

ACTA LINGUISTICA HAFNIENSIA

founded in 1939 by Viggo Brøndal and Louis Hjelmslev

EDITORS

Søren Egerod · Michael Fortescue · Jørgen Rischel
Jens Elmegård Rasmussen (secretary)

EDITORIAL ADDRESS

Department of Linguistics, University of Copenhagen, Njalsgade 96,
DK-2300. Copenhagen S, Denmark.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

C. A. Reitzels Forlag, Nørregade 20, DK-1165. Copenhagen K,
Denmark.

SEE INSIDE BACK COVER FOR INFORMATION TO CONTRIBUTORS.

THE NEWAR VERB IN TIBETO-BURMAN PERSPECTIVE

by

GEORGE VAN DRIEM

Rijksuniversiteit Leiden

1. The Newar dialects and Dolakha verbal morphology

Newar is the Tibeto-Burman language native to the Kathmandu Valley of Nepal. The Newars are the sole Tibeto-Burman people to have adopted both a Sanskrit literary tradition and the Indo-Aryan caste system. The very name *Nepāl* originally referred to the Newar homeland in the Kathmandu Valley, and the term is still often used throughout the modern Kingdom of Nepal to refer just to the Kathmandu Valley. Only later did the name Nepal come to apply to the modern state consolidated by the campaigns of the eighteenth-century Indo-Aryan conqueror from Gorkhā, Pṛthvī Nārāyaṇ Śāh, and his military successors. The word *Nevār*, which first appears in local sources in *Nepāl Samvat* 772 (i.e. 1652 AD), is the spoken Prakṛt derivation of fourth century Sanskrit *Nepāla*. The Sanskrit term *Nepāla* derives from an older form **nepa*, or **ṇeṇpa*, of the autonym *Nevāḥ* 'Newar' by analogy with Sanskrit toponyms like *Himāla* and *Baṅgāla*. The second element of the old autonym, *-pa*, is a masculine Tibeto-Burman nominal suffix meaning 'the person who' or 'that which'. The first element, *ne-*, is the root of the original autonym. Various speculative etymologies have been proposed, such as **ne-*, allegedly 'middle', and **-pa*, allegedly 'country', giving a toponym meaning 'Middle Land' (Nepāl 2040: 11), or Tibeto-Burman **ṇe-* 'cow' + **-pa* 'man, keeper', i.e. 'cowherd', whereby the name *Nepāla* is presumed to be derived by analogy with Sanskrit *gopāla* 'cowherd' (Kamal Prasād Malla, as quoted in Gellner 1986: 117).

The language autonym is *Nevāḥ Bhāy* [neva: bḥæ] 'Newar language' or, in the Paharī dialects, [neva: pai]. The formal Sanskrit term *Nepālabhāṣā* for the Newar language has been in use since the late fourteenth century, and the

Sanskritic terms *deśabhāṣā* ‘language of the land’ and *rāṣṭrabhāṣā* ‘national language’ have also been in use for centuries. In modern Nepali, the preferred terms for the Newar language are *Nepāl-Bhāṣā* or *Nevār-Bhāṣā*, although the term *Nevārī* is certainly more commonly used. Use of the Nepali term ‘Newari’ by English speakers, with its Indo-Aryan suffix <-ī>, is increasingly felt to be objectionable by Newars. Therefore, I use the term ‘Newar’, which has recently become the term of preference in English parlance. After the Gorkhā Conquest in the late eighteenth century, the Kathmandu Valley underwent a large influx of speakers of the Indo-Aryan language known variously as *Gorkhālī* ‘the language of Gorkhā’, *Parvatīya* ‘mountain dialect’ or *Khas Kurā* ‘the language of the Khas’, who were the Indo-Aryan group originating from western Nepal which originally spoke the language. This language was only declared the national language or *rāṣṭrabhāṣā* of Nepal in 1905 by Candra Śamśer Rāṇā, who simultaneously changed the name of the language officially to Nepālī, although the British had already begun to use the term ‘Nepali’ to refer to the Indo-Aryan tongue of Nepal. Historically speaking, the very name of the native Tibeto-Burman language of the Kathmandu Valley was in this way usurped by the Indo-Aryan newcomers and applied to their own allochthonous and unrelated language.

On the basis of dialectological studies, Dayā Ratna Śākya (1989, 1992) divides the various Newar dialects into five groups: (1) the dialects of Kāṭh-māṇḍū and Pāṭan, (2) Bhaktapur, (3) Paharī,¹ (4) Citlāṅg, and (5) Dolakhā. With the exception of Dolakha Newar, all these dialects are spoken primarily in the Kathmandu Valley or in the surrounding hill tracts. The most divergent and conservative dialect is the language spoken in Dolakhā, an ancient Newar settlement dating at least as far back as the Licchavī period (ca. 300-879), and located some 130 km east-northeast of Kathmandu, in the Dolakhā

1. Paharī is not to be confused with Pahādī or Pāḍhī, which terms apply not to Newar, but to certain montane dialects of the Indo-Aryan language Nepali, although all three terms are erroneously glossed as synonyms in the authoritative Nepali dictionary (Pokhrel *et al.* 2040). Māī researched a Paharī dialect spoken in the village of Lele near Baḍīkhel in the south of Lalitpur District. Lele is immediately adjacent to the larger village of Pyāṅgāū, which numbers some 2,000 families. The latter Newar dialect, however, belongs to the Pāṭan group. The location of the Paharī speaking village of Lele within the Kathmandu Valley is anomalous. Paharī proper is spoken in Kābhre Palāṅcok and Sindhu Palāṅcok Districts (Dayā Ratna Śākya 1989, 1992 & personal communication, Kathmandu, 29 November 1992).

2. I should like to thank Dayā Ratna Śākya and Carol Genetti for their valuable comments on a preliminary version of this article.

District of Janakpur Zone. A splendid study has been devoted to Dolakha Newar (Nep. Dolakhālī Nevārī) by Carol Genetti (1990), from which all the Dolakha data in this article have gratefully been quoted, and Genetti (1988b) has also written a lucid contrastive study of Kathmandu and Dolakha Newar. My synchronic analyses differ from Genetti’s on several rather minor points. In this article, I discuss the Dolakha material and Genetti’s findings, make a number of observations of my own and undertake to compare Newar verbal morphology to the conjugations of related Tibeto-Burman languages.²

Whereas the Dolakha verb shows person and number agreement with the subject (intransitive subject and transitive agent) in all tenses, the conjugation of Kathmandu Newar distinguishes conjunct from disjunct forms. Generally speaking, the *conjunct* is the form used with a first person subject in statements and with a second person subject in questions, and the *disjunct* is the form used with second and third person subjects in statements and with first and third person subjects in the interrogative. The verb of a subordinate clause in reported speech is *conjunct* when the subjects of main and subordinate clause are coreferential, and *disjunct* when they are not (Malla 1985: 38, Hargreaves 1989: 1). The conjunct/disjunct conjugation of Kathmandu Newar apparently derives from the Classical Newar system, whereas the Classical Newar system derives from a more complete verbal agreement system more faithfully reflected in the Dolakha verb.

