pat₂ > Exp₁Stim₂</u>	
cED			Pat > Ag					
ncA	<u>Exp > Ag</u>	<u>Pat > Ag</u> Pat > Pat	Exp > Ag					
ncAD								
ncDA		<u>Ben₁Pat₂ > Ag₁Pat₂</u>	<u>Ben₁Pat₂ > Ag₁Ben₂</u> <u>Ben₁Pat₂ > Ag₁Pat₂</u>					
ncEA	Exp > Ag	Exp ₁ Stim ₂ > Ag ₁ Pat ₂	Exp > Ag	Exp ₁ Stim ₂ > Ag ₁ Pat ₂				

Table 3. Reference relations attested for the subordinator -pata/ -ata/ -lata/ -ŋata/ -wata

The information in the tables shall be illustrated with a few additional examples. In example (17), the cA verb $t\check{c}^{h\check{i}}$ ‘to go’ and the cEA verb $n\check{c}\check{e}$ ‘to buy’ are connected with *-ne*. The agents of both clauses are coreferential (‘I’) and they are the actants that occupy the highest possible position in the hierarchy.

- (17) $\eta\check{a}$ $t\check{s}^h\check{o}m$ -la $t\check{c}^{h\check{i}}\text{-ne}$, $\check{c}\check{a}$ $n\check{c}\check{e}$ -wa-jĩ. / * $t\check{c}^{h\check{i}}$ -pata
 [1SG market-DAT go.PFV-ANT] meat buy.PFV-NR-VOL.DIREV
 ‘After I had gone to the market, (I) bought meat.’

The cEA verb $n\check{c}\check{e}$ ‘to buy’ in example (18) is subordinated to the ncAD verb $s\check{e}mp\check{a}$ $\check{c}\check{o}r$ ‘to be enthusiastic’ with *-wata*. The patient of the first clause and the stimulus of the second clause are coreferential (‘a new Chupa (traditional Tibetan dress)’), but they are not in the highest possible position in the hierarchy.

- (18) $\eta\check{i}\check{e}$ $t\check{c}^h\check{u}p\check{a}$ $s\check{a}p\check{a}$ -t\check{c}i $n\check{c}\check{e}$ -wata, $pi\check{e}m\check{a}$
 [1SG:ERG Chupa new-INDEF buy.PFV-ANT] Pema

 $s\check{e}mp\check{a}$ $\check{c}\check{o}$ -so. / * $n\check{c}\check{e}$ -ne
 be.enthusiastic.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘After I had bought a new Chupa, Pema was enthusiastic (about it).’

In example (19), the cED verb \check{a} ‘to ignore’ and the cEDA verb $\check{c}i\check{e}$ ‘to speak’ are connected with *-wata*. The patient of the first clause and the agent of the second clause are coreferential (‘Pema’), but only the agent of the second clause occupies the highest possible position in the hierarchy.

- (19) $\eta\check{i}\check{e}$ $pi\check{e}m\check{a}$ -la \check{a} -wata, $pi\check{e}mi\check{e}$ $t\check{s}\check{a}\check{c}i$ -la
 [1SG:ERG Pema-DAT ignore.PFV-ANT] Pema:ERG Tashi-DAT

 $k\check{a}t\check{c}\check{a}$ $\check{c}i\check{e}$ -so. / * \check{a} -ne
 speech speak.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘After I had ignored Pema, (she) spoke to Tashi.’

The ncEA verb $t^h\check{o}\eta$ ‘to see’ in example (20) is subordinated to the cEA verb $t\check{c}\check{y}$ ‘to catch’ with *-ata*. The experiencer of the first clause and the agent of the second clause (‘Tashi’) are coreferential, just as the stimulus of the first clause and the patient of the second clause (‘the rabbit’). Experiencer and agent are in the highest possible position in the hierarchy respectively, but the verb of the first clause is a non-control verb.

- (20) $t\check{s}\check{a}\check{c}i$ -k^{hi} $ri\check{k}\check{o}$ -k^{ho} $t^h\check{o}\eta$ -ata, $l\check{a}ms\check{a}$
 [Tashi-ERG rabbit-DEF see.PFV-ANT] immediately

 $t\check{c}\check{y}$ -so. / * $t^h\check{o}\eta$ -ne
 catch.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘After Tashi had seen the rabbit, (he) caught (it) immediately.’

