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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-Westere 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 comparatists. 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 Karma Tshe-ring of Gaselô and myself appeared in 1998 under the title Dzongkha as the first volume in Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region, a series launched by His Excellency 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 Mônpa, 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 Tibetic 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 traditore 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 ‘up-liftment’, 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 symbiogenetically 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. ‘isolirend, agglutinirend, 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adh.</td>
<td>adhortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art.</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bur.</td>
<td>Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col.</td>
<td>collective suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem.</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dz.</td>
<td>Dzongkha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emp.</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.p.</td>
<td>experienced past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erg.</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ger.</td>
<td>gerund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.p.</td>
<td>inferred past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf.</td>
<td>infinitival future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interj.</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kur.</td>
<td>Kurtöp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nep.</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>nominalising suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num.</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.Bur.</td>
<td>Old Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opt.</td>
<td>optative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.Tib.</td>
<td>Old Tibetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.</td>
<td>past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postp.</td>
<td>postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>present tense stem (Tibetan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro.</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>interrogative suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rGy.</td>
<td>rGyalrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel.</td>
<td>telic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib.</td>
<td>Tibetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>volitional future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wr.Bur.</td>
<td>Written Burmese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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 དུན་མཚན 'Ucen script are provided between parentheses. Roman Dzongkha is based on the phonology of the standard or prestige dialect of Dzongkha spoken in སྒང་ Wang and ཆུ་ Thê, by which names the ཆུས་ Thimphu and ལུ་སྤོག་ Pûnakha 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 [ ˆ ]. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voiceless</th>
<th>Aspirated</th>
<th>Voiced</th>
<th>Devoiced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>velar plosives</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatal plosives</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retroflex plosives</td>
<td>tr</td>
<td>thr</td>
<td>dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dental plosives</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilabial plosives</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>ph</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilabial-palatal affricates</td>
<td>pc</td>
<td>pch</td>
<td>bj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alveolar affricates</td>
<td>ts</td>
<td>tsh</td>
<td>dz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatal sibilants</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>zh</td>
<td>zh’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alveolar sibilants</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voiceless</th>
<th>Voiced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voiced velar nasal</td>
<td>’ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced palatal nasal</td>
<td>’ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced dental nasal</td>
<td>’n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced bilabial nasal</td>
<td>’m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced palatal approximant</td>
<td>’y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced lateral</td>
<td>’l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless lateral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced labiovelar approximant</td>
<td>’w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced apical trill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless apical fricative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless glottal approximant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dzongkha distinguishes thirteen vowels. Vowel length is distinctive. The diaeresis marks the inherently long vowels ä [æː], ö [œː] en ü [yː]. The vowels a, e, i, o, u also occur as long vowels, in which case they are marked by a circumflex accent á, è, í, ó, ú. 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

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
i  & î  & ü  & u  & û  \\
e  & ê  & ö  & o  & ô  \\
ä  & a  & â  \\
\end{array}
\]

Written Dzongkha in the 'Ucen script is transliterated in Tibetological transliteration: k, kh, g, ŋ; c, ch, j, ŋ; t, th, d, n; p, ph, b, m; ts, tsh, dz, w; ż, z, ḫ; y, r, l; š, 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 ོག་ 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’amgang, known in Bumthang as Zhramzhrong. 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 Tawang, for which the orthography བོད་དབང་ is also attested, in the Indian state of Arunācal Pradeś. 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) ‘Tâkpa’ material, which Shafer incorrectly identified with the Tibetan dialect of Dags-po, situated southeast of Lha-sa, south of the gTsañ-po and west of the Koñ-po area. Hodgson’s ‘Tâkpa’ data,
however, originate from Tawang, a former Tibetan vassal state northeast of Bhutan which is known in Tibetan sources as the Dag-pa Tsho-lha ‘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 Dགས་པ་ཁ་ Dakpakha or Dགས་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.  Chummat,  Chogor,  'Ura and  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 རྩུམ་ཞིང་ལ། Thrumshingla (Khrum-śing-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 རྡ་ཤོས་སངས་སོའི་ Dr’âsho Sanggâ Dôji ‘Sangye Dorji’ of  Chutô, 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 གཤིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིིི་
Pêma Döndr’u of གཞིས་ཨི་ Zungnge in Chunmat, གཞིས་ཨི་ Shêrapla, former གཞིས་ཨི་ gap of ‘Ura, གཞིས་ཨི་ Camkhar in Chogor, གཞིས་ཨི་ Minjur, former gap of གཞིས་ཨི་ Sanggâ Zâm, a woman from གཞིས་ཨི་ Dazur in Tang and གཞིས་ཨི་ Chôdrö, a woman from གཞིས་ཨི་ Tahung in Tang.

The dialect of གཞིས་ཨི་ 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 གཞིས་ཨི་ Trongsabi ‘language of Trongsa’ and is also sometimes called གཞིས་ཨི་ 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 ए, Bumthang has a complete initial series of apical trilled fricatives ऑ shra, ऑ hr and ऑ zhr. Like Roman Bumthang ए hy, the symbols ऑ shra, ऑ hr and ऑ zhr do not represent retroflex sounds or consonant clusters, but single initial consonant phonemes unique to the Bumthang language. The shra is a voiceless apical trilled fricative [ʂ̥], e.g. ऑ shra [ra] ‘meat’, ऑ shrai [rai] ‘drool, drivel’, ऑ shraima [rai] ‘toothless harrow’, ऑ shrap [rap] ‘veranda’, ऑ shram [ram] ‘shoe’ (Dz. རྣ lham); ऑ shrup [rup] ‘sheath’, ऑ shrung [run] ‘shake everything into place (e.g. things in a sack), heave whilst sobbing’, ऑ shrokseng [roksen] ‘juniper’ (Dz. རུ་ལུན་ shupashing); ऑ shrordo [rordo] ‘an extra chore performed in addition to the main task assigned in order to show devotion to one’s boss’ (Dz. རྣ་ zhôkha).
TABLE 3

Bumthang initial consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voiceless</th>
<th>aspirated</th>
<th>voiced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>velar plosives</td>
<td>k ལ</td>
<td>kh ལ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatal plosives</td>
<td>c ལ</td>
<td>ch ལ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retroflex plosives</td>
<td>tr ལ</td>
<td>thr ལ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dental plosives</td>
<td>t ལ</td>
<td>th ལ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilabial plosives</td>
<td>p ལ</td>
<td>ph ལ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alveolar affricates</td>
<td>ts ལ</td>
<td>tsh ལ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatal sibilants</td>
<td>sh ལ</td>
<td>zh ལ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alveolar sibilants</td>
<td>s ལ</td>
<td>z ལ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottal approximant</td>
<td>h ལ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatal-glottal fricative</td>
<td>hy ལ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velar nasal</td>
<td>ng ལ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatal nasal</td>
<td>ny ལ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dental nasal</td>
<td>n ལ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilabial nasal</td>
<td>m ལ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatal approximant</td>
<td>y ལ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labiovelar approximant</td>
<td>w ལ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lateral liquid</td>
<td>lh ལ</td>
<td>l ལ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apical trilled fricative</td>
<td>shr ལ</td>
<td>hr ལ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>low tone</th>
<th>high tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ng  ཉ</td>
<td>'ng ཉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ཉ</td>
<td>'n ཉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y ཉ</td>
<td>'y ཉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l ཉ</td>
<td>'l ཉ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. མ་ ‘ai ‘who’ vs. ་་ ‘ayā ‘jackal’, བ་ ་ ‘ya ‘deposit at the bottom of copper pans’ vs. བ ་ ‘ya! ‘grab it!’ In contrast to Dzongkha, Bumthang syllables beginning with initial r may also be in high register tone, e.g. ར་ ་ ‘rat ‘bamboo fibre for weaving traditional Bhutanese bowls’ vs. ་ ར་ ‘rato ‘root’, ར ་ ‘ri ‘start, beginning’ vs. ་ ར ‘ri ‘hill, mountain’, ་ ར ‘ra ‘hair on scalp’ vs. ་ ར ‘ra ‘goat’, ་ ར ་ ‘rok ‘river’, ་ ར ་ ‘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: \( \text{kr}, \text{khr}, \text{gr}, \text{pr}, \text{phr}, \text{br}, \text{mr}, '\text{mr} \). Therefore, in Bumthang, the combinations ꜒ and ང, for example, represent the initial cluster ꜒ and ང and not single retroflex phonemes as in Dzongkha, e.g. གྱི་ སྙེང་ ‘village’, གྲི་ཁྲང་ ‘crane (bird)’, གྲ་བྱུང་ ‘grangka grangae ‘count!’ (literally ‘count the counting!’), གྲ། སྤྱར ‘compete’, གྲ། སྤྱར (dialect form for གྲ། སྤྱར ‘priu’) ‘rhesus monkey’ (as opposed to གྲ། སྤྱར སྤྱར ‘golden langur’), གྲ། སྤྱར prat-mala ‘fight’, གྲ། སྤྱར སྤྱར སྤྱར wet neng ngat phratsang ‘you and I shall get into conflict’, གྲ་ལ་ brat-mala ‘scratch’, གྲ་ལ་ branma ‘Tatary buckwheat’ (Fagopyrum tataricum, Dz. གྲ་ བ་ ཅ།), གྲ། སྤྱར ‘paddy’, གྲ། སྤྱར ‘flour to thicken soup with’, གྲ། སྤྱར ‘blackhead, sebum’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
<th>Bumthang initial clusters with ( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voiceless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velar plosives</td>
<td>꜒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilabial plosives</td>
<td>ང</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilabial nasals</td>
<td>ང</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bumthang has five initial consonant clusters of which \( l \) is the second element: ꜒, ꜔, ང, ང, ང, e.g. གྲ་ སྤྱར klatpa ‘brains’, གྲ་ སྤྱར སྤྱར glabae ~ སྤྱར glabä ‘hit!’; གྲ། སྤྱར ble ‘four’, གྲ་ སྤྱར སྤྱར maplagae ‘don’t make noise!’, གྲ་ སྤྱར plakta ‘noise’, གྲ་ སྤྱར ꜒ blakbloga ‘sloppy, spilt’ [said of fluid or of handwriting], གྲ་ སྤྱར blaktang ‘spilt fluid, goo, sticky mass, viscous slime’, གྲ་ སྤྱར mlakmla ‘viscous, syrupy, oozing’, གྲ་ སྤྱར mlaks ‘[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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>high tone</th>
<th>low tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velar plosives</td>
<td>kl  ﷑</td>
<td>gl  ﷑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilabial plosives</td>
<td>pl  ﷑</td>
<td>bl  ﷑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilabial nasals</td>
<td>ml  ﷑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>high tone</th>
<th>high tone</th>
<th>low tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>aspirated</td>
<td>voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velar plosives</td>
<td>kw  ﷑</td>
<td>khw  ﷑</td>
<td>gw  ﷑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4 Final consonants

In Bumthang, the consonants k, t, p, ng, n, m, h and s may occur as finals, e.g. ཁི brak ‘cliff’ (Dz. ཁི bj’â), དེ pat ‘leech’ (Dz. དེ pêp), ནལོ tawa phop ‘instep’, དི zon ‘two’, དི sum ‘three’, དི naphang ‘nose’, དི ya! ‘grab it!’ vs. དི yah! ‘watch out!’ vs. དི 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. དི tups ‘cut’, དི dos ‘slept’.
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 [ˈ], 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  ཀའ | 'a  ཀལ |}
| e  ཀེ | 'e  ཀེ |}
| i  ཀི | 'i  ཀི |}
| o  ཀོ | 'o  ཀོ |}
| u  ཀུ | 'u  ཀུ |}
| ä  ཀུ | 'ä  ཀུ |}
| ö  ཀུ | 'ö  ཀུ |}
| ü  ཀུ | 'ü  ཀུ |}
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>absolutive</td>
<td>absolutive</td>
<td>ergative</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ང་ ngat</td>
<td>ང་ nget</td>
<td>ང་ ngai</td>
<td>ང་ ngei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ང་ ngai)</td>
<td>(ང་ ngei)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>གི་ wet</td>
<td>གི་ yin</td>
<td>གི་ wi</td>
<td>གི་ yinle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ི་ wile)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>གི་ khit</td>
<td>གི་ bot</td>
<td>གི་ khi</td>
<td>གི་ boi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ི་ khoile)</td>
<td>(ི་ khoile)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