In TABLE 1 the indicative conjugation is given of the Dolakha verb *yeri* ‘to do’, with stem <yet>, as provided by Genetti (1990: 131). Dolakha verbs have the stem finals /n/, /t/, /r/ or /l/ and are often more archaic in form than their Kathmandu counterparts, e.g. Dolakha <syāt> ‘kill’ vs. Kathmandu <syā>, Dolakha <bir> ‘give’ vs. Kathmandu <bi>. The tense morphemes are affixed immediately to the stem and occupy the first suffixal slot in the affixal chain of a Dolakha verb. The past habitual suffix is <-gu>, devoiced to <-ku> after stem final /t/ and with the allomorph <-u> after stem final /r/. Stem final /t/ and /r/ elide before this suffix. The past tense is zero-marked in Dolakha. The present tense suffix is <-a>. The future suffix is <-i>, with the allomorph <-e> before a suffix /u/ or /ŋ/. Before this suffix, stem final /t/ becomes /r/, and final /r/ becomes zero. A stem final /n/ alternates paradigmatically with /ŋ/ and with nasalization of the stem vowel in a fixed pattern.

TABLE 1: Conjugation of <yet> 'to do' (Genetti 1990: 131)

	PAST HABITUAL	PAST	PRESENT	FUTURE
1s	ye-ku-ī	yet-ki	yet-a-gi	yer-i
1p	ye-ku-pe	yet-ku	yet-a-gu	yer-i
2s	ye-ku-n	yet-mun	yet-a-n	yer-i-na
2p	ye-ku-min	yet-min	yet-a-min	yer-i-nan
2hon	ye-ku-pe	yet-ku	yet-a-gu	yer-i-ta
3s	ye-ku-ju	yet-cu	yet-a-i	yer-e-u
3p	ye-ku-tan	yet-hin	yet-a-hin	yer-e-u

The person and number suffixes follow the tense suffixes in the affixal chain of the Dolakha verb, and there are a large number of tensed, and therefore tense-redundant, *portemanteau* morphemes. In my analysis, the choice in favour of tensed *portemanteaux* above tense-motivated allomorphy is determined by formal considerations.

First person singular is marked by <-gi> in past and present (devoiced to <-ki> immediately after stem final /t/) and by a zero allomorph in the future. Dolakha has a distinct first singular past habitual morpheme <-ī>. First person plural is marked by <-gu> in past and present (devoiced to <-ku> immediately after stem final /t/) and by a zero allomorph in the future. There is a distinct first plural past habitual suffix <-pe>. The second person honorific forms are identical to the first person plural forms in the present, past and past habitual tenses, but there is a distinct second person honorific suffix <-ta> in the future. The Dolakha second person honorific appears to have originated in a polite inclusive usage such as that observed in various modern Kiranti languages (van Driem 1987, 1993b).

The second person singular suffix is <-mun>, with the abbreviated allomorph <-n> in the present and past habitual, and the allomorph <-na> in the future. The second person plural suffix is <-min>. In the future, second person plural subject is indexed by the suffix <-nan>.

The suffix <-ju> (<-cu> immediately after stem final /t/) indexes a third person singular subject in the past habitual. The same suffix indexes third singular agent in the past of transitive verbs. In the past of intransitive verbs, however, a third person singular subject is indexed by the morpheme <-a>, e.g. *on-a* 'he/she went', *khora-a* 'he/she cried'. With the exception of this morpheme, there is no difference between the transitive and intransitive paradigm in the Dolakha non-negated indicative conjugation. A third singular subject in present time is marked by the suffix <-i>. Third person plural is marked by

the suffix <-hin>. A third plural subject in past habitual time is indexed by <-tan>. In the future, a third person subject is unmarked for number and indexed by the suffix <-u>.

TABLE 2: Dolakha tense and verbal agreement morphemes

SUFFIXAL SLOT 1: TENSE

<-ku ~ -u>	past habitual
<∅>	past
<-a>	present
<-i ~ -e>	future

SUFFIXAL SLOT 2: PERSON AND NUMBER

<-ki ~ ∅>	first person singular (1s)
<-ī>	first singular past habitual (1s/PH)
<-ku ~ ∅>	first person plural (1p), second person honorific
<-pe>	first plural past habitual (1p/PH), second person honorific past habitual
<-ta>	second person honorific future (2hon/F)
<-mun ~ -n ~ -na>	second person singular (2s)
<-min>	second person plural (2p)
<-nan>	second person plural future (2p/F)
<-ju>	third person singular in past tenses (3s/HP/PT)
<-a>	third person singular past intransitive subject (3sS/PT)
<-i>	third singular subject present (3s/PR)
<-hin>	third person plural (3p)
<-tan>	third person plural past habitual (3p/PH)
<-u>	third person future (3/F)

Indicative forms are negated by the prefix <ma->, which exhibits the vowel harmonic allomorphs <mo->, <mā-> and <mwā->. The tense distinction past vs. present is neutralized in the negative, and Genetti reports that negative forms of the past habitual and future do not exist. In the tenseless negative indicative, the flexional endings are the same as those of the past tense except in the third person singular. In the negative indicative, the third person singular ending is zero except after *transitive* r-stem verbs, where it is <-u>, e.g. *ma-sit* 'didn't/doesn't/won't die' vs. *ma-bi-u* 'didn't/doesn't/won't give' (from <bir-> 'to give').

Dolakha Newar also shows agreement in the imperative and optative. The singular imperative ending is zero, e.g. *syāt!* ‘kill’, *yā!* ‘come’ (from <yār-> ‘to come’), but it is <-u> after *transitive* r-stems, *na-u!* ‘eat!’ (from <nar-> ‘to eat’). The plural imperative ending is <-dun> after stem final /l/, <-un> after stem final /t/, and <-n> after stem finals /n/ and /r/, e.g. *pul-dun!* ‘pay!’, *sīt-un!* ‘die!’, *yā-n!* ‘come!’ (from <yār-> ‘to come’), *to-n!* ‘drink!’ (from <ton-> ‘to drink’). Honorific imperatives are indexed by the suffix <-sin> suffixed to the infinitive stem of the verb. Imperatives in the singular and the plural imperatives of intransitive verbs are negated by adding the prefix <da->, which has the vowel harmonic allomorphs <do->, <dā-> and <dwā->, e.g. *do-kho!* ‘don’t cry!’ [sg.] (from <khor-> ‘to cry’), *da-sīt-un!* ‘don-t die!’ [pl.]. Transitive verbs with a plural subject, however, form their negative imperative by prefixation of negative <da-> and suffixation of the second person plural suffix <min->, e.g. *da-nyāt-min!* ‘don’t buy!’.

