

神戸市外国語大学 学術情報リポジトリ

Dramatizers in Purik and how they-smack!-evolved

著者	Zemp Marius
journal or publication title	Journal of Research Institute : Historical Development of the Tibetan Languages
volume	49
page range	87-113
year	2013-03-01
URL	http://id.nii.ac.jp/1085/00001407/



Dramatizers in Purik and How They – Smack! – Evolved¹

Marius Zemp
University of Berne

1. Introduction

Purik is a Tibetan dialect² spoken in the Kargil district of Ladakh in Northern India. According to the Census of 2001³, approximately 100,000 people – almost exclusively muslims – have Purik as their mother tongue. Nevertheless, Purik is not taught in schools, and the influence of the national language Urdu as well as of English has been rapidly increasing.

This paper focuses on a peculiar feature of the Purik dialect, namely the word class of dramatizers⁴, which serve the function of dramatizing specific events or facets of events as exemplified in sentences (1) – (3):

- (1) *kwaq loqs*
DRAM⁵ get.up:IMP

¹ I have collected all the data during field trips in 2005, 2007, 2009, and 2010, funded by the Schweizerischer Nationalfonds in the context of the SNF-project 100015_124486 / 1 zur vergleichenden Syntax des Tibetischen, which was led by Prof. Roland Biemeier. I also wish to express my thanks to my main informants Syed Abbas, his son Syed Mehdi, and Kacho Shabir Jawed of Gongma Kargil, as well as their wonderful families and the extremely hospitable people of Kargil in general. Finally, I would like to thank Manuel Widmer for his helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article.

² According to Biemeier et al. (forthcoming), Purik belongs to the Western Archaic branch of Tibetan, together with Balti (spoken to its north, in Pakistan) and Lower and Central Ladakhi (to its east).

³ Cf. <http://kargil.nic.in/profile/profile.htm>.

⁴ In my presentation in Kobe, I still called the same words *intensifiers*, a term that was coined by Schulze (1987: 63) for Sunwar, a Kiranti language spoken in Nepal, and that was later applied to the Tibetan dialects of Yohlmo and Jirel by Hari and Lama (2004: 762) and Strahm and Maibaum (2005: 815), respectively. The present paper will make clear why *dramatizer* is better suited to characterize the primary function of the word class at discussion in the Purik dialect. I derived this term from the “special dramaturgic function” Voeltz and Kilian-Hatz (2001: 3) attribute to ideophones and will therefore generally give the meaning of a dramatizer in brackets and paraphrase it fuzzily with ‘at once’, if it does not express a more particular notion.

⁵ The interlinear glosses used in this paper are AUX - (existential) auxiliary, CAUS - causative, COMP - comparative, COND - conjunction subordinating conditional clauses, COP - (equative) copula, DAT - dative, DIREV - direct evidential (existential auxiliary), DRAM - dramatizer, DUB - dubitative, ERG - ergative, GEN - genitive, IMP - imperative, INESS - inessive, INF - infinitive, INFR - inferential, INT - interrogative, LIM - limitive, LOC - locative,

‘Get up (at once)!’

- (2) *nam-po lqum k^hor-suk*
 sky-DEF DRAM be.clouded-INFR
 ‘The sky was clouded (at once).’

- (3) *toq tʃ^hes*
 DRAM trust
 ‘(I) trusted (her/him) (just like that).’

The use of dramatizers does not seem to be an idiosyncratic trait of Purik. Very similar systems of dramatizers have been described for neighboring Tibetan dialects of Ladakh (cf. Zeisler 2008), the less closely related Tibetan Dialects of Yohlmo (cf. Hari and Lama 2004) spoken in the north of Kathmandu (Nepal) and Jirel (cf. Strahm and Maibaum 2005), as well as the Kiranti language Sunwar (cf. Schulze 1987), the latter two spoken in the east of Nepal. This distribution suggests that dramatizers are not only a common grammatical phenomenon in Tibetan dialects, but may even be an areal feature of the languages spoken in the Himalayas.

However, to the present day dramatizers have barely received any attention from the research community and are often not recognized in grammatical descriptions. This shortcoming is obvious in the case of Purik, where neither of the earlier descriptions (i.e. Bailey 1920, Rangan 1979, Sharma 2004, and Purig 2007) contain any hints as to the existence of dramatizers, and in the case of Sunwar, where Borchers’ (2008) comprehensive grammar similarly appears to completely ignore them, even though they had already been described for the same language by Schulze (1987) (who called them “intensifiers”, cf. footnote 4).

One aim of this study is thus to describe and delineate this word class with its peculiar formal and functional characteristics (chapter 3). The second aim arose out of the impression that the dramatization of at least those events that do not consistently involve a characteristic sound (cf. (1) – (3) again) is not very likely to originate from onomatopoeia. Indeed, a considerable number of dramatizers is shown in chapter 4 to have grammaticalized out of verbs, nouns and adjectives (some of which have to be reconstructed on the basis of data from other varieties of Tibetan), and a smaller number was created by means of alliteration to the verb that is dramatized. The second aim of this paper is thus to reconstruct some of the symbolic (as opposed to iconic) origins of the Purik dramatizers. That there are, on the other hand, still a number of cognate dramatizers in Purik and Jirel indicates that this word class exhibits a certain degree of conservativity and may thus provide us with valuable information on the history of these Tibetan dialects.

MAN - conjunctive participle specifying manner, NEG - negation, NR - nominalizer, POL - politeness marker, PST - past tense, PRS - present tense, REQ - requestive, SIM - participle expressing simultaneity.

The structure of this article is thus as follows: After a short chapter (2) in which dramatizers are embedded in the current research on ideophones, in chapter 3, the synchronic properties of the Purik dramatizers will be described. The sections on phonology and prosody (3.1) and morphology and syntax (3.2) are primarily aimed at formally defining what will be examined with regard to its semantic and especially pragmatic functions in section 3.3. This rather comprehensive section is followed by a shorter section in which it will be shown how a dramatizer may come to have synchronically varying functions (3.4). And in 3.5, a few compounds containing synchronically still used dramatizers are testimony to the entrenchment of these dramatizers. This leads into chapter 4, where the evolution of dramatizers through alliterative processes, from onomatopoeia and the different word classes (verbs, nouns and adjectives) as well as of the dramatizer system as a whole is discussed. Concluding remarks in chapter 5 will round this article off.

2. Ideophones

Dramatizers may be viewed as a subcategory of what has been termed ideophones in current research on the topic. The International Symposium on Ideophones held in January 1999 in St. Augustin, Germany, took the definition of Doke (1935: 118) – even though it does not offer any criteria of defining ideophones as such, as Voeltz and Kilian-Hatz (2001: 2) noted – as its basis, according to which an ideophone is “a vivid representation of an idea in sound. A word, often onomatopoeic, which describes a predicate, qualificative or adverb in respect to manner, colour, sound, smell, action, state or intensity.” Doke’s definition visualizes the elusive nature of the category of ideophones in a single language as well as cross-linguistically. Nevertheless, the functional and formal parallels that were agreed upon in all contributions to the volume on the above mentioned symposium “allow the conclusion that one spoke about the same or similar word class“ (Voeltz and Kilian-Hatz 2001: 3). Since the dramatizers of Purik all share a number of characteristic properties that clearly distinguish them from the bulk of the world’s ideophones, I will restrict myself to adducing in footnotes these differences as well as the most striking parallels found in the contributions to that volume.

3. Synchronic properties of the Purik dramatizers

From the three examples in the introduction it should be understood that dramatizers by definition dramatize the event denoted by the verb they immediately precede. Before we investigate this pragmatic function more closely in 3.3, we will formally describe the word class at question in a section on its phonology and prosody (3.1) and one on its morphology and syntax (3.2). This latter section will include discussions of only those functional aspects that are linked to a morphological alteration. In 3.4, the observation of a few dramatizers with synchronically varying functions is hoped to shed some light on the processes that may generally be involved in the evolution of dramatizers. Finally, in 3.5, the evidence of a few compounds that contain synchronically productive dramatizers suggests that dramatizers are a

well-entrenched word class of Purik that may participate in derivational processes like the members of any other word class.

3.1 Phonology and prosody

Apart from a handful of bisyllabic ones, all dramatizers of Purik are monosyllabic. In their position immediately before the verb they dramatize, they receive an accentuation that exceeds any other syntagmatically present accent in pitch height, often along with an increased intensity and/or duration (relative to other syllables). Typically, this super-high pitch is reached shortly after the beginning of the vowel and may then slightly drop – depending on the sonority of the syllable coda – towards the verb, which is always pronounced at a low pitch level. The stretched realization of the initial consonantal section may delay the attainment of the high pitch and thereby give the impression of a short pause. A similar effect may arise when intensity is substituted by an ostensibly dramatic voice quality.

