

## Shared Morphology in Qiang and Tibetan

著者(英)	Huang Chenglong
journal or publication title	Senri Ethnological Studies
volume	75
page range	223-240
year	2009-09-18
URL	<a href="http://doi.org/10.15021/00002566">http://doi.org/10.15021/00002566</a>

## Shared Morphology in Qiang and Tibetan

Huang Chenglong

*Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology  
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*

1. Introduction
2. Shared Morphology
  - 2.1 The Genitive Marker
  - 2.2 The Agentive Marker
  - 2.3 The Suffix -p
  - 2.4 Nominalizers
3. Conclusion

### 1. Introduction

The Qiang language belongs to the Qiangic sub-branch of the Tibeto-Burman family, Sino-Tibetan stock. It is spoken by about 80,000 Qiang and Zang (Tibetan) people, though a recent census shows a population of 306,072 Qiang people in the Aba Tibetan and Qiang Autonomous Prefecture of Sichuan, China (2000 census). The majority of Qiang speakers live in Mao County, Wenchuan County, Li County, Heishui County, and Songpan County. The Qiang speakers that live in Heishui County have been classified as a subgroup of the Zang (Tibetan) nationality. The language is divided into two dialects, the Northern dialect and the Southern dialect (Sun 1981: 177–178). The speakers of the Northern dialect live in Heishui County and the Chibusu district of Mao County. The Southern dialect speakers live in Li County, Wenchuan County, Mao County, and the Zhenjiangguan district of Songpan County. The Southern dialect is more internally divergent than Northern Qiang.

Lexical and morphological sharing is a common phenomenon among Tibeto-Burman languages. For example, the causative *s-* prefix in Ronghong Qiang, e.g. *tɕhə* ‘to eat/drink’ : *ɕtɕə* ‘to feed’ (with assimilation of the prefix to the point of articulation of the initial), corresponds with the *s-* prefix, e.g., *thi* ‘to drink’ : *sti* ‘to feed’ in Mawo Qiang (Liu 1998: 169), and *thə* ‘to drink’ : *stə* ‘to feed’ in Hexi Qiang. This phenomenon is also found in many other Sino-Tibetan languages, e.g., Tibetan *nub* ‘sink, decay, decline’ : *snu* ‘destroy, cause to perish’; *ring* ‘long’ : *sring* ‘stretch, extend’ (DeLancey 2003a: 263); and *\*tju?* (帚) ‘broom’ : *\*stu?* (掃) ‘to sweep’; *\*ljek* (易) ‘to exchange’ : *\*sljeks* (賜) ‘to give’ in Old Chinese (LaPolla 2003a: 22).

Another feature in common is a voiced-voiceless (aspirated) contrast in simplex-causative pairs (LaPolla 2003a: 23), as shown in examples from Mawo Qiang (Liu 1998: 169) and Ronghong Qiang (LaPolla with Huang 2003: 128) in Table 1. Both the *s-* causative prefix and the voicing contrast in simplex-causative pairs can be dated back to Proto-Sino-Tibetan.

**Table 1** Simplex-causative pairs in Qiang

Mawo Qiang		Ronghong Qiang		Meaning
<i>Simplex</i>	<i>Causative</i>	<i>Simplex</i>	<i>Causative</i>	
ɛlɔ	χlɔ	(da-)ɛli	(fia-)χli	break (in two of tree limbs, etc.)
bi <sup>ɪ</sup>	phi <sup>ɪ</sup>	(de-)pe	(fie-)phe	tear (of clothes)
ɛe	qhe <sup>ɛ</sup>	(da-)ɛe	(fia-)qhe	break (of bowls, etc.)

Apart from a handful of shared morphology that is reconstructible to the proto-language, the majority of the morphology in Sino-Tibetan cannot be reconstructed to the proto-language. Some of the morphological sharing only occurs within a few languages or a few sub-branches, and this could be evidence of language contact or parallel development, for example, parallel development of verb morphology in Sidaba rGyalrong and Lavrung (Sun 2000).

## 2. Shared Morphology

In comparing Qiang nominal relational morphology and nominalization with those of Tibetan, I found some morphology that is shared by Qiang and Tibetan. This phenomenon caught my attention and curiosity. Is the phenomenon of shared morphology in Qiang and Tibetan due to a genetic relationship? If not, how can we explain these morphological similarities?

In this paper I present and analyze morphological forms shared between Qiang and Tibetan, and discuss four possible explanations: (1) borrowing of Qiang from Tibetan, (2) common areal features found in both Qiang and Tibetan, (3) cognates inherited from the parent language of both Qiang and Tibetan, and (4) substrate influence, that is, when speakers of one language shift to another language, the habits from their original language are often retained when they speak the new language (see LaPolla, this volume).

### 2.1 The Genitive Marker

Most varieties of Qiang have genitive marking, as shown in Table 2:

**Table 2** The genitive marking in Qiang

Subdialects	Varieties <sup>1)</sup>	GEN	BEN	DAT
麻窝土语 (Mawo)	黑水县麻窝 (Mawo)	-k	-çi	-çi
三龙土语 (Sanlong)	茂县三龙勒依村 (Leyi)	-k	-qua	-k
?? <sup>2)</sup>	黑水县慈坝乡慈坝村 (Ciba)	-k	-s/-χu	-k/-j

较场土语 (Jiaochang)	松潘县小姓乡埃溪村 (Aixi)	-k	-χuthe/-khuɕa	-j
绵麓土语 (Mianchi)	汶川县绵麓簇头寨 (Cutou)	-ki	-ki	-zɔ
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县雅都乡荣红寨 (Ronghong)	-tɕ	-tɕ/-χu	-tɕ/-ta
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县曲谷乡河西村 (Hexi)	-tɕ	-χuɕa	-tɕ
三龙土语 (Sanlong)	茂县白溪乡余家沟村 (Yujiagou)	-tɕ	-tɕ/-quɕa	-tɕ/-ta
黑虎土语 (Heihu)	茂县黑虎乡二队 (Erdui)	-ts	-ts	-ts
黑虎土语 (Heihu)	茂县永和乡卡尔寨 (Ka'er)	-s/-tɕ	-s/-χuɕ	-tɕ/-j/-ta
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县维城乡中村 (Zhongcun)	-ɕ	-ɕ/-χua	-ɕ
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县雅都乡俄口寨 (Ekou)	-ɕ	-ɕ	-ʂə
较场土语 (Jiaochang)	茂县松坪沟乡麦石寨 (Maishizhai)	-j	-χuta	-j/-tə
三龙土语 (Sanlong)	茂县洼底乡热额辣寨 (Re'ela)	-j	-j/-qua	-j
龙溪土语 (Longxi)	汶川县龙溪乡玛得村 (Made)	-ji <sup>31</sup>	-ji <sup>31</sup>	-ji <sup>31</sup>
大岐山土语 (Daqishan)	理县蒲溪乡休溪寨 (Xiuxi)	-ə <sup>1</sup>	-zɔ	-zɔ
大岐山土语 (Daqishan)	理县木卡乡水塘寨 (Shuitang)	-ə <sup>1</sup>	-zɔ	-zɔ
大岐山土语 (Daqishan)	理县木卡乡九子营 (Jiuziying)	-ə <sup>1</sup>	??	-zɔ/-ta
桃坪土语 (Taoping)	理县桃坪乡 (Taoping)	-zɔ <sup>33</sup>	-zɔ <sup>33</sup>	-zie <sup>33</sup>
绵麓土语 (Mianchi)	汶川县雁门乡萝卜寨 (Luobuzhai)	-	-ge	-to