If the actants of two clauses are not singular, they may, on the one hand, be plural and completely coreferential or completely non-coreferential. On the other hand, one or more actants of one clause may form a subset of the actants of the other clause and they thus may be partly coreferential. In this case, the question is whether a language treats such a situation as altogether coreferential or not. In favour of the treatment as altogether coreferential is the fact that one or more actants are coreferential, against, that not all are coreferential. The following two examples show that in Shigatse Tibetan, such a situation comes under the definition of coreferentiality.

In example (21), the cA verb *lòa* ‘to return’ and the cEA verb *tiè* ‘to watch’ are connected. The agent of the first clause (‘Tashi’) also is agent of the second clause, but not the only agent, as the action expressed by the second clause is performed by three agents (‘Tashi, Pema and Drolma’). Nevertheless, the clauses are connected with *-ne*. Apart from that, this subordination fulfils the conditions required for employment of *-ne*: The verb of the first clause is a control verb and the coreferential actants, the agents, occupy the highest possible position in the hierarchy. Note that two of the agents are expressed through a postpositional phrase.

- (21) *ʈsāçì taŋkò naŋ-la lòa-ne, piēmā-ta*
 [Tashi yesterday.evening home-DAT return.PFV-ANT] Pema-and
*ʈsɔ:mā tç^hāla tiēmō tiè-so. / *lòa-wata*
 Drolma together television watch.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘After Tashi had returned home yesterday evening, (he) watched television together with Pema and Drolma.’

In example (22), the cEA verb *tsè* ‘to play’ is subordinated to the ncDA verb *t^hōp* ‘to get’. Only one of the three agents of the first clause (‘Tashi’) is the beneficiary/ recipient of the second clause. In this case, too, the clauses are preferentially connected with *-ne*. As the verb of the first clause is a control verb, and the coreferential actants, agent and beneficiary/ recipient, are in the highest possible position in the hierarchy respectively, the requirements for subordination with *-ne* are met. Note that, in this example too, two of the agents are expressed through a postpositional phrase.

- (22) *ʈsāçì-k^hi piēmā-ta ʈsɔ:mā tç^hāla pà*
 [Tashi-ERG Pema-and Drolma together playing.card
tsè-ne, ʈsāçì-la t^hōp-so. / ~ tsè-wata
 play.PFV-ANT] Tashi-DAT get.PFV-NVOL.DIREV
 ‘After Tashi had played cards together with Pema and Drolma, (he) won.’

In addition, there is a construction that I call asyndetic sentence construction, where two or more copulative clauses follow each other without being connected by subordinators. The predicate of a preceding clause consists of the bare

perfective stem and the actants that occupy the highest possible position in the hierarchy respectively must be coreferential. The cEDA verbs *jòà* ‘to dress’, *tēr* ‘to present, give’ and *tɕ^hiè* ‘to make’ in example (23) follow each other without being connected by subordinators. The agents (‘I’) that are in the highest possible position in the hierarchy are coreferential.

(23) t̤a:kì òlō-la k^hɕɕcū jòà, tō tēr, kākō
 [1SG:ERG child-DAT clothes dress.PFV] [food give.PFV] all

tɕ^hiè-wa-jĩ.

make.PFV-NR-VOL.DIREV

‘I dressed the child, fed (it) and did everything (else).’

3. SWITCH-REFERENCE IN THE BIOGRAPHY OF MILAREPA

The Biography of Milarepa (1040-1123), which was completed in western Central Tibet in 1488, is one of the most important works of autochthonous Tibetan literature. The author of this biography, Gtsang smyon he ru ka (1452-1507), comes from a village between Shigatse and Gyantse. In the present article, I will give examples from the first three chapters of this biography, which also provide the material for my work “Die weltlichen Taten des Milarepa (The worldly deeds of Milarepa)” (Haller 2009b).

In this material, we find a greater diversity of subordinators that is most pronounced in the field of simple anteriority, to which I will restrict myself in the following. Simple anteriority alone may be expressed by nine subordinators altogether, and the question is whether these are really functionally identical, as they are sometimes described in traditional grammars (cf. e.g. Hahn 1996 [1971]). The findings for switch-reference in Shigatse Tibetan provide the stimulus to also investigate the subordinators in the Biography of Milarepa in this direction.