There are two ways in which the strong accentuation of the Purik dramatizers appears to be related to their phonological peculiarities⁶ and especially their violations of phonotactic constraints all other words comply with.⁷ First, the dramatizer *ʃr* (as used in (16) and (17)) is the only word of Purik that contains a syllabic (and normally fricativized) *r*; syllabic consonants are otherwise alien to the Purik phonology. And it is only in dramatizers – e.g. *sul* (used with *but* ‘fall down’), *rwar* (*tʃʰarpa joŋ* ‘rain’, *rdip* ‘collapse’), *skir* (*loχse joŋ* ‘come back’), or *tir* (*zar* ‘leak’) – that a final liquid is often stretched considerably. Thus, the accentuation certainly exploits sonorous consonants as carriers of either higher pitch, increased intensity, or dramatic voice quality. Second, the diphthong *-wa-* is a very common sound in dramatizers and found after some initial consonants or consonant clusters exclusively in dramatizers, as e.g. in *zwal* (*jas* ‘blossom’), *zgwaq* (*taŋ* ‘hit (hard)’), *χwar* or *ʃrwaq* (*tral* ‘slit’), *lqwat* (*but* ‘fall down’), *rwaŋ* (*loq, gjeŋ* ‘fall down (of sth. long)’), etc. That it is only in dramatizers that such a *-wa-* can sometimes be shown to derive from an old *-o-* (cf. 4.2) is evidence for the special role of the dramatizer-specific accentuation. A few other consonant clusters that almost exclusively occur in dramatizers such as *sqop* (*ʃuk* ‘pour (e.g. rice)’, etc.), *tʰre* (*bo* ‘be spilled, fall (e.g. apricots)’), *krik* (*kʰil* ‘be curled, bent’), and *tʰam* (*spruk* ‘shake’), or the unique combination of a uvular consonant and a front vowel in *qit* (*ba* (neg.) ‘have power’), on the other hand, indicate that conspicuous and presumably expressive sound combinations may also contend with intensity as a means of accentuation.

⁶ This is generally a feature of ideophones in the languages of the world, cf. Voeltz and Kilian-Hatz (2001: 2).

⁷ “Ideophones typically violate the segmental and prosodic constraints of the matrix language.” (Childs 1994: 182)

3.2 Morphology and Syntax

Dramatizers are morphologically very simple.⁸ Somewhat exceptional are those few dramatizers that have two variants that are distinguished by means of voice or aspiration. This distinction closely resembles the one of some pairs of mono- and bivalent verbs (such as *rdip* ‘collapse (intransitive)’ vs. *stip* ‘collapse (transitive)’, *dres* ‘becomed mixed’ vs. *stre* ‘mix’, *tʃʰat* ‘be cut’ vs. *tʃat* ‘cut’, etc.) phonetically as well as semantically, where the voiced and the aspirated variants in (4) and (7) tend to collocate with the non-controllable verb but the voiceless and the unaspirated variants in (5) and (7) with the controllable one.

Analogically distinguished are *tʃet* (*sa-a duk* ‘sit down (on the ground)’) and *tʃet* (*s-eka ʒaq* ‘set, put down (on the ground)’) as well as *ldep/tʃep gul(-tʃuk)* ‘(make) shake (at once)’. In other contexts such as (6), the voiced variant implies the perpetuation and the unvoiced one the initiation of an event.

(4) *lɔwat but-e joŋ-s*
 DRAM fall-MAN come-PST
 ‘It fell down (at once).’

(5) *tʃwat pʰut-e toŋ*
 DRAM throw.down-MAN give:IMP
 ‘Throw it away (at once)!’

(6) *lɔp/tʃap tʰoms*
 DRAM hold
 ‘Hold on (to this)/Get a hold (of this)!’

(7) *di rdwa-o ʃaq tʃax-s-p-in, dekana tʰaq tʃʰax-se soŋ*
 this stone-DEF DRAM break(tr.)-PST-NR-COP and.then DRAM break(intr.)-MAN
 go:PST
 ‘(She) broke this stone (at once), thus (it) broke (at once).’

In a similar fashion (i.e. again in analogy to pairs of causative and neutral verbs), the dramatizer *sqop* might be derived from *qop*. While *qop* is found dramatizing an event such as the falling down of masses of petals, *sqop* is used with masses of more compact and heavier things such as (a bag of) rice or (a great number of) pellets (of sheep and goats). As in the other

⁸ Cf. Kilian-Hatz (2001: 156): “Ideophones are simplexes, i.e. they are not marked for person, tense and mood like verbs, and they are not marked for case, gender and number like nouns. The lack of tense makes sense insofar as the ideophonic event happens simultaneously in the moment when it is uttered; ideophones are generally therefore per se actual.” Childs (1994: 185) writes that “ideophones display very little morphology.”

pairs of dramatizers, the variant resembling bivalent verbs appears to imply more “action”.⁹ That some dramatizers exhibit this verbal property correlates with the observation that a considerable proportion of the Purik dramatizers have a verbal origin (cf. 4.3).

Another morphological alteration dramatizers may undergo is reduplication, which signifies plurality of the event or of a participant¹⁰, as can be seen in (8) and (9).

- (8) *tfuli-u t^ham t^ham spruk*
 apricot-DEF DRAM DRAM shake
 ‘Shake the apricot tree (well) again and again!’

- (9) *ŋa-s k^h-i so-un soq soq taŋ-nug-hii*
 I-ERG you-GEN tooth-PL DRAM DRAM give-FUT-DUB
 ‘I might just knock out your teeth one by one (just like that)!’

Furthermore, the Purik dramatizers may also be modified by the indefinite article *-tʃi(k)*, which is derived from the numeral ‘one’ (*tʃik*). In fact, the meaning expressed by *-tʃi* in the context of (10) and (11) is closer to singularity than to indefiniteness¹¹. More accurately, it delimits the duration of the action expressed by the predicate (typically in the imperative mood) to a degree implied by the context.

- (10) *kwaq-tʃi loŋs*
 DRAM-INDEF get.up:IMP
 ‘Get up (for a moment)!’ (E.g. when the addressee is thought to be sitting on sth.)

- (11) *χar-tʃi brob-aŋ-gii*
 DRAM-INDEF scratch:IMP-IMP-REQ
 ‘Please scratch (my back quickly, until it doesn’t itch any more)!’

⁹ Schulze (1987: 72) describes a similar system for the Sunwar “intensifiers”, as visible for instance in *kor’ hiltsa* ‘to grind quickly (a small quantity)’ vs. *gor’ hiltsa* ‘to grind quickly (a large quantity)’. Gregerson (1984), who describes a similar system for Rengao, a Mon-Khmer language, calls this phenomenon “magnitude symbolism”.

¹⁰ Similarly, reduplication in Sunwar “can indicate repetition or distribution of the action” or “plurality of participants in the action” (Schulze 1987: 67).

¹¹ Other uses of *-tʃi(k)* as well have an intermediate position on the grammaticalization path from the lexical meaning ‘one’ to the grammatical meaning ‘indefiniteness’.

Another suffix that can be joined to a dramatizer is the emphatic¹² marker *-na*, although the only instance I came across this combination was in the following riddle (and variations of it), which appears to mock the dramatizing function of the dramatizers by using it abundantly in connection with a startled deer in (12).

- (12) *rik-tʃi-na* *ʃta-s*, *ʃrwiʃ-tʃi-na* *ba-s*, *ruk-tʃi-na* *k^hums*, *t^har-tʃi-na*
 DRAM-INDEF-EMPH look-PAST D-I-E¹³ do-PST D-I-E shrink D-I-E
ʃkjaŋ-s, *tsat-tʃi-na* *tʃ^hoŋs*, *par-tʃi-na* *p^har*, *laŋs-e-na* *rgjaŋ-s*
 spread.out-PAST D-I-E jump D-I-E bounce get.up-MAN-CONDhit-PST
 ‘(The deer) looked, made “*ʃrwiʃ*”, winced, spread out (its legs), jumped, bounced, and when (I) got up, it took off.’

As mentioned above, dramatizers are always uttered immediately before the associated predicate. This also applies to the complex predicate in (13). Since *rwar* can only be used to dramatize ‘coming (i.e. falling) of rain’ and not ‘coming’ in general, the dramatizer in this case has to be put even before the predicate noun. It explicitly cannot appear after it. This is possible in (14), however, even though *rdzaq* can clearly only be associated with ‘putting wood into the stove’ and not just ‘putting’ in general. It appears that the indefinite article reduces the cohesion between the predicate noun *ʃiŋ* ‘wood’ and the verb *toŋ* ‘give!’, upgrading the former to a direct object by increasing its referentiality.

- (13) *rwar* *tʃ^harpa* *joŋ-s* †*tʃ^harpa* *rwar* *joŋ-s*
 DRAM rain come-PST
 ‘It started raining (just like that).’

- (14) *rdzaq* *ʃiŋ* *toŋ* *t^hap-pw-eaŋ*, *ʃiŋ-tʃi* *rdzaq* *toŋ*,
 DRAM wood give:IMP stove-DEF-INCESS wood-INDEF DRAM give:IMP
 ‘Put (some) wood into the stove (at once)! Put some wood (into the stove) (at once)!’

3.3 Semantics and pragmatics

The most peculiar and defining feature of dramatizers is their dramatizing¹⁴ the event or a facet of the event denoted by the predicate they immediately precede. This entails that

¹² The emphatic marker *-na* essentially contributes to the irony of (12) in that it marks the antecedent element (that dramatizes by definition) as counterexpectational information, which it – one word later, i.e. after the utterance of the verb that is predictable on grounds of the respective dramatizer – turns out not to be after all. The repetition of this pattern pushes the irony even further.

¹³ The repeated gloss-combination DRAM-INDEF-EMPH is abbreviated to D-I-E here.

dramatizers may not be used without such a predicate. On the other hand, they may thus – apart from a few exceptions that will be discussed below – be omitted without actually changing the meaning of a sentence.¹⁵ This appears to be the main reason why my Purik informants would not consider dramatizers to be “real words”¹⁶.

Another consequence of their dramatizing function is that they have a limited distribution with regard to sentence types and speaking registers, most notably that they do not normally appear in questions¹⁷. A specific type of rhetorical question demanding an affirmative back-channel from the hearer – a frequently employed strategy in Purik to establish common ground between the speech-act participants (cf. Clark and Brennan 1991) – is exempted from this rule (as shown in (19) below). And contrary to cross-linguistic tendencies (cf. footnote 17), the Purik dramatizers are also used in negated contexts, as will be discussed at the end of this section.

