KURTÖP CASE: THE PRAGMATIC ERGATIVE AND BEYOND[*]

Gwendolyn Hyslop
University of Oregon

Abstract: Kurtöp, an East Bodish language of Bhutan, uses case markers for a variety of functions. Like many Tibeto-Burman languages, Kurtöp evidences an ergative whose functions extend above and beyond the typical role of distinguishing the A argument in a bivalent clause. The Kurtöp ergative signals the A argument in some bivalent clauses and denotes a variety of pragmatic and semantic functions in both monovalent and bivalent clauses. In bivalent clauses, a set of verbs also exhibit differential object marking, employing a locative case-marker to designate various types of pragmatic focus.

Keywords: East Bodish, Kurtöp, Bhutan, ergative, differential object marking, pragmatics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Tibeto-Burman languages, particularly those of the Himalayas, are known for employing systems of case that are difficult to capture using the traditional terminology outlined in, for example, Dixon (1994), Payne (1997), Givón (2001). Ongoing research (e.g. McGregor 2009, *inter alia*) has shown that ergative systems, in general, are rarely systematic, and that ergativity is rarely (if ever) found consistently throughout all aspects of a language's syntax. Kurtöp, a Tibeto-Burman (East Bodish) language of Bhutan, is no exception to this generalization. In this article I describe the case-marking system of Kurtöp, including an 'ergative' postposition with heavy semantic/pragmatic functions and a system of differential object marking.

With regard to marking A/S arguments, an 'optional' ergative has been described by scholars for many Tibeto-Burman languages, such as Kinnauri (Saxena ms), Darma (Willis 2007), Tshangla (Andvik to appear), Tibetan (Tournadre 1991), to some extent Newar (DeLancey 1985, Genetti 1988) and Tibeto-Burman in general (LaPolla 1995). Kurtöp also displays a postposition which I analyse as an 'optional' or 'pragmatic' ergative, though note that, often, the term 'ergative' is less appropriate for the Kurtöp phenomenon and instead the form may be at times better understood as a contrastive focus marker. The

distribution of the ergative morpheme in Kurtöp is largely conditioned by semantic and pragmatic factors.

Differential object marking, or DOM (Bossong 1991), has also been described for Tibeto-Burman languages to varying degrees. LaPolla (1992: 6), for example, describes 'antiergative' as following from the motivation to disambiguate potential agents. The idea of 'antiergative', which can be attributed to Comrie (1975), who used the term to describe marking that was functionally motivated by a need to distinguish between a subject or object. In a similar vein, LaPolla (1992) uses the term to describe the need to distinguish between an agent and non-agent. Kurtöp also displays DOM, though it is not clear that the Kurtöp DOM is motivated entirely by factors suggested in LaPolla (1992) or in Bossong (1991).

This article is structured as follows. In Section 2 I provide the relevant background for this article, including an overview of ergative marking in Tibeto-Burman and an outline of Kurtöp grammar. Section 3 describes the marking of A and S arguments with the ergative postposition enclitic. Section 4 describes differential object marking in Kurtöp and in Section 5 I summarize the article and discuss conclusions.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. *Kurtöp*

Kurtöp is an East Bodish language spoken in the upper Kurtö region of Lhüntse, Bhutan, located approximately 50 kilometres west of the border with Arunachal Pradesh, India, and ranging from approximately 50 kilometres south of the border with Tibet to the border itself. There are approximately 15,000 speakers of Kurtöp. Within Kurtöp, there are a number of mutually intelligible dialects, including those spoken in the localities of Ne, Zhamling, Tangmachu, Shawa, and Dungkar. The variety of Kurtöp represented in this article is that of Dungkar *geok*, or block. This block begins at Tabi, approximately 40 kilometres north of Lhüntse and small villages (at times consisting of only one or two houses) in this block run north on both sides of the Kur River until the border with Tibet. There are about 3,000 speakers of the Dungkar dialect of Kurtöp.

Shafer (1954) appears to be the first to use the term 'East Bodish', identifying the proto language from which Dwags (Dakpa), a language spoken southeast of Lhasa, had come. In addition to Kurtöp, other East Bodish languages are Bumthap, Khengkha, Nupbikha, 'Nyenkha, Chali, Dzala, Monkha (also called Black Mountain) and Dakpa (van Driem 1998). Bhutan appears to be the centre of gravity for East Bodish but some East Bodish languages are also spoken in Tibet (e.g. Dzala[1]) and Arunachal Pradesh, India (e.g. Dakpa).

---

[1] Lù (1986) outlines the grammar of two dialects of *Cuona Memba*, spoken in Tibet. Van Driem (2001) later asserts these two dialects are distinct languages, one being Tshangla and the other Dzala. Of course, a thorough comparison of Cuona Memba with Cangluo (Zhang 1986) and Tshangla (Andvik to appear) is needed to confirm this.

The data for this paper come from native speakers of Kurtöp, based on fieldwork conducted in the United States and Bhutan. All speakers are from Dungkar *geok* in Lhüntse. Whenever possible, data are drawn from four texts: one conversation and three stories from five different speakers (three males, ranging in age from 23 to roughly 40, and two females, aged 43 and roughly 65). The textual corpus is well over 100 pages in length (translated but not parsed). When a certain form or combination of forms was not found in the data, we used elicitation to search for it. Thus, negative data are data that have not occurred in over 100 pages of text and also have been checked with a native speaker to be sure that there is no imaginable context in which the given example could be said in Kurtöp. All elicited data have been checked with at least two speakers.[2]

2.2. Ergativity and Tibeto-Burman

McGregor (2009: 481) cites Fabricius (1801/1791), a sketch of Greenlandic Eskimo as the first mention of an ergative system. A similar phenomenon was noted for Awabakal (Pama-Nyungan, Australia) in Threlkeld (1835) and then again in the Caucasian languages (Schuchardt 1895). The modern interest in ergativity began with Dixon's (1972) description of Dyirbal and took off especially with Comrie (1978) and Dixon (1979). A typical definition of ergativity can be taken from Dixon (1994: 1): 'a grammatical pattern in which the subject of an intransitive clause is treated in the same way as the object of a transitive clause, and differently from a transitive subject'.[3] Ergativity in this sense is a property of a construction, not of a language, and few languages have only ergative syntax. In a recent survey McGregor (2009) details the variety of "ergative" syntactic patterns found in languages, including the pattern found in Kurtöp.

With regard to morphological ergativity,[4] McGregor (2009) describes several different systems of split-ergativity, wherein a system of ergative case-marking applies in some instances, while a separate system applies elsewhere. There are four main factors which condition the split typologically: 1) the nature of the verb; 2) the nature of the agent NP; 3) tense/aspect/mood; and 4) construction (McGregor 2009: 486). McGregor (2009, §4) also includes a section on 'optional

---

[2] Data in this paper are represented in Roman letters designed for Dzongkha by George van Driem and Karma Tshering and adapted to Kurtöp. The symbols correspond to the IPA as follows: <k> [k], <kh> [kʰ], <g> [g], <ng> [ŋ], <c> [c], <ch> [cʰ], <j> [ɟ], <ny> [ɲ], <tr> [ʈ], <thr> [ʈʰ], <dr> [ɖ], <t> [t̪], <th> [t̪ʰ], <d> [d̪], <p> [p], <ph> [pʰ], <b> [b], <m> [m], <ts> [ts], <tsh> [tsʰ], <sh> [ç], <zh> [ʝ], <s> [s], <z> [z], <l> [l], <lh> [l̥], <r> [r], <a> [ɑ], <e> [e], <i> [i], <o> [o], <u> [u], <ö> [ø], <ü> [y], <'CV> high tone on following vowel, <^> long vowel. For more details on Kurtöp phonology, see our work in Lowes (2006) and Hyslop (2008, 2009).

[3] In this article I assume the syntactic-semantic roles A, S and O put forth in Dixon 1979. S is taken to be the sole argument of a monovalent verb. In bivalent verbs the A argument is assigned to the argument that is more agentive or more actor-like and O is assigned to the less agentive and more affected argument.

[4] McGregor (2009) also mentioned lexical-semantic ergativity, syntactic ergativity and discourse ergativity.

ergative case-marking', describing situations in which ergative markers may be present or absent without affecting the grammaticality of a given clause. McGregor himself notes that the term 'optional' in this instance may be misleading since the use of ergative markers in this instance is not random (2009: 493). As I will show below, this is precisely the sort of system at play in Kurtöp; I use the term 'pragmatic ergative' to describe the phenomena in Kurtöp.

McGregor (2009, §4) states that 'optional ergativity' exists in at least 10% of morphologically ergative languages and is found in Nilotic, Circassian, Kawapana, Nyulnyulan, and Tibeto-Burman language families, amongst several others. McGregor (2009: 494) furthers points out that there are 'optional ergative' concentrations in, amongst other places, the India-Nepal-Tibet-Western China region. Bhutan falls easily within this geographic landscape and Kurtöp clearly evidences the phenomena of 'optional', or 'pragmatic' ergativity.

Within the Bodish branch of Tibeto-Burman, ergativity is well documented and many ergative markers are shown to be formally similar to the Kurtöp ergative *-gi*. Ergativity in many Tibetan dialects is marked by a morpheme consisting of a velar initial and a high front vowel (c.f. Written Tibetan *-gyis ~ -kyis ~-(i)s*). Van Driem (1998) describes a *-gi* ergative with heavy pragmatic functions in Dzongkha. Tshangla also reports an agentive *-gi* (e.g. Andvik to appear), and LaPolla (1995: 193) suggests that the Tamang and Gurung ergative morphemes could be palatalized versions of the Tibetan forms.

2.3. Kurtöp grammar

Like many TB languages, Kurtöp is AOV/SV in elicitation but constituent order tends to be quite free in natural speech. There is a tendency in the language for clause-chaining and serial verb constructions and light verbs are common. With regard to nominal arguments, Kurtöp verbs can be divided into two categories: monovalent and bivalent verbs.[5] Monovalent verbs are those which may take one and only one argument while bivalent verbs may take two arguments.[6] This difference is illustrated by the data in (1-4).[7] The data in (1-2) show that the verb

---

[5] Although the analysis is still ongoing, at present, there is no evidence in Kurtöp for trivalent verbs.

[6] Bivalent verbs may be used in discourse with neither argument present, with only the A argument, or only the O argument present. What distinguishes the bivalent verbs from monovalent verbs is the *possibility* of two overt arguments; one overt argument is possible with bivalent verbs.