I also distinguish the eight verb classes cA, cEA, cEDA, cED, ncA, ncAD, ncDA and ncEA in the Biography of Milarepa, which will be illustrated in the following. The verbal noun in example (24) is formed with the cA verb *log* ‘to return’. Its agent, ‘you’, is in the absolutive case.

cA control verb (agent_{absolutive})

(24) log, log, no imp. ‘to return’

Thos.pa.dga' khyod **log** mi-'gro-ba ci yin

Thöpage [2SG return.IPFV NEG-go.IPFV-NR] what be

‘Thöpage (worldly name of Milarepa)! What is (the reason that) you do not return (home)?’ (3:21.4)⁶

In example (25) spoken by Milarepa, the cEA verb *brdzangs* ‘to send’ is part of the predicate. The agent ‘mother’ and the patient ‘I’ are in the ergative and absolutive cases, respectively.

⁶ The references apply to the segmentation in Haller (2009b).

cEA control verb (agent_{ergative}, patient_{absolutive})

(25) brdzangs (only pfv.) ‘to send’

de-la lan gzhan glan-pa-'i stobs
[[that-DAT answer other respond.IPFV-NR-GEN] power

med-pa-r| a.ma-s bdag mthu
exist.VOL.NEG-NR-LOC] mother-ERG 1SG [sorcery

slob-tu **brdzangs-pa.lags|**
learn.IPFV-DEST] send.PFV-AUX

‘Without the power to respond in a different way, (my) mother sent me to learn sorcery, (as is generally known).’ (3:22.2)

The predicate of the first clause of example (26) is construed with the cEDA verb *byin* ‘to present, give’. The agent ‘I’, the beneficiary/ recipient ‘yogin’ and the patient ‘gold’ are in the ergative, dative, and absolutive cases, respectively.

cEDA control verb (agent_{ergative}, beneficiary/ recipient_{dative}, patient_{absolutive})

(26) byin (only pfv.) ‘to present, give’

de-nas nga-s rnal.'byor.pa-la gser zho gang
[that-ABL 1SG-ERG yogin-DAT gold dram one

byin-pas dga'-song|
present.PFV-CAUS] glad-PFV.NVOL

‘Then I, (Milarepa), presented the yogin with a dram of gold and (he), therefore, was glad.’ (3:58)

In example (27), the predicate is formed with the cED verb *phug* ‘to bite’, the agent ‘dog’ is marked with the ergative case, and the patient ‘foot’ with the dative case. Here the patient is topicalized for emphasis and placed in front of the agent.

cED control verb (agent_{ergative}, patient_{dative})

(27) phug (only pfv.) ‘to bite’

... rkang.pa-la khyi-s **phug-ste** ...
foot-DAT dog-ERG bite.PFV-CAUS

‘... because (a) dog had bitten (me, Milarepa,) in the foot ...’ (3:69)

The patient of the ncA verb *grang* ‘to freeze’ in the second clause of example (28), ‘the two of us too’, is in the absolutive case.

ncA non-control verb (patient/ experiencer_{absolutive})

(28) grang (only pfv.) ‘to freeze’

de-'i rjes-la char.rlung chen.po-zhig byung-ste|
[that-GEN trace-DAT rainstorm big-INDEF arise.PFV-CAUS]

nged.rang gnyis-kyang **grang-nas** brag.phug
 [1PL two-PTL freeze.PFV-MAN] [rock.cave

kha.byang.bstan-zhig-tu spen.ma-'i me
 pointing.to.the.north-INDEF-LOC tamarisk-GEN fire

btang-nas bsdad-pas| ...
 make.PFV-ANT] sit.PFV-ANT

‘Because a big rainstorm came up afterwards, the two of us froze too, made (a) tamarisk fire in a rock cave pointing to the north, and sat (down) ...’ (3:66)

In example (29), the ncAD verb *'cham* ‘to agree’ is part of the predicate of the first clause. The experiencers ‘paternal uncle and aunt, the two,’ and the stimulus ‘what (here used indefinitely: whatever)’ have the absolutive and dative cases, respectively.

ncAD non-control verb (experiencer_{absolutive}, stimulus_{dative})
 (29) *'cham* (only ipfv.) ‘to agree’

a.khu-dang a.ne gnyis ci-la
 [paternal.uncle-and paternal.aunt two what-DAT

mi-'**cham**-rung lto-la 'cham-pa.dang| ...
 NEG-agree.IPFV-CONC] food-DAT agree.IPFV-SIM