The most important interrogative pronouns and adverbs in Bumthang are: གི་ ་ai ‘who’, e.g. གི་ ་ai གི་ khit ‘ai yo? ‘who are you?’; གི་ ་aji ‘who’ [erg.], e.g. གི་ ་aji bus ‘who did that’; གི་ ་aji ‘whose’, e.g. གི་ ་aji cala ‘whose stuff’; གི་ ་ai-do ‘to whom’, གི་ ་zhra ‘what’, གི་ ་ao ‘where, whither’, e.g. གི་ ་ao gai-ge? ‘where are we going?’, གི་ ་angi ‘whence’, e.g. གི་ ་angi shal ‘where are you from?’. གི་ ་zhrabudze ‘how much’, གི་ ་adoro ‘how’, གི་ ་arba ‘when’. 
3.2 Nominals and nominal affixes

The plural suffix in nouns is ཁོ་ <tshai>, e.g. སི་ན་ཐོ་ <minbotsa-tshai> ‘women’, སི་ལ། <cala-tshai> ‘stuff, articles’. Adjectives in Bumthang follow the noun they modify, e.g. སི་ལ། གཟོང་ <yam khangma> ‘long road’, སི་ལ། ཁྱེད་ <mi bong khangma> ‘tall person’ (literally ‘man of tall length’). The final t in the absolutive forms of the pronouns appears to be a mark-er of the absolutive <t> with a zero allomorph after the final n of yin ‘you’ [pl.]. How-ever, this ending does not occur other than in personal pronouns.

The ergative suffix in nouns is གཞུ་ <le>. Nouns and plural pronouns may take the collective suffix བར་ <gampo>, comparable in meaning to Dzongkha ག་ <chachap>. In such cases, the ergative suffix <le> follows <gampo>. The ergative suffix in personal pronouns, on the other hand, is བོ ་<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 ~ ngei ‘I’ [erg.], wi ~ vile ‘you’ [erg.], ngei ~ ngeile ‘we’ [erg.]. Pronominal forms with a double ergative ending གཞུ་<ile> have contras-tiive 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. ལྟའོ་ཁག་ སྲེབ། ngat zam zus ‘I [abs.] ate rice’ vs. བོ ་<i> 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 གཞུ་ <le>, but the suffix བོ ་<i> has also become widespread under the influence of Dzongkha and Chöke, e.g. ཝབ་ཏི མཛད་ yak-gi ‘nyiphang ‘tail of the yak, yaktail’. The allomorph of the genitive suffix after nominals which end in a vowel is བོ ་<e> (in Chunmat and ’Ura བོ ་<i>). This allomorph appears to be etymologically related to the genitive suffix allomorph occurring after vowels in Dzongkha, viz. བོ ་<i>, e.g. བཟེ་ནྱ་ཟླ༉<ngae ‘apaе meng ‘my father’s name’, ཝབ་ཏི མཛད་ ngae charo-gi meng ‘my friend’s name’. The allomorph བོ ་<e ~ i> sometimes occurs in combination with the suffix བོ ་<i>, e.g. ཝབ་ཏི མཛད་ 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>genitive singular</th>
<th>genitive plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ཆེ་ ngæ, ཆེ་ ngale</td>
<td>ཆེ་ nge, ཆེ་ ngele, ཆེ་ ngegi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ཆེ་ we, ཆེ་ wele</td>
<td>ཆེ་ yiinde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ཆེ་ khi, ཆེ་ khile</td>
<td>ཆེ་ boegi, ཆེ་ boile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dative singular</th>
<th>dative plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ཆེ་ ngado</td>
<td>ཆེ་ ngedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ཆེ་ wedo</td>
<td>ཆེ་ yindu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ཆེ་ khidu</td>
<td>ཆེ་ bodo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bumthang also distinguishes emphatic forms of the genitive which are formed by attaching the genitive suffix allomorph <e> to the emphatic suffix ཀ ཅ ར ཆ <ra>, most probably cognate with Tibetan ཀ ཅ ར ཆ ra 'self', e.g. ཆེ་ nga-rae 'my own', ཆེ་ nge-rae 'our own', ཆེ་ we-rae 'your own' [sg.], ཆེ་ yin-rae 'your own' [pl.], ཆེ་ khi-rae 'his own, her own', ཆེ་ 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. གང་ངོ་ nga-do 'bring it to me!', ལྷེ་ིས་པ་ we-do bimala 'I shall give it to you', བི་དུ་ bi-du be! 'give it to him!', ལྷེ་ shar-do ‘to the east’, འིན་ 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. གོང་ Thimphuk-gu ‘to Thimphu’. After a final /ng/, the phonological value of <Q> is /ng/, giving the form <ngO>, e.g. གང་ ngro ‘to the village, in the village’. After final /p/ or /t/, the variable <Q> is realised as /t/, yielding the form <tO>, e.g. ཤི་ thap-to ku-la! ‘put it in the oven!’ [<་མ་ལ་ kut-mala ‘to put, place’], ཽད་ yaktit-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. རྗེས་ 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. རྗེས་ bo-do ‘to them’, ལོང་ དོག་ yi-gampo-ro ‘to you’ [col.pl.], ལོང་ bot-gampo-ro ‘to them’ [col.], ལོང་ mai-do ‘home, at home’. The suffix ཚའི་ <nang> ‘inside, within’ is often used in combination with the telic ending, e.g. རྗེས་ 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 ཉ་ <na>, e.g. ལོང་ yak-na ‘in the hand’, ལོང་ ju-na tog-ae! ‘fondle [her] breast!’. In certain contexts either suffix is equally apt, e.g. ལོང་ mi-ru bi-mala ‘I shall give it to the man’, ལོང་ 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. ལོང་ nat-do phan-mala ‘recover from an illness [tel.]’, ལོང་ 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 *khaechen* ‘eight thousand’, and a score of *khaechen* 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 ག་*thek* ‘one’ is also used in the sense of ‘a/an, a certain’, e.g. ག་*thek* *phecung-thek* ‘a bag’. There are also Bumthang postpositions which act as articles or demonstratives, e.g. the postposition ལ་*di* ‘the’. The postposition ལ་*di* ‘the’ is possibly a loan from Dzongkha, e.g. ལ་*di* *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. ག་*thek* བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* ‘these women’.

**Table 12**

Bumthang numerals

| 1 ག་ | thek | 11 མ་ | chwaret | 21 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | khaethek neng thek |
| 2 ར་ | zon | 12 མ་ | chwa’nyit | 22 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | khaethek neng zon |
| 3 བ་ | sum | 13 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | chusum | 23 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | khaethek neng sum |
| 4 བ་ | ble | 14 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | cheble | etc. | |
| 5 བ་ | yanga | 15 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | chânga | | |
| 6 བ་ | grok | 16 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | chöegrok | 40 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | khaezon |
| 7 བ་ | ’nyit | 17 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | cher’nyit | 60 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | khaesum |
| 8 བ་ | jat | 18 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | charjat | etc. | |
| 9 བ་ | dogo | 19 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | chöedogo | | |
| 10 བ་ | che | 20 བཞི་*minbotsa-o-tshai* | khaethek | | |
Bumthang has separate numerals for ‘one’ and ‘two’ when counting filled vessels or receptacles. This is reminiscent of the Dzongkha numeral འ Cargo ‘one’ used in the same way. These Bumthang numerals are འ Cargo ‘one’ and འ Cargo ‘two’, e.g. འ Cargo འ Cargo ‘jappar Cargo’  ‘wai ‘bring one cup of tea’, འ Cargo  འ Cargo ‘jappar Cargo’  ‘wai ‘bring two cups of tea’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tang</th>
<th>'Ura</th>
<th>Tang</th>
<th>'Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 འ Cargo thek འ Cargo thek</td>
<td>11 འ Cargo chwaret འ Cargo choware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 འ Cargo zon འ Cargo zon</td>
<td>12 འ Cargo chwa’nyit འ Cargo chowa’nyis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 འ Cargo sum འ Cargo sum</td>
<td>13 འ Cargo chusum འ Cargo chusum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 འ Cargo ble འ Cargo blä</td>
<td>14 འ Cargo cheble འ Cargo cheblä</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 འ Cargo yanga འ Cargo yanga</td>
<td>15 འ Cargo chänga འ Cargo chä’nga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 འ Cargo grok འ Cargo grok</td>
<td>16 འ Cargo chöegrok འ Cargo chegrok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 འ Cargo ’nyis འ Cargo ’nyis</td>
<td>17 འ Cargo cher’nyit འ Cargo cher’nyis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 འ Cargo jat འ Cargo jat</td>
<td>18 འ Cargo charjat འ Cargo cherjat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 འ Cargo dogo འ Cargo dogo</td>
<td>19 འ Cargo chöedogo འ Cargo chedogo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 འ Cargo che འ Cargo che</td>
<td>20 འ Cargo khaethek འ Cargo khaethek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bumthang numerals in the Tangpa and 'Urapa dialects
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 Sanggâ Dôji is identical to that of the ’Urappa 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>, ཆིན་ག་ ‘I miss you’, གཞི་ངད་ ‘he’s going’, ལེགས་ ‘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་ག་ zhego zut-da ‘he is eating food’ < zu ‘eat’, རྲོལ་ ‘bot zon rat-da ‘the two of them are coming’ < ར། ra ‘come’, ངང་འདུག་ ‘yô rat-da ‘it is raining’ (literally ‘rain comes’), རྒྱུད་ ‘chi nga-do tiru bit-da ‘he is giving me money’ < bi ‘give’, དིབོང་ ‘ngai tosang-le phecung-di bit-da ‘my friend is giving me the bag’, ཆིན་ག་ ngat yat but-da ‘I am working’ < ལུ bu ‘do’, གཞི་ ‘ot-da ‘brings’ < པོ o ‘bring’, ས་ set-da ‘dies’ < ཥེ s ‘die’. Hard open stems do not take an epenthetic /t/, e.g. མོག་ tshü-da ‘seeks’, ཆིན་ ‘ngat throi-da ‘I am weeding’, ལོ་ nget gā-da ‘we are going’. Closed stems are hard as well, e.g. བོད་ dot-da ‘sleeps, ཆིན་ ‘chit nyit-da ‘he is sitting’, དཔྲ་ lap-da ‘says, tells’, རོག་ pok-da ‘hits, strikes’, རྒྱུད་ lok-da ‘returns, comes back’, རྒྱུད་ bran-da ‘recognises’, ཆིན་ khan-da ‘knows’, བོད་ ngam-da ‘tastes good’, ས་ khrang-da ‘climbs’.
TABLE 14
Morphophonology of present tense endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chogor</th>
<th>Tang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ས་ ་&lt;sa&gt;</td>
<td>ས་ ་&lt;sa&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(epenthetic /t/</td>
<td>after /p, k, m, ng/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in soft stems)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ཀ ་&lt;ta&gt;</td>
<td>ཀ ་&lt;ta&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after soft stems</td>
<td>after /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བ ་&lt;ta&gt;</td>
<td>བ ་&lt;ta&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after soft stems</td>
<td>after /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བ ་&lt;ta&gt;</td>
<td>བ ་&lt;ta&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after hard open stems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ས ་&lt;da&gt;</td>
<td>ས ་&lt;da&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after /n/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>’Ura</th>
<th>Chunmat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ས ་&lt;sa&gt;</td>
<td>ས ་&lt;sa&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after a voiceless</td>
<td>after /p, t, k, m, ng/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final consonant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བ ་&lt;za&gt;</td>
<td>བ ་&lt;za&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after a vowel or</td>
<td>after /n/ and after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a voiced consonant</td>
<td>hard open stems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the dialect of Tang, the present tense ending has the form ཀ ་<ta> after soft stems and stems ending in final /t/, e.g. གཏ་ zu-ta ‘eats, is eating’, གཏ་ bi-ta ‘gives’, གཏ་ nyit-ta ‘sits’, གཏ ་t ་dot-ta ‘sleeps’. The ending takes the allomorph ས ་<da> after stems ending in final /n/, e.g. གན ་t ་bran-da ‘recognises’, གན ་khan-da ‘knows’. The ending has the form ས ་<sa> after other closed stems, e.g. ག་lap-sa ‘says, tells’, གཞེན་shropse khrang-
sa ‘he is shining up’ (literally ‘he is climbing, a-shinning’), འོབ་ས་ glap-sa ‘hits, strikes, taste good’ lok-sa ‘comes back, returns’, ཡོབ་ ngam-sa ‘tastes good’. The ending takes the allomorph ར་ <za> after open hard stems, e.g. ཤུ་ tshí-za ‘seeks’, སྙེགས་་ཉུད། 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 ར་ <sa> after stems ending in a voiceless consonant, e.g. རི་ཤོན་ khit nyít-sa ‘he is sitting’, རི་ཤོན་ dot-sa ‘sleeps’, རི་ཤོན་ lap-sa ‘says, tells’, རི་ཤོན་ pok-sa ‘hits, strikes’, རི་ཤོན་ lok-sa ‘returns, comes back’. In all other environments the ending takes the allomorph ཀྲ་ <za>, e.g. རི་ཤོན་ yô ra-za ‘it is raining’ (literally ‘rain comes’), རི་ཤོན་ khit zhego zu-sa ‘he eats food’, རི་ཤོན་ kha ng-do tiru bi-sa ‘he gives me money’, རི་ཤོན་ nget gai-sa ‘we are going’, རི་ཤོན་ bot sum ra-sa ‘the three of them are coming’, རི་ཤོན་ ngai tosang-nge phreng-thek bi-sa ‘my friend gave me the bag’, རི་ཤོན་ tshí-sa ‘seeks’, རི་ཤོན་ bran-sa ‘recognises’, རི་ཤོན་ khan-sa ‘knows’, རི་ཤོན་ khrang-sa ‘climbs’, རི་ཤོན་ ngam-sa ‘tastes good’.