The specificity of the event that is dramatized varies greatly from dramatizer to dramatizer. Many of them dramatize a specific event that is directly expressed by the verb they collocate with, as for instance *boq* (collocating with *χol* ‘boil’), illustrated in (15):

- (15) *tʰu-u* *boq* *χol-tʰuk-s*
 water-DEF DRAM boil-CAUS-PST
 ‘(I) brought the water to boil (just like that).’

Other dramatizers that dramatize such verbal notions (that will typically be expressed by verbs in other languages as well) are *kwaq* (*laŋs* ‘get up’), *ʃtus* (*ʃu* ‘peel’), *ʃtup* (*ʃor* ‘run away’), *krik* (*kʰil* ‘be curled, bent’), *mur* (*skraq* ‘knead’), *par* (*pʰar* ‘bounce’), *pʰur* (*ne* ‘rub’), *pat* (*droχs* ‘be startled’), *ʃal* (*trut* ‘drag’), *tʰap* (*tsir* ‘wring’), *tʰam* (*spruk* ‘shake (off)’), *tʰiŋ/tʰoŋ* (*laŋs* ‘become erect’), *tʰjaŋ* (*tʰen* ‘pull’), *tʰop* (*tsuk* ‘prick’), *tʰus* (*tʰoχs* ‘crumble off’), *tʰip* (*ʒip* ‘suck’), *tʰir* (*zar* ‘leak’), *tsap* ~ *tsat* (*tʰoŋs* ‘jump’), *tʰop* (*ldat* ‘chew’), *waŋ* (*sat* ‘kill’), *zwal* (*jas* ‘blossom’), etc. There is only a minor difference between this group of dramatizers and the one that is attested in collocation with both mono- and bivalent verbs derived from the same root, which includes *brum* (*gjel* ‘fall’, *zgjel* ‘fell’), *kat* (*bjar* ‘be attached’, *zbjar* ‘attach’), *ʃtiŋ* (*ʒu*

¹⁴ About ideophones in general, Kilian-Hatz (2001: 156) writes that “their function is to dramatize a narration.” Along with her, we may relate this to Kock (1985: 51): “It is the intention, the communicative purpose of ideophones to ‘actualize’ that which it described.”

¹⁵ Similarly, ideophones in Kisi are “a semantically optional element, unnecessary in any referential or information-theory sense” (Childs 1994: 187).

¹⁶ This is in accordance with the experience of field-workers trying to elicit ideophones in general (cf. Voeltz and Kilian-Hatz).

¹⁷ According to Childs (1994: 188), “another common observation is that ideophones appear only in a few sentence types,” i.e. “declarative sentences”, while they are “not found in questions and negative sentences.” Kilian-Hatz (2001: 158) notes that “negated sentences where ideophones may be used are in most cases rhetoric.”

‘melt’), *naq* (*k^hil*, *skil* ‘stop’), *rup* (*k^hums* ‘be crouched, shrink’, *skum* ‘crouch, shrink’), *t^hum* (*züks* ‘be closed’, *tfuk* ‘close’), *tsot* (*t^hjaq* ‘be able to lift’, *stjaq* ‘lift’), and others.

A few other dramatizers are found to collocate with a group of verbs that all share a certain verbal notion, namely the one that appears to be dramatized, i.e. *ʔap* (*t^hams* ‘grasp, get a hold of’, *zun* ‘catch’), *ʔoq* (*tʃ^hes* ‘believe’, *rdjaŋ* ‘trust’), and with a broader variety of verbs *poq* (*p^hut* ‘take out’, *ʃko* ‘dig (out)’), *ʔek* (*k^hil* ‘stop’, *gaχs* ‘be blocked’, *ban(d) ba* ‘close, stop’, etc.), and *χar* (*zar* ‘sweep’, *brap* ‘scratch’), etc. The dramatizer *t^haq* (*zur* ‘peel’, *kas* ‘be cleft’, *tʃ^haq* ‘break’, *zar* ‘leak’, *jas* ‘blossom’, *k^hsu* ‘wash’) appears to dramatize something like ‘separation’, the notion that is shared by all the verbs it collocates with.

Some of the dramatizers that collocate with a variety of verbs can be said to dramatize an inchoative notion. This is significant insofar as some of these dramatizers may be related to an adjective that describes the state resulting from this inchoative process (cf. 4.4), cf. *ʔap* (*nan* ‘press’, *nal* ‘lie down’, *zgu* ‘bend, bow’; < *‘flat, low’), *ril* (*k^hsil* ‘be bent’, *dams* ‘gather’, *zdu* ‘collect’; < *‘round, encircled and thus grouped together’), *saŋ* (*duks* ‘be lit’, *tuk* ‘light’, *p^he* ‘open’, *rdan* ‘gape’; < *‘bright, open’), *siŋ* (*p^hi* ‘clean, sweep’, *p^hiŋ* ‘take out’; < *‘clean’). Other dramatizers that relate to an inchoative notion are more restricted as to which verbs they may collocate with, cf. *bir* (*gaŋ* ‘be filled’, *skan* ‘fill’; < *‘full’) and *ʔep* (*gaŋ* ‘be filled’, *skan* ‘fill’; < *‘full’), *p^hal* (*jas* ‘blossom’; < *‘broad, wide’), *kaŋ* (*p^he* ‘open (wide, of eyes); < *‘wide’), *ʃrr* (*daŋ* ‘become straight’, *laŋs* ‘get up, stand up, sit up’; < *‘straight’), etc. The last example may serve to illustrate how this adjectival meaning is contained to different degrees in the different verbs the dramatizer collocates with. As a consequence, in connection with the verb *laŋs* in (17), *ʃrr* must not be omitted in order to convey the full meaning of the construction.

(16) *ʃrr* *daŋ*
 DRAM become.straight
 ‘(The pole) became straight (at once).’

(17) *ʃrr* *laŋs-e* *duk*
 DRAM get.up-MAN stay
 ‘(Don’t sit there so slouched!) Sit upright!’

A smaller number of dramatizers is found to collocate with complex predicates only, that is, the notion these dramatizers dramatize is somewhat more specific than that of simple predicates and crucially involves a typical undergoer (or noun complement), cf. *lqum* (*nam k^hor* ‘become clouded (sky)’), *qap* (*p^he gam* ‘put flour into one’s mouth’), *fuk* (*pene p^hiŋ* ‘spend money’), *suŋ* (*baŋ taŋ* ‘run’), or *χas* (*so tap* ‘bite’).

Even more specific is the notion that is dramatized by *sqop* in the following examples:

- (18) *sqop tuk, di bras-po sqop di-ka tuk*
 DRAM fill.in this rice-DEF DRAM this-LOC fill.in
 ‘Fill (it) in (at once)! Fill the rice in here (at once)!’
- (19) *nor-is rilbaŋ taŋ-et, sna-a tʃiktʃik hjaŋa joŋ-et, dekana*
 sheep-ERG droppings give-PRS, before-DAT just.one down come-PRS after.that
e-en gaŋma ŋambo sqop joŋ-ma-min-dug-a
 the.other-PL all together DRAM come-NR-NEG-DIREV-INT
 ‘(When) the sheep shits, at first, only one pellet rolls down, then, all the others come
 down at once, don’t they?’
- (20) *p^he sqop mi gam-ba rgo-f-in, gaqs-pa-t*
 flour DRAM NEG eat(of flour)-NR need-INF-COP be.blocked-NR-PRS
 ‘(You) mustn’t eat flour in large amounts at once, (or you) will choke.’

In all these three examples *sqop* dramatizes events that involve large quantities of small (and perhaps by definition identical) items that (are) move(d) into one direction, i.e. in (18) rice that is filled into a bag for storage, in (19) pellets that (*gaŋma ŋambo* ‘all together’) roll downhill, and in (20) flour that is put into the mouth. While in the first two examples the large quantities are thus expressed in the context, this notion exclusively hinges on the dramatizer *sqop* in (20), the omission of which would therefore render the sentence nonsensical (since speakers of Purik consider it very common to put flour into one’s mouth, albeit in moderate quantities). It may not be a coincidence that the dramatizer that cannot be omitted in (20) is one that dramatizes a highly specific notion.

There are a few other dramatizers that crucially depend on a certain composition on part of the undergoer, i.e. *zbur* (*p^hur* ‘fly’, only used in connection with a hole flock of birds), *rwar* (*tʃ^harpa joŋ* ‘rain’, *rdip* ‘collapse’, the latter only if it involves something that will fall to pieces, unlike, e.g., a concrete wall), *t^hre* (*bo* ‘be spilled, fall down’, *p^ho* ‘spill, let fall’, only of a great number of things such as, e.g., apricots shaken from a tree), and *rwaŋ* (*loq, gjeŋ* ‘fall down’, of sth. long only).

A few somewhat unspecific verbs take different dramatizers depending on the specific nuances they are meant to express in a certain context. This is best illustrated by means of the two verbs *t^huŋ* ‘drink’ and *taŋ* in its meaning ‘hit’, which both may be specified by a handful of different dramatizers. Thus, the drinking of a *t^hukpa* (a noodle-soup) may be dramatized with *hur*, the drinking of tea with *tʃap*, the drinking by means of a straw (along with the smoking of a cigarette) with *ʃip*, and the complete drinking up of sth. with *ʃim*. Similarly, depending on the dramatizer it collocates with, *taŋ* may assume different meanings, cf. *k^hjap taŋ* ‘crush (i.e. make flat, e.g. a mosquito)’, *ʃtʃaŋ taŋ* ‘slap’, *ʃap taŋ* ‘hit (causing a lot of pain)’, *zgwaaŋ taŋ* ‘hit (hard)’, or *soq taŋ* ‘knock out (e.g. teeth)’, etc.

