

Synoptic grammar of the Bumthang language

A language of the central Bhutan highlands

George van Driem

in the collaboration with

འག་ཤོས་སངས་རྒྱས་རྗེ་ Dr'asho Sangye Dorji

with contributions by

Nathan Wayne Hill

Himalayan Linguistics

Archive 6

Himalayan Linguistics Archive 6 (2015), 1-77

© Royal Government of Bhutan, published by Himalayan Linguistics with gracious permission

Contents

	Foreword	4
	Prolegomena	5
	Abbreviations and symbols	13
	Language map of Bhutan	15
	Transcriptions	16
1	About the Bumthang language	18
2	Bumthang phonology	20
	2.1 Initial consonants	21
	2.2 Register tone	23
	2.3 Initial clusters	24
	2.4 Final consonants	25
	2.5 Vowels	26
3	Nominal morphology	27
	3.1 Pronouns	27
	3.2 Nominals and nominal affixes	28
	3.3 Numerals and articles	31
4	Verbal morphology	33
	4.1 Present tense	33
	4.2 Experienced past tense	36
	4.3 Inferred past tense	38
	4.4 Experienced imperfective	39
	4.5 Copula	40
	4.6 Periphrastic perfect	40
	4.7 Infinitival future	41
	4.8 Volitional future	42
	4.9 Imperative	43
	4.10 Supine	44
	4.11 Gerund	45

4.12	Adhortative	45
4.13	Optative	45
4.14	Aspectivisers <thung> and <thro>	46
4.15	Hearsay evidential	47
5	Kinship terms	48
6	Bumthang language glossary with Trans-Himalayan comparanda provided by Nathan Wayne Hill	51
	Bibliography	67



དཔལ་ལྷན་འབྲུག་གཞུང་གི་ཁོང་ཁྱོད་ལ་འཕེལ་སྐྱོད་ཆོག་པུ།
DZONGKHA DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
ROYAL GOVERNMENT OF BHUTAN



Foreword

This grammatical sketch of the Bumthang language is a tribute to the great Bhutanese scholar Dasho Sangay Dorji, who for decades guided the Dzongkha Development Commission as Secretary. Under his visionary leadership, the Commission took great strides in advancing Dzongkha, the national language of the kingdom of Bhutan, in manifold ways. At the same time, Dasho Sangay Dorji conducted, stimulated and orchestrated linguistic research on all of the languages of Bhutan and essentially launched and nurtured Bhutan's first programme of documenting the nation's linguistic diversity. It is thanks to the close friendship between Dasho Sangay Dorji and Jamyang Özer, alias George van Driem, that this sketch grammar was produced. It is hoped that this grammar will act as a seed to stimulate future linguistic research that will yield accounts that supersede this first exploratory grammatical sketch.

The grammar of the Bumthang language was first prepared in Dutch and published in 1995 by George van Driem. An English version was submitted to the Royal Government of Bhutan in the same year, and the Dzongkha Development Commission made the original version available on the commission's website. To enhance the dissemination of the material for scholarly research, the Dzongkha Development Commission now cordially grants *Himalayan Linguistics*, currently headquartered at the University of California at Santa Barbara, the right to publish the polished 2013 version of this account of the Bumthang language in the freely available journal *Himalayan Linguistics*. Naturally, the Royal Government of Bhutan retains the right to publish the grammar and any future editions thereof in Bhutan, as the need arises.

Dasho Sherub Gyeltshen
 Secretary DDC, Thimphu

Prolegomena

A first edition of the present synoptic grammar of the Bumthang language was published in Dutch in 1995 as *Een eerste grammaticale verkenning van het Bumthang, een taal van midden-Bhutan, met een overzicht van de talen en volkeren van Bhutan*. The Dutch title can be rendered into English as ‘a first grammatical reconnaissance of the Bumthang language, a language of central Bhutan, with an overview of the languages and linguistic communities of Bhutan’. The Bumthang grammar was published in Leiden by the curiously named and now defunct *Onderzoeksschool Centrum voor niet-Westerse Studiën* or — as its name used to be rendered into English — the School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies. In the same year, an English version of the manuscript was also prepared and submitted to the Dzongkha Development Commission of the Royal Government of Bhutan in Thimphu. Recently, this draft has been made available by the Dzongkha Development Commission on the internet as: <http://www.dzongkha.gov.bt/research/papers/DRIEM-Bumthang-ALL.pdf>

This grammatical exploration of Bumthang made the linguistic data on the language available to the international academic community, particularly to interested comparativists. At the time it was our intent that a comprehensive grammar of the Bumthang language would be prepared in English after the publication of the revised Dzongkha grammar. The expanded Dzongkha textbook by དགའ་མེད་ཀུན་ཚུ་ Karma Tshering of Gaselô and myself appeared in 1998 under the title ལྷོ་ཁྲོ་ཁ། Dzongkha as the first volume in Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region, a series launched by His Excellency འཇིགས་མེད་འབྲིན་ལས་འོད་ཟེར་ Jigme Thinley Yoezer, then Ambassador of the Kingdom of Bhutan to the United Nations in Geneva. A second grammar of a Kiranti language of Nepal, entitled Yamphu by Roland Rutgers, appeared in the series just before the newly established School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies was abolished. With the exception of the grammar series, publications of the school were taken over by the fledgling Leiden University Press. The series Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region, however, was adopted by the academic publisher Brill, who has nurtured the grammar series ever since.

Subsequently, the three most endangered languages of the kingdom, i.e. Gongduk, Lhokpu and Black Mountain Mönpa, were targeted for documentation. This initiative is described in the article ‘Bhutan’s endangered languages programme under the Dzongkha Development Authority: Three rare gems’ (van Driem 2004b). As the title indicates, the Dzongkha Development Commission went by the name of the Dzongkha Development Authority for a brief spate, but meanwhile now again goes by its original name of Dzongkha Development Commission. This semi-autonomous body in Thimphu is en-

trusted by the Royal Government of Bhutan both with the task of advancing the national language Dzongkha as well as with documenting and safeguarding Bhutan's linguistic diversity and the kingdom's rich native linguistic heritage.

Due to the focus on the country's most endangered languages, further study of the Bumthang language came to be neglected. However, interest in languages of the East Bodish group grew. East Bodish and Tibetan together comprise a higher-order subgroup which Robert Shafer called Bodish. Gwendolyn Hyslop first studied the Kurtöp language in 2005, as part of a Field Methods class at the University of Oregon, and since 2006 has been researching the language *in situ* in Bhutan. The glossary of lexical items at the end of this grammatical sketch has been augmented with Trans-Himalayan comparanda from other Tibeto-Burman languages by Nathan Hill of the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London on the basis of his study of the original Dutch edition of the Bumthang grammar.

The present account of the Bumthang language and any observations regarding other East Bodish languages as well as Dzongkha are based on my own investigations. It lies beyond the scope of this work to present a bibliography of all recent work on East Bodish languages that has appeared since the original 1995 Dutch edition of this sketch grammar. Nonetheless, I gladly seize the opportunity to recommend the newer work of both Gwendolyn Hyslop and Tim Bodt on East Bodish. The present sketch does not contain the overview of the languages and linguistic communities of Bhutan included in the 1995 Dutch edition, since that information has been superseded by the more elaborate exposition in the 2001 handbook entitled *Languages of the Himalayas*, and more elaborate information on East Bodish languages in general has been provided by Bodt (2012, 2105).

With an estimated 30,000 speakers, the Bumthang language is a major regional language of the kingdom of Bhutan. This synoptic grammar, which is being made available in English thanks to the kind urging of Nathan Wayne Hill and Gwendolyn Hyslop, describes just the most obvious grammatical features in the four main dialects of the language, with an emphasis on phonology and morphology. A description of kinship terms and a limited glossary are included, the latter now having been enriched with Trans-Himalayan comparanda. It is hoped that the appearance of this brief and preliminary sketch, with the blessings of the Honourable Secretary of the Dzongkha Development Commission, Dr'âsho Sherub Gyeltshen, will stimulate the study of the Bumthang language and the research and documentation of East Bodish languages more generally.

In describing the grammar of any language, theoretical and typological issues arise, some of which appear to be recurrent or perennial themes in linguistics. Their recurrence may in some cases be ascribed to a certain degree of Eurocentrism in the outlook

of many linguists. For example, on occasion linguists treat certain grammatical categories in other languages as ‘optional’. In response to the abuse of the term ‘optional case marking’, which had recently come into vogue in discourse on Himalayan languages, I once felt compelled to state that: ‘Strictly speaking no morphemes are ever optional’ (van Driem 2001: 643). Whilst the singular vs. plural distinction in English nouns is equipollent *sensu* Jakobson, leaving the English speaker no choice but to specify morphologically whether one or more of a countable thing is intended, the plural in Nepali or Mandarin nouns, for example, is a privative opposition in that non-use of the plural ending does not indicate the presence of a zero morpheme denoting singular number, but merely the absence of the plural category.

Not surprisingly, the Nepali plural does not mean the same thing as the English plural. whilst the latter conveys the rather mechanical meaning of ‘more than one of a countable object’, the grammatical meaning of the Nepal plural marker <-harū> entails an imprecise muchness. Consequently, the Nepali grammatical meaning is inherently incompatible with a precise number so that nouns do not take the plural suffix <-harū> in *tīnauṭā phul* ‘three flowers’ or *cārauṭā kursī* ‘four chairs’. Yet the larger difference is that Mandarin and Nepali lack a zero marker denoting singular number in nouns. Similarly, there is no zero morpheme denoting non-diminutive or non-augmentative meaning in Italian nouns whenever a speaker chooses not to add a diminutive or an augmentative suffix to a noun.

In a language such as Limbu, the non-use of the ergative suffix in nouns signals absolutive, which is marked by a zero suffix so that some might argue that the distinction between absolutive and ergative in Limbu nouns might represent an equipollent opposition. In some other languages, such as Bumthang, the use or non-use ergative is a privative opposition, and the occurrence of the ergative is consequently said by some linguists to be ‘optional’. In a privative opposition, either the speaker chooses to express the meaning denoted by the grammatical morpheme or he chooses not to do so. The marking itself is not optional. Rather, the speaker can choose to express or not to express the meaning. In this regard, Roman Jakobson famously observed that ‘[l]anguages differ essentially in what they *must* convey and not in what they *may* convey.’ (1959: 236). Where a language has an equipollent opposition, there is no choice but to make a choice.

The same applies *mutatis mutandis* for case marking. Transitive verbs in the past tense more or less automatically trigger the ergative case in Hindi, whereas in Nepali the semantics of the ergative are more subtle. The Nepali ergative can, for example, also be used in other tenses whenever it seems natural to highlight the agentivity of the subject. For example, one might say of an unfamiliar gadget *Yasle ke garcha?* ‘What does

this do?’ Similarly, in Bumthang grammar, the ergative morpheme is part of a privative opposition. The speaker will not use the morpheme when he does not choose explicitly to express this category of grammatical meaning. In a great number of largely predictable cases, however, the speaker will choose to do so because it makes better sense to express the meaning of the grammatical suffix.

Merely to establish that an ergative case suffix is ‘optional’, therefore, is an inadequate description. If the ergative marker partakes in a privative opposition, then the description of the language is more informative when it states that the opposition is privative. In such cases, the linguist may wish explicitly to state that there is no zero morpheme denoting absolutive. The best that the linguist can do is to describe in words and with examples as aptly as possible the precise language-specific meaning of the grammatical category in a given language, such as the ergative case suffix in Bumthang.

Logically, the ‘Leipzig glossing rules’ and their Platonic essentialist underpinnings are likewise rejected as part of a semantically stunted approach to language. Semantically perceptive empirical linguists document fundamental differences in meaning between grammatical systems across languages, and this appreciation is palpably manifest in sound analytical documentation of language phenomena. The Italian proverb *traduttore traditore* ‘the translator is a traitor’ continues to hold true. Yet linguists perennially fall prey to the Platonic idealism of labels such as ‘mirative’, ‘plural’ or ‘aspect’. Such labels compel a certain variety of linguist to make arbitrary typological judgements, whereby they presume the ‘cross-linguistic’ reality of the posited notional categories, e.g. Haspelmath *et al.* (2005). Although the terms ‘imperfective’ and ‘perfective’ were first coined in 1808 to describe Czech grammar, the term ‘aspect’ was first coined in 1860 for Russian (cf. van Driem 2001: 648-660). Insightful contrastive studies have long shown that there is no such thing as ‘Slavic aspect’. Rather, each aspectual category of grammar expresses a language-specific meaning, e.g. Mathesius (1947), Wierzbicka (1967), Stunová (1991, 1993).

The obvious semantic domains of colour, spatial deixis and number were presumed to represent readily accessible targets more amenable to empirical investigation. Studies on colour perception have taken on an almost iconic status since Gladstone’s (1858) study of colour terms in the Homeric Greek, and a steady stream of studies has appeared since Brent and Kay’s (1969) study of allegedly ‘basic’ colour terms, e.g. Saunders and van Brakel (1997), Lucy (1997), Kay and Maffi (1999, 2005), Levinson (2000), Roberson *et al.* (2000, 2005a, 2005b), Roberson (2005), Regier *et al.* (2005), Winawer *et al.* (2007), Gilbert *et al.* (2006, 2008), Kay and Regier (2007).

The investigation of motion and spatial deixis, although seemingly more tangible, has not proved necessarily more tractable to linguistic inquiry, yielding both insightful

and contestable results, e.g. Haviland (1993), Bickel (1997), Gennari *et al.* (2002), Levinson (1997, 2003a, 2003b, 2008), Pederson (1995), Pederson *et al.* (1998), Li and Gleitman (2002), Munnich and Landau (2003), Levinson *et al.* (2002, 2003), Majid *et al.* (2004). Newer research has investigated the influence of language-specific spatial and temporal metaphors on the conceptualisation of time, e.g. Boroditsky (2011), Lai and Boroditsky (2013), Saj *et al.* (2014). Since some recent work has addressed the role of metaphor on cognition more broadly, e.g. Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2011), it is useful to recall that the phenomenon of metaphor shaping linguistic reality and yielding abstract concepts from concrete linguistic notions is a topic with a venerable history of scholarship dating back to the work of Clauberg (1663).

In the context of the Bumthang epistemic marking systems which distinguishes categories such as the experienced past, the inferred past and the experienced imperfective, it is bracing to recall the exhilaratingly choleric controversy which has broken out about mirativity, with the empirical realists pitted against the essentialist typologists, e.g. Hill (2012, 2013), Aikhenvald (2012), DeLancey (2012), Friedman (2012), Hengeveld and Olbertz (2012), Hyslop (2014). In this context, we might also mention a few of the studies which have been devoted to numerical cognition as expressed linguistically, e.g. Imai (2000), Imai and Mazuka (2003), Gordon (2004), Pica *et al.* (2004).

The easily demonstrable and widespread semantic non-equivalence of grammatical categories between languages is matched by substantive differences between the conceptual repertoires reflected in the lexicons of different languages. Consequently, the problem of translatability or, rather, intranslatability was already recognised by John Locke (1690), Étienne de Condillac (1746), Pierre de Maupertuis (1748, 1756) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (1822, 1825, 1836), and this pivotal issue has remained a conundrum for language philosophers, e.g. Quine (1987, 1990). Scientific inquiry into linguistic relativity was introduced relatively late to the Americas, e.g. Sapir (1921, 1949), Greene (1966), Grace (1981, 1987), where it is ironically best known under the name of one of its most rickety latter-day proponents, i.e. Whorf (1940, 1956). The perceptive writings of those who understand such differences have periodically been assailed by those who lack the semantic insight, sensitivity and precision to grasp the nature of such differences, e.g. Maine de Biran (1815), McWhorter (2014). A corollary assertion to that of Roman Jakobson, quoted above, is therefore that languages differ not only in what they *must* convey, but often also in what they *can* convey.

In consultation with the editors at Himalayan Linguistics, the English glosses of the Bumthang verb *jumala* have been rendered into Latin by the corresponding forms of the verb *futuere*. This practice, quite familiar from old-fashioned philology, may strike some readers as stuffy, but in fact the editors are entirely correct in pointing out that the

most common colloquial word denoting sexual congress in English is imbued with a hue of verbal aggression which is singularly lacking in the Bumthang verb. Whilst both the Bumthang verb *jumala* and its straightforward Dutch translation, used in the 1995 edition of the grammar, exude a mirthful and wholesome sense of *joie de vivre*, the most readily available English translation for Bumthang *jumala* highlights a sad dimension of Anglo-American culture. The English verb is effectively employed more often in verbal abuse than as a neutral term denoting carnal congress, whereas neither Bumthang nor Dutch are handicapped in this respect in the way that English happens to be. The English word has therefore not been eschewed out of squeamishness, but avoided because its meaning yields an unsuitable translation. At the same time, whereas the Latin verb *futuere* has been chosen as a translation for the Bumthang verb *jumala* for the purposes of this grammatical sketch, it would be preposterous to claim that *jumala* corresponds precisely to Latin *futuere* in either meaning and style register.

As has become clear in the course of these prolegomena, the concerns raised by the editors at Himalayan Linguistics regarding the English rendering of Bumthang *jumala* and the use or avoidance of some linguistic labels which have recently come into vogue touch directly upon broader and deeper issues in linguistics. The opposition between the essentialist typological and empirical realist approach to lexical and grammatical signs and their meanings and the associated views of language itself can be used to highlight two different models of language evolution. Some categories of meaning appear to thrive and propagate themselves at the expense of others, and a number of studies have begun to explore the epidemiology of language-borne constructs and categories, e.g. van Driem (2001, 2003, 2004a, 2005, 2008a, 2008b), Enfield (2002, 2003, 2008)

Greene (1966) discussed how Irish lacks many precise equivalents for notions that elsewhere in Europe had been calqued from one language to another, e.g. *in-fluence*, *Ein-fluss*, *в-лияние*, *in-vloed*, *v-liv* etc. This has led to the paradox whereby some advocates of Irish have observed that the greatest single threat to the language might be the compulsory nature of education in Irish to and often by people who express their thoughts more comfortably in English. The contrasts between the notional repertoire expressed through the traditional Irish lexical inventory as opposed to numerous concepts shared by most other European languages get ironed away when users of Irish use Irish words as if they were translation equivalents of English concepts:

Linguists have long recognized that something is lost when a language disappears, that humankind is impoverished by each decrease in the linguistic diversity of the world. However, ...a still more serious loss... is marked, not so much by the decrease in the number of languages spoken in the world as by an *increase* in the extent to which the existing languages are intertranslatable. The extent to which intertranslatability increases is the extent

to which all languages have become expressions of the same culture. And *that*, in turn, is the extent to which our accumulated cultural capital — our heritage from all of the preceding generations of humankind — has been dissipated. (Greene 1966: 143)

Globalisation is characterised by increasing conceptual assimilation worldwide, whereby language communities participating in a shared *Kulturkreis* come to exhibit increasing uniformity in their lexical and grammatical meanings. What is happening to Irish is happening to many languages today on a worldwide scale. In this context, the ongoing controversy surrounding Daniel Everett's work on Pirahã (2005), which has been hailed both as a heterodox profundity and as a hoax, vividly illustrates the fundamental importance of linguistic relativity to the scientific study of language. Since Everett's work, and the protests of envious colleagues who were displeased by the prospect of having to modify their views of language to accommodate his findings, a development scheme has been implemented by the Brazilian government intended to bring the Pirahã into the mainstream of the national culture of the Brazilian nation state. This programme of 'upliftment', if this is the right word, will inexorably lead to the assimilation of the Pirahã conceptual universe to the mental universe mediated by Brazilian Portuguese.

Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* was published on 24 November 1859. The German translation by the palaeontologist Heinrich Georg Bronn appeared in 1860 as *Über die Entstehung der Arten*. The maverick German biologist Ernst Haeckel sent a copy of the German translation to his friend, the linguist August Schleicher. Inspired by this work, Schleicher adopted the view of individual languages as species, which compete against each other 'im Kampfe ums Dasein' (1863). A modern proponent of Schleicher's view of languages as species subject to natural selection is Salikoko Mufwene (2001, 2005a, 2005b). By contrast, Friedrich Max Müller conceived language as such to be an organism. On the 6th of January 1870, in the very first issue of *Nature*, Müller took issue with Schleicher's idea of language survival in terms of 'die Erhaltung der höher entwickelten Organismen' and instead argued that language survival was a more complex issue.

Although this struggle for life among separate languages exhibits some analogy with the struggle for life among the more or less favoured species in the animal and vegetable kingdoms, there is this important difference that the defect and the gradual extinction of languages depend frequently on external causes, i.e. not on the weaknesses of the languages themselves, but on the weakness, physical, moral or political, of those who speak them. A much more striking analogy, therefore, than the struggle for life among separate languages, is the struggle for life among words and grammatical forms which is constantly going on in each language. Here the better, the shorter, the easier forms are constantly gaining the upper hand, and they really owe their success to their inherent virtue. (1870: 257)

Darwin (1871, I: 60-61) adopted Müller's of language evolution in his *Descent of Man*. Over a century later, I voiced an essentially similar view, diametrically opposed to that of Schleicher and Mufwene.

The survival of a language is not determined by its grammatical subtlety, its degree of refinement or the richness of concepts and notions which find expression in its lexicon, but by largely unrelated economic, demographic and political factors affecting the people who happen to speak the language. Languages which survive are not necessarily in any way superior to those that go extinct... The fecundity with which a particular language spreads and outcompetes another language may have little or, in some cases, nothing to do with its grammatical propensities or lexical richness and refinement. (2001: 113)

These two approaches, language as an organism vs. languages as species, represent distinct views of language evolution. In the Müller-van Driem approach, the emergence and evolution of language in hominids is viewed in terms of language as a semiotic organism which arose symbiotically within the human brain. Relevant to our understanding of the nature of this semiosis is the novel claim advanced by George Grace (1981, 1987) that language evolved primarily not as a system of communication, but as an epistemological system in order to organise the vast amount of sensory input and build conceptual models of possible realities. The communicability of language-borne constructs and categories would, in Grace's conception, be a secondary feature. The language organism model studies natural selection as operative at the levels of lexical and grammatical morphemes and language structures.

By contrast, the Schleicher-Mufwene conception views individual languages as species in competition on a global scale. Whereas both models envisage natural selection as operating on observable linguistic diversity and driving language change, the units of selection are on a different order of magnitude. Notwithstanding my critical and initially skeptical stance with regard to the Schleicher-Mufwene conception, the premiss formulated by Schleicher and elaborated by Mufwene is an intrinsically interesting one, and this model deserves to be tested and studied in the current context of language endangerment on a global scale. The challenge would clearly be to design a programme of research which aims analytically to assess the Schleicher-Mufwene model.

Such a programme would have to assess the applicability of the notion of inclusive fitness to grammatical structures and semantic systems in the light of competing linguistic developments in the cultural environment of a language community. Mathematical models have been developed to quantify inclusive fitness, e.g. Dawkins (1982), Demetrius and Ziehe (1994), Grafen (2009), Keller (1994), Maynard Smith (2000, 2004), but for languages weighted assessments of socio-economic, demographic and

politico-historical factors affecting the vitality of individual languages would also have to be quantified and modelled. Without overstretching biological analogies, the utility and applicability of the notion of an extended phenotype manifestly holds promise for modelling the vitality of individual languages. One reason why such a programme of research has not been undertaken until now is the sheer difficulty and analytical complexity of conducting an empirically grounded study of all linguistic and other observable phenomena relevant to developing and testing the Schleicher-Mufwene model.

Another reason why this model has not been tested today is that the concept of individual languages as entities in competition goes back to the early days of language typology, at a time when the field was marred with a chequered history. After Pott (1848) distinguished the basic linguistic types, e.g. ‘isolierend, agglutinierend, flexivische, einverleibend’, a racist form of linguistic typology was developed by others who did not heed the exhortations of Julius von Klaproth and Max Müller not to confuse linguistic affinity and biological ancestry. Scholars such as Arthur de Gobineau, Heymann Steinthal and Ernest Renan used language typology to buttress a racist world view and arranged language types hierarchically on a typological ladder of evolutionary development. If we keep this egregious episode of Social Darwinism in linguistics in mind as a cautionary example, it should be possible today to devise a programme of inquiry to explore and test the Schleicher-Mufwene hypothesis within a Darwinian framework devoid of ludicrous value judgements.


