


Review of Lopen P. Ogyan Tanzin's "tshangs-lha-ḥi tshig-mdzod - Tshanglha dictionary" (Sarnath: Ogyan Chokhor-Ling Foundation, 2015).

Timotheus Adrianus Bodt
(Bern University, Switzerland /
Tezpur University, India)

 s a linguist, it is always encouraging and enriching to come across publications on poorly described languages by local authors. Lopen P. Ogyan Tanzin's "tshangs-lha-ḥi tshig-mdzod¹ - Tshanglha dictionary" is a recent example of this. The hefty volume, 713 pages plus a CD-ROM, is a valuable source of information for the approximately 200,000 Tshangla speakers in India, Bhutan, Tibet and elsewhere, and a potentially welcome contribution to Tibetology and Tibeto-Burman linguistics.

The dictionary is a description of the *Padma-bkod-pa* Pemaköpa variety of Tshangla, spoken in the Yarlung Tsangpo gorge from Payi and Tongjuk in Kongpo on the Tibetan plateau till Tuting just across the border in the Indian state of Arunachal Pradesh. This variety is very close to, and mutually intelligible with, standard Tshangla as spoken in eastern Bhutan, but not mutually intelligible with any other language, including the varieties of Tibetan. The Pemakö Tshangla speakers migrated to this area in successive waves from their Eastern Bhutanese homeland between the late 17th and mid 20th centuries.

On the back cover, the dictionary is called a 'landmark contribution to the documentation of the Tibeto-Burman languages'. This is surely the case, as there have been no previously published dictionaries of Tshangla beyond a few incomplete wordlists in, among others, Hoffrenning (1959), Das Gupta (1968), Sün et al. (1980), Zhāng

¹ As per the journal's guidelines, the review generally confirms to the Wylie method of transcription of 'Ucen orthography from the dictionary. However, without dwelling further on the discussion about the exact phonetic value of the 'Ucen letter 'ꨀ', following the suggestion by van Driem (2001: xiii) it is here represented by an ḥ and not an apostrophe. The ḥ is also preferred over Hill's 2005 choice to use the symbol *v*, common in Chinese transcriptions of Tibetan, although in later publications, probably to conform to editorial guidelines, Hill also employs the orthographies ' and *h*. All dictionary entries are represented by a Wylie transcription of the 'Ucen Tshangla, the Roman Tshangla entry in cursive, and an English translation. Wherever possible, the English translation follows the Tibetan of the dictionary, however, sometimes improvisation based on either the sample sentence or the reviewer's knowledge of Tshangla was necessary.

(1986), Hoshi (1987) and Egli-Roduner (1987). The lack of publications on Tshangla is strange for a language with a relatively large speaker population and geographical spread, and a dictionary has been long awaited and is certainly welcomed.

The dictionary comes with a CD-ROM that contains 13 mp3 sound files with a total length of 5 hours and 45 minutes. The sound files, read by the author himself, contain all the Tshangla lexical entries as well as the Tshangla example sentences. The quality of the recordings is good, and phonetic analysis remains a possibility. Without having been able to listen to the entire CD, it is observed that for example the entries on page three were omitted. Hopefully, this is not repeated throughout the recordings. The religiously educated background of the speaker is rather prominent, for example, in the usage of the rounded vowels [y] and [ø] in lexemes where the author's choice of 'Ucen orthography triggers their realisation according to Tibetan pronunciation rules. However, most Tshangla speakers would pronounce the unrounded vowels [i] and [e] instead. Nevertheless, both for people who want to learn Tshangla and for linguists who want to analyse the sound system of the language, the CD-ROM is a valuable addition and a good use of the opportunities that modern technology provides.

The introduction of the dictionary contains a short overview of Tshangla and its relation to other languages, particularly Tibetan (i-vii), an overview of the spelling of Tshangla vis-a-vis the spelling of Tibetan (vii-xi), a short overview of the morphophonemic rules followed and the function of several suffixes and particles (xi-xix) and a description of the way of arranging the entries and the need for adding Roman transcriptions in the dictionary (xix-xxii). After the foreword by the translator and the acknowledgements by the author follows an index with all the head glosses. This is followed by the main body of the dictionary, containing head glosses, sub-entries, and example sentences in Tshangla with Roman transcription and Tibetan translation and definition.

The decision to call the language Tshangs-lha *Tshanglha* seems to be based on the purported descent of the Tshangla people from Lha Tshangs-pa *Lha Tshangpa*, the Tibetan Buddhist name for the Hindu deity Brahma (Bodt 2012: 180-181 and the dictionary entry *brah+mA+desh Brahmadesh* under entry *ḥbar-ma Barma* 'Myanmar', p. 427). To date, however, I have not met any Tshangla speakers who pronounce their ethnicity, nor their language as [s^haŋla], rather it is pronounced as [s^haŋla ~ saŋla], with most uneducated Tshangla speakers realising even Tibetan lha 'deity' as [la], with a lateral approximant rather than a lateral fricative. As earlier reported (Bodt

2012: 178-179; 2014: 393) *tshangla* [tʰaŋla] is still retained in archaic Bhutan Tshangla varieties as the word for ‘human being, man, person’ and thus reminds us of the reconstructed Proto-Lolo-Burmese root *tsaŋ¹ PERSON (Matisoff 2003: 265), cf. also Bisu [tʰaŋ⁵⁵] (Xu 2001: 240) and Anong [tʰaŋ³¹] (Sun and Liu 2009: 363). Other possible etymologies and references to the name can be found in Bodt (2012: 178-181). The author mentions a possible relation between the ‘indigenous’ language of Tibet, whatever that may be, and Tshangla, and therefore the importance of Tshangla for the understanding of Tibetan (page vii). Interesting is also the affiliation suggested by the author between Tshangla and the language of Manipur (Meiteilon, page vi).

The role of the translator, Dylan Esler of the Institut Orientaliste, Université Catholique de Louvain, appears to remain limited to concisely translating the last concluding paragraph of the 23 pages of the introduction, and writing a foreword to the dictionary. That is a pity, as it is the introduction that provides meaningful and important insights in the orthographic choices made by the author.

This review has been written keeping three main points in mind: the intended audience of the dictionary; the background of the author; and the aims of the author. After discussing these, I will focus on the benefits and drawbacks of the dictionary, shortly describe some of the main orthographic choices the author has made, and finally pose several recommendations how to improve the dictionary in what hopefully will be an expanded second edition.

The intended audience

The intended audience of the dictionary is a local, Pemaköpa and Tibetan audience, among whom the author wants to promote the language (p. iv-vii). The author’s targeted audience does not specifically include Tibeto-Burman linguists or Tibetologists, although the value of the dictionary for these people is tacitly presumed by the translator (p. iv-v).

The author’s background

The author has a background in both a religious education, including an MA in Tibetan Nyingma Philosophy, and an MA in Tibetan Language and Literature. This educational background pervades throughout the dictionary, with considerable focus on religious aspects of the lives of the Tshangla people and a clear focus on trying to harmonise Tshangla spelling with that of Tibetan.