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

The negative of the present tense is formed through prefixation of the negative morpheme ར་ <me>, in Chunmat ར་ <mi>, e.g. (Tang, Chogor) རི་ཤོན་ me-yan-da ‘does not obey’, (‘Ura) རི་ཤོན་ me-yan-sa, (Chunmat) རི་ཤོན་ mi-yan-za. In the interrogative, the vowel in the present tense ending changes from /a/ to /e/, e.g. རི་ཤོན་ 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. རི་ཤོན་ 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 15</th>
<th>Morphophonology of experienced past tense endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chogor</th>
<th>Tang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Ø&gt;</td>
<td>in Chutö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after /k/ and /ng/, whereby /k/ is dropped</td>
<td>as in ’Ura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ད ས&lt;≤&gt; in other environments</td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as in Chogor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Ura</th>
<th>Chunmat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ད&lt;≤&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;≤&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after hard stems and after /t/</td>
<td>as in Chogor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Ø&gt;, whereby the stem final is dropped if it happens to be /k/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the dialect of ’Ura, the experienced past tense ending has the form <≤> regardless of the nature of the final segment of the verb stem to which it is affixed, e.g. ཀ་འཁ་ ngat wet kran-s ‘I have missed you’, ས་འག་ gai-s ‘went’, ས་ pha-s ‘it’s done, happened’ (Nep. ‘bhayo’), འི་ ག་ zu-s ‘at’, འི་ ཀ ང མ thong-s ‘drank’, ས་ sgā sā khro-s dema ngat khrak-s ‘I arrived yesterday’, ས་ ས བ ག ngui tshüs ‘I sought’, ས་ ས བ ག pron-s ‘crashed a party or prayer service’, ས ས བ ག sham-s ‘set the table’, ས ས བ ག throi-s ‘uprooted’ (e.g. plants), ས ས བ ག bri num-s ‘has smelled at it’, ས ས བ ག ngai seng thu-s ‘I’ve chopped the wood’, ས ས བ ག
tup-s ‘cut’, སྙིང་ ‘has bathed’, གཞན་ ‘much’, ཅྱོར-‘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. སྤེལ་ ‘slept’ < སྤེལ་ ‘sleep’.

In other Bumthang dialects, the experienced past tense suffix also has the form སྤེལ་ after soft stems and after stem final /t/, e.g. ཐུན་གུ་ ngat zus ‘I’ve eaten’, ཤིས་ ‘gave’, ཨ་ཡུན་ ‘yat bus ‘worked’, སྤེལ་ ‘much’, ཅྱོར-‘nyor’ ‘sex’, thung ‘commit, perform’) ‘we had lots of sex’.

7་ར་སག་གདུག་པ། 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. སྤེལ་ ‘slept’ < སྤེལ་ ‘sleep’.

In other Bumthang dialects, a stem final /t/ is also dropped before the experienced past tense ending, e.g. སྤེལ་ ‘slept’ < སྤེལ་ ‘sleep’.

In the Chunmat dialect, a zero allomorph of this ending occurs in environments other than these, e.g. རྡོ་ལོག་ ngai lap ‘I said’, རྡོ་ ‘sought’. In the dialect of Chogor, the zero allomorph occurs only after the stem finals /k/ and /ng/, whereas the allomorph སྤེལ་ occurs in all other environments, e.g. རྡོ་ལོག་ ngai dangma thung ‘I saw it yesterday’, but རྡོ་ལོག་ chi khors ‘he took it away’, རྡོ་ལོག་ chi tshüs ‘he sought’, རྡོ་ལོག་ ngai laps ‘I said’, རྡོ་ལོག་ ngai brans ‘I recognised’, རྡོ་ ‘sit, remain’, ‘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: སྤེལ་ ngai khra ‘I arrived yesterday’ < སྤེལ་ khra ‘arrive’, Chunmat: སྤེལ་ ngai dangma hra ‘I arrived yesterday’ < སྤེལ་ hra ‘arrive’, Chogor: སྤེལ་ dangma ngai po ‘I hit him yesterday’ < སྤེལ་ pok ‘hit, beat’.

In all dialects other than that of ‘Ura, the verb ‘to go’ has an irregular past tense form in སྤེལ་, སྤེལ་ gai-e ‘went’, e.g. སྤེལ་ ngai do prons-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 སྤེལ་. 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 སྤེལ་, whereas the experienced past tense ending has a special allomorph སྤེལ་ in negative forms after soft stems, and a zero allomorph in other environments, e.g. སྤེལ་ ma-zu-t ‘didn’t eat’, སྤེལ་ ngai khi-do tiru ma-bi-t ‘I didn’t give him any money’, སྤེལ་ ma-se-t ‘didn’t die’, སྤེལ་ ma-sut ‘didn’t kill’, སྤེལ་ ma-tshüs ‘didn’t seek’, སྤེལ་ ma-thor ‘didn’t pluck’, སྤེལ་ khit ma-gai ‘he didn’t go’, སྤེལ་ seng ma-thu-t ‘didn’t chop the wood’, སྤེལ་ khit khakso ma-yang ‘he didn’t stand up’, སྤེལ་ ma-rat ‘he has not come’.

In other Bumthang dialects, the experienced past tense suffix also has the form སྤེལ་ after soft stems and after stem final /t/, e.g. སྤེལ་ ‘gave’, སྤེལ་ ‘sat, stayed’ < སྤེལ་ ‘sit, remain’.

In the Chunmat dialect, a zero allomorph of this ending occurs in environments other than these, e.g. རྡོ་ལོག་ ngai lap ‘I said’, རྡོ་ ‘sought’. In the dialect of Chogor, the zero allomorph occurs only after the stem finals /k/ and /ng/, whereas the allomorph སྤེལ་ occurs in all other environments, e.g. རྡོ་ལོག་ ngai dangma thung ‘I saw it yesterday’, but རྡོ་ལོག་ chi khors ‘he took it away’, རྡོ་ལོག་ chi tshüs ‘he sought’, རྡོ་ལོག་ ngai laps ‘I said’, རྡོ་ལོག་ ngai brans ‘I recognised’, རྡོ་ ‘sit, remain’, ‘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: སྤེལ་ ngai khra ‘I arrived yesterday’ < སྤེལ་ khra ‘arrive’, Chunmat: སྤེལ་ ngai dangma hra ‘I arrived yesterday’ < སྤེལ་ hra ‘arrive’, Chogor: སྤེལ་ dangma ngai po ‘I hit him yesterday’ < སྤེལ་ pok ‘hit, beat’.

In all dialects other than that of ‘Ura, the verb ‘to go’ has an irregular past tense form in སྤེལ་, སྤེལ་ gai-e ‘went’, e.g. སྤེལ་ ngai do prons-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 སྤེལ་. 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 སྤེལ་, whereas the experienced past tense ending has a special allomorph སྤེལ་ in negative forms after soft stems, and a zero allomorph in other environments, e.g. སྤེལ་ ma-zu-t ‘didn’t eat’, སྤེལ་ ngai khi-do tiru ma-bi-t ‘I didn’t give him any money’, སྤེལ་ ma-se-t ‘didn’t die’, སྤེལ་ ma-sut ‘didn’t kill’, སྤེལ་ ma-tshüs ‘didn’t seek’, སྤེལ་ ma-thor ‘didn’t pluck’, སྤེལ་ khit ma-gai ‘he didn’t go’, སྤེལ་ seng ma-thu-t ‘didn’t chop the wood’, སྤེལ་ khit khakso ma-yang ‘he didn’t stand up’, སྤེལ་ 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 "<na>, e.g. དོད་ nyit-na ‘has remained, has sat down’ (Dz. བོད་ dö-nu), ཐི་ག་ chit gä-na ‘he has gone’ (Dz. ཐི་ག་ so-nu), བོད་ཁྲུང་། khit tarshing shropse khrang-na ‘he shinned up the prayer flagpole’. In the dialect of ‘Ura, the ending of the inferred past tense is བོད་ zumut, and in Tang with the exception of Chutö the ending is བོད་ simut, e.g. ‘Ura: ཐི་ག་ zumut ‘he is gone’, Tang: ཐི་ག་ 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 བོད་ ngai tshüs ‘I sought’, and not *ngai tshüna, 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 བོད་ ngat zus ‘I have eaten’ (Dz. z’a-yi), but about someone else one may say either གཟུ་ chit zus (‘Ura: གཟུ་ chit zus) ‘he has eaten’ (Dz. kho z’a-yi) or གཟུ་ chit zu-na (‘Ura: གཟུ་ chit 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 གཟུ་ 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 ངཱ་ཟུ་ གཏུ་ le ngat zus ‘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 ངཱ་ཟུ་ le ngat zus ‘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. བྲིན་པ་ 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 འཛིན། <zhit> ‘forget’ takes the inferred past tense even with a first person subject, e.g. འཛིན། 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 མ་ <na>, e.g. མ་ད་ ma-nyit-na ‘he didn’t stay’. In some locolects, however, the inferred past tense morpheme does have a special negative allomorph མ་ <da>, e.g. མ་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 མ་ <ba>, the initial consonant of which /b/ is but weakly voiced and often sounds like [p], e.g. རྫིར། བོི་མ་ kher-ba ‘they’ve built their house’, དང་ཁུ ཕུ་ ngat zu-ru ‘nyam-ba ‘I feel like eating’, དང་ནས། དངོས་ dangma-gi zhego ngamba ‘yesterday’s food tasted good’, བོི་མ་ ngai khit thung-ba ‘I saw him’, དོན་ tun-ba ‘showed’, རྒྱུ་ སྐྱ་ tiru chong-ba ‘produced the money’, དོ་མ་ khor-ba ‘took away’, རྒྱུ་ སྐྱ་ lap-ba ‘I said’, རྒྱུ་ ngui bran-ba ‘I recognised’, རྒྱུ་ སྐྱ་ ngui dangma thung-ba ‘I saw it yesterday’, དོ་མ་ tshü-ba ‘sought’, རྒྱུ་ khit gai-ba ‘he went’, དང་ཁུ ཕུ་ ngat khrak-ba ‘I arrived, I’ve been there’. The suffix མ་ <ba> is realised as /wa/ in allegro speech, particularly after stem final /t/ or /ng/, e.g. རྒྱུ་ སྐྱ་ wi churma thong-wa ya? ‘did you drink beer?’, རྒྱུ་ སྐྱ་ 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. རྒྱུ་ སྐྱ་ ngadzi zhego zusya ya? ‘have you had breakfast?’, རྒྱུ་ སྐྱ་ ngai yat busa ‘we did the work’, རྒྱུ། bisa ‘gave’. In 'Ura, forms of the type ཕུ་མ་ zuspa ‘has eaten’ are attested.