[7] The following abbreviations are used in this article: <1> 1st person, <2> 2nd person, <3> 3rd person, <ABL> ablative, <ABS> absolutive, <AGR> agreement, <COP> copula, <CTM> co-temporal, <DBT> dubiative, <DEF> definite, <DEM> demonstrative, <DIST> distal, <DIR> direction, <DM> discourse marker, <EGO> egophoric, <EMPH> emphasis, <EQ> equational, <ERG> ergative, <EXIS> 'existential', <EVID> evidential, <EXCL> exclamation, <EXL> exclusive, <FOC> focus, <FUT> future, <GEN> genitive, <HON> honorific, <IMP> imperative, <IPFV> imperfective, <INAN> inanimate, <IND> indirect evidential, <INF> infinitive, <INSTR> instrumental, <IRR> irrealis, <LOC> locative, <MIR> mirative, <NEG> negative, <NF> non-final, <NMLZR> nominalizer, <PL> plural, <PFV> perfective, <PROX> proximate, <PTCP>

throng 'grow' cannot take a second argument, while the verb *ke* 'bear', illustrated in (3-4), can take two arguments. The verb in (1-2) is considered to be monovalent while the verb in (3-4) is considered to be bivalent. Note that overt NP forms of the verbal arguments are not required in Kurtöp. It is possible, and indeed common, for a Kurtöp sentence to consist of only a verb, or a verb and one overt argument, if the verbal participants are already made clear by the preceding discourse.

(1)   meto   throng-ta
      flower   grow-IPFV.MIR
      'The flower is growing' (elicited data)

(2)   *ngai/ngat   meto   throng-ta
      1.ERG/ABS   flower   grow-IPFV.MIR

(3)   khit   ke-shang
      3.ABS   bear-PFV.EGO
      'S/he was born' (elicited data)

(4)   khî   khit   ke-shang
      3.ERG   3.ABS   bear-PFV.EGO
      'She gave birth to him/her' (elicited data)

This article considers only core arguments, that is, those which are not obligatorily marked with a locative postposition[8]. Kurtöp uses three postpositions to mark case, most of which will be recognizable to those familiar with Bodish languages. On NPs the ergative case is marked by *-gi ~ -i ~ -li*[9] and absolutive case is unmarked. The pronouns, however, have separate forms for the ergative and absolutive cases, as shown in Table 1.

It is interesting to note that the Kurtöp ergative is, in many instances, formally identical to the genitive. On nouns the Kurtöp genitive has the same form *-gi ~ -i ~ -li*, but on pronouns the genitive is *-ci*.

---

particle, <QP> question particle, <REFL> reflexive, <SFP> sentence final particle, <SUB> subordinator, <TAG> tag particle.

[8] In addition to two locatives marking oblique arguments, Kurtöp also employs a genitive (*-gi, -ci, -i*) and instrumental (*-gi, -ki, -i*). The distribution of these case markers is a separate matter from that of grammatical relations and is not directly relevant to the focus of this article.

[9] The ergative allomorph *-i* may occur in place of a word-final vowel; the form *-li* may occur following a coronal or velar nasal, and *-gi* may occur in either of these phonological situations or elsewhere. See Hyslop (in prep) for more details.

Person	Absolutive	Ergative
1.SG	ngat	ngai
1.PL	net	nei
2.SG	wit	wî
2.PL	nin	ningi
3.SG	khit	khî
3.PL	bot	boi

Table 1. Kurtöp pronouns marked for case

In some sense, the term 'absolutive' is somewhat problematic for Kurtöp. Kurtöp 'absolutive' pronouns (with the one exception of *nin* '2.PL'), like those in Bumthap (called 'absoluteif' by van Driem 1995: 21-22), are characterized by an absolutive marker *-t*, which is clearly innovative historically. In fact, the obligatory nature of the *-t* in personal pronouns appears to be limited to Kurtöp and Bumthap and not found in the other East Bodish languages[10], and thus is a very recent development. Despite this, the source for the absolutive *-t* is unknown. The absolutive *-t* alternates with ergative and genitive forms of the personal pronouns. However, there are some instances in which *-t* as an absolutive marker is problematic. For example, as a clitic, the ergative marker will cliticize to the right end of a NP in Kurtöp. Most modifiers follow the noun in Kurtöp NP and thus the ergative marker will often occur on a modifier instead of a noun or pronoun in natural discourse. In such instances, the pronoun usually retains its absolutive form, despite ergative marking on the NP, as in *net gapi* '1.PL.ABS FOC.ERG'. Further, a form like *net gapi* may contrast with *nei gapi* '1.PL.ERG PL.FOC.ERG'. The motivation behind what appears to be double marking of case in Kurtöp NPs in these instances remains unknown and will not be resolved within the scope of this article. Instead, this article will focus on the use of ergative pronouns and ergative-marked NPs. In this article, the term 'absolutive' is used to refer to pronouns which are formally marked as absolutive (i.e. not genitive or ergative) as well as unmarked NPs.

Data in (5) and (6) illustrate the Kurtöp ergative. In (5) an intransitive clause with an absolutive argument is displayed while (6) shows a transitive clause with an ergative marked A. Note that to say the Kurtöp ergative functions solely to mark the A argument in a clause is simplifying the matter considerably.

(5) ngat   ge-wala   minla
     1.ABS   go-PFV   NEG.COP.EQ.MIR
     'I went, didn't I.' (SBC20051126KW)

---

[10] Although a thorough analysis of East Bodish pronouns remains outstanding, there are some preliminary observations that can be made. In my field notes, Chali, Khengkha, and 'Mangdep have pronominal forms with and without the *-t* though whether or not any functional, semantic or pragmatic difference is encoded by the *-t* is unknown. There is no evidence in either Dakpa or Dzala for the absolutive *-t*, though Dzala marks inclusive plural pronouns with a *-ta(ŋ)* formative (2008-2009 Field Methods class at the University of California Santa Barbara).

(6) Kinle-gi   yang darung zhanma ’am   the   zong-wala
     Kinley-ERG also again   another woman one   hold-PFV
     wenta-mi
     COP.EQ.MIR-TAG
     ‘Kinley also got a hold of another woman again, right’
     (SBC20051126KW)

In addition to the ergative *-gi*, Kurtöp utilizes two locative postpositions in marking grammatical relations: *-ro* (allomorphs *-to, -do, -o, -go, -ngo, -ko*) and *-na/-nang*.[11] These suffixes mark location in existential clauses, subjects of possessive predicates, recipients and sometimes mark the O argument (discussed in §4).

The data in (7) and (8) show the locative postpositions marking semantic recipients.[12]

(7) ngai   khit-na   bi-shang
     1.ERG   3.ABS-LOC   give-PFV.EGO
     ‘I gave it to him/her’ (elicited data)

(8) ngai   khit-o   bi-shang
     1.ERG   3.ABS-LOC   give-PFV.EGO
     ‘I gave it to him/her’ (elicited data)

The Kurtöp locatives can also mark semantic possessors, as shown in (9) and (10).

(9) ngat-na   tiru   nâ
     1.ABS-LOC money COP.EXIS.MIR
     ‘I have money’ (elicited data)

(10) ngat-o   tiru   nâ
     1.ABS-LOC money COP.EXIS.MIR
     ‘I have money’ (elicited data)

The difference between the use of *-na* in (7) and (9) versus *-ro* in (8) and (10) remains unclear. Resolving the difference between these morphemes is beyond the scope of this paper and it will suffice for our purposes to consider both as

---

[11] The difference between *-na* and *-nang* is stylistic. In natural conversation the final nasal velar is never pronounced, but during storytelling or more formal speech, there appears to be a tendency to pronounce the final nasal.

[12] Themes in these contexts are usually not marked, as in:
   zhor   thek the bi-shang
   alcohol one one give-PFV.EGO
   ‘She gave one (cup of) alcohol (to) each’ (SaT.SW20090919.808.875SaT)

general locatives. The differences they display in object marking will be considered in greater depth in section 4.

I understand the underlying semantics of verbs to play a large – though not exclusive – role in the assignment of case. More precisely and for our purposes, I argue that Kurtöp verbs may selectionally restrict for arguments that are typical agents (such as humans or animate entities that act with volition) of typical themes or patients (such as inanimate objects). Verbs that typically have take an agentive argument may allow for pragmatic ergative marking on their arguments, usually with the pragmatic result of contrastive focus. Monovalent verbs which typically restrict for theme or patient arguments are unlikely to use the ergative marker. When they do, an added sense of agency is attributed to the S argument. Bivalent verbs which typically select two agentive arguments rely on the ergative marker to make the syntactic distinction between A and O. On the other hand, bivalent verbs with at least one patient argument allow for the ergative morpheme to be used for a variety of semantic and pragmatic factors.

As stated, this article assumes that the semantics of the verb play a large role in the possibility of the presence of the ergative. In addition to the place of a given argument on the animacy scale, I also occasionally appeal to the semantic roles of agent and patient, as defined in Payne (2006). In his words, 'agent' is defined as 'a semantic role (cf.) defined in terms of a prototype as "the normally conscious, perceived instigator of an event"'(2006: 321). I also use 'patient' according to his definition: 'the semantic role held prototypically by entities that undergo a visible, concrete change in state' (2006: 338), which I do not distinguish from theme in this article.

3. CASE-MARKING ON S AND A ARGUMENTS

Kurtöp S and A arguments may be unmarked or marked with the ergative morpheme. Depending on the semantics of the verbal arguments, S arguments in Kurtöp may be unmarked or employ the ergative morpheme for semantic or pragmatic reasons. Likewise, A arguments may be unmarked, be required to be marked with the ergative as a means to denote the A function in the clause, or may be marked with the ergative morpheme for a variety of semantic and pragmatic functions, often denoting what has been described as focus in the literature (cf. Chafe 1976, Dik et al. 1981, Lambrecht 1994, Watters 1979).

In some instances the Kurtöp ergative marks the A argument in a bivalent clause while the S of monovalent clauses and O of bivalent clauses are unmarked, as illustrated in (5) and (6) above. The data in (5) show the S argument in absolutive case. The data in (6) illustrate the ergative postposition marking the A argument in a bivalent clause. Non-canonical patterns are also attested, as we describe below.

To say the Kurtöp ergative consistently and exclusively marks the A argument in a bivalent clause would be inaccurate. For example, the Kurtöp ergative is not even restricted to bivalent clauses. In (11) I show an S argument marked with ergative case.

(11) tshe 'ai   ni   mem   zon-gi   'ngo-zi
     so   grandma   and   grandfather   two-ERG   cry-NF
     'So the old man and woman both cried...' (PS20061206P)

The remainder of this section is devoted to illustrating the distribution of the Kurtöp ergative. Section 3.1 describes a subset of Kurtöp verbs which require the ergative. In §3.2 I describe the pragmatic ergative and in §3.3 I describe a subset of verbs, which are all monovalent, for which the ergative case does not occur.