In Dolakha, the optative was apparently attested only with third person subjects, and Genetti does not mention the existence of a negative optative in Dolakha. The singular optative is formed by prefixation of the optative morpheme <tha->, with the vowel harmonic allomorphs <tho->, <thā-> and <thwā->, to the singular imperative form of the verb, e.g. *tha-cō!* ‘may he stay!’ (from <con-> ‘to stay’), *tha-na-u!* ‘may he eat!’ (from <nar-> ‘to eat’). Plural optatives are formed by prefixation of optative <tha-> and suffixation of the third person plural suffix <-hin> to the stem of the verb, whereby the stem finals /n/ and /r/ elide, and stem finals /t/ and /l/ are maintained, *thamwāl-hin!* ‘may they search [for it]’, *tha-nyāt-hin!* ‘may they buy [it]!’, *tho-to-hin!* ‘may they drink!’ (from <ton-> ‘to drink’), *thā-yā-hin!* ‘may they come!’ (from <yār-> ‘to come’).

The abbreviations used in tables in the next two sections are clarified below. Abbreviations are avoided elsewhere. In Section 3, superscript numbers in the verbal morphemes of several languages indicate a given tone in that language (cf. van Driem 1993a).

1	first person	A	agent
2	second person	S	subject
3	third person	P	patient
s	singular	→, ↔	indicate the direction of
d	dual		a transitive relationship
p	plural		
ns	non-singular	PT	preterite
hon	honorific	NPT	non-preterite

i	inclusive	HP	habitual past
e	exclusive	PR	present
REF	reflexive	F	future
pf	prefixal slot (followed by the slot number)		
sf	suffixal slot (followed by the slot number)		

2. Proto-Newar

Dolakha Newar distinguishes more than the two basic or ‘simplex’ tenses, viz. preterite and non-preterite, characteristic of Kiranti languages as well as of Kathmandu Newar. The anomaly of the Dolakha four-way tense distinction in the comparative context suggests that the Dolakha tense system is innovative, and on the basis of internal reconstruction Genetti (1990: 182) proposes ‘that the Dolakha system has innovated the present and the past habitual tenses, and that a past/non-past distinction should be reconstructed for Proto-Newar’. Because the present tense morpheme <-a> undergoes no morphophonological alternations, Genetti (1990: 141, 183) sees reason to suppose that this suffix could be ‘a relatively recent concatenation’, perhaps originating from an auxiliary construction with ‘the verb *yār-* “to come”, which may fit phonologically, since r-stems would be the most likely to undergo erosion in a construction of this sort’. Genetti (1990: 183-4) posits an etymological relationship between the past habitual suffix <-gu ~ -ku ~ -u> and the Dolakha first nominalizer/relativizer suffix, which has the allomorph <-gu> after the stem finals /n/ and /l/ and the allomorph <-u> after stem finals /t/ and /r/. The Dolakha first nominalizer/relativizer suffix is used in relative clauses ‘when the head noun is the subject of the relative clause’, whereas the Dolakha second nominalizer/relativizer suffix in <-a ~ -e> ‘is used when the head noun is in any other grammatical relation to the relative clause verb’ (Genetti 1990: 177). Of the two remaining tenses, past is the zero-marked tense in Dolakha, as it is, for example, in Dumi (van Driem 1993b).

In assessing the arguments for reconstructing a conjunct/disjunct system for Proto-Newar, Genetti (147-51) points out that the Dolakha phenomenon of first person agreement in complements of *verba dicendi et sentiendi* where the subjects of main and subordinate clause are coreferential is only superficially similar to the Kathmandu Newar use of the conjunct verb form in the complements of *verba dicendi et sentiendi* when the subject of main and subordinate clause are coreferential, and the disjunct verb form when it is not. Genetti

(151-5) describes how the ‘optional use of third person morphology with non-volitional first and second person actors’, for example, with verbs like *siri* <sit-> ‘to die’, *turi* <tut-> ‘to shiver’, *tuli* <tul-> ‘to fall’, *burā jui* <jur-> ‘grow old’, marks ‘the semantic category of volitionality’. These two Dolakha phenomena show that the ‘use of verb agreement for referent tracking in complement clauses and for marking absence of volition in non-control verbs are in principle independent of the other parameters of the conjunct/disjunct system’, and neither phenomenon provides a conclusive argument to reconstruct a conjunct/disjunct system for Proto-Newar (Genetti 1990: 155, 185-6).

Genetti (1990: 185-93) presents several arguments in favour of reconstructing verbal agreement for Proto-Newar. Her first argument is the sheer extent of the Dolakha agreement system, which operates not only in the indicative, but also in the imperative and optative. Her second argument is that Classical Newar had retained vestiges of an agreement system. Jørgensen (1941: 60-1) describes that of the three morphs <-am ~ -a ~ -o> of the Classical Newar ‘A1’ form,³ which Genetti identifies as ‘the precursor of the modern Kathmandu past disjunct’, were not used in the same way: The morph <-am> was used with the third person, the morph <-o> with the first and second person, and the morph <-a> with any person in direct speech preceding the direct speech marker *dhakam*. Preliminary reports by Dayā Ratna Śākya indicate that a first and second vs. third person opposition may also exist in the verbal morphology of Paharī dialects of Newar, spoken in the hills tracts surrounding the Kathmandu Valley (Genetti 1990: 199). Genetti’s third argument is that comparative study of Newar pronominal systems indicates that there was no ‘pronominal source’ in Proto-Newar that could have provided the elements now found as flexional affixes in Dolakha, except that there could perhaps be an etymological relationship between the modern Dolakha and Kathmandu pronoun *ji* ‘I’ and the Dolakha first singular ending <-gi>, whereby the former would represent a palatalized reflex of a common Newar first singular etymon, and between the element /i/ in the Kathmandu Newar pronoun *i-pi*: ‘they’ and the element /hi/ in the Dolakha third person plural suffix <-hin>. In fact, a comparison of the flexional suffixes of the Dolakha verb and the independent pronouns corroborates Bauman’s conclusion that the conjuga-

3. In Classical Newari, form ‘A1 is a finite verb, A2 and C1-3 are imperatives, A3-7 are used predicatively as finite verbal forms, attributively and substantively as relative participles or relative clause-equivalents, and as verbal nouns; the rest [viz. forms A8-12, B1-7, C4-8] (including some cases of A4-6 ...) are used as infinitives of purpose, adverbial and conjunctive participles, and as subordinate clause-equivalents’ (Jørgensen 1941: 59-60).

tional systems of Tibeto-Burman languages, and consequently any ancient pronominal system they may reflect, are more conservative than the independent pronominal systems attested in individual languages.

