REVIEW OF: THURGOOD, GRAHAM, AND RANDY LAPOLLA, EDS. THE SINO-TIBETAN LANGUAGES. SECOND EDITION. LONDON AND NEW YORK: ROUTLEDGE, 2017. XXX + 1018 PP. ISBN 978-1-138-78332-4. PRICE 300 GBP.

Reviewed by George van Driem
University of Bern, Switzerland
vandriem@isw.unibe.ch

It has been fourteen years since the appearance of the first edition of this compendium of Trans-Himalayan languages. In its second edition, the volume has swollen to encompass 53 chapters. As Simon and Hill (2015: 381) noted, the language family "is known by names including 'Tibeto-Burman', 'Sino-Tibetan' and 'Trans-Himalayan', of which the last is the most neutral and accurate". McColl *et al*. (2018: 362) put it more succinctly in their *Science* article, stating simply: "Trans-Himalayan (formerly Sino-Tibetan)". In the very title to this volume, the two editors, Graham Ward Thurgood and Randy John LaPolla, loudly proclaim their adherence to the obsolete and empirically unsupported "Sino-Tibetan" phylogeny, but many of the contributors to this Routledge volume do not themselves subscribe to the same antiquated Indo-Chinese understanding of the language family. Outside of this volume, a good number of the contributing scholars openly abjure this family tree model. Later, we shall examine how the outspoken bias of the two editors pervades the volume in a thorough and more insidious manner than in the first edition. The anthology comprises 44 grammatical sketches, two of which are devoted to dead Trans-Himalayan languages, five survey articles, two editorial pieces, a piece on the Chinese writing system and a discussion of word order.

Editorial misrepresentations, the state of the art and Gerber's Law

This volume contains many valuable, some truly wonderful and a few problematic instalments, but the Routledge compendium is truly marred by the two editorial pieces authored by Thurgood and LaPolla and positioned at the very beginning of the book. In addition to the two large editorial pieces, the first section also contains a brief study of word order in Trans-Himalayan languages by Matthew Synge Dryer. A volume that purports to present a general overview of the field should dispassionately present different positions held by specialists in that field, and the failure even just once to mention that alternative views exist that are quite at variance with Thurgood and LaPolla's own particular view characterises an unfair comportment on the part of the two editors that is not just unsportsmanlike, but unscholarly and unworthy of our field. For well over a century, the phylogeny of the language family has been a matter of considerable controversy. Yet both editors are careful to cite and quote only such sources as happen to agree with their own model.

The empirically unsupported Indo-Chinese taxonomy relentlessly propounded by an ever dwindling number of "true believer" Sino-Tibetanists permeates the very arrangement of the book, and the two editors have even wilfully skewed the contents of the volume in order to fit their obsolete Indo-Chinese family tree. In keeping with this "Sino-Tibetan" conceit, the editors have included six instalments on Sinitic, though the sheer brevity of Dah-an Ho's instalment on Mandarin could reflect a reluctance on the part of its contributor to indulge the paradigm championed by the two editors. Indeed, as already noted, many of the scholars who have contributed to this volume reject the language family tree model touted by the editors. Moreover, the editorial twosome surreptitiously sneak their own "Rung" subgroup into the table of contents, thereby falsely suggesting that this fiction represents a valid taxon within the family. To exacerbate matters, their table of contents incompetently groups Tshangla and Newar as "Bodish" languages.

The volume opens with Thurgood's own classification of the language family, which unconscionably cites only articles that happen to concur with the editors' model. The arguments put forward by scholars who have assailed the "Sino-Tibetan" family tree model and by linguists who have shown that Rung is wrong are not addressed. All such literature is categorically ignored. Even if one were inclined to pardon the inaccuracy and sloppiness of the earlier 2003 edition with regard to the internal classification of the language family under the pretext that few detailed language descriptions and data were then available, then such a defence, which indeed would have only partially held up fifteen years ago, would be entirely invalid today. Enough data are available to allow a more rigorous classification and not simply the classification of certain selected languages in an entirely intuitive and impressionistic manner. Hill (2017:307-310) has already pointed out the conspicuous bibliographical lacunae and factual errors in Thurgood's introductory chapter, including flagrant mistakes in his treatment of Tibetan, one of the most well documented languages of the family.

In his confused section on "Tshangla", Thurgood includes the remarkable anacoluthon "Not members of Tshangla: Lhokpu and Gongduk are not in the Tshangla branch." This not particularly enlightening statement would be analogous to asserting truthfully: "Not members of Greek: Albanian and Armenian are not in the Greek branch". An inconvenient consequence of the editors' avoiding literature by authorities who do not happen to agree with their obsolete view of linguistic phylogeny is that they are quite unable to write knowledgeably about languages such as Lhokpu, Gongduk and Tshangla (cf. Bodt 2012, van Driem 2001, 2013).[1] Instead of consulting scholars who actually work on the languages in question, Thurgood relies on personal communications from Gwendolyn Hyslop and Mark Post for his sources of information on Tshangla and Gongduk respectively. As I argued in my review of the first edition of this book (van Driem 2014), it would have been desirable that such a volume be edited by capable, knowledgeable and widely read scholars. It was a trifle presumptuous on the part of this twosome, who do not span the field, to have undertaken to shoulder the editing of a volume of such girth and scope, not just once but twice.

Thurgood's garbled ruminations on Tshangla, Lhokpu and Gongduk have already begun to misinform scholars and to lead a life of their own. Thurgood professes to have gleaned that: "Gongduk *daŋli* 'water', *taɦ* 'meat', *diŋ* 'wood, firewood', *ɤn* 'tooth', *um* 'face' have no known cognates". He immediately contradicts this contention in a footnote that reads: "Perhaps *siŋ 'tree; wood' (< Mark Post)" (pp. 15, 31). These disconnected bits of information prompted Hill (2017:308) to write in his review: "Staying with meat, if we accept Post's suggestion that Gongduk *diŋ* 'tree' descends from *siŋ (cf. Tib. *śiṅ* 'tree' and Chi. 薪 siŋ 'firewood'), then it is logical to suppose that Gongduk *taɦ* 'meat' continues *sya 'flesh' (p. 15)." I have been compelled to redress some of LaPolla's grosser misrepresentations of the history of linguistics (van Driem 2018), and so it should perhaps not come as a surprise that the highly selective ruminations of Thurgood and LaPolla would themselves spawn an inadvertant falsification of the history of thought.