3.1. Syntactic ergative

The majority of Kurtöp verbs allow an S or A argument to be marked with ergative case. There is a subset of verbs for which the ergative is grammatically required on the A argument. The first group I will examine consists of perception, cognition and utterance verbs. In (12) I show an example of an ergative-marked first person pronoun used with the verb *dri* 'ask'.

(12) [ga-ta   Rinzin khî-ra   shama-the-ni   ngai
     laugh-IPFV.MIR   Rinzin 3.ERG-EMPH   sometime-one-ABL   1.ERG
     dri-mo-tako
     ask-CTM-IPFV
     'Even Rinzin himself was laughing when I asked.' (SBC20051127.KW)

Example (13) illustrates an ergative first person pronoun with *je* the honorific form of the verb 'see'.

(13) soithap   zon   je-shang   ngai
     stove.HON   two   see.HON-PFV.EGO   1.ERG
     'I saw two stoves (of the angel).' (SaT.SW20090917.1341.340.SaT)

Another example of the ergative is found with the verb *ko* 'hear', illustrated in (14).

(14) 'napa   ["soithap nâ"   ngaksi   ha
     earlier   stove.HON COP.EXIS.MIR   QUOT   meaning
     ko-shang   nâ   ngai
     hear- PFV.EGO   COP.EXIS.MIR   1.ERG
     'I understood earlier (someone say) there were two stoves.'
     (SaT.SW20090917.1356.725 SaT)

The verb *ngak* 'do' may also be used as a verb meaning 'to say' and is the source of the quotative in the language. When used as a speech act verb, *ngak* 'do' also appears with an ergative-marked A argument, as shown in (15).

(15) tshe ngai   'ama-na   "shê"   nga-wala   je-ro   ge-ci
     DM   1.ERG   mother-LOC come.IMP   do-PFV   go.HON-INF go-HORT
     'I told my mom "come, go and visit (it)".'
     (SaT.SW20090917.1370.964SaT)

The verb *dran* 'remember' is shown in (16) to also condition ergativity on an A argument.

(16) khî   dran-ta-mi
     3.ERG   remember-IPFV.MIR-TAG
     'He remembers, right' (SBC20051127.KW)

Similarly, the verb *bran* 'know', requires an ergative-marker on the A argument. Consider the data in (17-19). In (17) the A argument appears in natural discourse marked with the ergative case. If we try to alter the case in elicitation to absolutive, in (18), the argument is interpreted as being the O argument, but the sentence becomes somewhat unnatural for native speakers. Instead, speakers prefer data like that in (19), in which both the A and O are overtly marked.

(17) bran-ci   ke   wî
     know-HORT   QP   2.ERG
     'Do you know?'
     (SBC20051127KW525)

(18) ? wit   bran-ci   ke
       2.ABS know-HORT   QP
      '(Does s/he) know you?' (elicited data)

(19) khî   wit   bran-ci   ke
     3.ERG   2.ABS know-HORT   QP
     'Does s/he know you?' (elicited data)

The verbs described so far fall into the category of perception, cognition, and utterance (PCU) verbs. There are many more such examples in the texts and no exceptions have been found to the generalization that verbs of this semantic category will require the A argument to be ergative.

There is a further subset of verbs for which the ergative is required to disambiguate potential agents. Consider the data in (20) and (21), in which the verb *thrung* 'bear.HON' relies on the ergative marker to disambiguate the role of the two potential human verbal arguments.

(20) Drowa Zangmo khepo   o   gatpo   ganmo   zon-nang
     Drowa Zangmo FOC   DEM.PROX   old.man   old.woman   two-LOC
     thrung-wala   wenta-mi
     bear.HON-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR-TAG
     'Drowa Zangmo was born to these two old man and woman, right'
     (PS20061206P)

(21) 'Am   Sonam-gi   se   thrung-wala   wenta
     Lady   Sonam-3.ERG   son.HON   bear.HON-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR
     'Lady Sonam gave birth to a son' (elicited data)[13]

In (20) *Drowa Zangmo khepo*, in absolutive case, is understood to be the O of the sentence. However, if an argument in the clause is marked with ergative case it is understood to be the A argument, as in (21).

A similar situation is illustrated in (22) and (23). The verb *zon* 'send' has human A and O arguments, and thus without case marking it would be ambiguous as to which argument is the A and which is the O. In (22) the three referents *yum* 'mother.HON', *se* 'son.HON' and *semo* 'daughter.HON' are all understood to be the O argument of the clause while the A is unmentioned. If we mark *yum* with ergative case, as in (23), then *yum* must be understood to be the A argument.

(22) yum   se   ni   semo   yap
     mother.HON   son.HON   and   daughter.HON   father.HON
     zhuk-sa-na   zon-pala   wenta   la
     stay.HON-NMLZR-LOC   send-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR   POL
     'The mother, prince and princess were sent to where the father was'
     (elicited data)

---

[13] There were no examples of an overt ergative-marked agents co-occurring with the verb *thrung* 'bear.HON' occurring in the texts (note that in (20) there is an example of an agent but it is marked as a recipient rather than ergative). In order to elicit an example I asked two different questions over an interval of nearly two years to a very linguistically aware consultant. The first question I asked was how a native Kurtöp speaker what various examples with ergatively marked arguments meant in Kurtöp. In all instances I was told the ergative-marked argument was the agent (the one giving birth). I followed up with this topic nearly two years later by asking the same speaker whether several given utterances were possible Kurtöp sentences, and if so, what they meant. The utterances consisted of data the speaker had previously accepted as well as examples I had fabricated, some of which I predicted to be ungrammatical. The speaker identified the grammatical examples and gave translations for them and also told me which examples were ungrammatical. The example in (21) is one of the examples which was given to me twice, the second time with the accompanying translation by the very linguistically aware native Kurtöp speaker. This example was cross-checked with another native speaker for grammaticality.

(23) yum-gi   se   ni   semo   yap   zhuk-sa-na
     mother.HON-ERG   prince and princess father.HON   stay.HON-NMLZR-LOC
     zon-pala   wenta   la
     send-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR   POL
     'The mother sent the prince and princess to where the father was'
     (PS20061206P)

Another instance of the ergative distinguishing the A from a potential O argument is illustrated by the data in (24) and (25) with the bivalent verb *phang* 'feel.pity.for'. Recall that a bivalent verb in Kurtöp is one for which two arguments may be expressed, as described in §2.3 and illustrated in (1-4). In (24) the only overt argument of the clause is in absolutive case and is thus interpreted as the O argument. If the same argument is marked in the ergative case, as in (25), then the argument is interpreted as the A argument. The data in (25) come from a text in which fishermen were ordered to kill a prince and princess, but in the end they felt pity for the prince and princess and were not able to complete their task. Again, note that both the A and O are human in this case.

(24) nyarop   zon phang-zi
     fisherman two feel.pity.for-NF
     'The two fishermen were pitied...' (elicited data)

(25) nyarop   zon-gi   phang-zi
     fisherman two-ERG feel.pity.for-NF
     'The two fishermen felt pity (for the prince and princess) ...'
     (PS20061206P)

The verbs described in this section consistently use the ergative to mark the A argument. In many instances the verb selectionally restricts for arguments which are high on the animacy scale. The primary exceptions to this were *zon* 'send' and *bran* 'know'. While the other verbs in this section would normally have two human arguments, the verb *zon* 'send', can also readily select for one inanimate argument, as can *bran*. It is not known why these verbs behave differently than other verbs which also typically select for one human and non-human argument.

The data in this section so far illustrate an ergative morpheme with the expected distribution; it has marked the A argument while the S and O are unmarked. However, the situation is more complicated than this. Consider, for example, the data in (26-28), showing bivalent verbs with two overt NPs yet no ergative morphemes.

(26) tiru   zhip   ma-tshu-wala   net   gapo
     money   straighten.out NEG-be.able-PFV   1.PL.ABS   PL.FOC
     'We were not able to straighten out the money' (SBC20051127KW)

(27) Rinzin   gari   'lup
     Rinzin   car   learn
     Rinzin was learning to drive (lit. learn car)' (SBC20051127.KW)

(28) Tshewang   khit   thre-si   'ot-pala   wen   tshe
     Tshewang   3.ABS   lead-NF   bring-PFV   COP.EQ   DM
     New York-ni
     New York-ABL
     'Tshewang brought him along from New York' (SBC20051127KW)

In (26) the verb *zhip* 'straighten.out' takes the A argument *net gapo* '1.PL.ABS FOC.PL' and the O argument *tiru* 'money'. Both arguments are absolutive. Likewise in (27) the *'lup* 'learn' has the A argument *Rinzin* and O *gari* 'car' but neither argument is ergative. (28) provides another example, but with two human arguments; the verb *thre* 'lead' plus auxiliary *ot* 'bring' take the A argument *Tshewang* and the O argument *khit* '3.ABS', both of which are absolutive. Importantly, there are no ergative-marked A arguments in the examples (26-28).

3.2. Pragmatic ergative

For a large portion of Kurtöp verbs, the ergative enclitic actually displays a pragmatic function associated with topicality or emphasis. More specifically, the Kurtöp ergative often exhibits what can be referred to as 'contrastive focus' as defined by Dik *et al.* (1981: 58). That is, the Kurtöp ergative often references an argument ('piece of information') which is opposed to another reference ('some other piece of information'). Consider the data in (29) and (30).

(29) tshe   ge-shang   khit
     DM   go-PFTCV.EGO   3.ABS
     'So he left' (SBC20051127.7KW)

(30) khî   ge-shang
     3.ERG   go-PFTCV.EGO
     '**She** went' (contrary to interlocutor's assumption)

(29) appeared in a conversation during which the speaker discusses the activities of friends and family members back home in Bhutan. He explains to the interlocutor that a certain person is no longer working at his father's shop; he found a good job and left. This is unmarked situation. The use of the ergative in (30) with the same verb signals a pragmatic function. The speaker uses the ergative to highlight the S argument, to contrast the S from another possible (the presupposed) referent. The interlocutor had incorrectly thought the speaker had gone back to their home village and the speaker clarified the issue by using the third person ergative pronoun to signal it was not the speaker who had gone, but a third person referent (the author in this instance).

For another example, consider the data in (31) and (32). The example in (31) describes an event in a story and the S argument occurs in absolute form.

(31) tshe   ozi   meme-the   jong-shang
      DM   then   grandfather-one   emerge-PFV.EGO
      'So then an old man came out' (SBC20051127.7KW)

However, (32) is also possible.

(32) meme-the-gi   jong-shang
      grandfather-one-ERG   emerge-PFV.EGO
      '**An old man** came out' (Elicited data)

A speaker could utter (32) if they wanted to highlight or focus the NP *meme* 'grandfather'. One possible scenario is one in which a group of people are discussing was able to come to a given event. Perhaps it was difficult for people to come; even a number of strong men were not able to complete the journey. At the end of the discourse, (32) could be uttered, stressing that the old man had managed to come even though those who are younger and stronger did not.