There are no distinct negative forms of the imperfective past tense. Therefore, a form like བྲིན། ma-nyit ‘didn’t sit, didn’t stay’ corresponds both to བྲིན། nyis ‘sat, stayed’ as well as བྲིན། nyitba ‘sat, stayed’.
4.5 Copula

In Bumthang, the copula རིན་‘is’ and its negative counterpart རིན་‘is not’ may connect two substantives and thereby establish the identity of the referent (Dz. 'ing ‘is’, mä ‘is not’, Nep. ho ‘is’, hoïna ‘is not’). In general, the interrogative suffix ག་<ga> is affixed to the finite at the end of an interrogative clause, but the special interrogative suffix རིན་<na> is affixed to the copula རིན་‘is’ or རིན་‘is not’, e.g. རིན་‘is not’.

The copulas རིན་na ‘there is’ and རིན་mut ‘there is not’ are used in existential, location-al and attributive senses, i.e. ‘there is’, ‘to be somewhere’, ‘to have a quality’ (Nep. cha ‘is’, chaïna ‘is not’), e.g. རིན་‘is not’ chan mut ‘it doesn’t matter’ (literally ‘there is no difference’; Dz. རིན་khê mê). The copula རིན་mut takes the same endings as other verbs, e.g. རིན་‘is not’ minbotsa-tshai kackan mut-da ‘the women aren’t any good’. The copula རིན་na is used to indicate location, e.g. རིན་na ‘is not for sale’.

4.6 Periphrastic perfect

The Bumthang perfect is a periphrastic tense formed by the auxiliary རིན་‘is’ in combination with the past participle of the verb. The past participle is derived from the experienced imperfective form of the verb through suffixation of the nominalising ending <i>, e.g. གནས་‘sat’ < གནས་‘sat’, ཤཱས་‘ate’. The Bumthang nominalising suffix can also be attached to an infinitive form of the verb, although this does not yield a past participle, e.g. རིན་‘is not’ mi-mala-i cala-tshai mai-do na [not-sell-inf.-nom. things-pl. house-in is] ‘the stuff that’s not for sale is in the house’.

The opposition experienced vs. inferred is neutralised in the periphrastic perfect, which is used indifferently with respect to all three persons, e.g. རིན་‘is not’ nge tshübai wen ‘we have sought’, རིན་‘is not’ khit yangbai wen ‘he has stood up’, རིན་‘is not’ khaïna wen ‘she has eaten’, རིན་‘is not’ wet zhego zu-sai ya? ‘have you eaten?’, རིན་’he has arrived, རིན་‘is not’ wet lapbai wen ‘you are the one who said it’, རིན་‘is not’ bot dotpai wen ‘they have slept’. In ‘Ura, past participles occur of the type རིན་‘is not’ zospa ‘eaten’, e.g. རིན་‘is not’ khrakpai wen ‘he has arrived, རིན་‘is not’ wet zhego zu-spi-ge? ‘have you eaten food? (in which utterance བཟ ལཟ བཟ ལཟ ཟ ལཟ ཟ gi 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. ང་འང་བ་ཞིན། 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. དོན་ག་དང་ཞིབ་བའི། Thimphuk-gu gai-wai mi khit wen [Thimphu-in go-part. person he is] ‘He is the one who went to Thimphu’, བོད་དཔོས་འཛིན་ཨི་ཞིན། 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 ར་<gi> of the past participial ending is used in the negative instead of ར་<i>, e.g. ནིི་བོས་པ་<ན་tshübagi min ‘has not sought’. After soft stem verbs, both the allomorph ར་<i> occurs to which the allomorph ར་<gi> too is affix-ed, e.g. ར་<gi> 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 ར་<mala> in the dialects of Chogor and Chunmat, e.g. རང་ལྟ་ནས། ngat wet kran-mala ‘I shall miss you’, རོའི་འདི་དེ་འཇིག་ཐུབ་པར་དུ། minbotsa-o-tshagampo-ro tiru bi-mala [woman-these-pl.-col.-tel. money give-inf.] ‘I shall give some money to these women’, དོན་བསྐལ་བ་པ་<ན་wet yampat gā-mala ya? ‘are you going away tomorrow?’, རིལ་ra-mala ‘I shall come’, ནིི་བོས་པ་<ན་bot bri num-mala ‘they will smell at it’, དོི་རི་དེ་འཇིག་ཐུབ་པར། charo-do tiru bi-mala ‘I shall give the money to my friend’, ནགོ་དོན་གཉིས་ཕྲ་<ན་maï-do gai-mala ‘I’ll go home’, དོན་ལྟ་འོ་ruk-mala ‘we’ll put it away, we’ll clean it up’, རིལ་<mala> sut-mala? ‘are they going to slaughter [the pig]??’, རིལ་<mala> dot-mala ‘will sleep’. In the dialects of 'Ura and part of Tang, the future ending is ར་<sang>, e.g. ར་<sang> dot-sang ‘shall sleep’, རིལ་<sang> zu-sang ‘shall eat’.

The ending ར་<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. སྐྲ་བསྐལ་ mrū-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 ར་<mala ~ sang> are used with auxiliary ར་<i> wen ‘is’, e.g. རིལ་<i> gaimala wen ‘I shall go, I am to go’ (‘Ura: རིལ་<i> 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, རྣལ་འབབ་ནི་བོད་ལྕགས་སྐད་ཡིན། ཡོད་ཡབ་པད་གི་སང་དཀར་པོ་ས། ‘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 ལྷ་<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, རྣལ་ ‘I will sit’, རྣལ་ ོ་ ‘I will eat’, རྣལ་ ོ་ ‘futuam’. The infinitival future in ཤི་ <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. རྣལ་ ‘he will [probably] stay on’ vs. རྣལ་ ོ་ ‘I will eat’, རྣལ་ ོ་ ‘yam-ta ron gai-ge’ ‘I am going off to work’. With the infinitival future in ཤི་ <mala> the speaker assumes a possible future, e.g. རྣལ་ ‘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. རྣལ་ ‘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 རྣལ་ <me>, in Chunmat རྣལ་ <mi>, whereby the suffix རྣལ་ <ge> is dropped, e.g. རྣལ་ me-nyit ‘I won’t sit down, I won’t stay’, རྣལ་ me-gai ‘he won’t leave’, རྣལ་ me-ju ‘he won’t eat’, རྣལ་ me-sut ‘he won’t kill’, རྣལ་ me-cok ‘I won’t shit’ (literally ‘I won’t defaecate faeces’), རྣལ་ ོ་-ra ‘he won’t come’. In the interrogative, the volitional future suffix རྣལ་ <ge> is dropped before the interrogative suffix རྣལ་ <ga>, e.g. རྣལ་ ོ་-ga ཡོད་ལྕགས་སྐད་ཡིན། ‘Did you want to sit here?’

The suffix རྣལ་ <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. ཡོད་ལྕགས་སྐད་ཡིན། yam-ta nambun gai-do
‘nyam-ge-na ‘he’ll be pleased to be leaving soon’. This Bumthang suffix བས་ <na> is comparable in meaning to the Dzongkha suffix བས་ ~ བས་ <wä ~ bä>, which also expresses the epistemo-mological stance of the speaker with respect to the contents of the utterance. When the volitional future ending བས་ <ge> has been compounded by the ending བས་ <na>, then the volitional future suffix བས་ <ge> is not dropped in the negative, e.g. ཁོ་ཏི་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ འྲི་ཏི་ཏོ་ ཁོ་ཏི་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ ‘Is he going to stay?’ (whereby བས་ <ga> is the interrogative suffix) — ཁོ་ཏི་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ 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. བཙླྟླ དུ་ ‘in order to kill’, བཙླྟླ ནྱིན-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ཏི་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ ཁོ་ དུ་ དཀར་ ‘in order to sleep’, བཙླྟླ ལྱིན-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ཏི་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ ཁོ་ ཏོ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ དུ་ ‘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. གཙླྟླ དུ་ ‘in order to kill’, གཙླྟླ མཛྲྲ-ཏླྷྲ གཙླྟླ ལྱིན-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ཏི་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ ཁོ་ ཙེ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླྷྲ-ཏླྷྲ ཁོ་ ཕེ་ ‘I’m going there to give him a beating’. (2) After stem final /ng/ the ending has the form <ngO>, e.g. སྤྷྦ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཁོ་ཏི་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ཏོ་ ཁོ་ ཙེ་ དྲ-ཏླ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླ ཕེ་ ཕེ ‘we are going to put everything back in its place’, སྤྷ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླ ཕེ་ དྲ-ཏླ ཕེ ‘wet or wet or wet or wet’. (3) After final /p/ the ending has the form <tO>, e.g. བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’. (4) After all other final consonants and after hard open stem verbs, the telic ending has the form <dO>, e.g. བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’. (5) After all other final consonants and after hard open stem verbs, the telic ending has the form <dO>, e.g. བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ དྲ དྲ དཀར-ཏླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’. 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. བཙླྟླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’. After soft open verb stems, the initial of the telic suffix has the phonological value <rO>, e.g. བཙླྟླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’, བཙླྟླ ཕེ ‘in order to cut’.
4.10 Imperative

The imperative is formed through affixation of the suffix འལ  in allegro speech pronounced as འལ ས, e.g. འལ་ mrü-lae! ‘squeeze it out, scratch it out!’, འལ་ throi-lae! ‘weed, extirpate!’, འལ་ thor-lae! ‘pluck, pick!’, འལ་ pron-lae! ‘crash [a dinner party]’. The verb བོད་ gai-mala ‘to go’ has the stem བོད་ in the imperative, e.g. བོད་ ga-la! ‘go away!’ The negative imperative is formed through affixation of the negative prefix མ་ e.g. མ་ mrü-lae! ‘don’t squeeze it out!’, མ་ ma-throi-lae! ‘don’t look for it!’, མ་ ma-ga-la! ‘don’t go!’, མ་ ma-tshü-la! ‘don’t pick the flowers!’, མ་ ma-thor-la! ‘don’t uproot the flowers!’, མ་ ma-se! ‘don’t die!’.