Previously I have related both the Kathmandu relative <-mha> for animate referents (replaced in the plural by the plural suffix for animate nouns <-pī:>) and the Hayu assertive marker <-mi ~ -m> to an ancient copula, of which the Dumi fourth conjugation intransitive verb ‘to be’ for animate referents <-mo:-/-mī/-mu-> is a reflex. The Kathmandu relativizer for inanimate referents <-gu>, on the other hand, is cognate with the Dumi fourth conjugation intransitive verb ‘to be’ for inanimate referents <-go:-/-gī/-gu-> (van Driem 1990b: 569-70, 1990c: 278-9). Therefore, I would be inclined to believe that the occasional use in Kathmandu of the relativizer <-gu> ‘in some sentence-final finite contexts’ does not indicate ‘a development from nominalized to finite verb’, as Genetti (1990: 194-5) hypothesizes, but is rather a vestige of the use of <-gu> as a finite.

From Jørgensen’s (1941: 59-70) descriptions, it can be seen that the meanings of Classical Newar finite forms were already something like those of the modern Kathmandu tenses. Of the Classical Newar A1 and A6 forms, which were later to give rise to the modern Kathmandu past tense disjunct and past tense conjunct respectively, Jørgensen writes that the A1 form denoted ‘a completed action’, although its meaning had apparently not yet become wholly restricted to past tense contexts, and that the A6 form likewise ‘generally denote[d] a completed action’. The instances cited by Jørgensen in which the A6 form is used in what appears to be non-past meaning, and for which Jørgensen provides a present tense translation, might actually represent cases of a perfective past, conveying a meaning similar to that of the English present perfect, e.g. *je vayā* ‘I have come’, *jen sayā* ‘I have come to know’, *bho mantri-ju, chu ujan dayakā* ‘Oh honourable Minister, what order have you given?’. Of the A3 and A4 forms, which were to become the Kathmandu non-past disjunct and conjunct, Jørgensen writes that the A3 form denoted ‘either a customary or habitual action, or a future action’, and that the A4 form denoted ‘an action which ought to be done, might be done, or is intended to be done’. Jørgensen described the meaning of the A5 form, which was the predecessor of the modern Kathmandu stative, as that of ‘an incompleted action, an action in progress’.

TABLE 3: Classical and Kathmandu Newar finite endings expanded from Genetti (1990: 194)

Classical Newar, 15th century ⁴ (Jørgensen 1941: 47-56)	Kathmandu Newar (Malla 1985: 35-9)
<-am̄ ~ -a ~ -o> (A1) 'a finite verb'	<-a> 'past disjunct'
<-i ~ -iwo ~ -ino> (A3) 'a habitative'	<-i/-i:> 'non-past disjunct'
<-ë ~ -ya> (A4) 'a gerundive or infinitive'	<-e/-i> 'non-past conjunct'
<ñ/-k ~ -wo/-u ~ Ø> (A5) 'a relative participle'	<-i:> 'stative'
<ñā ~ -yā ~ -ā> (A6) 'id.'	<-ā> 'past conjunct'

Not only the modern Kathmandu tense distinctions, but also the beginnings of the modern conjunct/disjunct opposition appear to have been present in Classical Newar. Above we discussed Jørgensen's observation concerning the various morphs of the Classical A1 finite. The morph <-am̄>, which appears to be the direct predecessor of the modern Kathmandu past disjunct suffix <-a>, was in Classical Newar associated with the third person. The modern non-past conjunct derives from the Classical A4 form, which Jørgensen describes as denoting 'the intention of a future action (a "subjective future")' with a first person subject, i.e. in the non-interrogative indicative, where in modern Kathmandu a non-past conjunct would likewise be used. When the A4 form is used with a second or third person, Jørgensen speculates that 'it may have the same meaning', for which he provides one example sentence, in the second person interrogative, *cha vane lā, cone lā?* 'will you go, or will you stay?', where in modern Kathmandu we would also expect the non-past conjunct. Jørgensen writes that the Classical A6 finite was used with the first and second person in a way which corresponds to the way in which the A1 or A5 form are used for a third person subject.

In short, even Jørgensen's pioneering investigations into the semantics of Classical Newar finite verbs permit us to establish that the Classical Newar verb was in all likelihood well on its way to developing into the conjunct/disjunct system manifest in modern Kathmandu. For the choice of finite form in subordinate clauses in Late Classical Newar, Hargreaves (1989) reports that the A4 form, corresponding to the modern non-past conjunct, and the A6 form, corresponding to the past conjunct, are used when the subject of main

4. For a treatment of the morphology and morphophonology of the Classical Newari verb, see Kölver & Kölver (1978).

and subordinate clause are coreferential, and that the A5 form, corresponding to the modern stative, and the A3, corresponding to the non-past disjunct, are used when this is not the case. The A1 form or past disjunct only occurs in a main clause in both Classical and Kathmandu Newar. In other words, the rudiments of a conjunct/disjunct system characteristic of modern Kathmandu Newar were already fully in place in Classical Newar. On the other hand, the Classical Newar system retained traces of a verbal agreement system like the conjugation which is still preserved in Dolakha. The Dolakha conjugation is therefore probably a more faithful reflexion of the Proto-Newar system than is Classical Newar verbal morphology.

3. Newar in Tibeto-Burman perspective

Having established the Dolakha verbal agreement system to be more conservative than the conjunct/disjunct system observed in Kathmandu and other dialects, we shall here undertake a systematic comparison of Dolakha conjugational morphemes with apparent or suspected cognate affixes in the flexional systems of other Tibeto-Burman verbs.

Genetti (1990: 144) suggests that the first singular morphemes <-ī>, past habitual, and <-gi>, past and present, could be cognate to the corresponding Lohorong morphemes, which are the preterite first singular patient/subject morpheme <-iŋ> and the first singular suffix <ŋa> respectively (van Driem 1992). Although the cognacy of the Dolakha first singular past habitual morpheme <-ī> with the Lohorong preterite first singular patient/subject morpheme <-iŋ> appears straightforward, the Dolakha first singular suffix <-gi> is problematic. Genetti finds support for the view that the /k/ in the Dolakha first singular suffix <-gi> could have derived from *ŋ in the irregular first person future form of the verb *wōi* 'to go', viz. *u-e-ŋ* 'I shall go', which retains a velar nasal. On the other hand, Genetti does not exclude the possibility that the modern Newar pronoun *ji* 'I' and the first singular ending <-gi> derive from a common Newar first singular etymon, say, **ki*. Of course, it might be that the velar nasal preserved in the Dolakha form *u-e-ŋ* 'I shall go' reflects the first singular morpheme *<-a ~ -ŋ ~ -ŋa> reconstructed for Proto-Tibeto-Burman, whereas the <-gi> does not.