We can see in Table 2 that there are four types of genitive marking in Qiang:

- k ~ -ki found in Mawo, Ciba, Leyi and Aixi. These are the earliest forms of the genitive marking, and they correspond with -kyi ~ -gyi ~ -gi in Written Tibetan (DeLancey 2003a: 258), and -ki ~ -ki? in Lhasa Tibetan (DeLancey 2003b: 275–276), -ki ~ -gi in Sherpa (Kelly 2004: 228), and -kə in Maqu Tibetan (Zhou 2003: 210).
- tɕ ~ -ɕ/-ts ~ -s in Ronghong, Hexi, Yujiagou, Erdui, Ka'er, Zhongcun and Erkou. These seem to be the result of palatalization of -k.
- j ~ -ji in Maishizhai, Re'ela, Made. These correspond with -i in Written Tibetan, Balti, Cogtse Gyarong (Nagano 2003: 488), Chantyal (Noonan 2003a: 319), Nar-phu (Noonan 2003b: 340), and -ji in Lavrung (Huang 2007: 94–96; Yin 2007: 205–206), Baima (Chirkova 2005).
- ə<sup>1</sup> and -zɔ<sup>33</sup> in Xiuxi, Shuitang, Jiuziying and Taoping. These do not have corresponding forms in Tibetan, and are probably markings that developed independently (that is, they are unique innovations).

It is interesting to note that no genitive marking is found in Luobuzhai.

## 2.2 The Agentive Marker

Agentive marking expresses the initiator or causer of an action, and all but one of the varieties of Qiang discussed here have such an enclitic/postposition. The agentive marking in

those varieties that have it is not obligatory and not systematic (cf. LaPolla 1994, 1995a–b, 2003a, 2004). The use of the agentive is determined by semantics, so we do not call it ergative marking, but call it agentive marking (C. Huang 2004: 141–143, 2007 [2006]: 131–135). However, there are some constraints on the use of the agentive marker. If the actor is an inanimate entity (e.g., a natural force), then the agentive marker is used, as in (1). When there is a need to emphasize ‘who did it’ (focus), the agentive marker is also used, as in (2); or when the agent appears in immediate pre-verbal position (non-topic position) functioning as a focus, then the agentive marker occurs, as in (3), from Ronghong Qiang:

- (1) [*moku-wu*]<sub>[A]</sub>    [*qa*]<sub>[P]</sub>    *da-tua-zə*.  
 wind-AGT            1sg            DIR-blow.down-CAUS  
 ‘The wind blew me down.’
- (2) [*the:-wu*]<sub>[A]</sub>    [*qa*]<sub>[P]</sub>    *zə-dzi*.  
 3sg-AGT            1sg            DIR-beat  
 ‘It is him who beat me.’
- (3) [*kuatʂa-le:*]<sub>[P]</sub>    [*qa-wu*]<sub>[A]</sub>    *fa-qhe-w-a*.  
 bowl-DEF:CL        1sg-AGT        DIR-break-3sg:P-1sg:A  
 ‘The bowl was broken by me.’

In circumstances other than the above, the use of agentive marking is optional. The agentive marker is shown in Table 3:

**Table 3** The Agentive Marker

土语 (Subdialects)	Varieties	AGT
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县维城乡中村 (Zhongcun)	-kə
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县雅都乡俄口寨 (Ekou)	-kə
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县雅都乡荣红寨 (Ronghong)	-wu
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县曲谷乡河西村 (Hexi)	-ʂ
??	黑水县慈坝乡慈坝村 (Ciba)	-ʂ
较场土语 (Jiaochang)	松潘县小姓乡埃溪村 (Aixi)	-ʂ
较场土语 (Jiaochang)	茂县松坪沟乡麦石寨 (Maishizhai)	-ɕ
三龙土语 (Sanlong)	茂县洼底乡热额辣寨 (Re'ela)	-ɕi
三龙土语 (Sanlong)	茂县白溪乡余家沟村 (Yujiagou)	-ɕi
黑虎土语 (Heihu)	茂县永和乡卡尔寨 (Ka'er)	-s
绵虬 (Mianchi)	汶川县雁门乡萝卜寨 (Luobuzhai)	-sə
麻窝土语 (Mawo)	黑水县麻窝乡 (Mawo)	-ji
绵虬土语 (Mianchi)	汶川县绵虬簇头寨 (Cutou)	-ji

大歧山土语 (Daqishan)	理县蒲溪乡休溪寨 (Xiuxi)	-i
桃坪土语 (Taoping)	理县桃坪乡 (Taoping)	-i <sup>33</sup>
大歧山土语 (Daqishan)	理县木卡乡水塘寨 (Shuitang)	-i/-ti
大歧山土语 (Daqishan)	理县木卡乡九子营 (Jiuziying)	?? <sup>3)</sup>
黑虎土语 (Heihu)	茂县黑虎乡二队 (Erdui)	-sta
龙溪土语 (Longxi)	汶川县龙溪乡玛得村 (Made)	-le <sup>31</sup>
三龙土语 (Sanlong)	茂县三龙勒依村 (Leyi)	-χkən

Table 3 shows that all but one of the varieties of Qiang under discussion here have an agentive marker, though they are not necessarily the same. Some varieties have similar markers, e.g., *-kə* (Zhongcun, Ekou); *-wu* in Ronghong (the initial *-k* is lost in Ronghong); *-ʂ* (Hexi, Ciba, Aixi); *-ci ~ -c* (Re'ela, Yujiagou, Maishizhai); *-ji ~ -i* (Mawo, Cutou, Xiuxi, Taoping, Shuitang). However, there are three varieties that show a local innovation: *-sta* (Erdui/Heihu), *-le<sup>31</sup>* (Made/Longxi), *-χkən<sup>b)</sup>* (Leyi/Sanlong).