Verb stems ending in /t/ drop this final before the imperative suffix, e.g. མ་ ma-mra-lae! ‘don’t scratch!’ < བོད་ mrat-mala ‘scratch’, བོད་ saro nyi-lae! ‘sit down!’ < བོད་ nyit-mala ‘sit’, བོད་ do-lä! ‘go to sleep!’ < བོད་ dot-mala ‘sleep’, བོད་ su-la! ‘kill!’ < བོད་ sut-mala ‘kill’. After verb stems in final /ng/, /k/ or /p/, the imperative ending is realised as the allomorph འ<e> and the verb stem finals /k/ and /p/ become voiced /g/ and /b/, e.g. མ་ ma-yang-ae! ‘don’t stand up!’, མ་ ma-throm-mae! ‘don’t break the porcelain cup!’, མ་ ma-throm-mae! ‘don’t sniff at it!’ (whereby མ་ bri ‘smell’ is the obligatory complement of the verb བོད་ 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 /æ/ and /u/ goes to /ø/, e.g. མ་ nga-do ma-be! ‘give it to me!’ < བོད་ bi-mala ‘give’, བོད་ zöl! ‘eat!’ < བོད་ zu-mala ‘eat’, བོད་ ma-jö! ‘ne future!’ < བོད་ ju-mala ‘futuere’, བོད་ thö! ‘chop!’ < བོད་ thu-mala ‘chop’. The verbs བོད་ ra-mala ‘come’ and བོད་ o-mala ‘bring’ have irregular imperative
forms, viz. ལྷི་ hrai! ‘come!’, ལྷི་ ma-hrai! ‘don’t come’, ལྷི་ wai! ‘bring!’, ལྷི་ ma-‘wai! ‘don’t bring!’.

4.11 Gerund

The ending of the gerund is བྱྫི <se>, and in Chunmat བྱྫི ~ བྱྫི <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. བྱྫི ~ བྱྫི <di>, Nep. <-era>), e.g. ལོང་ལོངས་པའི་ mai hram-se gai-e ‘after they had destroyed the house, they left’, ལོང་ལོངས་པའི་ shrai-da, shrai-se gai-da ‘it’s overflowing, it’s overflowing and getting away’, ལོང་ལོངས་པའི་ eucu shrop-se ma-nyi-lä! ‘don’t just sit there masturbating!’ The verb ལགས་ zat-mala ‘complete, finish’ governs the gerund, e.g. ལོང་ལོངས་པའི་ yigu dri-se zas ‘I’ve finished writing, I’m done with writing’. The verb ལགས་ got-mala ‘must’, however, takes the bare stem of a verb as its complement, e.g. ལོང་ལོངས་པའི་ 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 བྱྫི <se> and the Bumthang experienced past tense suffix <s>.

4.12 Adhortative

The adhortative ending is ལྷི་ <kya>, e.g. ལོང་ལོངས་ tup-kya ‘let’s cut it’, ལོང་ བསྐེལ་ pron-kya ‘let’s crash [their dinner]’, ལོང་ལོངས་ sham-kya ‘let’s set out [the wares] for display’, ལོང་ལོངས་ dot-kya ‘let’s go to sleep’, ལོང་ བསྐེལ་ zu-kya ‘let’s eat’, ལོང་ལོངས་ yat bu-kya ‘let’s work’, ལོང་ལོངས་ 'ngon throi-kya ‘let’s uproot the grass’, ལོང་ལོངས་ thong-kya ‘let’s drink’, ལོང་ལོངས་ gai-kya ‘let’s go’, ལོང་ལོངས་ tshü-kya ‘let’s look for it’, ལོང་ལོངས་ 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. ལོང་ལོངས་pron-kya ‘may [he/you/
etc. work!', རོ་ལ་ ‘may [he/you/etc.] do it!’', རོ་ལ་ ‘may [he/you/etc.] eat!’', རོ་ལ་ ‘may [he/you/etc.] sleep!’, རོ་ལ་ ‘may [you/they/etc.] crash [their dinner]!’, རོ་ལ་ tshii-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. ལོ་ལ་yat bu-nja! ‘may [he/you/etc.] work!’, རོ་ལ་ mu-nja! ‘may [he/you/etc.] do it!’, རོ་ལ་ zu-nja! ‘may [he/you/etc.] eat!’, རོ་ལ་ tshii-nja! ‘may [you/they/etc.] look for it’. The allomorph <ja> occurs after a closed stem verb, e.g. རོ་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. རོ་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, རོ་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 དི་ <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. རོ་ལ་ charo-le nga-do bi-t-thung ‘my friend has handed it over to me’, རོ་ལ་ khi bi-t-thung-ba ‘he gave it away’, རོ་ལ་ yat bu-t-thung ‘has he completed the task?’ (Nep. kām gari diyo), རོ་ལ་ zama zu-t-thung ‘has he finished off the rice’.

The aspectiviser ལྷ <thro> expresses the inexorability of a situation or process. The auxiliary <thro> is often used in conjunction with a past participle, e.g. རོ་ལ་ cala-tshai khi-le khorwai thro ‘he is the one who took away the stuff’. The English translation conveys the the meaning of the Bumthang syntax in the given utterance. The use of ལྷ <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 རོ་ལ་ jep-pai thro ware! ‘we enjoyed it!’, the auxiliary ལྷ <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 རྙིས་ ‘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 ་ནི་ལྱག་པོ་ 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. ལེ་ང་ང་ 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. ང་མ་ སྐྱེན་ 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 ང་མ་ སྐྱེན་ 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 ལ་ སྐྱེན། <shu> and a non-interrogative or indicative form ལ་ སྐྱེན། khit nyit-ge shu ‘does he say (do they say/is it said) that he is going to stay?’, ལ་ སྐྱེན། 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 hāmīsāṅga khāndaina re ‘he says (they say/it is said) that he won’t be eating with us’.
Kinship Diagram 1
brother's offspring and paternal relatives
(male speaker)

* However, see explanation in text.
Kinship Diagram 2
sister’s offspring and maternal relatives
(male speaker)

* However, see explanation in text.
5 Kinship terms

The Bumthang system of kinship terminology is described here on the basis of the Chu-tö dialect. The word for ‘father’ is ཆུ་ ‘apa, and ‘mother’ is ཆུ་ ‘ama. ‘Grandfather’ is ཆད་མེ་ ‘meme (Chunmat: རེ་ ལེ་ ‘mimi), and ‘grandmother’ is དི་ ‘aila (Chunmat: སྣ་ ‘aya). ‘Grandson’ is སྣ་ ‘dibu, and ‘granddaughter’ is སྣ་ ‘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 ཕུ་ ‘ugu (Chunmat: བུ་ ར། ‘ugo) and བཤེ་ ‘imin. Similarly, mother’s sisters and their husbands are respectively designated by the terms ཙི་ ‘imin and བུ་ ‘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 ཙི་ ‘nene (Chunmat: ཙི་ ‘nini) and བུ་ ‘asang, and mother’s brothers and their wives are respectively designated by the terms བུ་ ‘asang and ཙི་ ‘nene.