Some of the dramatizers used to specify *taŋ* can be shown to dramatize comparable notions in collocation with other verbs, cf. *k^hjap nan* ‘press (together, making sth. flat)’, *soq t^hen* ‘pull (hard)’ (cf. (9)), and *ɬap ʒen* ‘catch fire’. While *k^hjap* can be said to dramatize an inchoative notion resulting in something being ‘flat’ (cf. *k^hjapk^hjap* ‘flat’, and 4.5), the latter two appear to dramatize typically verbal notions like ‘uprooting’ and ‘catching fire, (metaphorically meaning) feeling pain’ (cf. 3.4), respectively.

There are a couple of somewhat less typical dramatizers that serve to dramatize a wide variety of events, cf. the examples illustrating two uses of *lip*:

(21) *lip zo*
INTS eat.IMP
‘Eat (it all up)!’

(22) *lip tʃ^hoŋs-waa, tʃi-a ʒiks-et*
INTS jump-hey! what-DAT be.afraid-PRES
‘Jump (just like that)! What are you afraid of?’

Similarly, the dramatizer *ʒar* may apparently collocate with any action, cf. *ʒar doŋ* ‘go (quickly)!’, *ʒar ɖul* ‘walk (quickly)!’, *ʒar zer* ‘talk (quickly)!’, *ʒar rgjoŋ* ‘eat (lit. fill in, quickly)!’, etc. Note that in contrast to *lip*, which conveys the typical dramatizing notion of ‘immediacy’, *ʒar* always implies ‘high speed’.

A very untypical dramatizer is *ʒop* ‘a lot, too much’, which may not only collocate with a wide variety of verbs such as *ɬops* ‘learn’ or *taŋ* ‘give, put’ and thereby consistently imply a ‘large amount’ but also with the bare (direct evidential) existential copula *duk*. Perhaps it may be said to dramatize the notion of mere ‘existence’.

At this point, it should be mentioned that there is a small number of bisyllabic dramatizers attested in Purik. Interestingly, these all appear to dramatize events that are less punctual than those dramatized by the majority of the monosyllabic dramatizers. This might be evidence for the significance of an iconic principle according to which monosyllabic dramatizers express ‘immediacy’ in depicting punctual events, while bisyllabic dramatizers either directly emphasize that an event must have gone on for a long time (cf. *turuŋ skams* ‘dry (completely, e.g. of clothes), *ɬaraq rat*, and *pampa rat* ‘dry up (completely, e.g. of boiled milk)’ or imply that it must have had some temporal extension by specifying it as to its somewhat complex composition or manner (cf. *ɬorot p^hap* ‘take down (a bird that will fall down in a very specific manner)’, *ʒurut but* ‘fall down after melting (e.g. of a wire)’, and *muruf ɬʃu* ‘twist (so.’s neck and suffocate (her/him)’).

At the periphery of what should be considered dramatizers are those that are used together with the light verb¹⁸ *ba* ‘do’ with its variant meanings ‘make a sound’ and – more general, i.e. synesthetic – ‘produce a sensation’. In collocation with *ba*, the semantic contribution of the dramatizer to the meaning of the predicate clearly prevails over its dramatizing function, cf. *ziu ba* ‘electrify’, *loŋ ba* ‘sway, stagger’, *tsap ba* ‘prick (e.g. the sensation of a mouse bite)’, and the clearly onomatopoeic *friu ba* ‘sound like an arrow’, *χaq ba* ‘prepare to spit’, *zwar ba* ‘sound like a zipper’, and the bisyllabic *firik ba* ‘scrub’, *kurpur ba* ‘growl (of stomach)’, or *št̪faraq ba* ‘sound like metal’, etc. As such a quotative verb, however, the light verb *ba* may be an important vehicle for possible dramatizers to enter the language (cf. 3.4).

There is one last group of dramatizers with rather distinct properties that needs to be discussed here. As illustrated in (23) through (25) below, *kum*, *mu*, and *qit* are all used in negated contexts. Formally, they may thus be distinguished from all the other dramatizers by the negative particle that in most contexts intervenes between themselves and the verb. Their function is also quite distinct from the one of dramatizers used in affirmative contexts: While the latter directly dramatize an event, the former may only indirectly do so, namely by emphasizing that not even the least bit of what is usually affected by the event-type it collocates with is affected by the event. As a consequence of this, the dramatizers that are used in negated contexts normally originate from nouns (cf. 4.4) that denote an entity that may be interpreted as that minimal amount that is not even affected by some event (implying that this event did or will not take place).

- (23) *kum ma dal-tʃuk-s, kum-tʃik dug-loŋ ma joŋ-s*
 DRAM NEG be.free-CAUS-PST DRAM-INDEF stay-time NEG come-PST
 ‘(I) didn’t have (a second of) leisure, (I) didn’t get the time to sit down (for a second).’

- (24) *mu ma fes*
 DRAM NEG know
 ‘(S)he didn’t know anything (at all).’

- (25) *qit ma ba-s, di beʃiri-aŋ sel qit min-duk*
 DRAM NEG do-PST this flashlight-INESS battery DRAM NEG-DIREV
 ‘(The battery) didn’t do a thing; there is no battery (i.e. power) (at all) in this flashlight.’

¹⁸ According to Peterson (2011: 225), these “light verbs” are “extremely productive means of forming predicates from adjectives and nouns and also for accommodating foreign elements as predicates” in Indo-Aryan. In the Tibeto-Burman language Lahu, too, the ideophones “function as adverbials, typically occurring directly before a “dummy” verb of very general meaning for its adverbiality to rest upon” (Matisoff 1994: 120); these verbs have meanings such as ‘to go’, ‘to be’ or ‘to do’. Childs (1994: 187), furthermore, notes that ideophones are “often introduced by a dummy verb with meanings such as “do,” “say,” “quote,” or “think.”

There are at least two examples of dramatizers in my data that are used in both negative and affirmative contexts, i.e. *rdzas* in (26) and (27) and *p^hrik* in (28) and (29). Although I cannot decide which use of the two dramatizers is primary, these examples show that extensions between the negative and the affirmative use are possible (and the respective functions might not be so different after all).

- (26) *ŋa-s k^hjaŋ-a rdzas taŋ-tʃa-men*
 I-ERG you-DAT DRAM give-INF-NEG:COP
 ‘I’m not going to give you a thing (i.e. nothing at all).’
- (27) *rdza-ʃik ɲon-aŋ-wa*
 DRAM-INDEF listen:IMP-IMP-hey
 ‘Listen carefully for a moment!’
- (28) *p^hrik ma skul-ba p^hur-et*
 DRAM NEG move-NR fly-PRS
 ‘(A particular bird) flies without moving its wings (at all).’
- (29) *saŋgul joŋ-se saq p^hrik p^hrik gul-en-jot-suk*
 earthquake come-MAN all DRAM DRAM be.moved-SIM-AUX-INFR
 ‘During the earthquake, everything was shaking (back and forth, again and again).’

3.4 Synchronically varying functions

In this section, we will look at a few dramatizers that are used in different contexts in which they convey varying specific semantic notions in addition to or at the cost of their pragmatic dramatizing function. By internally reconstructing some of the extensions and reanalyses that involve the dramatizers of today’s Purik, we hope to gain some insight into the processes that were also productive in earlier stages of the evolution of the dramatizer system.

Let us first readdress the two metonymical extensions of *ʃrr* and *k^hjap* for that matter. The first of the two, *ʃrr*, is confined to its dramatizing function in collocation with verbs that directly express straightness, as e.g. *qaj* ‘become straight’ (cf. (16)). In collocation with a verb like *laŋs* ‘get up, stand up, sit up’, which is not very specific as to the degree of straightness involved, however, *qaj* expresses the semantic notion of straightness as a result of the action (cf. (17)), somewhat diminishing its dramatizing function. The second dramatizer to be considered here, *k^hjap*, may as well be used with a verb like *nan* ‘press (together)’, which – at least in the context of a shapeable object – entails flatness. In collocation with *taŋ* ‘hit’, however, it is *k^hjap* that specifies the action as to its outcome, i.e. flatness. The direction of both these metonymical extensions cannot be recovered with certainty. Both ways are theoretically possible in both cases. The onomatopoeic look of *ʃrr* insinuates that its semantics might have been coined in the

recurrent collocation with verbs that directly express straightness before it was extended to contexts in which it may itself express that same notion. The dramatizer *k^hjap*, on the other hand, must be related to the adjective *k^hjapk^hjap* ‘flat’. It cannot be decided, however, which of these two uses of the root *k^hjap* is primary.

The analyses of the following instances of semantic-pragmatic variation crucially depend on evaluations by my language informants. Examples (30) – (32) illustrate two analogous cases of a metonymical extension. The dramatizer *spat* is normally used together with the verb *tʃat* ‘cut (off)’, as shown in (30). Somewhat later in the same story (30) occurs in, the story teller, Syed Abbas, uses the same dramatizer to describe how another limb was chopped off of someone, makes a short pause, and goes on to say that the person (whose limb was chopped off) died thereafter, cf. (31). He did not actually pronounce the verb the dramatizer normally collocates with. That *spat* may not dramatize *ʃi* ‘die’ is stated by the story teller’s son, Syed Mehdi, for whom this collocation sounds ungrammatical. Irrespective of the question of grammaticality, (31) illustrates a way in which a dramatizer may adopt autonomous semantics by means of hypoanalysis¹⁹. This is corroborated by an analogous example of an extension shown in (32). The dramatizer *χwar*, which is normally used with the verb *tral* ‘slit’, implies that the killing is done with a cutting instrument, because the verb *sat* only means ‘kill’.