Needless to say, the Müller-van Driem approach also merits testing, and arguably many experimental models in language evolution studies today have already for some years been directly germane to the further development of this model, since Müller’s conception of natural selection in language evolution quickly became the view espoused by Darwin. As announced previously (van Driem 2008b), a forthcoming monograph will be devoted to this topic.

Abbreviations and symbols

adh.	adhortative
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
art.	article
Bur.	Burmese
Ch.	Chinese
col.	collective suffix
dem.	demonstrative

Dz.	Dzongkha
emp.	emphatic
e.p.	experienced past
erg.	ergative
gen.	genitive
ger.	gerund
i.p.	inferred past
inf.	infinitival future
interj.	interjection
Kur.	Kurtöp
loc.	locative
n.	noun
Nep.	Nepali
nom.	nominalising suffix
num.	numeral
O.Bur.	Old Burmese
opt.	optative
O.Tib.	Old Tibetan
part.	past participle
pl.	plural
postp.	postposition
pres.	present tense stem (Tibetan)
pro.	pronoun
Q	interrogative suffix
rGy.	rGyalrong
sg.	singular
tel.	telic
Tib.	Tibetan
v.	verb
vol.	volitional future
Wr.Bur.	Written Burmese
*	only recorded in the Tang dialect form
√	symbol preceding the etymological root, after which an inflected form may be provided, as found in a dictionary
—	form recorded as such in all four major Bumthang dialects

following page: Map of the languages of Bhutan



Transcriptions

Two mutually compatible systems of transcription are used, and one system of transliteration. The first system of transcription is Roman Dzongkha, the linguistic standard of rendering Dzongkha, the national language of Bhutan, phonologically in Roman script. The second system is the Roman Bumthang, a phonological transcription of the Bumthang language proposed in 1995. Written Dzongkha spellings of names in the Bhutanese དབྱེ་ཅན་ 'Ucen script are provided between parentheses. Roman Dzongkha is based on the phonology of the standard or prestige dialect of Dzongkha spoken in རྩ་ཁྱེད་ Wang and རྩ་ཁྱེད་ Thê, by which names the རྩ་ཁྱེད་ Thimphu and རྩ་ཁྱེད་ Pünakha valleys are traditionally known. Roman Dzongkha makes use of twenty-two letters of the Roman alphabet (the F, Q, V and X are not used) and of three diacritics: the apostrophe ['], the diaeresis or *Umlaut* [¨] and the circumflex accent [^]. A complete description of Bhutanese romanisation is provided elsewhere (van Driem 1991, Karma Tshering and van Driem 1998). A brief outline of Roman Dzongkha is as follows:

The apostrophe at the beginning of a syllable indicates a preglottalised or high register tone in syllables beginning with a nasal, approximant, liquid other than /r/ or a vowel. Elsewhere the tone of a syllable can be predicted on the basis of the initial consonant: Syllables beginning with a voiceless or an aspirated plosive or affricate or with a voiceless sibilant or liquid or with /h/ are pronounced in the high register tone. Low register syllables are those beginning with a voiced or devoiced plosive, affricate or sibilant, or with /r/. An apostrophe after an initial consonant indicates that the initial is devoiced. The low register vowel following a devoiced consonant is characterised by breathy phonation. Many Bhutanese whose native language is not Dzongkha fail to distinguish voiced from devoiced initials. The initials of a Dzongkha syllable are listed in TABLE 1. In Dzongkha, the consonants n, m, ng, p, k and sh also occur as finals.

The transcription system used for Bumthang and the related languages Kheng and Kurtöp is largely based on Roman Dzongkha. Bumthang romanisation is explained in Section 2 on Bumthang phonology. Outside of the glossary, Bumthang, Kheng and Kurtöp words are italicised, unless they are placed between morpheme brackets. Phonetic transcriptions in International Phonetic Alphabet are placed between square brackets. People's names are given in Dzongkha. Toponyms within Bumthang District are given in their Bumthang pronunciation.

TABLE 1
Dzongkha initial consonants

	high tone voiceless	high tone aspirated	low tone voiced	low tone devoiced
velar plosives	k	kh	g	g'
palatal plosives	c	ch	j	j'
retroflex plosives	tr	thr	dr	dr'
dental plosives	t	th	d	d'
bilabial plosives	p	ph	b	b'
bilabial-palatal affricates	pc	pch	bj	bj'
alveolar affricates	ts	tsh	dz	
palatal sibilants	sh		zh	zh'
alveolar sibilants	s		z	z'

	high tone	low tone
voiced velar nasal	'ng	ng
voiced palatal nasal	'ny	ny
voiced dental nasal	'n	n
voiced bilabial nasal	'm	m
voiced palatal approximant	'y	y
voiced lateral	'l	l
voiceless lateral		lh
voiced labiovelar approximant	'w	w
voiced apical trill		r
voiceless apical fricative		hr
voiceless glottal approximant		h

Dzongkha distinguishes thirteen vowels. Vowel length is distinctive. The diaeresis marks the inherently long vowels **ä** [æ:], **ö** [œ:] en **ü** [y:]. The vowels **a**, **e**, **i**, **o**, **u** also occur as long vowels, in which case they are marked by a circumflex accent **â**, **ê**, **î**, **ô**, **û**. Vowel length is not indicated on a vowel before the final **ng** because vowels lengthen automatically before final **ng** if it has, in fact, not disappeared. The historical rules of apophony in Dzongkha appear to be more complex than those of Lhasa Tibetan (van Driem 1993).

TABLE 2
Dzongkha vowels

i î	ü	u û
e ê	ö	o ô
ä	a â	

Written Dzongkha in the 'Ucen script is transliterated in Tibetological transliteration: k, kh, g, ñ; c, ch, j, ñ; t, th, d, n; p, ph, b, m; ts, tsh, dz, w; ź, z, ħ; y, r, l; ś, s, h; a, i, u, e, o. Transliterated written forms are provided between parentheses. Syllables are separated by a hyphen in transliteration where they are separated by the triangular dot known as the ཨླ tshâ in written Dzongkha. The tshâ is not used in modern Dzongkha when what used to be two consecutive syllables in an older stage of the language have collapsed into a single syllable in modern Dzongkha.

1 About the Bumthang language

The Bumthang language or Bumthangkha, as it is known to its speakers, is the *kha* 'language' of Bumthang, the highlands covering the northern half of central Bhutan. There are approximately 30,000 speakers of Bumthang. Closely related to Bumthang are the languages Kheng and Kurtöp. Kheng is spoken by approximately 40,000 people south of Bumthang in the district of Zh'ängang, known in Bumthang as Zhramzhong. Kurtöp is spoken by approximately 10,000 people east of Bumthang in Lhüntsi district. It is linguistically defensible to consider Bumthang, Kheng and Kurtöp as three distinct dialect groups of a single Greater Bumthang language. The differences between the various dialects of Kheng appear to be just as great as the differences between any one of these dialects and a randomly chosen dialect of Bumthang. An important structural difference between Bumthang on one hand and Kheng and Kurtöp on the other is the fate of finals. In Kheng and Kurtöp finals have disappeared, resulting in the lengthening of the preceding vowel, whereas Bumthang has preserved the original situation, e.g. Bumthang *ka* 'snow' vs. *kak* 'blood' as against Kheng and Kurtöp *ka* [ka] 'snow' vs. *kâ* [ka:] 'blood'. Bumthang dialects do not exhibit distinctive vowel length.

Sir John Claude White noted that Bhutanese people belonging to a different linguistic stock lived to the east of the Dzongkha speaking area:

Amongst the people of the East who live beyond the Pele-la the bulk of the population is not of Tibetan origin, nor do they speak Tibetan. I give a few words they use, spelt phonetically, which seem to me different to those of Tibetan derivation. *Gami* = fire, *Nut* = barley, *Mai* = house, *Tyu* = milk, *Yak* = hand, *Tsoroshai* = come here. Their origin is not clear, but... They are of a different type to those in the west, smaller in stature, the complexion is darker and features finer cut, and their dress is different. (1909: 13)

On the basis of the words he cites — in modern phonetic notation [gami], [nat], [mai], [ju], [jak] and [tso-ro shai] — it is clear that White was speaking about the Bumthang language.

The languages Bumthang, Kheng and Kurtöp belong to the East Bodish branch of the Trans-Himalayan or Tibeto-Burman language family. The other East Bodish languages are: (1) Dzala, spoken in northeastern Bhutan by 15,000 people, (2) Mangde, a heterogeneous collection of dialects the Black Mountains which is also known as Henkê or 'Nyenkha or by a number of local toponyms, with 10,000 speakers, (3) Chali, with approximately one thousand speakers in the village of Chali and a few neighbouring hamlets on the left bank of the Kuri River in eastern Bhutan, and (4) Dakpa, spoken on the eastern border and in ཏཱའོ་ཐང་ Tawang, for which the orthography ཏཱའོ་ཐང་ is also attested, in the Indian state of Arunāchal Pradesh. Bumthang is classified by Aris (1979a: xv, 122, 1979b: 10) as a member of the branch which Shafer (1954, 1974) called 'East Bodish'.

In Shafer's phylogeny, East Bodish constitutes one out of three branches of Bodish, alongside West Bodish (sBal-ti, Bu-rig) and Old Bodish (Tibetan, Dzongkha and other languages descended from Old Tibetan). The languages and dialects which Shafer referred to as West Bodish and Old Bodish are now all subsumed under Nicolas Tournadre's newer term 'Tibetic', though traditional Tibetologists conventionally refer to these languages collectively as the 'Tibetan dialects'. Shafer's Bodish is, in turn, one of the branches of Bodic, a nebulously defined putative higher-order subgroup within Tibeto-Burman. Shafer's names are somewhat misleading in that, in Shafer's own assessment, it is not the Old Bodish languages but the East Bodish languages which are the more conservative and which tend to retain archaic traits. This idea is supported by a number of the phonological traits of Bumthang (Mazaudon and Michailovsky 1994, van Driem 1995).

Shafer's study of East Bodish was based entirely on a language called 'Dwags'. The data which Shafer studied were taken from Hodgson's (1853) 'Tákpa' material, which Shafer incorrectly identified with the Tibetan dialect of Dags-po, situated southeast of Lha-sa, south of the gTsan-po and west of the Koñ-po area. Hodgson's 'Tákpa' data,

however, originate from Tawang, a former Tibetan vassal state northeast of Bhutan which is known in Tibetan sources as the Dag-pa Tsho-lña ‘The Five Hosts of the Dakpa’ (Aris 1979a: xvi). From 1873, Tawang has been administratively within the Outer Line, i.e. south of the watershed and the line of highest peaks forming the Outer Line, and therefore under British colonial jurisdiction. Consequently, Tawang continues today to form part of Indian territory.

In Tawang, two languages are spoken which Aris (1979a: 120-122) called ‘Northern’ and ‘Central Monpa’. ‘Northern Monpa’, which Aris demonstrated to be related to Bumthang, is the language which is called དཀའ་པ་ཁ་ Dakpakha or དཀའ་པ་ཁ་ D’abikha in Bhutan. The ‘Central Monpa’ of Tawang is Tshangla or Shâchop, which happens also to be the major language of eastern Bhutan. Shafer’s (1954, 1955, 1974) comparative study of ‘Dwags’ and ‘Proto-East Bodish’ should therefore be read as applying collectively to the languages of the Bumthang group, which Aris (1979a) was the first to identify as East Bodish languages.

2 Bumthang phonology

Bumthang has four main dialects, which not coincidentally coincide with the four old main geographical and administrative divisions within Bumthang district, viz. ཅུང་མཚོ་ Chunmat, ཇོ་མོ་ག་ Chogor, ལུ་ཀྲ་ ’Ura and ལྷ་ཀྲ་ Tang. Local pronunciations of toponyms throughout Bhutan preserve valuable information about Bhutan’s past and furnish the basis for the study of historical toponymy. The lofty Thrumshingla pass, which lies within Bumthang, is *Phrumsengya* in Bumthang, which shows that the etymology assumed by the modern Dzongkha spelling ཐུམ་ཤིང་ལ་ *Thrumshingla* (Khrum-sing-la) is historically incorrect. There exists a tendency in Bhutan to devise Chöke, i.e. Classical Tibetan, spellings for place names in Bhutan which actually have far older names. Tibetologists often fall prey to this tendency, for example Snellgrove (1961, 1967) in the case of toponyms in Nepal with local non-Tibetan meanings. Such native local names often lack a Classical Tibetan etymology, but their local pronunciation preserves valuable information which holds the key to part of Bhutan’s unknown past.

In preparing this sketch, I have worked together closely with the respected Bhutanese scholar དཀ་ཤོ་སངས་རྒྱ་ཏེ་ Dr’âsho Sanggā Dôji ‘Sangye Dorji’ of ཅུ་ཏོ་ Chutö, who is my old friend and a native speaker of the Tang dialect of Bumthang, upon which this synoptic grammar is based. The innovative proposals regarding Bumthang ’Ucen orthography and Bumthang romanisation were conceived by Dr’âsho. Other Bumthang speakers whom I consulted in 1993 were the twenty-seven year old painter ལྷ་རྒྱ་ལྷ་ལྷ་

Pêma Döndr'u of ཟུང་གེ་ Zungge in Chunmat, ཤེ་རལ་ལ་ Shêrapla, former གཤོ་པོ་ gap of 'Ura, འཇམ་དབལ་དངོས་གྲུབ་ Jambe 'Ngödr'u from དུར་ Dur in Chogor, མི་འགྱུར་ Minjur, former gap of ལྷུ་མཁའ་ཁར་ Camkhar in Chogor, སངས་རྒྱས་ཟུང་མོ་ Sanggä Zâm, a woman from བདེན་ཟུར་ Dazur in Tang and ཆོས་རྒྱལ་ Chödrö, a woman from ཏ་ཏུར་ Tahung in Tang.

The dialect of ཁྲིང་གསར་ Trongsa, west of Bumthang and east of the Mangde speaking area, may be considered to be a dialect intermediate between Bumthang and Kheng. Unlike the Bumthang dialects, the loss of final occlusives in the Trongsa dialect has led to vowel lengthening, just as in Kheng and Kurtöp. The speakers of this dialect also do not identify themselves as Bumthangpas. The dialect is known as ཁྲིང་གསར་པ་འི་ཁ་ *Trongsa bi kha* 'language of Trongsa' and is also sometimes called ལུབ་པ་འི་ཁ་ *Nupbi kha* 'language of the West'. The latter descriptive name, however, is also used to designate the Hâ dialect of Dzongkha spoken in the westernmost part of Bhutan.

2.1 Initial consonants

The consonants which may occur at the beginning of a Bumthang syllable are listed in TABLE 3, along with their proposed equivalents in Bhutanese 'Ucen script. The well-chosen 'Ucen spellings for the Bumthang apical trilled fricative series are those proposed by Dr'âsho Sanggä Dôji. The romanisations of these unique Bumthang phonemes are based on Dr'âsho's Bumthang 'Ucen orthography, which is presented here below. A phonetic description of the Bumthang speech sounds is likewise provided below.

Bumthang is extraordinarily rich in rhotic sounds. In addition to the apical trill **r**, Bumthang has a complete initial series of apical trilled fricatives ཤ' **shr**, ཨ' **hr** and ལ' **zhr**. Like Roman Bumthang ཨ' **hy**, the symbols ཤ' **shr**, ཨ' **hr** and ལ' **zhr** do not represent retroflex sounds or consonant clusters, but single initial consonant phonemes unique to the Bumthang language. The **shr** is a voiceless apical trilled fricative [ɽ̥], e.g. ཤ' *shra* [ɽ̥a] 'meat', ཤ'འི་ *shrai* [ɽ̥ai] 'drool, drivel', ཤ'འི་མ་ *shraima* [ɽ̥aima] 'toothless harrow', ཤ'ལ་ *shrap* [ɽ̥ap] 'veranda', ཤ'མ་ *shram* [ɽ̥am] 'shoe' (Dz. ལྷ་མ་ lham); ཤ'ུབ་ *shrup* [ɽ̥up] 'sheath', ཤ'ུང་ *shrung* [ɽ̥uŋ] 'shake everything into place (e.g. things in a sack), heave whilst sobbing', ཤ'ལ་མེང་ *shrokseng* [ɽ̥oksɛŋ] 'juniper' (Dz. ཤུག་པ་ཤིང་ shupashing); ཤ'ར་དོ་ *shrordo* [ɽ̥ordo] 'an extra chore performed in addition to the main task assigned in order to show devotion to one's boss' (Dz. ཞོ་ཁ་ zhôkha).

TABLE 3
Bumthang initial consonants

	<i>voiceless</i>	<i>aspirated</i>	<i>voiced</i>
velar plosives	k ཀ་	kh ཁ་	g ག་
palatal plosives	c ཅ་	ch ཇ་	j ཉ་
retroflex plosives	tr ཐ་	thr ཌ་	dr ང་
dental plosives	t ཏ་	th ཏ་	d ཏ་
bilabial plosives	p ཕ་	ph ཕ་	b ཕ་
alveolar affricates	ts ཅ་	tsh ཅ་	dz ཅ་
palatal sibilants	sh ཤ་		zh ཤ་
alveolar sibilants	s ས་		z ས་
glottal approximant	h ཏ་		
palatal-glottal fricative	hy ཏ་		
velar nasal			ng ཏ་
palatal nasal			ny ཏ་
dental nasal			n ཏ་
bilabial nasal			m ཏ་
palatal approximant			y ཏ་
labiovelar approximant			w ཏ་
lateral liquid	lh ཏ་		l ཏ་
apical trilled fricative	shr ཏ་	hr ཏ་	zhr ཏ་
apical trill			r ཏ་

The **hr** is an aspirated apical trilled fricative [ɰ^h], e.g. མའི་མྱ་མཁའ་ *mai hram-mala* [ɰ^ham-mala] ‘they will break the house down’, མྱ་མྱ་ *hrak-hrok* [ɰ^hak-ɰ^hok] ‘mixed up’, མྱེ་ *hrai!* [ɰ^hai] ‘come!’. The **zhr** is a voiced apical trilled fricative [ɰ], more fully voiced than the Czech phoneme ř, e.g. ལྷ་ *zhra* [ɰa] ‘what’, ལྷོ་ *zhror* [ɰor] (dialect form for standard Bumthang ལྷ་མ་ *churma*) ‘native beer’ (Dz. ཆང་ *chang*), ལྷ་ *zhrap* [ɰap] ‘layer of butterfat on top of salted Bhutanese tea’, ལྷོ་ *zhrong* [ɰoŋ] ‘worm’, ལྷུ་ཏི་ *zhrurti* [ɰurti] ‘bamboo species’.

2.2 Register tone

Just as in Dzongkha, the distribution of the low and high register tone in Bumthang is predictable to some extent. Syllables with voiced plosives, affricates or fricatives are in low register tone (**g, j, dr, d, b, dz, zh, z, zhr**). Syllables with voiceless or aspirated initials, including voiceless liquids and fricatives, are in the high register tone (**k, kh, c, ch, tr, thr, t, th, p, ph, ts, tsh, sh, s, h, hy, lh, shr, hr**). Only Bumthang syllables beginning with a voiced continuant (**ng, ny, n, m, y, r, l, w**, or a vowel) may be in either the preglottalised high or the low register tone.

TABLE 4
Bumthang continuant consonants in low and high register tone

low tone		high tone	
ng	ང	'ng	ང'
ny	ཉ	'ny	ཉ'
n	ན	'n	ན'
m	མ	'm	མ'
y	ཡ	'y	ཡ'
w	ཞ	'w	ཞ'
l	ལ	'l	ལ'
r	ར	'r	ར'

Just as in Roman Dzongkha, the high register tone is indicated in such Bumthang syllables by an apostrophe at the beginning of a syllable, e.g. ཇའི་ 'ai 'who' vs. འཇུཡ་ auya 'jackal', རྩམ་ 'ya 'deposit at the bottom of copper pans' vs. ཡ་ ya! 'grab it!'. In contrast to Dzongkha, Bumthang syllables beginning with initial **r** may also be in high register tone, e.g. རྩམ་ 'rat 'bamboo fibre for weaving traditional Bhutanese bowls' vs. ར་ rato 'root', རྩམ་ 'ri 'start, beginning' vs. རི་ ri 'hill, mountain', རམ་ 'ra 'hair on scalp' vs. ར་ ra 'goat', རོག་ 'rok 'river', རྩམ་ 'rewa 'tool for removing ears of wheat from the stalks'.

2.3 Initial clusters

In contrast to Dzongkha and quite distinct from the retroflex series, however, Bumthang has eight initial consonant clusters of which **r** is the second element: **kr**, **khr**, **gr**, **pr**, **phr**, **br**, **mr**, **'mr**. Therefore, in Bumthang, the combinations ཀྲ and རྲ, for example, represent the initial cluster **kr** and **pr** and not single retroflex phonemes as in Dzongkha, e.g. ཀྲོང *krong* ‘village’, ཁྲ་ཁྲ་ *khrangkhrang* ‘crane (bird)’, གྲམ་གྲམ་རྩེ་ *grangka grangae* ‘count!’ (literally ‘count the counting!’), གྲན་ *gran* ‘compete’, རྲ་ *pra* (dialect form for རྩེ་ *priu*) ‘rhesus monkey’ (as opposed to རྲག་གི་ *raksha* ‘golden langur’), བྲམ་མེ་ *prat-mala* ‘fight’, རྲེ་འེང་ངའ་ཕྲམ་སང་ *wet neng ngat phratsang* ‘you and I shall get into conflict’, བྲམ་མེ་ *brat-mala* ‘scratch’, བྲན་མ་ *branma* ‘Tatary buckwheat’ (*Fagopyrum tataricum*, Dz. རྲོ་མ་ *brj’ô*), བྲན་ *mrat* ‘paddy’, རྲྱ་ *'mrat* ‘flour to thicken soup with’, རྲྱ་ *'mran* ‘blackhead, sebum’.

TABLE 5
Bumthang initial clusters with **r**

	high tone voiceless	high tone aspirated	low tone voiced	high tone voiced
velar plosives	kr ཀྲ	khr ཁྲ	gr གྲ	
bilabial plosives	pr རྲ	phr རྲ	br རྲ	
bilabial nasals			mr རྲ	'mr རྲ

Bumthang has five initial consonant clusters of which **l** is the second element: **kl**, **gl**, **pl**, **bl**, **ml**, e.g. ཀྲམ་པ་ *klatpa* ‘brains’, གྲམ་པ་ ~ གྲམ་པ་ *glabae ~ glabä* ‘hit!’, རྩེ་ *ble* ‘four’, མ་ཕྲམ་གྲེ་ *maplagae* ‘don’t make noise!’, ཕྲམ་ཀྲ་ *plakta* ‘noise’, ཕྲམ་ཕྲེ་ག་ *blakbloga* ‘sloppy, spilt’ [said of fluid or of handwriting], ཕྲམ་ཀྲ་ *blaktang* ‘spilt fluid, goo, sticky mass, viscous slime’, ཕྲམ་ཕྲེ་ག་ *mlakmloga* ‘viscous, syrupy, oozing’, ཕྲམ་མ་ *mlaksa* ‘[you] are soiling [your hand] in something sticky’. As a few of the above examples just cited will already show to the keen observer, the syllable boundaries suggested by the Bumthang orthography do not always coincide with morphological boundaries between Bumthang morphemes. The difference in phonological and morphological segmentation in the language is particularly manifest in some forms of the imperative and in the optative, to be discussed below. The Bumthang 'Ucen writing system used here was developed by Dr'âsho Sanggä Dôji's between 1991 and 1994 and first introduced in print in the 1995 Dutch edition of the Bumthang grammar sketch. This well-designed system is a phono-

logically complete and consistent system, suited to representing the phonological and morphological regularities of the Bumthang language.

TABLE 6
Bumthang initial clusters with **l**

	high tone voiceless	low tone voiced
velar plosives	kl ལྷ	gl ལྷ
bilabial plosives	pl ལྷ	bl ལྷ
bilabial nasals		ml ལྷ

The Bumthang phoneme **w** forms clusters with the velar initials, e.g. ལྷ *kwa* ‘tooth’, ལྷ *khwi* ‘dog’, ལྷ *khwe* ‘water’, ལྷ *khwit* ‘too big, oversize’, ལྷ *gwi* ‘hip’. The **w** in such clusters is often pronounced like the French glide [ɥ]. For example, Bumthang ལྷ *kwi* [kɥi] ‘round woven bamboo mat to underset pots and pans’ is pronounced just like French *cuit* ‘cooked’.