The author's aims

From the introduction, it becomes clear that the major aim of the author has been to record the Tshangla language in an effort to preserve and promote it among the Tshangla speakers and the wider Tibetan public (in diaspora). A second aim is to illustrate his idea that the Tshangla language and its pronunciation closely reflect the Tibetan language as it was spoken at the moment that Tibetan was committed to writing: Tshangla is considered to have preserved an archaic, conservative pronunciation whereas the pronunciation of Tibetan has undergone much more phonological change. Following these two major aims, we would expect a dictionary that is complete as to content, with as many Tshangla terms recorded as possible; exhaustive in explanatory detail, with detailed and clear but nonetheless to the point descriptions; convenient and easy in its usage; and providing etymologies for both loans from, and cognates with, (written) Tibetan. The first two points will be discussed separately, the latter two points will be discussed in relation to the orthographical choices of the author.

The coverage of the dictionary

As any language, Tshangla is very rich in expressing the world of the people that speak it, and a dictionary of Tshangla would have to reflect that richness. That much said, we cannot expect a 200,000+ main entry dictionary like the Oxford English dictionaries' second edition. With around 2,150 main entries, this Tshangla dictionary is of a medium-sized coverage, for comparison, a standard Bhutan Tshangla dictionary that has been in preparation by the reviewer contains over 3,150 main entries.

One of the major strengths of the dictionary is the wealth of sociolinguistic, ethnobotanic, socioeconomic, cultural and historical information, applicable to the Pemakö area itself and the Tshangla homeland in eastern Bhutan. Much of this information and knowledge is rapidly disappearing and the descriptions in this dictionary are a timely attempt to preserve what is still known. There are entries on both wild and cultivated useable plants and both wild and domesticated animal species. The single entry *hbar bar* 'rice' (p. 425) has a total of 16 sub-entries including a possibly complete list of traditionally cultivated paddy varieties. Other food grains and their ways of preparation include *kha-la khala* 'bitter buckwheat' (p. 57), *gun-tsung guntsung* 'sweet buckwheat' (p. 104), *pu-tang putang* 'noodles' (p. 358), *nam cha-min nam.chhamin* 'spicy condiment made of white sesame seed' (p. 336) and *hbe be* 'flat unleavened bread' (p.

434). Similar coverage can be found for household items, agricultural implements and practices and items of daily use such as *ħche-ma chhema* 'shifting cultivation land' (p. 195), *cang-zer-ma changzerma* 'arrow head' (p. 170), *tor-pa torpa* 'type of trap to catch small rodents' (p. 253), *run-ħdi rundi* 'bamboo strap for carrying baskets' (p. 592), *tog-tsi toktsi* 'mortar' (p. 251) and *stan-pang tanpang* 'chopping block' (p. 265). There are many references to places in the Pemakö area and their short history, such as villages like *po-dung podung* 'Podung' (p. 363), the *tsho-khag lnga tsho khak lnga* 'five *tsho* divisions' of Pemakö (p. 494) and the pilgrimage site of *De-wa-ko-Ta Dewakota* (p. 295), on the traditional dress style of the Pemakö Tshangla people including the ubiquitous *mon-Di mgo-shubs monde.goshup* 'woollen tunic' (p. 466) or *mgo-shubs kha-mung gushup.khamung* 'ladies' tunic' (p. 121)² still worn by women in Tibetan Pemakö; an example of a *mkar shig-pa kharshigpa*³ 'riddle (lit. both 'telling the *khar* riddle' and 'de-structing the *khar* mansion')' and the famous Tshangla test of cleverness and nursery rhyme *a-ma la-nyi ko-ko ama.lanyi.koko* 'round mother moon', in which 'where is' questions are asked and answered until either the person asking the question or answering it is at his wit's end (p. 698-702); and on religious aspects such the practice of *yong ra-ba yong.rawa* 'calling the life principle/energy' (Tibetan *bla ħbod*) (p. 562-567).

Also impressive is the rich recording of quintessentially Tshangla words, such as *le-pong lepong* (n.) 'a person who eats whenever it suits him, not sticking to timings' (p. 619), *wam-pang wampang* (adj.) 'charming, graceful, elegant, flirtatious (said of the style of girls)' (p. 512), *pra-le-mo pralemo* (n.) 'a well-adorned and well-dressed girl or woman' (p. 366), *ħga-leng-nang galengnang* (n.) 'rotational labour performed by girls of a peer group on individual household demand basis' (p. 124), *to-ka-re tokare* (n.) 'dish made of grain (usu. bitter buckwheat) flour' (p. 249), and the characteristic (partially) reduplicated adjectives such as *shang-shang shangshang* (adj.) 'unkempt, uncombed, ruffled (of hair)' (p. 630), *ba-na bo-no banabono* (adj.) 'said of a religious practitioner who is either insincere in his practice or unable to explain it' (p. 399), *ħjab-pa-ħjob-po jappajopo* (adj.)⁵ 'omnivorous, said of a person eating anything without specific demand or

² Note that both these entries basically refer to the same dress item, and also note the inconsistency in the transcription of the vowel, with *goshup* the Tibetan pronunciation, and *gushup* the Tshangla pronunciation.

³ This should be *kharshikpa*.

⁴ The Tshangla 'Ucen spelling here applies a spurious ^ʌ.

⁵ The Roman Tshangla should have been *jappajoppo*, and in 'Ucen Tshangla again the ^ʌ is unwarranted.

preference' (p. 207) and phe-se-ko-so *phesekoso* (adj.) 'be covered with dust on the face and the body' (p. 378), some of which, such as *hjon-no-no jonono* in the example on page 606 do not have a separate dictionary entry, with the Tibetan translation 'tho-lo-lo' not being particularly enlightening either. Also peculiar are many Tshangla verbs and noun-verb and verb-verb compounds, such as *gyes-pa jespa* 'to crack open (said of fruits that are ripened)' (p. 108), *tang leb-pha tang-lepha*⁶ 'lightening to occur' (p. 234), *ming shog-pa ming.shokpa* '1. (the eyes) to burn (e.g. because of chili); 2. to be jealous' (p. 457), the archaic and particular Pemakö and local Bhutan Tshangla term *hchohi-ba chhoiba* 'to wash (clothes)' (p. 200, standard Bhutan Tshangla has *zik {pe}* for general washing, including clothes), *pris-pa prispa* 'to pull back (the foreskin of the penis)' (p. 366), *hod-pa hotpa* '1. to be capable of doing (work); 2. to menstruate' (p. 691) and *ngon-ma ngonma* 'to be pleased with, to like (of persons, food etc.)' (p. 164). These terms are unique and are disappearing fast, and thus deserve recording as well as proper translation.