(30) *spat tʃa-s-ʒu-a*
 DRAM cut-PST-POL-INT
 ‘(He) chopped (the arm) off (just like that) (you know).’

(31) *spat ... ʃi*
 DRAM die
 ‘(His head being) chopped off ... he died (just like that).’

(32) *ŋa-s de nor-po χwar sat-s*
 I-ERG that sheep-DEF DRAM kill-PST
 ‘I killed that sheep, slashing it (just like that).’

A dramatizer that is used in a variety of contexts in which its semantics diverge considerably is *ʃap* (cf. (33) through (37)). The respective proportion of semantic content expressed in these contexts appears provide hints as to how the semantic changes may have come about. For instance, the dramatizer *ʃap* most often dramatizes events that involve ignition of some kind. That it is also used with the light verb *ba* in (33) indicates that it might have

¹⁹ In hypoanalysis, "the listener reanalyzes a contextual semantic/functional property as an inherent property of the syntactic unit. In the reanalysis, the inherent property of the context ... is then attributed to the syntactic unit, and so the syntactic unit in question gains a new meaning or function." (Croft 2000: 126-7)

entered the language that way, i.e. as an onomatopoeic (or rather synesthetic, since lightning isn't actually instantaneously auditively perceived) characterization of a lightning.²⁰ From that context it was extended onto non-light verbs describing ignition, as e.g. *bar* in (34). It is only there that it assumes the genuine dramatizing function, clear from any additional semantic notions. It must have then been metaphorically extended to emotional contexts, where instead of 'ignition' it comes to dramatize 'becoming angry' (cf. (35)), and to other sensational contexts, where it dramatizes 'feeling stinging pain' (cf. (36)). The autonomous semantics *ɬap* expresses (according to my informants) in collocation with the verb *taŋ* in its meaning 'hit' in (37) it must have acquired by means of hyponanalysis (i.e. metonymically) from contexts such as the ones shown in (35) and (36).²¹

(33) *skamloq bar, ɬap b-et*
 lightning light *ɬap* do-PRS
 'Lightning struck, it goes "ɬap!"'

(34) *ot-po ɬap bar*
 fire-DEF DRAM light
 'The light went on (just like that).'

(35) *k^ho-a ɬap ʒen-suk*
 (s)he-DAT DRAM catch.fire-INFR
 '(S)he got angry (lit. caught fire) (just like that).'

(36) *k^ho-ika ɬap ber-tʃuk-se toŋ*
 (s)he-LOC DRAM hurt-CAUS-MAN give:IMP
 'Hit her/him and make it hurt (badly)!''

(37) *k^ho-ika ɬap toŋ*
 (s)he-LOC DRAM give:IMP
 'Hit her/him (and make it hurt)!''

²⁰ According to Kilian-Hatz (2001: 161), "direct speech is evidently the preferred pattern in Kxoe to insert ideophones in a sentence."

²¹ It is not clear, whether Jäschke's (625b) *lhab-lháb-pa* "... Sch.: 'to flutter to and fro, to glimmer, glisten' (?)" is related to the Purik dramatizer.

3.5 Dramatizers in compounds

A few synchronically productive dramatizers may also be found in compounds in front of a verb, the whole representing a noun complement of another verb as in *qwaʁlen ldzoq* ‘take revenge (< *return the reception of a hit)’, of a light verb in *soqt^hen taŋ* ‘pull really hard (< *do a(n uprooting) pulling)’, and of the dynamic auxiliary in *t^hrestor tʃ^ha*, ‘explode (< *become lost after falling to pieces)’, but also as the second member, modified by a preceding noun, in *senʃ^haq taŋ* ‘flick (< *do a finger-nail flicking)’. The two parts of the first three compounds preserve the syntactic relations that once tied the dramatizers to their following verb, while they appear to have semanticized the originally pragmatic dramatizing functions. These three compounds shed light on the history of these dramatizers, insofar as they must have been fossilized in one of their most common uses, together with a verb they must have dramatized regularly. This is a kind of dependency that must be considered when etymologizing compounds in the Tibetan dialects. In the fourth compound *senʃ^haq*, the clipped form of the noun *senmo* ‘finger nail’ represents the instrument that is used in the action described by the entire compound (headed by the dramatizer *t^haq*) as a complement of the light verb *taŋ*.

4. The evolution of the Purik dramatizers

An investigation of the origins of the Purik dramatizers indicates that their evolution involves less onomatopoeia than might be expected on grounds of their expressivity.²² A considerable number of dramatizers can be shown to derive from verbs (4.3), nouns (4.4) and adjectives (4.5) that are either still in use in Purik or must be reconstructed on the basis of other varieties of Tibetan. The specificity of the event dramatized may thereby provide us with hints as to what word class a dramatizer might be derived from. Furthermore, a few instances of Purik dramatizers that can be found in other Tibetan varieties in the same function (4.1), along with the observation that alliteration must have been a productive means of creating new dramatizers in both Purik and Jirel (4.2), allows for the conclusion that the dramatizer systems of both these geographically distant varieties of Tibetan derive from one and the same system, which must therefore be reconstructed far back in the history of Tibetan. This, in turn, underlines that the Purik dramatizers that are derived from members of other word classes may shed light on the history of these other word classes as well.

4.1 Old dramatizers

Before we discuss the different origins the dramatizers of Purik may have, we should consider those dramatizers that appear to have adhered to this word class for quite some time, if we do not attribute the correspondences between Purik, Ladakhi, Jirel and sources cited by

²² According to Childs (1994: 189), ideophones generally “differ only quantitatively from the rest of the lexicon” in their exhibiting non-arbitrary relations between sound and meaning. In Childs (1989: 66), he wrote that “only a relatively small proportion of ideophones are usually based on sound.” (cf. also Samarin 1965)

Jäschke to coincidence.²³ The dramatizers that may be reconstructed the furthest back in the history of Tibetan are perhaps *sal*, *buŋ*, and *sul*, which are used in both Purik and the only distantly related dialect of Jirel to dramatize the notions of ‘spreading’, ‘heaping up’, and ‘coming off’, respectively, along with other meanings that can be easily explained as due to reanalyses in the sense described in 3.4. A few more dramatizers are phonetically similar enough and collocate with verbs that have only slightly diverging meanings in these two dialects that they may be assumed to have the same origin as well, i.e. Pur *ril* ‘collect’ ~ Jir ‘cover’ and Pur *t^har* ‘spread, shake (off, e.g. a carpet)’ ~ Jir *t^har*, *t^har* ‘rub on’, Pur *pur* ‘fly’ ~ Jir *bur* ‘fly away’. Although the forms of two more dramatizers are somewhat diverging, the similarity of the events they dramatize suggests that they might be related, cf. Pur *tsir* ~ Jir *ts^hir* ‘squeeze’, and Pur *t^hip* ~ Jir *t^hep* ‘crush, squeeze’.

Two dramatizers are shared by these two dialects with Ladakhi and find further support in Jäschke (1881)²⁴. Pur *kwaq* corresponds to the *koak* Zeisler (2008: 361: “für eine schnelle Aufwärtsbewegung”) finds in the Ladakhi variety of Domkhar. That it is related to Jir *k^hōk* ‘get up’ is strongly suggested by the monophthongal WT form Jäschke (5b) cites, cf. *kog lang-ba* “1. to splinter off 2. to rise suddenly and run away” (cf. below for *-o > Pur/Lad -wa-). Similarly, *lip*, which may collocate with a wide variety of verbs in Purik, is found dramatizing events meaning ‘disappear, set (of sun), enter’ in Jirel. Luckily, Jäschke (547b) already documented it in a clearly dramatizing function for both Ladakhi and Central Tibetan, cf. *lib* “all, Ld.: **lib du-ce** to sweep all together with the hands; C.: **kha-we lib kab song** all being covered with snow.” Zeisler (2008: 362) furthermore attests it for the Upper Ladakhi variety of Khalatse, where it may be used to dramatize the verb *t^heps* ‘jump (in a big leap)’. The dramatizer *lip* thus appears to have been generalized to different degrees in the different dialects.

Another dramatizer that may have been used as a dramatizer since early on is *sar*, which implies immediacy or speed with almost any action, e.g. as expressed by *drul* ‘walk’ or *rgjaŋ* ‘fill in’, and which must be a generalized reflex of the form Jäschke (581a) cites as: “adv. Sch.: severely, rigorously”. Considering his semantic descriptions of *lib* and *kog* above and *kob* right below, if *srar* did not serve a dramatizing function already in the source Jäschke cites (attributed to I. J. Schmidt), it certainly had a suited form (monosyllabic) and meaning to assume a dramatizing function in some other variety (such as Purik). A similar case is *qop*, the dramatizer collocating with the verb *bo* ‘fall off, be spilled’, if it goes indeed back to *kob* “all, Ld. col.” (Jk. 6a).

A few more of Zeisler’s list containing some 20 dramatizers from Upper Ladakhi varieties may be identified with Purik forms, i.e. Domkhar *hur*, collocating with *t^huŋ* ‘drink (fast)’

²³ The sound changes that are involved in the reconstructions of this chapter are extensively discussed in Zemp (2006 and forthcoming).

²⁴ Jäschke (1881) will be abbreviated in the following as Jk.