Genetti etymologically relates the Dolakha first plural past habitual suffix <-pe> to the Dolakha plural suffix in nouns <-pen>, Classical Newar <-pani>. The Dolakha plural suffix corresponds to the Kathmandu plural suffix <-pī:> used with kinship terms and terms of respect. The Dolakha plural suffix <-pen>, however, is not restricted to animate nouns (Genetti,

personal communication, 30 December 1992). Genetti's proposed etymological relationship is corroborated by the fact that the Dolakha past habitual tense derives from a nominalized construction, as explained above.

The Dolakha first person plural morpheme <-gu> can easily be related to its cognates in Kiranti languages, all reflexes of the Proto-Kiranti first plural suffix *<-k>. The closest match is with the Bahing first exclusive agent/subject morpheme <-ka ~ -ko ~ -ku>, both in terms of the vowel and in that, in the first person exclusive, Bahing, un-characteristically for Kiranti, opposes agent and subject against patient marking, in accordance with an accusative pattern like Dolakha Newar, rather than with an ergative one. The etymon is also attested outside the Kirant, for example in Jinghpaw and Kham, and a first person plural suffix *<-k> has tentatively been reconstructed for Proto-Tibeto-Burman (van Driem 1993a).

Limbu	e	<-ge>	sf10
Dumi	lp	<-k>	sf2
Hayu	lp	<-ke>	sf3
	lp/PT	<-ki>	sf1
Kulung	e	<-ka>	sf6
Thulung	e	<-ki>	sf6
Lohorung	e	<-ka>	sf8
Bahing	lpe/copy	<-k>	sf1
	1eAS	<-ka ~ -ko ~ -ku>	sf5
	1eP	<-ki>	sf5
Dolakha	lp	<-gu>	sf2
Jinghpaw	lpS	<-kaʔ ¹ >	sf3
Kham	1dAS	<gin->	pf1
	1pAS	<ge->	pf1

Genetti identifies the Dolakha future second person honorific suffix <-ta> with the plural suffix <-ta> found in animate Kathmandu Newar nouns other than kinship terms or terms of respect, which take the plural suffix <-pī:> (Malla 1985: 31). For the rest, the honorific second person forms are identical with first person plural forms, and the honorific evidently derives from a polite inclusive usage, as pointed out above.

The Dolakha second person singular suffix <-mun ~ -n ~ -na> and future second person plural <-nan> appear to be cognate with Proto-Tibeto-Burman second singular *<-na>, best reflected in the Kirant by Thulung and

Lohorung, but more widely reflected beyond the Kirant. The peculiarities of the reflexes listed, particularly the hypothetical segmentation of *portemanteau* reflexes, are explained elsewhere inasmuch as they are understood (van Driem 1993a). The future allomorph <-na> of the Dolakha second singular suffix exactly matches the reconstructed proto-morpheme, and the allomorph <-n> is not problematic. The element /mu/ in the past tense allomorph <-mun> appears to be a petrified artefact, to which we shall return below. The Dolakha future second plural suffix <-nan>, although synchronically a plural suffix, appears to derive from the second person singular proto-morpheme *<-na>.

The final element /n/ in the Dolakha future second plural suffix <-nan> may reflect an older non-first plural marker or remnant thereof, *<-n>, also reflected in the nasal finals of the Dolakha second plural suffix <-min>, third person plural <-hin> and third person plural past habitual <-tan>. Perhaps these nasal finals reflect a cousin of the Kiranti second person plural suffix *<ni> with generalized non-first person plural meaning, but the possibility cannot be excluded that the final nasal element in the Dolakha future second person plural <-nan> is just the result of remodelling by analogy with the Dolakha second plural suffix <-min>, and that the Dolakha third person suffixes <-hin> (3p) and <-tan> (3p/PH) are simply of distinct provenance.

Kulung	2sP	<-e>	sf1
	2→3s	<-a>	sf1
Lohorung	2	<-na>	sf7
Thulung	2	<-na>	sf1
Bahing	2sPS	<-e>	sf3
Dolakha	2s	<-mun ~ -n ~ -na>	sf2
	2p/F	<-nan>	sf2
Suōmò rGya-roñ	2	<-n>	sf1
lCog-rtse rGya-roñ	2	<-n>	sf1
Tangut	2s	<-na ² >	sf1
Rāwang	2s	<-a>	sf2
Qiāng	2s	<-nə ² ~ -o>	sf2
Primi	2s	<-o ¹ ~ -u ¹ ~ -uā ¹ >	sf1
Jinghpaw	2S	<-n ¹ t ~ -n ¹ ~ -t ¹ ~ Ø>	sf3
	3→2	<-nit ¹ >	sf3
Kham	2sAS	<nə->	pf1
	2sP	<-ni>	pf1

In the table below, the Dolakha second person plural suffix is listed together with cognate suffixes in Kiranti and other Tibeto-Burman languages. The Tibeto-Burman proto-morpheme reflected is the second person plural suffix *<-ni>, which, in contrast to the second singular proto-morpheme *<-na>, is more abundantly reflected in the various Kiranti languages than outside the Kirant. In the Dolakha second plural suffix <-min> it is the element /in/ which appears to be cognate with the proto-morpheme, whereas the element /m/ must be an artefact of the same origin as the petrified artefact /mu/ in the past tense allomorph <-mun> of the Dolakha second singular suffix.

Dumi	p23	<-ini>	sf6
Hayu	2p	<-ne>	sf3
Kulung	2p	<-ni>	sf3
Thulung	2p	<-ni>	sf1
Lohorung	2p	<-ni>	sf7
Bahing	2p↔3/copy	<-n>	sf1
	2p	<-ni>	sf6
Dolakha	2p	<-min>	sf2
Suōmò rGya-roñ	2p	<-ɲ>	sf1
Tangut	1p/2p	<-ni ² >	sf1
Răwang	2p	<-ning>	sf1
Trung	2p	<-n>	sf1
Qiāng	2p	<-sɿ ² -nə ² >	sf2
Primi	1p/2p	<-ē ¹ ~ -uā ¹ >	sf1
Nocte	2p→3s	<-ʌn ~ -ʌt>	sf2

Genetti (1990: 161, 191) identifies the suffix <-u> in the third singular negative indicative of Dolakha *transitive* r-stem verbs and the element /u/ in the past time morpheme of the third person singular <-ju> with the Proto-Tibeto-Burman morpheme *<-u>, which DeLancey (1989: 318) believes is 'a direction marker', but which I reconstruct at the Proto-Kiranti level, and tentatively at the Proto-Tibeto-Burman level, as third person patient marker *<-u> (van Driem 1991a, 1993a). Undoubtedly, the Dolakha third person future suffix <-u>, the element /(d)u/ in the plural imperative ending <-dun ~ -un ~ -n>, and the suffix <-u> found in the singular imperative and optative of *transitive* r-stem verbs reflect the same proto-morpheme. The third person proto-morpheme *<-u> is ubiquitously reflected in Tibeto-Burman, as seen in the following table. In the Himalayas, these reflexes are all suffixes,

and, in Kiranti languages, they all denote third person *patient* involvement. The Dolakha data likewise reflect third person *patient* marking: The vestigial suffix <-u> in the negative indicative, singular imperative and singular optative of r-stem verbs is clearly associated with grammatical patient marking, as it occurs only after transitive verbs. Similarly, in the past indicative, third singular subject is indexed by the suffix <-a> in intransitive verbs, but by <-u> in transitive verbs.