In 2012 and 2013, I taught a course on Gongduk for three consecutive semesters at the University of Bern. In this course, participants were given unimpeded access to all of my fieldnotes on Gongduk as well as to partially completed manuscripts and drafts. The students analysed and worked on the language data themselves. On the 13th of May 2013, Pascal Gerber presented a beautiful working paper entitled "Die Verhärtung von */s/ zu /t ~ d/ im Gongduk" in the course *Das Gongduk: Feldforschung und Grammatikbeschreibung II*, which I was teaching that semester. Gerber later went to Thimphu to work with Gongduk speakers himself. In July 2015, I witnessed Pascal explain this regular sound change in Gongduk, which I hereby christen Gerber's Law, to Mark Post in the Bernese tram № 6, as we rode in the direction of Worb. Evidently, Thurgood later gleaned this sound law from Mark, and the prompting in Thurgood's footnote enabled the highly observant and perspicacious Nathan Hill to stumble upon one of the very examples adduced by Gerber in his original 2013 class paper, which I have kept. Gerber will publish this Gongduk sound law and his other findings on the language in due course.

Both Thurgood's meanderings on the internal classification of the language family and LaPolla's piece on "Sino-Tibetan" morphosyntax represent egregious specimens of scholarship, although it must be conceded that LaPolla quite outdoes Thurgood in this regard. The editors' "Rung" wrongly lumps together rGyalrongic, Nungish, Kiranti and West Himalayish within an entirely fictitious subgroup. By dint of the absolute lack of evidence for Rung and the methodological shoddiness of the work of its proponents, Rung

---

[1] Since the appearance of this volume, new data have been presented and new hypotheses proposed with regard to Lhokpu, i.e. Grollmann und Gerber (2018).

differs fundamentally from intrinsically interesting higher subgrouping proposals such as Sino-Bodic (Simon 1929, van Driem 1997), Burmo-Qiāngic (Bradley 1997, 2002, Jacques 2014) and the Central Branch (DeLancey 2015). In fact, the sole purpose of Rung is to bestow an appearance of legitimacy upon LaPolla's dogged attempts to "reconstruct" a proto-language typologically similar to modern Mandarin Chinese.

Kepping (1994) and I (van Driem 1991, 1993c) assailed LaPolla's misunderstanding of historical linguistics and his misrepresentation of linguistic facts. Years later, Jacques (2016) was compelled to establish the evidently enduring nature of LaPolla's methodological problems and to criticise his persistence in falsely representing the facts of Tangut verbal morphology. Hill (forthcoming) and DeLancey (forthcoming) each dispassionately lay bare how the Rung construct stems from LaPolla's failure to grasp the comparative method and his unfamiliarity with the available grammatical descriptions of the languages which he undertakes to subgroup. In LaPolla's single paragraph on "person marking", he condescendingly asserts: "Attempts to associate the Rung pattern with other patterns in the family and reconstruct it to PTB have been unsuccessful (see LaPolla 1992a, 2012b for discussion)." Since the 1970s, a large volume of linguistic literature has been published which deals with this central feature in the historical grammar of the Trans-Himalayan language family. Some of the detailed literature pertaining to this pivotal issue in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax also takes to task the misrepresentation and misinterpretation of language data by LaPolla and his misunderstanding of historical linguistic methodology.

Although it is therefore understandable that LaPolla is consequently reluctant to acknowledge the very existence of such literature, he makes himself culpable of prejudiced and inept editorship by refusing to cite the most relevant literature on Trans-Himalayan morphosyntax, which includes Āṅgdembe (1999a, 1999b), Bauman (1975), Borchers (2008), DeLancey (1982, 1989, 2009, 2010, 2013a, 2013b, 2014, 2015), Dīng (1999), van Driem (1987, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1995, 1999, 2011), Genetti (1988a, 1988b, 1994, 2007), Henderson (1976), Jacques and Michaud (2011), Jacquesson (1996, 1997), Kansakār (1999), Kepping (1994), King (1994, 2001, 2002, 2009), Nagano (1984), Opgenort (2004, 2005), Rempt (1994), Rutgers (1993, 1998), Saxena (1992, 1997), Sharma (1996), Sūn (1983. 1995), Sun (2000a, 2000b), Turin (1998), Watters (2002), Yu (2011), as well as numerous older sources cited in the works listed here. LaPolla passes over this body of literature and analysed evidence in deafening silence, foists his own indefensible view of the language family onto the reader and refers the reader to the monotonous navel-gazing soliloquy of his own writings.

Turning now to Dryer's piece on word order, the third instalment in the opening section, Poppe (1965), Ch'en (1976), Hashimoto (1976a, 1976b, 1980, 1986) and Ballard (1979) developed the hypothesis that verb-medial word order in Sinitic represents a secondary state, which derived from the verb-final word order that originally characterised Tibeto-Burman syntax. These scholars proposed that this change transpired under the areal influence of neighbouring languages in the new northern habitat to which the ancient Sinitic people had migrated. Dryer cites only Hashimoto (1986), and his cursory reflections essentially add nothing new to the old discussion. Rather, the typological squib serves to uphold the Indo-Chinese conceit beloved of the two editors, which would purport to bifurcate the language family into Sinitic and non-Sinitic languages.

Survey articles

The volume contains two survey articles of Trans-Himalayan linguistic subgroups, viz. Kiranti and Tani, one geographical survey on the many languages of the linguistically heterogeneous area of northeastern India, and two survey articles on a single subgroup, Sinitic, each with a different focus. The empirically unsupported phylogenetic prominence that Thurgood and LaPolla accord to Sinitic is reflected in the fact that two survey articles are devoted to this single Trans-Himalayan linguistic subgroup. In fact, out of 41 validated or mooted branches that make up Trans-Himalayan, the grammatical sketches contained in this volume cover only 21 of the "fallen leaves" or linguistic subgroups of the language family. These 44 grammatical sketches are discussed in the next section of this review.

Boyd Michailovsky provides a panoramic overview of the Kiranti languages. In his characteristically self-abnegating style, Michailovsky neglects to mention his own unpublished *habilitation à diriger des recherches*, entitled *Études synchroniques et diachroniques sur les langues de l'Himalaya*, defended on the 2nd of June 2004, but he does cite Opgenort's (2005) historical comparative study of the Kiranti languages and Kiranti sound laws. Though predominantly typological in nature, the diachronic dimension remains palpable throughout Michailovsky's survey. Michailovsky asserts that the Kiranti languages represent a

"linguistic classification", but the validity of Kiranti as a linguistic subgroup was challenged by Winter (1986) and has now recently been reevaluated by Gerber and Grollmann (forthcoming), who propose their own novel phylogenetic hypotheses. Although the exonym Kiranti is ultimately of Sanskrit provenance, as Michailovsky correctly points out, the application of this name as a designation for a group of apparently related languages spoken in the region that today is eastern Nepal is historically recent.