The verb *jong* 'emerge' also appears with an ergative-marked S argument in our corpus, as shown in (33). Here, the speaker is again relaying a journey he experienced to his interlocutor. At the beginning of the journey there were about eight or nine people, including the speaker. Along the way, however, the bus broke down and the speaker and his brother decided to continue the journey on foot. By the time the speaker gets to (33) he has relayed most of the tedious journey and concludes with him and his brother reaching their destination. It is not clear, however, in this example that the use of the ergative signals pragmatic focus again, since the remaining passengers in the journey had not been mentioned for several lines previously at this point. Rather, it seems the speaker is stressing the importance of the feat by using the ergative in (33).

(33) zai..   'ngazi   nam   ma-khar-wa   dek-ni
      EXCL   morning   sun   NEG-rise-NMLZR   enter-ABL
      ge-wala-i   net   zon-li   chutshot   yanga
      go-NMLZR-GEN   3.PL.ABS   two-ERG   time   five
      winim-the-na   jong   ge-shang
      COP.EQ.DBT-one-LOC   emerge   go-PFV.EGO
      'Wow… having left early before the sun had risen the two of us came out by around five o'clock.' (SBC20051127.KW)

Another verb which may mark its S argument as ergative is *thrak* 'arrive', as demonstrated in (34) and (35).

(34) yau   thrak-shang   net   zon
     DEM.UP   arrive-PFV.EGO   1.PL.ABS   two
     'The two of us arrived up there' (SBC200511727.KW)

(35) yang   yang-sa-na   ngai   thrak-shang   Phuntsholing-go
     stand   stand-NMLZR-LOC 1.ERG   arrive-PFV.EGO   Phunthsoling-LOC
     'I reached Phuntsholing standing.' (SBC20051127.KW)

In (34) the speaker is again relaying a previous journey. The speaker and a friend had great difficulties in reaching their destination. He describes how they struggled to obtain transportation, how they had to run, and then, in the end, how they finally reached their desintiation. However, in (35) the speaker employs the ergative with the same verb *thrak* 'arrive' to highlight or contrast himself from amongst the others in the group. During a separate trip he was on a crowded bus where he and other people had to stand. At one point all of the others who had been standing had fallen to the ground and were sitting in the aisle of the bus. The speaker, however, remained standing throughout the duration of the trip, and thus uses the ergative to separate or contrast himself from the rest of the group.

Note that in both (29) and (34) the absolutive argument follows the verb while the ergative-marked argument precedes the verb in (30) and (35). While a potential correlation between word order and pragmatics needs to be researched, there does not appear to be a direct correlation between ergativity and word order. (36) shows the ergative-marked argument appearing before the verb while (37) shows the ergative argument following the verb. In both instance the verb is *juk-shang* 'run-PFV.EGO' and the S argument is *ngai* '1.ERG'.

(36) zai   ngai   juk-shang   Taktshang-ngi   yoto   barto
     EXCL   1.ERG   run-PFV.EGO   Taktshang-ABL   DIR:DOWN   DIR:MID
     khako   yoto
     DIR:UP   DIR:DOWN
     'Wow, I ran up and down and everywhere from Taktshang.'
     (SBC20051127)

(37) ong   tshe   shama   juk-shang   ngai
     AGR   DM   often   run-PFV.EGO   1.ERG
     'Yeah I ran often' (SBC20051127)

Note that (36) and (37) also present instances of the pragmatic ergative. These two can be contrasted with the data in (38).

(38) yam-ni   thun-do   gor-si   thiphin   gapo   otor
     road-ABL   DEM.DIST-LOC   turn-NF   tiffin   PL.FOC   like.this
     juk-ta   tshe
     run-IPFV.MIR   DM
     'The tiffins were all turning that way from the road, running like that.'
     (SBC20051127.KW)

The data in (38) can be considered an unmarked example in which the speaker is describing a scene. In the particular scene addressed in (38), the speaker is describing an incident in which a car door opened while the vehicle was enroute and cookware and cutlery came out of the car. In (37) and (36), however, the speaker is describing a difficult job he had to do and uses the ergative to emphasize his relationship to the task. Note that the use of the pragmatic ergative in these instances is again not a type of contrastive focus; the speaker is not identifying himself as opposed to someone else. Neither is the speaker expressing intentionality or volitionality on his part, as this was a job someone else made him do. He is emphasizing the difficulty of the task and his involvement; this use is similar to what was illustrated in (33).

Until now we have only seen the pragmatic ergative used with animate arguments. However, the pragmatic ergative may also be used with inanimate arguments. In (39) the pragmatic ergative is cliticized to *trak* 'truck'.

(39) trak-gi   tshe   trak   nami   gi-si   gi-si   sutla
     truck-ERG   DM   truck   ruin   go-NF   go-NF   night
     chutshot   chauni   ni   'akpa   winim-the-na
     time   eleven   and   how.much   COP.EQ.DBT-ONE-LOC
     yoi-shang   tshe   net   mau
     reach.TR-PFV.EGO   DM   1.PL.ABS   DEM.DOWN
     'As for the truck, the truck keeps breaking down and reaches us down there by around 11 at night.' (SBC2005112.KW)

Here, the function of the ergative seems to be one of marking definiteness and signaling change of topic. Note that the ergative appears only on the first mention of *trak* 'truck' and not on the second mention when immediately preceding the verb.

The unifying factor found in ergative-marked (30), (32), (35), (36), (37), and (39), S aguments compared to the absolutive-marked arguments in (29), (31), (34) and (38) is that the ergative serves to highlight or focus the argument while the absolutive arguments are pragmatically unmarked. The ergative in (30), (32), (35) versus the ergative in (36), (37) and (39), however does not appear to represent the same function. In the former three, the ergative is marking contrastive focus (cf. Dik *et al*. 1981; Chafe 1976) but that is not true of the latter three examples.

In fact, it is not clear that focus (broad or narrow) would be the best analysis for -*gi* in these instances.[14]

In at least one instance the choice between the ergative and absolutive also signals a tense difference. In (40) the verb *dot* 'sleep' is interpreted as past tense. However, in (41) the S argument appears in ergative case and the verb is interpreted as being in future tense.

(40) tshe   net   gapo-ya   o-ye-na   zhâ   dot
     DM   1.PL.ABS   PL.FOC-ALSO   PROX-UP-LOC   night   sleep
     'So we also slept up there.' (SBC20051127.KW)

(41) net   gapo-i-ya   dot
     1.PL.ABS   PL.FOC-ERG-ALSO   sleep
     'We will also sleep (up there).' (Elicited data)

I suspect the possible tense differences evidenced in (40-41) fall out from the combination of the pragmatic ergative with the particular aspectual/evidential function of the bare verb stem.

Until now I have illustrated uses of the pragmatic ergative with monovalent verbs. While the majority of verbs which may employ the pragmatic ergative are monovalent, there are instances of bivalent verbs also employing the pragmatic ergative. Compare (42) and (43).

(42) net   tiru   yanga   yanga   bi-shang
     1.PL.ABS   money   five   five   give-PFV.EGO
     'We gave five bucks ('ngultram) each' (SBC20051127.KW)

(43) nei   tiru   yanga   yanga   bi-shang
     1.PL.ERG   money   five   five   give-PFV.EGO
     '**We** gave five bucks ('ngultram) each.' (Elicited data)

Example (42) illustrates the unmarked instance for this verb; *bi* 'give' normally takes an absolutive marked A. This particular example comes from a conversation in which the speaker is relaying events of a journey, with one of the events being that he and a friend paid five 'ngultram each for a bus ticket. However (43) could be uttered if the speaker wanted to stress that he and a friend had paid (in contrast to some other party). In other words, (43) is another example of the ergative signaling contrastive focus, though this time with a bivalent verb.

---

[14] Interestingly, (35) begins with a sharp rising intonation. However, this type of intonation is not exclusive to examples like (35); a sharp rising intonation was also associated with (33). However, the interaction between intonation, word order, and morphosyntax in marking focus is beyond the scope of this article.

The fact that the possibility of using the pragmatic ergative is a feature of a given verb is underscored by the data in (44) and (45), which can be contrasted with (43) and (42).

(44) nei   tiru   yanga   yanga   zon-shang
    1.PL.ERG   money five   five   send-PFV.EGO
    'We sent five bucks ('ngultram) each' (Elicited data)

(45) *net   tiru   yanga   yanga   zon-shang
    1.PL.ABS   money five   five   send-PFV.EGO

In (42) and (43) the verb *bi* 'give' takes an absolutive-marked A argument in the unmarked scenario but may employ the pragmatic ergative to mark contrastive focus. In sharp contrast to this are (44) and (45), where the A argument must be ergative and the absolutive is not allowed. In addition to whatever semantic differences there are between *zon* 'send' and *bi* 'give', there are two syntactic differences: the verb *bi* 'give' occurs in many light verb constructions and occurs as a main verb only, while *zon* 'send' has not been found in any light verb constructions and, in addition to being a main verb, also occurs as an auxiliary. It is not clear these syntactic differences would have any effect on the use of the ergative marker.

3.3. Ergative resistant verbs

A subset of Kurtöp monovalent verbs mark their argument in absolutive case and rarely allow for ergative case. These verbs tend to have arguments which are typically patients and lower on the animacy scale. These verbs have been termed 'unaccusative' in the literature. Weather verbs and verbs which describe a change of state fall into this category. Consider the data in (46-49).

(46) meto   throng-ta
    flower   grow-IPFV.MIR
    'A/the flower is growing' (elicited data)
    *meto-gi throngta

(47) mar   zhu-ta
    butter   melt-IPFV.MIR
    '(The) butter is melting' (elicited data)
    *mar-gi zhuta

(48) phrum   rui-ta
    cheese   rot-IPFV.MIR
    '(The) cheese is rotting' (elicited data)
    *phrum-gi ruita

(49) yui   ra-ta
    rain   come-IPFV.MIR
    'It's raining' (elicited data)
    *yui-gi ruita

As illustrated by the data in (46-49), ergative counterparts are not available for the sentences.

Another verb which is resistant to the ergative is *shak* 'die.HON', as illustrated by the data in (50). While the verb *shak* 'die.HON' typically restricts for an argument high on the animacy scale, the argument generally has the semantic role of patient.

(50) yum   shak-shang   wu   ai
    mother.HON   die.HON-PFV.EGO TAG   EXCL
    'Oh, the mother expired, no?' (SBC720051127PC)
    *yum-gi shakshang

However, at least two of these verbs can occur with an ergative marked S in another context, as exhibited by the data in (51-52).