The focus on religious terms and terminology is sometimes a bit overdone, and the dictionary could have been served better with shorter entries than, for example, the almost two-page entries for the Buddhist mantra *badz+ra gu-ru bendzaguru* (p. 401) or on *tsha-tsha tshatsa* (sic. *tshatsha*) 'votive tablets' (p. 484). Also, entries such as *zu-lu-kha zulukha* (sic. *zi-lu-kha*) (p. 534), the name of a former village and now neighbourhood in Bhutan's capital Thimphu, *mon-kha monkha* 'Monkha Nering Shri Dzong' (p. 466), the name of a pilgrimage place in eastern Bhutan, or *gang-steng gangteng* (p. 103) 'Gangte' a village and monastery in western Bhutan, seem out of place in a Pemakö Tshangla dictionary, as they have no apparent relation with the Tshangla people in Pemakö. Similarly, what personal names like *tshe-ring rdo-rje tshing.doje* (p. 491), *nyim chos-rje nyim.choije* and *nyim nor-bu nyim.norbu* (p. 224) do in the dictionary is a bit mysterious. A three-page entry on the concept of *tsha-chu las-pa tshachhu.laspa* 'to soak in hot water springs' (p. 486-489) also appears overdone. Some entries are reduplicated, e.g. *tsau-tsau tsautsau* 'mental confusion or tension' on both p. 478 and p. 483. The four-page entry for the lexeme *smrang-ma mrangma* 'to grumble' (p. 469-473) is obviously intended to state the author's claims of the archaic antiquity and conservative phonology of Tshangla (cf. archaic Tibetan *smreng* 'to speak'), but the Tibetan translation ('dmod ngan ngag *sngags? nas hdon pa la bye ste': 'to chant a cursing mantra for causing harm') does not suit the Tshangla meaning. Also, there are no references to any of the other Tshangla occurrences of the initial clus-

⁶ This should have been *tang.leppha*.

ter *mr-*, some of which, such as *mras* 'pimple', *mrok* {*pa*} 'to keep in a disorderly fashion' and *mrek* ~ *mrak* ~ *mres* ~ *mras* {*pa*} 'to be stained with an oily or muddy substance; to get squashed' ostensibly also occur in Pemakö Tshangla.

On the whole, the dictionary provides a good overview of the Tshangla language as spoken in Pemakö. There are examples from all lexical fields and parts of speech, including some versatile particles like *sho* *sho* (p. 642) whose meaning is illustrated with examples. Many terms recorded in it are very peculiar to the language, many of them are very rarely used in everyday speech nowadays and might thus disappear rather rapidly. Their recording in this dictionary comes at the right time.

The definitions

The definitions of many of the entries are straightforward and illuminating, and the author provides adequate example phrases and sentences that further clarify their meaning. Usually, when a clear one-on-one Tibetan cognate is available for a Tshangla entry the meaning becomes quite clear immediately, but it is often typical Tshangla terms with no direct Tibetan translation that require considerable explanation, in which the author has been more successful in some cases than others.

Certain Tibetan definitions seem to reflect a marked variety of Tibetan, rather than standard Tibetan. It is not clear which variety this is, but looking at the history of Pemakö this would perhaps be rKong-po, sPo-bo or Khams Tibetan. Random sampling indicates that most speakers of Central Tibetan varieties have a problem with understanding some of these definitions as well as their sample phrases. An example is *hpheng* *pheng* 'spindle' which is defined as *zhu-lu* (p. 393), whereas standard Tibetan has *phang*, *hphang* or *phang-ma*. Perhaps in absence of any other clear translation, the Tibetan term *spags-ma* 'side dish ('curry') to *tsampa* dough' is used to refer to any kind of side dish eaten with the main grain-based dish, such as *kam-tang* *kamtang* 'side dish' (p. 6) and *hor-pa* *horpa* 'to slurp up the soup of a side dish' (p. 692). Most Tibetans and Pemaköpa in exile, however, would be more familiar with a Hindi term like 'curry' or 'sabji'.

The value of the ethno-botanical and zoological entries could be significantly increased by providing their respective common or scientific names. Explanations such as *ku-ku-mom* *kuku.mom* 'kind of green vegetable' (p. 8) and *ping-ku-lung* *pinkulung* and *ping-pi-rung* *pingpirung*, both 'a kind of bird' (p. 358) are not particularly enlightening and serve perhaps as 'dictionary fillers'. Similarly, there are

some identification errors, a *wa-ga-ri wagari* is a hornbill and not a 'vulture' and for *zum-phi zumphi* 'porcupine' (p. 535) the Tibetan name *byi-thur* could have been provided. Some very common wild animals, like the *phoskong* 'civet cat', *basha* 'goral' or *shangsha* 'serow' are missing in the dictionary.

The dictionary makes no mention of which part of speech an entry belongs to. It is thus up to the reader to make out from the Tibetan translation and the examples what the function of the entry in Tshangla is. The lack of reference to the part of speech is partially understandable, as in Tshangla, like in many Tibeto-Burman languages, nominalisers can mark nouns, adverbs and adjectives as well as certain tense and aspect properties of verbs, and the formal distinction between various parts of speech is thus often blurred. Nonetheless, assigning a part of speech to every head entry would be a big improvement.

One major issue is encountered with the way in which verbs - be it what are basically monomorphemic verb roots or (noun-verb/verb-verb) compounds - are presented. Tshangla has a relatively complex verbal morphology, with what could be termed as five conjugational classes (Bodt 2014: 195-198 and Bodt 2012: 422-423). Whereas it is largely the phonotactic environment (i.e. the verb root coda) that determines the conjugational class of a verb, there are also homonymous cases where the historical simplification of an underlying coda cluster is responsible for the conjugation according to a certain class, rather than the present simple coda. This fact is, unfortunately, not acknowledged in the dictionary. Instead, orthographic inconsistencies are introduced haphazardly to indicate the distinction between what are basically homonyms. Take for example the verb *nub-pha nupha* [nup^ha] 'to enter' (on p. 343 exemplified with 'the sun to set', however, this verb is also used for, for example, people to enter a building) and the verb *nub-pa nubpa* [nupa] 'to perish, to disappear (usu. in a religious sense)'. The root of these verbs is in both cases [nup], with degemination of the coda bilabial consonant when followed by a morpheme with a bilabial consonant (in this case the past tense nominaliser *-pa* ~ *-pha*). Distinctive, at least in modern Tshangla, is to which conjugational class the verb belongs: i.e. either *-pa* or *-pha*⁷.