The kin relationship to the offspring of བུ་ ‘ugu and བཤེ་ ‘imin, the parallel cousins, is felt to be closer than the relationship with the offspring of ཙི་ ‘nene and བུ་ ‘asang, 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 བུ་ ‘aco ‘elder brother’, བུ་ ‘no ‘younger brother’, ཙི་ ‘ashe ‘elder sister’ and ཙི་ ‘nomet ‘younger sister’. Cross cousins are, by contrast, called དྲུ་ ‘pun ‘son of father’s sisters or of mother’s brother’ and དྲུ་ ‘purungi ‘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 བུ་ ‘botsa ‘son’ (Chunmat: བུ་ ‘boza), and བུ་ ‘bomet ‘daughter’, and བུ་ ‘onga ‘child’. A male speaker refers to his sister’s children and their spouses by the terms བུ་ ‘tsau (male) and བུ་ ‘tsamet (female), and a female speaker uses these terms to refer to her brother’s offspring and their spouses. The Bumthang terms བུ་ ‘tsau and བུ་
tsamet are evidently related to the Dzongkha terms ཞེས་ tshaọ en ཞེས་ tsham, but the Bumthang term ཞེས་ tsamet contains the same indigenous suffix ལྩོ་ <met> as in Bumthang ཞེས་ dimet ‘granddaughter’, ཞེས་ nemet ‘younger sister’ and ཞེས་ 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 ཞེས་ namo (Chogor: སྙེ་ nesa), and a woman calls her husband སྙེ་ makpa. Daughters-in-law and the wives of parallel nephews are called སྙེ་ nama, and sons-in-law and the husbands of parallel nieces are also referred to as སྙེ་ makpa. A speaker may also refer to his or her sisters-in-law and brothers-in-law respectively as སྙེ་ nama and སྙེ་ makpa when these people live under a single roof with the speaker. If this is not the case, it is more usual to use descriptive circumlocutions like མེ་སོ་སེ་ 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 དབུ་མཐང་ ‘Ucen script developed by དཔའ་སྒྲོ་མཚན་སྦྱོན་ སྙིང་ དོར་ ཇི’ Dr’asho 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 ɛ. 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 ཀར་ — n., phlegm, slime.
auya འུ་ཡ་ — n., jackal, *Canis aureus*; Dz. འར་ འབུ་ ཁམ་ འད་ དོམ་.
’aco ཁོ་ — n., elder brother.
’adoro ཁོ་ བོ — adv., how.
’ai དེ་ — pro., who.
’aila དེ་ བོ་ — n., grandmother [Chunmat: འ་ བ དབ་]
’aji བེ་ — pro., who (erg.); whose (gen.).
’ama བ་ — n., mother.
’angdar རུང་ དར་ — n., [< Eng. underwear] underwear; cf. རུང་ ཀུར་ dorma.
’angi ཚེ་ — adv., whence, where from.
’ao དོ་ — adv., where.
’apa ར་ — n., father.
’arba ར་ — adv., when.
’ashang ར་ གེ་ — n., 1) mother’s brother; 2) father’s sister’s husband.
’ashe ར་ བེ་ — n., elder sister.
’adzing ར་ བེ་ — n., belt with which a woman fastens her རུང་ རུང་ kirat.
baspa ར་ བས — n., nest hair, peach fuzz; cf. རུ ཁོ po.
be བེ — v., imperative of བི་མ ཐ bi-mala.
beng མིང n., smegma; cf. Dz. མིང bj’eng.
binary འབུམ — v., give.
binn བིན n., calf [dialectally: བིདུ gapsa].
blakbloga མིག་ཞིག — adj., messy, spilt (said of fluids or of handwriting).
blaktang མིག་ཞིག — n., spilt fluid, goo, sticky mass, viscous slime.
ble, bla བེལ, བླད — num., four {Tib. སྭོ། ོ གོ་, O.Bur. སྭོ། ོ གོ་ liy, Ch. 四 sijH < *s.li[j]-s (0518a)}. 
bleng མིང — num., one (used of filled vessels or receptacles); Dz. རབ g’ang; cf. ར་ gwa.
bodok བྷན་ — n., long ceremonial scarf of raw Bhutanese silk, usually white; cf. Dz. གནའ kapni.
boi, boile བོི་, བོི་ — pro., they (erg.).
bomet རྒྱལ་ — n., 1) daughter; 2) girl {Tib. རྒྱལ་ bud-med}.
bong ལྷང་ — n., length, size.
bot རྩ་ — pro., they, them.
botsa རྩ་ — n., 1) son; 2) boy; [Chunmat: རྩ་ boza].
brak རྷང་ — n., cliff; cf. Dz. རང་ bj’â; Tib. རང་ brag.
bran-mala རང་མ་ལ་ — v., recognise, know.
brangdo རང་ — n., chest {Tib. རང braņ}.
branma རང་ — n., Tartary buckwheat, Fagopyrum tataricum; Dz. རྷང་ bj’ô.
brat-mala རང་མ་ལ་ — v., scratch, claw {Tib. རང་ hbrad}.
bre རེ — n., female yak; cf. Tib. རེ hbris-mo.
bri num-mala རེ་མ་ལ་ — v., smell, sniff at something.
bugang རིང་ — n., fontanelle.
bu-mala རིང་མལ་ — v., do.
cala རིང་ — n., wares, stuff.
cingdum རིང་དུམ — n., wares, or long breeches extending to just over the knees; cf. རིང་ dorma.
cingku རིང་ བུ n. (* adj., small {Tib. རིང་ chaun-ba}.
cok རタイミング n., shit, faeces.
cok-mala རタイミングམ་ལ་ — v., defaecate, shit.
comen རタイミング n., dimple [Tang: རタイミング hbrad].
comet sungsung རタイミング sungsung (* adv., in such a way that one’s dimples become visible; e.g. རタイミング sungsung gat-da ‘he smiled so that you could see his dimples’.
cong རིང་ — n., 1) anus, arse; 2) loins; རིང་ རིང་ རིང་ con-na ju-ky ་let’s commit sodomy’.
congmek རིང་ རིང་ — n., anus [dialectal: རིང་ རིང་ coksimek]
cucu ཀུ་ཤེ — n., penis; esp. the penis of a man after having attained puberty, but before fathering a child; cf. ཐུ་ཤེ mciling, བ་གཅ སྐག, ཤེས་པའི tempali.
cucui phailang ཀུ་ཤེ་ཤེ་དྲུངེ དུས ( *) n., glans penis, literally: penis forehead; cf. བ་ gang.
cucui shrop ཀུ་ཤེ་ཤེ་དྲུངེ (* n., [< ཁཔ་མ། shrop-mala, q.v.] foreskin, literally: penis sheath.
chan གཞི — n., difference. {Tib. རྒྱལ་ mtshan 'mark, characteristic'}
charjat, cherjat གཞི གཞི — num., eighteen.
charo གཞི — n., friend; cf. Dz. གཞི གཞི chaño; cf. tosang.
chanɡa, chä'nga གཞི གཞི — num., fifteen.
che གཞི — num., ten. {Tib. གཞི bcu}
cheble, cheblä གཞི གཞི — num., fourteen.
cher’nyit, cher’nyis གཞི གཞི — num., seventeen.
chetpu གཞི (* adj., big {Tib. གཞི ched-po}.
chewa གཞི — n., fangs of a snake; cf. dongkwa, kwa {Tib. ཁི་མ་ mche-ba, VbV > VwV indicates this word must be a Tibetic loan}.
chi གཞི — n., lip {Tib. ཁི mchu}.
chimbo གཞི གཞི — n., liver {Tib. ཁི གཞི mchin, Bur. མོ་ཐེ་ saññ}.
chit གཞི — pro., see གཞི khit.
cho གཞི — adv., here.
chong-mala གཞི གཞི — v., produce, take out, show; cf. གཞི གཞི tum-mala.
chöedogo, chedogo གཞི གཞི — num., nineteen.
chöegrok, chegrok གཞི གཞི — num., sixteen.
chubak གཞི — n., Bhutanese male garb (Dz. གཞི གཞི g’o < O.Tib. ཁི གཞི gos) [Chogor: གཞི chuba].
churma གཞི གཞི — n., native beer; cf. Dz. གཞི chang.
chusum གཞི གཞི — num., thirteen.
chwa’nyit, chowa’nyis གཞི གཞི གཞི — num., twelve.
chwaret, choware གཞི གཞི — num., eleven.
dakhu གཞི — n., sperm.
dangma གཞི — adv., yesterday ['Ura: གཞི dema].
dema གཞི — adv., see གཞི dangma.
denca གཞི (* n., a slap (with the hand).
dibu གཞི — n., grandson.
dimet གཞི — n., granddaughter.
dogo གཞི — num., nine {Tib. གཞི dgu}.
dongkwa གཞི — n., [< གཞི kwa ‘tooth’] fangs of a mammal; cf. གཞི chewa.
dot-mala — v., sleep.
döba (* n., male gayal, *Bos frontalis*; Dz. འབྲུག་ yangg’u.
döbam (* n., female gayal, *Bos frontalis*; Dz. འབྲུག་ yangg’um.
dumang — n., goitre.
dungshing rotpa — n., vertebrae [Chunmat: ཁྲོས་དུངས་ dungsing rosa].
dungshing — n., spinal column.
dusum (* adv., today.
gai-mala — v., go.
gajolewang — n., armpit.
gajolewangpo — n., armpit hair.
gami — n., fire {Tib. སྣ་ mye, Bur. སྣ་ mih, Ch. ȳ xjwix < *hmīj (0583e)}.
gamlang — n., chin [Chunmat en Tang: མག་ gam].
gampo — col.postp., altogether, all (often left untranslated); cf. Dz. མཁྲོད་ chachap.
gamtha — n., beard [Chunmat: མཁྲོད་ gamtshang, Tang: མཁྲོད་ gamchang].
gang — n., glans penis.
gapsa — see binma.
gapsawang — n., fossa poplitea.
gatpo (* n., old man {Tib. སྣཤ་ rgad-po}.
gā-mala — v., see gai-mala.
glap-mala (* v. [Tang], hit, strike, beat; cf. སྣཤ་ pok-mala.
gon — pro., the other one, that; cf. Dz. སྣཤ་ zhenmi.
got-mala — v., must, need, require.
grang-mala — v., count {Tib. སྣཤ་ hgran}.
gran-mala — v., compete {Tib. སྣཤ་ hgran}. 
grangka — n., counting {Tib. སྣཤ་ graṅs}. 
grekpo — n., yeti, the abominable snowman; Dz. སྣཤ་ ’migö; cf. སྣཤ་ mirmula.
grok — num., six {Tib. སྣཤ་ drug}. 
grumangti — n., elbow [Tang; སྣཤ་ grumang] {Tib. སྣཤ་ gru-mo}. 
gungmu — (* n., middle finger; cf. pramang bonpo.
guyung — n., head {Tib. སྣཤ་ mgo}. 
gwa — num., two (used of filled vessels or receptacles); cf. སྣཤ་ bleng.
gwi — n., hip.
hrak-mala — v., see khrak-mala.
hrang-mala — v., see khrang-mala.
hrai སྒི་— v., imperative of ན་པ་ ra-mala.
hra-k-hrok སྒི་ཁྲོ་— adv., confused, mixed up.
hram-mala ར་མ་ལ་— v., destroy, demolish.
hyawang མ་པ་— n., lamasery; cf. Dz. མ་པ་ lhakha.
in ཞེས་— pro., see yin.
’imin རེ་ི་— n., 1) mother’s sister; 2) father’s brother’s wife
jai རེ་— postp., on top of, atop, above.
jappar རེ་པར་— n., cup of tea.
jawā ག་— n., moustache.
jep-mala ག་མ་ལ་— v., enjoy.
jigpāla ག་ལ་ — (* ) adj., enormous, huge.
joma ག་— n., intestines, abdomen.
ju མ་— n., 1) breast, tit, teat; 2) milk {Tib. བ་ zo ‘yoghurt’; Japhug rGy. ts-lu ‘milk’}.
ju-mala ག་ལ་— v., [an etymological relationship with ju ‘breast’ cannot be excluded, although this seems improbable] future.
ka ལ་— n., snow {Tib. ལ་ kha-ba}.
kaga ལ་— n., penis of a boy before reaching puberty; cf. ཞེ་ cecu.
kai ལ་— n., back {Tib. བ་ sgal}.
kak ལ་— n., blood {Tib. ལ་ khrag, Ch. བ ར་ xaek < *qʰrak (0779a) ‘red, fiery’, Bur. རེ་ lhak ‘ashamed’}.
kakcan ལ་ཅན་— adj., good.
kande ལ་— n., palate.
kangbu ལ་བོ་— n., bladder {Tib. ཀ འ་ lga-bu}.
kangdung ལ་དང་— n., thigh.
karyu ལ་ཐ་ ( )* n., [< Tib. ཅོ་ dkar-yol] porcelain cup.
kat ལ་ ( )* n., language {Tib. ལ་ skad}.
ketpa ལ་ — n., waist {Tib. བ་ sked-pa}.
ki ལ་ ( )* n., potato, tuber.
kili ལ་— n., the little finger, pinkie [Chunmat: ལ་ མ ར ག ཡ kilik].
kirat ལ་– n., Bhutanese female garb (Dz. ར་ཁར་ kira) [Chogor: བ་ chuba]; cf. ལ་ kisang.
kisang ལ་ — n., cloth to wrap in which to wrap something, cf. ལ་ kirat.
klatpa ལ་པ་ — n., brain {Tib. ལ་པ་ klad-pa}.
konye ལ་— adj., next, following.
kra ལ་— n., hair on scalp [Tang: ལ་ ra] {Tib. ལ་ skra}.
kran-mala ཁེན་མ་ལ་ — v., miss someone, yearn, long for.
krong ལུང་ — n., village {Tib. ལུང་ sgroôn}.
kut-mala ཤ་མ་ལ་ — v., put, place.
kwa ས་ — n., tooth; cf. རྒྱ་ chewa, སྣད་ dongkwa, རྡོ་ phupkwa, སྣད་ surkwa.
kwii ས་ — n., round woven bamboo mat to underset pots and pans.
kha ས་ — n., mouth, language; cf. བཏོ་ kat {Tib. ས་ kha}.
kha-go-mala བེ་མ་ལ་ — v., understand, grasp; cf. Dz. ཤ་ཧྱི་ hag’oni {Tib. ས་ ha-go, not met in early Tibetan literature}.
khae ས་ — num., one score (twenty) {Tib. ས་ khal ‘a unit of volume equal to twenty ས་ bre’}.
khaechenthek བེ་ཅེ་དེ་ — num., eight thousand.
kaesum བེ་སུམ་ — num., sixty.
kaethek བེ་དེ་ — num., twenty.
khaezon བེ་ཟོན་ — num., forty.
khaido བེ་དོ — n., kidneys {Tib. བེ་ ཚག རྒྱ་ mkhal}.
khakso བེ་སོ — adv., up, straight up, upright.
khan-mala བེ་མ་ལ་ — v., know {Tib. བེ་ ཚག རྒྱ་ mkhan}.
khangma བེ་དག — adj., long.
kharkharma བེ་དག་ — adj., white {Tib. བེ་ བ ཨ རྒྱ་ dkar}.
khawa བེ་ ལུ། — n., chicken, hen.
khawate བེ་ ལུ། བེ་ — n. [< khawa ‘hen’ + ?te ‘egg’], egg, chicken egg
khawate khrangma བེ་ལ་་ཡ་མ་ — n. [literally ‘egg-pip’], yolk.
kenjang བེན་ཇང་ — n., shirt; Dz. བེན་ khenja.
kher-mala བེར་མ་ལ་ — v., cook, build, prepare.
khi, khile ས་ བི་ — pro., he, she (erg.).
khit ས་ བི་ — pro., he, him, she, her.
khor-mala བེར་མ་ལ་ — v., take away.
khrak-mala བེར་མ་ལ་ — v., arrive, have been somewhere [Chunmat: བེར་མ་ lhak-mala].
khrang ས་ (*) n., pip.
khrang-mala བེར་མ་ལ་ — v., climb [Chunmat: བེར་མ་ hrang-mala].
khrangkhrang སྣོད་པ་ — n., crane (bird).
khratpa སྣོད་ (*) n., the wild Himalayan gaur, Bos gaurus; Dz. བེ་ བི་ 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་བོ ས་ b’amö, for example, especially when a speaker is unfamiliar with the genuine grassroots *Ngalop pronunciation of a word.
khro-mala  རྒྱ་མ་ — v., bathe {Tib. kru, pres. ḥkrh}.  
khrong-mala  རྒྱུང་མ་ — v., germinate, sprout, sprout up, shoot up.  
khur  ར་ — n., cheek {Tib. mkhur-ba}.  
khurba  ར་བ་ — n., heavy Tatary buckwheat flatbread {Dz. bjø g’i khulep}.  
khü  སྨ་ — n., see kühr.  
khrong-mala  རུང་མ་ — v., germinate, sprout, sprout up, shoot up.  
khü  སྨ་ — n., see kühr.  
khü  སྨ་ — n., see khür.  
khwe  སྲ་ — n., water {Tib. khu-ba ‘liquid’}.  
khwe  སྲ་ — n., water {Tib. khu-ba ‘liquid’}.  
khwethor  སྲུད་ — n., heavy Tatary buckwheat flatbread; Dz. bjø g’i khulep.  
khwit  སྲིད་ — adj., too big, oversize.  
lajan  སྲུན་ — n., white cuffs to be worn with the chubak; Dz. ℓâge.  
lap-mala  སྲབ་མ་ — v., say, tell [note: low tone in contrast to Dz. ℓapni] {Tib. ℓap}.  
litpa  སྲིད་ — n., clitoris.  
