reference. The criteria for dating are unclear; the dates are often simply incorrect.

There are numerous misprints and mistranslations: *hamara mulk* (our country) is translated as “U.P.” (p. 54); *padr* means father, not son (p. 61). The translators have been unable to decipher English names written in Urdu script or make sense of Sayyid Ahmad’s efforts to develop a new, more colloquial, style of Urdu prose and to coin new terminology. A single example will have to suffice: “Sir William Mill’s house in Vermont” (p. 203) should be Sir William Miles’ mansion and parkland, *makān va ramma* (Asghar Abbas, p. 140). A revised edition of the translation, making due use of the new Urdu one, would be a worthy undertaking.

David Lelyveld
William Paterson University
forms. The comparison of Thangmi naru ‘horn’ to Tibetan ru ‘horn’ is more informative and persuasive than comparison to “*krew = kraw or *ruŋ = rwaŋ” (p. 20).

The Thangmi lexicon is of great interest to historical linguistics. In many cases a Thangmi word has more morphological material than cognate languages evince. Such cases divide into two types. In the first type, other languages have what looks like a reduced version of the Thangmi cognate: Th. cawah ‘walk’ (Bur. swā), Th. kili ‘excrement’ (Chi. *qʰijʔ, Tib. léi < *hli, Old Bur. khliy); Th. calaf-un ‘moon’ (Tib. sla < zla, Bur. la, in Thangmi -uni is the word for ‘day’); Th. kerep ‘cry’ (Chi. ཞ, *k-r ‘weep’, Tib. khrab-khrab ‘a person prone to weep’); Th. sirik ‘louse’ (Chi. ཞ, srik, Tib. šig); Th. suwa ‘tooth’ (Tib. so, Bur. swāh). In the second type Thangmi has an extra syllable before or after the material cognate to other languages. Th. ajil ‘gums’ (Chi. 龈 *ṭan, Tib. riñil ∼ snil); Th. alnaj ‘dream’ (Chi. 夢 *C.mn̪, Tib. rmain-, Bur. mak); Th. ulam ‘path’ (Chi. 尤 *lám ‘walk’, Tib. lam ‘path’, Bur. lamḥ); Th. olon ‘milk, yoghurt’ (Tib. zo < *lo ‘yoghurt’, Japhug Rgyalrong ts-lu ‘milk’); Th. nayja ‘fish’ (Chi. 魚 *na, Tib. ṇa, Bur. ṇāḥ); Th. naru ‘horn’ (Tib. ru); Th. narek ‘pheasant’ (Tib. sreg ‘partridge’, Bur. rac ‘pheasant’); Th. cato- ‘torch’ (Chi. 燈 *ток ‘torch’, Tib. dugs ‘light, kindle’, Bur. tok < *tuk ‘blaze, flame’). Because the a-, u-, o-, na-, and ca- are unpredictable, it is tempting to suggest that the disyllabic form of the word in Thangmi represents an archaism. In some cases, however, another lexical item in Thangmi containing the same lexical stem demonstrates that the monosyllabic Thangmi form is probably original. The correspondence of Thangmi thabu ‘heart’ with Tibetan thab ‘heart’, might make one think that the -u is original and lost in Tibetan, but Thangmi me-thap ‘fire-place’ confirms that the -u is some kind of suffix. Similarly, in the Thangmi word moro ‘corpse’, compared to Tibetan ro ‘corpse’, the element mo- can be seen to be a prefix as soon as one recognizes that the morpheme -ro- ‘corpse’ also occurs in the word rojeme ‘the fire on which a corpse is burnt’.

I offer here a few Tibeto-Burman comparisons which Turin omits: Th. chyου ‘fat’ (Tib. tsho-ba, Bur. chū, Th. lopsyek ‘heart’ (Bur. nha-lomh), Th. mus ‘body hair’ (Chi. 毛 *C.m̥aw, Bur. muyh), Th. mut ‘blow’ (Bur. mhu), Th. nip ‘set (of the sun)’ (Chi. 入 *nup ‘enter’, Tib. nub ‘to sink, set’, Bur. nūp ‘to dive, go beneath’), Th. nunu ‘milk, breast’ (Chi. 乳 *no ‘milk, nipple’, Tib. nu-ma ‘breast’, Bur. nuiw? ‘breast’), Th. nahun ‘say’ (Chi. 語 *na ‘speak’, Tib. nāg ‘speech’), Th. plen- ‘fill’ (Old Bur. plaññ < *plij?), Th. sat- ‘kill’ (Chi. 賣 *srat, Tib. √sad, Bur. sat), Th. tak- ‘weave’ (Chi. 纏 *tk, Tib. √tag, Bur. rak), Th. waj ‘come’ (Chi. 往 *cəŋʔ ‘go’, Tib. hoññ/yoññ ‘come’, Bur. waññ ‘go, come’), Th. min ‘ripen’ (Tib. smiñ, Bur. mhaññ?), Th. cuk ‘insert’ (Tib. √tsag). For two words the comparison is problematic, but perhaps still compelling: Th. thay ‘be well’ (Chi. 賣 *tsəñ ‘good’, Tib. bzaññ < *bdzan), Th. nem ‘home’ (Chi. 家 *qams ‘subterranean room’, Tib. khỹim ‘home’, Bur. im). Finally, the sequence -pra in mumpra ‘funeral’ might be cognate to Tib. bla ‘soul’, Bur. prā, Chi. 魂 *pʰra.