In comparison with Tibetan, three types of the agentive marker, *-kə ~ -wu*, *-ci ~ -c*, *ji ~ -i*, in Qiang are similar to the ergative/instrumental marking *-kyis ~ -gyis ~ -gis ~ i* in Written Tibetan (DeLancey 2003a: 258). Does this mean that the agentive marker in Qiang is cognate with Tibetan? Or, are the agentive markers in Qiang borrowed from Tibetan?

Looking at the regular path of the development of postpositions in the Tibeto-Burman family, LaPolla (1995b, 2003a, 2004) indicates that locational markers developed first, followed by other types of semantic roles often by metaphorical extension including agent marking. The predictable path is: *ablative > instrumental > agentive* (see appendix: samples of the Tibeto-Burman languages). In the case of Qiang, we find that the agentive markers of most varieties are isomorphic with the ablative and instrumental markers. These are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4** Case markers in Qiang

土语 (Subdialects)	Varieties	AGT	INST	ABL
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县维城乡中村 (Zhongcun)	-kə	-kə	-kə
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县雅都乡俄口寨 (Ekou)	-kə	-kə	-kə
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县雅都乡荣红寨 (Ronghong)	-wu	-wu	-wu
雅都土语 (Yadu)	茂县曲谷乡河西村 (Hexi)	-ʂ	-ɛɑ	-tci/-ta
??	黑水县慈坝乡慈坝村 (Ciba)	-ʂ	-ʂ	-ʂ
较场土语 (Jiaochang)	松潘县小姓沟乡埃溪寨 (Aixi)	-ʂ	-ʂ	-ʂ
较场土语 (Jiaochang)	茂县松坪沟乡麦石寨 (Maishizhai)	-c	-c	-c
三龙土语 (Sanlong)	茂县洼底乡热额辣寨 (Re'ela)	-ci	-ci	-ci
三龙土语 (Sanlong)	茂县白溪乡余家沟村 (Yujiagou)	-ci	-ci	-ci

黑虎土语 (Heihu)	茂县永和乡卡尔寨 (Ka'er)	-s	-s	-s
绵麓土语 (Mianchi)	汶川县雁门乡萝卜寨 (Luobuzhai)	-sə	-sə	-sə
麻窝土语 (Mawo)	黑水县麻窝乡 (Mawo)	-ji	-ji	-ji
绵麓土语 (Mianchi)	汶川县绵麓乡簇头寨 (Cutou)	-ji	-ji	-ji
大岐山土语 (Daqishan)	理县蒲溪乡休溪寨 (Xiuxi)	-i	-i	-tə
大岐山土语 (Daqishan)	理县木卡乡水塘寨 (Shuitang)	-i/-ti	-ti	-ti
大岐山土语 (Daqishan)	理县木卡乡九子营 (Jiuziying)	??	-ti	-ti
桃坪土语 (Taoping)	理县桃坪乡 (Taoping)	-i <sup>33</sup>	-i <sup>33</sup>	-ko <sup>33</sup>
黑虎土语 (Heihu)	茂县黑虎乡二队 (Erdui)	-sta	-sta	-sə
龙溪土语 (Longxi)	汶川县龙溪乡玛得村 (Made)	-le <sup>31</sup>	??	-le <sup>31</sup>
三龙土语 (Sanlong)	茂县三龙乡勒依村 (Leyi)	-ɣkən	??	??

As is shown in Table 4, the agentive markers of 13 Qiang varieties are isomorphic with the instrumental and ablative markers, even though the forms for marking in the different languages are different. However, in three varieties, i.e., Xiuxi, Taoping and Erdui, the agentive markers are isomorphic only with the instrumental. On the other hand, in Table 5, we can see that although the ergative, instrumental, and ablative markers all contain *-s*, the ergative and instrumental are built on the genitive, whereas the ablative is built on the locative, so the ergative markers in Tibetan are only fully isomorphic with the instrumental.

**Table 5** Case markers in Tibetan

Varieties	ERG	INST	ABL
Written Tibetan	-kyis/-gyis/-gis/-is	-kyis/-gyis/-gis/-is	-las
Lhasa Tibetan	-ki	-ki	-nas
玛曲藏语 (Maqu)	-kə	-yə	-nas
Balti	-i/-si	-i/-si/-na	-na
Ladakhi		-is	-nas
Sherpa	-ki/-gi/-re	-la	-ne/-me

Since the path of the development of the relevant postpositions in Qiang and Tibetan are different, we would assume that the agentive markers in Qiang are not cognate with the ergative markers in Tibetan. They both could be products of parallel drift (LaPolla 1994).

### 2.3 The Suffix *-p*

In the Chibusu area in Mao County, there is a suffix *-p* that occurs after a place name to denote a person from a specific place, as in the following examples, from Ronghong Qiang:

<i>joχ-ta</i>	‘Ronghong village’	<i>joχu-p</i>	‘a person of Ronghong’
<i>buya-la</i>	‘Muyu village’	<i>buju-p</i>	‘a person of Muyu’
<i>quak-la</i>	‘Kuali village’	<i>quazə-p</i>	‘a person of Kuali’
<i>koko-la</i>	‘Wowo village’	<i>koko-p</i>	‘a person of Wowo’
<i>gufu-ta</i>	‘Ekou village’	<i>gufu-pə</i>	‘a person of Ekou’
<i>çifu-ta</i>	‘Xihu village’	<i>çifu-pə</i>	‘a person of Xihu’
<i>spəχs-ta</i>	‘Chibusu Town’	<i>spəχsə-p</i>	‘a person of Chibusu’
<i>sezguə-ta</i>	‘Se’ergu Township’	<i>sezguə-p</i>	‘a person of Se’ergu’
<i>kuatçi-la</i>	‘Wadi Township’	<i>kuatçi-p</i>	‘a person of Wadi’
<i>speitçi-la</i>	‘Sanlong Township’	<i>speitçi-p</i>	‘a person of Sanlong’
<i>squni-la</i>	‘Fengyi Town’	<i>squni-p</i>	‘a person of Fengyi’
<i>satšhə-la</i>	‘Xuecheng Town’	<i>satšhə-p</i>	‘a person of Xuecheng’
		<i>tšhə-p</i>	‘a rGyalrong Tibetan’

In Tibetan, there is also a suffix *-pa* that occurs after the name of a place where a person comes from, for example, *bod-la* ‘Tibet’ : *bod-pa* ‘a Tibetan’ (Classic Tibetan), *phö?la* ‘Tibet’ : *phöö-pa* ‘a Tibetan’ (Lhasa Tibetan) (DeLancey 2003b: 285). Even though a form *\*-pa* goes back to Proto-Sino-Tibetan, since other varieties of Qiang have no remnant of the suffix *-pa*, the above phenomenon might be a borrowed form from Tibetan.