TABLE 7
Bumthang initial clusters with **w**

	high tone voiceless	high tone aspirated	low tone voiced
velar plosives	kw ལྷ	khw ལྷ	gw ལྷ

2.4 Final consonants

In Bumthang, the consonants **k**, **t**, **p**, **ng**, **n**, **m**, **h** and **s** may occur as finals, e.g. ལྷ *brak* ‘cliff’ (Dz. ལྷ bj’â), ལྷ *pat* ‘leech’ (Dz. ལྷ pêp), ལྷ *tawa phop* ‘instep’, ལྷ *zon* ‘two’, ལྷ *sum* ‘three’, ལྷ *naphang* ‘nose’, ལྷ *ya!* ‘grab it!’ vs. ལྷ *yah!* ‘watch out!’ vs. ལྷ *yak* ‘yak’. The sibilant /s/ only occurs as a final in forms of the experiential past tense, in which case it may also occur as a post-final, e.g. ལྷ *tups* ‘cut’, ལྷ *dos* ‘slept’.

TABLE 8
Bumthang final consonants

k	ཀ་
t	ཁ་
p	པ་
ng	ང་
n	ན་
m	མ་
s	ས་
h	ཨ་

2.5 Vowels

The Bumthang vowels are listed in TABLE 9. Length is not a distinctive feature of Bumthang vowels. Therefore, the Roman Dzongkha diacritic, the circumflex accent [^], is not used in Roman Bumthang. In rapid speech, the vowel sequence **ae** in Bumthang is realised as **ä**.

TABLE 9
Bumthang vowels in low and high register

low tone		high tone	
a	ཨ་	'a	ཨ་
e	ེ་	'e	ེ་
i	ེ་	'i	ེ་
o	ེ་	'o	ེ་
u	ུ་	'u	ུ་
ä	ེ་	'ä	ེ་
ö	ེ་	'ö	ེ་
ü	ུ་	'ü	ུ་

3 Nominal morphology

This section treats Bumthang pronouns, nouns, numerals, articles and the major endings of nominal parts of speech.

3.1 Pronouns

The Bumthang personal pronouns are listed in TABLE 10. In Bumthang, three persons and singular and plural number are distinguished, resulting in six pronominal categories. There is no dual, nor is there an inclusive vs. exclusive distinction in the first person.

TABLE 10
Bumthang personal pronouns

	singular absolutive	plural absolutive	singular ergative	plural ergative
1st	ང་ ngat	ེ་ nget	ངའི་ ngai (ངའི་ལེ་ ngaile)	ེའི་ ngei (ེའི་ལེ་ ngeile)
2nd	ཁེ་ wet	ཡི་ yin	ཁྱི་ wi (ཁྱི་ལེ་ wile)	ཡི་ལེ་ yinle
3rd	ཁི་ khit	བོ་ bot	ཁི་ khi (ཁི་ལེ་ khile)	བོའི་ boi (བོའི་ལེ་ boile)

In the dialect of Chunmat, the second person plural pronoun is རི་ *in* instead of ཡི་ *yin* ‘you’ [pl.], and the ergative form of the first person singular pronoun is རི་ *ngui* instead of རི་ *ngai* ‘I’ [erg.], e.g. རི་ཁ་མི་གོ་ *ngui kha-mi-go* ‘I don’t understand’ (Dz. རི་ཁ་མི་གོ་ *nga ha-mi-g’o*). The form of the third person singular pronoun in the Chogor dialect is ཆི་ *chit* ‘he, she’, although the form ཁི་ *khit*, pronounced [khjit], is also attested. The demonstrative གོ་ *gon* ‘that, the other’ is often used instead of ཁི་ *khit*. Bumthang གོ་ *gon* is translated into Dzongkha both as ཁོ་ *kho* ‘he’ and as གཞན་མི་ *zhenmi* ‘the other’.

The most important interrogative pronouns and adverbs in Bumthang are: ཡི་ *ai* ‘who’, e.g. ཁི་ ཡི་ཡོ་ *khit ai yo?* ‘who are you?’, ཡི་ *aji* ‘who’ [erg.], e.g. ཡི་བུ་ *aji bus* ‘who did that’, ཡི་ *aji* ‘whose’, e.g. ཡི་ཅལ་ *aji cala* ‘whose stuff’, ཡི་དོ་ *ai-do* ‘to whom’, ལྷ་ *zhra* ‘what’, ཡོ་ *ao* ‘where, whither’, e.g. ཡོ་གཞི་གོ་ *ao gai-ge?* ‘where are we going?’, ཡོ་ *angi* ‘whence’, e.g. ཡོ་ཡོ་ *wet angi yo?* ‘where are you from?’, ལྷ་ *zhrabudze* ‘how much’, ཡོ་ *adoro* ‘how’, ཡོ་ *arba* ‘when’.

3.2 Nominals and nominal affixes

The plural suffix in nouns is ཚཨི <tshai>, e.g. མིན་བོ་ཚཨི *minbotsa-tshai* ‘women’, ཅལ་ཚཨི *cala-tshai* ‘stuff, articles’. Adjectives in Bumthang follow the noun they modify, e.g. ཡམ་ཁང་མ་ *yam khangma* ‘long road’, མི་བོང་ཁང་མ་ *mi bong khangma* ‘tall person’ (literally ‘man of tall length’). The final **t** in the absolutive forms of the pronouns appears to be a marker of the absolutive <t> with a zero allomorph after the final **n** of *yin* ‘you’ [pl.]. However, this ending does not occur other than in personal pronouns.

The ergative suffix in nouns is ལེ <le>. Nouns and plural pronouns may take the collective suffix གམ་པོ་ <gampo>, comparable in meaning to Dzongkha ཆཅུབ་ <chachap>. In such cases, the ergative suffix <le> follows <gampo>. The ergative suffix in personal pronouns, on the other hand, is འི་ <i> with the exception of the second person plural pronoun *yin* ‘you’ [pl.], which takes the ergative suffix used in nouns and therefore has the ergative form *yinle*. Ergative pronouns in <i> may also take the ergative suffix for nouns <le> in addition to <i>, e.g. *ngai* ~ *ngaile* ‘I’ [erg.], *wi* ~ *wile* ‘you’ [erg.], *ngei* ~ *ngeile* ‘we’ [erg.]. Pronominal forms with a double ergative ending འི་ལེ <ile> have contrastive meaning, e.g. *ngeile* ‘we’ (and not somebody else) [erg.].

As opposed to a canonical ergative, the Bumthang ergative is not an obligatory marking of the agent of a transitive verb, e.g. རྟེན་ཟུག་ཟུག་ *ngat zam zus* ‘I [abs.] ate rice’ vs. རྟེན་ཟུག་ཟུག་ *ngai zam zus* ‘I [erg.] ate rice’. Just as in Dzongkha and modern Tibetan, the ergative category in Bumthang expresses a higher degree agentivity or volition on the part of the subject. This is why the ergative suffix occurs primarily, but not exclusively, as a marker of the agent of a transitive verb. This type of ergative does not appear to be a rare or unusual phenomenon. A possibly comparable difference in meaning is reportedly found between the ergative and absolutive cases in Bats, a Northeast Caucasian language, which, in the words of Comrie (1981: 53), is ‘entirely one of control’.

The personal pronouns have special genitive forms, which exhibit some superficial resemblance to the ergative forms. The original genitive suffix in nouns is evidently ལེ <le>, but the suffix གི་ <gi> has also become widespread under the influence of Dzongkha and Chöke, e.g. ཡག་གི་རྩི་མང་ *yak-gi nyiphang* ‘tail of the yak, yaktail’. The allomorph of the genitive suffix after nominals which end in a vowel is འི་ <e> (in Chunmat and ’Ura འི་ <i>). This allomorph appears to be etymologically related to the genitive suffix allomorph occurring after vowels in Dzongkha, viz. འི་ <i>, e.g. རེ་ཨ་པེ་མེང་ *ngae ’apae meng* ‘my father’s name’, རེ་ཆོ་ལོ་མེང་ *ngae charo-gi meng* ‘my friend’s name’. The allomorph <e ~ i> sometimes occurs in combination with the suffix <gi>, e.g. བོ་འི་གི་ཆེ་མ་ *po-i gi chewa* ‘the fangs of a snake’. A comparable phenomenon is observed in Dzong-

kha where two allomorphs of the genitive suffix are used together, apparently superfluously.

TABLE 11
Bumthang personal pronouns

	genitive singular	genitive plural
1st	ངའ་ ngae, ངལ་ ngale	ངེ nge, ངེལ་ ngele, ངེག་ ngegi
2nd	ཞེ we, ཞེལ་ wele	ཡིན་དེ yinde
3rd	ཁི khi, ཁིལ་ khile	བོལ་ལེག་ böegi, བོལ་ལེ boile
	dative singular	dative plural
1st	ངེད་ ngado	ངེད་ ngedo
2nd	ཞེད་ wedo	ཡིན་དུ་ yindu
3rd	ཁིད་ khidu	བོད་ bodo

Bumthang also distinguishes emphatic forms of the genitive which are formed by attaching the genitive suffix allomorph <e> to the emphatic suffix ར་ <ra>, most probably cognate with Tibetan ར་ rañ ‘self’, e.g. ར་ངའ་ *nga-rae* ‘my own’, ར་ངེལ་ *nge-rae* ‘our own’, ར་ཞེལ་ *we-rae* ‘your own’ [sg.], ར་ཡིན་ལེ *yin-rae* ‘your own’ [pl.], ར་ཁིལ་ *khi-rae* ‘his own, her own’, ར་བོལ་ *bo-rae* ‘their own’.

The dative forms of the personal pronouns listed in TABLE 11 are regular. The suffix is the same as the morpheme which marks the dative in nouns and the supine in verbs. In Bumthang, the dative and supine are not two separate categories but two separate manifestations of a single grammatical category, which I label ‘telic’. The telic category marks the syntactic constituent which represents the goal towards which a situation expressed by a verb is directed. The telic suffix marks both nouns as well as the supine verbal complements of verbs. The traditional names ‘dative’ and ‘supine’ describe the two ways in which the unitary function of the Bumthang telic suffix finds expression when combined with different parts of speech, i.e. nouns and verbs respectively.

The form of the telic ending is <-QO>, whereby both the segments <Q> and <O> are variables. The vowel <O> represents a vowel harmonic variable, with the realisation /u/ after the closed vowels /i/ or /u/ in the preceding syllable and with the realisation /o/

in all other environments, e.g. རྟོག་པའི་ *nga-do* 'wai! 'bring it to me!', བཞིན་པའི་ *we-do bi-mala* 'I shall give it to you', ཁྱི་དུ་བཞིན་ *khi-du be!* 'give it to him!', ཤར་པོ་ *shar-do* 'to the east', ཡིན་དུ་ *yin-du* 'to you, for you' [pl.].

The phonological value of the consonant <Q> is a function of the preceding final segment. After final /k/, the variable <Q> is realised as /g/, yielding the form <gO>, e.g. ཐིམ་ཕུག་གུ་ *Thimphuk-gu* 'to Thimphu'. After a final /ng/, the phonological value of <Q> is /ng/, giving the form <ngO>, e.g. ཀློང་ངོ་ *krong-ngo* 'to the village, in the village'. After final /p/ or /t/, the variable <Q> is realised as /t/, yielding the form <tO>, e.g. ཐམ་ཏཱ་ཀུ་ལེ་ *thap-to ku-lae!* 'put it in the oven!' [<ཀུ་ཏཱ་མ་ལ་ *kut-mala* 'to put, place'], ཡག་བེད་ཏུ་ *yakbit-tu* 'on the back of the hand'. After all other final consonants, the variable <Q> is realised as /d/, giving the form <dO>, e.g. ཡམ་པོ་ *yam-do* 'on the road, on the way'.

When a noun lacks a stem final consonant, the stem of the noun is said to be either hard or soft. Whether the stem of a noun or a verb is hard or soft is a lexical given. The terms 'hard' and 'soft' are taken from Dzongkha grammar, where the terms — used in the morphological rather than phonological sense — designate two groups of stems with different morphophonological behaviour. Open stems which behave like closed stems are called 'hard', whereas 'soft' open stems take different allomorphs of certain grammatical endings. In the case of the Bumthang telic ending, hard stems are followed by the allomorph <dO>, whereas soft stems take the allomorph <rO>, e.g. བོ་པོ་ *bo-do* 'to them', ཡིན་གཤམ་པོ་ལོ་ *yin-gampo-ro* 'to you' [col.pl.], བོད་གཤམ་པོ་ལོ་ *bot-gampo-ro* 'to them' [col.], མའི་པོ་ *mai-do* 'home, at home'. The suffix ནང་ <nang> 'inside, within' is often used in combination with the telic ending, e.g. མོར་ནང་ངོ་ *mor-nang-ngo* 'inside the old vagina'. The morphophonology of the telic ending after verbs works the same way, but this is treated in the following section.

As distinct from the dative sense of the telic category, Bumthang has a locative suffix ན་ <na>, e.g. ཡག་ན་ *yak-na* 'in the hand', རྩ་ན་ཏོག་པའི་ *ju-na tog-ae!* 'fondle [her] breast!'. In certain contexts either suffix is equally apt, e.g. མི་རུ་བཞིན་པའི་ *mi-ru bi-mala* 'I shall give it to the man', མི་ན་བཞིན་ *mi-na be!* 'give it to the man!'. Certain verbs appear to govern the telic <QO> as well as the locative <na> with a corresponding difference in meaning, e.g. རྟོག་པོ་ཕན་པའི་ *nat-do phan-mala* 'recover from an illness [tel.]', རྟོག་པོ་ཕན་པའི་ *nat-na phan-mala* 'cure an illness [loc.]'.

3.3 Numerals and articles

The Bumthang numerals are listed in TABLE 12. The element *neng* in compound numerals is just the conjunction ‘and’. In the dialects of ’Ura and Chunmat, the form of the conjunction is *ning*. Like all other languages of Bhutan, Bumthang counts according to a vigesimal system based on the *khae* ‘score’. A score of scores *nyishu* ‘four hundred’ represents the next higher stage of the system. In numerals greater than *nyishu*, scores are not counted with the word *khae*, but with the word *tsa*, e.g. *khae-thek* ‘one score, i.e. twenty’ but *nyishu-thek neng tsa-thek* ‘a score of scores plus one score, i.e. four hundred and twenty’. When more than one conjunction is used in numerals above four hundred, the first will be *neng* ‘and’, and the second *doma* ‘and’. A score of *nyishu* is a *khaeche* ‘eight thousand’, and a score of *khaeche* is a *yangchen* ‘one hundred sixty thousand’. TABLE 13 gives a comparison of the numerals up to one score in the *Tangpa* and *’Urapa* dialects.

The numeral ཐེག་ *thek* ‘one’ is also used in the sense of ‘a/an, a certain’, e.g. ཐེ་ཕུང་ཐེག་ *phecung-thek* ‘a bag’. There are also Bumthang postpositions which act as articles or demonstratives, e.g. the postposition འོ་ *o* ‘this’. The postposition དི་ *di* ‘the’ is possibly a loan from Dzongkha, e.g. ཐེ་ཕུང་དི་ *phecung-di* ‘the bag’. Although by no means rare, these postpositions do not occur with great frequency. As in Dzongkha, these demonstrative or article-like postpositions immediately follow the noun they modify, preceding any plural or case endings which there may happen to be, e.g. མིན་པོ་ཅ་འོ་ཚའི་ *minbotsa-o-tshai* ‘these women’.

TABLE 12
Bumthang numerals

1	ཐེག་	thek	11	ཅ་ཅེད་	chwaret	21	ཁའེ་ཐེག་ནང་ཐེག་	khaethek neng thek
2	ཟོན་	zon	12	ཅ་ཉིད་	chwa’nyit	22	ཁའེ་ཐེག་ནང་ཟོན་	khaethek neng zon
3	སུམ་	sum	13	ཅུསུམ་	chusum	23	ཁའེ་ཐེག་ནང་སུམ་	khaethek neng sum
4	ཟླེ་	ble	14	ཅེཟླེ་	cheble			etc.
5	ཡང་ཇ་	yanga	15	ཅང་ཡང་	chänga			
6	གྲོག་	grok	16	ཅོལ་འེ་གྲོག་	chöegrok	40	ཁའེ་ཟོན་	khaezon
7	ཉིད་	’nyit	17	ཅེར་ཉིད་	cher’nyit	60	ཁའེ་སུམ་	khaesum
8	ཇཅ་	jat	18	ཅར་ཇཅ་	charjat			etc.
9	དོག་	dogo	19	ཅོལ་འེ་དོག་	chöedogo			
10	ཅེ་	che	20	ཁའེ་ཐེག་	khaethek			

400	ཉིཤུ་ཐེག་	nyishuthek	420	ཉིཤུ་ཐེག་ནང་ཅ་ཐེག་	nyishuthek neng tsathek
800	ཉིཤུ་ཐོན་	nyishuzon	440	ཉིཤུ་ཐེག་ནང་ཅ་ཐོན་	nyishuthek neng tsazon
1200	ཉིཤུ་སུམ་	nyishusum	460	ཉིཤུ་ཐེག་ནང་ཅ་སུམ་	nyishuthek neng tsasum
	etc.			etc.	
481	ཉིཤུ་ཐེག་ནང་ཅ་སྒྲེ་དོམ་ཐེག་	nyishuthek neng tsable doma thek			
482	ཉིཤུ་ཐེག་ནང་ཅ་སྒྲེ་དོམ་ཐོན་	nyishuthek neng tsable doma zon			
483	ཉིཤུ་ཐེག་ནང་ཅ་སྒྲེ་དོམ་སུམ་	nyishuthek neng tsable doma sum			
	etc.				
8000	ཁའེ་ཆེན་ཐེག་	khaechenthek			
160 000	ཡང་ཆེན་ཐེག་	yangchenthek			

TABLE 13
Bumthang numerals in the Tangpa and 'Urapa dialects

	Tang		'Ura		Tang		'Ura
1	ཐེག་	thek	ཐེག་	thek	11	ཅ་རེད་	chwaret
2	ཐོན་	zon	ཐོན་	zon	12	ཅ་ཉིད་	chwa'nyit
3	སུམ་	sum	སུམ་	sum	13	ཅུ་སུམ་	chusum
4	སྒྲེ་	ble	སྒྲེ་	blä	14	ཅེ་སྒྲེ་	cheble
5	ཡང་	yanga	ཡང་	yanga	15	ཅཱ་ང་	chä'nga
6	གྲོག་	grok	གྲོག་	grok	16	ཅོལ་འཇོག་	chöegrok
7	ཉིད་	'nyit	ཉིས་	'nyis	17	ཅེར་ཉིད་	cher'nyit
8	ཇཏ་	jat	ཇཏ་	jat	18	ཅར་ཇཏ་	cherjat
9	དོག་	dogo	དོག་	dogo	19	ཅོལ་འདོག་	chöedogo
10	ཅེ་	che	ཅེ་	che	20	ཁའེ་ཐེག་	khaethek

Bumthang has separate numerals for 'one' and 'two' when counting filled vessels or receptacles. This is reminiscent of the Dzongkha numeral གང་ *g'ang* 'one' used in the same way. These Bumthang numerals are སྒྲེ་ *bleng* 'one' and གྲཱ་ *gwa* 'two', e.g. ཇའ་པར་སྒྲེ་ དབའི་ *jappar bleng 'wai* 'bring one cup of tea', ཇའ་པར་གྲཱ་ དབའི་ *jappar gwa 'wai* 'bring two cups of tea'.

4 Verbal morphology

A Bumthang verb is not conjugated for person or number of subject, object or other actant. The finite verb is inflected for tense and aspect. As a matter of convenience, conjugated verbs in sample sentences are often given a third person singular translation. In explaining each of the Bumthang tenses, whichever dialect has the simplest morphophonology for that particular tense is chosen as the point of departure from which to discuss the dialects with a more elaborate morphophonology. It has not been ascertained whether or not each of the four dialect areas is internally homogeneous. It is particularly uncertain whether the dialect of *Chutö* typifies the entire Tang dialect area because, for example, the experienced past tense in the dialect of Dr'âsho Sanggä Dôji is identical to that of the 'Urapa dialect, whereas the inferred past tense is formed in the same way as in the Chun-mat and Chogor dialects.

4.1 Present tense

The present tense suffix in the dialect of Chogor is <-da>, འགྲུབ་པ་ནས་ *ngat wet kran-da* 'I miss you', ཆིན་གཤམ་ནས་ *chit gä-da* 'he's going', བིན་ལྷན་ནས་ *bri num-da* 'he is smelling [it]'. Just as in Dzongkha, there is a morphophonologically relevant distinction in Bumthang between verbs with a hard stem and verbs with a soft stem. Verbs with a closed stem, i.e. with a final consonant, are hard. An open verb stem is either hard or soft, depending on the particular verb in question. In the Chogor dialect, a soft stem verb takes an epenthetic /t/ before the ending <-da>, e.g. ཆིན་ཞེ་གོ་ཟུང་ནས་ *chit zhego zut-da* 'he is eating food' < *zu* 'eat', བོན་ཟོན་རཱ་ནས་ *bot zon rat-da* 'the two of them are coming' < ར་ *ra* 'come', ཡོ་རཱ་ནས་ *yö rat-da* 'it is raining' (literally 'rain comes'), ཆིང་ཏི་ཏི་བུ་བུ་ནས་ *chi nga-do tiru bit-da* 'he is giving me money' < *bi* 'give', འཁོར་ཏིང་མང་ལེ་ཕེ་ཕེ་བུ་བུ་ནས་ *ngai tosang-le phecung-di bit-da* 'my friend is giving me the bag', འགྲུབ་པ་ལྟ་ནས་ *ngat yat but-da* 'I am working' < བུ་ *bu* 'do', ཏོན་ནས་ *'ot-da* 'brings' < ཏོ་ *'o* 'bring', སེན་ནས་ *set-da* 'dies' < སེ་ *se* 'die'. Hard open stems do not take an epenthetic /t/, e.g. ལྷན་ནས་ *tshü-da* 'seeks', འགྲུབ་པ་ལྟ་ནས་ *ngat 'ngon throida* 'I am weeding', འགྲུབ་པ་ལྟ་ནས་ *nget gä-da* 'we are going'. Closed stems are hard as well, e.g. ཏོན་ནས་ *dot-da* 'sleeps', ཆིན་ཏིན་ནས་ *chit nyit-da* 'he is sitting', ལམ་ནས་ *lap-da* 'says, tells', བོན་ནས་ *pok-da* 'hits, strikes', ལོན་ནས་ *lok-da* 'returns, comes back', བླན་ནས་ *bran-da* 'recognises', ལན་ནས་ *khan-da* 'knows', འཁོར་ནས་ *ngam-da* 'tastes good', ལྷན་ནས་ *khrang-da* 'climbs'.

TABLE 14
Morphophonology of present tense endings

Chogor	Tang
ཏྲ <da> (epenthetic /t/ in soft stems)	སྲ <sa> after /p, k, m, ng/
	ཏྲ <ta> after soft stems and after /t/
	ཟྲ <za> after hard open stems
	ཏྲ <da> after /n/
'Ura	Chunmat
སྲ <sa> after a voiceless final consonant	སྲ <sa> after /p, t, k, m, ng/
ཟྲ <za> after a vowel or a voiced consonant	ཏྲ <ta> after soft stems
	ཟྲ <za> after /n/ and after hard open stems

In the dialect of Tang, the present tense ending has the form ཏྲ <ta> after soft stems and stems ending in final /t/, e.g. ཟུ་ཏྲ *zu-ta* 'eats, is eating', བི་ཏྲ *bi-ta* 'gives', ཉི་ཏྲ *nyit-ta* 'sits', ཏྲ་ཏྲ *dot-ta* 'sleeps'. The ending takes the allomorph ཏྲ <da> after stems ending in final /n/, e.g. བླ་ཏྲ *bran-da* 'recognises', ཁྲ་ཏྲ *khan-da* 'knows'. The ending has the form སྲ <sa> after other closed stems, e.g. ལཔ་སྲ *lap-sa* 'says, tells', ཤྲོཔ་སྲེ་ཁྲང་སྲེ། *shropse khrang-*

sa ‘he is shinning up’ (literally ‘he is climbing, a-shinning’), གླུབ་སྒྲོལ་ *glap-sa* ‘hits, strikes’, ལོག་སྒྲོལ་ *lok-sa* ‘comes back, returns’, རྩམ་སྒྲོལ་ *ngam-sa* ‘tastes good’. The ending takes the allomorph ཟླ་ <za> after open hard stems, e.g. ལྷོ་ཟླ་ *tshü-za* ‘seeks’, ཤྲོལ་སྒྲོལ་གཞི་ཟླ་ *shropse gai-za* ‘he shinned up to it’ (literally ‘he went there, a-shinning’).