Kiranti languages are spoken in a portion of the Eastern Himalaya which became eastern Nepal when Sikkimese forces were finally driven from the area in 1786, a full ten years after the Battle of चैनपुर Cainpur. After this region came under the rule of the nascent Gorkhālī government in Kathmandu, the area was divided into three excise domains named the पल्लो किराँत *Pallo Kirānt* 'Hither Kirānt', the माझ किराँत *Mājh Kirānt* 'Middle Kirānt' and the वल्लो किराँत *Vallo Kirānt* 'Further Kirānt'. The use of the Indo-Aryan adjectival form *Kirāntī* collectively to designate the Tibeto-Burman languages indigenous to this region would therefore appear to be a usage of recent date (van Driem 2001:596–597).

A timely survey article by Mark William Post and Jackson Sun, alias Sūn Tiānxīn, provides a sorely needed update on the Tani subgroup of languages. Sten Konow first grouped the Tani languages together under the name "Central Group of the North Assam Branch" of Tibeto-Burman in the *Linguistic Survey of India* (Grierson 1909). The subgroup subsequently went by the names "Mirish", "Misingish" or, most imprecisely, by the mellifluous mouthful "Abor-Miri-Dafla" until Sun's seminal study (Sun 1993a, 1993b) validated the Tani languages as a linguistic subgroup and established the new label Tani, which represents a native etymon denoting 'man'. Since out of fifteen salient Tani phonological innovations "no two high-level innovations identified the same set of genealogical branches", Post and Sun propose that "it is best to view the Tani languages as a dialect continuum". Yet the historical phonology of the subgroup is in a state of flux, and the state of the art is best reflected by the provisional family tree of the Tani languages presented by Post and Sun, which represents a revision of Sun (1993a:297). Milang has been grouped together with Koro in a new Siangic subgroup, but whether Siangic represents a distinct linguistic phylum all unto its own, as Blench once insisted (Post and Blench 2011), or whether Siangic still somehow constitutes part of Tani, as suggested in this volume by the revised provisional Tani family tree presented by Post and Sun, remains to be clarified.

Perhaps the two authors of the survey article on Tani hold diverging opinions on the matter, for Siangic is recognised as a separate Trans-Himalayan subgroup and listed as distinct from the Tani languages in the geographically inspired overview of the Tibeto-Burman languages of northeastern India authored by Mark William Post and Robbins Burling in the same volume. Whereas six chapters in this compendium deal with just a single Trans-Himalayan linguistic subgroup, i.e. Sinitic, Post and Burling in this one single chapter present an overview of fifteen different Trans-Himalayan linguistic subgroups, all located in and around the geographical and typological centre of linguistic diversity of the language family as a whole. Indeed, in a more balanced and capably edited volume, at least one chapter each would have been devoted to every one of these linguistic subgroups: Kho-Bwa, Hrusish, Siangic, Tani, Digarish, Midźuish, Brahmaputran, Lolo-Burmese, Ao, Angami-Pochuri, Zeme or 'Zeliangrong', Tangkhulic, Karbi, Meithei and Mizo-Kuki-Chin. This wonderful but succinct overview by Post and Burling presents a more balanced and improved version of the same chapter in the earlier edition of this book (Burling 2003). To remedy the imbalanced picture of the language family resulting from the editorial mismanagement of this volume, it would be worthwhile for the serious student of Trans-Himalayan linguistics to consult the more detailed overviews of the languages and subgroups of this linguistically inordinately diverse region, including bibliographical references to much of the valuable earlier literature on these languages and linguistic subgroups (Marrison 1967, van Driem 2001).

In one of two survey articles devoted to the single Trans-Himalayan subgroup Sinitic, Handel provides a good overview of some of the major phonological changes which have manifested themselves in the course of the differentiation of Old Chinese into the various modern Sinitic languages. The Sinitic languages are distinct enough from one another to be recognised for the distinct languages that they are, and accordingly to be referred to in English parlance as *languages*, as famously advocated by Victor Mair (1991), and not — as is traditionally done in Sinology — as "dialects". In his summary of phonological developments, Handel concisely illustrates that this unitary linguistic subgroup "exhibits a high degree of regularity of correspondence, so that it is usually possible to explain phonological divergence in terms of regular historical development". Uncannily, however, whilst arguing that the Mandarin term *fāngyán* means something altogether different than the English word *dialect*, Handel exercises the old-fashioned Sinological usage of *dialect* to refer to Sinitic languages as if the English word *dialect* meant exactly what Handel believes the

Mandarin word *fāngyán* to mean. Then, quite inconsistently, and in a slavish spirit of solidarity with the Indo-Chinese phylogenetic conceit employed by the editors, Handel introduces his very own conceit that this single Trans-Himalayan linguistic subgroup, so manifestly cohesive in terms of its historical phonology and other linguistic traits, instead constitutes a *language family*, which he refers to as the "Chinese language family" or the Chinese "family of languages".[2]

A dazzling, substantive and highly readable overview of grammatical phenomena in Sinitic languages is provided by Anne Oi-kan Yue-Hashimoto. Her definition of perfective aspect as a category denoting "the realization of certain state or action in the past or in the future" is clearly just practical and utilitarian in the context of her survey article, rather than being either typologically Platonic essentialist or striving to be semantically precise. The same applies *mutatis mutandis* for other grammatical labels which she applies as she whisks her readers briskly through an exposition of selected gramatical phenomena shared across the languages of this subgroup. The brief instalment merely whets the appetite and so, quite fittingly, concludes by recommending good further reading in the form of Yue-Hashimoto (1993).

Distillates and novelties

Most of the grammatical sketches were elicited by the two editors specifically for this volume from linguists who then distilled their respective instalments from their own more complete grammars of the languages in question, i.e. Burmese based on Wheatley (1982), Black Lahu based on Matisoff (1982), the rGyalrongic language of lCog-rtse based on Nagano (1984), Eastern Kayah Li based on Solnit (1997), Garo based on Burling (1961, 2004), Hayu based on Michailovsky (1988), Japhug or *kɯrɯskɤt* based on Jacques (2004), Jinghpaw based on Kurabe (2016), Karbi based on Konnerth (2014), Lepcha based on Plaisier (2006), Kurtöp based on Hyslop (2017), Meitei based on Chelliah (1997), Mongsen Ao based on Coupe (2007), the Newaric language of Dolakhā based on Genetti (2007), Prinmi based on Dīng (2014), Pwo Karen based on Kato (2004), Tshangla based on Andvik (2010), Wambule Rai based on Opgenort (2004) and the Yǒngníng variety of Nà (traditionally known in English as Moso and in Mandarin as *Mósuō*) based on Lidz (2010). Any student or scholar with a serious interest in these languages would presumably consult the more complete grammars on which these instalments are based, so that the sketches appear to serve mainly to add weight to the volume, since merely a few of the fuller language descriptions are either unpublished or unavailable in English.