‘Although paternal uncle and aunt, the two, agreed on nothing, (they) did agree on food (i.e. property) ...’ (2:20.5)

The predicate of example (30) is construed with the ncDA verb *skyes* ‘to be born’. The beneficiary/ recipient ‘Mila Sherab Gyentsen, (the father of Milarepa),’ is marked with the dative case and the patient ‘son’ is in the absolutive case.

ncDA non-control verb (beneficiary/ recipient_{dative}, patient_{absolutive})
 (30) *skyes* (only pfv.) ‘to be born’

Mi.la.shes.rab.rgyal.mtshan-la bu **skyes-e.'dug|**
 Mila.Sherab.Gyentsen-DAT son be.born.PFV-INT

‘Wasn’t (a real) son born to Mila Sherab Gyentsen, (the father of Milarepa)?’ (3:34.6)

In the second clause of example (31), the predicate is formed with the ncEA verb *chod* ‘to be dispelled (doubts)’, and the experiencers ‘we’ and the stimuli ‘doubts’ are in the ergative and absolutive cases, respectively.

ncEA non-control verb (experiencer_{ergative}, patient/ stimulus_{absolutive})
 (31) *chod* (only pfv.) ‘to be dispelled (doubts)’

bla.ma-rang-la-'ang de-bas lhag.pa med
 [[Lama-PTL-DAT-PTL that-CMPR better exist.VOL.NEG]

gsung-gin.'dug-pas	nged.rnams-kyis	mthu-'i	sgro.'dogs
say.IPFV-NVOL-CAUS]	1PL-ERG	sorcery-GEN	doubt

chod|

be.dispelled.PFV

‘As (our lama) says that (he) himself does not have any (instructions to give) better than those, (our) doubts concerning (the completeness of his instructions of) sorcery are dispelled.’ (3:18)

Because it would be beyond the scope of the present article to treat all 64 combinations (eight x eight verb classes) for the nine subordinators that serve to express simple anteriority, as has been done for Shigatse Tibetan in tables 2 and 3 of the preceding section, I restrict myself to cEDA verbs combined with cEDA verbs in the following.

In this case, then, a preceding subordinate clause that is formed with a cEDA verb is followed by a superordinate clause that is likewise construed with a cEDA verb.

cEDA verbs are verbs with an argument in the ergative case, an argument in the dative case and an argument in the absolutive case, normally expressing an agent, a beneficiary/ recipient, and a patient (cf. example (26)).

The nine subordinators *rjes*, *te/ ste/ de*, *rting*, *na*, *nas* (Shigatse *-ne*), *pa dang/ ba dang* (Shigatse *-pata*), *pa la/ ba la*, *pa las/ ba las*, and *pas/ bas* may serve to express simple anteriority, but the combination of a cEDA verb with a cEDA verb is only attested for four subordinators, i.e. *te/ ste/ de* (5 cases), *nas* (18), *pa la/ ba la* (9) and *pas/ bas* (19). It turns out that these four subordinators may be divided into two groups with respect to their reference relations.

- Group 1 with the predominant reference relation $Ag_1Ben_2 > Ag_1Ben_2$, i.e. agent and beneficiary/ recipient of both clauses are coreferential.

As the survey listed below shows, different reference relations often can be found for the same subordinator. The number of examples observed for a particular reference relation is indicated in parentheses.

te/ ste/ de (5):

$Ag_1Ben_2 > Ag_1Ben_2$ (4)

$Ag_1Ben_2Pat_3 > Ag_1Ben_2Pat_3$ (1)

nas (18):

$Ag_1Ben_2 > Ag_1Ben_2$ (15)

$Ag > Ag$ (2)

$Ben_1Pat_2 > Ag_1Pat_2$ (1)

Only examples for the reference relation $Ag_1Ben_2 > Ag_1Ben_2$ will be given in the following discussion. In example (32), the predicate of the first clause is formed with *phul* ‘to give’ and the predicate of the second clause with *zhus* ‘to request’. Their agents, ‘I, (Milarepa),’ and their beneficiaries/ recipients, ‘he, (the lama),’ are coreferential.

