UC Santa Barbara

Himalayan Linguistics

Title
Brokpa nominal morphology

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4mr5f67b

Journal
Himalayan Linguistics, 19(1)

Author
Rüfenacht, Sara

Publication Date
2020

DOI
10.5070/H919146789

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

Himalayan Linguistics

Brokpa nominal morphology

Sara Rüfenacht

University of Bern

ABSTRACT

The Brokpa language marks noun phrases for plurality and for case. While the five case markers of the language are relatively conservative in form and function compared to other Tibetic languages, the plural marker has been completely innovated. This paper discusses form and function of these markers and will make some relevant comparative observations.

KEYWORDS

Brokpa nominal morphology*

Sara Rüfenacht
University of Bern

1 Introduction

The present paper discusses the nominal morphology of the Brokpa language.[1] This includes number, discussed in section 2, and the five case markers agentive, genitive, dative, ablative and comitative, discussed in section 3. In addition to a description of these morphemes, some historical and comparative notes compare them to those of related languages. For this comparison, Written Tibetan, Dzongkha and Choca-ngacakha will be used for this comparison within the Tibetic subgroup of Trans-Himalayan. Note that, while Written Tibetan will be used to compare Brokpa to an earlier stage of the language, Written Tibetan is not itself an ancestor of Brokpa. However, Written Tibetan is considered to be very similar to Old Tibetan (cf. Beyer 1992: 36–38; Tournadre 2014: 107). In the areal context, Brokpa has close contact with the non-Tibetic languages Tshangla and Dakpa (cf. Bodt 2012: 274; 302–304), which will be considered as well whenever appropriate.

2 Number

Number in Brokpa is marked with the morpheme *=ba* denoting plurality, while singular is never marked. However, if the plurality of the referent is already clear from context, the plural marker *=ba* may be omitted. The plural is always marked at the end of a noun phrase and its scope goes beyond the directly preceding word, which is why it is considered a clitic, similarly to the case markers, for which this analysis is described in section 3. In combination with certain morphemes, *=ba* has an allomorph *=bak*. Examples of the plural marker *=ba* are given in sentences (1) and (2), while its allomorph *=bak* is shown in (3). In all three examples, the pluralized noun phrase has been emphasized in order to better illustrate the scope of the plural.

[1] For general information about the Brokpa language and the Brokpa Documentation and Description Project as well as for the list of abbreviations and the transliteration of Written Tibetan used in this issue, see Gerber/Grollmann (this issue).

(1)   *on **miwa** mãle kuːgin na*

one	**mi=ba**	mã́ŋle	kuː-gin	na
and.then	people=PL	communal.work	instruct-NMLZ.AGT	COP.EQ.ASM

'They instruct people to do communal work.' [VH]

(2)   *ɔne **kat kan daŋ pʰrugubadi** tsul lo lokɸenas*

one	**katpo**	**kanmo**	**daŋ**	**pʰrugu=ba=di**
and.then	old.man	old.woman	and	child=PL=DEF

tsu=la	lo	lok-pe	na=se
here=DAT	again	return.PST-NMLZ.PST	COP.EQ.ASM=REP

'The old people and the children turned back again.' [BO]

(3)   *one ot tamdi **tɕʰi mi ɕanbaxe** tʰoː*

one	oti	tam=di	**tɕʰi**	**mi**	**ɕanma=ba=kʰe**	tʰoː
and.then	DEM.PROX	talk=DEF	outside	person	other=PL=FOC	hear

'Other people from outside had heard of this talk.' [YS]

As has already been mentioned, the plural marker does not stand in a privative opposition with a zero marked singular. Thus, lack of the plural morpheme does not necessarily denote singularity of the referent. If it is clear from the context that more than one referent is present or if explicit mention of plurality is not needed, the marking of plurality is optional, as seen in (4). Sentence (4a) can have singular or plural referents depending on context. On the other hand, sentence (4b) invariably refers to more than one horse.

(4)   a.   *ot tá na*

oti	tá	na
DEM.PROX	horse	COP.EQ.ASM

'This is a horse.' *or* 'These are horses.'

b.   *ot tába na*

oti	tá=ba	na
DEM.PROX	horse=PL	COP.EQ.ASM

'These are horses.'

Similarly, if a quantifier implies the presence of multiple referents, the plural is not marked, as can be seen in sentence (5). While the plural marking is necessary in (5a) because it is not implied by the context, it can be omitted in (5b), as the word *kaŋɟo* 'all' clearly implies that more than one dog did bite.

(5) a. *kiba kʰɔŋ muksɔŋ*

    kí=ba   kʰoŋ   múk-soŋ
    dog=PL   3PL   bite-PST.SEN

    'The dogs bit them.'

  b. *ki kaɲɟo rupne kʰɔŋ muksɔŋ*

    kí   kaɲɟo rupne   kʰoŋ   múk-soŋ
    dog   all   together 3PL   bite-PST.SEN

    'All the dogs bit them together.'

The same phenomenon can be observed when an exact number of referents is stated, such as in sentence (6). The quantifying numeral makes the plural marker =*ba* redundant, which is why the noun remains unmarked.

(6) *one kʰõ sumɟeraŋ tas eso ʈocina*

    one   kʰoŋ   sum-ɟeraŋ   tas   eskur   ʈo-cina
    and.then 3PL   three-all.of now   school   go.PRS-PRS.ALLO

    'All three of them are going to school now.' [MF]

In the same way, the plural marking of the copula complement in sentence (7) is not present, since the plurality is clearly implied by the plural marking of the proximal demonstrative pronoun *oba*, which can be segmented into the proximal deictic root *o–* and the plural =*ba*, rendering an additional marking with =*ba* redundant. In such cases, the plural is always marked on the demonstrative pronoun and not on the denoted noun itself.

(7) a. *oba ɲegi ki na*

    oba   ɲe=gi   kí   na
    DEM.PROX.PL   1SG.GEN=GEN   dog   COP.EQ.ASM

    'These are my dogs.'

  b. * oba   ɲe=gi   kí=ba   na
    DEM.PROX.PL   1SG.GEN=GEN   dog= PL   COP.EQ.ASM

    intended: 'These are my dogs.'

However, although the Brokpa plural pronouns inherently refer to multiple referents, they may bear an additional plural marking. In fact, plural pronouns are marked with =*ba* about as frequently as other nouns. The plural marker =*ba* on a plural pronoun is shown in sentence (8), whereas sentence (9) demonstrates that the plural marking on the personal pronouns is not obligatory. Note that both, (8) and (9), are from the same story ('Strawberry Incident [SI]' in Leki et al., this issue) and that sentence (9) without plural-marked pronoun is uttered before (8) with a marked pronoun, showing that it cannot be assumed that the marking is simply lacking due to the fact that the plurality has already been explicitly marked beforehand.