In the dialect of ’Ura, the present tense ending has the form སྒྲོལ་ <sa> after stems ending in a voiceless consonant, e.g. ཁྱིལ་ལྷོ་སྒྲོལ་ *khit nyit-sa* ‘he is sitting’, རྩལ་སྒྲོལ་ *dot-sa* ‘sleeps’, ལམ་སྒྲོལ་ *lap-sa* ‘says, tells’, ཤྲོག་སྒྲོལ་ *pok-sa* ‘hits, strikes’, ལོག་སྒྲོལ་ *lok-sa* ‘returns, comes back’. In all other environments the ending takes the allomorph ཟླ་ <za>, e.g. ཡོལ་རྩལ་ཟླ་ *yö ra-za* ‘it is raining’ (literally ‘rain comes’), ཁྱིལ་ཞེ་གོ་ཟླ་ཟླ་ *khit zhego zu-za* ‘he eats food’, ཁྱིལ་ངོ་ཉི་རུ་བྱི་ཟླ་ *khi nga-do tiru bi-za* ‘he gives me money’, རྩལ་གཞི་ཟླ་ *nget gai-za* ‘we are going’, བོད་སྐུམ་རྩལ་ཟླ་ *bot sum ra-za* ‘the three of them are coming’, རྩལ་ཉི་མ་རྩལ་ཞེ་གཞི་ཟླ་ *ngai tosang-nge phe-cung-thek bi-za* ‘my friend gave me the bag’, ལྷོ་ཟླ་ *tshü-za* ‘seeks’, བྱི་ཟླ་ *bran-za* ‘recognises’, ལྲོག་ཟླ་ *khan-za* ‘knows’, ཁྲམ་ཟླ་ *khrang-za* ‘climbs’, རྩམ་ཟླ་ *ngam-za* ‘tastes good’.

In the dialect of Chunmat, the present tense ending takes the form སྒྲོལ་ <sa> after stems ending in final /m/, /ng/ or a voiceless consonant, e.g. རྩམ་སྒྲོལ་ *ngam-sa* ‘tastes good’, རྩལ་སྒྲོལ་ *hrang-sa* ‘climbs’, བྱི་ལྷོ་སྒྲོལ་ *bri num-sa* ‘he is smelling at it’, རྩལ་སྒྲོལ་ *dot-sa* ‘sleeps’, ལྱིལ་སྒྲོལ་ *nyit-sa* ‘sits’, ལམ་སྒྲོལ་ *lap-sa* ‘says, tells’, ཤྲོག་སྒྲོལ་ *pok-sa* ‘strikes, hits’. The ending takes the allomorph ཏླ་ <ta> after soft stems, e.g. ལྷོ་ཏླ་ *zu-ta* ‘eats’, ལྷོ་རྩལ་ཏླ་ *long ra-ta* ‘a breeze is blowing’ (literally ‘a breeze comes’), ཤྲོ་ལྷོ་རྩལ་ཏླ་ *sho’long ra-ta* ‘a strong wind is blowing’ (literally ‘a strong wind comes’), ལོག་རྩལ་ཏླ་ *lok ra-ta* ‘comes back, returns’, བྱི་ཏླ་ *bi-ta* ‘gives’. The ending takes the form ཟླ་ <za> after open hard stems or stems ending in final /n/, e.g. ལྷོ་ཟླ་ *tshü-za* ‘seeks’, གཞི་ཟླ་ *gai-za* ‘goes’, བྱི་ཟླ་ *bran-za* ‘recognises’, ལྲོག་ཟླ་ *khan-za* ‘knows’.

The negative of the present tense is formed through prefixation of the negative morpheme མི་ <me>, in Chunmat མི་ <mi>, e.g. (Tang, Chogor) མི་ཡན་དྲ་ *me-yan-da* ‘does not obey’, (’Ura) མི་ཡན་ཟླ་ *me-yan-za*, (Chunmat) མི་ཡན་ཟླ་ *mi-yan-za*. In the interrogative, the vowel in the present tense ending changes from /a/ to /e/, e.g. ལྷོ་ལྷོ་དྲ་ *Zhra but-de?* ‘What are you doing?’. Negative prefixes are invariably attached to the root of a verb. In the case of polysyllabic verb stems, the root is the last syllable of the stem, e.g. ལ་མི་གོ་ *kha-mi-go* ‘I don’t understand’.

4.2 Experienced past tense

The experienced past tense expresses an event or situation in the past which the speaker has experienced himself. We shall return to the meaning of this tense in the next section.

TABLE 15
Morphophonology of experienced past tense endings

Chogor	Tang
<Ø> after /k/ and /ng/, whereby /k/ is dropped	in Chutö as in 'Ura
ས' <s> in other environments	elsewhere as in Chogor
'Ura	Chunmat
ས' <s>	ས' <s> after hard stems and after /t/
	elsewhere <Ø>, whereby the stem final is dropped if it happens to be /k/

In the dialect of 'Ura, the experienced past tense ending has the form ས' <s> regardless of the nature of the final segment of the verb stem to which it is affixed, e.g. རྟན་སྟེང་འགྲོ་སྟེང་ *ngat wet kran-s* 'I have missed you', གཤེད་སྟེང་ *gai-s* 'went', བསྟེང་ *pha-s* 'it's done, happened' (Nep. 'bhayo'), ལུ་སྟེང་ *zu-s* 'at', ཐོང་སྟེང་ *thong-s* 'drank', དེ་མ་རྟེང་ཁྲལ་སྟེང་ *dema ngat khvak-s* 'I arrived yesterday', རྟེན་སྟེང་ *ngui tshüs* 'I sought', རྟོན་སྟེང་ *pron-s* 'crashed a party or prayer service', ཤམ་སྟེང་ *sham-s* 'set the table', ཐྲོལ་སྟེང་ *throi-s* 'uprooted' (e.g. plants), སྟེན་སྟེང་ *bri num-s* 'has smelled at it', རྟེན་སྟེང་ *ngai seng thu-s* 'I've chopped the wood', རྟེན་སྟེང་

tup-s ‘cut’, *khro-s* ‘has bathed’, *tsamadü* ‘nyor-’nyor *thung-s* ‘we had lots of sex’ (whereby *tsamadü* ‘much’, ‘nyor-’nyor ‘sex’, *thung* ‘commit, perform’), *Mera Sakteng gai-do* ‘nyam-s’ he felt like going to Mera and Sakteng’. The stem final /t/ is dropped before the suffix of the experienced past tense, e.g. *dos* ‘slept’ < *dot* ‘sleep’, *nyis* ‘sat, stayed’ < *nyit* ‘sit, remain’.

In other Bumthang dialects, the experienced past tense suffix also has the form *s* < *s* > after soft stems and after stem final /t/, e.g. *ngat zus* ‘I’ve eaten’, *bis* ‘gave’, *yat bus* ‘worked’, *gon ras* ‘he has come’, *ngat dangma lok ras* ‘I came back yesterday’, *’os* ‘[I] have brought it’. In other Bumthang dialects, a stem final /t/ is also dropped before the experienced past tense ending, e.g. *dos* ‘slept’ < *dot* ‘sleep’.

In the Chunmat dialect, a zero allomorph of this ending occurs in environments other than these, e.g. *ngui lap* ‘I said’, *tshü* ‘sought’. In the dialect of Chogor, the zero allomorph occurs only after the stem finals /k/ and /ng/, whereas the allomorph *s* < *s* > occurs in all other environments, e.g. *ngai dangma thung* ‘I saw it yesterday’, but *chi khors* ‘he took it away’, *chi tshüs* ‘he sought’, *ngai laps* ‘I said’, *ngai brans* ‘I recognised’, *ngams* ‘It has come to be delicious’, i.e. ‘it tastes good’. In both Chunmat and Chogor, stem final /k/ is dropped before the zero allomorph of the experienced past tense ending, e.g. Chogor: *dangma ngat khra* ‘I arrived yesterday’ < *khra* ‘arrive’, Chunmat: *ngat dangma hra* ‘I arrived yesterday’ < *hra* ‘arrive’, Chogor: *dangma ngai po* ‘I hit him yesterday’ < *pok* ‘hit, beat’.

In all dialects other than that of ’Ura, the verb ‘to go’ has an irregular past tense form in <e>, *gai-e* ‘went’, e.g. *konye mai-do pron-do gai-e* ‘He went to ‘crash’ the other house [in the hope of being able to partake of the meal]’. With the exception of the verb ‘to go’, the experienced past tense in the Chutö dialect is formed as in ’Ura, i.e. with the suffix *s* < *s* >. In other Tang dialects, the same morphophonological rules seem to apply as in Chogor.

The negative of the experienced past tense is formed in the same way in all tenses: by the past tense negative prefix *ma* < *ma* >, whereas the experienced past tense ending has a special allomorph < *t* > in negative forms after soft stems, and a zero allomorph in other environments, e.g. *ma-zu-t* ‘didn’t eat’, *ngai khi-do tiru ma-bi-t* ‘I didn’t give him any money’, *ma-se-t* ‘didn’t die’, *ma-sut* ‘didn’t kill’, *ma-tshü* ‘didn’t seek’, *ma-thor* ‘didn’t pluck’, *khit ma-gai* ‘he didn’t go’, *seng ma-thu-t* ‘didn’t chop the wood’, *khit khakso ma-yang* ‘he didn’t stand up’, *ma-rat* ‘he has not come’.

4.3 Inferred past tense

Alongside the experienced past tense, Bumthang has an inferred past tense. The ending of the inferred past tense in the dialects of Chogor and Chunmat is ན <-na>, e.g. ཉིད་ན་ *nyit-na* ‘has remained, has sat down’ (Dz. ལྷོད་ནུག་ *dö-nu*), ཆིད་གཡ་ན་ *chit gä-na* ‘he has gone’ (Dz. སོ་ནུག་ *so-nu*), ཁིད་ཏར་ཤིང་ཤོབ་སེ་ཁང་ན། *khit tarshing shropse khrang-na* ‘he shinned up the prayer flagpole’. In the dialect of ‘Ura, the ending of the inferred past tense is ཟུད་ <zumut>, and in Tang with the exception of Chutö the ending is སི་ཟུད་ <simut>, e.g. ‘Ura: ཁིད་གཡི་ཟུད་། *khit gai-zumut* ‘he is gone’, Tang: ཁིད་གཡི་སི་ཟུད་། *khit gai-simut*.

The Bumthang experienced past tense is comparable in meaning to the Dzongkha past tense in <ci ~ yi>, whereas the inferred past tense corresponds to the Dzongkha past tense in <-nu>. The experienced past tense expresses an event or action in the past which the speaker has himself experienced or, in the case of question to the second person, which the person addressed is assumed to have personally experienced or observed. By contrast, the inferred past tense expresses an event or situation which the speaker has not himself experienced, but which he is able to infer has transpired on the basis of his observations or knowledge of the results in the present of the inferred past tense event. This explains why the experienced past tense is most often used when the subject is a first person, seldom when the subject is a second person, and sometimes when the subject is a third person. Under normal circumstances, one will say ངའི་ཚུལ་ས་ *ngai tshūs* ‘I sought’, and not **ngai tshūna*, because it is difficult to conceive of a situation whereby the speaker was looking for something but did not experience this process personally. One will therefore say ང་ཉི་ཟུག་ *ngat zus* ‘I have eaten’ (Dz. z’a-yi), but about someone else one may say either ཆིད་ཟུག་ *chit zus* (‘Ura: ཁིད་ཟུག་ *khit zus*) ‘he has eaten’ (Dz. kho z’a-yi) or ཆིད་ཟུན་ *chit zu-na* (‘Ura: ཁིད་ཟུ་ཟུད་ *khit zu-zumut*) ‘he has eaten’ (Dz. kho z’a-nu). The choice is determined by epistemological considerations. However, there is no person agreement as such in the Bumthang verb.

In the sentence ཆམ་ལོ་ངའི་ཁོ་ཁྱེ་ཁྱེ་ཁྱེ་ *charo-le nga-do bi-s* ‘[my] friend has given it to me’, only the experienced past tense can be used under normal circumstances because the speaker, who is the beneficiary in this sentence, must have experienced the event himself. Similarly, in the sentence ཡ་མི་ཁྱེ་ཁྱེ་ཁྱེ་ཁྱེ་ *‘ami khü-ru zhego bis* ‘mother has fed the dog’ (literally ‘mother [erg.] has given food to the dog’), the choice of past tense indicates that the speaker has himself observed the event described, whereas the speaker who uttered the sentence ཡ་མི་ཟ་མ་ཁྱེ་ཁྱེ་ *‘ami zama kher-na* ‘mother [erg.] has cooked rice’ only observed the results of mother’s efforts after the fact but did not remain in the kitchen all the while as it was happening. This is why the inferred past tense is the usual form to employ when establishing a present tense state or condition which is the result

of a process which one has not personally observed, e.g. བོ་ཁྲོང་ན་ *po khrong-na* ‘he needs a shave’ (literally ‘body hair has sprouted up’).

The lexical meaning of some verbs influences the choice of tense, e.g. the verb ཞིན་ <zhit> ‘forget’ takes the inferred past tense even with a first person subject, e.g. ཞིན་ན་ *zhit-na* ‘I forgot’, because the speaker did not consciously experience the process of forgetting. Much attention has been devoted to this distinction in Dzongkha (van Driem 1992, 1993, 2007, Karma Tshering and van Driem 1998). Just as with the experienced past tense, the negative of the inferred past tense is formed through prefixation of the past tense negative morpheme མ་ <ma>, but in most dialects the inferred past tense morpheme undergoes no allomorphic changes in the negative, remaining ན་ <-na>, e.g. མ་ཉིན་ ན་ *ma-nyit-na* ‘he didn’t stay’. In some locolects, however, the inferred past tense morpheme does have a special negative allomorph ད་ <da>, e.g. མ་ཉིན་ད་ *ma-nyit-da* ‘he didn’t stay’.

4.4 Experienced imperfective

A verb in the experienced past tense can take an imperfective aspectual ending བ་ <ba>, the initial consonant of which /b/ is but weakly voiced and often sounds like [p], e.g. བོ་མེ་མེ་བ་ *boi mai kher-ba* ‘they’ve built their house’, འད་ཕུ་ཕུ་མ་བ་ *ngat zu-ru ’nyam-ba* ‘I feel like eating’, དང་མ་གཞི་ཞེ་གོ་ངམ་བ་ *dangma-gi zhego ngamba* ‘yesterday’s food tasted good’, འདི་ཁྱེད་ཕུང་བ་ *ngai khit thung-ba* ‘I saw him’, ཏུན་བ་ *tun-ba* ‘showed’, ཉི་ཕྱོགས་བ་ *tiru chong-ba* ‘produced the money’, ཁོར་བ་ *khör-ba* ‘took away’, སུའི་ལམ་བ་ *ngui lap-ba* ‘I said’, སུའི་བློ་བ་ *ngui bran-ba* ‘I recognised’, སུའི་དང་མ་ཕུང་བ་ *ngui dangma thung-ba* ‘I saw it yesterday’, ལྷུ་ལ་བ་ *tshü-ba* ‘sought’, ཁྱིད་གཞི་བ་ *khit gai-ba* ‘he went’, འད་ཁྲག་བ་ *ngat khrak-ba* ‘I arrived, I’ve been there’. The suffix བ་ <ba> is realised as /wa/ in allegro speech, particularly after stem final /r/ or /ng/, e.g. བྱི་ཆུར་མ་ཐོང་མ་ཡ། *wi churma thong-wa ya?* ‘did you drink beer?’, བྱི་འད་ཕུང་མ་ *wi ngat thung-wa?* ‘did you see me?’. The allomorph <a> of the imperfective suffix occurs after soft stem verbs, whereby the experienced past tense ending <s> is retained, e.g. འདྲི་ཞེ་གོ་ཕུང་མ་ཡ། *ngadzi zhego zusa ya?* ‘have you had breakfast?’, འདི་ཡང་ཕུང་མ་ *ngei yat busa* ‘we did the work’, བི་ས་ *bisa* ‘gave’. In ’Ura, forms of the type ཕུས་བ་ *zuspa* ‘has eaten’ are attested.

There are no distinct negative forms of the imperfective past tense. Therefore, a form like མ་ཉིན་ *ma-nyit* ‘didn’t sit, didn’t stay’ corresponds both to ཉིས་ *nyis* ‘sat, stayed’ as well as ཉིན་བ་ *nyitba* ‘sat, stayed’.

In Bumthang, the copula ཟེན་ *wen* ‘is’ and its negative counterpart མིན་ *min* ‘is not’ may connect two substantives and thereby establish the identity of the referent (Dz. *’ing* ‘is’, *mā* ‘is not’, Nep. *ho* ‘is’, *hoina* ‘is not’). In general, the interrogative suffix ། *<ga>* is affixed to the finite at the end of an interrogative clause, but the special interrogative suffix ན་ *<na>* is affixed to the copula ཟེན་ *wen* ‘is’ or མིན་ *min* ‘is not’, e.g. ཟེན་ན་ *wen-na* ‘isn’t that so?’.

4.6 Periphrastic perfect

The opposition experienced vs. inferred is neutralised in the periphrastic perfect, which is used indifferently with respect to all three persons, e.g. *ངེ་ཤུལ་བའི་མེན།* *nge tshübai wen* ‘we have sought’, *ཁིཏ་ཡང་བའི་མེན།* *khit yangbai wen* ‘he has stood up’, *ཁི་བྱས་འི་མེན།* *khi zusai wen* ‘she has eaten’, *མེད་ཞེ་གོ་བྱས་འི་ཡ།* *wet zhego zu-sai ya?* ‘have you eaten?’, *ཁྲག་པའི་མེན།* *khvakpai wen* ‘he has arrived’, *མེད་ལ་བ་བའི་མེན།* *wet lapbai wen* ‘you are the one who said it’, *བོད་དོད་པའི་མེན།* *bot dotpai wen* ‘they have slept’. In ’Ura, past participles occur of the type *བྱས་པི་* *zuspi* ‘eaten’, e.g. *མེད་ཞེ་གོ་བྱས་པི་གེ།* *wet zhego zu-spi-ge?* ‘have you eaten food? (in which utterance *གེ་* *ge* is the ’Urapa form of the interrogative suffix).

The Bumthang perfect not only expresses an event or situation in the past with present time relevance but also serves to establish the identity of the agent who performed an activity, e.g. རེ་ཐོང་བཞིན་ *ngai thongbai wen* ‘I have drunk, I am the one who has drunk’ as a response to the question as to who drank. In this function the past participle is also used attributively, e.g. ཐིམ་ཕུག་གུ་གཞི་མི་ཁོ་ཞིན་ *Thimphu-gu gai-wai mi khit wen* [Thimphu-in go-part. person he is] ‘He is the one who went to Thimphu’, སེང་ཐུས་པའི་ཇའི་ཉིན་ *seng thus-pai jai-do nyit-na* [wood chop-part. atop-tel. sit-i.p.] ‘he is the one who has been sitting on the chopped wood’.

The negative of the periphrastic perfect is formed by means of the negative copular auxiliary མིན་ *min* ‘is not’. The allomorph གི་ <gi> of the past participial ending is used in the negative instead of འི་ <i>, e.g. ཚུལ་བཞིན་ *tshübagi min* ‘has not sought’. After soft stem verbs, both the allomorph འི་ <i> occurs to which the allomorph གི་ <gi> too is affix-ed, e.g. ཟུ་སའི་གི་མིན་ *zusaigi min* ‘has not eaten’. Here again the allomorphy of the nominal-ising suffix is identical to that of the genitive suffix.

4.7 Infinitival future

The future ending is མ་ལ་ <-mala> in the dialects of Chogor and Chunmat, e.g. རྟེན་མེད་ཀྱི་མ་ལ་ *ngat wet kran-mala* ‘I shall miss you’, མིན་བོ་ཙཱ་ཚའི་གམ་པོ་རྟེན་བཞིན་མ་ལ་ *minbotsa-o-tshai-gampo-ro tiru bi-mala* [woman-these-pl.-col.-tel. money give-inf.] ‘I shall give some money to these women’, མེད་ཡམ་པ་དག་མ་ལ་ལ། *wet yampat gä-mala ya?* ‘are you going away tomorrow?’, རམ་ལ་ *ra-mala* ‘I shall come’, བོད་བྱི་ལུ་མ་ལ་ *bot bri num-mala* ‘they will smell at it’, ཆའོ་རྟེན་བཞིན་མ་ལ་ *charo-do tiru bi-mala* ‘I shall give the money to my friend’, མའི་རྟོག་འཇམ་ལ་ *mai-do gai-mala* ‘I’ll go home’, རུག་མ་ལ་ *ruk-mala* ‘we’ll put it away, we’ll clean it up’, སུད་མ་ལ་ *sut-mala?* ‘are they going to slaughter [the pig]?’, རྟོད་མ་ལ་ *dot-mala* ‘will sleep’. In the dialects of ’Ura and part of Tang, the future ending is སང་ <sang>, e.g. རྟོད་སང་ *dot-sang* ‘shall sleep’, ཟུ་སང་ *zu-sang* ‘shall eat’.

The ending མ་ལ་ <mala> is also affixed to the verb to denote the action or event as such, i.e. to give the infinitive of the verb, e.g. རླུ་མ་ལ་ *mrü-mala* ‘scratch, carve out, squeeze out’. In other words, there is a verbal category in Bumthang the meaning of which covers both what in English is felt to be future as well as an infinitival meaning. This is vaguely similar to the use of the Nepali infinitive in <ne>, but the Bumthang tense is its own system, whereas Nepali has an array of other infinitival endings and other future tenses. Forms in མ་ལ་ ~ སང་ <mala ~ sang> are used with auxiliary ཞེན་ *wen* ‘is’, e.g. གཞི་མ་ལ་ཞེན་ *gaimala wen* ‘I shall go, I am to go’ (’Ura: གཞི་སང་ཞེན་ *gaisang wen* ‘I shall go, I am to go’). Such a construction portrays the event as a situation which will

take place according to schedule or some tacitly assumed scheme of things, རྩེ་ཡམ་པ་དག་གི་སང་མེན་ན། *wet yampat gai-sang wen-na?* ‘Are you leaving tomorrow?’ This question is not a query about what the person addressed wants to do, but about his intended plan of action or programme.

4.8 Volitional future

The Bumthang volitional future in གེ་ <ge> expresses an action which the subject of the sentence intends to carry out or an event about which the subject is very sure that it will take place in the future. This is why the volitional future is apt to express an action which will be realised in the immediate future, and why it is often used when the subject is a first person about whose future intentions the speaker generally has a good deal of knowledge, ཉིད་གེ་ *nyit-ge* ‘I will sit’, ཟུ་གེ་ *zu-ge* ‘I will eat’, ཇུ་གེ་ *ju-ge* ‘futuam’. The infinitival future in མ་ལ་ <mala> merely expresses a future possibility, whereas the volitional future expresses the wish, intent or decision of the subject about a future event and in this way expresses an almost certain future, e.g. ཁིད་ཉིད་མ་ལ་ *khit nyit-mala* ‘he will [probably] stay on’ vs. རྩེ་ཟུ་གེ་ *ngat zu-ge* ‘I will eat’, ཡང་བུ་རུ་གཞི་གེ་ *yat bu-ru gai-ge* ‘I am going off to work’. With the infinitival future in མ་ལ་ <mala> the speaker assumes a possible future, e.g. རྩེ་ཉིད་མ་ལ་ རྩེ་ན། *wet nyit-mala, wen-na?* ‘you’re going to be staying on, aren’t you? (Nep. *timī basne, hoina?*). With the volitional future, by contrast, the speaker asserts or questions the intent or will of the subject about the event denoted by the verb, e.g. རྩེ་ཉིད་གེ་ རྩེ་ན། *wet nyit-ge, wen-na?* ‘you intend to stay, don’t you?’ (Nep. *timī baschau, hoina?*).