(51) phrum-gi   rui-zi   me-nyan-ta
    cheese-ERG   rot-NF   NEG-accept-IPFV.MIR
    '**The cheese** is going on getting **rotten**' (elicited data)

(52) yui-gi   nenca   rang   ra-ta
    rain-ERG   day   EMPH   come-IPFV.MIR
    'It's always **raining** during the day' (elicited data)

The data in (51) and (52) were offered by different speakers during elicitation. In both instances, the ergative can only occur with the added words and an expanded context. The speakers expressed the view that in the data in (51) and (52), the S argument is somehow **rotting** or **coming** on purpose. In one speaker's own words, with regard to (52) 'you want to blame the rain by using *-gi*'. In both instances the S argument is attributed with a sense of volition. That is, when a context is made explicit, the S argument can take the ergative morpheme as a way to provide the sense that the given S argument is instigating or controlling the event, or force an agent interpretation onto the S argument. The data in (53) and (54), in contrast to those in (51) and (52), show that when the ergative morpheme is removed, the added sense of agency is removed as well.

(53) phrum   rui-zi me-yan-ta
    cheese   rot-NF NEG-accept-IPFV.MIR
    'The cheese just keeps getting rotten' (elicited data)

(54) yui   nenca rang ra-ta
     rain   day   EMPH come-IPFV.MIR
     'It's always raining during the day' (elicited data)

The data in (53) and (54) could be uttered when the speaker just wishes to articulate an observation and perhaps complain about the situation. However, the complaint can go a step further with (51) and (52) above by using the ergative to attribute an added sense of agency or volition, and blaming the *phrum* 'cheese' and *yui* 'rain' for the action. The use of the ergative in these instances differs from the uses we have seen previously. Here, the ergative does not signal the A argument nor mark contrastive focus. The function of the ergative in (51) and (52) also appears different than that of (36) or (37).

To summarize, the data (51-52) showed that verbs in this category may take the ergative if a non-agent is conceived of as an agent or instigator. The use of the ergative to encode agency or intentionality is witnessed in these examples for the first time; previous uses of the ergative described in this article did not have this function.

Within the text database the verbs described in this section have not occurred with ergative marking on their S argument, and in fact I found that the ergative was allowed only in further conversation and elicitation with native speakers. The verbs presented in this section illustrate a small set of verbs which share the semantics of what have been termed 'unaccusative' verbs in the literature. These verbs tend to have arguments which are low on the animacy scale. Verbs in this category are monovalent and are unlikely to use the ergative marker. When the ergative marker is employed, instead of providing a sense of contrastive focus, as we have seen prevalent in other instances of the optional ergative, the ergative here adds a sense of agency.

4. CASE-MARKING ON O ARGUMENTS

Kurtöp bivalent verbs can be divided into two sets with regard to case-marking on the O argument. One set of bivalent verbs requires the O argument to be unmarked while a subset of bivalent verbs exhibit differential object marking (DOM). This latter set of verbs marks their O argument with a locative postposition depending on various pragmatic factors. Section 4.1 examines the verbs which do not allow the O argument to be marked and §4.2 presents the verbs which display differential object marking.

4.1. Unmarked O

A large set of verbs in Kurtöp require the O arguments to be unmarked. The data in (55-56) below provide an example of a verb which cannot mark its O argument with either the *-na* or *-ro* locative.

(55) tiru   drangkha   thung-taki
money counting   do-IPFV
'(We were) counting money' (SBC720051127913KW)
*tiru-na/-ro drangkha thungtaki

(56) ja co-zi   'ipa co-zi   bi-ta
tea make-NF food make-NF give-IPFV.MIR
'(He) made tea and food for (us) (SBC720051127KW)
*ja-na/-ro cozi

Although (55) and (56) show verbs with inanimate arguments, it is not required that verbs in this category have inanimate Os, as shown by the data in (57-58) below.

(57) net   zon   'ru-zi
1.PL.ABS   two   wake.up-NF
'(He) woke the two of us up...' (SBC720051127KW)
*net zon-na/-ro 'ruzi

(58) khit   dom-zi tshene khit   tapthi   charo
3.ABS   meet- NF then 3. ABS together friend
'(I) met him and then befriended him' (SBC720051127KW)
*khit-na/-ro domzi

Some other verbs which fit this category are: *bja* 'summon', *ker* 'carry', *tup* 'slice', *lup* 'study', *me thung* 'build.a.house', *zu* 'eat', *nyang* 'receive', *kim* 'step.over', *ki* 'plant' and *kang* 'fill.with'. Interestingly, the verb *bja* 'summon' does display DOM when it occurs with *kha shû ngak* 'yell', as shown in §4.2 below. It remains unknown how the remainder of these verbs differ from those which may take DOM, described §4.2.

4.2. Differential Object Marking

Differential object marking (DOM) is the phenomenon in which verbal O arguments are marked differently under different contexts. Classic examples are Spanish and Hindi, which, to varying degrees, mark animate and topical O arguments with the same forms used to mark dative case. Bossong (1991) describes DOM in Semitic and Romance and its functional motivations, arguing that DOM represents a preferred diachronic development in which arguments that are semantically prototypical, that is, patient-like, are intimately tied to the verb and therefore unmarked. However, objects which are more independent, autonomous, or more likely to be subjects, are positively marked[15] (Bossong

---

[15] Regarding what he means by "subject" and "object" Bossong (1991: 144, fn1) writes: "The intricate problems connected with these notions cannot be discussed here. These basic grammatical relations can be described as combinations of formal, semantic, and pragmatic

1991). The situation in Kurtöp appears to be more complex than this. In Kurtöp, one set of verbs may leave their O unmarked or marked with *-na* or *-ro* depending on pragmatic factors. However, it remains to be seen whether the diachronic motivation described in Bossong (1991) will obtain for Kurtöp.

Before discussing the Kurtöp data in detail, it will be useful to review the locative markers in the language. Recall that Kurtöp employs two postpositions to mark locative case: *-na* and *-ro*. Both mark recipients and possessors and both locatives can also be used in DOM. Although I note a slight difference in the pragmatics of each, I have not yet discerned the full functional difference between the two locatives. Consider (59-61) below.

(59) draiber sit-gi   chando ose   no   khepo bre
      driver   seat-GEN side   there   younger.brother FOC   keep
      '(I) kept my younger brother by the driver's seat' (SBC720051127KW)

(60) draiber sit-gi   chando   ose   no   khepo-na   bre
      driver   seat-GEN side   there   younger.brother FOC-LOC   keep
      '(I) kept my younger brother by the driver's seat' (elicited data)

(61) draiber sit-gi   chando   ose   no   khepo-ro   bre
      driver   seat-GEN side   there   younger.brother FOC-LOC   keep
      '(I) kept my younger brother by the driver's seat' (elicited data)

The precise pragmatic differences between (60) and (61) compared to (59), and the difference between (60) and (61) require further research, though the consensus among the speakers is that somehow *no* 'younger.brother' becomes more important, or more salient, in (60) and (61).

At least one verb (*bja* 'summon') mentioned in §4.1, evidences DOM when it occurs as an auxiliary with a light verb. Consider the data in (62-64). Again, the data without a locative marked O is the unmarked utterance, but (63) and (64) are also possible if the speaker would like to stress the O. However, it remains unclear in which way the O becomes stressed.

(62) khî   ngat   kha   shû   ngak   bja-ta
      3.ERG   1.ABS   mouth strength QUOT   summon-IPFV.MIR
      'S/he is yelling at me' (elicited data)

(63) khî   ngat-na   kha   shû   ngak bja-ta
      3.ERG   1.ABS-LOC   mouth strength QUOT summon-IPFV.MIR
      'S/he is yelling at me' (elicited data)

---

features. … For the purpose of the present contribution it is sufficient to understand the terms 'subject' and 'object' in their current traditional sense."

(64) khî   ngat-o   kha   shû   ngak bja-ta
     3.ERG   1.ABS-LOC mouth strength QUOT summon-IPFV.MIR
     'S/he is yelling at me' (elicited data)

Another example of DOM is illustrated by the data in (65-67). In these data we were able to obtain a better sense of the pragmatics associated with the use of DOM.

(65) khî   ngat   kha   'num-shang
     3.ERG   1.ABS   mouth attach-PFV.EGO
     'S/he kissed me (asserting a fact)' (elicited data)

(66) khî   ngat-na   kha   'num-shang
     3.ERG 1.ABS-LOC mouth   attach-PFV.EGO
     'S/he kissed **me** (rather than someone else)' (elicited data)

(67) khî ngat-o   kha   'num-shang
     3.ERG 1.ABS-LOC   mouth   attach-PFV.EGO
     'S/he **kissed me** (contrary to expectation)' (elicited data)

In the unmarked instance (59) the O is unmarked. When the speaker wishes to emphasize the O in terms of contrastive focus, the locative *-na* is employed, as in (66). The data in (67) appear to be marking broad, rather than narrow focus. In the terms of Dik et al. (1981), the data in (67) represent predication focus, where the whole predicate is being focused.

DOM in Kurtöp may occur with a number of other verbs, such as *prin* 'lick', *tshoda thung* 'scold', *danjali thung* 'slap', *dokpi thung* 'kick', *jagaling top* 'tickle', *tsimbi bra* 'scratch', *khuntol thung* 'punch', and *ga* 'enjoy'. What these verbs have in common, in contrast to the verbs described in §4.1, remains to be understood.

There are some additional verbs in Kurtöp which exhibit a different pattern altogether. Consider the data in (68).

(68) ["hapta the khepo"] [trong-i   mi gapo pura-na] lap-si
       week one FOC   village-GEN man PL.FOC all-LOC   say-NF
     "[hapta the   khepo] [[o   ko   khepo] phi-ra
       week one FOC   DEM.PROX   door   FOC   open-EMPH
     ma-phi-ye-re]"   ngaksi
     NEG-open-IMP-PTCP   QUOT
     '(He) told the villagers that for one week, "you absolutely must not open the door for one week".' (KS20061212KL)
     *trongi mi gapo pura lapsi

These data show that the verb *lap* 'say' must mark the perceived O argument with locative case. If we remove the locative *-na* from the putative O *trongi mi gapo pura* 'all the villagers', the sentence becomes ungrammatical. We have found the verbs *tsho* 'order' and *pco khot* 'tell lies' to also exhibit this pattern. Whether these verbs are bivalent and require obligatory marking of the O argument, or are monovalent and are marking an oblique argument remains to be seen and is an area of ongoing research.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Kurtöp provides yet another example of a Tibeto-Burman language which employs a system of case marking that is difficult to capture in purely grammatical terms. Verbal semantics play an important role in determining whether Kurtöp verbal arguments may or may not utilize the ergative marker, and further, verbal semantics seem to play a role in deciding what the function of the ergative case marker will be. Specifically, we have seen the Kurtöp ergative to obligatorily mark the A argument in a bivalent clause, to disambiguate two potential agents, to mark contrastive focus, to attribute greater volition to inanimate objects, and to supply further pragmatics, the exact function of which remains to be studied.