(32) *te/ ste/ de*

nga-s gser g.yu kun **phul-te** | ... **zhus-pas** | ...
 [1SG-ERG gold turquoise all give.PFV-ANT] request.PFV-ANT
 ‘After I, (Milarepa), had given (him, the lama,) everything, the gold (and)
 the turquoise, (I) requested (of him): ...’ (3:15)

In example (33), the predicate of the first clause is construed with *bskur* ‘to send’, and the predicate of the second clause with *btang* ‘to send’. In this example, too, the agents, the parents of Dzese, (the fiancé of Milarepa), and the beneficiaries/ recipients, ‘I, (Milarepa),’ are coreferential.

(33) *nas*

khyad.par Mdzes.se-'i pha.ma-s rgyags chu
 [especially Dzese-GEN parents-ERG food water

 sdor me.shing yan **bskur-nas** nga
 sth.added.to.a.soup firewood up send.PFV-ANT] [1SG

 klog slob-sa-r Mdzes.se mo-rang sems.gso-la
 reading learn.IPFV-NR-LOC] Dzese 3SG.F-PTL consolation-DAT

 yang.yang **btang-byung**
 again.and.again send.PFV-NVOL
 ‘After especially the parents of Dzese, (the fiancé of Milarepa), had sent
 food, water, things to be added to a soup (and) firewood up (to me,
 Milarepa, they also) sent herself, Dzese, again and again for (my)
 consolation to the place where I learnt reading.’ (2:30)

• Group 2 with the predominant reference relation $Ag_1Ben_2 > Ag_2Ben_1$, i.e. the agent and the beneficiary/ recipient of the first clause are coreferential with the beneficiary/ recipient and the agent of the second clause.

pa la/ ba la	(9):	pas/ bas	(19):
$Ag_1Ben_2 > Ag_2Ben_1$	(8)	$Ag_1Ben_2 > Ag_2Ben_1$	
$Ben > Ben$	(1)		

In the following discussion, examples will only be given for the reference relation $Ag_1Ben_2 > Ag_2Ben_1$. In example (34), the predicate of the first clause is formed with *zer* ‘to say’ and the predicate of the second clause with *byas* ‘to say’. The agent of the first clause, ‘my mother’, is coreferential with the beneficiary/ recipient of the second clause and the beneficiary/ recipient of the first clause, ‘I, (Milarepa),’ is coreferential with the agent of the second clause.

(34) *pa la/ ba la*

e-'ong ltos-dang **zer-ba.la** | nga-s
 [[[INT-be.practicable.IPFV] see.IMP-PTL] say.PFV-ANT] 1SG-ERG

kneeled (down) in (his) presence, folded (his) hands and requested (of the venerable one): ...' (1:16)

Apart from the theoretical interest in this finding, the knowledge that certain reference relations are characteristic for a given subordinator may be helpful for the interpretation of difficult passages, as in (37).

- (37) This passage of the frame is preceded by the following context: The mother of Milarepa hides gold for him in the lining of the clothing of a yogin, and writes Milarepa about this in a letter that the yogin is to deliver to him. She is therefore forced to express herself enigmatically in the letter. Milarepa and his lama do not understand the letter, but the wife of the lama does. For that reason, she thinks up a trick to get hold of the clothing of the yogin and take the gold out of the lining. She first instructs Milarepa to call the yogin ...

bos-nas me chen.po **btang|** chang zhim.po
[call.PFV-ANT] [fire big make.PFV] [beer tasty

byin-te| rnal.'byor.pa-'i rgyab-nas bem.po
give.PFV-ANT] [yogin-GEN back-ABL lined.clothing

phud-de yum-gyis gyon-nas| bem.po
take.off.PFV-ANT] [wife-ERG wear.PFV-ANT] [[[lined.clothing

'di.'dra gyon-nas rgyal.khams skor-ba-'i
such wear.PFV-ANT] kingdom wander.IPFV-NR-GEN]

mi-la skyid yong gsung-zhing| ...
human-DAT happiness come.IPFV] say.PFV-CONN

My translation of this passage runs as follows:

'After (I) had called (him, I) made (a) big fire (at her behest), gave (him) tasty beer, and (she) took the lined clothing off (his) back, put (it) on and said: "(A) person wearing such lined clothing that wanders through the kingdoms will be happy!" ...' (3:52)

However, this passage is interpreted in different ways (Here only a selection of translations is given.):