(8)   *on parparɕu ɲíba tsemtse*

one	parparɕuŋ	ɲí=ba	tsemtse
and.then	sometimes	1PL.EXCL=PL	play.PST

'And in between we played.' [SI]

(9)   *on ɲí ʈosin di saradi eso teaŋ tʰopcina*

one	ɲí	eskur	ʈo-sin	di	sara=di
and.then	1PL.EXCL	school	go.PRS-CVB1	TOP	lunch=DEF

eskur	teaŋ	tʰop-cina
school	plain	achieve-PRS.ALLO

'When we go to school, we get lunch at school.' [SI]

The allomorph =*bak* has so far exclusively been attested before the focus morpheme =*kʰe* and in the paucal morpheme =*baxɕik* discussed below, where =*bak* combines with the indefinite article =*ɕik*. [2]

The combination of a plosive and a fricative or an aspirated plosive (for which, in turn, a lenition to fricatives often takes place) often causes an assimilation of the plosive. Thus, since =*bak* is only attested before =*kʰe* and =*ɕik*, it is always realized as [bax]. Etymologically, the plural morpheme can be traced back to the Tshangla plural =*bak* (see historical and comparative notes below). Since there is a synchronic explanation for the overt form [bax], =*bak* is analyzed based on its etymology with an underlying final stop rather than a fricative. It can be assumed that the final /k/ has been lost in all other environments, leading to the more prevalent allomorph =*ba*. Example (10) shows that both plural allomorphs occur in similar semantic and phonological contexts.

(10) a.   *pʰruguba kaŋɟoɟe ɟabena*

pʰrugu=ba	kaŋɟo=ɟe	ɟap-pe	na
child=PL	all=AGT	do-NMLZ.PST	COP.EQ.ASM

'All the children did it.'

      b.   *pʰrugubaxkʰe ɟabe na*

pʰrugu=bak=kʰe	ɟap-pe	na
child=PL=FOC	do-NMLZ.PST	COP.EQ.ASM

'All the children did it.'

---

[2] The indefinite article =*ɕik* also occurs independently, as demonstrated in sentence (a).

(a)   *one ɲe auɕ ɟena*

one	ɲe	au=ɕik	jena
and.then	1SG.AGT	older.male.parallel.cousin=INDF	COP.EX.ASM

'And I had an older cousin.' [SI]

Paucal number only coding a few tokens of a group can be marked by adding either of the the paucal markers =*lal* or =*baxɕik*. The latter is clearly composed of the plural allomorph =*bak* and the indefinite article =*ɕik*. Since the paucal meaning cannot be derived from the individual meanings of its components, =*baxɕik* is considered a single grammaticalized morpheme. On the other hand, the origin of the morpheme =*lal* is unclear. It does not seem to be derived from any other morpheme such as the dative marker =*la*, which is often realised as [l] (see chapter 3.3). Examples of the paucal are listed in (11), where the listed variants are all semantically identical. It can be observed that when using =*lal*, the plural marking with =*ba* may be omitted, as in (11b). So far, no difference has been noted between the meaning of the two paucal morphemes. It is however possible, that =*baxɕik* refers to indefinite referents rather than a few tokens of a group.

(11)   a.   *kibalal ɕili na*

   kí=ba=lal   ɕí-pe   na
   dog=PL=PAUC1   die-NMLZ.PST   COP.EQ.ASM

   'Some of the dogs died.'

   b.   *kilal ɕili na*

   kí=lal   ɕí-pe   na
   dog=PAUC1   die-NMLZ.PST   COP.EQ.ASM

   'Some of the dogs died.'

   c.   *kibaxɕik ɕili na*

   kí=baxɕik   ɕí-pe   na
   dog=PAUC2   die-NMLZ.PST   COP.EQ.ASM

   'Some of the dogs died.'

Just like the plural, the paucal can be followed by a case marker, as is demonstrated in sentence (12).

(12)   *lupunbaxɕikɟe ɕuɕin jo lapcina*

   lopon=baxɕik=ɟe   ɕukɕen   jo   lap-cina
   teacher=PAUC2=AGT   strong   COP.EX.EGO   say-PRS.ALLO

   'Some of the teachers used to say I am strong.'

Historical and comparative notes.   In Written Tibetan, no single morpheme is used to express plural. However, plurality may be expressed optionally through so-called 'number words' (DeLancey 2003: 263). Just like in Brokpa, those number markers are antecedent to potential case markers (Hahn 1994: 52) and the exact number of referents can be expressed with a numeral instead (Hahn 1994: 51; Beyer 1992: 220–221). As in Brokpa, the plural marker may be omitted if plurality can be inferred from context (Schwieger 2006: 42). The most common number words are ཚོ *tsho*, རྣམས *rnams* and ཅག *cag* (DeLancey 2003: 263). Hahn (1994: 50) also cites the particles དག *dag*, ཕྲག *phrag* (on

collectives of certain numbers) and ᭢ *cog* (only on the demonstrative pronoun ᭢ *'o*) which may indicate plural under certain circumstances. However, the use of these particles is restricted and not productive (cf. Hahn 1994: 50–52; Beyer 1992: 230). For all of these markers, a phonological change to the Brokpa plural marker *=ba* seems implausible. Rather, it can be assumed that the Brokpa morpheme is a loan from the neighbouring Tshangla[3] language, where the plural is marked by *=bak* (cf. Bodt 2012: 203; Grollmann, in press). It seems very probable that the morpheme has been borrowed from Tshangla, since the Brokpa people and the Tshangla share a long history of contact and cultural affinity and a number of nativised loans from Tshangla into Brokpa have already been observed (cf. Bodt 2012: 311).

3 Case

Brokpa distinguishes five case markers, which will be discussed in the following subsections: the agentive *=ɟe* (section 3.1), the genitive *=gi* (section 3.2), the dative *=la* (section 3.3), the ablative *=ne* (section 3.4) and the comitative *=daŋ* (section 3.5). Table 1 provides a short overview of the Brokpa case markers and the main semantic roles they cover.

Case (gloss)	Morpheme	Role
Agentive (AGT)	*=ɟe*	Agent
Genitive (GEN)	*=gi*	Possessor, Modifier
Dative (DAT)	*=la*	Location, Possessor, Goal, Recipient, Bene-/Maleficiary, Stimulus
Ablative (ABL)	*=ne*	Source
Comitative (COM)	*=daŋ*	Companion

Table 1. Brokpa case markers

Brokpa marks case at the end of the respective noun phrase (so-called *Gruppenflexion*), just as Tibetan does (cf. Hill 2015: 920). As such, case markers are always located at the end of the modified noun phrase, thus not exclusively following nouns but also adjectives or numerals, as seen in sentence (13).

---

[3] Note that Tshangla is not considered to be part of the Tibetic subgroup but rather an independent subclade of Trans-Himalayan (van Driem 2014: 22).

(13) **namɕi eɕinɟe** *ŋa gautsor tɕuki*

namɕi	**eɕen=ɟe**	ŋa	gautsor	tɕúk-pe
weather	good=AGT	1SG	happiness	put.inside-NMLZ.PST

'The good weather makes me happy.'

     Additionally, the scope of the case marker goes beyond the directly preceding element, such as in sentence (14), where it is the whole noun phrase, *kʰoe naːsi doː ɕanma=ba=la* 'to another of his yak herder friends' that is marked with the dative *=la*. Further examples of the clitic behaviour of the case markers is given for the genitive in (15) and for the comitative in (16).