Kurtöp also displays differential object marking via the use of two possible locative markers, though the Kurtöp phenomenon differs from what has been described for other languages such as Spanish, Hindi and Semitic (cf. Bossong 1991). In §4 I illustrated that a subset of Kurtöp verbs allow for both locative markers to appear on the O argument. This phenomenon in Kurtöp remains the least understood, though it is clear that in at least one instance the use of locative *-na* was associated with contrastive focus and *-ro* was associated with predication focus. A coherent semantic basis for the group of verbs which allowed for DOM is not obvious.

That semantics contribute to case marking—and especially ergativity—in Tibeto-Burman has been noticed by many. Meithei (Chelliah 1997), for example, is argued to encode semantic, rather than syntactic, roles with postpositions. Darma (Willis 2007) appears to have a more or less ergative/absolutive case-marking system, with ergative appearing on the A argument in all tenses and aspects. The Darma ergative is described as 'optional', though it tends to appear more in the past tense. However, based on the data and arguments presented in Willis (2007), it does not appear that the optional ergative in Darma bears any particular pragmatic function, unlike in Kurtöp.

The Kinnauri ergative appears to be closer in function to the Kurtöp form. Saxena (ms) describes the Kinnauri ergative as a form which occurs almost obligatorily with subjects of main clauses introducing direct speech. Saxena (ms) argues that the distribution of the Kinnauri ergative cannot be accounted for unless we take into account such notions as context-shift, and again, contrastive focus. Perhaps the Tibetan ergative as described by Tournarde (1991) is most similar to Kurtöp. Tournarde describes a "rhetorical" ergative in Tibetan, the

distribution of which is guided by a combination of verbal semantics and syntax. When optional, the Tibetan ergative takes on a contrastive type of focus. In the Tibetan dialect spoken in Kyirong, the distribution of the ergative is similarly complex. Huber (2005, §4.4) shows that in Kyirong Tibetan verb type (control, valency) and aspect condition whether or not the ergative morpheme is possible. When used, the Kyiron Tibetan ergative seems to have an emphatic function. Tshangla (Andvik to appear), another Tibeto-Burman language of Bhutan, provides an additional instance of ergative marking that is impossible to describe without reference to semantics and pragmatics.

In a comparative survey on ergativity in 151 Tibeto-Burman languages, LaPolla (1995) identifies both 'systemic' and 'non-systemic' morphological marking of ergativity. The function of 'non-systemic' ergativity is to disambiguate two potential agents—one function of the Kurtöp ergative. Because of the different functions of 'non-systemic' ergativity when compared to 'systemic' ergativity, LaPolla prefers to use the term 'agentive' to refer to this phenomena. Given the description of 'agentive' marking in recent descriptions of Tibeto-Burman (e.g. Chelliah 1997 for Meithei; Coupe 2007 for Ao; Andvik to appear for Tshangla), one could argue the term of 'agentive' would be useful to describe what I have called the Kurtöp 'ergative'. Despite this, I opt to maintain the term 'ergative' because of its obligatory presence in some instances and its formal similarity to other ergative markers in closely related languages.

One could argue that the Kurtöp 'ergative' system may be more akin to the 'agentive' marking described for Tshangla (Andvik to appear) and Meithei (Chelliah 1997) than an 'optional ergative' system described, for example, by McGregor (2009). However, the fact remains that the Kurtöp ergative is required in some instances (§3.1) and not possible in other (§3.3), as would be expected of a grammaticalized system of case-marking. In terms of McGregor's typology and in terms of what we know about ergativity in Tibeto-Burman languages, particularly of the Himalayas, the apparent non-systemicity and pragmatic functions of the Kurtöp ergative are less striking. Ergativity, it seems, particularly in the India to western China region, is often intertwined with pragmatic factors. Recently, Poornima (2009) reports similar pragmatic uses of the Hindi ergative, pushing the pragmatic ergative beyond Tibeto-Burman.

APPENDIX

Many of the examples from this article came from a collection of transcribed and translated texts and I have included examples of some of these texts below. The first text below is a very small section from a larger conversation between two friends, which gives examples of the pragmatic ergative. The second text is the entire narration of a story about an encounter of an old woman with Drukpa Künle, the divine madman. In the second text there are many instances of the syntactic ergative.

SBC20051125.7.KW

ngat	khepo-yang	ngak-si	net	sum-bakti	yang-zi	nâ
1.ABS	FOC-ALSO	do-NF	1.PL.ABS	three-AROUND	stand-NF	COP.EXIS.MIR

'I was standing, there were about three of us who were standing'

bar-to	yam-na	jong-khan	'ê-yang	mutna
middle-LOC	path-LOC	emerge-NMLZR	who-ALSO	COP.EXIS.NEG.MIR

'There was no one who got off along the way'

net	sum	nga-wal-the	yang-zi
1.PL.ABS	three	do-NMLZR-DEF	stand-NF

'The three of us were the only ones standing'

yang	yang-sa-na	Phuntsholing	thrak-shang	ngai
stand	stand-NMLZR-LOC	Phuntsholing	arrive-PFV.EGO	1.ERG

'While standing **I** arrived at Phuntsholing'

charo	sum-ta	ri	gi-na	o	bas-gi	o
friend	three-EMPH	fall	go-PFV.MIR	PROX.DEM	bus-GEN	PROX.DEM

bar-ni	thun-do	gwar-zi	se-sal	sisa
middle-EMPH	DIST-LOC	turn-NF	die-NMLZR	LIKE

yang	yang-sa-na	ngai	thrak-shang	Phuntsholing-go
stand	stand-NMLZR-LOC	1.ERG	arrive-PFV.EGO	Phuntsholing-LOC

'(My) three friends fell down in the middle of that bus, going like they had died; (but) standing, **I** arrived at Phuntsholing'

KS20061212.KL

'ator	mapa	o	sung	khepo	aaa	ner-i..	nangpa-gi
how	originally	DEM.PROX	story	FOC	HES	3.PL.INCL-GEN	insider(Buddhist)-GEN

'lama	'lam	Drukpa	Künle	nga-wala-gi	gang-ki	wenta
lama	lama	Drukpa	Künle	do-NMLZR-GEN	time-GEN	COP.EQ.MIR

'This story is about how, originally, our … it's during the time of our Buddhist lama Lama Drukpa Künle'

'napa	'ama	the-gi	'namisami	khit-na	depa
earlier	woman	one-ERG	very	3.ABS-LOC	devotion

na-wala-gi	korni
cop-NMLZR-GEN	about

'It's about a woman in the past who was very devoted to him'

o-ci   korni   wen   sung   khepo   mapa
DEM.PROX-GEN   about   COP.EQ story FOC   originally
'This is what the story is about originally'

'napa   'napa   tshe trong   the-na   'ai
earlier earlier DM   village one-LOC   grandmother

the nawal   wenta
one COP.EXIS   COP.EQ.MIR
'A long time ago in a village there was an old woman.'

'ai   khepo   tshe   mapa   'lam   Drukpa
grandmother   FOC   DM   originally   lama   Drukpa

Künle nga-khan   khepo
Künle do-NMLZR   FOC

me-je-na   je-mal-ta   tshe
NEG-see.HON-PFV.MIR   see.HON-FUT-EMPH   DM

shara   khir   thun   tshon-do   pholap
continuously   3.REFL   DIST.DEM   here-LOC   talks

hago-zi   'lam-gi   korni tshe
hako-si   lama-GEN   about DM
'Even though the old woman had never seen this man called Drukpa Künle she'd heard about him continuously through the talks here and there.'

ne   thu-sa-ning   'namisami   depa   kut-si   'lama-nang
ear hear-NMLZR-ABL   very   devotion   bow-NF   lama-LOC
'After hearing about him she was very devoted to the lama.'

[da   "[[ngaci   tsawa-i] 'lama]   wen"   ngak   [nang-i]   [khira sem-gi
now   1.GEN   root-GEN lama   COP.EQ QUOT   inside-GEN   3.REFL mind-GEN
nang-i]   tshe   ['namisami depa   kut-si]   ][tsawa-i 'lama] ngak
inside-GEN DM   very   devotion bow-NF   root-GEN   lama   QUOT
tan-pal   wenta]   tshe]
dedicate-PFV COP.EQ.MIR   DM
'"Now he's my root lama" she said and inside, inside her mind she became very devoted to him as her root lama and dedicated herself to him.'

o   'lam DrukpaKünle khepo
DEM.PROX lama   Drukpa   Künle FOC

da   mapa   'napa   mapa   'ai   khepo-gi
now originally earlier originally grandmother FOC-ERG

'lam DrukpaKünle   khepo 'napa   je-rang
Lama DrukpaKünle   SG.FOC earlier see.HON-EMPH

me-je-na   tshe shara   khir   'namisami depa   kut-si
see.HON-PFV.MIR DM continuously 3.REFL very   devotion   bow-NF

da   ngaci tsawa-i 'lama   wen   share ngaksi
now 1.GEN root-GEN lama   COP.EQ EXCL QUOT

'The lama Drukpa Künle, now the women had never ever seen the lama Drukpa Khepo earlier but she being continuously devoted to him said "now he is my root lama!"'

nenmal-gongto   'namisami châ   tshe-sha-ra...
every.day   very   hand.HON prostrate-PFV-EMPH

'Every day she would prostrate'

'lam Drukpa Künle   sem-na   dren-zi   châ   tshe
lama Drukpa Künle   mind-LOC REMEMBER-NF hand.HON   prostrate

'With Lama Drukpa Künle in her mind should prostrate'

otor   ngak-si 'namisami depa   kut-tak   wenta
like.this do-NF   very   devotion bow-IPFV   COP.EQ.MIR

'That's how devoted she was'

tshe nam   the   khit   chorten   the   chorten kora
DM day   one   3.ABS chorten   one   chorten circumambulation

thung ngak ni-sal   wenta   chorten the   kora   thung
do   do   stay-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR chorten one   circumambulation do

mani jang-zi   om   mani   pemi hung mani
prayer chant-NF   om   mani   pemi hung mani

pemi hung ngaksi   tshe
pemi hung QUOT   DM

chorten the kora   thung ngak   ni-mo
chorten one circumambulation do   do   stay-CTM

mi   the ra-ta-ri
person one come-IPFV.MIR-HSY

'napa   'arwa-yang   mik ma-thung-wala-i   mi   the
earlier   when-also   eye NEG-do-NMLZR-GEN   man   one
'So one day, a chorten, she was circumambulating the chorten, she was circumambulating the chorten saying "om mani pemi hung, mani pemi hung", so while circumambulating the chorten a man came, a man she had never seen.'