In Ronghong Qiang, the suffix *-p* is opaque semantically, and so the native word *mi* ‘person’ can be added after the suffix *-p* in the following examples:

<i>buju-p</i>	~	<i>buju-p</i>	<i>mi</i>	‘a person of Muyu’
<i>spəχsə-p</i>	~	<i>spəχsə-p</i>	<i>mi</i>	‘a person of Chibusu’
<i>sezguə-p</i>	~	<i>sezguə-p</i>	<i>mi</i>	‘a person of Se’ergu’
<i>speitçi-p</i>	~	<i>speitçi-p</i>	<i>mi</i>	‘a person of Sanlong’
<i>squni-p</i>	~	<i>squni-p</i>	<i>mi</i>	‘a person of Fengyi’
<i>satšhə-p</i>	~	<i>satšhə-p</i>	<i>mi</i>	‘a person of Xuecheng’

## 2.4 Nominalizers

There are two types of nominalizers among the Qiang varieties. One is seen on verbs or noun-verb phrases to which the nominalizer *-m* is added to form agentive nouns. This is used to refer to a person carrying out the activity represented by the verb. The other type consists of a verb to which the nominalizer *-sa* ~ *-s* is added to form instrumental nouns and object nouns, as shown in the Table 6:

Table 6 Nominalizers

土语Subdialects	Varieties	NOM (AGT)	NOM (INST)
雅都土语 (Yadu)	雅都荣红 (Ronghong)	-m	-s
雅都土语 (Yadu)	曲谷河西 (Hexi)	-m	-s
大歧山土语 (Daqishan)	木卡水塘 (Shuitang)	-nə	-sa



大岐山土语 (Daqishan)	蒲溪休溪 (Xiuxi)	-m	-sa/-s
麻窝土语 (Mawo)	麻窝 (Mawo)	-n	??
黑虎土语 (Heihu)	黑虎二队 (Erdui)	-m/-ka	-ka
绵箴土语 (Mianchi)	绵箴簇头 (Cutou)	-mu	-ki
桃坪土语 (Taoping)	桃坪 (Taoping)	-mə <sup>33</sup>	-tsɿ <sup>33</sup>

As can be seen in Table 6, all varieties have agentive nominalizers, i.e., *-m* in Ronghong, Hexi, Xiuxi, and Erdui; *-mu* in Cutou; *-mə<sup>33</sup>* in Taoping; *-n* in Mawo and *-nə* in Shuitang. (*nə* ‘person’ in Mawo and Shuitang corresponds with *mi* ‘person’ in Ronghong, Hexi and Erdui; *me* ‘person’ in Xiuxi; *mu* ‘person’ in Cutou and *mə<sup>33</sup>* ‘person’ in Taoping. It seems *nə* derived from *mi*,<sup>5)</sup> and *nə/mi* ‘person’ grammaticalized into the agentive nominalizer.) In view of this, the agentive nominalizer is therefore reconstructable to Proto-Qiang. The instrumental nominalizer seems not to go back to Proto-Qiang even though Ronghong, Hexi, Xiuxi and Shuitang share the instrumental nominalizer *-sa/-s* (*-sa* > *-s*). Taoping Qiang has a unique instrumental nominalizer *-tsɿ<sup>33</sup>*, whereas Cutou Qiang uses the genitive marker *-ki* to encode instrumental nominalization, and Erdui Qiang uses the general nominalizer *-ka*.

In Classic Tibetan and Lhasa Tibetan, the word *sa* ‘ground, earth’ may be used as a locative marker *-sa* (DeLancey 1986, 1999, 2003b: 276) though it cannot be used as an instrumental marker.<sup>6)</sup> The instrumental marker *-sa/-s* in Qiang is unlikely a grammaticalization from the voiced initial words *zə* ‘ground’ ~ *zəp* ‘earth’ (Ronghong); *zue* ‘ground’ ~ *zuepe* ‘earth’ (Xiuxi); *zuəpə* ‘earth’ (Shuitang), though *-sa/-s* in Qiang may also be used in nominalization/relativization of a place, as in (4), and its Tibetan counterpart as in (5):

(4) a. *the*      *zi-s-ta*                  *zəp*      *la-kua*                  (Ronghong Qiang)  
3sg      exist-NOM-LOC                  place      DEF-CL

b. *thala*      *zə-sa*                  *zuepe*      *tha-thio*                  (Xiuxi Qiang)  
3sg      exist-NOM                  place      that-CL  
‘the place that s/he is in’

(5) *mo-s*                  *mog = mog*                  *bzo-sa*                  (Lhasa Tibetan, DeLancey 2003b: 276)  
she-ERG                  momos                  make-NOM  
‘the place she makes momos’

The parallel examples in (4) and (5) both in Qiang and in Tibetan show that nominalizer *-sa/-s* in Qiang might be related to Tibetan *sa*; it might be an old loanword from Tibetan.

### 3. Conclusion

In comparing Qiang nominal relational morphology and nominalization markers with those of Tibetan, I have observed the morphology shared by Qiang and Tibetan. Some is recon-

structable to the proto-language, some is most likely due to Qiang borrowing from Tibetan, some is due to independent innovation, and some is due to parallel development. The shared morphology is unlikely to be an areal feature, as the rGyalrong language, which is closer to Tibetan than Qiang, does not manifest those forms shared between Qiang and Tibetan.

Substratum influences may play a major role in the lexical and morphological sharing between languages. In the case of Qiang, this is quite unlikely as we do not have evidence of Tibetan speakers shifting to speaking Qiang.

### Acknowledgment

The work reported in this paper has been supported by an Academia Sinica Postdoctoral Research Fellowship (the author) and by the National Science Council of the Republic of China (Taiwan), grant #95-2411-H-001-077 (Jonathan P. Evans). I would like to thank Randy J. LaPolla, Dory Poa, Yasuhiko Nagano, James A. Matisoff, Sarah G. Thomason, Jonathan P. Evans, Yoshiharu Takahashi, Takumi Ikeda, Guillaume Jacques and Hiroyuki Suzuki for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Any remaining errors are the author's.