(14) *oni kʰuɕtɕik ɲe aɕaŋ* **kʰoe nas doːɕanmal** *tɕik lagoɸe tɕun […]*

one	kʰuɕ-tɕik	ɲe	aɕaŋ	**kʰoe**	**naːsi**
and.then	times-one	1SG.GEN	maternal.uncle	3SG.GEN	yak.herder

doː	**ɕanma=ba=la**	tɕik	lap-go-pe	tɕuŋ-ne
friend	other=PL=DAT	one	say-must-NMLZ.PST	happen-CVB2

'Once it happened that my uncle had to tell something to another of his yak herder friends […]' [NC]

(15) **ri meti tɕomigi** *leak ko tsuk*

ri	**me-pe**	**tɕo-mi=gi**	leaka	ko	tsuk
mountain	not.exist-NMLZ.PST	make-NMLZ.ACT=GEN	work	head	put.on

'They began the work of destroying the mountain.' [BO]

(16) **iː ɕimgindaŋ** *ɲi kʰuɕtɕik preaŋne jal kʰim tɕiti*

iː	**ɕim-gin=daŋ**	ɲí	kʰuɕ-tɕik	preaŋ=ne	ja=la
grandmother	be.dead-NMLZ.AGT=COM	1PL.EXCL	times-one	hut=ABL	up=DAT

cʰim	tɕi-pe
house	go.PST-NMLZ.PST

'My late grandmother and I were once walking up home from the yak herder's place.' [YE]

     Thus, all case markers have been analyzed as clitics, similarly to the plural, since they do not necessarily follow the head noun directly and their scope encompasses the whole noun phrase (cf. DeLancey 2003; Genetti 1993).

3.1 *Agentive =ɟe*

The Brokpa case marker *=ɟe* may mark both the agent and the instrument of a verbal action. However, this marking is largely pragmatically conditioned, which is fairly typical of Tibetic languages (cf. DeLancey 2011). Since the agentive marking with *=ɟe* is mostly conditioned by the pragmatic context of the utterance, it marks semantically agentive arguments rather than subjects of a transitive verb, which is why it is not analyzed as an ergative. As such, the agentive marker is mostly employed when the agent cannot be inferred from context or if the speaker wants to emphasize its agentivity. Thus, it is used regularly but by no means as frequently as other case markers in natural speech, as can be seen in the texts in Leki et al. (this issue).

Examples of the agentive marking in non-elicited speech can be found in (17), where the agent of the action is marked with *=ɟe*, whereas the patient remains unmarked. Example (17) shows the beginning of the story of the bat and the vulture (labelled [BV] in Leki et al., this issue). While in (17a) the vulture is acting as the one who eats people and is thus marked with the agentive, in (17b) it is the bat who performs the verbal action of subduing and thus bears the agentive marker *=ɟe*, while the vulture bears no case marker.

(17) a. *taŋbo koɟe mi sacinase*

taŋbo   ko=ɟe   mi   sa-cina=se
first   vulture=AGT person   eat.PRS-PRS.ALLO=REP

'The vulture used to eat people.' [BV]

b. *ta mi samiɕúkmigi ton komɕɸagoɟe ko tuːmi ɟam nekap tóninase*

ta   mi   sa-mi-ɕúk-mi=gi   ton
now   person   eat.PRS-NEG.FUT-put.inside-NMLZ.ACT=GEN   reason

komɕinpʰaŋgo=ɟe   ko   tʰuː-mi   ɟap-ne   nekap
bat=AGT   vulture   subdue-NMLZ.ACT   do-CVB2   idea

tón-pe   na=se
take.out-NMLZ.PST   COP.EQ.ASM=REP

'To stop it from eating people, the bat had some ideas to try to subdue the vulture.'
[BV]

Due to the largely pragmatic conditioning of the agentive marking, it is possible that the agent of a transitive verb is unmarked or that the subject of an intransitive verb is marked with the agentive, as demonstrated in sentences (18) and (19) respectively. In (18), the agent need not be marked, since he can be inferred from the context. In (19) the agentive marking only serves the purpose of emphasizing the agentivity of the subject – here the speaker. Both sentences in (19) are correct in the appropriate context. Sentence (19a), can be used if the speaker wants to emphasize that it is him who is going and not someone else, which is not the case in (19b).

(18) *ŋa lakpa tuptaŋe*

ŋa   lakpa   tup-taŋ-pe
1SG   hand   cut.apart-do-NMLZ.PST

'I cut my hand off.'

(19) a. *ɲe ʈocoʔ*

ɲe   ʈo-coʔ
1SG.AGT   go.PRS-PRS.EGO

'I'm going.'

b. *ŋa ʈocoʔ*

ŋa   ʈo-coʔ
1SG   go.PRS-PRS.EGO

'I'm going.'

Answers to questions with *sú=ɟe* 'who= AGT' demand a referent marked with the agentive. Thus, in (20) the answer to the question 'Who cut the wood?' requires the subject to be marked with the agentive, while the neutral utterance in (21) does not.

(20) a. *syi ɕiŋ tuɸi*

sú=ɟe   ɕiŋ   tup-pe
who=AGT   wood   cut.apart-NMLZ.PST

'Who cut the wood?'

b. *ɲe tuɸe*

ɲe   tup-pe
1SG.AGT   go.PRS-PRS.EGO

Answer: 'I cut [the wood].'

(21) *ŋa tuɸe*

ŋa   tup-pe
1SG   cut.apart-NMLZ.PST

'I cut [the wood].'

The agentive *=ɟe* can be used to mark the instrument of an action. A single sentence may contain both the marking of the agent as well as that of the instrument, as can be seen in sentence (22) and the sentences in (23) below.

(22)   *ɲe tɕinɟe ɸosɔŋ*

ɲe   tɕin=ɟe   pʰok-soŋ
1SG.AGT   urine=AGT   hit-PST.SEN

'I peed on someone.' (lit. 'I hit someone with urine.')

     Just as with the marking of the agent, the morpheme *=ɟe* may be omitted when an instrument role is involved. Thus, both sentences in (23) have the same meaning. The morpheme *=ɟe* may be omitted in (23a), since it is clear from the context that the axe was used for cutting. Formally, no difference between the marking of the agent and the marking of the instrument can be found, which is why *=ɟe* is considered a single polysemous morpheme rather than two distinct homophonous morphemes with the same etymological source. This is not surprising, given the areal linguistic context, as will be detailed in the historical and comparative notes below.

(23)   a.   *ɲe auɟe ɕiŋ deri duɸtuk*

ɲe   au=ɟe   ɕiŋ   teri   tup   tuk
1SG.GEN   older.brother=AGT   tree   axe   cut.apart   COP.EX.ACQ

'My brother cut the tree with an axe.'

    b.   *ɲe auɟe ɕiŋ deriɟe duɸtuk*

ɲe   au=ɟe   ɕiŋ   teri=ɟe   tup   tuk
1SG.GEN   older.brother=AGT   tree   axe=AGT   cut.apart   COP.EX.ACQ

'My brother cut the tree with an axe.'

     As could be observed in sentences (18) through (23) (with the exception of (18), (19b) and (20)), the agentive is not always overtly marked with *=ɟe* after words ending in vowels or in pronouns. Further examples are given in (24) and (25). However, the purely vocalic marking of the agentive occurs only after the vowel *a*, which becomes *e*, i.e. there is no overt agentive marker *=ɟe*. An exception to this is the plural marker *=ba* (which historically was *=bak*), which is never realised as [be], as demonstrated in sentence (26). After *u* the agentive is often only realised as *i*, occasionally fronting the final *u* to *y*, such as in *syi* (from *sú=ɟe* 'who=AGT') in sentence (20) above, but not always, as seen in (25).