The negative of the volitional future is formed by addition of the negative prefix མེ་ <me>, in Chunmat མི་ <mi>, whereby the suffix གེ་ <ge> is dropped, e.g. རྩེ་མེ་ཉིད་ *ngat me-nyit* ‘I won’t sit down, I won’t stay’, ཁིད་མེ་གཞི་ *khit me-gai* ‘he won’t leave’, མེ་ཇུ་ *me-ju* ‘non futuam’, མེ་སུད་ *me-sut* ‘I won’t kill’, ཁིད་མི་ཟུ་ *khit mi-zu* ‘he won’t eat’, རྩེ་ཁག་མེ་མི་ཡང་ *ngat khakso mi-yang* ‘I won’t get up’, རྩེ་ཙག་མེ་ཙག་ *ngat cok me-cok* ‘I won’t shit’ (literally ‘I won’t defaecate faeces’), ཁིད་མི་ར་ *khit mi-ra* ‘he won’t come’. In the interrogative, the volitional future suffix གེ་ <ge> is dropped before the interrogative suffix ག་ <ga>, e.g. རྩེ་ཇོ་རང་ཉིད་ག་ *wet cho-rang nyit-ga* [you here-emp. sit-Q] ‘Did you want to sit here?’

The suffix ན་ <na> can be added to a volitional future form to indicate that the utterance represents newly acquired knowledge on the part of the speaker, knowledge about which the speaker has reason to believe is an accurate representation of reality, but not beyond the shadow of a doubt, e.g. ཡམ་པ་དག་ན་སུན་གཞི་དོན་སྒྲུབ་གེ་ན། *yampat-nanmun gai-do*

'nyam-ge-na 'he'll be pleased to be leaving soon'. This Bumthang suffix ན་ <na> is comparable in meaning to the Dzongkha suffix བས་ ~ བས་ <wä ~ bā>, which also expresses the episte-mological stance of the speaker with respect to the contents of the utterance. When the volitional future ending གེ་ <ge> has been compounded by the ending ན་ <na>, then the volitional future suffix གེ་ <ge> is not dropped in the negative, e.g. ཁིན་ཉིན་གེ་ན་ག། *khit nyit-ge-na-ga* 'Is he going to stay?' (whereby ག། <ga> is the interrogative suffix) — མི་ཉིན་གེ་ན་ *mi-nyit-ge-na* 'no, he won't stay'.

4.9 Supine

The supine is a function of the Bumthang telic category expressed by the suffix <-QO> when this morpheme is attached to a verb. In this suffix, the vowel symbol <O> represents a vowel harmonic variable with the phonological value /u/ when the vowel in the preceding syllable is either of the closed vowels /i/ or /u/. In all other environments, its phonological value is /o/, e.g. ལུ་དུ་ *sut-du* 'in order to kill', རྟོད་དོ་ *dot-do* 'in order to sleep', ཉིན་དུ་ *nyit-du* 'in order to sit', རེད་མེན་ཏོ་ཐོར་དོ་གེ་གེ་ *nget mento thor-do gai-ge* 'we are going to pick flowers'. The phonological value of the variable represented by <Q> depends on the stem final of the verb. (1) After final /k/, the telic ending is <gO>, e.g. ཁིན་པོ་གེ་རད་གེ་གེ་ *khit pok-go ngat gai-ge* 'I'm going there to give him a beating', རྩ་གུ་གེ་གེ་ *ruk-gu gai-ge* 'we are going to put everything back in its place', མེད་ཅོག་ཅོག་གོ་མ་གེ་ཡ། *wet cok cok-go ma-gai-ya?* 'Didn't you just go off to shit?'. (2) After stem final /ng/ the ending has the form <ngO>, e.g. ཐོང་ཏོ་ *thong-ngo* 'in order to drink', ཡུང་དུ་གེ་གེ་ *yung-ngu gai-ge* 'I shall go to fetch it'. (3) after final /p/ the ending has the value <tO>, e.g. ཏུ་ཏུ་ *tup-tu* 'in order to cut', ཐམ་ཏོག་ལཱེ་ *thap-to ga-lae!* 'go away (i.e. somewhere else) to argue!', ལམ་ཏོག་གེ་གེ་ *lap-to gai-ge* 'we are going off to tell [them]'. (4) After all other final consonants and after hard open stem verbs, the telic ending has the form <dO>, e.g. ཏོར་དོ་ *tor-do ga-lae!* 'go sow!', ཇུ་ཕོར་དོ་གེ་གེ་ *ju phor-do ga-lae!* 'go to fondle her breasts!', ཕོན་དོ་ *pron-do* 'in order to crash a party or prayer service', ཤམ་དོ་ *sham-do* 'in order to set the table, in order to display wares on a table' (Dz. བཀྲམ་ནི་ *bkram-ni*), བྲི་ལུ་དུ་གེ་གེ་ *bri num-du gai-ge* 'I am going to smell at it', མུལ་དོ་ *mrü-do* 'in order to squeeze it out', ལྷུ་དོ་ *tshü-do* 'in order to look for it', རྩོན་ཐོན་དོ་ *'ngon throi-do* 'In order to extirpate weeds'. In contrast to the morphophonology of the telic suffix when attached to nominal parts of speech, the telic suffix also has the form <dO> after verb stems in final /t/, e.g. ཐོད་དོ་ *thot-do* 'in order to join', རྟོད་དོ་ *dot-do* 'in order to sleep'. After soft open verb stems, the initial of the telic suffix has the phonological value <rO>, e.g. ལུ་ལུ་ *zu-ru* 'in order to eat',

སེ་རོ་ *se-ro* ‘in order to die’, སེང་ཐུ་རུ་གཞི་གེ་ *seng thu-ru gai-ge* ‘I am going off to chop wood’, ཉི་རུ་བི་རུ་ *tiru bi-ru* ‘in order to give money, in order to pay’.

The supine is not only the form of verbal complements of verbs of motion. The supine is also the form of verbal complements of the Bumthang verbs ཚུག་མ་ལ་ *tshuk-mala* ‘to be able’ and རྟམ་མ་ལ་ *nyam-mala* ‘to feel like doing something’, e.g. གཞི་དོ་རྟམ་དྲ་ *gai-do nyam-da* ‘I feel like going’, རྟ་ཚུར་མ་ཐོང་ངོ་མེ་ཚུག་ས་ *ngat churma thong-ngo me-tshuk-sa* ‘I can’t drink the beer’.

4.10 Imperative

The imperative is formed through affixation of the suffix ལཱེ <lae>, in allegro speech pronounced as ལལ་ <lā>, e.g. མྱལ་ལཱེ་ *mrü-lae!* ‘squeeze it out, scratch it out!’, ཐྲོའི་ལཱེ་ *throi-lae!* ‘weed, extirpate!’, ཐོར་ལཱེ་ *thor-lae!* ‘pluck, pick!’, རློན་ལཱེ་ *pron-lae!* ‘crash [a dinner party]!’, The verb གཞི་མ་ལ་ *gai-mala* ‘to go’ has the stem ག་ <ga> in the imperative, e.g. གལ་ལཱེ་ *ga-lae!* ‘go away!’. The negative imperative is formed through affixation of the negative prefix མ་ <ma>, e.g. མ་མྱལ་ལཱེ་ *ma-mrü-lae!* ‘don’t squeeze it out!’, མ་ཚུལ་ལཱེ་ *ma-tshü-lae!* ‘don’t look for it!’, མ་གལ་ལཱེ་ *ma-ga-lae!* ‘don’t go!’, མེན་ཏོ་མ་ཐོར་ལཱེ་ *mento ma-thor-lae!* ‘don’t pick the flowers!’, མེན་ཏོ་མ་ཐྲོའི་ལཱེ་ *mento ma-throi-lae!* ‘don’t uproot the flowers!’, མ་སེ་ *ma-se!* ‘don’t die!’.

Verb stems ending in /t/ drop this final before the imperative suffix, e.g. མ་སྒ་ལཱེ་ *ma-mra-lae!* ‘don’t scratch!’ <སྒ་མ་ལ་ *mrat-mala* ‘scratch’, མ་རོ་ཉི་ལཱེ་ *saro nyi-lae!* ‘sit down!’ <ཉི་མ་ལ་ *nyit-mala* ‘sit’, རོ་ལལ་ *do-lä!* ‘go to sleep!’ <རོ་མ་ལ་ *dot-mala* ‘sleep’, སྒལ་ལཱེ་ *su-lae!* ‘kill!’ <སྒལ་མ་ལ་ *sut-mala* ‘kill’. After verb stems in final /ng/, /k/ or /p/, the imperative ending is realised as the allomorph <ae> and the verb stem finals /k/ and /p/ become voiced /g/ and /b/, e.g. མ་ཡང་ལཱེ་ *ma-yang-ae!* ‘don’t stand up!’, ཉི་རུ་ཡང་ཚོང་ལཱེ་ *tiru yanga chong-ae!* ‘get out five ngütram’ (Bhutanese currency unit), མ་པོ་གཞི་ལཱེ་ *ma-pog-ae!* ‘don’t beat!’ <པོ་གཞི་མ་ལ་ *pok-mala* ‘hit, beat’, ཏུ་བཞི་ལཱེ་ *tub-ae!* ‘cut it!’ <ཏུ་བ་མ་ལ་ *tup-mala* ‘cut’. After the verb stem final <m>, the imperative ending has the allomorph མཱེ <mae>, e.g. ཀར་ཡུ་མ་ཐོམ་མཱེ་ *karyu ma-throm-mae!* ‘don’t break the porcelain cup!’, བྱི་མ་རྒྱུ་མཱེ་ *bri ma-num-mae!* ‘don’t sniff at it!’ (whereby བྱི་ *bri* ‘smell’ is the obligatory complement of the verb རྒྱུ་མ་ལ་ *num-mala* ‘to smell’ if there is no other overt complement).

Soft open stem verbs with either the stem vowel /i/ or /u/ form their imperatives through the apophonic rule whereby /i/ goes to /e/ and /u/ goes to /ö/, e.g. རོ་ཐོ་མ་བེ་ *nga-do ma-be!* ‘give it to me!’ <བི་མ་ལ་ *bi-mala* ‘give’, ཐོ་ལ་ *zö!* ‘eat!’ <ཐུ་མ་ལ་ *zu-mala* ‘eat’, མ་ཇོ་ལ་ *ma-jö!* ‘ne futue!’ <ཇུ་མ་ལ་ *ju-mala* ‘futuere’, ཐོ་ལ་ *thö!* ‘chop!’ <ཐུ་མ་ལ་ *thu-mala* ‘chop’. The verbs ར་མ་ལ་ *ra-mala* ‘come’ and འོ་མ་ལ་ *’o-mala* ‘bring’ have irregular imperative

forms, viz. ཨྲཱི *hrai!* ‘come!’, མ་ཨྲཱི *ma-hrai!* ‘don’t come’, རྟཱི *wai!* ‘bring!’, མ་རྟཱི *ma-wai!* ‘don’t bring!’.

4.11 Gerund

The ending of the gerund is སེ <se>, and in Chunmat སི ~ སེ <si ~ zi>. This suffix is attached to a verb which expresses an event or situation which obtains simultaneously or immediately prior to the situation denoted by the main verb (cf. Dz. ཏྲཱི ~ ཏྲེ ~ ཏྲེ <di>, Nep. <-era>), e.g. མའི་རྩམ་སེ་གའི་ཤེ *mai hram-se gai-e* ‘after they had destroyed the house, they left’, ཤྲའི་དྲུག་སེ་གའི་དྲུག *shrai-da, shrai-se gai-da* ‘it’s overflowing, it’s overflowing and getting away’, རུ་རུ་ཤྲོབ་སེ་མ་ཉི་ལཱ *cucu shrop-se ma-nyi-lä!* ‘don’t just sit there masturbating!’. The verb ཟད་མེ་ལ *zat-mala* ‘complete, finish’ governs the gerund, e.g. ཡི་གུ་རྩི་མེ་ཟས་ *yigu dri-se zas* ‘I’ve finished writing, I’m done with writing’. The verb གོ་མེ་ལ *got-mala* ‘must’, however, takes the bare stem of a verb as its complement, e.g. ཞེ་གོ་ཟུས་རྟེན་དོ་གོ་དུས་ *zhego zus, dan dot got-sa* ‘[we] have eaten the food, now [we] must go to sleep’. It is not clear whether any etymological relationship exists between the Bumthang gerund suffix སེ <se> and the Bumthang experienced past tense suffix <s>.

4.12 Adhortative

The adhortative ending is ལྟ *<kya>*, e.g. ཏུབ་ལྟ *tup-kya* ‘let’s cut it’, རྩོན་ལྟ *pron-kya* ‘let’s crash [their dinner]’, ཤམ་ལྟ *sham-kya* ‘let’s set out [the wares] for display’, རྟེན་ལྟ *dot-kya* ‘let’s go to sleep’, ཟུ་ལྟ *zu-kya* ‘let’s eat’, ཡན་བུ་ལྟ *yat bu-kya* ‘let’s work’, རྩོན་ཐྲོའི་ལྟ *’ngon throi-kya* ‘let’s uproot the grass’, ཐོང་ལྟ *thong-kya* ‘let’s drink’, གའི་ལྟ *gai-kya* ‘let’s go’, རྩུ་ལྟ *tshü-kya* ‘let’s look for it’, མུ་ལྟ *mu-kya* ‘let’s do it’. The adhortative may be used with respect to a second person subject in questions, where it has the connotation of polite encouragement, e.g. ཟུ་འི་སེ་མ་ཟད་པའི་ཅལ་གསལ་པོ་མའི་དོན་ ཞེད་གོད་ལྟ རྩུ་ལའི་ལྟ། *’mui-se ma-zat-pai cala-gampo mai-do na. wet got-kya? ’ngüi-kya?* [sell-ger. not-finish-part. stuff-col. house-in be. you need-adh.? buy-adh.?] ‘The things which have not been sold off yet are still in the house. Mightn’t you need them? Won’t you buy them?’

4.13 Optative

The optative ending is གྱ *<ga>*. As this ending is homophonous with the interrogative suffix, intonation serves a disambiguating function, e.g. ཡན་བུ་གྱ *yat bu-ga!* ‘may [he/you/

etc.] work!’, མུ་ག་ *mu-ga!* ‘may [he/you/etc.] do it!’’, ཟུ་ག་ *zu-ga!* ‘may [he/you/etc.] eat!’’, རྟ་ག་ *dot-ga!* ‘may [he/you/etc.] sleep!’’, རྟོ་ག་ *pron-ga!* ‘may [you/they/etc.] crash [their dinner]!’’, རྟུ་ག་ *tshü-ga!* ‘may [he/you/etc.] look for it’. In certain Bumthang locolects, the optative ending has the form <(n)ja>, whereby the full allomorph <nja> occurs after open stem verbs, e.g. ཡེ་བུ་ལ་ *yat bu-nja!* ‘may [he/you/etc.] work!’’, མུ་ལ་ *mu-nja!* ‘may [he/you/etc.] do it!’’, ཟུ་ལ་ *zu-nja!* ‘may [he/you/etc.] eat!’’, རྟུ་ལ་ *tshü-nja!* ‘may [he/you/etc.] look for it!’’. The allomorph <ja> occurs after a closed stem verb, e.g. རྟོ་ལ་ *pron-ja!* ‘may [you/they/etc.] crash [their dinner]!’’. Verb stems ending in /t/ lose this final before the optative ending in locolects where the optative suffix is <(n)ja>, e.g. རྟ་ལ་ *do-ja* ‘may [he/you/etc.] sleep!’’. The optative can be used with respect to a subject in all three persons. The optative is only attested in the first person in the questions intended to solicit the approval of the person addressed, ཡང་ག་ལ་ *ngat gai-ga* ‘shall I go now?’.

4.14 Aspectivisers <thung> and <thro>

The term ‘aspectiviser’ denotes an auxiliary which expresses an *Aktionsart*, adding a dimension of meaning to the meaning of the main verb. Bumthang probably has more aspectivisers than just <thung> and <thro>, but a complete treatment of all such Bumthang verbal auxiliaries falls beyond the scope of this modest synoptic grammar. The two aspectivisers <thung> and <thro> do not exhibit similar morphological behaviour. The data available at present are too limited to draw any conclusions in the regard.

The Bumthang aspectiviser ཐུང་ <thung> adds a dative of relinquitive meaning to a verb in the past. When the auxiliary <thung> is affixed to a soft stem verb, the allomorph <t> of the experienced past tense is retained, e.g. ཆམ་ལ་བུ་ལ་ཐུང་ *charo-le nga-do bi-t-thung* ‘my friend has handed it over to me’, ཁི་བུ་ལ་ཐུང་བ་ *khi bi-t-thung-ba* ‘he gave it away’, ཡེ་བུ་ལ་ཐུང་ *yat bu-t-thung* ‘has he completed the task?’ (Nep. *kām gari diyo*), ཟུ་ལ་ཐུང་ *zama zu-t-thung* ‘has he finished off the rice’.

The aspectiviser ཐོ་ <thro> expresses the inexorability of a situation or process. The auxiliary <thro> is often used in conjunction with a past participle, e.g. ཅལ་ཆའི་ཁི་ལ་ཐོ་ *cala-tshai khi-le khorwai thro* ‘he is the one who took away the stuff’. The English translation conveys the meaning of the Bumthang syntax in the given utterance. The use of ཐོ་ <thro> conveys the sense of ‘it just happens to be the case that he is the one who took the stuff away, and there’s nothing we can do about it’. In the sentence རྟེ་པེ་ཐོ་ *jep-pai thro ware!* ‘we enjoyed it!’, the auxiliary ཐོ་ <thro> connotes that the enjoyment was long-lasting. The emotive word *ware* at the end of the clause expresses a meaning similar to that of Dzongkha མཎེ་ *mare*, which might be described as conveying


an air of authority on the part of the speaker. The use of the auxiliary <thro> in the utterance ཉིད་པ་རིཿ་ *nyitpai thro* ‘he just kept on sitting there’ conveys the idea that the subject is immovable, inert or lethargic.


The auxiliary <thro> may also be attached directly to the stem of a verb instead of the present tense ending, e.g. རྟོ་རྩེ་རྩེ་ཉིད་ཉིད་ *ngat cho-rang nyit thro* ‘I’m staying here!’. The aspectiviser <thro> can be used as a main verb in the meaning ‘persist, continue to’, in which case it takes all the regular endings of a main verb and itself takes a gerund as its complement, e.g. ལུ་སེ་ལུ་ལུ་རྩེ་ཉིད་ཉིད་ *zu-se thro-na, rang ses* ‘[the pig] just kept on eating, it died just like that’. The latter utterance pertains to the practice of feeding a hemp porridge to pigs in Bhutan. This porridge renders pigs docile and lazy, making them easier to keep track of and prone to fattening. This porridge is not fed to pigs who are ripe for the slaughter, but to growing pigs. The amount of *Cannabis indica* is gradually increased, but it can happen that a pig dies of an overdose if moderation is not observed in the initial stages by an inexperienced farmhand preparing the porridge. The sentence ལུ་སེ་ལུ་ལུ་ལུ་ལུ་ *zu-se thro wen* ‘I am going to keep on eating it’ can, for example, be said to a person who is entertaining the idea of eating an apple which the speaker has already started eating and temporarily put aside.

4.15 Hearsay evidential

A hearsay evidential is a grammatical particle which indicates that the information conveyed in an utterance is neither the product of the speaker’s own observations, nor information the accuracy of which the speaker has been able to ascertain. A hearsay evidential expresses that the content of the utterance represents intelligence obtained from a third party, which the speaker has come to know from hearsay, or an assertion made by the subject of the sentence itself.

Bumthang distinguishes between an interrogative hearsay evidential ལུ་ <shu> and a non-interrogative or indicative form ལུ་ <re>, ལུ་ལུ་ལུ་ལུ་ *khit nyit-ge shu* ‘does he say (do they say/is it said) that he is going to stay?’, ལུ་ལུ་ལུ་ལུ་ *khit nyit-ge re* ‘he says (they say/it is said) that he is going to stay’. It is no doubt merely a remarkable coincidence that the non-interrogative Bumthang hearsay evidential happens to be formally similar to its Nepali counterpart *re*, e.g. *U hāmīsaṅga khāndaina re* ‘he says (they say/it is said) that he won’t be eating with us’.





* However, see explanation in text.

5 Kinship terms

The Bumthang system of kinship terminology is described here on the basis of the Chutö dialect. The word for ‘father’ is ཨ་པ་ *’apa*, and ‘mother’ is ཨ་མ་ *’ama*. ‘Grandfather’ is མེ་མེ *meme* (Chunmat: མི་མི *mimi*), and ‘grandmother’ is ཨའི་ལ་ *’aila* (Chunmat: ལ་ཡ་ *aya*). ‘Grandson’ is དི་བུ་ *dibu*, and ‘granddaughter’ is དི་མེད་ *dimet*. For uncles and aunts, a terminologically distinguishing criterion is whether the sex of the referent is the same as or different from the sex of the connecting relative, in this case the parent. Father’s brothers and their wives are respectively designated by the terms ལུ་གུ་ *’ugu* (Chunmat: ལུ་གོ་ *’ugo*) and ཨི་མེན་ *’imin*. Similarly, mother’s sisters and their husbands are respectively designated by the terms ཨི་མེན་ *’imin* and ལུ་གུ་ *’ugu*. Different terms are used to designate uncles and aunts whose sex is not the same as that of the connecting relative, i.e. the parent. Father’s sisters and their husbands are respectively designated by the terms རེ་རེ་ *nene* (Chunmat: རི་རི་ *nini*) and ཨ་ཤང་ *’ashang*, and mother’s brothers and their wives are respectively designated by the terms ཨ་ཤང་ *’ashang* and རེ་རེ་ *nene*.

The kin relationship to the offspring of ལུ་གུ་ *’ugu* and ཨི་མེན་ *’imin*, the parallel cousins, is felt to be closer than the relationship with the offspring of རེ་རེ་ *nene* and ཨ་ཤང་ *’ashang*, the cross cousins. Parallel cousins are terminologically equivalent to one’s own siblings and are designated, depending on their relative age as compared with that of the speaker, by the sibling terms ཨ་ཙོ་ *’aco* ‘elder brother’, རོ་ *no* ‘younger brother’, ཨ་ཤེ་ *’ashe* ‘elder sister’ and རོ་མེད་ *nomet* ‘younger sister’. Cross cousins are, by contrast, called ཕུན་ *pun* ‘son of father’s sisters or of mother’s brother’ and བུ་རིང་མོ་ *puringmo* ‘daughter of father’s sister and mother’s brother’. It is forbidden to marry a parallel cousin, just as it is forbidden to marry one’s own sibling. However, a cross cousin represents a preferable choice of spouse in Bumthang, as it does throughout central Bhutan (Kurtöp, Khengpa, Gongdukpa). Cross cousin marriage is not practised in western Bhutan by the ’Ngalong population. In the list of Bumthang kinship terms collected by Imaeda and Pommaret (1990), cross cousins and parallel cousins are not terminologically differentiated. The terms which they recorded also exhibit formal differences with the terms presented here.

In accordance with the division into parallel and cross cousins, brother’s offspring are for a male speaker terminologically equivalent to his own offspring, and the same applies to sister’s offspring in the case of a female speaker. The terms for one’s own offspring are བོ་ཙ་ *botsa* ‘son’ (Chunmat: བོ་ཟ་ *boza*), and བོ་མེད་ *bomet* ‘daughter’, and ཨོང་ *’onga* ‘child’. A male speaker refers to his sister’s children and their spouses by the terms ཙ་ལུ་ *tsau* (male) and ཙ་མེད་ *tsamet* (female), and a female speaker uses these terms to refer to her brother’s offspring and their spouses. The Bumthang terms ཙ་ལུ་ *tsau* and ཙ་མེད་

tsamet are evidently related to the Dzongkha terms ཚཞོ *tshao* en ཚཞོ *tsham*, but the Bumthang term ཚཞོ *tsamet* contains the same indigenous suffix མེད <met> as in Bumthang དིམེད *dimet* ‘granddaughter’, རྩོམེད *nomet* ‘younger sister’ and བོམེད *bomet* ‘daughter’. The kinship diagrams illustrate the kinship system for a male Bumthang speaker. The kinship system for a female Bumthang speaker can be easily derived on the basis of the description provided here.

A man calls his wife རྩོམ་ *namo* (Chogor: རེས་ *nesa*), and a woman calls her husband མགམ་ *makpa*. Daughters-in-law and the wives of parallel nephews are called རྩོམ་ *nama*, and sons-in-law and the husbands of parallel nieces are also referred to as མགམ་ *makpa*. A speaker may also refer to his or her sisters-in-law and brothers-in-law respectively as རྩོམ་ *nama* and མགམ་ *makpa* when these people live under a single roof with the speaker. If this is not the case, it is more usual to use decriptive circumlocutions like ཡུ་ལོ་མེད་ལྷོ་ *‘ajo-le namo* ‘elder brother’s wife’.