Zhū provides a sketch of the Zaiwa variety spoken in Zhēfàng in Mángshì, based on a reference grammar written in Mandarin which he co-authored. In his review of this Routledge volume, Hill (2017:306) observes that, other than Burmese, "Zaiwa is the best described Burmish language, worked on at least by Yabu, Wannemacher and Lustig. Zhū ignores these authors". In this vein, it is noteworthy that Matisoff, both in his contribution to this volume as well as in his original grammar, neglected to cite Telford's 1893 Lahu grammar, which manifestly exerted a seminal influence on Matisoff's own Lahu work. Likewise, the grammatical sketch of Tǔjia spoken in Tāshā in Lóngshān county, provided by Xú Shìxuán, Lǚ Měiyàn and Hú Hóngyàn, neglects to mention most important earlier work on the language in their highly abbreviated bibliography, e.g. Tián (1986), Yè (1995), Péng (1998), Dài (2005), Brassett et al. (2006), Chén (2006), Yáo (2013), Xú et al. (2017).

Bradley's contribution on Lisu assembles disparate pieces of information from his earlier work into a coherent whole, whilst Hildebrandt and Bond provide a synopsis of Manange grammar, which represents an enhancement of the grammar by Hildebrandt (2013). Similarly, Saxena provides a sketch of Sangla Kinnauri, a language to which she has devoted a good number of earlier studies. In one particular respect, the useful grammatical sketches of Akha by Hansson, Tamang by Mazaudon and Belhare by Bickel will prove to be of enduring value in that these succinct summaries will serve in lieu of the holistic reference grammars which these authors never completed. Moreover, Mazaudon's instalment is of great interest because her formulations appear, albeit reluctantly and ever so gingerly, to retreat from the stance which she has espoused for decades with regard to the phonological status of tone in the language. In his contribution on

---

2   The terminological incongruities with which Zev Handel indulges his own Sinocentrism find a parallel in the Anglocentrism inspiring the decidedly odd use of the plural in the German label *Institut für Englische Sprachen und Literaturen,* which my dear colleagues at the English Department of my university have in recent years managed to impose upon the Faculty of Humanities in Bern.

Lhasa Tibetan, DeLancey attempts to give a balanced bibliography of sources on Tibetan, although it would have been beyond the scope of such an instalment to provide an exhaustive bibliography in a field of scholarship of such fecundity as Tibetology. DeLancey states a preference for Tournadre's "Tibetic languages" above the traditional but linguistically inaccurate Tibetological expression "Tibetan dialects", but he does not explain why he does not just use Shafer's more well-established term "Bodish languages", which has the distinct advantage of being less objectionable to speakers of, for example, Dzongkha.

Two antique Trans-Himalayan languages are treated in the volume, a lovely overview of Tangut by Gong Hwang-cherng and an instalment by Scott DeLancey on Classical Tibetan. Hill (2017:310-312) has already detailed the problems with the latter instalment, and students of Tibetology and of Trans-Himalayan linguistics are advised to consult Hill's discussion. The volume contains several short instalments devoted to Sinitic. The synopsis of Shanghainese grammar by Eric Zee and Xú Lièjǒng and the sketch of Cantonese grammar by Robert Stuart Bauer and Stephen Matthews each provide pleasant but superficial introductions, each off which merely scratches the surface when compared with the far more detailed studies authored or co-authored by the same scholars, notably Xú and Shào (1998) and the many contributions by Bauer listed in his bibliography. In view of the gargantuan volume of extant scholarship on Mandarin Chinese, it is perhaps fitting that Dah-an Ho competently and concisely contributed just 4½ pages to the topic of "characteristics of Mandarin dialects". In the same section of the book, a short introduction to the Chinese writing system by Hansell appears a trifle out of place in a volume ostensibly devoted to the language family in its entirety.

One of the editors authored two brief instalments. The more gossamer of the two short instalments is a sketch of the language conventionally known in English as Trung, but which LaPolla refers to in Mandarin Chinese instead, insisting on the sinicised pronunciation "Dulong" for the language name known to its speakers as well as to speakers of English as Trung. LaPolla's piece on Qiāng contains slightly more detail, but both grammatical sketches are highly unsatisfactory in that the verbal agreement morphology, flectional systems which are a salient morphosyntactic feature of both languages, are summarily ignored. One reason for this is that LaPolla downplays linguistic evidence that presents an inconvenience to his "Sino-Tibetan" conception of the language family, another reason being that LaPolla draws primarily on his own attempts at language documentation, which are alarmingly superficial in the domain of morphology and morphosyntax. Even my two three-page discussions, one on Trung and one on Qiāng (van Driem 1993a), based on previously published sources, contain far more grammatical information on the morphosyntax of both languages. By way of contrast to Lapolla's treatment of these languages, in the same volume Kurabe's careful sketch of "standard" Jinghpaw, i.e. the variety spoken in Myitkina and Bhamo, includes a table with the conjugation of the verbs *sa* 'come, go' and the copula *ráy* in the declarative and interrogative, thus providing at least one good sample illustration of the Jinghpaw person and number agreement paradigm.

Some of the sketches represent entirely new contributions, such as the exquisite grammatical synopsis of the hitherto undescribed rGyalrongic language spoken in Tsho-bdun (Mandarin: *Cǎodēng*) by Jackson Sun, alias Sūn Tiānxīn. Another novel contribution is the highly valuable grammatical account of the otherwise virtually undocumented rGyalrongic language Stau, also known in Tibetan as *Hor-pa* or in Mandarin *Ěrgōng*, by a team comprising Guillaume Jacques, Lài Yúnfān, Anton Antonov and Lobsang Nima. A scintillating new study of Tangsa was contributed by Stephen Donald Morey. Two other major new contributions are the studies of Chantyal as well as of yet another Tamangic language spoken at Nar and Phu by Kristine Ann Hildebrandt and the late Michael Noonan. Because Noonan is no longer here to carry on his sterling research, Hildebrandt conscientiously saw these contributions through to publication. Also new are the studies of Hakha Lai by David August Peterson, the Lîzû variety of Ěrsū by Chirkova and the synopsis of Kathmandu Newar by Hargreaves.

In the latter contribution, David Hargreaves is a trifle too concise in his discussion of the conjunct vs. disjunct distinction in the Newar verb and, as in most of the literature on this topic, characteristically neglects to mention why these terms were coined in the first place by Austin Hale (1980) with respect to a distinction in the verbal system of the Newar dialects of the Kathmandu Valley. In fact, these terms are inspired by the phenomenon that, in reported speech, the verb of a subordinate clause is conjunct when the subjects of main and subordinate clause are coreferential, and disjunct when they are not. In simple sentences, the conjunct is the form usually used with a first person subject in statements and with a second person subject in questions, and the disjunct is the form usually used with second and third person subject in statements and with first and third person subjects in the interrogative. Hale showed that the semantics of the conjunct-disjunct distinction is actually more complex than indicated by this simplified and inadequate characterisation of the distribution

of forms. In so doing, he followed in the footsteps of Edward Herman Bendix (1974), who first described the choice of verb forms in Newar as being motivated by factors such as "evidence", "experience", "circumstantial evidence", "intentional performance", "hearsay" and "observation". To describe this Newar opposition, Bendix used the terms "internal experience" and "disjunction" in senses that appear directly to have inspired the later coinages *conjunct* vs. *disjunct.* In his later writings, Bendix (1993) equated the new coinages with his own older terms "internal" and "external".