(24)   **mɛrakpe** *paktsal paktsa mato ɲoːɕ lak mɛna*

merakpa=ɟe   paktsa=la   paktsa   mato   ɲoːɕe   lap-ki
merak.person=AGT   animal.skin=DAT   animal.skin   only   animal.skin   say-NFIN

    mena
    COP.EX.NEG.ASM

'People from Merak call the animal skin only *paktsa*, not *ɲoːɕe*.' [MU]

(25) *on mibaxe kʰo **pʰui** kʰergalenas laɸena*

one	mi=ba=kʰe	kʰo	**pʰu=ɟe**	kʰer-gaː-pe
and.then	person=PL=FOC	3SG.M	village.deity=AGT	take-leave-NMLZ.PST

na=se	lap-pe	na
COP.EQ.ASM=REP	say-NMLZ.PST	COP.EQ.ASM

'People said he was taken away by the village deity.' [VD]

(26) *ɕotsin di ɲíba ɲí **tɕuŋɕbaço** kʰoe kʰai naŋ tɕíse sisi torgoxinas*

ɕot-sin	di	ɲí=ba	ɲí	**tɕuŋku-ɕo=ba=ɟe**	kʰo=gi
jump-CVB1	TOP	1PL.EXCL=PL	1PL.EXCL	small-COMPR=PL=AGT	3SG.M=GEN

kʰa=gi	naŋ	tɕí=se	sisi	tor-go-cina=se
mouth=GEN	inside	what=REP	strawberry	throw-must-PRS.ALLO=REP

'When he jumps, we the smaller ones, we have to throw, um, strawberries in his mouth.' [SI]

As such, a vocalic allomorph =*e* (which is raised to *i* after high vowels) of the agentive occurring after vowels seems possible. However, while all words ending in *a* change their coda to *e* in the agentive case, this is not consistently done for all other vowels, as could be seen in (17), where the vulture, *ko*, was marked as *ko=ɟe* and not, as might be expected, **koe* or **køe*. The assumption of a historical final consonant in /ko/ which has been lost later in time is implausible, since Brokpa *ko* 'vulture' corresponds to Written Tibetan གོ་(བོ་) *go (bo)*. The same can be said for *ri=ɟe* (WT རི་ *ri* 'mountain') in sentence (27) below. It might be hypothesized, that after *i* the form =*ɟe* is used, since otherwise *i* would be expected after a high vowel, which caused a merger of the case marker and stem coda so that the agentive became covert in this context. Since the agentive is only marked when the speaker wants to highlight the agentivity, a covert, untraceable marker would need reinforcement.

(27) *di ri o **riɟe** kʰɔl kʰoi ɸoʈaŋla ɲima kapcinas*

di	ri	oti	**ri=ɟe**	kʰo=la	kʰo=gi	pʰoʈaŋ=la
TOP	mountain	DEM.PROX	mountain=AGT	3SG.M=DAT	3SG.M=GEN	palace=DAT

ɲima	kap-cina=se
sun	cover-PRS.ALLO=REP

'The mountain, that mountain shielded him, his palace from the sun.' [OS]

The singular personal pronouns also show considerable variation when they take the agentive, especially the first person singular pronoun *ŋa* (agentive *ɲe*) and the second person singular *cʰo* (agentive *kʰe*). It may well be possible that an allomorph =*e* following the pronouns caused the alternating stems (that is, *ŋa=e* > *ŋe* > *ɲe*). However, it is unclear what led to the de-palatalization of the onset of *cʰo* 'you' (2SG) before =*e*. For the third person pronouns, *kʰo* (agentive *kʰoe*) and *mo* (agentive *moe*), the segmentation *kʰo=e* and *mo=e* seems straightforward.

Table 2 shows the agentive forms of the singular pronouns alongside their regular unmarked forms. Note that no such stem alternation is present in plural pronouns.

person	unmarked	agentive
1SG	*ŋa*	*ɲe*
2SG	*cʰo*	*kʰe*
3SG.M	*kʰo*	*kʰoe*
3SG.F	*mo*	*moe*

Table 2. Brokpa agentive singular pronouns

While the alternating pronoun stems clearly point towards an allomorph *=e*, it cannot consistently be identified after vowels. It is possible, that nowadays the form *=ɹe* is starting to be generalized, thus replacing the use of a historically present allomorph *=e*. Why this is not the case following the vowel *a* is, however, unclear.

Historical and comparative notes. The Brokpa agentive *=ɹe* shows considerable similarities with the ergative of other Tibetic languages. Written Tibetan has the morpheme ཀྱིས་ *-kyis* ~ གིས་ *-gis* ~ གྱིས་ *-gyis* ~ ཡིས་ *-yis* ~ འིས་ *-'is*, which marks both ergative and instrumental case (Tournadre 2010: 102–103). Of these Written Tibetan allomorphs, especially གྱིས་ -gyis is very reminiscent of the Brokpa agentive *=ɹe*. Regarding the Brokpa allomorph after vowels, nowadays it can be found both as *=i* and *=e*. However, etymologically, the form *=e* seems more plausible, presumably corresponding to Written Tibetan ཡིས་ *-yis* or འིས་ *-'is*. It can be assumed that *=e* is raised to *i* after high vowels, such as *u* or *y*.

As for other Tibetic languages, the corresponding marker (often dubbed 'ergative') can clearly be traced back to the same source: Dzongkha ergative is marked by གྱིས་ ~ གིས་ ~ གྱིས་ *-gi*.[4] As in Brokpa, it can be used for the instrument of a verbal action. Additionally, it is also rather used to highlight the agentive nature of marked subjects instead of being a classic ergative consistently marking the subjects of transitive verbs (Tshering & van Driem 2019: 187–179). The same can be said of Choca-ngachakha (Tournadre & Rigzin 2015: 76). The ergative is marked with *-gi* after consonants and *-ki* ~ *-i* after vowels (Tournadre & Rigzin 2015: 76–77). As such, the Brokpa agentive does not stand out in the Tibetic context in neither form nor function.

3.2 Genitive *=gi*

The Brokpa genitive is marked with *=gi* and expresses the affiliation of the marked noun with another. Typically, the head follows the dependent marked with *=gi*. An example of the genitive is given in (28), where the same meaning ('This is our dog.') is expressed in both sentences. As can

---

[4] The rules of spelling of the orthographic form are based on conventions from Classical Tibetan and the orthographic final grapheme of the preceding word (Tshering & van Driem 2019: 178).

be seen in sentence (28b), the possessor can follow the possessed element semantically, although they are separated by a phrase boundary.

(28) a. *ot ɲigi kí na*

	oti	ɲi=gi	kí	na
	DEM.PROX	1PL.EXCL=GEN	dog	COP.EQ.ASM

'This is our dog.'

   b. *ot kí ɲigi na*

	oti	kí	ɲi=gi	na
	DEM.PROX	dog	1PL.EXCL=GEN	COP.EQ.ASM

'This is our dog.' (more accurately: 'This dog is ours.')