Limbu	3P	<-u>	sf4
Dumi	1s→3/PT	<-u>	sf5
	3sP/PT	<-i>	sf5
Hayu	3P/PT	<-ko>	sf1
Kulung	3P	<-o ~ -ə ~ -u>	sf4
Thulung	1e→3/NPT	<-u>	sf7
	1e→3/PT	<-o>	sf7
	3s→3	<-iu>	sf7
Lohorung	3P	<-u>	sf4
Bahing	2s/3s→3	<-p>	sf1
	1s→3/NPT	<-u ~ -gna>	sf3
	1s→3/PT	<-ong>	sf3
	3s→3	<-a>	sf3
	2s→3	<-i ~ -eu>	sf3
Dolakha	3s/HP/PT	<-ju>	sf2
	3/F	<-u>	sf2
Suōmò rGya-roñ	3A	<wu->	pf2
	2s/3s→3	<-u>	sf1
ICog-rtse rGya-roñ	3A	<wu->	pf2
	2s/3s→3	<-w>	sf1
Răwang	d→3	<-saw>	sf1
	3P	<-u>	sf2
Jinghpaw	1→3	<-weɿ ¹ ~ -eɿ ¹ >	sf3
	3P	<-nuɿ ¹ ~ -uɿ ¹ >	sf3
Nocte	1s→3s	<-ʌŋ ~ ʌk>	sf2
	2s→3s	<-ɔɿ>	sf2
	2p→3s	<-ʌn ~ ʌt>	sf2
	3→3s	<-a ~ -aʔ>	sf2
	3→2s	<-hoʔ>	sf2
	2s→1s/3→1s	<-hʌŋ>	sf2
Kham	3sA	<-o>	sf3

The Dolakha conjugation is evidently the descendant of an agreement system which once distinguished both a transitive and an intransitive paradigm, and now still does so in the third person singular past tense and negative plural imperative as well as in the negative indicative, singular imperative and optative of r-stem verbs. Above, the element /m/ in the Dolakha second plural suffix <-min> and the element /mu/ in the past tense allomorph <-mun> of the Dolakha second singular suffix were identified as petrified artefacts. The fact that, in non-indicative forms, the Dolakha suffix <-min> occurs only in the negative plural imperative of *transitive* verbs provides us with a strong indication as to what kind of artefacts these are. In Bahing, the labial character of the proto-morpheme *<-u> is preserved in the anticipatory copy morpheme <-p> in the first suffixal slot of the Bahing verb (van Driem 1991a). In Dolakha too, the labial elements /mu/ in the past tense allomorph <-mun> of the second singular suffix and the /m/ in the Dolakha second plural suffix <-min> evidently reflect the third person patient proto-morpheme *<-u>, whereby the former also preserves the original vowel itself. It is not yet clear how and why the labiality of the vocalic proto-morpheme became transferred to a consonant in Bahing and in Dolakha, or what the direct source of these consonants are.

The only element yet unaccounted for is the initial /j/ ~ /c/ in the Dolakha third singular morpheme in the past tenses <-ju>. In view of its palatal character, the element looks like the artefact of an older dual morpheme, but in view of its distribution, viz. in past tenses before the reflex of the vocalic proto-morpheme *<-u>, this /j/ ~ /c/ may also be a palatalized reflex of the older Proto-Tibeto-Burman preterite morpheme *<-tɛ>, in which case Dolakha, in spite of its demonstrably innovative four-way tense distinction, may have retained a segmental reflex of the older Tibeto-Burman preterite vs. non-preterite opposition.

The Dolakha morpheme <-a> indexing a third person singular intransitive subject in past time is most certainly cognate with the Dumi second and third person intransitive subject morpheme <-a> and perhaps also with the Dumi singular number morpheme of a second or third person actant <-a>. All these may reflect the tentatively reconstructed Proto-Tibeto-Burman third person morpheme *<-a> (van Driem 1993a).

Dumi	23S	<-a>	sf5
	s23	<-a>	sf6
Dolakha	3sS/PT	<-a>	sf2
Qiāng	3/PT	<-i ² >	sf2

Jinghpaw	3S	<∅ ~ aʔ ¹ >	sf3
Nocte	3→3s	<-a ~ aʔ>	sf2
Primi	3	<-a ¹ ~ -uu ¹ ~ -ua ¹ >	sf1

Although Genetti also prefers the above comparison whereby the cognacy is assumed of the Dolakha suffix with the Dumi non-first person intransitive subject marker (personal communication, 30 December 1992), it is too early to exclude the alternative possibility that the tensed Dolakha morpheme <-a> is but another remnant the Proto-Tibeto-Burman preterite morpheme *<-tɛ>. This would not preclude the proposed cognacy with the Dumi morphemes. In a previous publication, I tentatively proposed cognacy of these Dumi suffixes with the Tibeto-Burman second singular morpheme *<-na> (van Driem 1991a), although this now seems less likely in view of the data which have since then been accumulated and analysed.

It would be far-fetched to suppose cognacy of the Dolakha morpheme indexing a third singular subject in present time <-i> with the proto-morpheme *<-u>. The Dolakha suffix <-i> occurs after the tense morpheme <-a> of the innovative Dolakha present, and its provenance is uncertain.

The third person plural morpheme <-hin> in Dolakha indicative and optative forms might be related to the Yakkha non-singular patient suffix <-ha>, which is evidently cognate to the Limbu plural suffix in nouns <-haʔ> (van Driem 1994). Both Limbu and Yakkha are Eastern Kiranti languages. The Dolakha third plural suffix <-hin> also resembles the Dumi third plural subject prefix <ham->. Genetti points out a possible etymological relationship between the root <i> of the Kathmandu pronoun *i-pī*: 'they' and the element /hi/ in the Dolakha suffix <-hin>.