Translation 1: Bacot (1925: 71): "Quand l'ermite fut là, elle lui fit un grand feu, et elle lui donna de la bière excellente. Puis, enlevant le manteau du dos de l'ermite, elle s'en couvrit et dit: 'Voici un manteau agréable pour voyager de royaume en royaume.'" (When the hermit arrived, she made a big fire for him and gave him some excellent beer. Then, removing the hermit's coat from his back, she covered herself with it and said: "This is a nice coat for travelling from kingdom to kingdom." (my translation from the French))

Translation 2: Evans-Wentz (1999 [1928]: 76): “She [i.e. my Guru’s wife] read through the letter once, and then ordered me to call the pilgrim, which I did. She then had a nice big fire made, and *chhang* [beer] served, and caused the pilgrim to take off the cloak he was wearing. Then, assuming a playful air, she put it on her own back, and strutting up and down the room said, ‘Happy indeed those persons must be who can go everywhere with no other clothing but this on their back!’”

Translation 3: Lhalungpa (1997 [1979]: 31-32): “When the yogin came, the lama’s wife made a big fire and gave him some excellent beer. Then, removing the cloak from the yogin’s back, she put it on herself and said, ‘This is a nice cloak for traveling from place to place.’”

Translation 4: Wang (1997: 234): 瑜伽行者被请进来以后，太太便燃起熊熊的炉火，以甘美的酒给行者喝。到行者的背后，把他补缀的衣裳脱下，穿在自己身上说：“穿着这样破衣朝山的人，一定很舒服的吧！” “After the yogin had been asked to come in, the wife (of the master) lighted a blazing fire in the stove and gave the monk sweet and refreshing beer to drink. (She) went behind the monk, took off his patched clothing, put (it) on herself and said: ‘A person wearing such worn-out clothes that makes a pilgrimage to a holy mountain will certainly feel very comfortable!’” (my translation from the Chinese)

Translation 5: Chang (1991 [1971]: 52): 師母就燒了一盆大火，請行者進去烤火喝酒。師母指天劃地，東說西說，順便就從行者的背後，把他的大衣脫下來，披在自己的身上說：「穿著這樣破舊的衣服去朝山，福氣一定會來的。」 “The wife of the master lighted a big fire at once and asked the monk to go in to warm himself by the fire and drink beer. (She) chatted (with him) without restraint, took off (the monk’s) overcoat from behind in passing, put (it) on herself and said: ‘If (someone) wearing such old and shabby clothes goes to make a pilgrimage to a holy mountain, good luck will certainly come.’” (my translation from the Chinese)

Translation 6: Liu (1994 [1985]: 44): 我招呼瑜伽师进来，烧起温暖的火盆之后，给他斟上很好的酒，师母便从行者的背后帮他把衲衣脱下，自己披在身上说：“穿着这样的衲衣云游天下的人，会很舒服的！” “I told the yogin to come in, lighted a warm fire pan and, thereafter, poured him very good beer; the wife of the master helped (the monk) to take off (his) patchwork vestment from behind, put (it) on herself and said: ‘A person wearing such a patchwork vestment that wanders about in the world is sure to feel very comfortable!’” (my translation from the Chinese)

Now, the question is who in all probability is the agent of *me btang* ‘to make fire’: Milarepa or the wife of the lama? The agent of *bos* ‘to call’ is Milarepa

because the wife of the lama instructed him to do so. She cannot be the agent of *byin* ‘to present, give’ as the honorific form of the verb would be required for her (In a passage shortly following (3:55) the honorific verb *gnang* ‘to present, give’ is used for her). Because it is clear from the context who the actants of *bos* ‘to call’ are—agent: Milarepa, patient: yogin—the reference relations attested for the subordinator *nas* in the remaining material may provide an indication of who could be the agent of *btang* ‘to make’ in this passage. In this context *bos* ‘to call’ and *btang* ‘to make’ theoretically could be interpreted as cEA or cEDA verbs. We find the following reference relations for cEA and cEDA verbs subordinated with *nas* in the rest of the material:

• cEA + cEA (8):		• cEA + cEDA (11):	
Ag > Ag	(7)	Ag > Ag	(8)
Ag ₁ Pat ₂ > Ag ₁ Pat ₂	(1)	Ag ₁ Pat ₂ > Ag ₁ Ben ₂	(2)
		Ag ₁ Pat ₂ > Ag ₂ Ben ₁	(1)
• cEDA + cEA (11):		• cEDA + cEDA (18):	
Ag ₁ Ben ₂ > Ag ₁ Pat ₂	(6)	Ag ₁ Ben ₂ > Ag ₁ Ben ₂	(15)
Ag > Ag	(4)	Ag > Ag	(2)
Ben > Ag	(1)	Ben ₁ Pat ₂ > Ag ₁ Pat ₂	(1)