### Data Sources

Achang (Dai and Cui 1985); Akha (Hansson 2003); Anong (Sun and Liu 2005); Bai (Xu and Zhao 1984); Bai (Xu and Zhao 1984); Baima (Chirkova 2005, Sun, Qi and Liu 2007); Balti (Read 1934); Belhare (Bickel 2003); Bengni-Bogar (Ouyang 1985); Bisu (S. Xu 1998); Bola (Dai, Fu and Liu 1991); Boro (Basumatary 2005); Burmese (Wheatley 2003); Byangsi (Sharma 2001b); Camling (Ebert 2003); Cangluo Menba (Zhang 1986); Caodeng rGyalrong (J. Sun 2003); Chang (Hutton 1987); Chantyal (Noonan 2003b); Chaudangsi (Krishan 2001b); Cogtse Gyarong (Nagano 2003); Cuona Menba (Lu 1986); Daohua (Acuo 2004); Darang Dengyu (Sun; Lu; Zhang and Ouyang 1980: 174–231); Darma (Krishan 2001a); Dhankute Tamang (Poudel 2006); Dolakhā Newār (Genetti 2003); Dulong (H. Sun 1982, LaPolla 2003c); Dumi (van Driem 1993); Garo (Burling 2003); Geman (Sun *et al.* 1980: 232–315, Li Daqin 2002); Geshizha Daofu (Duo'erji 1998); Hakha Lai (Peterson 2003); Hani (Li and Wang 1986); Hayu (Michailovsky 2003); Jero (Oppenort 2005); Jingpho (Liu 1984, Dai and Diehl 2003); Jinuo (Gai 1986); Kathmandu Newar (Hargreaves 2003); Kazhuo (Mu 2003); Kham (Watters 2003); Ladakhi (Francke 1901, Koshal 1979); Lahu (Matisoff 2003); Langsu (Dai 2005); Lavrung (Huang 2007); Lepcha (Plaisier 2003 and 2007); Lhasa Tibetan (DeLancey 2003b); Limbu (van Driem 1987); Lisu (Xu, Mu and Gai 1986); Lüsü (Huang and Renzeng 1991a); Manange (Hildebrandt 2004); Maqu Tibetan (Zhou 2003); Meithei (Chelliah 1997 and 2003); Munya (Huang 1991c); Namuzi (Huang and Renzeng 1991b); Nar-phu (Noonan 2003b); Naxi (He and Jiang 1985); Niwan Daofu (Huang 1991a); Nuosu Yi (Chen and Wuda 1998); Nusu (Sun and Liu 1986); Pangi Kinnauri (Takahashi 2001 and 2008); Pumi (Lu 1983); Queyü (Wang 1991); Raji (Krishan 2001c); Rongpo (Sharma 2001a); Rouruo (Sun, Huang and Zhou 2002); Sangkong (Y. Li 2002); Sherpa (Kelly 2004); Shixing (Huang and Renzeng 1991c); Sulong (D. Li 2004); Tamang (Mazaudon 2003); Tangut (Gong 2003); Thangmi (Turin 2006); Tshangla (Andvik 2003); Tujia (Tian and He 1986); Wāmbule

(Opgenort 2002); Classic Tibetan (DeLancey 2003a); Yamphu (Rutgers 1998); Yelong Lavrung (Yin 2007); Yidu (Jiang 2005); Zaiwa (Xu and Xu 1984); Zhaba (Huang 1991b, Gong 2007).

### Abbreviations

1sg	first person singular	DAT	dative marker
3sg	third person singular	DIR	directional prefix
A	agent of prototypical transitive clause	ERG	ergative marker
ABL	ablative marker	GEN	genitive marker
AGT	agentive marker	INST	instrumental
BEN	benefactive marker	LOC	locative marker
CAUS	causative	NOM	nominalizer
CL	classifier	P	patient of prototypical transitive clause
DEF	definite marker		

### Appendix: GEN/AGT/INST/ABL in Tibeto-Burman

Languages	GEN	AGT/ERG	INST	ABL
Written Tibetan	-kyi/-gyi/-gi/-i	-kyis/-gyis/-gis/-i	-kyis/-gyis/-gis/-i	-las
Lhasa Tibetan	-ki	-ke/-ki	-ke/-ki	-ne
Pumi	-ga <sup>55</sup>	-gue <sup>55</sup> ie <sup>13</sup>	-gue <sup>55</sup> ie <sup>13</sup>	-nāu <sup>13</sup>
Cangluo Menba	-ka <sup>13</sup>	-ki <sup>13</sup>	-ki <sup>13</sup>	-kai <sup>13</sup>
Tshangla		-gi/-ki		-gai/-kai
Caodeng		-kə	-kə	-s
Maqu Tibetan	-kə/-yi	-kə	-γə	-nas
Burmese	-ké/-yé	-ká	-né	
Sherpa	-ki/-gi/-re	-ki/-gi/-re	-la	-ne/-me
Cogtse Gyarong	-i	-ki	-s	-s
Lavrung	-ji <sup>33</sup>	-γə <sup>53</sup>	-γə <sup>53</sup>	-tchi <sup>53</sup>
Niwan Daofu	-ji	-γu	-qha	-ηe
Munya	-γæ	-ji	-ji	-tsə <sup>33</sup> ke <sup>33</sup>
Balti	-i/-e	-i/-si	-i-si/-na	-na
Pangi Kinnauri	-ū	-is/-s	-is/-s	-č
Ladakhi	-gi/-yi		-is	-ne
Kham	-e/-ye	-e/-ye	-e/-ye	-ni
Yelong Lavrung	-ji <sup>55</sup>	-ji <sup>33</sup>	-ji <sup>55</sup>	-na <sup>33</sup>
Queyu	-ji	-ji <sup>13</sup> ni <sup>55</sup>		-ni
Nusu	-e <sup>31</sup>	-i <sup>31</sup>	-i <sup>31</sup>	-do <sup>35</sup> le <sup>31</sup>
Zaiwa	-e <sup>55</sup>	-e <sup>31</sup>	-e <sup>31</sup>	-mai <sup>31</sup>
Dulong		-mi <sup>55</sup> /-i <sup>55</sup>	-mi <sup>55</sup> /-i <sup>55</sup>	-paŋ <sup>55</sup>