In connected speech, the genitive marking may be omitted if the connection between the head and the dependent is clear from context. This is especially true in constructions with so-called relator nouns (see DeLancey (2003: 264) for a discussion of the term and Mittaz (this issue [a]) for a description of relator nouns in Brokpa), where a location is specified with a relator noun such as *tsé* 'top, peak', *naŋ* 'inside', *tʰi* 'bottom', thus leading to a more specific meaning concerning the location of the object (such as 'in, inside of' in the case of *naŋ*). This is demonstrated in sentence (29), where a genitive after *paku* 'purse' might be expected. Example (30) shows that the marking of the genitive is, however, not impossible in constructions with relator nouns.

(29) *ɲe paku naŋla rup jo*

ɲe	paku	naŋ=la	rup	jo
1SG.GEN	purse	inside=DAT	money	COP.EX.EGO

'There's money in my purse.'

(30) *tsʰogi naŋ do tomtaŋ otɕin ɟasin tsʰo kʰoː*

tsʰo=gi	naŋ	do	tom-taŋ	otɕins	ɟap=sin	tsʰo	kʰoː
lake=GEN	inside	stone	throw-do	thus	do-CVB1	lake	boil

'They were throwing stones into the lake; doing so, the lake boiled.' [LS]

Similar to the agentive marker, the genitive is often phonetically reduced after vowels in natural speech and can cause assimilation of the preceding final vowel. As such, an allomorph consisting of only a vowel is just as plausible for the genitive as it is for the agentive. However, similar to the agentive which is still often realised as =ɟe after vowels and not as =e, the same holds true for the genitive, which may also be realised as =gi without influencing the preceding vowel. A genitive =gi following a word ending in a may lead to final a being realised as e or i, such as in the example (31a), where underlying *merakpa=gi* 'merak.person=GEN' is realised as *merakpe*. However, (31b) shows that this is not consistently done.

(31) a. *unl merakpi o:ɕik sâteaŋla jõ*

unla	merakpa=gi	o:=ɕik	sâteaŋ=la	joŋ
previously	merak.person=GEN	boy=INDF	Sakteng=DAT	come

'Some time ago, a Merak boy came to Sakteng.' [MU]

b. *brokpagi mar tɕʰora tɕʰo tʰaŋgi korn tɕik lapna*

brokpa=gi	mar	tɕʰora	tɕo	tʰaŋ=gi	kor=ne	tɕik
Brokpa=GEN	butter	cheese	make	way=GEN	about=ABL	one

lap	na
say	COP.EQ.ASM

'I talk about the way the Brokpa make butter and cheese.' [MB]

The same can be said for word-final *u* and *o* before the genitive, which are often fronted to *y* and *ø* respectively or may be deleted entirely. The genitive may be reduced to *=i* in this case. After *o*, a similar behaviour as after *a* is possible as well (that is, *o* becomes *e* and no overt genitive marker is present). Examples for genitive after *u* are given in (32), while (33) shows the genitive after *o*. After final *e* and *i*, however, the genitive is usually realised as *=gi*. The reason for this is probably again that the genitive would otherwise be untraceable – similar to the agentive *=ɟe* discussed earlier.

(32) *do tɕʰygi thil tuk*

do	tɕʰu=gi	tʰî=la	tuk
stone	water=GEN	bottom=DAT	COP.EX.ACQ

'The stone is under the water.'

(33) a. *on gom ɟebi tsam tɕi dynɕaŋ ɟap*

one	go:ma	ɟebo=gi	tsam	tɕi	dyntɕʰaŋ	ɟap
and.then	evening	king=GEN	nearby	go.PST	party	do

'[...] and in the evening they went to the king's place for a party.' [BO]

b. *kʰegi bome miŋ tɕina*

kʰe=gi	bomo=gi	miŋ	tɕí	na
2SG.GEN=GEN	daughter=GEN	name	what	COP.EQ.ASM

'What is your daughter's name?'

In a similar vein to the agentive, the singular personal pronouns are influenced by the following genitive. The first and second person singular have the same stem when marked with the genitive as when marked with the agentive, that is, first person *ŋa* plus genitive becomes *ɲe=gi* and second person *cʰo* plus genitive becomes *kʰe=gi*. Sometimes the genitive marker *=gi* is not present, rendering the form identical to the agentive pronouns. This is also the case for the third person

pronouns, male *kʰo* and female *mo*, which may simply be marked with *=gi*, or occur as *kʰoe ~ kʰoi* and *moe ~ moi* respectively. Table 3 shows both possible genitive forms for the singular personal pronouns. Again, no such distinction is present for the plural pronouns, which are simply marked with *=gi*.

person	unmarked	genitive
1SG	*ŋa*	*ɲe=gi ~ ɲe*
2SG	*cʰo*	*kʰe=gi ~ kʰe*
3SG.M	*kʰo*	*kʰo=gi ~ kʰoe ~ kʰoi*
3SG.F	*mo*	*mo=gi ~ moe ~ moi*

Table 3. Brokpa genitive singular pronouns

Thus, again an allomorph consisting only of a vowel can be assumed, possibly *=i*. This would explain the apparent 'loss' of the velar onset of the morpheme *=gi* in many instances. Additionally, it would explain alternation for the first person pronouns, which may have arisen in a similar manner as the agentive pronouns. Thus, *ŋa=i* became *ŋe ~ ŋi* which in turn became *ɲe*. A similar change could have led to *kʰe*. The additional marking with the genitive in *ɲe=gi* and *kʰe=gi* may be a newer addition in order to prevent confusion with the agentive.

Historical and comparative notes. Like the agentive, the Brokpa genitive can clearly be traced back to the same source as the genitive case markers of other Tibetic languages. In Written Tibetan, the genitive is marked with ཀྱི་ *-kyi* ~ གི་ *-gi* ~ གྱི་ *-gyi* ~ ཡི་ *-yi* ~ འི་ *-'i* and can be used to modify the noun following the marked element directly. It is most commonly used to mark affiliation and attributes (cf. Tournadre 2010: 105; Hahn 1994: 79–82). Brokpa genitive *=gi* thus clearly corresponds to Written Tibetan གི་ *-gi*. The allomorph after the vowels /a, u, o/ presumably corresponds to Written Tibetan ཡི་ *-yi* ~ འི་ *-'i*. Similarly, the Dzongkha genitive is formed with the suffix གྱི་ ~ གི་ ~ ཀྱི་ *-gi* or འི་ *-i* after some but not all words ending in vowels (Tshering & van Driem 2019: 111). This case marker is homophonous with the agentive, just as it is in Choca-ngachakha, where it is *-gi* After vowels, however, the Choca-ngachakha genitive is marked with *-yi ~ -gi* (Tournadre & Rigzin 2015: 77).[5]

Additionally, in Dzongkha it may be the case that the genitive allomorphs *-gi* and *-i* are both combined. This is particularly true in the first singular possessive, *ngêgi* 'my' from the first person singular pronoun *nga* and the genitive (Tshering & van Driem 2019: 111). This is reminiscent of the Brokpa genitive pronouns for the first and second person singular. Possibly, Brokpa may have had such a double marking with *-i-gi* 'GEN-GEN' as well, which gave rise to the forms of the personal pronouns *ɲe=gi* '1SG.GEN-GEN' and *kʰe=gi* '2SG.GEN-GEN'.

---

[5] The exact conditioning for this allophony after vowels is not explained (Tournadre & Rigzin 2015: 77).

3.3   Dative =*la*

The Brokpa dative is marked with =*la*, which is often reduced to [l] in natural speech. The dative is used for expressing locations, beneficiaries and maleficiaries, goals, possession, time-periods and final states of transformations.