6 Bumthang language glossary with Trans-Himalayan comparanda provided by Nathan Wayne Hill

The alphabetical order of this glossary in Bumthang Roman basically follows the alphabetical order of Roman Dzongkha.

a	g	'm	p	ts
'a	h	n	ph	tsh
ä	hr	'n	r	u
'ä	hy	ng	'r	'u
b	i	'ng	s	w
c	'i	ny	sh	'w
ch	j	'ny	shr	y
d	k	o	t	'y
dz	kh	'o	th	z
e	l	ö	thr	zh
'e	m	'ö	tr	zhr

Entries followed by an asterisk between parentheses (*) have only been recorded in their Tang dialect forms. Entries immediately followed by a dash (—) have been recorded for all four major Bumthang dialects, whereby a deviant form in any of these

dialects is given separate mention. Polysyllabic verb stems are hyphenated before the root, which corresponds to the last syllable of the verb stem, in order to indicate the position at which prefixes are attached to the verb. Verbs are listed in their future infinitival form in <mala>. Each entry is also given in the Bumthang orthography in Bhutanese འུཅན་ 'Ucen script developed by འཤོ་སངས་རྒྱ་ཐོན་ Dr'âsho Sanggä Dôji 'Sangye Dorji' between 1991 and 1994, but never formally proposed.

Comparanda suggested by Nathan Hill are added between braces { }. Chinese characters are followed by Baxter's (1992) Middle Chinese reconstruction, an Old Chinese reconstruction that is either taken from or compatible with the current version of Baxter and Sagart's (2011) system, and the character number in Karlgren (1964 [1957]). As in Baxter's own recent work, for Middle Chinese the digraphs ae and ea are used in place of his original æ and ε. The newer convention of changing i to + has, however, not been followed, on aesthetic grounds. Old Chinese reconstructions lacking in Baxter and Sagart (2011) are provided in Hill's own reconstructions, which often rely on Schuessler (2009). Certain features of Baxter and Sagart's system are omitted here, such as pointed brackets, intended to show morphological structure. Tibetan verbs are cited by verbal root and present stem, whereby verbs that undergo voicing alternation are assumed to have a voiceless root (cf. Hill 2010).

ar འར་ — n., phlegm, slime.

auya འུཡ་ — n., jackal, *Canis aureus*; Dz. འུམ་ or འུ་མ་ âd'ôm.

'aco འུ་ཙོ་ — n., elder brother.

'adoro འུ་རོ་ — adv., how.

'ai འུ་འི་ — pro., who.

'aila འུ་འི་ལ་ — n., grandmother [Chunmat: འུ་ལ་ aya]

'aji འུ་འི་ — pro., who (erg.); whose (gen.).

'ama འུ་མ་ — n., mother.

'angdar འང་དར་ — n., [< Eng. underwear] underwear; cf. རོ་མ་ *dorma*.

'angi འང་འི་ — adv., whence, where from.

'ao འུ་འོ་ — adv., where.

'apa འུ་པ་ — n., father.

'arba འར་བ་ — adv., when.

'ashang འུ་ཤང་ — n., 1) mother's brother; 2) father's sister's husband.

'ashe འུ་ཤེ་ — n., elder sister.

'adzing འུ་རྩེང་ — n., belt with which a woman fastens her ཀྲ་རྩ་ *kirat*.

baspa བས་པ་ — n., nest hair, peach fuzz; cf. ཐོ་ *po*.

be བེ་ —v., imperative of བེ་མ་ལ་ *bi-mala*.

- beng བེང་ (*) n., smegma; cf. Dz. བེང་ bj'eng.
 bi-mala བི་མལ་ — v., give.
 binma བིན་མ་ — n., calf [dialectally: གཤ་མ་ gapsa].
 blakbloga ལྷག་ལྷོག་ — adj., messy, spilt (said of fluids or of handwriting).
 blaktang ལྷག་ཏར་ — n., spilt fluid, goo, sticky mass, viscous slime.
 ble, blā ལྷེ་ ལྷལ་ — num., four {Tib. བཞི་ bži, O.Bur. ལོའོ་ liy, Ch. 四 sijH < *s.li[j]-s (0518a)}.
 bleng ལྷེང་ — num., one (used of filled vessels or receptacles); Dz. གཤ་ g'ang; cf. གཤ་ gwa.
 bodok བོདོག་ — n., long ceremonial scarf of raw Bhutanese silk, usually white; cf. Dz. བཀའ་ནམ་ kapni.
 boi, boile བོའི་ བོའི་ལེ་ — pro., they (erg.).
 bomet བོ་མེད་ — n., 1) daughter; 2) girl {Tib. བུ་མེད་ bud-med}.
 bong བོང་ — n., length, size.
 bot བོད་ — pro., they, them.
 botsa བོ་ཙ་ — n., 1) son; 2) boy; [Chunmat: བོ་ཙ་ boza].
 brak བར་ — n., cliff; cf. Dz. བར་ bj'â; Tib. བར་ brag.
 bran-mala བར་མལ་ — v., recognise, know.
 brangdo བར་དོ་ — n., chest {Tib. བར་ brañ}.
 branma བར་མ་ — n., Tartary buckwheat, *Fagopyrum tataricum*; Dz. བར་མ་ bj'ô.
 brat-mala བར་མལ་ — v., scratch, claw {Tib. བར་མ་ hbrad}.
 bre བེ་ — n., female yak; cf. Tib. བེ་མོ་ hbri-mo.
 bri num-mala བི་ལུ་མལ་ — v., smell, sniff at something.
 bugang བུ་གར་ — n., fontanelle.
 bu-mala བུ་མལ་ — v., do.
 cala ཅལ་ — n., wares, stuff.
 cingdum ཅིང་དུམ་ — n., trousers, or long breeches extending to just over the knees; cf. ཅིང་མ་ dorma.
 cingku ཅིང་ཀུ་ (*) adj., small {Tib. ཅིང་བ་ chuñ-ba}.
 cok ཅོག་ — n., shit, faeces.
 cok-mala ཅོག་མལ་ — v., defaecate, shit.
 comen ཅོ་མེན་ — n., dimple [Tang: ཅོ་མེན་ comet].
 comet sungsung ཅོ་མེན་སུང་སུང་ (*) adv., in such a way that one's dimples become visible;
 e.g. ཅོ་མེན་སུང་སུང་གདད་། comet sungsung gat-da 'he smiled so that you could see his dimples'.
 cong ཅོང་ — n., 1) anus, arse; 2) loins; ཅོང་ན་རྩུ་ཀྲ་ cong-na ju-kya 'let's commit sodomy'.
 congmek ཅོང་མེག་ — n., anus [dialectal: ཅོག་མི་མེག་ coksimek]

cucu ཕུཕུ — n., penis; esp. the penis of a man after having attained puberty, but before fathering a child; cf. མི་ལིང་ *miling*, ཀ་ག་ *kaga*, ཏིམ་པ་ལི་ *tempali*.

cucui phailang ཕུཕུའི་པའི་ལང་ (*) n., glans penis, literally: penis forehead; cf. གང་ *gang*.

cucui shrop ཕུཕུའི་ཤྲོཔ་ (*) n., [< ཤྲོཔ་མ་ལ་ shrop-mala, q.v.] foreskin, literally: penis sheath.

chan ཆན་ — n., difference. {Tib. མཚན་ mtshan ‘mark, characteristic’}

charjat, cherjat ཆར་ཇན་ ཆེར་ཇན་ — num., eighteen.

charo ཆར་འོ་ — n., friend; cf. Dz. ཆར་གཤམ་ châro; cf. *tosang*.

chänga, chä’nga ཆལ་ང་ ཆལ་ང་ — num., fifteen.

che ཆེ་ — num., ten. {Tib. བཅུ་ bcu}

cheble, cheblä ཆེ་བླེ་ ཆེ་བླལ་ — num., fourteen.

cher’nyit, cher’nyis ཆེར་རྩིན་ ཆེར་རྩིས་ — num., seventeen.

chetpu ཆེན་པུ་ (*) adj., big {Tib. ཆེན་པོ་ ched-po}.

chewa ཆེམ་ — n., fangs of a snake; cf. *dongkwa*, *kwa* {Tib. མཆེབ་ mche-ba, VbV > VwV indicates this word must be a Tibetic loan}.

chi ཆི་ — n., lip {Tib. མཚུ་ mchu}.

chimbo ཆིམ་བོ་ — n., liver {Tib. མཆིན་ mchin, Bur. འདྲུཅ་ saññh}.

chit ཆིན་ — pro., see ཁིན་ *khit*.

cho ཆོ་ — adv., here.

chong-mala ཆོང་མ་ལ་ — v., produce, take out, show; cf. ཏུན་མ་ལ་ *tun-mala*.

chöedogo, chedogo ཆོལ་འདྲི་གོ་ ཆེན་གོ་ — num., nineteen.

chöegrok, chegrok ཆོལ་འཇོག་ ཆེགོག་ — num., sixteen.

chubak རྩུབ་ག་ — n., Bhutanese male garb (Dz. བཞོ་ g’ô < O.Tib. གོས་ gos) [Chogor: རྩུབ་ chuba].

churma རྩུར་མ་ — n., native beer; cf. Dz. ཆང་ chang.

chusum རྩུསུམ་ — num., thirteen.

chwa’nyit, chowa’nyis རྩ་རྩིན་ ཆོམ་རྩིས་ — num., twelve.

chwaret, choware རྩ་རེན་ ཆོམ་རེ་ — num., eleven.

dakhu ར་ཁུ་ — n., sperm.

dangma རང་མ་ — adv., yesterday [’Ura: རེམ་ dema].

dema རེམ་ — adv., see རང་མ་ *dangma*.

denca རེན་ཅ་ (*) n., a slap (with the hand).

dibu རིབུ་ — n., grandson.

dimet རིམེན་ — n., granddaughter.

dogo རོགོ་ — num., nine {Tib. རྟ་ dgu}.

dongkwa རོང་ཀྱ་ — n., [< ཀྱ་ kwa ‘tooth’] fangs of a mammal; cf. ཆེམ་ *chewa*.

dorma རོར་མ་ — n., short pants, underpants [cf. Tib. རོར་མ་ dor-ma ‘trousers’]; cf. ཨང་དར་ *’angdar*, ཅིང་དུམ་ *cingdum*.

- dot-mala དོད་མ་ལ་ — v., sleep.
- döba དོཔ་བ་ (*) n., male gayal, *Bos frontalis*; Dz. ཡང་གུ་ yangg'u.
- döbam དོཔ་བམ་ (*) n., female gayal, *Bos frontalis*; Dz. ཡང་གུ་མོ་ yangg'um.
- dri-mala དྲི་མ་ལ་ — v., write {Tib. $\sqrt{\text{ri}}$, pres. འདྲི་ ḥdri, cf. Hill 2005}.
- dumang དུམང་ — n., goitre.
- dungshing rotpa དུང་ཤིང་རོཏ་པ་ — n., vertebrae [Chunmat: དུང་ཤིང་རོ་ས་ dungshing rosa].
- dungshing དུང་ཤིང་ — n., spinal column.
- dusum དུསུམ་ (*) adv., today.
- gai-mala གཞི་མ་ལ་ — v., go.
- gajolewang གཞོལ་ལྗང་ — n., armpit.
- gajolewangpo གཞོལ་ལྗང་པོ་ — n., armpit hair.
- gami གམི་ — n., fire {Tib. མེ་ mye, Bur. མི་ mīh, Ch. 焜 xjwīX < *hmij? (0583e)}.
- gamlang གམལ་ལང་ — n., chin [Chunmat en Tang: གམ་ gam].
- gampo གམཔོ་ — col.postp., altogether, all (often left untranslated); cf. Dz. ཆཆུབ་ chachap.
- gamtha གམཐ་ — n., beard [Chunmat: གམཐ་ཚང་ gamtshang, Tang: གམཐ་ཚང་ gamchang].
- gang གང་ — n., glans penis.
- ganji-khenjang གན་ཇི་ཁེན་ཇང་ — n., [< Hindi *ganjī* 'singlet, t-shirt' + Bum. *khenjang*] singlet, t-shirt.
- gapsa གཔ་ས་ — see བེན་མ་ binma.
- gapsawang གཔ་ས་ལྗང་ — n., fossa poplitea.
- gatpo གད་པོ་ (*) n., old man {Tib. རྒད་པོ་ rgad-po}.
- gä-mala གཡ་མ་ལ་ — v., see གཞི་མ་ལ་ gai-mala.
- glap-mala གླཔ་མ་ལ་ (*) v. [Tang], hit, strike, beat; cf. བོག་མ་ལ་ pok-mala.
- gon གོན་ — pro., the other one, that; cf. Dz. གཞན་མི་ zhenmi.
- got-mala གོད་མ་ལ་ — v., must, need, require.
- grang-mala གར་མ་ལ་ — v., count {Tib. འགྲང་ ḥgran}.
- gran-mala གར་མ་ལ་ — v., compete {Tib. འགྲན་ ḥgran}.
- grangka གར་ཀ་ — n., counting {Tib. གར་ས་ grans}.
- grekpo གེག་པོ་ — n., yeti, the abominable snowman; Dz. མི་གློ་ཏོ་ 'migö; cf. མི་རྒྱལ་ mirgula.
- grok གྲོག་ — num., six {Tib. ལྷུག་ drug}.
- grumangti གུམ་ངནི་ — n., elbow [Tang: གུམ་ང་ grumang] {Tib. གུ་མོ་ gru-mo}.
- gungmu གུང་མུ་ (*) n., middle finger; cf. *pramang bonpo*.
- guyung གུཡུང་ — n., head {Tib. མགོ་ mgo}.
- gwa གྱ་ — num., two (used of filled vessels or receptacles); cf. སྒོར་ bleng.
- gwi གྱི་ — n., hip.
- hrak-mala རྩ་མ་ལ་ — v., see རྩ་ག་མ་ལ་ khrak-mala.
- hrang-mala རྩང་མ་ལ་ — v., see རྩང་མ་ལ་ khrang-mala.

- hrai རྩེ — v., imperative of ར་མ་ལ་ *ra-mala*.
 hrak-hrok རྩེ་མྱོག་ — adv., confused, mixed up.
 hram-mala རྩེ་མ་ལ་ — v., destroy, demolish.
 hyawang རྩེ་མ་ — n., lamasery; cf. Dz. ལྷ་ཁང་ lhakha.
 in རིན་ — pro., see *yin*.
 'imin རི་མེན་ — n., 1) mother's sister; 2) father's brother's wife
 jai རེའི་ — postp., on top of, atop, above.
 jappar རབ་པ་ — n., cup of tea.
 jat རྩ་ — num., eight {Tib. རྩྭ་ bgyad, Wr.Bur. རྩཾ rhac < O.Bur. *rhyat (cf. Nishi 1999: 47), Ch. 八 peat < *p^hret (0281a)}.
 jawa རེ་མ་ — n., moustache.
 jep-mala རེ་མ་ལ་ — v., enjoy.
 jigpala རྩེ་མ་ལ་ (*) adj., enormous, huge.
 joma རོ་མ་ — n., intestines, abdomen.
 ju རུ་ — n., 1) breast, tit, teat; 2) milk {Tib. རོ་ zo 'yoghurt': Japhug rGy. tx-lu 'milk'}.
 ju-mala རུ་མ་ལ་ — v., [an etymological relationship with *ju* 'breast' cannot be excluded, although this seems improbable] futuere.
 ka ཀ་ — n., snow {Tib. ཀ་ kha-ba}.
 kaga ཀ་ག་ — n., penis of a boy before reaching puberty; cf. རུ་ཅུ་ *cucu*.
 kai ཀ་འི་ — n., back {Tib. ཀ་ལ་ sgal}.
 kak ཀ་ག་ — n., blood {Tib. ཀ་ག་ khrag, Ch. 赫 xæk < *q^hrak (0779a) 'red, fiery', Bur. རྩཾ rhak 'ashamed'}.
 kakcan ཀ་ག་ཅན་ — adj., good.
 kan ཀ་ན་ — n., palate.
 kangbut ཀ་ང་བུ་ — n., bladder {Tib. ཀ་ང་བུ་ lgañ-bu}.
 kangdung ཀ་ང་དུང་ — n., thigh.
 karyu ཀ་རུ་ཡུ་ (*) n., [< Tib. རྩེ་མ་ལ་ dkar-yol] porcelain cup.
 kat ཀ་ཏ་ (*) n., language {Tib. ཀ་ཏ་ skad}.
 ketpa ཀེཏ་པ་ — n., waist {Tib. ཀེཏ་པ་ sked-pa}.
 ki ཀི་ (*) n., potato, tuber.
 kili ཀི་ལི་ — n., the little finger, pinkie [Chunmat: ཀི་ལི་ག་ kilik].
 kirat ཀི་རེན་ — n., Bhutanese female garb (Dz. རྩེ་མ་ལ་ kira) [Chogor: རུ་བ་ chuba]; cf. ཀི་མ་ལ་ *kisang*.
 kisang ཀི་མ་ལ་ — n., cloth to wrap in which to wrap something, cf. ཀི་རེན་ *kirat*.
 klatpa ཀ་ལཏ་པ་ — n., brain {Tib. ཀ་ལཏ་པ་ klad-pa}.
 konye ཀོ་ཡེ་ — adj., next, following.
 kra ཀ་ — n., hair on scalp [Tang: རྩ་ 'ra] {Tib. ཀ་ skra}.

- kran-mala གྲམ་མལ་ — v., miss someone, yearn, long for.
 krong རྫོང་ — n., village {Tib. རྫོང་ sgron}.
 kut-mala རྒྱུ་མལ་ — v., put, place.
 kwa ཀྱ་ — n., tooth; cf. ཆེ་ཤ་ *chewa*, དོང་ཀྱ་ *dongkwa*, ཕུཅ་ཀྱ་ *phupkwa*, སུར་ཀྱ་ *surkwa*.
 kwi ཀྱི་ — n., round woven bamboo mat to underset pots and pans.
 kha ཁ་ — n., mouth, language; cf. ཀྱ་ *kat* {Tib. ཁ་ kha}.
 kha-go-mala ཁ་གོ་མལ་ — v., understand, grasp; cf. Dz. ཉ་གོ་ཉི་ *hag'oni* {Tib. ཉ་གོ་ *ha-go*, not met in early Tibetan literature}.
 khae ཁེ་ — num., one score (twenty) {Tib. ཁལ་ *khal* 'a unit of volume equal to twenty *bre*'}.
 khaechenthek ཁེ་ཆེན་ཐེག་ — num., eight thousand.
 khaesum ཁེ་སུམ་ — num., sixty.
 khaethek ཁེ་ཐེག་ — num., twenty.
 khaezon ཁེ་བོན་ — num., forty.
 khaido ཁའི་དོ་ — n., kidneys {Tib. མཁལ་ *mkhal*}.
 khakso ཁག་སོ་ — adv., up, straight up, upright.
 khan-mala ཁན་མལ་ — v., know {Tib. མཁན་ *mkhan*}.
 khangma ཁང་མ་ — adj., long.
 kharkharma ཁར་ཁར་མ་ — adj., white {Tib. དྭ་ཀར་ *dkar*}.
 khawa ཁ་ཤ་ — n., chicken, hen.
 khawate ཁ་ཤ་ཏེ་ — n. [< khawa 'hen' + ?te 'egg'], egg, chicken egg
 khawate khrangma ཁ་ཤ་ཏེ་ཁང་མ་ — n. [literally 'egg-pip'], yolk.
 khenjang ཁེན་ཇང་ — n., shirt; Dz. ཅེན་ཇ་ *khenja*.
 kher-mala ཁེར་མལ་ — v., cook, build, prepare.
 khi, khile ཁི་ ཁི་ལེ་ — pro., he, she (erg.).
 khit ཁི་ད་ — pro., he, him, she, her.
 khor-mala ཁོར་མལ་ — v., take away.
 khrak-mala ཁྱག་མལ་ — v., arrive, have been somewhere [Chunmat: ཉྱག་མལ་ *hrak-mala*].
 khrang ཁང་ (*) n., pip.
 khrang-mala ཁང་མལ་ — v., climb [Chunmat: ཉང་མལ་ *hrang-mala*].
 khrangkhrang ཁང་ཁང་ — n., crane (bird).
 khratpa ཁྱེད་པ་ (*) n., the wild Himalayan gaur, *Bos gaurus*; Dz. བ་མེན་ *b'amö*.¹

¹ Most speakers of the national language in Bhutan are not native speakers of Dzongkha. Therefore, sometimes so-called reading pronunciations can be heard, such as the non-native *bamen for correct Dzongkha བ་མེན་ *b'amö*, for example, especially when a speaker is unfamiliar with the genuine grassroots 'Ngalop pronunciation of a word.

- khro-mala ཁྲོ་མ་ལ་ — v., bathe {Tib. $\sqrt{\text{kru}}$, pres. ཁྲུ མཁུ}.
- khrong-mala ཁྲོང་མ་ལ་ — v., germinate, sprout, sprout up, shoot up.
- khur ཁུར་ — n., cheek {Tib. མཁུར་ mkhur-ba}.
- khurba ཁུར་བ་ — n., heavy Tatar buckwheat flatbread; Dz. ཕྱོལ་ཁུ་ལེབ་ bj'ô g'i khulep.
- khü ཁུ་ — n., see ཁྱི khwi.
- khwe ཁྱེ་ — n., water {Tib. ཁུ་ khu-ba 'liquid'}.
- khwethor ཁྱེ་ཐོར་ — n., rapids, surf, turbulent water.
- khwi, khü ཁྱི་ ཁུ་ — n., dog {Tib. ཁྱི་ khyi, O.Bur. ཁྱུཾ: khuyh, Ch. 犬 khwenX < *k^{wh}en? (0479a)}.
- khwit ཁྱི་ཉ་ (*) adj., too big, oversize.
- lajan ལ་རྩ་ — n., white cuffs to be worn with the *chubak*; Dz. ལག་རྩ་ལྷ་ lâge.
- langma ལང་མ་ — n., buttocks.
- lap-mala ལཔ་མ་ལ་ — v., say, tell [note: low tone in contrast to Dz. ལཔ་མ་ལ་ 'lapni] {Tib. ལཔ་ lab}.
- litpa ལིཏ་པ་ — n., clitoris.
- lok ལོག་ — adv., back.
- lok-mala ལོག་མ་ལ་ — v., return, come back {Tib. ལོག་ log}.
- luspa ལུས་པ་ — n., body [Chunmat: ལུས་ lusa, dialectal: ལུཏ་པ་ lutpa] {Tib. ལུས་ lus}.
- 'li ལྷི་ — n., tongue {Tib. ལྷི་ lce, Bur. ལྷཱ་ lhyā, Ch. 舌 zyeX < *Cə.le? (0867f) 'lick'}.
- 'lijungmet ལྷི་ཅུང་མེད་ — n., uvula.
- 'lithakpa ལྷི་ཐག་པ་ — n., frenulum linguae.
- 'long ལྷོང་ — n., wind, breeze. {Tib. ལྷོང་ rlung}
- mai མའི་ — n., house {Tib. མའ་ mal 'bed'}.
- makpa མག་པ་ — n., 1) husband; 2) son-in-law, grandson-in-law {Tib. མག་པ་ 'bridegroom', Bur. མཙོ་ mak}.
- matki མཉུ་གྱི་ — n., male sarong (Nep. luṅgī).
- mek མེག་ — n., eye {O.Tib. མེག་ dmig, མིག་ mig, Bur. མུཾ myak, Ch. 目 mjuwk < *C.muk (1036a)}.
- mekbo མེག་པོ་ (*) n., pupil of the eye [Chunmat, Chogor: མེ་ cha].
- mekkharti མེག་ཁར་ཉི་ — 1) n., white of the eye; 2) adv., with the white of one's eyes, e.g. མེག་ཁར་ཉི་ཉན་ mekkharti tat-da 'he looked at him with the whites of his eyes'.
- mekpakpa མེག་པག་པ་ — n., eyelid (literally 'eye-skin').
- mekpuli མེག་པུ་ལི་ — n., tear.
- meme མེ་མེ་ — n., grandfather [Chunmat: མེ་མི་ mimi] {Tib. མེས་ 'ancestor'}.
- Meng མེང་ (*) n., 'Ngalong, the Dzongkha speaking population of western Bhutan.
- meng མེང་ — n., name {O.Tib. མྱིང་ myiñ, Bur. མཙྰ maññ, Ch. 名 mjieng < *C.men (0826a)}.