Achang	-a <sup>31</sup>	-a <sup>31</sup>		-a <sup>31</sup>
Akha	-ə	-nɛ	-nɛ	-nɛ
Dolakhā Newar	-e	-na/-n	-na/-n	-lān
Kathmandu Newar	-yɑ	-sũ/-nɔ	-nɔ	-nɔ
Hakha Lai		-niʔ/-ʔii	-ʔin/-ʔii	-ʔin/-ʔii
Hani	-ɣ <sup>33</sup>	-ne <sup>33</sup>	-ne <sup>33</sup>	-ne <sup>33</sup>
Shixing	-ji <sup>55</sup>	-rẽ <sup>33</sup>	-rẽ <sup>33</sup>	-rẽ <sup>33</sup>
Lisu	-te <sup>55</sup>	-ne <sup>33</sup> /-le <sup>33</sup>	-ne <sup>33</sup>	
Namuzi	-ni <sup>55</sup> /-ji <sup>31</sup>	-ni <sup>55</sup>	-la <sup>31</sup>	-ni <sup>31</sup>
Meithei		-nə		
Naxi	-gə <sup>33</sup>	-nu <sup>33</sup>		-nu <sup>33</sup>
Bengni–Bogar	-ka	-nuŋ	-nuŋ	-ga
Sangkong	-e <sup>55</sup> /-i <sup>55</sup>			-ha <sup>33</sup>
Jingpho	-a <sup>31</sup> /-na <sup>55</sup>	-e <sup>31</sup>	-the <sup>31</sup>	
Raji	-kə	-yẽ	-gəi/-kəi/-əi	-di
Thangmi	-ko/-go	-e/-ye	-e/-ye	-yinj/-yinj
Byangsi	-gɛ	-sɛ/-se	-sɛ/-se	-ci
Darma	-ko/-go	-so	-so	-so
Chaudangsi	-gɛ/-gə	-sə	-sə	-sə/-khərɕi
Chantyal	-ye/-i	-sə	-sə	-gəm-sə
Nar-phu	-ye/-i	-se	-se	-se
Tamang	-la	-se	-se	-se
Dhankute Tamang	-la	-se/-i/-gjam	-se	-gjam/-hense
Manange	-lɛ	-tse	-tse	-tɛr/-ro
Rouruo	-ze <sup>33</sup>	-ɕi <sup>33</sup>	-ɕi <sup>33</sup>	-ɕi <sup>33</sup>
Nuosu Yi			-sɪ <sup>21</sup>	-ta <sup>33</sup>
Chang	-bu/-ebu/-webu	-e/ye		-ka
Kazhuo	-pv <sup>323</sup>	-ke <sup>33</sup>	-ke <sup>33</sup>	-ke <sup>33</sup>
Geman	-pha <sup>35</sup>	-ka <sup>35</sup>	-ka <sup>35</sup>	-lam <sup>55</sup>
Darang Dengyu	-a <sup>31</sup> ba <sup>55</sup>	-go <sup>31</sup>	-go <sup>31</sup>	-ma <sup>55</sup> /-nu <sup>31</sup>
Dumi	-po	-ʔa	-ʔa	-ləkə
Daohua	-di	-ki	-ki	-dɛ
Sulong	-da <sup>31</sup>	-ta <sup>33</sup>	-da <sup>33</sup>	-da <sup>33</sup>
Baima	-te <sup>53</sup> /-ti <sup>53</sup>	-i <sup>53</sup>	-re <sup>53</sup> /-no <sup>13</sup>	-iɔ <sup>53</sup>
Rongpo	-tə	-jə	-jə	-se
Cuona Menba	-ko <sup>31</sup>	-te <sup>31</sup>	-te <sup>31</sup>	-ki <sup>31</sup>
Geshizha Daofu	-je	-wə	-tɕe	-tɕe/-nɔ
l̥isu	-ji <sup>53</sup>	-le <sup>53</sup>	-le <sup>53</sup>	-le <sup>53</sup>
Jinuo	-ɛ <sup>55</sup>		-la <sup>35</sup>	-jə <sup>33</sup>
Yidu	-tɕi <sup>55</sup>	-ni <sup>55</sup>	-tɕi <sup>53</sup>	-ne <sup>31</sup>
Anong	-ni <sup>55</sup> /-kha <sup>33</sup>	-mi <sup>53</sup>	-mi <sup>55</sup>	-ne <sup>55</sup>
Wāmbule	-nān/-n			-no/n

Boro	-ni		-zwɿŋ	-ni-phrai
Bai	-no <sup>33</sup>			-no <sup>33</sup>
Tujia	-ne <sup>21</sup>			-le <sup>55</sup>
Langsu	-nɔ <sup>31</sup>	-jan <sup>31</sup>	-jan <sup>31</sup>	-me <sup>55</sup>
Bola	-na <sup>31</sup>	-jan <sup>31</sup>	-jan <sup>31</sup>	-mẽ <sup>31</sup>
Garó	-ni	-a (NOM)	-chi	-chi
Hayu	-mʊ	-ha	-ha	-khen
Camling	-mo	-wa	-wa	
Belhare	-ŋakak	-ŋa/-a	-ŋa/-a	-huŋ
Jero	-ŋaŋ/-ŋ			-ŋo
Zhaba	-zɤ <sup>31</sup>		-kə <sup>55</sup> tə <sup>31</sup>	-ni <sup>31</sup>
Tangut	-jij <sup>1</sup>		-ŋwu <sup>2</sup>	
Lepcha	-sá			-nu/-nun
Bisu	-xy <sup>33</sup>	-no <sup>31</sup>		
Lahu	-ve			

## Notes

- 1) I am indebted to Randy J. LaPolla, Dory Poa and Jonathan P. Evans, who have allowed me to use the Qiang data that we have investigated together. Other data are Ekou 俄口 (Huang 1991d); Hexi 河西 (Huang & Zhou 2006); Puxi 蒲溪 (Huang 2004, 2007 [2006]); Taoping 桃坪 (Sun 1981); Mawo 麻窝 (Liu 1998); and Jiuzaiying 九子营 (Wen Yu 1950).
- 2) This variety has not been mentioned in the literature, so we do not know which subdialect Ciba Qiang belongs to.
- 3) We did not find an agentive marker in Wen (1950), therefore, it is unclear if there is an agentive marker.
- 4) This dialect normally has final consonants, e.g., *spən* ‘kidney’, *tʂ<sup>h</sup>uen* ‘step on’, *minχua* ‘evening’, and it isn’t in contact with Tibetan, so it is unlikely this is a loan of the Tibetan agentive nominalizer.
- 5) The parallel correspondence of *n-m* is also found in Rawang and Dulong (a Tibeto-Burman language), where *nut* ‘mind’ in Rawang corresponds with *mit* ‘mind’ in Dulong (personal communication with Prof. Randy J. LaPolla), and among many other Lolo-Burmese languages (personal communication with Prof. James A. Matisoff).
- 6) Though *-sa* cannot be used as an instrumental nominalizer in Classic and Lhasa Tibetan, in Khams (Puguoding variety in Danba County), however, *-s<sup>h</sup>ɔ<sup>55</sup>* can be used as an instrumental nominalizer, e.g., *dɔw<sup>24</sup>* ‘sit’ : *dɔw<sup>24</sup>-s<sup>h</sup>ɔ<sup>55</sup>* ‘chair’; *le<sup>24</sup>ba<sup>55</sup>* ‘hand’ + *htu<sup>53</sup>* ‘wash’ : *le<sup>24</sup>ba<sup>55</sup>htu<sup>53</sup>-s<sup>h</sup>ɔ<sup>22</sup>* ‘soap’; *ts<sup>h</sup>aj<sup>55</sup>* ‘vegetable’ + *htɕə<sup>55</sup>* ‘take’ : *ts<sup>h</sup>aj<sup>55</sup>htɕə<sup>55</sup>-s<sup>h</sup>ɔ<sup>22</sup>* ‘plate’; *se<sup>24</sup>* ‘meal’ + *sɔ<sup>55</sup>* ‘eat’ : *se<sup>24</sup>sɔ<sup>22</sup>-sɔ<sup>55</sup>* ‘chopsticks’, etc. (personal communication with Hiroyuki Suzuki).