Yakkha	nsP	<-ha>	sf9
Dumi	3pS	<ham->	pf1
Dolakha	3p	<-hin>	sf2

The element /m/ in the Dumi prefix <ham-> has been related to the Proto-Kiranti third person plural agent prefix *<me-> and the Proto-Tibeto-Burman plural agent prefix *<me->. If the /n/ in the Dolakha suffix <-hin> is also to be related to this proto-morpheme, the delabialization of the reflex would have to be explained by sound laws in the future. Yet that the element /-n/ in Dolakha <-hin> derives from a sign marking plural number of a third person actant is evident from its occurrence in the Dolakha third person plural past habitual morpheme <-tan> and the plural imperative ending

<-dun ~ -un ~ -n>. The element /ta/ in the Dolakha third person plural past habitual morpheme <-tan> might, like the Dolakha future second person honorific suffix <-ta>, be related to the plural suffix <-ta> found in animate Kathmandu Newar nouns other than kinship terms or terms of respect. In view of the fact that the Dolakha past habitual is an innovated tense, it would seem less likely that this element derives from the Proto-Tibeto-Burman preterite morpheme *<-te>.

4. Conclusion

The Dolakha verb is shown to be a generally more faithful reflexion of the Proto-Newar system than the verb in the Classical Newar language of the Kathmandu Valley. In Classical Newar we find both the vestiges of a verbal agreement system like that exhibited in Dolakha as well as the rudiments of the conjunct/disjunct system operative in modern Kathmandu Newar. Dolakha conjugational affixes can be readily related to their cognate morphemes in other Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement systems.

Certain features of the Dolakha verb suggest a closer genetic relationship with the Kiranti languages, e.g. that the Dolakha reflex of the Tibeto-Burman proto-morpheme *<-u> is a suffix, and that this suffix indexes third person patient involvement. Although comparison of the conjugational systems constitutes only one type of evidence which has yet to be corroborated by regular lexical and phonological correspondences, flexional comparison provides evidence of a highly sound and compelling kind, which, to our present state of knowledge, points towards a greater genetic affinity between Kiranti and Newar.

Genetti (1990: 180-1) offers a reason which plausibly accounts for the conservative nature of Dolakha Newar: 'In Kathmandu, there has been a history of intimate contact with people of Indic descent, which has been progressively more intense during the last seven hundred years. This has been somewhat counter-balanced by strong ethnic unity in the large Newari community. The Dolakha inhabitants have been somewhat more secluded from the Indic immigration, and have tended to interact more intensively with speakers of the surrounding Tibeto-Burman languages, these being primarily speakers of Rai languages of the Kiranti subgroup and Tibetans'. Indeed, the Newar kingdoms of the Kathmandu Valley were great centres of culture which influenced the course of cultural history in South and Central Asia at least as much as the Valley was exposed to migration and influence from without. In this respect the Kathmandu Valley contrasts sharply with the

ancient and remote Newar community at Dolakha. The evident archaism of Dolakha verbal morphology corroborates my view (van Driem 1993a) that it is the stability of a linguistic community through time which is the actual cause unifying the several norms for retention of archaic traits postulated by Bàrtoli (1942, 1945).

References

This bibliography includes the work on Dolakha and other Newar dialects written by the Newar scholars Māli, Sāyamī, Rājā Śākya, Śreṣṭha and Tāmṛākār, although this work is written in Newar and inaccessible to the author. The titles and their English translations have been provided, courtesy of Dayā Ratna Śākya (personal communication, Kathmandu, 29 November 1992), because these studies by native scholars represent the first pioneering scholarly work on Dolakha Newar and its verbal morphology.

- Aryāl, Īśvararāja. 2040 (= 1983/84). *Nayā Nepālko Itihās*, Kāṭhmāṇḍū: Ratna Pustak Bhaṇḍār.
- Bàrtoli, Matteo. 1942. 'Figure similari e norme spaziali', *Bollettino dell'Atlante linguistico italiano* III, 1-22.
- Bàrtoli, Matteo. 1945. *Saggi di linguistica spaziale*, Torino: Vicenza Bona.
- Bauman, James John. 1975. *Pronouns and Pronominal Morphology in Tibeto-Burman*, Berkeley: University of California Ph.D. thesis.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1989. 'Verb Agreement in Proto-Tibeto-Burman', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LII (2), 315-333.
- Driem, George van. 1987. *A Grammar of Limbu*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Driem, George van. 1990a. 'An exploration of Proto-Kiranti verbal morphology', *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 22: 27-48.
- Driem, George van. 1990b. Review of *La langue hayu* by Boyd Michailovsky, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LIII (2), 565-71.
- Driem, George van. 1990c. 'À propos de *La langue hayu* par Boyd Michailovsky', *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* XIX (2), 267-85.
- Driem, George van. 1991a. 'Bahing and the Proto-Kiranti verb', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LIV (2), 336-56.
- Driem, George van. 1991b. 'Tangut verbal agreement and the patient category in Tibeto-Burman', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LIV (3), 520-34.
- Driem, George van. 1992. 'Le proto-kiranti revisité, morphologie verbale du lohorung', *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 24, 33-75.
- Driem, George van. 1993a. 'The Proto-Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement system', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LVI (2), 292-334.
- Driem, George van. 1993b. *Grammar of Dumi*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Driem, George van. 1994. 'The Yakkha verb, interpretation and analysis of the Omruwa material (a Kiranti language of eastern Nepal)', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*.
- Driem, George van. forthcoming a. 'The ethnic origins, demise and rediscovery of the Tangut civilisation'.
- Driem, George van. forthcoming b. *A Grammar of Lohorong*.