Although Thangmi phonology is not exotic, it yields up facets of considerable historical or typological interest. The presence of the medial -w- only after velars potentially supports the reconstruction of labio-velar consonants in Tibeto-Burman. Medial -l- occurs only after b- g-, p-, k- perhaps suggesting that as in Tibetan etymologically -l- is not a medial, but rather phonetic material preceding -l- originated as morphological prefixes. Although Thangmi has the voiceless nasal ŋ- it lacks both ŋ- and ŋ-. Whereas many Tibeto-Burman languages including Chinese and Burmese obscure inherited -r and -l, Thangmi like Tibetan preserves them intact (e.g. Th. sarma ‘young, fresh’, Chi. 鮮 *ser ‘fresh’, Tib. gsar ‘new’, Bur. sa ‘titivate’; Th. per ‘fly’, Chi. 飛 *Cə.par, Tib. ȡphur; Thangmi anjil
An intriguing phenomenon which requires further clarification is the appearance of a glottal stop final in the Sindhupālcok dialect, where Dolakhā sometimes has a glottal stop but other times has -k (p. 188). If this state of affairs originated from a merger in Sindhupālcok, it is possibly of great consequence for etymological research.

Roughly speaking the Thangmi verb occupies a level of complexity in its agreement system midway between the Kiranti languages, to which Turin makes frequent comparison, and the Dolakhā dialect of Newar as described by Carol Genetti. Highlights of inherited morphology include a third person patient morpheme -u (p. 366) and an imperative suffix -o (p. 430). Guillaume Jacques and Robert Shafer respectively argued that fragmentary evidence of these same morphemes occurs in Tibetan. Another striking Thangmi–Tibetan parallel is that ‘eat’ is among the more irregular of verbs in both languages. Filling in the overall picture of verbal morphology in the family, Thangmi provides further evidence against LaPolla’s theory that agreement is everywhere an innovation.

Thangmi word order is not always what one would expect for a language of this region. Adjectives precede the nouns they modify (p. 309) and compound verbs of motion are prefixing, ya-cya ‘go to eat’, ya-yo ‘go to look’ (p. 462).

In addition to a comprehensive description of Thangmi grammar, the work under review contains an ethnographic survey of the Thangmi. The detail and clarity of presentation far exceeds the level of cultural description found in most grammars. A short review cannot do justice to the wide array of observations on family structure, diet, clothing, religion, etc., many of which may be of great import for the comparative study of Himalayan anthropology. By way of example, the Thangmi have three death rites, respectively on the day of death, shortly after (three days), and up to a year after (pp. 153–4). These three stages in interment may help to shed light on the three stages in the burial of Tibetan emperors as reported in the Old Tibetan Annals.

The grammar is of course not without blemishes. Too little is said about word classes, in particular the reasons for distinguishing adjectives from nouns (p. 250). The gerunds and the participles are similarly insufficiently distinguished (pp. 464–8). The proposal that the non-preterite tense marker -du is cognate with Dzongka Tibetan dü (spelled ḡdug; p. 399); there is quite a literature on Tibetan ḡdug and this proposal cannot be accepted without reference to this work. When Ramble says that Bonpos fled Khri-sronшение-n-brtsan, this reflects a well-known Tibetan tale, but not the current state of scholarship on Bon (p. 67, note 50). A distinction between elicited and naturally occurring examples would have added value. Such minor objections do not detract from the overall value of the work.

In other respects Turin’s grammar reflects a methodological high water mark, e.g. he includes longitudes and latitudes for villages (p. 75). Turin commendably includes close comparisons with Nepali, the contact language and regional lingua franca, throughout; not only does he identify loans, but he elucidates Nepali influence in calques, fixed expressions and syntax. By laying bear the mediated nature of his own acquisition of the language Turin achieves an honesty and explicitness that few linguists attempt. The importance of this excellent description of an endangered Himalayan language is difficult to overstate; the book is a triumph.

Nathan W. Hill
SOAS, University of London
Due to a typesetting error ń is doubled to ňń throughout this review.