For example, a first person subject can take a verb in either the conjunct or the disjunct form. The choice of the conjunct form appears to be determined either by intention or conscious action on the part of the subject. When an action or situation denoted by the verb comes about without the knowledge or intent of the subject, then the disjunct form occurs, e.g. conjunct *ji nāya juyā* 'I became the leader' (intentionally) vs. disjunct *ji nāya jula* 'I became the leader' (unintentionally or unwittingly), conjunct *jĩ dakko khã thuikā* 'I made myself understand everything' vs. disjunct *jĩ dakko khã thula* 'I understood everything'. This same difference in meaning carries through in other uses of the conjunct and disjunct, such as the denial of responsibility, e.g. conjunct *jĩ la: wã machwayā* 'I did not throw away the water' vs. disjunct *jĩ la: wã chwata* 'I threw away the water' (accidentally or inadvertently); the expression of doubt or uncertainty, e.g. conjunct *jĩ thwa jyā yāe lā?* 'May I do this work?' vs. disjunct *jĩ thwa jyā yāi lā?* 'Would I do this work?'; to show compliance, e.g. conjunct *ji thathẽ wayā* 'I came immediately' vs. disjunct *ji thathẽ wala* 'I am coming immediately'; and unexpected realisation, e.g. disjunct causative *jĩ jyā syãkala khani* 'I just now realised that I spoilt the work'.

In the same vein, in contrast to the simplified characterisations of the Newar disjunct vs. conjunct distinction in much of the literature, a Newar speaker can choose between the conjunct and the disjunct form when asking questions about a first or second person subject. In the third person no such choice exists, and the disjunct is the appropriate form in the interrogative just as it is in the affirmative. For example, the conjunct form is the usual choice in a statement such as *ji vane* 'I'll go'. Yet whereas the corresponding conjunct interrogative form *ji vane lā?* 'Shall I go?' is a straightforward request for new information, the use of the disjunct in the question *ji vani lā?* 'am I going out?' could indicate irony on the part of the speaker, for example to imply something along the lines of 'of course, I'm not going out, silly'. A statement about the future of a second person subject takes the disjunct form, as in *chã khuyi* 'you will steal', whilst the corresponding question usually takes the conjunct, *chã khuye lā?* 'are you going to steal?'. The use of the disjunct in the question *chã khuyi lā?* 'are you going to steal?' would be appropriate if the speaker, having come to know that the person addressed is going to take part in a burglary, wishes to pose a rhetorical question in order to express disbelief or outrage.

In Newar, as in most other languages, an interrogative can be used to express a request, and both the conjunct and disjunct can be used for this purpose with different implications. With the use of the disjunct form in *chĩ ciyā luyi lā?* 'will you pour tea?', the speaker presumes to know that the second person will comply with his request. The request is rhetorical, but polite. If the speaker uses the conjunct form, *chĩ ciyā luye lā?* 'will you pour tea?', his question is less of a polite instruction and more of a polite request. Whereas the use of the conjunct in the question *chã dugucā syāye lā*? 'are you going to kill the goat?' results in a request for information and is appropriate if the speaker has, for example, forgotten who had been designated to slaughter the goat at a Hindu festival, the use of the disjunct in *chã dugucā syāyi lā?* 'are you going to kill the goat?' could be used to express disbelief or some other similar attitude on the part of the speaker towards the activity in question. Both forms could be used as requests with the different implications already explained in the previous examples about pouring tea. Similarly, the use of the disjunct in *chã khicā-yā lā nayi lā?* 'do you eat dog meat?' would be appropriate if the speaker wishes to express surprise of disgust, whereas the conjunct form in *chã khicā-yā lā naye lā?* 'do you eat dog meat?' is suitable if the speaker is making a sincere inquiry about someone's culinary habits.

This distinction in meaning between the conjunct and disjunct carries over into the preterite and interacts with the meaning of the tense category to influence its pragmatic behaviour. In the Newar preterite, a conjunct form such as *ji vanā* 'I went' may be used to express an event which has happened in the past, whereas the corresponding disjunct form *ji vana!* may be used at the very moment of departure in the sense of 'well, I'm off now!' or 'I'll be on my way now!'. Similarly, the conjunct in *ji vayā* 'I came' is appropriate in a statement about an event in past time, whereas the use of the disjunct in *ji vala!* 'I'm already there!' might be shouted by the speaker to reassure the listener that the speaker is on his way, even if the speaker is, for example, still lying in bed at the moment of utterance. An implication of the disjunct in such cases,

therefore, is that the speaker knows that a reading of an actually realised activity or state would be untrue. The conjunct in *ji vanā lā?* 'did I go?' would be appropriate in a sincere question whereby the speaker had honestly forgotten whether or not he had been to see a particular film, whereas the use of the disjunct in *ji vana lā?* 'did I go [there]?' would be appropriate in a weak denial whereby, for example, the speaker's wife has found out that he has been to a disco without her approval and the speaker wishes to feign forgetfulness.

In the second person too, the use of the conjunct in interrogative utterances such as *cha vanā lā?* 'did you go?' is an honest request for new information, whereas the disjunct form in *cha vana lā?* 'did you go [there]?' may be used to express disbelief or disapproval when, for example, the speaker has come to know that the person addressed had gone to a place that has turned out to be the scene of a crime. Similarly, the conjunct *chã khuyā lā?* 'did you steal it?' is a request for new information, whereas the disjunct in *chã khula lā?* 'did you steal it?' can be used rhetorically to express disappointment if, for example, the speaker has come to know that the second person was caught red-handed in the act of stealing. In the third person, by contrast, only the disjunct forms yield plausible readings in both the affirmative and interrogative, e.g. *vo vala* 'he came' and *vo vala lā?* 'did he come?'

In sum

The volume contains 44 grammatical sketches, which are naturally each inherently more superficial than a reference grammar, but some of these descriptive instalments are novel and highly original contributions. Indeed, most of the grammatical synopses are exceedingly valuable. The five survey articles contain numerous important and timely statements, observations and conjectures. The sole blemishes which permeate the book are editorial in nature. The pieces by Thurgood and LaPolla feature a wholly obsolete phylogenetic model and simultaneously propose a purely speculative subgrouping of the language family. The biased editorial twosome disregard relevant sources as if they were utter tyros, and the sloppiness of Thurgood and LaPolla's scholarship does a disservice to their readership and to the many scholars who contributed to their volume. The imposition of editorial prejudices has ensured that this book provides neither a fair reflection of the state of the art nor a balanced presentation of the language family.