(Zeisler 2008: 361) as in Purik²⁵, *pok*, used with *skjuk* ‘vomit’ (p. 363), and with ‘take out, uproot’ in Purik, and *Idoat* “für ein plötzliches Fallen oder Schwanken” (p. 361), along with Khalatse *htoat*, corresponding to both *lqwat* and *ʃwat* (used e.g. with *but* ‘fall down’ and *p^hut* ‘throw down’) in Purik (where the voiceless form implies more intensity). Finally, *koar* “für eine vollständige Bewegung“ (p. 361) might be the same as the *kwar* used in Purik to dramatize the verb *k^hor* in its various meanings ‘turn, go for a walk, etc.’. Another striking parallel between Purik and Upper Ladakhi is the frequency of the diphthong *-oa-* (that I prefer to transcribe as *-wa-*) in dramatizers (“Überaus häufig tritt der Diphthong *oa* auf, den die Sprache sonst nicht kennt.” p. 361).

4.2 Alliteration and Expressivization

This leads us to a few general characteristics of dramatizers that must be considered before we can try to reconstruct their evolution from other parts of speech. Most importantly, more than a third of the Jirel dramatizers²⁶ resemble the verb they collocate with closely enough to deserve the label “alliterated”. These alliterations of dramatizers are either fully identical (e.g. *çōp çōp* ‘thin out’), involve a change of the tone of the syllable (e.g. *sil sil* ‘split lengthwise’) or of the consonantal section in the onset (e.g. *t^hik fik* ‘drip’ or *šūp rup* ‘flock together’), or combinations of these, along with certain vocalic correspondences (e.g. *dzok tsòk* ‘stab, poke’, *k^hāp gēp* ‘cover’, or *t^hāp dēp* ‘throw down’).

Purik has only very few apparently alliterated dramatizers, namely *par p^har* ‘move up and down, bounce’, *pur p^hur* ‘fly’²⁷, *pup bups* ‘brood’, and *buŋ spuŋ* ‘heap up’.²⁸ In two more alliterated dramatizers, an etymological *-o-* (as contained in the verb) has – under influence of the strong accent – turned into *-wa-*, cf. *kwar k^hor* ‘turn, take a walk’ and *lwaq ldzoq* ‘turn over, throw down’ (where the verbal roots may be led back to a root **kor* and **loq*, respectively). Another candidate for such a diphthongizing alliteration is the pair of *lqwat but* ‘fall down’ ~ *ʃwat p^hut* ‘throw down’, which may be hypothesized to have originally collocated with a verb **tot* ‘be loose’ (cf. *lhód-pa* “loose ... slackened ...” Jäschke 602b).

²⁵ Cf. also *hūr-po* “1. quick, alert, dexterous, clever. 2. hot hasty, passionate Ld. ...” (Jäschke 597b).

²⁶ I was able to extract these from Hari and Lama’s (2004) data as they have been made exploitable by Marianne Volkart for the project “Syntax of Tibetan dialects” (cf. footnote 1) in Berne.

²⁷ Perhaps not by coincidence, *p^hur* functions as an dramatizer collocating with *ber* ‘to fly’ in Sunwar as well, along with a voiced correspondence that is used when referring to something big, cf. (Schulze 1987: 74):

phur bertsa ‘to fly off in a flurry (of a small bird)’

bhur bertsa ‘to fly off in a flurry (of a large bird)’

²⁸ At the end of Jäschke’s (369a) entry we find “*bung* many (?)”, which might indicate that it already had the function of a dramatizer in that unspecified variety. If it didn’t, the noun *bungs* “mass, heap, bulk” Jäschke cites (ibid.) certainly had the predisposition to be appointed with dramatizing the verb *spuŋ* ‘heap’ in a variety that has dramatizers.

The diphthong *-wa-* appears to be the outcome of a sound change that depends on the strong accent that only regularly occurs in dramatizers. As discussed in 3.1, the lengthened liquids in the coda or even the core of the syllable may also be directly linked with this accent. Other features, however, such as uvular *q-* before a front vowel or clusters like *sq-*, *χw-*, *lqw-*, *zw-* or *ʃrw-*, etc., cannot be directly related to this strong accent. Instead, one may safely assume that these consonants or consonant clusters themselves are perceived to be more expressive than others by speakers of Purik. They all require a clearly increased articulatory effort as they all violate phonotactic constraints of the language outside of dramatizers and onomatopoeia.

Given these facts, it would not be very surprising to find other restricted²⁹ sound changes that apply to dramatizers only and that might be viewed as “accretions” in the sense of Bolinger (1940: 65), i.e. the building of non-arbitrary sound-symbolic associations. The final plosives in a few dramatizers might thus go back to final nasals that were perhaps not deemed expressive enough for their function, i.e. the dramatizing of their collocated verbs, cf. *ldep/ʔtep gull/skul* ‘shake’ < **ldem* (cf. *ldem-ldém-pa* “Sch. to move up and down, ... trembling ...” Jäschke 292a), *ʔtep gaj* ‘be full’ < **ltem* (cf. *ltém-pa* “the state of being full ... overflowing ... *ltem-ltém* so full that it runs over” Jk. 219a), or (less compelling) *ʔtup for* ‘run away’ < **gtum* (cf. *gtúm-pa* “furious ...” Jk. 208a), as well as *ʔip zíp* ‘suck’, where the dramatizer might be an altered form of *ʔim*, the dramatizer of the event ‘drink (up)’. Parallel developments of a final labial in *kat (z)bjar* ‘stick’ < **gan* (“nearness ... *gan-du* close by ...” Jk. 66b) and a final velar in *ʔtjaq skaj* ‘fill up’ < **ʔteŋ* (cf. *lténg-ka* “pool, pond Dzl.” Jk. 219a) might give these rather speculative reconstructions some plausibility. Furthermore, some of the cases in which a retroflex in a dramatizer of Purik corresponds to a dental in WT may also be hypothesized to have been perceived as more expressive and thus generalized by Purik speakers.

The onomatopoeic source may be expected to considerably contribute to the stock of dramatizers in Purik. Together with the expressivization described in the preceding paragraph, this is a factor that makes historical reconstruction difficult. Nevertheless (and having perhaps identified already the most pervasive ones of these expressivizing changes), for many dramatizers we can find etymologies within Purik, in other Tibetan dialects, or in WT that trace them back to all different parts of speech.

4.3 Dramatizers from verbs

Unlike I still claimed in my Kobe presentation, I do not expect the verbs to have entered their dramatizing function through a construction involving the conjunctive *-(s)e*-participle. It is only those collocations with a dramatizer ending in *-r*, *-l*, *-n*, *-t* and *-s* that may like *tsir p^hiŋ* ‘take out (at once)’ have resulted from an originally participial *tsir-e p^hiŋ* (synchronically grammatical, meaning ‘take out by squeezing’), where the *-e* was dropped as in other frequently used instances of the same construction (cf. *p^hut-(e) toŋ* ‘let (it) out (< give (it) after putting (it)

²⁹ According to Mithun (1982: 49), ideophones “seem particularly resistant to regular phonetic change.”

out)!’, *p^haŋ-s(e) taŋ-s* ‘threw (it) away (< gave it by throwing it)’ or *loχ-s(e) soŋ* ‘went back (< went by returning)’, etc.). The other dramatizers that might theoretically originate from such a participial construction are *tʃur(*-e) p^hiŋ* ‘put out (at once)’ (cf. *gčúr-ba* ‘secondary form of *’júr-ba*; *gčúr-phe* Ld. a coarse sort of vermicelli” Jk. 144b), *zbut(*-e) zgo p^hul* ‘push the door (at once < *bellowing)’ (cf. Purik *zbutpá* ‘bellows’ as well as WT *sbúd-pa* ‘vb. to light, kindle ... sbst. bellows” Jk. 404b), and *tʃ^hat(*-e) stor* ‘be lost (at once)’ (cf. Purik *tʃ^hat* ‘be cut (off)’), where the verb that evolved into the dramatizer specified the event expressed by the main verb. Two other dramatizers can be traced back to verbs that are synonymous with the verbs they collocate with, i.e. *p^hur(*-e) ŋe* ‘rub (well)’ and *mur(*-e) skraq* ‘knead (well)’, which is why they appear to dramatize the quality rather than the immediacy of the event. Note that *tʃur*, *zbut*, *p^hur*, and *mur* are found as verbs in the suitable meaning only outside of Purik and even WAT³⁰; the evidence of these dramatizers, however, strongly suggests that the verbs at question were used in an earlier stage of Purik, too.