Sentence (34) shows the dative indicating the location, while it marks both destinations of *joŋ* 'come' in example (35) and the destination of *cur* 'throw' in (36).

(34)   *ŋa mo luɹasala jo*

ŋa	mo	lú	ɹap-sa=la		jo
1SG	3SG.F	song	do-NMLZ.LOC=DAT		COP.EX.EGO

'I was where she was singing.'

(35)   *[...] one desin tɕik meral jɔŋ desin tɕik sâteaŋla jɔŋɸenas*

one	desin	tɕik	merak=la	jɔŋ	desin	tɕik	sâteaŋ=la
and.then	group	one	Merak=DAT	come	group	one	Sakteng=DAT

jɔŋ-pe	na=se
come-NMLZ.PST	COP.EQ.ASM=REP

'[...] one group came to Merak and one group came to Sakteng.' [AC]

(36)   *sisi ɸal otɕins curgoxinas*

sisi	pʰa=la	otɕins	cur-go-cina=se
strawberry	there=DAT	thus	throw-must-PRS.ALLO=REP

'We thus have to throw the strawberries there.' [SI]

Possession can be expressed by marking the possessor with the dative =*la* and an unmarked possessed element. This construction does not differentiate between alienable and inalienable possession, as can be seen in the (37) with the alienable possession of cows and (38) with the inalienable possession of a father. Example (38) also shows that negative possession is formed in the same way but using the appropriate negative copula.

(37)   *mol pa ɹaɕik jena*

mo=la	pa	ɹaɕik	jena
3SG.F=DAT	cow	100	COP.EX.ASM

'She has a hundred cows.'

(38)   *ŋala ap meʔ*

ŋa=la	apa	me
1SG=DAT	father	COP.EX.NEG.EGO

'I don't have a father.' [MF]

The dative also marks the final state of a transformation or change, as can be seen in sentence (39). Together with the ablative =*ne*, which marks the starting-point of the process, full transformations can be described, such as in sentence (40).

(39) *ɕiŋ tʰalal ɟurtuk*

    ɕiŋ   tʰala=la   ɟur   tuk
    tree   ash=DAT   change   COP.EX.ACQ

    'The tree turned to ash.'

(40) *nam ŋonbone marbul ɟurtuk*

    nam   ŋonbo=ne   marbo=la   ɟur   tuk
    sky   blue=ABL   red=DAT   change   COP.EX.ACQ

    'The sky changed from blue to red.'

The dative =*la* also marks both beneficiary and maleficiary, as seen in sentences (41) and (42) respectively. The recipient of the verbal action is marked in sentence (43), while in (44) the dative =*la* marks the addressee.

(41) *kʰe ŋala doɟabna ɲe cʰol doɟapko*

    kʰe   ŋa=la   do: ɟap   na   ɲe   cʰo=la   do: ɟap-ko
    2SG.AGT   1SG=DAT   friend   do   COP.EQ.ASM   1SG.AGT   2SG=DAT   friend   do-ADH

    'If you help me, I will help you.'

(42) *ɲe mol duŋɟoʔ*

    ɲe   mo=la   duŋ-co?
    1SG.AGT   3SG.F=DAT   beat-PRS.EGO

    'I beat her.'

(43) *ɕimiɟe ɲal tɕeɕik cʰɔɲtɕinsɔŋ*

    ɕimi=ɟe   ŋa=la   tɕe:=ɕik   cʰoŋ-tɕin-soŋ
    cat=AGT   1SG=DAT   rat=INDF   bring-give.PST/IMP-PST.SEN

    'The cat brought me a rat.'

(44) *ɔne ɲe i: ɕimginla tɕí ŋam na lam ʈisin […]*

    one   ɲe   i: ɕim-gin=la   tɕí   ŋam
    and.then   1SG.GEN   grandmother   be.dead-NMLZ.AGT=DAT   what   sound

na	lap-ne	ʈi-sin
COP.EQ.ASM	say-CVB2	ask-CVB1

'When I asked my late grandmother saying "What sound was that?" […]' [YE]

In addition, the dative can mark a stimulus as can be seen in (45). While the wolf, the stimulus of the fear, is not expressed in (45a), it is marked with the dative when present in (45b). Note that as soon as the wolf becomes the agent in (45c), it is not marked with the dative *=la*.

(45) a. *ɻibɔŋ ɕik tuk*

ribɔŋ	ɕik	tuk
rabbit	be.afraid	COP.EX.ACQ

'The rabbit is afraid.'

  b. *ɻibɔŋ ɸarala ɕikne tɕare deti na*

ribɔŋ	pʰara=la	ɕik-ne	tɕar-pe	te-pe	na
rabbit	wolf=DAT	be.afraid-CVB2	hide-NMLZ.PST	stay.PST-NMLZ.PST	COP.EQ.ASM

'The rabbit was afraid of the wolf, so it hid itself.'

  c. *ɸare ribɔŋ ɕik tɕucina*

pʰara=ɻe	ribɔŋ	ɕik-tɕúk-cina
wolf=AGT	rabbit	be.afraid-put.inside-PRS.ALLO

'The wolf makes the rabbit afraid.'

Historical and comparative notes.   When comparing the Brokpa dative to Written Tibetan it becomes clear that Brokpa *=la* covers the function of both the Written Tibetan dative (or allative, according to Hill 2004) ལ *-la* and the Written Tibetan locative ན *-na*. While the Written Tibetan dative ལ *-la* marks the benefactive, possessor or the superessive, inessive or allative location of an action (cf. Tournadre 2010: 106), the locative ན *-na* expresses inessive-locative meanings where no movement is involved (cf. Tournadre 2010: 110). Beyer (1992: 267–269) distinguishes these two cases, which he calls locus roles, by the boundedness of the location where the action takes place: the dative/allative ལ *-la* is used to mark the location in a closed area and the locative ན *-na* is used in non-bounded spaces. It can be assumed that the Brokpa locative *=la* has the same source as the dative/allative morpheme ལ *-la* but has generalized its meaning to include that of the Written Tibetan locative ན *-na*, which has in turn been eliminated. It is not uncommon that the function of the dative/allative and the locative are covered by a single morpheme in modern Tibetic languages. Choca-ngachakha, for example, uses a single morpheme *-le ~ -ge ~ -nge ~ -e*.[6] Its meaning is said to be "dative as well as locative and allative" (Tournadre & Rigzin 2015: 78). However, some Tibetic languages have retained a distinction, such as Dzongkha: The Dzongkha locative suffix ནང *-na* indicates location or destination, whereas the goal or site of an activity is marked with ལུ *-lu*, called

---

[6] The allomorphy is conditioned as follows: *-le* after /t, n, p, r/, *-ge* after /k/, *-nge* after /ng/ and *-e* after /m/ or vowels (Tournadre & Rigzin 2015: 78). The morpheme also pharyngalises the preceding vowel.

dative or 'target' case (Tshering & van Driem 2019: 111–112). A similar function is also described for the locative/dative case marker *-ga* of the non-Tibetic language Tshangla, which marks recipients, goals, bene-/maleficiaries, locations, possessors and end-states of transformations (cf. Andvik 2010: 155–160).