It follows from the survey that the agents in each of the four combinations almost always are coreferential, i.e. denote the same participants in the situations described by the verbs. If this result is applied to example (37), it follows that the agents of *bos* and *btang* are almost certainly identical, and it is, therefore, Milarepa who made the fire. In this respect, the translations of Bacot, Lhalungpa, Wang, and Chang are thus probably wrong. Note that the asyndetic sentence construction involving *btang* and *byin* only implies that the actants occupying the highest possible position in the hierarchy respectively—in this case, the agents—are coreferential, but provides no clue as to who this participant is.

4. SUMMARY

In the Central Tibetan dialect of Shigatse, and presumably other spoken varieties of Tibetan, and in the Biography of Milarepa, too, certain reference relations are characteristic for specific subordinators. This fact—seldom mentioned in the previous literature—facilitates the interpretation of difficult passages and suggests that in Tibetan subordination arguments are not only deleted for reasons of context, but also because their mention is regarded as redundant due to reference relations encoded by subordinators.

SIGNS AND ABBREVIATIONS

In the interest of economy, a category that is always expressed by zero, e.g. the absolutive case, is not shown in the interlinear gloss. The translation of the

Sanskrit in the interlinear gloss refers to the root with absolutes and to the stem with finite verb forms. For lack of better glosses, I have used AUX and PTL at several occasions in the present article.

*	ungrammatical	Exp	experiencer
>	subordinate clause precedes	F	feminine
	superordinate clause	GEN	genitive
~	about equivalent, but not preferred (in tables 2 and 3: underlined)	IMP, imp.	imperative
–	no actants are coreferential	IND	indicative
–		INDEF	indefinite
A	absolute	INT	interrogative
ABL	ablative	IPFV, ipfv.	imperfective
ABS	absolute (Sanskrit)	LOC	locative
ACT	active (parasmaipadam of Sanskrit)	M	masculine
Ag	agent	MAN	subordinator expressing an elaborative relation
ANT	anterior		
AUX	auxiliary	nc	non-control verb
Ben	beneficiary/ recipient	NEG	negative
c	control verb	NOM	nominative
CAUS	subordinator expressing a causal relation	NR	nominalizer
		NVOL	non-volitional
CMPR	comparative particle	Pat	patient
CONC	subordinator expressing a concessive relation	PFV, pfv.	perfective
		PL	plural
CONN	subordinator expressing a copulative relation	PTL	particle
		SG	singular
D, DAT	dative	SIM	simultaneous
DEF	definite	Stim	stimulus
DEST	subordinator expressing a destinative relation	VOL	volitional
		1	1st person
DIREV	direct evidential	2	2nd person
E, ERG	ergative	3	3rd person

REFERENCES

- Bacot, Jacques (transl.). 1925. *Le poète Tibétain Milarépa: ses crimes, ses épreuves, son nirvana* [The Tibetan poet Milarépa: his crimes, his ordeals, his nirvana] (*Les classiques de l'orient 11*). Paris: Éditions Bossard.
- Chang, Garma C. C. (ZHANG Chengji 張澄基) (transl.). 1971. *Biography of the great master Milarepa* (Mileriba dashi zhuan 密勒日巴大師傳). Taipei: Torch of Wisdom (Huiju chubanshe 慧炬出版社). Reprint 1991.
- Evans-Wentz, Walter Y. (ed.), Lama Kazi Dawa-Samdub (transl.). 1928. *Tibet's great yogi Milarepa: a biography from the Tibetan being the Jetsün-Kahbum or biographical history of Jetsün-Milarepa*. London: Oxford University Press. Reprint 1999.
- Givón, Talmy. 1983. Topic continuity in discourse: the functional domain of switch reference. In John Haiman and Pamela Munro (eds.), *Switch-reference*