⁷ It goes beyond this review to pay attention to the underlying reasons for the existence of these conjugational classes and what determines a verb to belong to them. As a first indication, it may be noticed that verbs with stems ending on fricative *-s* always conjugate with the past tense nominaliser *-pa*, and that verbs with roots ending on plosive *-p* may conjugate either with the past tense nominaliser *-pa* or *-pha*. Relevant in this context is perhaps that the past tense spelling of the Tibetan verb *snub* 'do away with, cause to perish, abolish etc.' is *bsnubs*,

The dictionary would have greatly benefited if attention could have been given to this fact, by providing the stems of each verb in combination with the past tense nominaliser (or any other marker that indicates the conjugational class of the verb), e.g. *nup {pha}* 'to enter'; *nup {pa}* 'to perish' rather than spurious spellings such as *nu-pha* 'to set' and *nubpa* 'to perish'⁸. Such an approach would also have avoided inconsistencies such as *zom-ma zoma* 'to gather, to assemble' (p. 531) where the stem of the verb appears to be *zo-* judging from the Roman Tshangla entry, whereas this is actually *zom-* [zom]. This approach would also have removed the need to provide a whole set of different head entries for conjugated verbs, such as the examples of the verb *khe* (*khewa/khencha/khenchuma*, p. 92-95) '1. to contract (a disease, intransitive); 2. to need, to have to, require to (auxiliary); 3. to hit (an arrow, but also the rain on the ground i.e. to rain, a latch of a lock etc., intransitive and transitive)', or for a whole set of subentries, such as the examples of the verb *khowa* 'to break, to split (of stones, bamboo, wood)' (p. 95-97). The dictionary abounds in similar inconsistencies, again, for example, on p. 98 we find the entry *ħkhob-pha khopha* 'to peel off (actually 'peeled off')' and a few entries later on p. 99 the entry *ħkhob-bca khobcha* 'peels off', in which, when relying on the Roman Tshangla, a reader who does not know Tshangla and cannot read Tibetan, might understand these as two different verbs. Rather than providing examples of the meaning of the same verb in different tense and aspect combinations, it would be advisable to provide the verb root and its conjugational class, and then focus on the semantics of the verb, i.e. on the various meanings that a verb can have in its various contexts, but also according to its transitivity, and whether a verb operates as an independent verb or as an auxiliary. The meaning of the various verbal suffixes with their allomorphs according to the conjugational class could then be provided in the introduction. There is no need to provide for each verb a separate entry or subentry simply stating, for example, that the verb stem followed by *-chhuma* gives the verb a completive sense.

while the past tense of the Tibetan verb *nub* 'to go down, to set etc.' is simply *nub*. For establishing a possible relation between Tshangla and Tibetan as well as for the identification of loan verbs, these conjugational classes are of great interest.

⁸ What appears to be an attempt at this might be observed in the entries for *bceb-pa chep.pa* 'to hit, to bruise' and *bcob-pa chop.pa* 'to loot kitchen utensils' (?) (p. 176).

*Tshangla pronunciation
as closely approaching written Tibetan*

The second aim that the author has, is to show that Tshangla is in many ways more archaic in its pronunciation than the modern Tibetan varieties, maintaining the pronunciation of Tibetan at the time it was committed to writing. The editor (p. ii) gives as example the word for 'chest', which is written as *brang* or *brang-khog* in written Tibetan, pronounced as *drang* [ɖaŋ] in most Tibetan varieties, but still pronounced as *brang*, actually (p. 414) *brangtong* [bɾaŋtɔŋ], in Tshangla⁹. This is an irrefutable fact. But more than this observation cannot sensibly be derived from it. The fact that Tshangla [bɾaŋ] and written Tibetan *brang* are the same, does not necessarily provide evidence to support any hypothesis that the historical speakers of (Old) Tibetan at the time it was committed to writing and the contemporary Tshangla speakers are somehow directly related to each other: the similarities between written Tibetan and spoken Tshangla might be the result of a much older shared Tibeto-Burman root. Two other examples might illustrate that: Proto-Tani **haŋ-braŋ*/**haŋ-kwaŋ* (Sun 1993: 99) and Dulong (Trung) [pɿɑŋ] (Sün 1982: 217) are also very similar, if not the same.

Loans versus inherited words

A distinction has to be made between loan words from Tibetan, and inherited Tshangla words that have cognates in Tibetan. These are two fundamentally different ways as to how the part of the present day Tshangla lexicon with similar forms in written Tibetan has come into being. Loans are obviously present in Tshangla. But the long and intricate relationship between Tshangla and Central Bodish varieties makes it difficult to determine what is a loan, what is a nativised loan (often with a nativised pronunciation) and what is a native word that just happens to have Central Bodish cognates because of a shared Proto-Tibeto-Burman root.

Tshangla has been under strong influence from Bodish languages at least since the 8th century AD¹⁰. Successive waves of migration

⁹ Incidentally, Tawang Monket also has [bɾaŋ], and the Tibetan speakers I am currently surrounded with pronounce 'chest' as [p^hɑŋk^hɔʔ], with Nepali Sherpa speakers saying [pɾaŋɔʔ].

¹⁰ The question of whether Tshangla itself is a Bodish language, related to the Central and other Tibetan varieties, is an open question that has not yet been satisfactorily answered in linguistics. Perhaps it is rather intense language contact and borrowing that might have created this impression, with Tshangla a dis-

from the Tibetan plateau, the establishment of a Tibetan aristocracy ruling a Tshangla populace and the influence of both classical and spoken Tibetan through the spread of Buddhism and the administrative system has had an enormous impact on the Tshangla language. To this can be added the increasing influence of Bhutan's national language Dzongkha during the latter century in the Tshangla homeland and, in the case of Pemakö Tshangla, the influence of different Tibetan varieties (mainly Kong-po, sPo-bo and Khams Tibetan) since the advent of the Tshangla speakers in the Pemakö area and the subsequent diaspora of part of their people.

But the distinction between inherited vocabulary and later loans is hard to make. To revert to the example of 'chest': can this word be considered a loan from Tibetan at the time that it was still pronounced as [bran] in Tibetan? And did the phonological changes that affected the pronunciation in Tibetan not take place in Tshangla? I think few people would agree to this idea, and rather consider a root like 'chest', which is shown cross-linguistically to be not very susceptible to borrowing, to be an inherited root. On the other hand, *ḥu-lag ḥulag*¹¹ 'compulsory labour service' (p. 542), *zheb-sa zhepsa* 'honorific speech' (p. 516), *gtor-ma tormā* 'dough offering' (p. 257) and a verb like *sgrub-pa dupha*¹² 'to practice, accomplish (in a religious sense)' (p.117) are clear Tibetan loans, cf. Tibetan *ḥu-lag* 'compulsory service', *zhe-sa* 'honorific speech', *gtor-ma* 'dough offering', *sgrub* 'to accomplish, to attain etc.', all introduced as administrative and religious terminology. There are, however, many doubt cases, even in basic lexical items. Pemakö Tshangla has *gdong-pa dongpa* 'face' (p. 303). Bhutan Tshangla, on the other hand, has *gum* 'face'. Because Tibetan also has *gdong-pa* 'face', this might well be a Tibetan loan in Pemakö Tshangla. But does the fact that Dirang Tshangla also has *dongpa* 'face' mean that Bhutan Tshangla *gum* is actually an innovation? Or that Dirang Tshangla also borrowed *dongpa* 'face' from Tibetan?