References

Andvik, Erik. 2010. *A Grammar of Tshangla.* Leiden: Brill.

Āṅgdembe, Tej Mān. 1999a. The rise of honorific marking and the demise of the verbal agreement system. *Gipan* 1 (1): 43-99.

Āṅgdembe, Tej Mān. 1999b. Anomalous conjugation of copulas, development of tense/aspect morphemes and the loss of agreement prefixes, pp. 498-524 in Yogendra Prasād Yādava and Warren William Glover, eds., *Topics in Nepalese Linguistics*. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.

Ballard, William Lewis. 1979. Chinese — A bastard at the Sino-Tibetan family reunion, paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Paris.

Bauman, James John 1975. *Pronouns and Pronominal Morphology in Tibeto-Burman.* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.

Bendix, Edward Herman. 1974. Indo-Aryan and Tibeto-Burman contact as seen through Nepali and Newari verb tenses, *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics*, 3 (1): 42-59.

Bendix, Edward Herman. 1974. The grammaticalization of responsibility and evidence: Interactional manipulation of evidential categories in Newari, pp. 226-247 in Jane Hassler Hill and Judith Temkin Irvine, eds., *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bodt, Timotheus Adrianus. 2012. *The New Lamp Clarifying the History, Peoples, Languages and Traditions of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon*. Wageningen: Monpasang Publications.

Borchers, Dörte. 2008. *A Grammar of Sunwar. Descriptive Grammar, Paradigms, Texts and Glossary.* Leiden: Brill.

Bradley, David. 1997. Tibeto-Burman languages and classification, pp. 1-71 in David Bradley, ed., *Tibeto-Burman Languages of the Himalayas, Pacific Linguistics A-86*. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Bradley, David. 2002. The subgrouping of Tibeto-Burman, pp. 73-112 in Christopher Beckwith, ed., *Mediaeval Tibeto-Burman Languages*. Leiden: Brill

Brassett, Philip, and Cecilia Brassett and Lǔ Měiyàn. 2006. *The Tǔjiā Language.* Munich: Lincom.

Burling, Robbins. 1961. *A Garo Grammar* (Deccan College Monograph Series, 25). Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.

Burling, Robbins. 2003. The Tibeto-Burman languages of northeastern India, pp. 167-192 in Graham Ward Thurgood and Randy John LaPolla, eds., *The Sino-Tibetan Languages.* London: Routledge.

Burling, Robbins. 2004. *The Language of the Modhupur Mandi, Vol. 1: Grammar.* Delhi: Bibliophile Asia.

Chelliah, Shobhana Lakshmi. 1997. *A Grammar of Meitei.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chén Kāng (陈康). 2006. *Tǔjiā yǔ yánjiū* (土家语研究). Peking: Mínzú Dàxué.

Ch'en Chieh-hsien. 1976. The decline of the Manchu language in China during the Ch'ing period, pp. 137-154 in *Altaica Collecta: Berichte und Vorträge der XII. Permanent International Altaistic Conference (3.-8. Juni 1974 in Bonn/Bad Honneg).* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Coupe, Alexander Robertson. 2007. *A Grammar of Mongsen Ao*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dài Qìngxià (戴庆厦). 2005. *Xiānrén Tǔjiā yǔ yánjiū* (仙仁土家语研究). Peking: Mínzú Dàxúe.

DeLancey, Scott. 1982. Tangut and Tibeto-Burman morphology, *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area,* 7 (2): 100-108.

DeLancey, Scott. 1989. Verb agreement in Proto-Tibeto-Burman, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* LII (2): 315-333.

DeLancey, Scott. 2009. Towards a history of verb agreement in Tibeto-Burman, *Himalayan Linguistics*, 9 (1): 1–39.

DeLancey, Scott. 2010. Notes on verb agreement prefixes in Tibeto-Burman, *Himalayan Linguistics*, 10 (1): 1-29.

DeLancey, Scott. 2013a. The history of postverbal agreement in Kuki-Chin, *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society,* 6: 1-17.

DeLancey, Scott. 2013b. Verb agreement suffixes in Mizo-Kuki-Chin, pp. 138-150 in Gwendolyn Hyslop, Stephen Morey and Mark Post, eds., *Northeast Indian Linguistics 5*. Delhi: Cambridge University Press.

DeLancey, Scott. 2014. Second person verb forms in Tibeto-Burman, *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area,* 37 (1): 3-33.

DeLancey, Scott. 2015. Morphological evidence for a Central Branch of Trans-Himalayan (Sino-Tibetan), *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale*, 44: 122-149.

DeLancey, Scott. forthcoming. The comparative method, subgrouping and the antiquity of verb agreement in Trans-Himalayan (Sino-Tibetan). [already widely circulated on the internet for several years]

Dīng, Picus Sīzhì. 1998. *Fundamentals of Prinmi (Pumi): A Tibeto-Burman Language of Northwestern Yunnan, China*. Canberra: Australian National University doctoral dissertation.

Dīng, Picus Sīzhì. 2014. A *Grammar of Prinmi, based on the Central Dialect of Northwest Yúnnán, China*. Leiden: Brill.

van Driem, George. 1987. *A Grammar of Limbu*. West Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

van Driem, George. 1990. An exploration of Proto-Kiranti verbal morphology, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia,* 22: 27-48.

van Driem, George. 1991. Tangut verbal agreement and the patient category in Tibeto-Burman, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* LIV (3): 520-534.

van Driem, George. 1992. Le proto-kiranti revisité, morphologie verbale du lohorung, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia,* 24: 33-75.

van Driem. George. 1993a. The Proto-Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement system, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* LVI (2): 292-334.

van Driem, George. 1993b. The Newar verb in Tibeto-Burman perspective, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia,* 26: 23-43.

van Driem, George. 1993c. Language change, conjugational morphology and the Sino-Tibetan *Urheimat*, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia,* 26: 45-56.

van Driem, George. 1995. Black Mountain conjugational morphology, Proto-Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax, and the linguistic position of Chinese, pp. 229-259 in Yoshio Nishi, James Alan Matisoff and Yasuhiko Nagano, eds., *New Horizons in Tibeto-Burman Morphosyntax* (Senri Ethnological Studies 41). Ōsaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

van Driem, George. 1997. Sino-Bodic, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, LX (3): 455-488.

van Driem, George. 1999. The Limbu verb revisited, pp. 209-239 in Yogendra Prasāda Yādava and Warren William Glover, eds., *Topics in Nepalese Linguistics*. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.

van Driem, George. 2001. *Languages of the Himalayas: An Ethnolinguistic Handbook of the Greater Himalayan Region, containing an Introduction to the Symbiotic Theory of Language* (two volumes). Leiden: Brill.

van Driem, George. 2004. Review Article: '*The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. Edited by Graham Thurgood and Randy J. LaPolla. Routledge Language Family Series, no. 3. London: Routledge, 2003. xxii, 727 pp. $295.00 (cloth)'*, Journal of Asian Studies*, 63 (4): 1127-1128.

van Driem, George. 2011. Tibeto-Burman subgroups and historical grammar, *Himalayan Linguistics,* 10 (1): 31-39.

van Driem, George. 2013. Biactantial agreement in the Gongduk transitive verb in the broader Tibeto-Burman context, pp. 69-81 in Timothy J. Thornes, Erik Andvik, Gwendolyn Hyslop and Joana Jansen, eds., *Functional-Historical Approaches to Explanation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Driem, George. 2018. Linguistic history and historical linguistics, *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area,* 41 (1): 106-127.