lök  སྲུད་ — adv., back.  
lök-mala  སྲུད་མ་ — v., return, come back {Tib. ℓog}.  
luspa  སྲོག་ — n., body {Chunmat: ℓus, dialectal: ℓus; Bur. myak, Ch. Myak < *C.muk (1036a)}.  
'li  སྲི་ — n., tongue {Tib. སྲི lc, Bur. Ψlhyā, Ch. Ψle zyeX < *C.a.le? (0867f) ‘lick’}.  
'lujungmet  སྲིིནོ་ཞིན་ — n., uvula.  
'lithakpa  སྲིིན་ཁ་ — n., frenulum linguae.  
'long  སྲིང་ — n., wind, breeze. {Tib. སྲིང་ rlun}.  
mai  སྲིིན་ — n., house {Tib. སྲིིན་ mał ‘bed’}.  
makpa  སྲིིན་པ་ — n., husband; 2) son-in-law, grandson-in-law {Tib. སྲིིན་ ‘bridegroom’, Bur. སྲིིན་ mak}.  
matki  སྲིིན་ཐིི — n., male sarong (Nep. luṅg).  
mek  སྲིིན་ — n., eye {O.Tib. སྲིིན་ dmig, སྲིིན་ mig, Bur. སྲིིན་ myak, Ch. སྲིིན་ mjuwk < *C.muk (1036a)}.  
mekbo  སྲིིན་ — n., pupil of the eye {Chunmat, Chogor: cha}.  
mekkharti  སྲིིན་ཁར་ — 1) n., white of the eye; 2) adv., with the white of one’s eyes, e.g. སྲིིན་ཁར་ཏད་ ‘he looked at him with the whites of his eyes’.  
mekpabpa སྲིིན་པ་ — n., eyelid (literally ‘eye-skin’).  
mekpuli  སྲིིན་ཤིི — n., tear.  
meme  སྲིིི — n., grandfather {Chunmat, σmim < *C.men (0826a)}.
Mengkat ཨོ་དཀར་ (*)& n., Dzongkha, the national language of Bhutan, native to western Bhutan.
menko གཤེར་ — n., flower {O.Tib. གཤེར་ men-tog}.
mewa ིབ་ — n., small mole or birthmark {Tib. ིབ་ rme-ba, the change VbV > VwV shows that this word is a Tibetic loan}.
mi གི — n., person, man (note: low tone in contrast to Dz. གི 'mi) {Tib. གི mi}.
miling ིིང་ིང་ — n., penis of a man who has fathered a child; cf. ིིང་ cu cu.
min ིིམ — v., not to be (used to establish identity of referent). {Tib. ིིམ min}
mindetsa ིིང་ངོས — n., woman {Chunmat: ིིང་ངོས membaza}.
mirgula ིིང་།ལ་ — n., rhesus monkey; cf. ིིང་། grekpo, ིིང་། raksha.
mlak-mala ིིང་མ་ལ་ — v., soil something or part of one’s body in something sticky, syrupy or slimy.
mlakmloga ིིང་མ་ལ་ — adj., sticky, syrupy, slimy.
mor ིོར — n., vagina of an old woman, large vagina; cf. ིོར pepe.
mos ིོས — n., pubic hair; Dz. ིོས hung {Thangmi mus ‘body hair’, O.Bur. ིོས: muyh, Ch. ིོས maw < *C.maw (1137a)}.
mrat ིེར — n., paddy, standing rice {Tib. ིེར hbras, Ch. ིེར lat < *(m)-r at (0340g)}.
mrat-mala ིེར་མ་ལ་ — v., scratch {Tib. ིེར hbrad}.
mu-mala ིེར་ལ་ — v., do.
mukduma ིེར་ལ་ — n., fist, cf. ིེར pare.
mtnu ིེར་ — n., not to be (in the existential, locational and attributive senses) {Tib. ིེར med}.
’mringma ིེར་མ་ — n., eyebrow {Tib. ིེར smin}.
’mrnan ིེར་ — n., sebum, blackhead.
’mrat ིེར་ — n., flour to thicken soup with.
’mrnu-mala ིེར་ད་ལ་ — v., sell.
na ར། — loc.postp., in, at, on.
na ར། — v., be (in the existential, locative or attributive senses).
na ར། — n., ear {Tib. ར། rna}.
namo, nama རོ་བ་ — n., 1) wife [Chogor: རོ་ nesa]; 2) daughter-in-law, granddaughter-in-law {Tib. རོ་ རོ་ རོ་ na-mo}.
nang རོ་ — postp., inside, within {Tib. རོ་ nang}.
nanmun རོ་།།ཀྲ་ — adv., the day after tomorrow.
nat རོ་ — n., illness, disease {Tib. རོ་ nad}.
natpa རོ་།། — n., ear wax [Chunmat: རོ་།། naskap]
neng རེ་—— conj., and, with.
nene སྤྱ་བྱ། སྤྱ་བྱ། — n., 1) father's sister; 2) mother’s brother’s wife; [Chunmat: རེ་ སྤྱ་བྱ། nini].
nengma རེ་མ་—— n., heart {Tib. རེ་ sñi, Bur. རེ་ nhac, Ch. རེ་ nyin < *nin (0388f) ‘kindness’}. 
ning རེ་—— conj., see རེ་ neng.
nor ་ཀྱ་—— n., younger brother {Tib. རེ་ nu-bo ‘younger brother’, Ch. རེ་ nyuH < *nos (0134d) ‘child, mild’}.
nomet རེ་ད་—— n., younger sister.
ning རེ་—— conj., see རེ་ neng.
no རེ་—— n., younger brother {Tib. རེ་ nu-bo ‘younger brother’, Ch. རེ་ nyuH < *nos (0134d) ‘child, mild’}.
nomet རེ་ད་—— n., younger sister.
ning རེ་—— conj., see རེ་ neng.
no རེ་—— n., younger brother {Tib. རེ་ nu-bo ‘younger brother’, Ch. རེ་ nyuH < *nos (0134d) ‘child, mild’}.
nomet རེ་ད་—— n., younger sister.
ning རེ་—— conj., see རེ་ neng.
no རེ་—— n., younger brother {Tib. རེ་ nu-bo ‘younger brother’, Ch. རེ་ nyuH < *nos (0134d) ‘child, mild’}.
no རེ་—— n., younger brother {Tib. རེ་ nu-bo ‘younger brother’, Ch. རེ་ nyuH < *nos (0134d) ‘child, mild’}.
no རེ་—— n., younger brother {Tib. རེ་ nu-bo ‘younger brother’, Ch. རེ་ nyuH < *nos (0134d) ‘child, mild’}.
'nyor-'nyor སྣྱུར་སྣྱུར་ — n., sexual union.
omtsho-khenjang བོད་སྤིན་གཞིང་གིས། བོད་སྤིན་གཞིང་ ‘shirt’] cardigan, pullover.
otomang གཏོགས་ — n., front of the neck.
'o-mala བོ་མ་ལ་ — v., bring.
'onga བོ་ང་ — n., child.
pak, pakpa སྣ་པ་པ་ — n., skin; སྣ་པ་པ་ སྣ་པ་པ་ pak shrop-na, gang plik-na ‘the [fore]skin has been retracted, [your] glans penis has been exposed’; cf. སྣ་པོ་བྲི་མི་cucui shrop {Tib. སྣ་པོ་བི་lpags-pa}.
pare མ་ (*) n., a held up hand, the hollow of the hand; cf. མ་ རུ་ mukduma.
pare-gang མ་དང་ (*) num., a handful {Tib. མ་དང་ sbar-gan}.
pat མ་ — n., leech; cf. Dz. མ་ pêp.
patmong མ་ཉེང་ — n., knee {Tib. མ་ཉེང་ spus-mo, མ་ཉེང་ dpus-mo, Bur. རྡོ་མདོ pu-chac}.
pepe མ་ — n., vagina; cf. mor.
pethe མ་ — adj., bald.
plak-mala བ་མ་ལ་ — v., scream, make noise.
plakta བ་ལ་ — n., screaming, hollering, noise, racket.
plik-mala བ་ལ་ — v., be peeled, be uncovered, be lid bare.
po མ་ — n., body hair {Tib. མ་ spu}.
po མ་ — n., snake, serpent {Tib. མ་ sbul, O.Bur. བྱུང་ mruy, Ch. རྒྱ་ jwix < *ruj}}.
pok-mala བ་ལ་ — n., strike, hit, beat.
pongma བ་ཅེས་ — n., shoulder {Tib. བ་ཅེས་ dpuñ-pa}.
pra, priu མ་ — n., rhesus monkey; cf. མ་ སྣ་ raksha {Tib. མ་ spra ‘monkey’, མ་ spre hu ‘monkey’, the Tibetan diminutive suffix suggests a Tibetic loan}.
pramang བ་མང་ — n., 1) fingers, toes; 2) index finger.
pramang bonpo བ་མང་བོད་ — n., middle finger [Tang: བོད་ gungmu].
prat-mala བ་ལ་ — v., fight.
priu མ་ — see མ་ pra.
pron-mala བ་ལ་ — v., crash a party, dinner or prayer service in the hope of being able to partake thereof.
pun མ་ — n., male cross-cousin, i.e. son of father’s sister or of mother’s brother {Tib. མ་ spun}.
puringmo མ་ཤེས་ — n., female cross-cousin, i.e. daughter of father’s sister or of mother’s brother.
pha-mala བ་མ་ — v., happen, be done.
phai མ་ — n., forehead [Tang: སྣ་ phailang} {Tib. མ་ dpral}. 
phan-mala རྒྱ་མ་ལ་ — v., cure an illness (loc.), recover from an illness (tel.) {Tib. རྒྱ་, phan ‘help, benefit’}.
phecung གཅུ་ — n., bag, sack.
phoja བ ་ — n., man.
phor-mala རྒྱ་མ་ལ་ — v., fondle, feel; cf. རྒྱ་མ་ལ་ tok-mala.
phrat-mala བ ་ ་ — v., come into conflict, be at loggerheads.
phupkwa ཡུའ་ཧ་ — n., [< ཀ་ kwa ‘tand’] molars.
ra ར — n., goat {Tib. ར ra}.
ra-mala རྒྱ་མ་ལ་ — v., come.
raksha རེ་་ — n., golden langur; cf. རེ་་ mirgula; རེ་་ grekpo, རེ་ priu {< Skt. rakṣa}.
rang རང (before the genitive suffix: རི ra) — pro., self, own; adv. by itself, of it own accord {Tib. རི ra}.
rantsam རྒྱ་ཙམ་ — n., hairline [dialectal: རྒྱ་ཙམ་ krantsam].
rantsham thonmo རྒྱ་ཙམ་ཐོན་མོ — n. + adj., receding hairline. {Tib. རོི tshom ‘beard’, Bur. རོི cham- ‘hair’, Ch. རོི tshrim < *tshrim (0660g) ‘hairpin’}
ra-to རོ་ — n., root.
re རི — adv., hearsay evidential in non-interrogative sentences.
ri རི — n., hill, mountain {Tib. རི ri}.
rotpa རོ་འབ — n., bone [Chunmat: རོ་ ཐེ ཈ rosa] {Tib. རོ ཈ rus, O.Bur. རོ ལོ ruiwh}.
ruk རུ ག — n., curry.
ruk-mala རུ་མ་ལ་ — v., put away, clean up.
’ra ཤ་ — n., hair on scalp.
’rat ཤ་ — n., bamboo fibre for weaving traditional Bhutanese bowls.
’rewa ཤ་ི་ — n., tool for removing ears of wheat from the stalks.
’ri ཤ་ — n., start, beginning.
’rok ཤ་ — n., river.
’ronman ཤ་ཙམ་ — n., thread [Chunmat: ཤ་ཙམ་ ‘rotman’].
’rotpa ཤ་འབ — n., appendix.
sar, saro སར་ ས་ — adv., down.
se-mala ས་མ་ལ་ — v., die {Tib. སི, the lack of palatalisation shows that the Bumthang form is cognate and not a Tibetic loan}.
seng སེང — n., wood, tree {Tib. སེ སི, the lack of palatalisation shows that the Bumthang form is cognate and not a Tibetic loan}.
sengma སེང ག — n., urine{Tib. སེ སི, the lack of palatalisation shows that the Bumthang form is cognate and not a Tibetic loan}.
sima སིམ་ — n., nails (on digit) {Tib. སིི sen-mo}.
sinla झिङ्गा — n., ring finger [Tang: झिङ्गण् sinlak].
sirsirma झिङ्गरमा — adj., yellow {Tib. झिङ्गरे ser-po ‘yellow’}.
sotro झोट्रु (*) adj., with crooked teeth.
sum झुम — num., three {Tib. झुम्न gsum}.
sunla झुन्ला — 1) n., night; 2) adv., at night.
surkwa झुर्क्व — n., [< झु kwa ‘tand’] canine teeth.
sut-mala झुत्मल — v., kill, slaughter {Tib. झुत्साथ gsd}. 
sham-mala झुममल — v., set the table, display wares.
shar झर — n., east {Tib. झर śar}.
shekpa झेरप — n., scrotum [Chunmat: झेरप shekpat].
shekpa khrangma झेरपमल — n., [literally ‘scrotum pip’] testicles [Chunmat: झेरपमल shekpat khrangma, Tang: झेरपमल shekpai khrang].
shindi झिङ्गदी — adj., red {Daai Chin sʰen}.
sho’long झेलिङ्ग — n., strong wind.
shu झु — adv., hearsay evidential in interrogative sentences.
shra झ्रा — n., meat {Tib. झा sa, Bur. झास sāḥ, Lashi ーター, Daai Chin sʰa}. 
shrai झ्राई — n., drool, drivel.
shrai-mala झ्राईमल — v., overflow.
shraima झ्राईमा — n., harrow without teeth.
shram झ्राम — n., shoes; cf. Dz. झ्राम lham {Tib. झ्राम lham}.
shrambrat झ्रामब्रात — n., sash for fastening traditional shoes at the top.
shrap झ्राप — n., veranda.
shrà, shrai झ्रा झ्राई — n., drool, drivel.
shrokseng झ्रोक्सेंग — n., juniper; Dz. झ्रोक्सेंग shupashing, Lat. Juniperus.
shrop-mala झ्रोपमल — v., be retracted [of foreskin]; clasp or hold something cylindrical in shape; shin, climb by shining.
shropse झ्रोपसे — adv., gerund of झ्रोपमल shrop-mala.
shrordo झ्रोर्दो — n., extra chore performed in addition to the main task assigned in order to show devotion to one’s boss (cf. Dz. झ्रोर्दो zhôkha).
shrung-mala झ्रुंगमल — v., shake everything into place (e.g. articles in a bag); heave whilst sobbing.
shrup झ्रुप — n., sheath. {Tib. झ्रुप bṣub}.
takpa thatsa झक्सा थड्सा — n., nape of the neck, lower part of the neck near the shoulders.
takpa झक्झा — n., back of the neck.
tarpa झर्पा — n., whey; Dz. झर्पा d’âu.
tarshing झर्सिङ्ग — n., prayer flag.
tawa lem झत्वा ले — n., upper surface of the foot.
tawa phop ཏ་ཝ་བ་ — n., instep of the foot.
tawanang ཏ་ཝ་ནང་ — n., sole.
tegolong ཏ་ཝ་ཐོ་ — n., ankle.
templali འི་། མ་ — n., 1) penis of an old man; cf. འི་། མ་ cu cu; 2) wooden penis used as a talisman suspended from the eaves of the house to ward off evil spirits {Tib. མེ་ mje, Kur. plik, Bur. མི་ līh}.
tep འི་། — n., rib.
tingma འི་། པ་ — n., heel.
tiru འི་། — n., money, Ngütram (the Bhutanese currency unit); Dz. འི་། འི་། tiru.
tiwit འི་། — n., navel {Tib. འི་། ག་ l-te-ba}.
to འི་། — n., nipple
tok-mala འི་། ར་མ་ལ་ — v., fondle, fiddle with something; cf. འི་། འི་། phor-mala.
toktemet འི་། ཐ་ད་ — n., cheekbones.
tor-mala འི་། — v., sow.
tosang འི་། — n., friend; cf. charo; Dz. འི་། འི་། totsha.
tottong འི་། — n., white collar worn in conjunction with a chubak (Dz. tōgo) {Chogor: འི་། འི་། totdung}.
tun-mala འི་། ར་མ་ལ་ — v., show, display; cf. chong-mala {Tib. འི་། འི་། ston}.
tup-mala འི་། འི་། — v., cut, slice {Tib. འི་། འི་། gtub}.
turtsum འི་། ཐ་ཙ་ — n., suctionsal movement made by the vagina around the penis; cf. Dz. འི་། ཐ་ཙ་ tuzum ‘ibidem’, འི་། ཐ་ཙ་ khazum ‘sucking movement of the mouth’.
thap འི་། ག་ — n., oven {Tib. འི་། འི་། thab}.
thap-mala འི་། འི་། ར་མ་ལ་ — v., argue, dispute, harangue.
thatsa, cucui thatsa འི་། ཐ་ཙ་ འི་། ཐ་ཙ་ — n., corpus spongiosum penis; cf. Dz. འི་། ཐ་ཙ་ thâtsa.
theik འི་། — num., one; art., a/an, a certain. {Tib. གཅིག gcig, Bur. རོ་ཝ་ tac, Ch. 隻 tsyek < *tek (1260c) ‘one of a pair’}
theip འི་། — n., spit, saliva.
therma འི་། ཐ་ཙ་ — adv., the day before yesterday.
thimang འི་། ག་ — n., thumb, big toe. {Tib. འི་། ག་ mthe-bo}.
Thimphu འི་། ཐིམ་དག་ — n., Thimphu, capital city of Bhutan.
thomala འི་། ག་ — n., arm above the elbow [Chunmat, Tang: འི་། ག་ tho].
thong-mala འི་། ག་ — v., drink; cf. Dz. འི་། ག་ thun {Tib. འི་། ག་ བུན thung}.
thor-mala འི་། ག་ — v., pluck, pick; cf. Dz. འི་། ག་ ཆིད câni.
thot-mala འི་། ག་ — v., join, connect, bind.
thu-mala འི་། — n., chop.
thung-mala ཞང་ལ་ v., see; cf. Dz. ཡུལ་ thong {Tib. ཞང་ mtho'}.  
thung-mala ཞང་ལ་ v., 1) commit, execute, perform; 2) dative or relinguitative aspectiviser.  