Another example is the Tshangla verb *nyong* [ɲoŋ] 'to get, to obtain'. The Tshangla dictionary lists this under the 'Ucen spelling myong, in consistency with a Tibetan spelling of a word with a wide range of meanings, myong 'to enjoy, undergo, feel, comprehend, taste, to experience with one of the five senses, etc.'. But there are two main issues with this approach. First of all: in this case, as in many, Tshangla has not preserved the archaic Tibetan pronunciation

tinctly non-Bodish language whose centuries of language contact and subsequent creolisation have made it to appear as a Bodish language.

¹¹ This should be *ḥulak*.

¹² This should have been *sgrub-pa* and *duppha* if consistency was maintained.

of the period when the language was committed to writing: any Tshangla speaker will say [ɲoŋ] similar to modern Tibetan pronunciation, not [mjoŋ]. And secondly, considering the meanings of Tibetan *myong*, the question arises whether these two words perhaps just derive from the same root. These are issues that historical-comparative linguistics has to deal with, and should not be of concern to a compiler of a dictionary of a contemporary language. But by making the orthographic choice for the 'Ucen Tshangla spelling *myong*, not simply *nyong* in accordance with Tshangla pronunciation, the author implicitly presumes either that Tibetan *myong*, with its wide variety of meanings, and Tshangla *nyong*, with a much more restricted definition, derive from the same Bodish (and not earlier, Proto-Tibeto-Burman) root, or that Tshangla borrowed the word from Tibetan, with subsequent semantic change resulting in divergent meanings and phonetic change resulting in a similar pronunciation. Luxi Bola (Pəla, Jingpo) also has [mjɔ̃³¹ju⁵⁵] 'to get, to acquire' (Huang and Dai, 1992), this form is even closer to the Tibetan spelling, but everyone would consider it spurious to consider this as evidence of a genetic relation between Luxi Bola and Tibetan.

Whereas I do not want to argue against using standard Tibetan spelling for Tshangla words that are clearly loans from Tibetan, I would caution against overdoing that by trying to find Tibetan spellings for each and every Tshangla word, irrespective of whether this word is an actual loan or a native word, and otherwise invent spurious spellings that do not reflect the actual Tshangla pronunciation. Thus accepting written Tibetan spellings for at least the most obvious loans, it is then puzzling to notice that the author has decided to spell an obvious recent Tibetan loan like *mikshe* 'eye glasses' in the 'Ucen Tshangla orthography as *mig-she* (p. 453), in according with Tshangla pronunciation [mikɛ], and not according to the Tibetan spelling as *mig-shel*. On the other hand, for unknown reasons the author chose the 'Ucen Tshangla spelling *hgaḥ-ḥdang* (p. 124) for the native Tshangla word *gadang* [gadan] without any obvious written Tibetan source. These kind of inconsistencies are a serious drawback to the dictionary.

The main point, apart from the possible ramifications of the approach taken by the author for the historical-comparative side of the story, is that this approach has serious implications for the usefulness and user-friendliness of the dictionary. A user of the dictionary will have to a priori know that Tshangla [ɲoŋ] has the 'Ucen Tshangla spelling *myong* listed under the syllable MA, because he will not be able to find the entry *nyong* under the syllable NYA. This brings me to the next point, namely a general review of the ortho-

graphic choices of the author, the consistency of the use, and the implications for the user-friendliness of the dictionary.

The orthographies and consistency of its use

In the introduction, the author describes the conventions for both his 'Ucen Tshangla and his Roman Tshangla orthographies. Unfortunately, much is lacking in the consistency of the usage of these orthographic conventions throughout the dictionary. There are plenty of instances where the orthographic rules set out by the author at the onset are not followed in the main body of the dictionary.

The Roman orthography

The Roman orthography used in the dictionary is pretty straightforward, though no motivation for the choices made is given. The choice for representing the Tshangla unaspirated and aspirated affricates [tɕ, tɕʰ] with /ch, chh/ rather than /c, ch/ respectively is unfortunate from a linguistic point of view, but understandable under influence of the prevalence of haphazard romanisation in use throughout much of the Subcontinent, although it is at variance with both the Indological tradition and the principle of economy which should govern a new system of romanisation. Many native Tshangla speakers who write their language actually employ the same orthography, because for them the /c/ represents a [k], as in English cat [kʰæt] and not an affricate [tɕ].

But when it comes to the consistent use throughout the dictionary, there are some flaws to be observed. The main issue lies with the representation of the unvoiced and voiced syllable final plosives /k ~ g/, /p ~ b/ and /t ~ d/. Whereas in some cases the unvoiced Tshangla coda /t/ is represented in the Roman orthography with a /t/, in other cases the author has followed the Tibetan orthography in the Roman orthography and written a voiced plosive /d/, e.g. stod-ka *totka* [totka]¹³ 'at the top of (in elevation)' (p. 266) and nad-pa *natpa* [natpa] (p. 335), but then pad-pa *padpa* [patpa] 'leech' not **patpa* (p. 357). In other cases, the author, under written Tibetan influence, introduces a syllable-final plosive /t/ where the Tshangla pronunciation actually doesn't even have one, such as in stod-tung *todtung* cf.

¹³ Not that here the author pronounces [tɕka], in conformity with the written Tibetan spelling, rather than in accordance with the actual Tshangla pronunciation [totka]. The rounding of vowels [i] and [o] to [y] and [ø] under influence of written Tibetan spellings, even for native Tshangla words, can be observed throughout the recordings.

Tibetan *stod-tung* 'jacket' (p. 266) not **totung* [totun] 'jacket'. Other examples can be found with both the velar and bilabial plosive in coda position, which are sometimes written with Roman /p/ and /k/ and sometimes with Roman /b/ and /g/, as in *lag-pa lakpa* 'hide' (p. 609) but *har-khag-tang harkhagtang* not **harkhaktang* 'phlegm' (p. 689), *tseb-tseb tseptsep* 'crunchy when eating because of containing sand particles, said of e.g. flour' (p. 477) but *teb-pa tebpa* not **tep-pa* 'be squeezed or quashed (in a crowd)' (p. 247), and *nub-pa nubpa* [nupa] 'to perish, to disappear (usu. in a religious sense)' not **nuppa* (p. 343), *zhob zhob* [zɔp] not **zhop* 'ritual hearth deity pollution' (p. 519) or *mo-rab morab* 'beautiful' but then in the sample sentence *morap* (p. 465). Where degemination of the syllable final bilabial plosive takes place in actual pronunciation it is completely omitted in the Roman Tshangla, as in *heb-pha hepaha* not **heppha* '1. to settle down (of heated butter or oil); 2. to pant' (p. 690), even though this creates a root **he-* not *hep-*. This inconsistency between the actual Tshangla pronunciation, the written Tshangla in 'Ucen script and the written Tshangla in Roman script is an almost constant source of ambiguity throughout the dictionary.

The choice for the use of dots to separate 'which parts of the word are to be pronounced together' (p. iv) in the Tshangla sample sentences is odd, as in English the full stop indicates the end of a sentence or a syllable boundary in phonetics. Moreover, this practice obscures which criteria are used to determine what in Tshangla constitutes a word, with many suffixes, enclitics and particles separated from their head word with a full stop. An example is the sentence *khangri.zangpo.gai.lama.mangpo.jonma.la* 'Many lamas came from good lineages', where both the ablative marker *-gai* and the existential copula *-la*, used in a periphrastic construction as the continuous past *jonmala* 'having come', are treated as independent words rather than suffixes.