Ebert, Karin Heide. 1997. *Camling.* Munich: Lincom.

Genetti, Carol Elaine. 1988a. A contrastive study of the Dolakhali and Kathmandu Newari dialects, *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale*, XVII (2), 161-191.

Genetti, Carol Elaine. 1988b. Notes on the structure of the Sunwari transitive verb, *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 11 (2), 62-92.

Genetti, Carol Elaine. 1994. *A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Dolakha Newari Dialect.* Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Genetti, Carol. 2007. *A Grammar of Dolakha Newar.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gerber, Pascal, and Selin Grollmann. forthcoming. 'What is Kiranti? – A critical account'.

Grierson, George Abraham, ed. 1909. *Linguistic Survey of India (Vol. III, Part I, Tibeto-Burman Family: Tibetan Dialects, the Himalayan Dialects and the North Assam Group).* Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, India.

Grollmann, Selin, and Pascal Gerber. 2018. Linguistic evidence for a closer relationship between Lhokpu and Dhimal, including some remarks on the Dhimalish subgroup, *Cahiers de Linguistique, Asie Orientale*, 47: 1-96.

Hale, Austin. 1980. Person markers: Finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari, pp. 95-106 in Ronald L. Trail, ed., *Papers in South East Asian Linguistics, No. 7*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Hashimoto Mantarō. 1976a. Language diffusion on the Asian continent, *Computational Analyses of Asian and African Languages*, 3: 49-64.

Hashimoto Mantarō. 1976b. The agrarian and the pastoral diffusion of language, pp. 1-14 in *Genetic Relationship, Diffusion and Typological Similarities of East and Southeast Asian Languages*. Tokyo: Japan Society for the Promotion of Sciences.

Hashimoto Mantarō. 1980. Typogeography of phonotactics and suprasegmentals in the languages of the East Asian continent, *Computational Analyses of Asian and African Languages*, 13: 153-164.

Hashimoto Mantarō. 1986. The altaicization of Northern Chinese, pp. 76-97 in John McCoy and Timothy Light, eds., Contributions to Sino-Tibetan Studies. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Henderson, Eugénie Jane Andrina. 1976. Vestiges of morphology in some Tibeto-Burman languages, pp. 1-16 in Vol. 2 of Nguyễn Đăng Liêm, ed., In *Southeast Asian Linguistic Studies*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Hildebrandt, Kristine Ann. 2013. Manange (South Asia): A language sketch, pp. 404–423 in Carol Genetti, ed., *How Languages Work.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, Nathan Wayne. 2017. The State of Sino-Tibetan, *Archiv Orientalní*, 85: 305-315.

Hill, Nathan Wayne. forthcoming. Word families, allofams and the comparative method.

Hyslop, Gwendolyn. 2017. *A Grammar of Kurtöp.* Leiden: Brill.

Jacques, Guillaume, and Alexis Michaud. 2011. Approaching the historical phonology of three highly eroded Sino-Tibetan languages: Naxi, Na and Laze, *Diachronica,* 28 (4): 468-498.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2014. *Esquisse de phonologie et de morphologie historique du tangoute.* Leiden: Brill.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2016. Tangut, Gyalrongic, Kiranti and the nature of person indexation in Sino-Tibetan/Trans-Himalayan, *Linguistics Vanguard.* ISSN (online) 2199–174X <doi: 10.1515/lingvan-2015-0033>, May 2016.

Jacquesson, François. 1996. Langues tibéto-birmanes du nord-est de l'Inde: investigations typologiques en Assam et au Nagaland, *Journal Asiatique,* 284 (1): 159-212.

Jacquesson, François. 1997. L'expression morphologique de la personne dans les langues tibéto-birmanes du Nord-Est: une utilisation systématique des techniques possibles, pp. 127-136 in Laurent Danon-Boileau and Mary-Anninck Morel, eds., *Les Langues d'Asie du Sud.* Paris: Éditions Ophrys.

Kansakār, Tej Ratna. 1999. Verbal agreement in Classical Newar and modern Newar dialects, pp. 421-443 in Yogendra Prasāda Yādava and Warren William Glover, eds., *Topics in Nepalese Linguistics*. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.

Kato Atsuhiko. 2004. *A Two Karen Grammar.* Tōkyō: Tōkyō University doctoral dissertation.

Kepping, Ksenia Borisovna. 1994. The conjugation of the Tangut verb. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* LVII (2): 339-346.

King, John Timothy. 1994. Picking up where Hodgson left off: Further notes on Dhimal, *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area,* 17 (2): 121-132.

King, John Timothy. 2001. The affinal kin register in Dhimal, *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area,* 24 (1): 163-182.

King, John Timothy. 2002. Marked transitive scenarios and archaic biactantial morphology in Dhimal, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia,* 34: 39-69.

King, John Timothy. 2009. *A Grammar of Dhimal.* Leiden: Brill.

Konnerth, Linda. 2014. *A Grammar of Karbi.* Eugene: University of Oregon doctoral dissertation.

Kurabe Keita. 2016. *A Grammar of Jinghpaw, from Northern Burma.* Kyōto: Kyōto University doctoral dissertation.

Lidz, Liberty. 2010. *A Descriptive Grammar of Yongning Na (Mosuo).* Austin: University of Texas doctoral dissertation.

Mair, Victor Henry. 1991. What is a Chinese "Dialect/Topolect"? Reflections on some key Sino-English linguistic terms, *Sino-Platonic Papers*, 29: 1-31.

Marrison, Geoffrey Edward. 1967. *The Classification of the Naga Languages of North-East India* (2 volumes). London: University of London doctoral dissertation.

Matisoff, James Alan. 1982. *The Grammar of Lahu* (2nd edition). Berkeley: University of California Press.

McColl, Hugh, *et al*. 2018. The prehistoric peopling of Southeast Asia, *Science,* 361: 88-92.