wai 'aiya   zha ngak-tak   yo   ngâ-mo
hey grandmother what do-IPFV   QP   do-CTM

tshe ngat chorten   kora   thung-ta   nga-wal
DM   1.ABS chorten   circumambulation   do-IPFV.MIR do-PFV

wenta   tshe
COP.EQ.MIR   DM
(When the lama asked) "hey old woman, what are you doing" she said: "well I am circumambulating a chorten"

tshe wici   'lama 'ê   yo
DM   2.GEN   lama who   QP

ngâ-mo   tshe ngaci tsawa-i 'lama
do-CTM   DM   1.GEN root-GEN lama

khepo 'lam Drupka   Künle   wen nga-wala   wenta   tshe
FOC   lama Drupka   Künle   COP do-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR   DM
'When he asked "who is your lama", she said "well it's Lama Drupka Künle".'

eee tshe wai wici   tsawa-i   'lama khepo 'lam   Drupka
HES dm   hey 2.GEN   root-GEN   lama FOC   lama   Drupka

Künle ra-mal   wenta
Künle come-FUT   COP.EQ.MIR
Um, 'Hey, your root lama, Lama Drupka Künle, is coming now.'

dara   ...   perna   ...   wici   tsawa-i   'lama
present   suppose   2.GEN   root-GEN   lama

khepo wi-ci   dong-go   'rung-zi   nâ-nani
FOC   2-GEN   in.front-LOC stand-NF   COP.EXIS-COND

wî   zha   ngak   ko   nga-wal   wenta   tshe
2-ERG what   do   QP   do-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR   DM
'Now, suppose, if your root lama were standing in front of you, what would you do?'

da   ngâ-mal-ta zha   ngak ko ...   ngari   'namisami nang-i
now   do-FUT-EMPH what   do   QP   1.REFL.GEN   very   inside-GEN

depa   da   na-wala tshe share ngat   tshe
devotion   now   do-PFV   DM   EXCL   1.ABS DM

'namisami   chukpo-ni   min   tshe me-do   ...
very   rich-ABL   COP.EQ. NEG   DM   house-LOC

zhor   palang the ning   tshe khauti dakti nawala
alcohol bed   one and   DM   egg   few   COP.EXIS
'Now what would I do… I am very devoted indeed, but I am not rich, so at my house there is alcohol, a bed, and a few eggs.

o   khep   phui-male   nga-wal   wenta   'lama-nang
DEM.PROX   FOC   offer-FUT   do-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR   lama-LOC
'"I will offer that", (she) said, to the lama.'

tshe 'lam-i   ... 'lam-i   zumthrul-gi   ngak-si tshe
DM   lama-ERG   lama-GEN   supernatural.powers-ERG do-NF   DM
'So the lama, the lama's supernatural powers…'

tshe 'lam tshe khir   'lam ngoma   khep   ...   'napa
DM   lama DM   3.EMPH lama original FOC   earlier

khep khir   mi   soso   co-zi   ra
FOC   3.REFL person different make-NF   come
'So the lama, the original lama, earlier he had come as a different person'

ju-na   'lama tun-zi..   tshe 'lam Drukpa Künle ngat   wen
end-LOC   lama show-NF   DM   lama Drukpa Künle 1.ABS COP.EQ

ngâ-mo   'namisami 'ai   tshe
do-CTM   very   grandmother   DM

depa   mögü kut-si   'namisami yi   che-zi   tshe 'lama
devotion   esteem bow-NF   very   truth.feeling moan-NF   DM   lama

châ   tshe-zi   o   thang-na-ra   châ   tshe   bito-rang
arm.HON   prostrate-NF   DEM.PROX   plane-LOC-EMPH   arm.HON   prostrate   outside-EMPH
'In the end, the lama showed himself and when he said "Drukpa Künle am I", the
old woman became very overcome with devotion and she prostrated right there on
the ground outside.'

tsheni   tshe   me-do   thre-zi   khor-wal   wenta   tshe
then   DM   house-LOC   lead-NF   take-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR   DM

me-do   khor-zi   da   nga-ci   zhor   palang the   ni
house-LOC   take-NF   now   1-GEN   alcohol   bed   one   and

'lama khepo 'namisami   zhor-na   thu   'nye-tak   wenta
lama   FOC   very   alcohol-LOC   heart.HON   enjoy.HON-IPFV   COP.EQ.MIR
'And then she lead him to her house, lead him to house, and now my alcohol,
alcohol, bed and… the lama was very interested in the alcohol.'

tshe medo   thre-zi   khor   ngak   tshe ...
DM   house-LOC   lead-NF   take   do   DM
'She led him to her house'

zhor   khepo-ya   drang   ..   khauti
alcohol   FOC -also   give.HON   egg

khepo-ya   drang-zi   tshe
FOC -also   give.hon-NF   DM

'ai   'namisami sem   ga-zi
grandmother   very   mind   enjoy-NF

'enji   ngâ-male wen   ma-bran-pal   depa-gi
how.much   do-NMLZR COP   NEG-know-PFV   devotion-INSTR
After also offering the alcohol and eggs the woman was so happy and she didn't
know what to say out of devotion.'

tshe trong-na   mi   gapo   pura   ja-zi   mi   gatpo
DM   village-LOC   person PL.FOC all   summon-NF   person   old.man

ganmo   khir-i   charo   gap   pura   ja-zi   tshe
old.woman   3.REFL-GEN   friend   PL.FOC all   summon-NF   DM

'lam   Drukpa Künle jon-zi   nawal   share ngaksi
Lama Drukpa Künle come.go.HON-NF   COP.EXIS   EXCL QUOT
'So   she called all the villagers, the old folks - her friends - she called, "Lama
Drukpa Künle has come, hey."

tshe mi   zhanma gapo-i-yang   'napa-ni-ra   'lama-i   korni ne
then person another PL.FOC-ERG-also   earlier-ABL-EMPH lama-GEN   about ear.HON

thu-zi   na-wal-i   tshe depa-i   ngak-si
hear.HON-NF   COP-NMLZR-GEN   DM   devotion-INSTR   do-NF

pura-gi   zhor   'ot-si   pura-gi   zhor   gapo-ya   'lama-ro
all-ERG   alcohol bring-NF   all-ERG   alcohol   PL.FOC-also lama-LOC

drang   ngak   ni-sal   wenta   tshe   ...
give.HON do   stay-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR   DM
'And then the other people also, having heard earlier about the lama, respected
him and all brought alcohol, all brought the alcohol and all and were offering it to
the lama.'

shama the-ni   tshe   ...   'lama-gi   mir   khira-gi
awhile one-ABL DM   lama-ERG   others   3.REFL-GEN

'ngöshü-gi   ngak-si 'ai   khepo da   se-i   ran-pal
omniscience-INSTR   do-NF   grandmother FOC   now   die-GEN time.to-NMLZR

wen-ci   bran-pal   wenta
COP-GEN know-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR
'After a while, then the lama, due to his omniscience, knew that the old woman's
time to die had come'

da   se-mal   wenta ngak 'ai   khepo
now   die-FUT   COP.MIR QUOT grandmother   FOC
'"Now the old woman is going to die" (he said).'

da   se-mal   wenta ngak   bran-zi
now   die-FUT   COP.MIR QUOT   know-NF

tshe   'ai   khepo   tsheni 'lamagi
DM   grandmother FOC   then   lama-ERG

mi   zhanma gapo   pura zon   ngak
person   another PL.FOC all   send do

'ai   khepo   rum   the-nang   dam ...
grandmother FOC   room   one-LOC   lock

thu   chösham-na   the ngak dam   bre-wal   wenta
over.there alter.room-LOC one do   tie   keep-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR
'Now, knowing she is going to die, the old woman, then the lama sent out all the
other people and locked the woman in the alter room over there, he locked her
up.'

ko   thung-zi   dimi   thung-zi   hapta   the   khepo
door do-NF   lock   do-NF   week   one   FOC

ko   phi-ra   ma-phi-yo   ngaksi   'ê-ya-nang ...
door open-EMPH   NEG-open-IMP.FUT QUOT   who-also-LOC

hapta   the   khepo   trong-i   mi   gapo
week   one   FOC   village-GEN   person PL.FOC

pura-na   lap-si   hapta   the   khepo
all-LOC   tell-NF   week   one   FOC

o   ko khepo phi-ra   ma-phi-ya-re   ngaksi
DEM.PROX door FOC   open-EMPH   NEG-open-IMP-EXCL QUOT

ban   thung-zi-ra   brek go   ngaksi
shut   do-NF-EMPH   keep need QUOT

otor   lap tshe khit gi-mu
like.this   tell DM   3.ABS go-PFV.IND
'He locked the door and said "For one week you absolutely cannot open the
door", he told the villagers, don't let anyone open the door for one week, "For one
week you absolutely cannot open the door, okay", he said "shut it and keep it that
way" he said left'.

tshe-ni tsheni hapta the ge-sha-ra   tshe 'ai   jong-mal
DM-ABL DM-ABL week one go-PFV-EMPH DM   grandmother emerge-FUT

mutle
COP.EQ.NEG.IND
'Then, then even after one week the old woman didn't emerge.'

tsheni tshe   mira nang-o   to   mû
then   DM   others inside-LOC food COP.EXIS.NEG

zha-ya   mû   'ai   jong-mal   mutle
what-also COP.EXIS.NEG grandmother   emerge-FUT   COP.EQ.NEG.IND

mi   gapo   'namto lang-zi   wai   dangan   la   ...
person   PL.FOC   shock   be.full-NF EXCL   EXCL   POL

o   mi   'ê   wen   mutle   otor   co   khot-pal
DEM.PROX   person who CO.EQP COP.EQ.NEG.IND   like.this lies   tell-NMLZR

the-gi   'lama wen   ngak   co-zi   ra-zi   da   'ai
one-GEN   lama COP.EQ   QUOT   lie-NF   come-NF   now   grandmother

sut-pal   wenta   ngaksi
kill-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR   QUOT

'Then, so, others, inside there was no food, there was nothing, the old woman didn't come out and the people were so shocked, "hey, now, that man who is nothing, the lie-telling man came lying saying "I am a lama" and now he killed the old woman", they said.'

tsheni   o   'ai   khep-i   bo   the
then   DEM.PROX grandmother   FOC-GEN   son one

nawal   wenta   o   bo   khepo
COP.EXIS   COP.EQ.MIR   DEM.PROX   son   FOC

tshong-na   gi nawal   wenta
trade-LOC   go COP.EXIS   COP.EQ.MIR

'Then, that grandmother had a son, that son had gone for trade.'