The 'Ucen orthography

The author both acknowledges that the phonology and pronunciation of Tshangla and Tibetan are different in many aspects (p. xx) and that in the past it must have been difficult for the Tibetan grammarians to compose the spelling with prefix, superscript, subscript and suffix letters and that this is still cause of weariness and inconvenience (p. ix). Nonetheless, the author then continues that as Tshangla shares 70% of its vocabulary with Tibetan¹⁴ and that Tibet-

¹⁴ This might be an overestimate. Lieberherr and Bodt (2015) in a lexicostatistical analysis of 100 basic roots found a cognate percentage between Written Tibetan

an and Tshangla have a similar *sgra-gdangs* ‘tune, pronunciation’, it is no more than logical and even a necessity to know and employ the various affixes of the Tibetan spelling in the Tshangla orthography as well, explaining why and how he has tried to harmonise the Tshangla spellings and grammar with that of Tibetan (p. x). In his ‘Ucen Tshangla spellings, the author thus makes profuse use of the written Tibetan *sngon-hjug* ‘prefixed letters’, *rjes-hjug* ‘suffixed letters’, *yang-hjug* ‘final letters’, *ya-byags*, *ra-btags*, *la-btags*, *wa-zur* ‘subscript *ya*, *ra*, *la*, *wa* letters’ and *ra-mgo*, *la-mgo*, *sa-mgo* ‘super-script *ra*, *la*, *sa* letters’. He employs these in purported loans from Tibetan, in Tshangla words with Tibetan cognates, but, most unfortunately, also in purely native Tshangla terms without justifying the necessity of their use.

So, *wang* [waŋ] ‘blessing’ (p. 423) is written as *dbang* under the syllable BA, rather than with Tshangla spelling *wang* under the syllable WA because it is likely a Tibetan loan, cf. Tibetan *dbang* ‘blessing’, and *tsi* [tsi] ‘fodder; weed’ (p. 482) might have been written as *rtsi* rather than simply *tsi* because of a (doubtful) Tibetan cognate *rtswa* ‘grass, weeds’. But why the orthographies *bang* [baŋ] ‘grass’ as *ḥbang* rather than simply *bang* (p. 424); *cha* [tʂa] ‘have {copula}’ as *bcaḥ* (p. 173) rather than simply *ca*; *khungma* ‘to wait’ as *ḥkhung-ma* (p. 92) rather than simply *khung-ma* (but on the other hand *khongma* ‘raw, uncooked’ as *khong-ma*, p. 82); or *bamung* [bamuŋ] as *ḥbaḥ-mung* ‘mushroom’ (p. 429) rather than simply *ba-mung*? Similarly, in Tshangla there is no phonetic difference between the adjective *ringbu* [riŋbu] ‘long, tall’ (p. 586) and the noun *ringbu* [riŋbu] ‘intestinal worm’ (p. 586), thus the Tibetan orthography *ring-bu* for the former and *ring-ḥbu* for the latter is completely based on the spelling of *bu* [bu] ‘insect’ in Tibetan, *ḥbu*, and not on the pronunciation in Tshangla.

The effect of the use of the affixes of written Tibetan on the user-friendliness of a Tshangla dictionary can also be shown through the following example. If a Tshangla user living in Delhi wants to find the meaning of the Tshangla word *lutumang* just used by his grand-

and Bhutan Tshangla of 41%. Despite being higher than the cognate percentages between Tshangla and any other language under review, or between Written Tibetan and any other language under review, this percentage is not so high considering the long period of language contact. Moreover, this percentage does not take into account roots descended from a common Proto-Tibeto-Burman root shared between all Tibeto-Burman languages. However, these basic roots exclude many lexemes from higher semantic fields, that are more susceptible to borrowing. The view that Tshangla is very close to, and even derived from, written Tibetan is very strongly maintained among educated Tshangla speakers, be it in the Tibetan diaspora or in Bhutan.

ma, and starts searching either in the main body of the dictionary or in the index in the beginning under the syllable LA, he will not find the word. It cannot be presupposed that every user will know written Tibetan orthography well enough to start searching all possible combinations of prefixes and sub- and superscript letters for the syllable LA and (luckily under KA) end up finding *klu-tu-mang* [lu-tu-maŋ] 'pestle'. One simple solution for this problem would be to group all phonetically identical onsets together under the same syllable heading, rather than based on their 'Ucen onsets.

In the following sections, I will shortly introduce some of the author's orthographical choices for both the vowels and the consonants, and discuss the consequences this has, mainly for the user-friendliness of the dictionary.

The vowel representations

As for the vowels, the author introduces a long vowel A apparently solely on basis of the minimal pair *wa wa* 'cattle' (p. 509) and *wA* *ḥphi-ba wa.phiwa* 'to joke' (p. 510), with not a single other attestation of a long vowel /a/ in the dictionary apart from the Hindi loan words *thA-II thali* 'plate' (> थाली 'plate', p. 282) and *DAG-khang drak.khang* (> डाक 'post, mail' + Tibetan *khang* 'building', p. 328). This, in combination with the fact that in the recording there is no audible distinction between the vowel length in the two occurrences of *wa*¹⁵ and the knowledge that vowel length is not distinctive in any other phonological descriptions of varieties of Tshangla to date (Das Gupta 1968, Zhāng 1986, Andvik 2009, Grollmann 2013, Bodt 2014), leads to the conclusion that the long versus short vowel /a/ distinction that the author makes is unwarranted¹⁶.

The author introduces the orthographic Tibetan AI and AU to represent two Tshangla diphthongs/offglides [ai ~ aj] and [au ~ aw]. These are commonly used for transcription of Sanskrit diphthongs and are as a choice defensible over, for example, aḥi and aḥu. It is unfortunate that, ostensibly under influence of Tibetan spelling conventions, the Tshangla diphthongs are neglected in many cases, such as *bral-ba braiba* [braiba] 'to separate' (p. 418) instead of *brAI-ba* (cf. Tibetan *kha bral-ba* 'to divorce, separate'). It is also unfortunate that

¹⁵ In fact, rather than a vowel length distinction, the *wa* in *wa.phiwa* appears to have a high register tone onset.