## References

- Acuo, Yeshes Vodgsal  
 2004 *Daohua Yanjiu (A Study of the Daohua)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

- Andvik, Erik  
 2003 Tshangla. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.) 439–455. London and New York: Routledge.
- Basumatary, Phukan  
 2005 *An Introduction to the Boro Language*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications.
- Bickel, Balthasar  
 2003 Belhare. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 546–570.
- Burling, Robbins  
 2003 Garo. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 387–400.
- Chelliah, Shobhan L.  
 1997 *A Grammar of Meithei*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.  
 2003 Meithei. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 427–438.
- Chen, Kang and Wuda  
 1998 *Yiyu Yufa (Nuosuhua) (A Grammar of the Yi Language (Nuosu Dialect))*. Beijing: The Central University for Nationalities Press.
- Chirkova, Katia  
 2005 Baima nominal postpositions and their etymology. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 28(2): 1–41.
- Dai, Qingxia  
 2005 *Langsuyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Langsu Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Dai, Qingxia and Cui, Zhicao  
 1985 *Achangyu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Achang Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Dai, Qingxia, Huang, Bufan, Fu, Ailan, Renzeng, Wangmu and Liu, Juhuang  
 1991 *Zang-Mianyu Shiwu Zhong (Fifteen Tibeto-Burman Languages)*. Beijing: Yanshan Chubanshe.
- Dai, Qingxia, Fu, Ailan and Liu, Juhuang  
 1991 Bolayu (The Bola Language). In Dai *et al.* (eds.), 316–351.
- Dai, Qiangxia and Diehl, Lon  
 2003 Jingpho. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 401–408.
- Dai, Qingxia, Jiang, Ying and Kong Zhi'en  
 2007 *Bolayu Yanjiu (A Study of the Bola Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- DeLancey, Scott  
 1986 Relativization as nominalization in Tibetan and Newari. Paper presented at the 19<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on Sino-Tibetan Language and Linguistics. Ohio State University, Ohio.  
 1999 Relativization in Tibetan. In Yogendran P. Yadava and Warren W. Glover (eds.), *Topics in Nepalese Linguistics*, 231–249. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.  
 2003a Classic Tibetan. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 255–269.  
 2003b Lhasa Tibetan. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 270–288.
- Duo'erji  
 1998 *Daofuyu Geshizhahua Yanjiu (A Study of The Geshizha Variety of the Daofu (Horpa) Language)*. Beijing: The Chinese Tibetology Press.
- Ebert, Karen H.  
 2003 Camling. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 533–545.

- Francke, A. H.  
1901 *Sketch of Ladakhi Grammar. Extra No. 2 to the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. 70, Part I.
- Gai, Xingzhi  
1986 *Jinuoyu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Jinuo Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Genetti, Carol  
2003 Dolakha Newar. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 355–370.
- Gong, Hwang-Cherng  
2003 Tangut. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 602–620.
- Gong, Qunhu  
2007 *Zhabayu Yanjiu (A Study of the nDrapa Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Hansson, Inga-Lill  
2003 Akha. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 236–252.
- Hargreaves, David  
2003 Kathmandu Newar (Nepāl Bhāsā). In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 371–384.
- He, Jiren and Jiang, Zhuyi  
1985 *Naxiyu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Naxi Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Hildebrandt, Kristine A.  
2004 A Grammar and Glossary of the Manange Language. In Carol Genetti (ed.), *Tibeto-Burman Languages of Nepal: Manage and Sherpa*, 1–189. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, The Australian National University.
- Huang, Bufan  
1991a Daofuyu (Niwanhua) (The Daofu Language (Niwan variety)). In Dai *et al.* (eds.), 1–45.  
1991b Zhabayu (The nDrapa Language). In Dai *et al.* (eds.), 64–97.  
1991c Muyayu (The Munya Language). In Dai *et al.* (eds.), 98–131.  
1991d Qiangyuzhi (the Qiang branch). In Ma Xueliang (ed.), *Han-Zanyu Gailun (A General Introduction to the Sino-Tibetan Languages)* I: 208–369. Beijing: Beijing University Press.  
2007 *Lavrunyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Lavrung Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Huang, Bufan and Renzeng, Wangmu  
1991a Lüsüyu (The Lüsü Language). In Dai *et al.* (eds.), 132–152.  
1991b Namuziyu (The Namuzi Language). In Dai *et al.* (eds.), 153–173.  
1991c Shixingyu (The Shixing Language). In Dai *et al.* (eds.), 174–197.
- Huang, Bufan and Zhou, Facheng  
2006 *Qiangyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Qiang Language)*. Chengdu: Sichuan Renmin Chubanshe.
- Huang, Chenglong  
2004 *A Reference Grammar of the Puxi Variety of Qiang*, Ph.D. dissertation, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.  
2007 [2006] *Puxi Qiangyu Yanjiu (Studies on Puxi Qiang)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Hutton, J. H.  
1987 *Chang Language: Grammar and Vocabulary*. Delhi: Gian Publishing House.
- Jiang, Di  
2005 *Yiduyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Yidu Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Kelly, Babara

- 2004 A Grammar and Glossary of the Sherpa Language. In Carol Genetti (ed.), *Tibeto-Burman Languages of Nepal: Manange and Sherpa*, 190–324. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, Australian National University.

Koshal, Sanyukya

- 1979 *Ladakhi Grammar*. India: Motilal Banarsidass.

Krishan, Shree

- 2001a A sketch of Darma grammar. In Nagano and LaPolla (eds.), *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Language*, 347–400. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- 2001b A sketch of Chaudangsi grammar. In Nagano and LaPolla (eds.), 401–448.
- 2001c A sketch of Raji grammar. In Nagano and LaPolla (eds.), 449–501.

LaPolla, Randy J.