3.4 *Ablative =ne*

The Brokpa ablative *=ne* expresses movement away from the source or starting-point of an action, be it a location, a state or a moment in time, such as in (46). As mentioned above in section 3.3, the ablative also marks the starting state of a transformation.

(46) *lum ɖukne cʰoŋɸe na*

lum	ɖuk=ne	cʰoŋ-pe	na
alcoholic.drink	Bhutan=ABL	bring-NMLZ.PST	COP.EQ.ASM

'Lum is brought from Bhutan.'

Just as with the locative, the ablative can be used together with relator nouns, whenever the movement away from a certain place is expressed, as can be seen in (47), where *=ne* combines with the relator noun *tsé* 'top'.

(47) *dʑu ɕiŋ tsene mala pruga꞉sɔŋ*

tɕju	ɕiŋ	tsé=ne	ma=la	pru-ga꞉-soŋ
small.bird	tree	top=ABL	down=LOC	fall.off-leave-PST.SEN

'The bird fell from the tree.'

Similarly, the place of origin is also marked with the ablative, although there is not necessarily a movement away from it, as can be seen in (48). The speaker states that he is originally from eastern Bhutan without necessarily implying that he has left.

(48) *on ŋa ɖuk ɕertɕon jin laɸi*

on	ŋa	ɖuk	ɕertɕo=ne	jin	lap-pe
and.then	1SG	Bhutan	eastern.part=ABL	COP.EQ.EGO	say-NMLZ.PST

'I said "I'm from the eastern part of Bhutan".' [MP]

Historical and comparative notes. The function of the Brokpa ablative *=ne* corresponds to the Written Tibetan ablative case ལས་ *-las* and the elative case ནས་ *-nas*. These are described as 'source roles' by Beyer (1992: 267–270). Written Tibetan ablative ལས་ *-las* marks the source of an action when it is the surface of an object, whereas the Written Tibetan elative ནས་ *-nas* is used in a broader context and marks the temporal or locational source of an action (cf. Beyer 1992: 267–270). Hill (2012: 10–11) describes the difference as being dependent on the transcending of a boundary: The elative ནས་ *-nas* implies that a boundary has been overstepped, whereas the ablative ལས་ *-las* does not. He further states that only ནས་ *-nas* is used in combination with relator nouns and that only ལས་

-las can be used as a comparative (Hill 2012: 16; 18). While the Brokpa ablative *=ne* cannot be used as a comparative, the other functions of the Written Tibetan ablative and elative are united in Brokpa *=ne*. The merger of ablative ལས་ *-las* and elative ནས་ *-nas* is also attested in other Tibetic languages: The point of origin of a verbal action is marked with the ablative suffix ལས་ *-le* in Dzongkha (Tshering & van Driem 2019: 112). For Choca-ngachakha, Tournadre & Rigzin (2015: 79–80) describe the marker *-leki ~ -geki ~ -ngeki ~ -eki* whose allomorphs are distributed exactly as those of the Choca-ngachakha dative and suggest that it has been innovated from a combination of the dative *-le ~ -ge ~ -nge ~ -e* and the ergative *-gi ~ -yi*. Still, the function of marking the origin or source of an action, both cross-boundary or inside a boundary are marked with the same morpheme, just as in Brokpa.

As for the form of Brokpa *=ne*, it can be assumed that the morpheme can be traced back to ནས་ *-nas* since historically the combination of syllable final <-as> became *e* (see Rüfenacht & Waldis, this issue). Interestingly, while the Brokpa dative *=la*, which merges the functions of both, Written Tibetan dative ལ་ *-la* and locative ན་ *-na*, can be traced back to the case marker beginning with <l>, the Brokpa ablative *=ne*, which merged ལས་ *-las* and ནས་ *-nas*, starts with <n>.

3.5 Comitative *=daŋ*

The Brokpa comitative *=daŋ* denotes a companion of the subject of a verbal action. It is however, only seldomly used. More often, the word *daŋ* appears as a conjunction of two noun phrases which can be translated as 'and' as can be seen in (49).

(49) *[…] ser daŋ kiŋku doxɸenas*

ser	daŋ	kiŋku	dok-pe	na=se
blood.pheasant	and	red.billed.chough	arrive-NMLZ.PST	COP.EQ.ASM=REP

'[…] the blood pheasant and the red-billed chough came.' [BV]

While the comitative *=daŋ* and the conjunction *daŋ* can clearly be traced back to the same source, they behave differently both syntactically and semantically in the modern language. Whereas the conjunction has to stand between the two noun phrases it connects (such as in (50a), where the variant (50b) is incorrect), the comitative marker is usually used as a clitic on the last element of a noun phrase, as demonstrated in (51). If two noun phrases are present in order to specify who the companion marked with *=daŋ* accompanies, the companion marked with *=daŋ* usually follows the unmarked subject, as can be seen in (53) and (54a). It is probable that these syntactic differences between the comitative and the conjunction arose in order to avoid confusion of the comitative with the conjunction.

(50) a. *moe toptɕe kaɲʝo kídaŋ ɕimila ɕinsɔŋ*

moe	toptɕe	kaɲʝo	kí	daŋ	ɕimi=la	tɕin-soŋ
3SG.F.AGT	food	all	dog	and	cat=DAT	give.PST/IMP-PST.SEN

'She gave all the food to the dog and the cat.'

b. * moe toptɕe kaɲɟo kí ɕimi daŋ=la tɕin-soŋ
3SG.F.AGT food all dog cat and=DAT give.PST/IMP-PST.SEN

inteded: 'She gave all the food to the dog and the cat.'

Sentence (51) shows the comitative when only one subject, the father *apa*, is present. Since *apa* 'father' is followed by the plural pronoun *kʰoŋ* 'they' and it is specified that two (*ɲí*) people are present, it is not possible to analyze *=daŋ* as a conjunction (i.e. 'father and them'), since otherwise at least three people would need to be present. The person with whom he travels is not explicitly mentioned in the sentence, since he is already known from context, having been mentioned two sentences earlier (for the full text, see 'Village Deity [VD]' in Leki et al., this issue).

(51) *[...] apdaŋ kʰɔŋ ɲi ɲam tɕitina*

apa=daŋ kʰoŋ ɲî ɲambu tɕi-pe na
father=COM 3PL two together go.PST-NMLZ.PST COP.EQ.ASM

'[...] he and his father were traveling together.' [VD]

Sentence (51) also demonstrates that a single referent marked with *=daŋ* is referred to by plural pronouns, since it inherently implies that some other referent is present, even if it is not explicitly stated. This is also the case in sentence (52). In fact, most cases of the comitative *=daŋ* in natural speech favour this construction, i.e. a single referent marked with *=daŋ* followed by the appropriate plural pronoun or number.

(52) *profesor dzozdaŋ ɲí ɲi undagif- unda ɸre tʰaŋgi kon lapna*

profesor dzoz=daŋ ɲí ɲî unda pʰre tʰaŋ=gi
Professor George=COM 1PL.EXCL two for.the.first.time meet way=GEN

kor=ne lap na
about=ABL say COP.EQ.ASM

'I talk about how Professor George and I first met.' [MP]

When both referents are explicitly stated, *=daŋ* is often replaced by the word *ɲambu* 'together'. It is possible to mark a noun with the comitative *=daŋ* and use *ɲambu* in the same sentence, such as in (53), although in this case *=daŋ* is often omitted due to redundancy. Especially when *daŋ* 'and' is also used in the sentence, the comitative is not used in order to prevent confusion. Thus, while sentence (54a) is not wrong, (54b) would be strongly favoured.

