treatises attributed to Thonmi Saṃbhoṭa. In these texts and subsequent commentaries, Tibetan verbs are divided into three categories based on the dominant relational characteristics of their arguments: *tha dad* ("different"), *tha mi dad* ("not different"), and *rjes mthun* ("concordant"). In terms of function, however, these traditional verbal categories lack sufficient distinctions to serve as the basis of a fully descriptive system. Wilson's categories, on the other hand, provide a substantial basis for a rigorous verb subcategorization scheme. This subcategorization often, though not always, follows a variation in the number and types of arguments and sense. Different classes—as one might suspect—have different subcategorization profiles (also known as "alternations" or "syntactic frames"). As testimony to their validity, moreover, these categories can be seen to be nonconflictive and coextensive in coverage with Wilson's categories (see figure 1).

Verb Class			Subject/Object Relation
I	Nominative-nominative Verbs		concordant
II	Nominative-locative Verbs		
	2.1	**simple verbs of existence**	concordant
	2.2	**verbs of living**	not different
	2.3	**verbs of dependence**	not different
	2.4	**verbs expressing attitudes**	not different
III	Nominative-objective Verbs		
	3.1	**verbs of motion**	not different
	3.2	**nominative action verbs**	not different
	3.3	**rhetorical verbs**	not different
IV	Nominative-syntactic Verbs		
	4.1	**separative verbs**	not different
	4.2	**verbs of absence**	not different
	4.3	**conjunctive verbs**	concordant
	4.4	**disjunctive verbs**	not different
V	Agentive-nominative Verbs		different
VI	Agentive-objective Verbs		different
VII	Purposive-nominative Verbs		not different
VIII	Locative-nominative Verbs		
	8.1	**verbs of possession**	concordant
	8.2	**attributive usage**	different

Figure 1. Correspondence Between Wilson Verb Class and Indigenous Categories