All the other dramatizers that can be provided with a verbal etymology cannot, however, have originated in a participial form, since the participle has the form *-se* after their finals (*-q*, *-k*, *-p*, *-ŋ*, and *-m*) and the elision of the *-e* (which would have taken place, since its condition, high frequency is also a condition for the entrenchment of the dramatizer) would therefore still have left these dramatizers with an *-s-* that lacks in the dramatizers, as e.g. in *poq p^hut/ško* ‘take/dig out (at once)’ (†*poχ-s(e) p^hut*, but cf. *’bog(s)-pa* ‘pf. *bog* ... to be rooted out, uprooted, pulled out ...” Jk. 395b). All of the following dramatizers are therefore claimed to derive from the verb adduced in parentheses, however, not via the discussed participial construction, cf. *rdzaq siŋ taŋ* ‘put wood into the fire (at once)’ (cf. *gzágs-pa* ‘magnify, multiply Sch.” Jk. 492b), *spaŋ mik taŋ* ‘kiss (at once)’ (cf. *spág-pa* ‘W. to smack” Jk. 329b), *rjaŋ zdam* ‘grasp, hug (at once)’ (cf. *rág-pa* ‘W. for *rég-pa* to touch, feel” Jk. 521b), *soq t^hen* ‘pull (at once)’ (cf. *sóg-pa* ‘... to gather, heap up, hoard up ...” Jk. 579a), *p^hrik gul/skul* ‘move, shake’ (cf. *’phríg-pa* ‘1. to struggle, flutter Cs.; to throb, pulsate, Lt. ...” Jk. 360a), *rup k^hums* ‘wince, crouch (at once)’ (cf. Purik *rup* ‘rush in upon’), *tʃap t^hams* ‘get a hold of (at once)’ (cf. Purik *tʃap* ‘fold’), *siŋ p^hi* ‘clean, sweep (at once)’ (cf. Purik *siŋs* ‘become clear (water)’ and WT ‘**bal sing-ce** to pick out, sort out, **sing cug-ce** to clarify, to purify” Jk. 572b, 573a), *qañ k^hil* ‘stop, wait’ (cf. Purik *qañ* ‘become straight’ and *qañ ba* ‘wait’), *lqum nam k^hor* ‘be clouded (at once)’ (cf. *zlúm-pa* ‘roundish ... to put together, collect“ Jk. 491b-492a), and *t^hum tʃuk* ‘close (at once)’ (cf. *t^hum* ‘wrap, cover’).

Because these dramatizers cannot be abbreviated participial constructions, they must go back to plain verbal stems that were directly converted into dramatizers. The almost complete absence of verbal dramatizers that are synchronically used as synonymous verbs indicates that a conversion of this type is not productive in today’s Purik. At the time it was productive, it must

³⁰ The CDTD attests Nubri *p^hy*: ‘blow’, Tholing (and many CT dialects) *teür* ‘squeeze’, Themchen *m^hp^hər* ‘massage’ and Kyirong *mū(r)* ‘massage’.

have presupposed a stock of well-entrenched dramatizer-verb collocations that provided speakers with a model according to which a verb would be deemed a suitable recruit to enter into the first position. The monosyllabicity of all simple verbs in Purik would seem to be an important but not sufficient precondition to make them at least candidates. However, if we compare the systems of dramatizers of Purik and the distantly related Jirel dialect, we notice that about a third of the dramatizers in the latter system alliterate to the verb they collocate with, while in the former, at the most 7 out of about 130 do. If we hypothesize now that the Purik system as well once contained a large number of alliterated dramatizers, these alliterating dramatizers may at one point have been interpreted as verbs themselves, since they at least closely resemble or were identical with these. If we further assumed that some of these alliterating dramatizers came to be extended onto partially synonymous verbs they now did not resemble any more (e.g. **mur mur* → *mur skraq* or **p^hur p^hur* → *p^hur .ne³¹*), this would provide us with a model that enabled any semantically suited verb (i.e. either largely synonymous with or specifying the verb that is to be dramatized) to assume a dramatizing function in collocation with another verb. It might further be hypothesized that these new non-alliterating, dissimilar collocations came to be perceived as more expressive – perhaps triggered and later paralleled by other expressivizing processes such as the diphthongization of (*)-*o-* to *-wa-* but also the creation of onomatopoeic dramatizers, the innovative force of which is indicated by the considerable number of dramatizer-specific clusters and violations of phonotactic constraints discussed above. Another process that appears to have contributed to the diversification of what were perceived to be good dramatizers is the recruitment of nouns in predominantly negated contexts that will be discussed in the next section. In summary, the mutually fueled productivity of all the processes mentioned in the preceding paragraphs must at one point have opened the way for any monosyllabic word to be converted into a dramatizer. I have tried to make it seem plausible that it was the verblike nature of alliterated dramatizers that sparked the evolution from a mainly onomatopoeic and alliterated and therefore iconic system to a one with a considerable proportion of symbolic tokens.

4.4 The nominal origin of dramatizers emphasizing negation

The dramatizers that are used in negated constructions typically have nominal sources. This results from the fact that nouns are better suited than the members of any other word class to dramatize a negated event. The examples of *rdzas ma zaq-pa* ‘not leaving a thing’ (cf. *rdzas* ‘1. thing, matter object ...’ Jäschke 468a), *ful min-duk* ‘there is not even a trace’³² (cf. *shul* ‘3.

³¹ The verbal *p^hur* perhaps became obsolete and exchanged by *.ne* because of the homonymous *p^hur* ‘fly’. Both **mur mur* and **p^hur p^hur* might furthermore be preserved in the Purik adjectives *murmur* ‘healthy’ and *p^hurp^hur* ‘good (consistence of *khulaq*, a flour dish, which is reached by adding some tea and kneading it)’.

³² Cf. Purik *tfaful* ‘tea-ful, i.e. the remainders of tea in an emptied cup, or the evidence in an empty cup, that someone must have drunk tea from it’, which perfectly corresponds to the meaning given by Jäschke (561a).

any thing left behind by a person departed, or by a thing removed ...“ Jk. 561a), and perhaps *mu ma fes* ‘did not even know a bit’ (if it goes indeed back to the noun *mu* ‘border, boundary, limit, edge, end ...’ Jk. 415b) illustrate how a negated event may well be dramatized by means of a noun implying a minimal amount of an entity the event is indicated not to even affect.³³ For the dramatizer *kum* that is used together with the negated word *dal* ‘have time’ and thereby implies ‘(not even) a moment’, it would not be surprising to find a nominal origin meaning ‘a very short stretch of time’ or ‘a moment’. On the other hand, it might also be of onomatopoeic origin. This might also be the case for *qit*, the dramatizer that has come to be used with the negated light verb *ba* ‘do’ or the existential copula *duk* ‘be there’, which leave the dramatizer with the typically nominal meaning of ‘a minimal movement, a small bit of electricity’.

This does not mean that nouns may not also be applied to dramatize affirmative events. I have found, however, only three candidates for a nominal origin, that is the one in *naq k^hil/skil* ‘stop, bend (at once)’, if it goes back to *nyag* ‘3. ... notch, indenture ...’ (Jk. 184b), and in *buḡ spuḡ* ‘heap up (at once)’, where the dramatizer might either go back to the noun *bungs* ‘mass, heap, bulk’ (Jk. 369b), or is an alliteration of the collocating verb, or – vice versa – the noun *bungs* might itself be a reanalyzed form of the dramatizer *buḡ*, because the action of ‘heaping’ always involves to some extent a ‘heap’. The last example of a dramatizer that might have a nominal origin is *fal*, which collocates with the verb *trut* ‘drag’. Instead of a clipped version of the noun *shal-ba* ‘2. a harrow, *shál-shal-ba* Sch., **shál-la qúd-ce** Ld. to harrow’ (Jk. 557b), however, and given the general scarcity of affirmatively used dramatizers, I tend to think that both noun and dramatizer are actually derived from a verb **shal* ‘harrow’.

Finally, the presumably verbal dramatizer *p^hrik* may also be used in affirmative as well as negated contexts (cf. (28), (29), and 4.3). The negated contexts emphasize the nominal properties of this and other dramatizers (constant use in negated contexts may also secondarily turn a dramatizer into a noun) by implying some ‘minimal amount or other unit (temporal, of power, of knowledge, etc.)’. This is not the case in affirmative contexts, where only unspecific amounts or other units are implied; this is why only concepts that are very unspecific as to their extension (such as ‘heap’) may be applied in or be reanalyzed out of affirmative dramatizer-verb collocations.

4.5 Adjectival dramatizers

A few dramatizers with an adjectival meaning (denoting the result of an inchoative event, cf. 3.3) may also be contrasted with those dramatizers that dramatize rather specific verbal notions (such as ‘fall down’, ‘be cut’, ‘leak’, ‘believe’, etc.). The dramatizers *p^hal* ‘wide’,

³³ An analogous emphasis of the negation was once expressed by French *pas* ‘step’, i.e. a minimal amount of motion, except that *pas* later (prevailing over concurrent nouns exhibiting the same function) came to fully replace the former negation *ne* in today’s spoken French. It is not only the fact that negative dramatizers may also be used in affirmative contexts that prevents the emphasized negation in Purik from entering Pedersen’s cycle (cf. Dahl 1979).

t^har/t^har ‘wide (asunder)’, *ldʒap/ʰtʃap* ‘flat’, *bir* ‘full (to the brim)’, *ril* ‘round, grouped together’, and *saj* ‘open, bright’ can all be simplistically paraphrased adjectivally, denoting the result of the inchoative events they dramatize. At the same time, they can all be related to an adjective in WT, Purik or other varieties of Tibetan (cf. below). In none of these cases, however, is it clear which is the original use of the root. Even if the most straight-forward interpretation is the one of the dramatizer as the root that serves as a base for the adjectival derivations (suffixation and reduplication), it appears equally plausible that the suffixed and reduplicated adjectives were clipped in order to enter the dramatizing function.

In my data, the dramatizer *p^hal*³⁴ collocates with the verb *jas* ‘bloom, unfold’, *t^har* with *t^hiŋ* ‘spread’ and *spruk* ‘shake off (e.g. a carpet)’ and *t^har*³⁵ with *skjaŋ* ‘stretch (out)’, *ldʒap/ʰtʃap* (where the voiceless variant appears to be secondarily derived from the first by means of onset gradation, cf. 3.2³⁶) with *nan* ‘press’, *nal* ‘sleep’, and *zgu* ‘bow, bend down’, *bir*³⁷ with *gaŋ/skaŋ* ‘be filled, fill’, *ril*³⁸ with *k^hʂil* ‘be curled, bent’, *dams* ‘gather’, and *zdum* ‘collect’, and *saj*³⁹ with *p^he* ‘open’, *rdaŋ* ‘be wide open’, *tuk* ‘light’, and *duks* ‘be lit’.