¹⁶ The same can be said of the aspirated voiced velar plosive *gha* [gʰ] on basis of the single lexeme *ghi ghi* [gi] 'Sichuan pepper, *Xanthoxylum armatum*, *X. bungeanum*', with neither a convincing minimal pair besides the near-minimal pair with the existential copula *gila* 'to be', nor clear aspiration in the recording.

the Tshangla diphthongs/offglides [oi ~ oj] and [ui ~ uj] are not recognised as distinctive phonemes in the introduction on page viii. In the remainder of the dictionary they are haphazardly represented, either by introducing a new vowel combination such as in *nyoḥE-ba nyoiba* [noiba] 'to swallow without chewing' (p. 228); with written Tibetan spelling conventions, e.g. *sbkul-ba kuiba* [kuiba] 'to invoke, arouse, admonish' (p. 43); or even completely ignored, as in *bri-ba brui-ba* [bruiba] 'to write' (p. 440) under influence of Tibetan *bri* 'write'. Over-reliance on written Tibetan spelling conventions rather than actual Tshangla pronunciation also results in inconsistencies such as [gau] 'amulet box' (p. 106), one of the few occurrences of the Tshangla diphthong [au] AU. Unfortunately, in the 'Ucen orthography the author stuck to the Tibetan spelling *gwaḥu*, with for the Roman orthography the odd spelling *ga.'u*.

The consonant representations

The consonant inventory described is pretty standard for Tshangla and the 'Ucen representations are straightforward. The author chose to represent the retroflex sounds with the lokta *Ta*¹⁷, *Tha* and *Da*, which is understandable. What is less clear is why these retroflex phonemes are then sometimes mentioned under their alveolar counterpart syllables TA, THA and DA and sometimes with their written Tibetan spellings like *sgra* under the syllable GA. As distinctive phonemes, they should have been accorded their own separate dictionary headings. In the current scenario, there is the confusing and inconsistent situation that a user has to look for *dupha* [dupp^ha] 'accomplished' (spelling *sgrub-pa*, p. 117) and *dom* [dɔm] 'box' (spelling *sgron*, p. 117) under the syllable GA, but for the phonetically same onsets in *dumsho* [dumɕo] 'gather towards this side (fire wood in a hearth)?¹⁸' (spelling *Dum-sho*, p. 330) and *domdom* 'sound of feet stamping on a wooden floor during a traditional 'kick dance'' (spelling *Dom-Dom*, p. 332) under syllable DA.

In many cases, it is unfortunate that the author has resorted to innovating 'Ucen Tshangla spellings for the retroflex phonemes that deviate from his own proposed orthography. There is a justification in the case of actual or plausible loans from Tibetan, such as *gru du*

¹⁷ The single unvoiced retroflex entry *Tau-li tauli* [tauli] 'wrung out?' (p. 268) is said to be a Chinese loan, even the Tibetan translation *skra dkyu-li* cannot be found in the most common dictionaries, and its inclusion in this dictionary is therefore questionable.

¹⁸ The meaning of Tibetan *ḥtshur* is unclear, and the reason why this verb is mentioned in the imperative is similarly unknown.

[dʉ] 'boat' (p. 109), Tibetan gru 'boat', not *Du and ḥgrig-pe *dikpe* [dʉkpe] 'to be ok' (p. 142¹⁹), Tibetan ḥgrig 'be ok, be alright etc.' not *Dig-pe. But little justification can be given to extend this even to lexemes where there is no written Tibetan basis to deviate from simply writing a lokta retroflex, such as khre *thre* [tʰe] 'veranda' (p. 85) instead of *Thre, phrog-rkyang *thokyang* [tʰokkjaŋ] 'Sausage vine *Holboellia latifolia*' (p. 383) instead of *Throk-kyang²⁰, especially since the next lexeme, phros-pa *phrospa* 'to vomit' (p. 383) is pronounced as [pʰɾospa] and not as *[tʰospa].

The same line of thought, with plenty of examples of inconsistencies, holds for the various representations of the Tshangla affricates /ch, chh, j/, depending on the variety realised as [tʰ ~ tʃ, tʰ ~ tʃʰ, dʒ ~ dʒʃ]. Lexical entries that have an affricate onset can be found under the direct 'Ucen syllables CA, CHA, and JA but also under the written Tibetan spellings rkya, skya, bskya spyā (syllables KA, PA); khya, ḥkhyā, phya, ḥphya (syllables KHA, PHA); and gya, rgya, ḥgya, bya, and ḥbya (syllables GA, BA) respectively. What this means in practice is, that a potential user who has just been called a *jungpo rolang* [dʒuŋpo rolaŋ] by a Pemakö Tshangla speaker, and who has no idea of the origin or spelling the word might have in Tibetan, would have to look under syllable JA for jung-po, mjung-po, ḥjung-po or ljung-po, under syllable GA for gyung-po, rgyung-po or ḥgyung-po and under syllable BA for byung-po, to finally find it under ḥbyung-po ro-langs *jungpo.rolang* 'a boy with an evil or offensive behaviour and attitude' (p. 439), from ḥbyung-po *jungpo* 'class of evil spirits' and ro-langs *rolang* 'zombie'. That's simply not practical, and not user-friendly. Wouldn't it have been easier to just write it in 'Ucen Tshangla as jung-po ro-lang, and then give the Tibetan etymology as (< Tib. ḥbyung-po ro-langs)?

In his listing of Tshangla onsets on page ix, the author does not include the lateral fricative [ɬ], in written Tibetan spelling lha, a fact consistent with most spoken Tshangla varieties. However, a grapheme /lh/ does occur in the Roman transcriptions in the dictionary, with Tibetan orthographies as divergent as rla, e.g. rlang-pa *lhankpa* 'left-over (food)' (p. 606) under RA; kla, e.g. klam-pa *lhampa* 'read, study' (p. 41) under KA; gla, e.g. gleng *lheng* 'over there, on the other side' (p. 118) under GA; bla, e.g. blug-pa *lhug-pa* 'pour' (p. 441) under

¹⁹ Why the author lists this as ḥgrig-pe *dikpe* with the non-past nominaliser and not as ḥgrig-pa *dikpa* with the past nominaliser like in other verb forms is another inconsistency.

²⁰ For this lexeme even a spelling *khrok-kyang* might be preferable, to reflect the archaic pronunciation Standard Bhutan Tshangla [tʰoktʰaŋ], archaic and dialect [kʰrokʰtʰaŋ] which is, however, probably not known to the author.

BA; and *sla*, e.g. *sla-nga lha-nga* ‘frying pan’ (p. 677) under SA. Whereas the recordings do not attest a lateral fricative but a lateral approximant for these entries, there does appear to be a high register onset distinguishing these lexemes from *langs-pa langpa* ‘to sit; to suffice’ (p. 610); *lam lam* ‘road, path’ (p. 611); *leng-ma lengma* ‘to change (clothes)’ (p. 621); *lugs luk* ‘habit, custom’ (p. 616); and *lam-ma lamma* ‘to accept; to find’ (p. 612) respectively. But the contradictory spelling of the entries *leng gtad-pa leng.tatpa* ‘towards the other side’ and *leng-gtad leng-gtad lengtat lengtat* ‘further and further towards the other side’ (p. 622), derivations clearly based on *gleng lheng* ‘over there, on the other side’ (p. 118) appear to suggest that, rather than that the ‘Ucen spelling of the lexemes with onset /lh/ in the Roman orthography represents an actually realised high versus low register onset distinction in Tshangla, the pronunciation of the speaker has been adapted to the ‘Ucen spelling employed. The complete absence of any discussion on suprasegmental features such as register onset, pitch or tone, important in Tibetan but only marginal in some Tshangla varieties, is also a shortcoming of the dictionary.