- and *Universal Grammar (Typological Studies in Language 2)*, 51-82. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goldstein, Melvyn C. & Nawang Nornang. 1970. *Modern spoken Tibetan: Lhasa Dialect (Bibliotheca Himalayica II, 14)*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar. 2nd rev. ed. 1978.
- Hahn, Michael. 1971. *Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache* [Textbook of the classical Tibetan literary language] (*Monographien zu den Sprachen und Literaturen des indo-tibetischen Kulturraumes 10*). Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag. 7th ed. 1996.
- Haiman, John & Pamela Munro (eds.). 1983. *Switch-reference and Universal Grammar (Typological Studies in Language 2)*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Haller, Felix. 2004. *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Themchen: Sprachwissenschaftliche Beschreibung eines Nomadendialektes aus Nord-Amdo* [Dialect and folktales from Themchen: linguistic description of a nomad dialect from North Amdo] (*Beiträge zur tibetischen Erzählforschung 14*). Bonn: VGH (Vereinigung für Geschichtswissenschaft Hochasiens) Wissenschaftsverlag GmbH.
- Haller, Felix. 2006. Verbal valence in Shigatse Tibetan and Themchen Tibetan. *LTBA* 29(2).63-77.
- Haller, Felix. 2007. Stem alternation and verbal valence in Themchen Tibetan. In Roland Bielmeier and Felix Haller (eds.), *Linguistics of the Himalayas and beyond (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 196)*, 85-95. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haller, Felix. 2009a. *Einführung in das moderne Zentraltibetische: Auf Basis des Dialektes von Shigatse/ westliches Zentraltibet (Tsang)* [Introduction to modern Central Tibetan: based on the dialect of Shigatse/ western Central Tibet (Tsang)]. (in collaboration with Chungda Haller; internal textbook, based on my dissertation; in preparation; incl. four audio CDs)
- Haller, Felix. 2009b. *Die weltlichen Taten des Milarepa: Sprachwissenschaftliche Beschreibung, kritische Edition und Übersetzung der ersten drei Kapitel der Biographie des Milarepa* [The worldly deeds of Milarepa: linguistic description, critical edition and translation of the first three chapters of the Biography of Milarepa]. Bern: University of Bern, Institute of Linguistics, habilitation thesis. (in preparation)
- Jacobsen, William H. 1967. Switch-reference in Hokan-Coahuiltecan. In Dell H. Hymes and William E. Bittle (eds.), *Studies in southwestern ethnolinguistics: meaning and history in the languages of the American southwest (Studies in General Anthropology 3)*, 238-63. The Hague, Paris: Mouton & Co.
- Jäschke, Heinrich August. 1881. *A Tibetan-English dictionary: with special reference to the prevailing dialects: to which is added an English-Tibetan vocabulary*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. Reprint 1990.

- Jong, Jan Willem de (ed.). 1959. *Mi la ras pa'i rnam thar: texte tibétain de la vie de Milarépa* [Mi la ras pa'i rnam thar: the Tibetan text about the life of Milarépa] (*Indo-Iranian Monographs 4*). 's-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co.
- Lhalungpa, Lobsang P. (transl.). 1979. *The life of Milarepa*. San Francisco: Far West Editions. Reprint 1997.
- LIU Liqian 刘立千 (transl.). 1985. *Biography of Milarepa* (Milariba zhuan 米拉日巴传). Chengdu: Sichuan Nationalities Publishing House (Sichuan minzu chubanshe 四川民族出版社). Reprint 1994.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1983. Switch reference in the Northeast Caucasus. In John Haiman and Pamela Munro (eds.), *Switch-reference and Universal Grammar (Typological Studies in Language 2)*, 245-65. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Stenzler, Adolf Friedrich, Renate Söhnen-Thieme (transl.). 1869. *Primer of the Sanskrit language*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. 2nd rev. ed. 1997.
- Stirling, Lesley. 1993. *Switch-reference and discourse representation (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 63)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WANG Yinuan 王沂暖 (transl.). 1997. Biography of Milarepa (Milariba zhuan 米拉日巴传). In *The great masters of esotericism in Tibet (Zangmi dashi 藏密大师)*, 207-341. [Lhasa]: People's Publishing House of the Tibet Autonomous Region (Xizang renmin chubanshe 西藏人民出版社). (Presumably this is a reprint of the following work—not accessible to me—that is mentioned in de Jong (1959: 7): Wang Yi-nouan, 1949, *Mi-la-je-pa ti yi cheng*, Shanghai (2nd ed. 1955).)
- Zeisler, Bettina. 2007. Sentence patterns and pattern variation in Ladakhi: a field report. In Roland Bielmeier and Felix Haller (eds.), *Linguistics of the Himalayas and beyond (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 196)*, 399-425. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.