thrpa ཞ་ n., gall bladder {Tib. ཡུལ་ mkhris-pa, the sound change khr- > thr- ensures a Tibetic loan}.  

thro ཞ v., aspectiviser meaning ‘persist, persevere, continue, be inexorably involved in’.  

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

throm-mala ཞང་ལ་ — v., break, shatter.  

thrung ཞ n., rice.  

tsa ཞ n., vein, artery {Tib. ར་ rtsa}.  

tsamadü ར་མ་དལ་ adv., intensely, a lot, much.  

Tsamet ར་མ་དལ་ 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. ར་ tsham.  

Tsau ར་ n., brother’s son or husband of brother’s daughter (for a female speaker); sister’s son or huband of sister’s daughter (for a male speaker); cf. Dz. ར་ tshao.  

Tisrphat ར་ n., wart.  

Tshai ར་ plural suffix.  

Tshakti ར་་ n., crown.  

Tshuk-mala ར་ལ་ v., can, be able to.  

Tshū-mala ར་ལ་ v., seek, look for, search {Tib. འི་མ་ སྱི་ tshol}.  

'ugu ཡ་ n., 1) father’s brother; 2) mother’s sister’s husband; [Chunmat: ཡ་ ¥་ tugo].  

Wagam ཡ་ n., jaw.  

Waktem ཡ་ད་ n., [< Dz. ཡ་ད་ waktém] hip movements of a woman during intercourse.  

Ware ཡ་ adv., emotive particle gently demanding the attention of the person addressed and underscoring the speaker’s authority; cf. Dz. ཡ་ mare.  

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

Wet ཡ་ pro., you (sg.).  

Wi ཡ་ pro., you (sg.erg.).  

'wai ཡ་ v., imperative of ཞང་ལ་ ‘o-mala.  

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

Yah ཡ་ interj., watch out!  

Yak ཡ་ n., lower arm from the elbow on down, lower arm and hand {Tib. ཡ་ lag, Bur. ཡ་ lag}.  


yak འག་ — n., yak, i.e., male yak; cf. bre {Tib. ལག་ g.yag}.
yakbit འག་ཚིག་(*) n., back of the hand.
yakinangma འག་ནང་མ་ — n., palm of the hand, the inner surface of the extended palm and fingers.
yaktshik འག་ཚིག་ — n., wrist {Tib. འག་ཚིག་ lag-tshigs}.
yam འག་ — n., road, way {Tib. ལམ་ lam, Bur. སྲེལ lamd}. 
yampat འབབའུ — adv., tomorrow.
yampat-nanmun འབབའུནན་ — adv., one of these days, soon.
yan-mala འབབའུ — v., obey.
yanga འང་ — num., five {Tib. སྤྱ་ lṅa, Bur. ངུ་ ngā, Ch. ང་ ngāḥ, Ch. ང་ ngā< *Cŋˤaʔ(0058a)}. 
yang-mala འང་མ་ལ་ — v., stand, stand up; e.g. ཆུ་ཤེན་ cúcu yang-da ‘I have an erection’ (literally: ‘penis is standing’).
yangchenthek འང་ཞེན་ཐེ་ — num., one hundred sixty thousand.
yat འད — n., chore, work, task {Tib. ལས་ las}.
yigu རི་ — n., letter; cf. Dz. རི་ yig’u {Tib. རི་ y-ge}.
yin རིན་ — pro., you (pl.).
yinle རི་ལེ་ — pro., you (pl.erg.).
yo རོ — clause-final interj., hey, y’hear.
yi འི — n., rain [Tang: འི་ yi, Ch. འི་ hju< *Cʷaʔ(1200a)].
yung-mala འིང་མ་ལ་ — v., get, fetch.
’ya འད (*)& n., deposit at the bottom of copper pans.
zama, zam རམ་ — n., cooked rice.
zat-mala རི་མ་ལ་ — v., finish, complete [governs the gerund in <se>].
zhimnyae རིམ་ཉེ་(*) n., cat {Tib. རིམ་ཉེ་ zi-mi, the change *ly > ž suggests a Tibetic loan}.
zon རོ་ — num., two {Tib. རོ་ zuñ ‘pair’, Bur. རོ་ cuñ, Ch. (?) རོ་ sraewng < *s’roŋ (1200a)}. 
zödem རོད་ཅོད་(*) n., tasty, pungent, soft yak cheese with veins of blue and black fungus; 
Dz. རོད་ z’othū.
zu-mala རོ་མ་ལ་ — v., eat {Kur. zur, Tib. zur za, Bur. སྲེལ cāh, Japhug rGy. ndza, Ch. སྲེལ dzjo< *dza? (0046u)}.
zhego རིག་ — n., food.
zhit-mala རིག་མ་ལ་ — v., forget.
zhra རི་ — pro., what.
zhrabudze རི་བུད་ — adv., how much, how many.
zhrap རི་ — n., layer of butterfat on top of salted Bhutanese tea {Tib. (?) སྲེལ žag}.
zhrong རིང་ — n., worm.
zhror རིང་ — n., dialect word for churma ‘native beer’.
zhrurti དེར། — n., bamboo species; Dz. གང་བ། changsho.
zhruwa བྲུ་ — n., lungs {Tib. (?) ལུ་ཞེ glo-ba}.
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