- 1994 Parallel grammaticalizations in Tibeto-Burman: Evidence of Sapir's 'drift'. *Linguistics of Tibeto-Burman Area* 17(1): 61–80.
- 1995a Ergative marking in Tibeto-Burman. In Nishi, Matisoff and Nagano (eds.), *New Horizons in Tibeto-Burman Morphosyntax (Series Ethnological Studies 41)*, 189–228. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- 1995b On the utility of the concepts of markedness and prototypes in understanding the development of morphological systems. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 66(4.1): 149–185.
- 2003a Overview of Sino-Tibetan morphosyntax. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*, 22–42. London and New York: Routledge.
- 2003b Qiang. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 573–587.
- 2003c Dulong. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 674–682.
- 2004 On nominal relational morphology in Tibeto-Burman. In Lin Yin-chin *et al.* (eds.), *Studies on Sino-Tibetan Languages: Papers in Honor of Professor Hwang-cherng Gong on His Seventieth Birthday*. 43–74. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

LaPolla, Randy J. with Huang Chenglong

- 2003 *A Grammar of Qiang, with Annotated Texts and Glossary*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Li, Daqin

- 2002 *Gemanyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Geman Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- 2004 *Sulongyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Sulong Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Li, Yongsui

- 2002 *Sangkongyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Sangkong Language)*. Beijing: The Central University for Nationalities Press.

Li, Yongsui and Wang, Ersong

- 1986 *Haniyu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Hani Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Liu, Guangkun

- 1998 *Mawo Qiangyu Yanjiu (Studies on the Mawo Variety of Qiang)*. Chengdu: Sichuan Minzu Chubanshe.

Liu, Lu

- 1984 *Jingpozu Yuyan Jianzhi (Jingpoyu) (A Brief Description of the Language of the Jingpho People (Jingpho Language))*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.



- Lu, Shaozun  
 1983 *Pumiyu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Pumi Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.  
 1986 *Cuona Menbayu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Cuona Menba Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Matisoff, James A.  
 2003 Lahu. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 208–221.
- Mazaudon, Martine  
 2003 Tamang. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 291–314.
- Michailovsky, Boyd  
 2003 Hayu. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 518–532.
- Mu, Shihua  
 2003 *Kazhuoyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Kazhuo Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Nagano, Yasuhiko  
 2003 Cogtse Gyarong. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 469–489.
- Nagano, Yasuhiko and LaPolla, Randy J. (eds.)  
 2001 *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages*, Senri Ethnological Reports 19. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Noonan, Michael  
 2003a Chantyal. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 315–335.  
 2003b Nar-phu. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 336–352.
- Opgenort, Jean Robert  
 2002 *The Wāmbule Language. Grammar, Lexicon, Texts and Cultural Survey of a Kiranti Tribe of Eastern Nepal*. Ph.D. dissertation, Amsterdam.  
 2005 *A Grammar of Jero*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ouyang, Jueya  
 1985 *Luobazu Yuyan Jianzhi (Bengni-Bogaryu) (A Brief Description of the Language of the Luoba People (Bengni-Bogar Language))*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Peterson, David A.  
 2003 Hakha Lai. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 409–426.
- Plaisier, Heleen  
 2003 Lepcha. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 705–716.  
 2007 *A Grammar of Lepcha*. Leiden: Brill.
- Poudel, Kedar Prasad  
 2006 *Dhankute Tamang Grammar*. Muenchen: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Read, A. F. C.  
 1934 *Balti Grammar*. London: The Royal Asiatic Society.
- Rutgers, Roland  
 1998 *Yamphu: Grammar, Texts & Lexicon*. Leiden: School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies.
- Sharma, Suhnu Ram  
 2001a A sketch of Rongpo grammar. In Nagano and LaPolla (eds.), 195–270.  
 2001b A sketch of Byangsi grammar. In Nagano and LaPolla (eds.), 271–341.

Sun, Hongkai

1981 *Qiangyu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Qiang Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

1982 *Dulongyu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Dulong Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Sun, Hongkai, Lu, Shaozun, Zhang, Jichuan and Ouyang, Jueya

1980 *Menba, Luoba, Dengren de Yuyan (The Menba, Luoba and Deng Languages)*. Beijing: Chinese Social Sciences Press.

Sun, Hongkai and Liu, Lu

1986 *Nuzu Yuyan Jianzhi (Nusuyu) (A Brief Description of the Language of the Nu people (Nusu Language))*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Sun, Hongkai, Huang, Chenglong and Zhou, Maocao

2002 *Nuzu Rouruoyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Rouruo Language of the Nu Nationality)*. Beijing: The Central University for Nationalities Press.

Sun, Hongkai and Liu, Guangkun

2005 *Anongyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Anong Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Sun, Hongkai, Qi, Kajia (Chirkova Katia) and Liu, Guangkun

2007 *Baimayu Yanjiu (A Study of the Baima Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Sun, Jackson T.-S.

2000 Parallelism in the verb morphology of Sidaba rGyalrong and Lavrung in rGyalrongic. *Language and Linguistics* 1(1): 161–190.

2003 Caodeng rGyalrong. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 456–466.

Takahashi, Yoshiharu

2001 A descriptive study of Kinnauri (Pangi dialect): a preliminary report. In Yasuhiko Nagano and Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), 97–119.

2008 A descriptive and morphosyntactic study on Kinnauri (2): A report of a research project, Grant-in Aid for Scientific Research (c), (No. 16520250). Aichi Prefectural University.

Thurgood, Graham and Randy J. LaPolla (eds.)

2003 *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London and New York: Routledge.

Tian, Desheng and He, Tianzhen

1986 *Tujiayu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Tujia Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Turin, Mark

2006 *A Grammar of the Thangmi Language*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Leiden, Leiden.

van Driem, George

1987 *A Grammar of Limbu*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

1993 *A Grammar of Dumi*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wang, Tianxi

1991 Queyuyu (The Queyü Language). In Dai *et al.* (eds.), 46–63.

Watters, David, E.

2003 Kham. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 683–704.

Wen Yu

1950 An abridged Ch'iang vocabulary (Chiu Tzu Ying Dialect). *Studia Serica* 9(2): 17–54.

Wheatley, Julian K.

2003 Burmese. In Thurgood and LaPolla (eds.), 195–207.

Xu, Lin and Zhao, Yansun

1984 *Baiyu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Bai Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Xu, Lin, Mu, Yuzhang and Gai, Xingzhi

1986 *Lisuyu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Lisu Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Xu, Shixuan

1998 *Bisuyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Bisu Language)*. Shanghai: Shanghai Far East Publishing Press.

Xu, Xijian and Xu, Guizhen

1984 *Jingpozu Yuyan Jianzhi (Zaiwayu) (A Brief Description of the Language of the Jingpho People (Zaiwa Language))*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Yin, Weibin

2007 *Yelong Lavrungyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Yelong Variety of the Lavrung Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Zhang, Jichuan

1986 *Cangluo Menbayu Jianzhi (A Brief Description of the Cangluo Menba Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Zhou, Maocao

2003 *Maqu Zangyu Yanjiu (A Study of the Maqu Tibetan Language)*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.