tshemo tshe   tshong-na   ge   ngak-si   ...   tshe   lok   ra-tak
but   DM   trade-LOC   go   do-NF   DM   return come-IPFV

wenta
COP.EQ.MIR

'But he had gone for trade and so he was coming back.'

bo   lok   ra-mo   tshe trong-ni   mi   gapo-i   wici
son   return come-CTM   DM   village-ABL person   FOC-ERG   2.GEN

'aiya   otor   mi   the   ra-zi   co   khot-si
grandmother   like.this   person one   come-NF   lie   tell-NF

'lam   Drukpa   Künle   wen   ngak   lap-si
lama   Drukpa   Künle   COP   QUOT   say-NF

tshe otor   me nang-o   dam   brek-shang
DM like.this house inside-LOC lock keep-PFV.EGO
'When the son came back then the people from the village said "your grandmother, a man like that came, telling lies, saying "I am Drukpa Künle" and like that she was locked inside the house.'

dam   brek-si   dasum ngâ-mo nen   drô ge-shang   da
lock   keep-NF   today do-CTM day   six go-PFV.EGO now
'Since being locked, today six days have gone.'
da   nei   hapta   the   phi-ra   ma-phi-ye
now   3.PL.ERG   week   one   open-EMPH NEG-open-IMP

ngak-ta   da   nen   drô ge-shang ...
do-IPFV.MIR now   day   six go-PFV.EGO
'Now, we, for one week, say "do not open the door at all". Now six days are gone.'

tshe   bo   'namisami tsikpa   za-zi
then   son   very   anger   become-NF

shui   …   mi   canglong ...
grrrr   person   crazy

'ê   wen   mutle   ra-zi
who   COP   COP.EQ.NEG.IND come-NF

otor   ngaci   'ai   sut-pal
like.this 1.GEN   grandmotherkill-PFV

wenta   ngaksi tshe
COP.EQ.MIR   QUOT   DM
'The the boy, becoming very angry says "grrr ... a crazy man ... who is no one, comes like that and killed my grandmother.'

tshe chösham   khepo hapta   the   ko
DM   alter.room FOC   week   one   door

ma-phi-ye   ngâ-khan   khepo   khî
NEG-open-IMP   do-NMLZR   FOC   3.ERG

ko   phis   thung-wal   wenta
door   open   do-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR
'So this alter room door that was said not be opened, he opened this door.'

ko   phis   thung   ge-mo   nang-o
door   open   do   go-CTM   inside-LOC

'namisami   ozi   drizang-gi   bri   sang
very   then   saffron.milk-GEN   smell   incense.type

thung-wal   pita   bri   lemtoka
do-PFV   like   smell   sweet

'nam-zi   otor
emit-NF   like.this

ne   tsha-sal   pita   yö   bar-zi   nâ-ri
sun   shine-PFV   like   shine burn-NF   COP.EXIS.MIR-HSY
'When he opened the door inside then there was a very sweet smell like saffron-milk incense coming out.'

tshe   udi-na
DM   DEM.DIST-LOC

palang-gi   ...   palang   nawal   wenta   palang-gi   jedo
bed-GEN   bed   COP.EXIS   COP.EQ.MIR   bed-GEN   top

thila   the   dar-na-ri,   tawa-i   thila   the
thumb   one   remain-PFV.MIR-HSY   leg-GEN   thumb   one
'And then, the bed's … there was a bed. On the top of the bed there was a thumb, a thumb of a foot (big toe).'

tshe   mapa   'ai   khepo   mira
DM   originally grandmother   FOC   others

se-mal   khepo 'lama-gi   bran 'lama-gi
die-NMLZR   FOC   lama-ERG   know lama-ERG

bran-ci-ning   tshe   zhingkham-na
know-NMLZR-ABL   DM   heaven-LOC

drang-wal   wenta   khakto
give.HON-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR   DIR:UP
'So the lama knew that the old woman was actually going to die, and knowing she was going to die, the lama offered her up to heaven.'

zhingkham-na   drang-mo   tshe   traim   …   dutshot
heaven-LOC   give.HON-CTM   DM   time (<English)   time

ma-tshang-wala
NEG-complete-PFV
'At the time of being offered to heaven, the time hadn't been completed.'

tshe	dutshot	khepo	hapta	the	ko	ma-phi-ye
then	time	FOC	week	one	door	NEG-open-IMP

ngak	bre-mo	tshe	dutshot
QUOT	keep-CTM	DM	time

mat-shang-wa-na	ko	phis	thung-wal-i
NEG-complete-NMLZR-LOC	door	open	do -NMLZR-GEN

o	thila	khepo	tshe
DEM.PROX	thumb	FOC	DM

aaa ...	jayö	drena	ye-zi	ma-gi-wala	tshe
EXCL ...	rays	among	disappear-NF	NEG-go-PFV	DM

dar-wal   wenta
remain-PFV   COP.EQ.MIR
'Then the time "do not open the door for one week", while the time hadn't completed, in opening the door the big toe, aaaa, the big toe didn't disappear among the rays; it remained.'

tshe   otor-rang
DM   like.this-EMPH

tshe	o	khepo	mira	'lam	Drukpa	Künle
DM	DEM.PROX	FOC.SG	others	lama	Drukpa	Künle

jinlap-gi	ngak-si	'ai
blessing-GEN	do-NF	grandmother

khepo	thori-na	drang-wal-i	korni
FOC	godly.realm-LOC	give.hon-NMLZR-GEN	about

wenta	ngak	o	sung	khepo	mapa
COP.EQ.MIR	do	DEM.PROX	story	FOC	originally

wakti   wenta
this.much   COP.MIR
'And so just like this, all this, this story is about the blessing of Drukpa Künle offering the old woman up to the Godly realm; it's just this much.'

REFERENCES

Andvik, Erik. to appear. *A grammar of Tshangla*. Leiden: Brill.

Bossong, Georg. 1991. Differential object marking in Romance and beyond. In D. Kibee and D. Wanner (eds.), *New analyses in Romance linguistics*, 143-170. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Chafe, Wallace. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. In Charles Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 25-55. New York: Academic Press.

Chelliah, Shobhana. 1997. *A grammar of Meithei*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Comrie, Bernard. 1975. Antiergative. In R.E. Grossman, L.J. San, and T.J. Vance (eds.), *Papers from the 11th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 112-121. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1978. Ergativity. In Winfred Lehmann (ed.), *Syntactic typology*, 329-94. Austin: University of Texas Press.

DeLancey, Scott. 1985. On active typology and the nature of agentivity. In Frans Plank (ed.), *Relational typology (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 28)*, 47-107. Berlin: Mouton.

Dik, Simon C., Maria E. Hoffman, Jan R. de Long, Sie Ing Djiang, Harry Stroomer, and Lourens Devries. 1981. On the typology of focus phenomena. In Teun Hoekstra, Harry van der Hulst, and Michael Moortgat (eds.), *Perspectives of functional grammar,* 41-74. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1972. *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1979 Ergativity. *Language* 55: 59-138.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Driem, George van. 1995. *Een eerste grammaticale verkenning van het Bumthang, een tal van Midden-Bhutan, met een overzicht van der talen en volkeren van Bhutan*. Leiden: Centrum voor Niet-Westerse Studiën.

Driem, George van. 1998. *Dzongkha*. Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region, Vol. 1. Leiden: Research School CNWS.

Driem, George van. 2001. *Languages of the Himalayas*, Volume 1-2. Leiden: Brill.

Fabricus, Otho. 1801/1791. *Forsøg til en forbedret grønlandsk grammatika*. Copenhagen: E.F. Sehnsart.

Genetti, Carol. 1988. A syntactic correlate of topicality in Newari narrative. In John Haiman and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, 29-40. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Givón, T. 2001. *Syntax: an introduction*, Volumes 1-2. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Huber, Brigitte. 2005. *The Tibetan dialect of Lende (Kyirong)*. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag BmbH.

Hyslop, Gwendolyn. In prep. *A gramar of Kurtöp*. Eugene: University of Oregon, PhD Dissertation.

Hyslop, Gwendolyn. 2009. Kurtöp tone: A tonogenetic case study. *Lingua* 112: 825-827.

Hyslop, Gwendolyn. 2008. Kurtöp phonology in the context of Northeast India. In Stephen Morey and Mark Post (eds.), *Indian linguistics: Papers from the First International Conference of the North East Indian Linguistic Society (NEILS)*, 3-25. New Delhi: Foundation/Cambridge University Press.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LaPolla, Randy J. 1992. 'Anti-ergative' in Tibeto-Burman. *LTBA* 15(1): 1-9.

LaPolla, Randy J. 1995. 'Ergative' marking in Tibeto-Burman. In Yoshio Nishi, James Matisoff and Yasuhiko Nagano (eds.), *New horizons in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax (Senri ethnological studies 41)*, 189-228. Osaka: National museum of ethnology.

Lowes, Gwendolyn. 2006. Kurtoep phonetics and phonology. Eugene: University of Oregon, Master's thesis.

Lu, Shaozun 陆绍尊. 1986. *Cuona Menba-yu jianzhi* 错那门巴语简志 *(A brief description of Cuona Monba)*. Beijing: Mínzú Chúbǎnshè.

McGregor, William. 2009. Typology of ergativity. *Language and linguistic compass* 3(1): 480-508.

Payne, Thomas. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Payne, Thomas. 2006. *Exploring language structure: A student's guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poornima, Shakthi. 2009. The role of ergative case assignment in discourse. Paper presented at the 28th South Asian Languages Analysis Roundtable, University of North Texas, Denton, TX.

Saxena, Anju. ms. Optional ergative as a discourse marker in Himalayan languages.

Shafer, Robert. 1954. The linguistic position of Dwags. *Oriens* 7: 348-356.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1895. Über den passiven Charakter des Transitivs in den kaukasischen Sprachen. *Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse*, vol. 133, 1-91. Vienna.

Threlkeld, Lancelot. 1834. *An Australian grammar, comprehending the principles and natural rules of the language, as spoken by the Aborigines in the vicinity of Hunter's River, Lake Macquarie, &c. New South Wales*. Sydney: Stephens and Stokes.

Tournarde, Nicolas. 1991. The rhetorical use of the Tibetan ergative. *LTBA* 14(1): 93-107.

Watters, John. 1979. Focus in Aghem: a study of its formal correlates and typology. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), Aghem grammatical structure, 137-197. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Willis, Christina. 2007. A descriptive grammar of Darma, an endangered Tibeto-Burman language. Austin: University of Texas, PhD dissertation.

Zhang Jichuan 张济川. 1986. *Cangluo Menbayu jianzhi* 仓洛门巴语简志 *(A brief description of the Tsangla Monba language)*. Beijing: Nationalities Press.