- Driem, George van. forthcoming c. *The Languages of the Himalayas, a Linguistic and Cultural History of Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan*.
- Gellner, David N. 1986. 'Newar: caste and identity', *Europäisches Archiv für Soziologie – Archives Européennes de Sociologie* xxvii (1), 102-148.
- Genetti, Carol Elaine. 1988a. 'From postposition to subordinator in Newari', paper presented at the Symposium on Grammaticalization at the University of Oregon at Eugene, May 1988.
- Genetti, Carol Elaine. 1988b. 'A contrastive study of the Dolakhali and Kathmandu Newari dialects', *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* xvii (2), 161-191.
- Genetti, Carol Elaine. 1989. 'Imperatives, prohibitives and optatives in Newari', paper presented at the 22nd International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics at the University of Hawai'i at Honolulu, 6 October 1989.
- Genetti, Carol Elaine. 1990. *A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Dolakha Newari Dialect*, Eugene: University of Oregon, unpublished Ph.D. thesis.
- Hargreaves, David. 1989. 'Relative clauses in Late Classical and Kathmandu Newari', paper presented at the 22nd International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics at the University of Hawai'i at Honolulu, 6 October 1989.
- Hargreaves, David, and Dayā Ratna Śākya. 1992. 'Verb morphology in six Newari dialects', paper presented at the 25th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics at the University of California, Berkeley, 16 October 1992.
- Hargreaves, David, and Kāśīnāth Tamot. 1985. 'Notes on the history of some Newari verbs: preliminary evidence', paper presented at the 18th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics at Ramkhamhaeng University, Bangkok, 28 August 1985.
- Hashimoto, Mantarō J. 1977. *The Newari Language: A Classified Lexicon of its Bhadgaon Dialect* (Monumenta Serindica No. 2), Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Jørgensen, Hans. 1936a. *A Dictionary of the Classical Newārī* (Det Kongelige Danske Videnskaberne Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser xxiii, 1), Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Jørgensen, Hans. 1936b. 'Linguistic remarks on the verb in Newārī', *Acta Orientalia* (ediderunt Societates Orientales Batava Danica Norvegica) xiv, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 280-5.
- Jørgensen, Hans. 1941. *A Grammar of the Classical Newārī* (Det Kongelige Danske Videnskaberne Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser xxvii, 3), Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Kölver, Ulrike, and Bernard Kölver. 1978. 'Classical Newārī verbal morphology', *Zentralasiatische Studien* 12, 273-316.
- Korolev, Nikolaj Ivanovič. 1989. *Nevarskij jazyk*, Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka'.
- Māli, Indra. *Nepāl Saṃvat* 1094 (= 1974/75). 'Paharī Bhāṣā Chagu Adhyayan' ("A study of the Paharī dialect"), *Nepāl Bhāṣā Patrikā* 5: 1.
- Māli, Indra. 1978. *Jhūgu Bhāy Jhūgu Khāgvaḥ* ("Our language and lexicon"), Pokharā: Mābbhāy Mulukhā.
- Māli, Indra. N.S. 1099a (= 1979/80). 'Dolakhā Bhāṣikāyā Kriyāpad Chagu Adhyayan' ("A study on the verbal morphology of the Dolakhā dialect"), *Nhāykā* 1: 1.
- Māli, Indra. N.S. 1099b (= 1979/80). 'Paharī Bhāṣikāy Chapulu' ("An observation on the Paharī dialect"), *Sājhāḥ* 1: 1.
- Māli, Indra. N.S. 1100 (= 1980/81). 'Dolakhā Bhāṣikāy Chapulu' ("An observation on the Dolakhā dialect"), *Jah* 16: 9.
- Malla, Kamal Prasād. 1985. *The Newari Language: A Working Outline* (Monumenta Serindica No. 14), Tōkyō: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

- Mānandhar, Ṭhākur Lāl. 1986. *Newari-English Dictionary, Modern Language of the Kathmandu Valley* (École Française d'Extrême-Orient), Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan.
- Nepāl, Jñānamañi. *Vikram Saṃvat* 2040 (= 1983/84). *Nepāl Nirukta*. Kāṭhmāṇḍū: Nepāl Rājakīya Prajñā-Pratiṣṭhān.
- Pokhrel, Bālukṣṇa, et al. *Vikram Saṃvat* 2040 (= 1983/84). *Nepālī Bṛhat Śābdakoś*, Kāṭhmāṇḍū: Nepāl Rājakīya Prajñā-Pratiṣṭhān.
- Sāyamī, Prem. 1986. 'Dolakhā Bhāṣāyā Khāpu Munā' ("A collection of Dolakhā phrases"), Kirtipur: Nepal and Asian Research Centre.
- Shakya, Daya R. (= Dayā Ratna Śākya; also uses the *nom de plume* Nevāmī). 1989. 'The Dialects of Newari', a one-page family tree of Newar dialects, listing their geographical distribution; the position of the Pyāngāu dialect is corrected by Shakya (1992).
- Shakya, Daya R. 1992. *Nominal and Verbal Morphology in Six Dialects of Newari*. University of Oregon: unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Śākya, Rājā. 1981. 'Nepāl Bhāṣāyā Chakacā Dolakhā Bhāṣāy Chapulu' ("An observation on Dolakhā, a dialect of Newar"), *Situ* 56.
- Śreṣṭha, Rudra Lakṣmī. 1987. 'The verbal conjugation of the Dolakhā dialect of Newari', paper presented at the 8th Annual Conference of the Linguistic Society of Nepal, Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur.
- Śreṣṭha, Rudra Lakṣmī. *Nepāl Saṃvat* 1108 (= 1988/89). 'Dolakhā Nevāḥ Bhāyā Kārak Rūpāyana' ("The case marking system in Dolakha Newār"), *Nepāl Bhāṣā va Thvayā Sāhitya, Vibhāgiya Goṣṭhī* ("departmental seminar").
- Slusser, Mary Sheperd. 1982. *Nepal Mandala, a Cultural Study of the Kathmandu Valley* (2 Vols.), Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Śreṣṭhācārya, Īsvarānand. 1981. *Newari Root Verbs*, Kāṭhmāṇḍū: Ratna Pustak Bhaṇḍār.
- Tāmrākār, P.K. *Nepāl Saṃvat* 1101 (= 1981/82). 'Dolakhā Nevāḥ Bhāy' ("Dolakhā Newar language"), *Jhī* 25: 185.
- Vajrācārya, Dhanavajra, and Kamal Prasād Malla. 1985. *The Goṣṭhārājavamaśāvalī* (Nepal Research Centre Publications No. 9), Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS:

THE MANUSCRIPT	can be in English, French, or German. It should be double-spaced, typed in 10-pitch in a clear type. Format A4, with 5 cm left margin, leaving appr. 1500 type units per page. Two clear copies should be submitted, with an abstract of 10-15 lines, and a full copy should be retained by the author (cf. on PROOFS below).
REFERENCES	should be given in the body of the text, by author's surname, year of publication and, where relevant, page number. An alphabetically ordered list of references should be given on a separate sheet at the end of the text.
FOOTNOTES	should be avoided wherever possible, all points of substance being incorporated in the body of the text. If unavoidable, footnotes should be numbered consecutively and typed on a separate sheet. The appropriate number should be typed, raised, in the text, after any marks of punctuation. No bibliographical information should be given in footnotes, only in the list of references.
ILLUSTRATIONS AND DIAGRAMS	should be given on separate, numbered sheets, and with a corresponding, clear indication in the body of the text where each illustration belongs. All trees and diagrams should be drawn in black ink, in a directly reproducible form.
PROOFS	should be returned within 10 days of receipt. Note that the ms. will not be returned with the proof sheets (cf. on THE MANUSCRIPT above).

Authors not writing in their mother tongue are particularly requested to have their mss. checked for linguistic and stylistic errors.

No fees are paid for papers submitted for publication, but authors are entitled to 25-50 offprints of each published paper free of charge.