Coda consonant clusters

From a historical linguistic point of view, the dictionary provides additional evidence of what could be considered archaic retentions of syllable-final consonant clusters in Pemakö Tshangla, a feature of the language also reported in Bodt (2012: 197-201, 2014: 421-424) and Grollmann (2013: 39-41). Some of the rather abundant examples include *bordpa* [bort-pa] ‘to fry in oil’ (p. 410), *bertpa* [bertpa] ‘to be spicy’ (p. 408); *hbyard jart-* [dzart-] ‘to be stuck together’ (p. 119, but unfortunately a main entry for this lexeme seems missing), *hphird phirt-la* ‘to turn by itself’ (in the example on p. 390, but *phirpa* in the main entry), *hkhord khort-* ‘to turn’ (in the example on p. 389, but *khorpa* on p. 100). This is important information that needs to be further examined.

Conclusions

The Tshangla dictionary is an extremely rich source of lexical information on an important and enigmatic but nonetheless endangered Tibeto-Burman language. For an educated Tshangla speaker in Pemakö or the Tibetan diaspora the dictionary will be useful as a reference source on their own language. Similarly, for Tibetans who would like to study Tshangla it will be a useful assistance to master the vocabulary. For both groups of users, however, the biggest drawback will be the ‘Ucen orthography following Tibetan spelling

conventions and not the Tshangla phonology, not only for loans from Tibetan and Tshangla words with Tibetan cognates, but also for quintessentially native Tshangla words. This makes the usage of the dictionary time-consuming and complicated at the very least, and sometimes just outright frustrating: a user basically has to guess how the author has spelled a word. Another imminent danger is that following written Tibetan spelling conventions for Tshangla words results in a Tibetan, not a Tshangla pronunciation. In the included sound files, the author frequently, almost continuously, falls in this pit trap himself, by pronouncing the Tshangla entry based on Tibetan pronunciation rather than the Tshangla pronunciation. The absence of a reverse glossary with concise Tibetan glosses and their Tshangla translations is also a drawback, as the targeted audience has to know, or have access to, Tshangla speakers in order to use the dictionary. If someone would want to know how to say a certain Tibetan word in Tshangla, the dictionary will give no answer.

The dictionary might have some value for an educated Bhutanese audience. But for an external audience, including Tibeto-Burman linguists, Tibetologists and others, the ability to at least read, and preferably also understand Tibetan is a prerequisite to make use of this dictionary.

Hopefully, then, the author, the translator, the publisher and a linguist trained in the western tradition will find the time and funds to publish a second edition of this valuable dictionary. This should include a short overview of the basic Tshangla phonology, including onset clusters and rhymes and their realisation and IPA transcription. The Tshangla pronunciation, the spelling in the 'Ucen script, and the spelling in the Roman script should follow clear conventions and be consistent throughout the dictionary. Personally, I would strongly suggest that as much as possible, 'Ucen spellings conform the actual Tshangla pronunciation are maintained, neither adopting the spelling of cognate Tibetan words, which may or may not be loans, nor the innovation of spellings that do not reflect the Tshangla pronunciation but rather some Tibetan orthographical convention. If one of the aims be to show that Tshangla follows written Tibetan pronunciation rather closely, it is always possible to add an etymological or cognate note (cf. Tib./ < Tib.) with the written Tibetan spelling. At least the head entries, and preferably the entire dictionary should be translated into English. Entries should include a reference to the part of speech they belong to. The head entry of every verb should be its root, including the conjugational class, with as subentries noun-verb and noun-noun compounds with particular meanings. Definitions should be standardised in Central Tibetan and include as many common and/or scientific names as possible.

Definitely, the dictionary is a publication which merits being rendered accessible to a much wider audience, including Tibetologists, linguists, ethnologists and other interested individuals.

References

- Andvik, Erik Emerson. 2009. *A grammar of Tshangla*. Brill's Tibetan Studies library. Languages of the greater Himalayan region. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- Bodt, Timotheus Adrianus, 2012. *The New Lamp Clarifying the History, Peoples, Languages and Traditions of Eastern Bhutan and Eastern Mon*, Wageningen: Monpasang Publications.
- Bodt, Tim. 2014. Tshangla Phonology and a Standard Tshangla Orthography. In Thomas Owen-Smith and Nathan W. Hill (Eds.). *Trans-Himalayan Linguistics*, 393-436. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Das Gupta, K. 1968. *An introduction to Central Monpa*. Shillong.
- van Driem, George L. 2001. *Languages of the Himalayas. An ethnolinguistic Handbook of the Greater Himalayan Region*. Volume 1. Leiden: Brill.
- Egli-Roduner, Susana. 1987. *Handbook of the Sharchhokpa-lo/ Tsangla (language of the people of Eastern Bhutan)*. Thimphu: Helvetas.
- Grollmann, Selin. 2013. *A sketch grammar of Bjokapakha*. Unpublished MA thesis. Bern: University of Bern.
- Hill, Nathan W. 2005. Once more on the letter ꞑ. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 28:2.
- Hoffrenning, Ralph W. 1959. *First Bhutanese Grammar: Grammar of Gongar [=Tsangla], language of East Bhutan*. Madison.
- Hoshi, M. 1987. A Sharchok Vocabulary; A Language Spoken in Eastern Bhutan. *Integral Study on the Ecology, Languages and Cultures of Tibet and Himalayas No. 8*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa; Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Huang Bufan and Dai Qingxia, eds. 1992. *Zangmianyu yuyan ci-hui [A Tibeto-Burman Lexicon]*. Beijing: Mǐnzú Chūbǎnshè.
- Lieberherr, Ismael, and Timotheus Adrianus Bodt. (2015). "Kho-Bwa: A Lexicostatistical Analysis." Paper presented at the 21st Himalayan Languages Symposium, Tribhuvan University. Kathmandu, Nepal, November 26-28.
- Matisoff, James A. 2003. *Handbook of Proto-Tibeto-Burman: System and philosophy of Sino-Tibetan reconstruction*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

- Sūn Hongkai. et al. 1980. *Menba, Luoba, Deng ren de yuyin* [*The languages of the Menba, Luoba and Deng People*]. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshi (Chinese Social Science Press).
- Sūn Hongkai. 1982. *Dulongyu jianzhi* [*A brief description of the Dulong language*]. Beijing: Míngzú Chūbǎnshè.
- Sūn Hongkai and Guangkun Liu. 2009. *A grammar of Anong- language death under intense contact*. Brill's Tibetan Studies Library Volume 5/9, Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Xu Shixuan. 2001. *The Bisu language*. Languages of the world/materials 411. München: Lincom Europa.
- Zhāng Jichuan. 1986. *Cangluo Ménbāyu jianzhi* [*A brief description of the Tsangla Monba Language*]. Beijing: Míngzú Chūbǎnshè.