Three more Purik dramatizers can only be related to reduplicated forms either in Purik or in WT, i.e. those in the collocations *ʎaq gret* ‘slip, fall (at once)’ (cf. Purik *ʎaqʎaq* ‘slippery, slick’), *k^hʃap nan* ‘press (at once)’ (cf. Purik *k^hʃapk^hʃap* ‘flat’), and *rik ʰta* ‘look (at once)’ (cf. *rig rig* “*mig rig-rig byéd-pa* or *dug-pa* to look about, esp. in an anxious manner, shyly Tar., Mil.” Jk. 527b). In the cases of *murmur* ‘healthy’ and *p^hurp^hur* ‘good (consistence of *khulaq*)’ (cf. footnote 31), finally, perhaps an entire dramatizer-verb collocation was reanalyzed as an adjective.

³⁴ Cf. Purik *p^haltʃan* ‘wide, i.e. endowed with width’ (also documented for Ladakhi in Jk. 342a), *p^halhil* ‘loose, floppy (of clothes)’ (where *hil* is an abstract meaning ‘looseness’), or the reduplicated “**phal-phál chá-ce**, to feel flattered” from Ladakhi(?), cf. Jk. 341b. However, Jäschke also documents a use of an underived *p^hal* together with the verb *bco* (Purik (*s*)*tʃo*) ‘make’ that appears to be an important light verb to introduce new and esp. adjectival dramatizers in Ladakhi, cf. *phal* “I.? Ld.: 1. **phal cós-se (or te) dug**, step aside! make way!” (Jäschke 341b).

³⁵ Both the alveolar and the retroflex variant appear to go back to the same root but have been specialized differently, cf. also Purik *t^harant^horen-la* ‘astray’, similarly in Jäschke (230a), along with “**thar cós-se dug** Ld. sit wide asunder, not too close together! ...”.

³⁶ Cf. *ljab* “W. flat, plain, even; **ljab-ljáb-ba bor** lay or put it down flat; **ljab có-te dug** sit down flat (on the ground)!” (Jk. 183a).

³⁷ Cf. *byúr-po* “Cs. also *-bu*, vulg. *byur-byúr* heaped, a heaped measure of corn or meal; *byúr-por bkang* Thgy” (Jk. 377b).

³⁸ Cf. *ril-ba* “I. more frq. *ril-po*, *ril-mo* B., C.; **ril-ril** W. 1. round, globular ... 2. whole, entire ... II. ... 2. Bal. **ril-cas** (for *sgril-ba*) to wrap up.” (Jk. 530b).

³⁹ Cf. Purik *sajsaŋ* ‘bright, wide awake’ as well as *saj t^ha* ‘become wide awake, refreshed’, similarly attested for CT (with the dynamic auxiliary *song*) by Jäschke (571b).

5. Concluding remarks

Note that the scenario that was postulated in this article implies that the notions a dramatizer may dramatize diversified in the course of the history of Purik Tibetan and that this, in turn, made an increasing variety of words from all different major word classes eligible to serve a dramatizing function. While both alliteration and onomatopoeia will typically yield dramatizers that dramatize a specifically verbal event (the former because it dramatizes the alliterated verb in its entirety and the latter because a sound is always the result of an event), a certain stock of such dramatizers would have provided verbs with just the kind of model that was needed in order for them to be attracted into serving the same function in the preverbal slot (where they could until then only stand in nominalized forms). Both onomatopoeic and verbal dramatizers were also able to specify an event, i.e. to dramatize only a facet of it. This appears to have opened the doors for adjectives to acquire – in a clipped form – a dramatizing function (if their dramatizing function does not turn out to be older than their adjectival one after all, in which case they might have played a crucial role in an earlier stage of the evolution of the dramatizer system). A further diversification was achieved through the integration of monosyllabic nouns that emphasized negation into the dramatizer system. (Dramatizers such as *rdzas* and *p^hrik*, which can be used in both affirmative and negated contexts, are testimony to this integration). The sum of all these processes accounts for the different degrees of specificity that adhere to the dramatizers as they are synchronically attested in Purik.

I am convinced that similar systems of dramatizers are used in many more varieties of that area, and I hope that this article will encourage other researchers not to continue ignoring this central characteristic of at least some Tibetan dialects. Data from other dialects would be needed to fill the large gap between the dramatizer-systems of Northern India (Purik and Ladakhi) and those of Nepal (Jirel and Yohlmo) and to confirm or refute the above discussed hypotheses on the evolution of the Western Tibetan dramatizer system as a whole. Quite generally, dramatizers are as valid a source of information as any other lexical and grammatical material for the comparative reconstruction of the evolution of the Tibetan dialects. And specifically, it has been shown in this article that some dramatizers allow us to internally reconstruct certain verbs and nouns for an earlier stage of that variety.

Finally, the impression that some of the alliterated dramatizer-verb collocations of Jirel resemble stem alternation patterns of WT along with the observation that even those Tibetan dialects that share some features of the WT stem alternation (i.e. especially Amdo, but also some Kham and Central Tibetan dialects, among these Jirel) unlike WT never have a “separate future stem” (Bielmeier 2004: 401) suggests that for some of those WT verbal stems that have been assumed to lack any traces in the modern dialects we should also consider dramatizers as a possible source.

Bibliography

- Bailey, T. Grahame.
 1920. *Linguistic Studies from the Himalayas*. Asiatic Society Monographs 18. London.
- Bielmeier, Roland.
 2004. Shafer's proto-West Bodish hypothesis and the formation of Tibetan verb paradigms. In Saxena, Anju, ed. *Himalayan languages – past and present* (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 149). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 395–412.
- Bielmeier, Roland, *et al.*
 Forthcoming. *Comparative Dictionary of Tibetan Dialects (CDTD)*. Verbs. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bolinger, Dwight L.
 1940. Word Affinities. *American Speech* 15(1): 62–73.
- Borchers, Dörte.
 2008. *A grammar of Sunwar*. Brill's Tibetan studies library: Languages of the Greater Himalayan region 5/7. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Childs, G. Tucker.
 1989. Where do ideophones come from? *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 19(2): 57–78.
- Childs, G. Tucker.
 1994. African ideophones. In Hinton, Leanne, *et al.*, eds. *Sound Symbolism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 178–204.
- Clark, H. H. and S. E. Brennan.
 1991. Grounding in Communication. In Resnick, L. B., *et al.* eds. *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association: 127–149.
- Croft, William.
 2000. *Explaining Language Change: An Evolutionary Approach*. London: Longman.
- Dahl, Östen.
 1979. Typology of Sentence Negation. *Linguistics* 17: 79–106.
- Doke, Clement Martin.
 1935. *Bantu linguistic terminology*. London: Longmans, Green.
- Gregerson, Kenneth.
 1984. Pharynx symbolism and Rengao phonology. *Lingua* 62: 209–238.
- Hari, Anna Maria and Chhegu Lama.
 2004. *Yohmo - Nepali - English Dictionary*. Kathmandu.

Jäschke, Heinrich August.

1881. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul LTD.

Kilian-Hatz, Christa.

2001. Universality and diversity: Ideophones from Baka and Kxoe. In Voeltz, F. K. Erhard, and Christa Kilian-Hatz, eds. *Ideophones*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 155–163.

Kock, Inie J.

1985. The speech act theory: A preliminary investigation. *South African Journal of African Languages* 5: 49–53.

Matisoff, James A.

1994. Tone, intonation, and sound symbolism in Lahu: Loading the syllable canon. In Hinton, Leanne, et al., eds. *Sound symbolism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 115–129.

Mithun, Marianne.

1982. The synchronic and diachronic behavior of plops, squeaks, croaks, sighs, and moans. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 48: 48–58.

Peterson, John M.

2011. *A grammar of Kharia: a south Munda language*. Leiden: Brill.

Purig, Rinchan.

2007. *Purig skad = The Purig language*. Karachi: Purig Shazdeychan Foundation.

Rangan, K.

1979. *A grammar of Purki, a language of the Tibeto-Burman family, spoken in Ladakh District, Kashmir*. Grammar Series 5. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Samarin, William John.

1965. Perspective on African ideophones. *African Studies* 24(2): 117-121.

Schulze, Marlene.

1987. Intense Action Adverbials in Sunwar: a verbal intensifier system. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 10(1): 63–85.

Sharma, D.D.

2004. *Tribal Languages of Ladakh. Part III: A descriptive Grammar of Purki & Balti*. Studies in Tibeto-Himalayan Languages VI. New Delhi: Mittal Publications.

Strahm, Esther, Anita Maibaum.

2005. *Jirel - Nepali - English Dictionary*. Kathmandu.

Voeltz, F. K. Erhard and Christa Kilian-Hatz (eds.).

2001. *Ideophones*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Zeisler, Bettina.

2008. Wenn du deine Mühle gemahlen hast, womit mahlst du dann dein Mehl? – Idiomatiche Wendungen im Ladakischen. In Huber, Brigitte, Marianne Volkart and Paul Widmer, eds. *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek*. Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag, Band I: Chomolangma. IITBS. 359–88.

Zemp, Marius.

2006. *Synchronic and Diachronic Phonology of the Tibetan dialect of Kargil*. Lizentiatsarbeit Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Bern.
- Forthcoming. Purik Tibetan. In Sun, Jackson T.-S., ed. *Phonological profiles of little studied dialects of Modern Tibetan*, Volume I (Language and Linguistics Monograph Series).

<http://kargil.nic.in/profile/profile.htm> (31.3.2012)