Mengkat མེང་ཀཱ་ (*) n., Dzongkha, the national language of Bhutan, native to western Bhutan.

mento མེན་ཏོག་ — n., flower {O.Tib. མེན་ཏོག་ men-tog}.

mewa མེལ་ — n., small mole or birthmark {Tib. མེལ་ rme-ba, the change VbV > VwV shows that this word is a Tibetic loan}.

mi མི་ — n., person, man (note: low tone in contrast to Dz. མི་ 'mi) {Tib. མི་ mi}.

miling མི་ལིང་ — n., penis of a man who has fathered a child; cf. ཅུ་ཅུ་ *cucu*.

min མིན་ — v., not to be (used to establish identity of referent). {Tib. མིན་ min}

minbotsa མིན་བོ་ཙ་ — n., woman [Chunmat: མིན་བ་ཙ་ membaza]

mirgula མིར་གུལ་ — n., rhesus monkey; cf. གླེན་པོ་ *grekpo*, རྩ་ག་ *raksha*.

mlak-mala ལྷག་མ་ལ་ — v., soil something or part of one's body in something sticky, syrupy or slimy.

mlakmloga ལྷག་ལྷོ་ག་ — adj., sticky, syrupy, slimy.

mor མོར་ — n., vagina of an old woman, large vagina; cf. བེ་བེ་ *pepe*.

mos མོས་ — n., pubic hair; Dz. ལུང་ hung {Thangmi *mus* 'body hair', O.Bur. ལུང་: muyh, Ch. 毛 maw < *C.m^haw (1137a)}.

mrat མཚན་ — n., paddy, standing rice {Tib. མཚན་ hbras, Ch. 糯 lat < *(mə-)r^hat (0340g)}.

mrat-mala མཚན་མ་ལ་ — v., scratch {Tib. མཚན་ hbrad}.

mrü-mala ལྷུལ་མ་ལ་ — v., scratch, etch, squeeze out, scratch out {Tib. འདྲུ་ ~ འདྲུ་ 'scrape'; cf. Jacques (2010: 28)}.

mu-mala ལུ་མ་ལ་ — v., do.

mukduma ལུག་དུམ་ (*) n., fist, cf. བ་རེ་ *pare*.

mut ལུ་ — v., not to be (in the existential, locational and attributive senses) {Tib. ལུ་ med}.

'mingma མིང་མ་ — n., eyebrow {Tib. མིན་ smin}.

'mran མྲན་ — n., sebum, blackhead.

'mrat མྲཱ་ — n., flour to thicken soup with.

'mui-mala ལུའི་མ་ལ་ — v., sell.

na ལ་ — loc.postp., in, at, on.

na ལ་ — v., be (in the existential, locative or attributive senses).

na ལ་ — n., ear {Tib. ལ་ na}.

namo, nama ལ་མོ་ ལ་མ་ — n., 1) wife [Chogor: ལ་མ་ nesa]; 2) daughter-in-law, granddaughter-in-law {Tib. ལ་མོ་ ña-mo}.

nang ལ་ན་ — postp., inside, within {Tib. ལ་ན་ nañ}.

nanmun ལ་ན་ལུ་ན་ — adv., the day after tomorrow.

nat ལ་ན་ — n., illness, disease {Tib. ལ་ན་ nad}.

natpa ལ་ན་པ་ — n., ear wax [Chunmat: ལ་ན་པ་ naskap]

neng རེང་ — conj., and, with.

nene རེ་རེ་ — n., 1) father's sister; 2) mother's brother's wife; [Chunmat: རེ་རེ་ nini].

nengma རེང་མ་ — n., heart {Tib. སྙིང་ sñin, Bur. སྙིང་ nhac, Ch. 仁 nyin < *niŋ (0388f) 'kindness'}.

ning རིང་ — conj., see རེང་ neng.

no རོ་ — n., younger brother {Tib. རུ་བོ་ nu-bo 'younger brother', Ch. 孺 nyuH < *nos (0134d) 'child, mild'}.

nomet རོ་མེད་ — n., younger sister.

nu རུ་ — n., breast, tit, teat {Tib. རུ་ nu 'suck', Ch. 乳 nyuX < *noʔ (0135a) 'milk, nipple'}.

'naima རྣམ་མེད་ — n., wool yarn.

'namse རྣམ་སེ་ — n., pimple.

'nap རཎ་ — n., snot {Tib. སྤམ་ snabs, Bur. སྤྱོ་ nhap}.

'naphang རྣམ་ཕང་ — n., nose {Tib. སྤ་ sna, Bur. སྤ་ nhā}.

'naphangmek རྣམ་ཕང་མེག་ — n., [literally 'nose-eye'] nostril.

'ne རེ་ — n., gums {Tib. རྩལ་ rñil, རྩལ་ sñil, Ch. 齙 ngjin < *ŋə[n] (0416-)}.

ngartong རྣམ་རྩུང་ — n., shin.

ngat རག་ — pro., I, me {Tib. ར་ ña 'I, me', Bur. ར་ ñā, Ch. 吾 ngu < *ŋʰa (0058f)}.

ngei རེའི་ — pro., we (erg.).

ngadza ར་ཇ་ — n., morning.

ngai རེའི་ — pro., I (erg.).

ngam-mala རྣམ་མེད་ལ་ — v., taste good, be delicious.

nget རེད་ — pro., we, us {Tib. རེད་ ñed, Ch. 我 ngaX < *ŋʰajʔ (0002a)}.

ngui རུའི་ — pro., see རེའི་ ngai.

ngur རུར་ — n., face {Tib. རྩ་ ño}.

'ngon རོན་ — n., grass, weeds {Tib. རྩམ་མོ་ 'blue, green'}.

'ngüi-mala རུའི་མེད་ལ་ — v., buy {Tib. རྩུ་ dngul 'silver', O.Bur. རུ་ ñuy, Ch. 銀 ngin < *ŋrə[n] (0416k)}.

nya རྩ་ — n., muscle {Tib. རྩ་ ña 'tendon, sinew'}.

nya རྩ་ — n., fish {Tib. རྩ་ ña, Bur. ར་ ñāh 'fish', Ch. 魚 ngjo < *ŋa (0079a)}.

nyamgong རྩམ་གོང་ — n., thigh.

nyishu རྩུ་ — num., four hundred {Tib. རྩུ་ ñi-sū 'twenty'}.

nyit-mala རྩེད་མེད་ལ་ — v., sit, stay, remain.

'nyakpa རྩམ་པ་ — n., earlobe.

'nyam-mala རྩམ་མེད་ལ་ — v., feel like doing or having something.

'nyiphang རྩེཕང་ — n., tail.

'nyit, 'nyis རྩེད་ རྩེད་ — num., seven {Bur. རུ་མེད་ khu-nhac}.

- 'nyor-'nyor རྩོད་རྩོད་ — n., sexual union.
- omtsho-khenjang འོམ་ཤོ་ཁེན་ཇང་ — n., [< Dz. omtsho + Bum. khenjang 'shirt'] cardigan, pullover.
- otomang འོ་ཏོ་མང་ — n., front of the neck.
- 'o-mala འོ་མ་ལ་ — v., bring.
- 'onga འོ་ང་ — n., child.
- pak, pakpa བག་ བག་པ་ — n., skin; བག་ཤྲོབ་ན་ གང་ཤླིག་ན་ *pak shrop-na, gang plik-na* 'the [fore]skin has been retracted, [your] glans penis has been exposed'; cf. ཅུ་ཅུ་འི་ཤྲོབ་ *cucui shrop* {Tib. ཤླག་པ་ lpags-pa}.
- pare པ་རེ་ (*) n., a held up hand, the hollow of the hand; cf. མུག་དུ་མ་ *mukduma*.
- pare-gang པ་རེ་གང་ (*) num., a handful {Tib. སྒར་གང་ sbar-gan}.
- pat པལ་ — n., leech; cf. Dz. པཤལ་ pêp.
- patmong པད་མོང་ — n., knee {Tib. སྤུ་མོ་ spus-mo, དཔུ་མོ་ dpus-mo, Bur. ཕུ་ཅའི་ pu-chac}.
- pepe པེ་པེ་ — n., vagina; cf. *mor*.
- pethe པེ་ཐེ་ — adj., bald.
- plak-mala ཤླག་མ་ལ་ — v., scream, make noise.
- plakta ཤླག་ཏ་ — n., screaming, hollering, noise, racket.
- plik-mala ཤླིག་མ་ལ་ — v., be peeled, be uncovered, be lid bare.
- po ཐོ་ — n., body hair {Tib. སྤྱ་ spu}.
- po ཐོ་ — n., snake, serpent {Tib. སྤུ་ sbul, O.Bur. མྲུའོ་ mruy, Ch. 𑜉𑜢𑜤𑜂𑜫 xjwɨjX < *ruj?}.
- pok-mala ཐོག་མ་ལ་ — n., strike, hit, beat.
- pongma ཐོང་མ་ — n., shoulder {Tib. དཔུང་པ་ dpun-pa}.
- pra, priu པ་ སྤྱུ་ — n., rhesus monkey; cf. རྒྱ་ཤ་ raksha {Tib. སྤྱ་ spra 'monkey', སྤྱེ་ཅུ་ sprehu 'monkey', the Tibetan diminutive suffix suggests a Tibetic loan}.
- pramang པ་མང་ — n., 1) fingers, toes; 2) index finger.
- pramang bonpo པ་མང་བོན་པོ་ — n., middle finger [Tang: གུང་མུ་ gungmu].
- prat-mala པ་རྩ་མ་ལ་ — v., fight.
- priu པ་རྩུ་ — see པ་ *pra*.
- pron-mala པོན་མ་ལ་ — v., crash a party, dinner or prayer service in the hope of being able to partake thereof.
- pun པུན་ — n., male cross-cousin, i.e. son of father's sister or of mother's brother {Tib. སྤྱུན་ spun}.
- puringmo པུ་རིང་མོ་ — n., female cross-cousin, i.e. daughter of father's sister or of mother's brother..
- pha-mala པ་མ་ལ་ — v., happen, be done.
- phai པམེ་ — n., forehead [Tang: བཞེ་ལང་ phailang] {Tib. དཔམ་ dpral}.

- phan-mala ཕན་མ་ལ་ — v., cure an illness (loc.), recover from an illness (tel.) {Tib. ཕན་མ་ལ་ phan ‘help, benefit’}.
- phecung ཕེ་ཕུང་ — n., bag, sack.
- phoja ཕོ་ཇ་ — n., man.
- phor-mala ཕོ་ར་མ་ལ་ — v., fondle, feel; cf. ཏོག་མ་ལ་ *tok-mala*.
- phrat-mala ཕྱལ་མ་ལ་ — v., come into conflict, be at loggerheads.
- phupkwa ཕུབ་ཀྱ་ — n., [< ཀྱ་ kwa ‘tand’] molars.
- ra ར་ — n., goat {Tib. ར་ ra}.
- ra-mala ར་མ་ལ་ — v., come.
- raksha ར་ག་ཤ་ — n., golden langur; cf. མི་ར་གུ་ལ་ *mirgula*; གྲེག་པོ་ *grekpo*, བྱི་ཕུ་ *priu* {< Skt. rak-ṣasa}.
- rang རང་ (before the genitive suffix: ར་ ra) — pro., self, own; adv. by itself, of it own accord {Tib. རང་ ran}.
- rantsam རན་ཅམ་ — n., hairline [dialectal: གན་ཅམ་ *krantsam*].
- rantsham thonmo རན་ཅམ་ཐོན་མོ་ — n. + adj., receding hairline. {Tib. ཅོ་མ་ tshom ‘beard’, Bur. ཅོ་མ་ cham- ‘hair’, Ch. 簪 tsrim < *tsrəm (0660g) ‘hairpin’}
- rato རཏོ་ — n., root.
- re རེ་ — adv., hearsay evidential in non-interrogative sentences.
- ri རི་ — n., hill, mountain {Tib. རི་ ri}.
- rotpa རོ་ཏཔ་ — n., bone [Chunmat: རོ་མ་ rosa] {Tib. རུས་ rus, O.Bur. རྒྱུ་འོ་ ruiwh}.
- ruk རུག་ — n., curry.
- ruk-mala རུག་མ་ལ་ — v., put away, clean up.
- ’ra ར་བ་ — n., hair on scalp.
- ’rat ར་བ་ར་ — n., bamboo fibre for weaving traditional Bhutanese bowls.
- ’rewa ར་བེ་མ་ — n., tool for removing ears of wheat from the stalks.
- ’ri རི་བེ་ — n., start, beginning.
- ’rok རོ་ཁོག་ — n., river.
- ’ronman རོ་བོན་མན་ — n., thread [Chunmat: རོ་བོན་མན་ ’rotman].
- ’rotpa རོ་བོན་པ་ — n., appendix.
- sar, saro སར་ ས་རོ་ (*) adv., down.
- se-mala སེ་མ་ལ་ — v., die {Tib. སི་ śi, the lack of palatalisation shows that the Bumthang form is cognate and not a Tibetan loan}.
- seng སེང་ — n., wood, tree {Tib. སིང་ śin, the lack of palatalisation shows that the Bumthang form is cognate and not a Tibetan loan}.
- sengma སེང་མ་ — n., urine {Tib. གཅིན་ gcin, the lack of palatalisation shows that the Bumthang form is cognate and not a Tibetan loan}.
- sima སི་མ་ — n., nails (on digit) {Tib. སེན་མོ་ sen-mo}.

- sinla སིན་ལ་ — n., ring finger [Tang: སིན་ལག་ sinlak].
- sirsirma སིར་སིར་མ་ — adj., yellow {Tib. སེར་པོ་ ser-po ‘yellow’}.
- sotro སོ་ཏོ་ (*) adj., with crooked teeth.
- sum སུམ་ — num., three {Tib. གསུམ་ gsum}.
- sunla སུན་ལ་ — 1) n., night; 2) adv., at night.
- surkwa སུར་ཀྱ་ — n., [< ྱ་ kwa ‘tand’] canine teeth.
- sut-mala སུད་མ་ལ་ — v., kill, slaughter {Tib. √sad, pres. གསོད་ gsod}.
- sham-mala ཤམ་མ་ལ་ — v., set the table, display wares.
- shar ཤར་ — n., east {Tib. ཤར་ śar}.
- shekpa ཤེག་པ་ — n., scrotum [Chunmat: ཤེག་པད་ shekpat].
- shekpa khrangma ཤེག་པ་ཁང་མ་ — n., [literally ‘scrotum pip’] testicles [Chunmat: ཤེག་པད་ཁང་མ་ shekpat khrangma, Tang: ཤེག་པའི་ཁང་ shekpai khrang].
- shindi ཤིན་དི་ — adj., red {Daai Chin shen}.
- sho’long ཤོ་ལོང་ — n., strong wind.
- shu ཤུ་ — adv., hearsay evidential in interrogative sentences.
- shra ཤ་ — n., meat {Tib. ཤ་ śa, Bur. ལྟམ་ sāh, Lashi ལྟམ་, Daai Chin shā}.
- shrai ཤལ་ — n., drool, drivel.
- shrai-mala ཤལ་མ་ལ་ — v., overflow.
- shraima ཤལ་མ་ — n., harrow without teeth.
- shram ཤར་མ་ — n., shoes; cf. Dz. ལྷམ་ lham {Tib. ལྷམ་ lham}.
- shrambrat ཤར་མ་བར་ — n., sash for fastening traditional shoes at the top.
- shrap ཤར་པ་ — n., veranda.
- shrā, shrai ཤལ་ ཤལ་ — n., drool, drivel.
- shrokseng ཤོག་སེང་ — n., juniper; Dz. ཤུག་པ་ཤེང་ shupashing, Lat. *Juniperus*.
- shrop-mala ཤྲོཔ་མ་ལ་ — v., be retracted [of foreskin]; clasp or hold something cylindrical in shape; shin, climb by shinning.
- shropse ཤྲོཔ་སེ་ — adv., gerund of ཤྲོཔ་མ་ལ་ shrop-mala.
- shrordo ཤིར་ཏོ་ — n., extra chore performed in addition to the main task assigned in order to show devotion to one’s boss (cf. Dz. ཞོ་ཁ་ zhôkha).
- shrung-mala ཤྲུང་མ་ལ་ — v., shake everything into place (e.g. articles in a bag); heave whilst sobbing.
- shrup ཤྲུཔ་ — n., sheath. {Tib. བསྐྱབ་ bsub}.
- takpa thatsa ཏཀ་པ་ཐཱ་ས་ — n., nape of the neck, lower part of the neck near the shoulders.
- takpa ཏཀ་པ་ — n., back of the neck.
- tarpa ཏར་པ་ — n., whey; Dz. ཏར་ཕ་ d’âu.
- tarshing ཏར་ཤིང་ — n., prayer flag.
- tawa lem ཏཱ་ལམ་ — n., upper surface of the foot.

- tawa phop ཏ་ཕ་ཕོབ་ — n., instep of the foot.
- tawanang ཏ་ཕ་ནང་ — n., sole.
- tegolong ཏེ་གོ་ལོང་ — n., ankle.
- tempali ཏེམ་པ་ལི་ — n., 1) penis of an old man; cf. ཕུ་ཕུ་ *cucu*; 2) wooden penis used as a talisman suspended from the eaves of the house to ward off evil spirits {Tib. མཛེ་ mje, Kur. plik, Bur. ལི་ līh}.
- tep ཏེཔ་ — n., rib.
- tingma ཏིང་མ་ — n., heel.
- tiru ཏི་རུ་ — n., money, Ngütram (the Bhutanese currency unit); Dz. ཏིག་རུབ་ tiru.
- tiwit ཏི་མེད་ — n., navel {Tib. ལྷེ་བ་ lte-ba}.
- to ཏོ་ — n., nipple
- tok-mala ཏོག་མ་ལ་ — v., fondle, fiddle with something; cf. ཕོ་ར་མ་ལ་ *phor-mala*.
- toktemet ཏོག་ཏེ་མེད་ — n., cheekbones.
- tor-mala ཏོར་མ་ལ་ — v., sow.
- tosang ཏོས་ང་ — n., friend; cf. *charo*; Dz. ཏོ་ཚ་ totsha.
- tottong ཏོད་ཏོང་ — n., white collar worn in conjunction with a *chubak* (Dz. tögo) [Chogor: ཏོད་རུང་ totdung].
- tun-mala ཏུན་མ་ལ་ — v., show, display; cf. *chong-mala* {Tib. ལྷོན་ ston}.
- tup-mala ཏུཔ་མ་ལ་ — v., cut, slice {Tib. གཏུབ་ gtub}.
- turtsum ཏུར་ཐུམ་ (*) n., suctional movement made by the vagina around the penis; cf. Dz. ལྷུ་བ་ཐུམ་ tuzum ‘ibidem’, ལ་བ་ཐུམ་ khazum ‘sucking movement of the mouth’.
- thap ཐམ་ — n., oven {Tib. ཐམ་ thab}.
- thap-mala ཐམ་མ་ལ་ — v., argue, dispute, harangue.
- thatsa, cucui thatsa ཐཱ་ཙ་ ཕུ་ཕུ་ཐཱ་ཙ་ (*) n., corpus spongiosum penis; cf. Dz. ཐམ་ཙ་ thâtsa.
- thatsa-gatpo ཐཱ་ཙ་གཏཏོ་ (*) n., nerd, literally: ‘corpus spongiosum penis old man’; cf. Dz. ཐམ་ཙ་གཏཏོ་ thâtsa-gêp.
- thek ཐེག་ — num., one; art., a/an, a certain. {Tib. གཅིག་ gcig, Bur. ཏཱ་ tac, Ch. 隻 tsyek < *tek (1260c) ‘one of a pair’}
- thep ཐེཔ་ — n., spit, saliva.
- therma ཐེར་མ་ (*) adv., the day before yesterday.
- thimang ཐིམ་ང་ — n., thumb, big toe. {Tib. མཐེ་བོ་ mthe-bo}
- Thimphuk ཐིམ་ཕུག་ — n., Thimphu, capital city of Bhutan.
- thomala ཐོམ་ལ་ — n., arm above the elbow [Chunmat, Tang: ཐོ་ tho].
- thong-mala ཐོང་མ་ལ་ — v., drink; cf. Dz. འཕྱར་ thung {Tib. འཕྱར་ ḥthun}.
- thor-mala ཐོར་མ་ལ་ — v., pluck, pick; cf. Dz. བཅག་ནི་ câni.
- thot-mala ཐོད་མ་ལ་ — v., join, connect, bind.
- thu-mala ཐུ་མ་ལ་ — n., chop.

thung-mala ཐུང་མ་ལ་ — v., see; cf. Dz. མཐོང་ thong {Tib. མཐོང་ mthon}.

thung-mala ཐུང་མ་ལ་ — v., 1) commit, execute, perform; 2) dative or relinquitive aspectiviser.

thripa ཐྱིཔ་ — n., gall bladder {Tib. མཁྲིས་པ་ mkhris-pa, the sound change khr- > thr- ensures a Tibetic loan}.

thro ཐྱོ་ — v., aspectiviser meaning ‘persist, persevere, continue, be inexorably involved in’.

throi-mala ཐྱོའི་མ་ལ་ (*) v., weed, uproot, extirpate; cf. Dz. འབལ་ནི་ bāni {Tib. རྒྱལ་ ‘liberate, release’, the sound change sgr- > thr- ensures a Tibetic loan}.

throm-mala ཐྱོམ་མ་ལ་ — v., break, shatter.

thrung ཐུང་ (*) n., rice.

tsa ཅ་ — n., vein, artery {Tib. ཅ་ rtsa}.

tsamadü ཅམ་དུ་ — adv., intensely, a lot, much.

tsamet ཅམེད་ — n., brother’s daughter or the wife of brother’s son (for a female speaker); sister’s daughter or the wife of sister’s son (for a male speaker); cf. Dz. ཅམ་ tsham.

tsau ཅུ་ — n., brother’s son or husband of brother’s daughter (for a female speaker); sister’s son or husband of sister’s daughter (for a male speaker); cf. Dz. ཅའ་ tshao.

tsirphat ཅིར་ཕད་ — n., wart.

tshai ཅའི་ — plural suffix.

tshakti ཅཀྱི་ — n., crown.

tshuk-mala ཅུག་མ་ལ་ — v., can, be able to.

tshü-mala ཅུམ་མ་ལ་ — v., seek, look for, search {Tib. འཇོལ་ htshol}.

’ugu ལུ་གུ་ — n., 1) father’s brother; 2) mother’s sister’s husband; [Chunmat: ལུ་གོ་ ’ugo].

wagam ར་གམ་ — n., jaw.

waktem ར་གཏེམ་ (*) n., [< Dz. ར་གཏེམ་ waktêm] hip movements of a woman during intercourse.

ware ར་རེ་ — adv., emotive particle gently demanding the attention of the person addressed and underscoring the speaker’s authority; cf. Dz. ར་རེ་ ’mare.

wen རེན་ — v., to be (establishing the identity of referent) {Tib. ཡིན་ yin, the discrepancy in the initials ensures that the Bumthang form is not a Tibetan loan}.

wet རེད་ — pro., you (sg.).

wi རི་ — pro., you (sg.erg.).

’wai དབའི་ — v., imperative of རོ་མ་ལ་ ’o-mala.

ya ཡ་ — interj., grab it!, take it!, here you are!

yah ཡམ་ — interj., watch out!

yak ཡག་ — n., lower arm from the elbow on down, lower arm and hand {Tib. ལག་ lag, Bur. ལོ་ལོ་ lak}.