(53) *kí mibombodaŋ ɲambo gaːsɔŋ*

kí mi bombo=daŋ ɲambu gaː-soŋ
dog human big=COM together leave-PST.SEN

'The dog and the big person left together.'

(54)   a.   *ŋa au daŋ augi kʰimamdaŋ tɕiti*

ŋa   au   daŋ   au=gi   cʰimam=daŋ   tɕi-pe
1SG   older.brother   and   older.brother=GEN   wife=COM   go.PST-NMLZ.PST

'I went with my brother and his wife.'

b.   *ŋa au daŋ augi kʰimam ɲambu tɕiti*

ŋa   au   daŋ   au=gi   cʰimam   ɲambu   tɕi-pe
1SG   older.brother   and   older.brother=GEN   wife   together   go.PST-NMLZ.PST

'I went with my brother and his wife.' (more accurately: 'Me, my brother and his wife went together.')

Historical and comparative notes.   The Brokpa comitative =*daŋ* clearly corresponds to Written Tibetan ᡪᢅ *dang*, which has been described as a case marker by Beyer (1992: 270– 271) under the label 'accompaniment role'. Based on the fact that Written Tibetan ᡪᢅ *dang* 'behaves like other cases' (Hill 2004: 8), both Hill (2004: 83–84) and Tournadre (2010: 98; 113) describe it as an associative case instead of a conjunction. In fact, the Written Tibetan marker can also be used to connect two noun phrases, like the homophonous Brokpa conjunction *daŋ*. A similar associative case marker dang can also be found in Choca-ngachakha, where it has a similar function, although it is described as often being optional and to have a 'marginal status' in the case system (Tournadre & Rigzin 2015: 79).

4   Conclusion

The Brokpa language has one plural marker, =*ba*, two paucal markers, and five case markers. The agentive =*ɲe* marks the agent or the instrument of an action. The genitive =*gi* marks the modifier or the possessor and thus links it to the head noun. The dative =*la* can be used in many contexts as it marks the location where an action takes place or ends, as well as the recipient, the beneficiary or maleficiary of an action and can be used to form possessive constructions. Further, Brokpa has an ablative case =*ne*, which marks the source of an action, a transformation or a point in time as well as a marginal comitative case =*daŋ* which marks the companion of an action. However, instead of the comitative =*daŋ*, the word *ɲambu* 'together' is often used to express the same meaning.

The comparison of form and function of the markers with morphemes of the other Tibetic languages Written Tibetan, Dzongkha and Choca-ngachakha shows, that the Brokpa case markers can all be traced back to an earlier stage of the language. An overview of the Brokpa morphemes compared to the corresponding morphemes in Written Tibetan (WT), Dzongkha and Choca-ngachakha is given in table 4.

Case (WT)	Written Tibetan	Brokpa	Dzongkha	Choca-ngachakha
Ergative	*-kyis ~ -gis ~ -gyis ~ -yis ~ -'is*	*=ɟe*	*-gi*	*-ki ~ -i*
Genitive	*-kyi ~ -gi ~ -gyi ~ -yi ~ -'i*	*=gi*	*-gi*	*-gi ~ -yi*
Dative	*-la*	*=la*	*-lu*	*-le ~ -ge ~ -nge ~ -e*
Locative	*-na*		*-la*	
Ablative	*-las*	*=ne*	*-le*	*-leki ~ -geki ~ -ngeki ~ -eki*
Elative	*-nas*			
Comitative	*-dang*	*=daŋ*	–	*-dang*

Table 4. Comparison of Brokpa cases with related forms

As is often the case, some innovations occurred, such as two functional mergers of case markers which were historically distinct: Written Tibetan dative ལ་ *-la* and locative ན་ *-na* have merged to Brokpa dative *=la*, whereas the Written Tibetan ablative ལས་ *las* and the elative ནས་ *-nas* have merged in the Brokpa ablative *=ne*. It can be observed that while the Brokpa dative preserved the form with the inital <l>, the ablative preserved the forms with the onset <n>, thus eliminating the form starting with <l>, ལས་ *-las*.

Additionally, the plural marker *=ba* has been completely innovated and has clearly been borrowed from the plural *=bak* of the neighbouring Tshangla language, which is not part of the Tibetic subclade of Trans-Himalayan. This borrowing, along with numerous Tshangla loans in the Brokpa lexicon, showcase how even basic number categories can be borrowed from other languages.

REFERENCES

Andvik, Erik. 2010. *A grammar of Tshangla.* Leiden/Boston: Brill [Languages of the Greater Himalaya Region 10].

Beyer, Stephan. 1992. *The Classical Tibetan language.* Albany: State University of New York

Bodt, Timotheus. 2012. *The new lamp clarifying the history, peoples, languages and traditions of eastern Bhutan and eastern Mon.* Wageningen: Monpasang.

DeLancey, Scott. 2003. "Classical Tibetan". In: Thurgood, Graham & Randy LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*, 255–269. London & New York: Routledge.

DeLancey, Scott. 2011. "'Optional' 'ergativity' in Tibeto-Burman languages". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 34.2: 9–20.

van Driem, George. 2014. "Trans-Himalayan". In: Owen-Smith, Thomas & Nathan W. Hill (eds.), *Trans-Himalayan Linguistic*s, 10-40. Berlin: De Gruyter [Trends in Linguistics 266].

Genetti, Carol. 1993. "On the morphological status of case markers in Dolakha Newari". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 16.1: 57–73.

Grollmann, Selin. In press. *A grammar of Bjokapakha.* Leiden & Boston: Brill [Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region 24].

Hahn, Michael. 1994. *Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache.* Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag [Indica and Tibetica, Band 10].

Hill, Nathan W. 2004. "Compte rendu. (Review of Paul G. Hackett, *A Tibetan Verb Lexicon*, Ithaca: Snow Lion, 2003.)". *Revue d'Etudes Tibetaines* 6: 78–98.

Hill, Nathan W. 2012. "Tibetan *-las*, *-nas*, and *-bas*". *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 319.1: 3-38.

Hill, Nathan W. 2015. "Languages: Tibetan". In: *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Vol, 1, 917–924. Leiden: Brill.

Schwieger, Peter. 2006. *Handbuch zur Grammatik der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache.* Halle (Saale): International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies GmbH.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 2010. "The Classical Tibetan cases and their transcategoriality: From sacred grammar to modern linguistics". *Himalayan Linguistics* 9.2: 87–125.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 2014. "The Tibetic languages and their classification". In: Owen-Smith, Thomas & Nathan W. Hill (eds.), *Trans-Himalayan linguistics*, 105–129. Berlin: De Gruyter [Trends in Linguistics 266].

Tournadre, Nicolas; and Karma Rigzin. 2015. "Outlines of Choca-ngachakha. An undocumented language of Bhutan related to Dzongkha". *Himalayan Linguistics 14.2*. 49–87.

Tshering, Karma and van Driem, George. 2019. *The grammar of Dzongkha: Revised and expanded, with a guide to Roman Dzongkha and to Phonological Dzongkha* [Himalayan Linguistics Archive 7].

Sara Rüfenacht
sara.ruefenacht@students.unibe.ch