Michailovsky, Boyd. 1988b. *La langue hayu* (Collection « Sciences du Langage »). Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Nagano Yasuhiko. 1984. *A Historical Study of the rGyarong Verb System*. Tōkyō: Seishidō.

Opgenort, Jean Robert. 2004. *A Grammar of Wambule: Grammar, Lexicon, Texts and Cultural Survey of a Kiranti Tribe of Eastern Nepal.* Leiden: Brill.

Opgenort, Jean Robert. 2005. *A Grammar of Jero, with a Historical Comparative Study of the Kiranti Languages.* Leiden: Brill.

Péng Bó (□ □). 1998. *Tǔjiā yǔ yánjiū jí shílù* (□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □). Língxī: Yǒngshùn Xiàn Mínzú Shìwù Wěiyuánhuì.

Plaisier, Heleen. 2006. *A Grammar of Lepcha*. Leiden: Brill.

Poppe, Nikolaus ('Nicholas Poppe'). 1965. *Introduction to Altaic Linguistics.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Post, Mark William, and Roger Marsh Blench. 2011. Siangic a new language phylum in Northeast India, paper presented at the 6th International Conference of the North East Indian Linguistic Society, Tezpur University, 31 January 2011.

Rempt, Boudewijn. 1994. The verbal agreement system of four Khām languages, *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area,* 17 (1): 1-59.

Rutgers, Leopold Roland. 1993. The Chepang verb: a synchronic analysis with some diachronic observations, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia,* 26: 107-137.

Rutgers, Leopold Roland. 1998. *Yamphu*. Leiden: Research School for Asian, African and Amerindian Studies.

Saxena, Anju. 1992. *Finite Verb Morphology in Tibeto-Kinnauri*. Eugene: University of Oregon doctoral dissertation.

Saxena, Anju. 1997. Towards a reconstruction of the Proto West Himalayish agreement system, pp. 73-94 in David Bradley, ed., *Tibeto-Burman Languages of the Himalayas*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Sharma, Suhnu Ram. 1996. Pronouns and agreement in West Himalayan Tibeto-Burman languages. *Indian Linguistics* 57: 81-104.

Simon, Camille, and Nathan Wayne Hill. 2015. Tibetan, pp. 381-388 in Nicola Grandi and Lívia Körtvélyessy, eds., *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Simon, Walter. 1929. Tibetisch-chinesische Wortgleichungen, ein Versuch, *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*, XXXII (1): 157–228.

Solnit, David Benedict. 1986. *A Grammatical Sketch of Eastern Kayah (Red Karen).* Berkeley: University of California doctoral dissertation.

6Q⊞yQJN□ I(□K □! □Y □□Xyj□QJPLQG□z□QJFt□GHU□pQFKQJIj□QFKyX□   □F □□□□'□ □ □□□□), *Mínzú* *Yǔwén*, 1983 (2): 17-29.

Sūn Hóngkāi (□K □!□Y). 1995. A further discussion on verb agreement in Tibeto-Burman languages, pp. 17-30 in Yoshio Nishi, James Alan Matisoff and Yasuhiko Nagano, eds., *New Horizons in Tibeto-Burman Morphosyntax* (Senri Ethnological Studies 41). Ōsaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

Sun, Jackson Tianshin (i.e. 𝕄□ □ Sūn Tiānxīn). 1993a. *A Historical-Comparative Study of the Tani (Mirish) Branch in Tibeto-Burman*. Berkeley: University of California doctoral dissertation.

Sun, Jackson Tianshin (i.e. 𝕄□ □ Sūn Tiānxīn). 1993b. The linguistic position of Tani (Mirish) in Tibeto-Burman, *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 16 (2): 143-188.

Sun, Jackson Tianshin (i.e. 𝕄□ □ Sūn Tiānxīn). 2000a. Parallelisms in the verb morphology of Sidaba rGyalrong and Lavrung in rGyalrongic, *Language and Linguistics,* 1 (1): 161-190.

Sun, Jackson Tianshin (i.e. 𝕄□ □ Sūn Tiānxīn). 2000b. Stem alternations in Puxi verb inflection: Toward validating the rGyalrongic subgroup in Qiangic, *Language and Linguistics,* 1 (2): 211-232.

Telford, James Haxton. 1938. *Handbook of the Lahu (Muhso) Language and English-Lahu Dictionary*. Rangoon: Superintendent of Government Printing and Stationery, Burma.

Tián Déshēng (   ). 1986. *Tǔjiā yǔ jiǎnzhì* (à □ □ □   ). Peking: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.

Turin, Mark. 1998. The Thangmi verbal agreement system and the Kiranti connection, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* 61 (3): 476-491.

Watters, David. 2002. *A Grammar of Kham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wheatley, Julian Karl. 1982. *Burmese: A Grammatical Sketch*. Berkeley: University of California doctoral dissertation.

Winter, Werner. 1986. Aus der Arbeit des Linguistic Survey of Nepal, pp. 453-459 in Bernhard Kölver and Siegfried Lienhard, eds., *Formen kulturellen Wandels und andere Beiträge zur Erforschung des Himālaya: Colloquium des Schwerpunktes Nepal, Heidelberg, 1.-4. Februar 1984 (Nepalica 2)*. Sankt Augustin: Vereinigung für Geschichtswissenschaft Hochasiens Wissenschaftsverlag.

Xiàng Kuíyì (□ □ □). 2012. *Bǎojīng Tǔjiā yǔ shílù* (□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □). Chángshā: Húnán Shīfàn Dàxúe Chūbǎnshè.

Xú Lièjǒng and Shào Jìngmǐn (□ □ □ , □ □ □). 1998. *Shànghǎi fāngyán yǔfǎ yánjiū* (□ □ □ □ □ □ □). Shanghai: Huádōng Shīfàn Dàxué Chūbǎnshè.

Xú Shìxuán, Zhōu Chúnlù and Lǚ Měiyàn (□ □ □ , □ □ □ , □ □ □). 2017. *Tǔjiā yǔ yǔfa biāozhù wénběn* (□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □). Peking: Shèhuì Kēxué Wénxiàn Chūbǎnshè.

Yáo Yuánshēn (□ □ □). 2013. *Mǔyǔ cúnliúqū Lóngshān pōjiǎo de Tǔjiā yǔ kǒuyǔ* (□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □). Peking: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.

Yè Déshū (□ □ □). 1995. *Tǔjiā yǔ yánjiū* (□ □ □ □ □). Jíshǒu: Jíshǒu Dàxué.

Yu, Dominic. 2011. Reconstructing Proto-Ersuic, paper at the 17th Himalayan Languages Symposium, Kōbe City University of Foreign Studies, 6 September 2011.

Yue-Hashimoto, Anne Oi-kan. 1993. *Comparative Chinese Dialectal Grammar: Handbook for Investigators*. Paris: École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Centre de Recherche Linguistique sur l'Asie Orientale.