- yak ཡག — n., yak, i.e., male yak; cf. *bre* {Tib. གཡག་ g.yag}.
- yakbit ཡག་བིད་ (*) n., back of the hand.
- yaknangma ཡག་ནང་མ་ — n., palm of the hand, the inner surface of the extended palm and fingers.
- yaktshik ཡག་ཚིག་ — n., wrist {Tib. ལག་ཚིག་ lag-tshigs}.
- yam ཡམ་ — n., road, way {Tib. ལམ་ lam, Bur. ལམ་ lamh}.
- yampat ཡམ་པ་ — adv., tomorrow.
- yampat-nanmun ཡམ་པ་ནན་མུན་ — adv., one of these days, soon.
- yan-mala ཡན་མེལ་ — v., obey.
- yanga ཡང་ — num., five {Tib. ལྔ་ lña, Bur. ལྔ་ ñāh, Ch. 五 nguX < *C.ŋʰa? (0058a)}.
- yang-mala ཡང་མེལ་ — v., stand, stand up; e.g. ཅུ་ཡང་དྲོ་ *cucu yang-da* ‘I have an erection’ (literally: ‘penis is standing’).
- yangchenthek ཡང་ཆེན་ཐེག་ — num., one hundred sixty thousand.
- yat ཡད་ — n., chore, work, task {Tib. ལས་ las}
- yigu ཡི་གུ་ — n., letter; cf. Dz. ཡི་གུ་ yig’u {Tib. ཡི་གེ་ yi-ge}.
- yin ཡིན་ — pro., you (pl.).
- yinle ཡིན་ལེ་ — pro., you (pl.erg.).
- yo ཡོ་ — clause-final interj., hey, y’hear.
- yö ཡོ་ལ་ — n., rain [Tang: ཡོ་ལི་ yoi] {Wr.Bur. རྒྱ་ rwā, Ch. 雨 hjuX < *C.gʷa? (0100a)}.
- yung-mala ཡུང་མེལ་ — v., get, fetch.
- ’ya རྩ་ (*) n., deposit at the bottom of copper pans.
- zama, zam ཟམ་ ཟམ་ — n., cooked rice.
- zat-mala ཟད་མེལ་ — v., finish, complete [governs the gerund in <se>].
- zhimnyae རིམ་ཉལེ་ (*) n., cat {Tib. རི་མི་ zi-mi, the change *ly > ʒ suggests a Tibetic loan}.
- zon རོན་ — num., two {Tib. རྩོན་ zuñ ‘pair’, Bur. རྩོ་ cuṃ, Ch. (?) 雙 sraewng < *sʰroŋ (1200a)}.
- zödem རོད་ལེ་མ་ (*) n., tasty, pungent, soft yak cheese with veins of blue and black fungus; Dz. རོད་ལེ་མ་ z’öthü.
- zu-mala རུ་མེལ་ — v., eat {Kur. zù, Tib. རུ་ za, Bur. རུ་ cāh, Japhug rGy. ndza, Ch. 咀 dzjoX < *dza? (0046u)}.
- zhego རེ་གོ་ — n., food.
- zhit-mala རིད་མེལ་ — v., forget.
- zhra རྩ་ — pro., what.
- zhrabudze རྩ་བུ་ཙེ་ — adv., how much, how many.
- zhrap རྩ་བ་ — n., layer of butterfat on top of salted Bhutanese tea {Tib. (?) རྩ་ག་ ʒag}.
- zhrong རྩྭ་ — n., worm.
- zhror རྩྭ་ — n., dialect word for *churma* ‘native beer’.

Bibliography

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2012. ‘The essence of mirativity’, *Linguistic Typology*, 16: 435-485.
- Aris, Michael. 1979a. *Bhutan, the Early History of a Himalayan Kingdom*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- Aris, Michael.. 1979b, ‘Notes on the history of the Mon-Yul corridor’, pp. 9-20 in Michael Aris and Aung San Suu Kyi, eds., *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson: Proceedings of the International Seminar of Tibetan Studies*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- Baxter, William Hubbard. 1992. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baxter, William Hubbard, and Laurent Sagart. 2011. Baxter-Sagart Old Chinese Reconstruction (Version 1.00), online at < <http://crlao.ehess.fr/document.php?id=1217> >.
- Berlin, Brent, and Paul Kay. 1969. *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bickel, Balthasar, 1997. ‘Spatial operations in deixis, cognition, and culture: where to orient oneself in Belhare’, pp. 46-83 in Jan Nuyts and Eric Pederson, eds., *Language and Conceptualization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bodt, Timotheus Adrianus. 2012. ལྷ་མོ་འབྲུག་གི་རྒྱལ་སྐད་ཀྱི་ཁྱེད་ཀྱི་རྒྱུ་རྩུ་དང་མི་རིགས་སྤྱོད་རིགས་
ལྟགས་སྤྱོད་ རྒྱལ་སྐད་ཀྱི་གསལ་བའི་སློན་མི་གསལ་བ། | *The New Lamp Clarifying the History, Peoples, Languages and Traditions of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon*. Wageningen: Monpasang Publications.
- Bodt, Timotheus Adrianus. 2015. ‘Ethnolinguistic Survey of Monyu’l’, *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*.
- Boroditsky, Lera. 2011. ‘How languages construct time’, pp. 333-341 in Stanislas Dehaene and Elizabeth Brannon, eds., *Space, Time and Number in the Brain: Searching for the Foundations of Mathematical Thought*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Clauberg, Johannes. 1663. *Ars Etymologica Teutonum: E Philosophicæ fontibus derivata*. Duisburg: Daniel Asendorp.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- de Condillac, Étienne Bonnot. 1746. *Essai sur l'origine des connoissances humaines: Ouvrage où l'on réduit à un seul principe tout ce qui concerne l'Entendement Humain* (two volumes). Amsterdam: Pierre Mortier.
- Darwin, Charles Robert. 1871. *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (two volumes). London: John Murray.
- Dawkins, Richard. 1982. *The Extended Phenotype*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2012. 'Still mirative after all these years', *Linguistic Typology*, 16: 529-564.
- Demetrius, L., and M. Ziehe. 1984. 'The measurement of Darwinian fitness in human populations', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 222: 33-50.
- van Driem, George. 1991. གཞུང་འབྲེལ་ཨྲོང་ལོ་སྐད་ (འཛམ་གླིང་ཐུབ་ཐོག་མ་པའི་ཡིག་ཐོག་) འབྲི་ལུགས་ལམ་སྟོན། *Guide to Official Dzongkha Romanization*. Thimphu: Royal Government of Bhutan.
- van Driem, George. 1992. ཨྲོང་ལོ་བད་སྟོན་པའི་གཞུང་། *A Grammar of Dzongkha*. Thimphu: Royal Government of Bhutan.
- van Driem, George. 1993. 'The phonologies of Dzongkha and the Bhutanese liturgical language', *Zentralasiatische Studien* 24, 36-44.
- van Driem, George. 1995. *Een eerste grammaticale verkenning van het Bumthang, een taal van midden-Bhutan, met een overzicht van de talen en volkeren van Bhutan*. Leiden: Centrum voor Niet-Westerse Studiën.
- van Driem, George.. 2001. *Languages of the Himalayas: An Ethnolinguistic Handbook of the Greater Himalayan Region, containing an Introduction to the Symbiotic Theory of Language* (2 volumes). Leiden: Brill.
- van Driem, George. 2003. 'The Language Organism: The Leiden theory of language evolution', in Jiří Mírovský, Anna Kotěšovcová and Eva Hajičová, eds., *Proceedings of the XVIIth International Congress of Linguists, Prague, July 24-29, 2003*. Prague: Matfyzpress vydavatelství Matematicko-fyzikální fakulty Univerzity Karlovy.
- van Driem, George. 2004a. 'Language as organism: A brief introduction to the Leiden theory of language evolution', pp. 1-9 in Ying-chin Lin, Fang-min Hsu, Chun-chih Lee, Jackson T.-S. Sun, Hsiu-fang Yang and Dah-an Ho, eds., *Studies on Sino-Tibetan Languages* (Language and Linguistics Monograph Series W-4). Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- van Driem, George. 2004b. 'Bhutan's endangered languages programme under the Dzongkha Development Authority: Three rare gems', pp. 294-326 in Karma Ura and Sonam Kinga, eds., *The Spider and the Piglet: Proceedings of the First International Seminar on Bhutan Studies*. Thimphu: Centre for Bhutan Studies.
- van Driem, George. 2005. 'The language organism: The Leiden theory of language evolution', pp. 331-340 in James W. Minett and William S.-Y. Wang, eds., *Language*

- Acquisition, Change and Emergence: Essays in Evolutionary Linguistics*. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.
- van Driem, George. 2007. 'A holistic approach to the fine art of grammar writing: The Dallas Manifesto', pp. 93-184 in Novel Kishore Rai, Yogendra Prasad Yadav, Bhim N. Regmi and Balaram Prasain, eds., *Recent Studies in Nepalese Linguistics*. Kathmandu: Linguistic Society of Nepal.
- van Driem, George. 2008a. 'The language organism: Parasite or mutualist?', pp. 101-112, Vol. 2 in Rick Derksen, Jeroen Wiedenhof and Sjoerd Siebinga, eds., *Evidence and Counter-Evidence* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, vol. 33). Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- van Driem, George. 2008b. 'The origin of language: Symbiosism and Symbiomism', pp. 381-400 in John D. Bengtson, ed., *In Hot Pursuit of Language in Prehistory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Enfield, Nicholas J., ed. 2002. *Ethnosyntax: Explorations in Grammar and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Enfield, Nicholas J. 2003. *Linguistic epidemiology: Semantics and grammar of language contact in mainland Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Enfield, Nicholas J. 2008. 'Transmission biases in linguistic epidemiology'. *Journal of Language Contact* 2: 295-306.
- Everett, Daniel L. 2005. 'Cultural constraints on grammar and cognition in Pirahã: Another look at the design features of human language', *Current Anthropology*, 46 (4): 621-646.
- Friedman, Victor A. 2012. 'Perhaps mirativity is phlogiston, but admirativity is perfect: On Balkan evidential strategies', *Linguistic Typology*, 16: 505-527.
- Gennari, Silvia P., Sloman, Steven A., Malt, Barbara C., and Fitch, W. Tecumseh. 2002. 'Motion events in language and cognition', *Cognition*, 83, 49-49.
- Gilbert, Aubrey L., Terry Regier, Paul Kay and Richard B. Ivry. 2006. 'Whorf hypothesis is supported in the right visual field but not the left', *Proceedings of National Academy of Science*, 103: 489-494.
- Gilbert, Aubrey L., Terry Regier, Paul Kay and Richard B. Ivry. 2008. 'Support for lateralization of the Whorf effect beyond the realm of color discrimination', *Brain and Language*, 105: 91-98.
- Gladstone, William Ewart. 1858. *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gordon, Peter. 2004. 'Numerical cognition without words: evidence from Amazonia', *Science*, 306: 496-499.

- Grace, George William. 1981. *An Essay on Language*. Columbia, South Carolina: Hornbeam Press.
- Grace, George William. 1987. *The Linguistic Construction of Reality*. London: Croom Helm.
- Grafen, Alan. 2009. 'Formalizing Darwinism and inclusive fitness theory', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 364: 3135-3141.
- Greene, David Hubert (= Dáithní ó Huaithne). 1966. *The Irish Language — An Ghaeilge* (Saol Agus Cultúr in Éirinn — Irish Life and Culture XIV). Dublin: Cultural Relations Committee of Ireland
- Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil and Bernard Comrie, eds. 2005. *The World Atlas of Linguistic Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haviland, John B. 1993. 'Anchoring, iconicity, and orientation in Guugu Yimithirr pointing gestures', *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 3: 3-45.
- Hengeveld, Kees, and Hella Olbertz. 2012. "Didn't you know? Mirativity does exist!", *Linguistic Typology*, 16: 487-503.
- Hill, Nathan Wayne. 2005. 'The verb 'bri 'to write' in Old Tibetan', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 68: 177-182.
- Hill, Nathan Wayne. 2010. *A Lexicon of Tibetan Verb Stems as Reported by the Grammatical Tradition*. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hill, Nathan Wayne. 2012. ' "Mirativity" does not exist: ḥdug in "Lhasa" Tibetan and other suspects', *Linguistic Typology*, 16: 389-433.
- Hill, Nathan Wayne. 2013. 'Contextual semantics of 'Lhasa' Tibetan evidentials', *Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, 10 (3): 47-54.
- Hodgson, Brian Houghton. 1853. 'Sifân and Hórsók vocabularies, with another special exposition in the wide range of Mongolidan affinities and remarks on the lingual and physical characteristics of the family', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, XXII (II): 121-51.
- von Humboldt, Wilhelm. 1822. 'Ueber das vergleichende Sprachstudium in Beziehung auf die verschiedenen Epochen der Sprachentwicklung', *Abhandlungen der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, historisch-philosophische Klasse*, aus den Jahren 1820 und 1821: 239-260.
- von Humboldt, Wilhelm. 1825. 'Über das Entstehen der grammatischen Formen und ihren Einfluß auf die Ideenentwicklung', *Abhandlungen der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, historisch-philosophische Klasse*, aus den Jahren 1822 und 1823: 401-430.
- von Humboldt, Wilhelm. 1836 [posthumous]. Über die Kawi-Sprache auf der Insel Java, nebst einer Einleitung über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues

- und ihren Einfluß auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts. Berlin: Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hyslop, Gwendolyn. 2014. 'On the category of speaker expectation of interlocutor knowledge in Kurtöp', pp. 201-214 in Herman Leung, Zachary O'Hagan, Sarah Bakst, Auburn Lutzross, Jonathan Manker, Nicholas Rolle and Katie Sardinha, eds., *Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, February 7-9, 2014*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Imaeda Yoshiro, and Françoise Pommaret. 1990. 'Note sur la situation linguistique du Bhoutan et étude préliminaire des termes de parenté', Tadeusz Skorupski, ed., *Indo-Tibetan Studies: Papers in honour and appreciation of Professor David L. Snellgrove's contribution to Indo-Tibetan Studies (Buddhica Britannica, series continue II)*, Tring, United Kingdom: Institute of Buddhist Studies, pp. 115-127.
- Imai, Mutsumi, 2000. 'Universal ontological knowledge and a bias toward language-specific categories in the construal of individuation', pp. 139-160 in Susanne Nie-meier and René Dirven, eds. *Evidence for Linguistic Relativity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Imai, Mutsumi & Reiko Mazuka, 2003. 'Re-evaluating linguistic relativity: language-specific categories and the role of universal ontological knowledge in the construal of individuation', pp. 429-463 in Derdre Gentner and Susan Goldin-Meadow, eds., *Language in Mind: Advances in the Study of Language and Cognition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Jacques, Guillaume. 2010. 'Notes complémentaires sur les verbes à alternance 'dr-/br-en tibétain', *Revue d'Études Tibétaines*, 19: 27-29.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1959. 'On linguistic aspects of translation', pp. 232-239 in Reuben A. Brouwer, ed., *On Translation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1964 [1957]. *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.
- Karma Tshering of Gaselô and George van Driem. 1998. འགྲུལ་ཤིང་། *Dzongkha*. Leiden: School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies.
- Karma Tshering de Gaselô et Georges van Driem. 2014. *Parlons dzongkha* [avec un avant-propos par Françoise Pommaret]. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Kay, Paul, and Luisa Maffi. 1999. 'Color appearance and the emergence and evolution of basic color lexicons', *American Anthropologist*, 101: 743-760.
- Kay, Paul, and Luisa Maffi. 1999. 'Color appearance and the emergence and evolution of basic color lexicons', *American Anthropologist*, 101: 743-760.

- Kay, Paul, and Luisa Maffi. 2005. 'Colour terms', pp. 534-537 in Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil and Bernard Comrie, eds., *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kay, Paul, and Terry Regier. 2007. 'Color naming universals: the case of Berinmo', *Cognition*, 102: 289-298.
- Keller, E. F. 1994. 'Fitness: reproductive ambiguities', pp. 120-121 in E.F. Keller and E. Lloyd, eds., *Keywords in Evolutionary Biology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Lai, Vicky Tzuyin, and Lera Boroditsky. 2013. 'The immediate and chronic influence of spatio-temporal metaphors on the mental representations of time in English, Mandarin and Mandarin-English speakers', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9 April 2013 <doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00142>.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1997. 'From outer to inner space: linguistic categories and non-linguistic thinking', pp. 13-45 in Jan Nuyts and Eric Pederson, eds., *Language and Conceptualization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2000. 'Yéli dnye and the theory of basic colour terms', *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 10 (1): 1-53.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2003a. 'Language and mind: let's get the issues straight', pp. 25-46 in Dedre Gentner and Susan Goldin-Meadow, eds., *Language in Mind: Advances in the Study of Language and Thought*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2003b. *Space in Language and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Steven C. 2008. 'Landscape, seascape and the ontology of places on Rossel Island, Papua New Guinea'. *Language Sciences*, 30: 256-290.
- Levinson, Stephen C., and Penelope Brown. 1994. 'Immanuel Kant among the Tenejapans: anthropology as empirical philosophy', *Ethos*, 22: 3-41.
- Levinson, Stephen C., Sotaro Kita, Daniel B.M. Haun and Björn H. Rasch. 2002. 'Returning the tables: language affects spatial reasoning', *Cognition*, 84: 155-188.
- Levinson, Stephen C., Sergio Meira and the Language and Cognition Group. 2003. 'Natural concepts in the spatial topological domain: adpositional meanings in cross-linguistic perspective: an exercise in semantic typology', *Language*, 79: 485-516.
- Li, Peggy, and Lila Gleitman. 2002. 'Turning the tables: language and spatial reasoning', *Cognition*, 83: 265- 294.
- Locke, John. 1690. *An Essay concerning Humane Understanding, in Four Books*. London: Tho. Basset.

- Lucy, John A., 1997. 'The linguistics of "colour"', pp. 320-346 in C.L. Hardin & Luisa Maffi, eds., *Colour Categories in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maine de Biran, François-Pierre-Gonthier. 1932 [1815]. 'Note sur les réflexions de Maupertuis et de Turgot au sujet de l'origine des langues', pp. 315-338, vol. X in Pierre Tisserand, ed., *Œuvres de Maine de Biran* (14 vols.). Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan.
- Majid, Asifa, Melissa Bowerman, Sotaro Kita, Daniel B.M. Haun and Stephen C. Levinson. 2004. 'Can language restructure cognition? The case for space', *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8: 108-114.
- Mathesius, Vilém. 1947. 'O konkurenci vidů v českém vyjadřování slovesném', pp. 195-202 in *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt*. Praha: Melantrich.
- de Maupertuis, Pierre Louis Moreau. 1756a [originally 1748]. 'Réflexions philosophiques sur l'origine des langues et la signification des mots', pp. 258-309, vol. 1 in *Œuvres* (nouvelle édition corrigée et augmentée, 4 vols.). Lyon: Jean-Marie Bruyset.
- de Maupertuis, Pierre Louis Moreau. 1756b. 'Dissertation sur les différents moyens dont les hommes se sont servis pour exprimer leurs idées', pp. 435-468, vol. 3 in *Œuvres* (nouvelle édition corrigée et augmentée, 4 vols.). Lyon: Jean-Marie Bruyset.
- Maynard Smith, John. 2000. *Evolution and the Theory of Games*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maynard Smith, John. 2004. *Animal Signals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McWhorter, John H. 2014. *The Language Hoax: Why the World Looks the Same in any Language*. New York: Oxford University Press [In this rant against his own 'cartoonish perspectives' and simplified misrepresentation of linguistic relativity, the author boasts that his parochial understanding of language has been qualified as 'stunningly obtuse' (p. 55).]
- Michailovsky, Boyd, and Martine Mazaudon. 1994. 'Preliminary notes on the languages of the Bumthang group', *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Fagernes 1992* (Per Kvärne, ed.), Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture (Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning), Vol. 2, pp. 545-557.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2005a. *Créoles, écologie sociale, évolution linguistique: Cours donnés au Collège de France durant l'automne 2003*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2005b. 'Language evolution: The population genetics way', pp. 30-52 in Günter Hauska, ed., *Gene, Sprachen und ihre Evolution*. Regensburg: Universitätsverlag Regensburg.
- Müller, Friedrich Max. 1870. 'The science of language', *Nature*, I: 256-259.
- Munnich, Edward, and Barbara Landau. 2003. 'The effects of spatial language and spatial representation: setting some boundaries', pp. 113-15 in Dedre Gentner and Susan Goldin-Meadow, eds., *Language in Mind: Advances in the Study of Language and Thought*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Nishi Yoshio. 1999. *Four Papers on Burmese*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Pederson, Eric, 1995. 'Language as context, language as means: spatial cognition and habitual language use', *Cognitive Linguistics*, 6: 33-62.
- Pederson, Eric, Eve Danziger, David Wilkins, Stephen Levinson, Sotaro Kita and Gunter Senft. 1998. 'Semantic typology and spatial conceptualization', *Language*, 74: 557-589.
- Pica, Pierre, Cathy Lemer, Veronique Izard and Stanislas Dehaene. 2004. 'Exact and approximate arithmetic in an Amazonian indigene group', *Science*, 306: 499-503.
- Pott, August Friedrich. 1848. 'Die wissenschaftliche Gliederung der Sprachwissenschaft: eine Skizze', *Jahrbücher der freien deutschen Akademie*, 1: 185-190.
- Quine, Willard Van Orman. 1987. *Quiddities: An Intermittently Philosophical Dictionary*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Quine, Willard Van Orman. 1990. *Pursuit of Truth*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Regier, Terry, Paul Kay and Richard S. Cook. 2005. 'Focal colors are universal after all', *Proceedings of National Academy of Science*, 102: 8386-8391.
- Roberson, Debi. 2005. 'Color categories are culturally diverse in cognition as well as in language', *Cross-Cultural Research*, 39: 56-71.
- Roberson, Debi, Jules Davidoff and Ian Davies. 2000. 'Color categories are not universal: replications and new evidence from a stone-age culture', *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 129 (3): 369 – 398.
- Roberson, Debi, Jules Davidoff, Ian Davies and Laura R. Shapiro. 2005a. 'Color categories: Evidence for the cultural relativity hypothesis', *Cognitive Psychology*, 50: 315-412.
- Roberson, Debi, Ian Davies, Greville G. Corbett and Marieta van der Vyver. 2005b. 'Free-sorting of colors across cultures: Are there universal grounds for grouping?', *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, 5: 87-124.

- Rutgers, Roland. 1998. *Yamphu*. Leiden: School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies.
- Saj, Arnaud, and Orly Fuhrman, Patrik Vuilleumier and Lera Boroditsky. 2014 'Patients With Left Spatial Neglect Also Neglect the "Left Side" of Time', *Psychological Science*, 25 (1):207-214.
- Saunders, B.A.C., and J. van Brakel. 1997. 'Are there non-trivial constraints on colour categorisation?', *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 20: 167-228.
- Shafer, Robert. 1954. 'The linguistic position of Dwags', *Oriens, Zeitschrift der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Orientforschung* 7, 348-356.
- Shafer, Robert. 1955. 'Classification of the Sino-Tibetan languages', *Word, Journal of the Linguistic Circle of New York* 11, 94-111.
- Shafer, Robert. 1974. *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Schleicher, August. 1863. *Die Darwinsche Theorie und die Sprachwissenschaft: Offenes Sendschreiben an Herrn Dr. Ernst Haeckel, a.o. Professor der Zoologie und Direktor des zoologischen Museums an der Universität Jena*. Weimar: Böhlau.
- Schuessler, Axel. 2007. *ABC Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Snellgrove, David Llewellyn. 1961. *Himalayan Pilgrimage: A Study of Tibetan Religion by a Traveller through Western Nepal*. Oxford: Bruno Cassirer.
- Snellgrove, David Llewellyn. 1967. *The Nine Ways of Bon: Excerpts from gZi-brjid*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stunová, Anna. 1991. 'In defence of language-specific invariant meanings of aspect in Russian and Czech', *Studies in West Slavic and Baltic Linguistics — Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 16: 291-313.
- Stunová, Anna. 1993. *A Contrastive Study of Russian and Czech Aspect: Invariance vs. Discourse*. Universiteit van Amsterdam: Doctoral dissertation.
- Thibodeau, Paul H., and Lera Boroditsky. 2011. 'Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning', *Public Library of Science One*, 6 (2): e16782.
- White, Sir John Claude. 1909. *Sikkim and Bhutan: Twenty-One Years on the North-East Frontier, 1887-1908*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee. 1940. 'Science and Linguistics', *Technology Review*, 42 (6): 229-231, 247-248.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee. 1956. *Language, Thought and Reality*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Technology Press of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1967. 'On the semantics of the verbal aspect in Polish', pp. 2231-2249, Vol. III in *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his*

Seventieth Birthday, 11 October 1966 (Janua Linguarum Studia Memoriae Nicolai van Wijk Dedicata, Series Maior, XXXIII). Mouton: The Hague and Paris.

Winawer, Jonathan, Nathan Witthoft, Michael C. Frank, Lisa Wu, Alex R. Wade and Lera Boroditsky. 2007. 'Russian blues reveal effects of language on color discrimination', *Proceedings of National Academy of Science*, 104: 7780-7785.